

---

**From:** Zelasko, Elizabeth (FTA)  
**To:** 'Miyamoto, Faith'; hogan@pbworld.com; foell@pbworld.com; Zaref, Amy; Judy Aranda; Souki, Jesse K.; vanepps@pbworld.com  
**CC:** Sukys, Raymond (FTA); Matley, Ted (FTA); Bausch, Carl (FTA); Zusman, Nancy-Ellen (FTA)  
**Sent:** 7/7/2010 8:18:09 AM  
**Subject:** RE: Response Comments to Thielen  
**Attachments:** Word Response File.doc

Faith,

Thank you for sending the draft ideas for responding to the SHPO's comments. Some of the responses are helpful while others, I do not agree with and need more information. I would appreciate having a conversation with you and some of your staff for a few minutes at some point before the call the call.

Liz

Comments:

With the first comment on the post-review archeological discoveries, I understand that the goal is to identify all potential impacts prior to construction. The response relays that intent and identifies the difference between the proposed rail project and the other projects that the SHPO identified to support her concern. I do not understand the harm in identifying in the PA a more specific post construction discovery procedure per the SHPO's request. If it is not ever used because the pre-construction process was very effective in identifying all potential effects, I think that is fine. Developing the language is something that could help us move forward in completing the PA. **Therefore, I would like the City to develop specific draft language that could be shared with the other signatories for inclusion in the PA. Today I can say that we are working on that language.**

I do not find the second response that the PA could be revised to reduce the requirements on the SHPO to be particularly helpful and I do not think that it is an option at this point.

Thank you for the information on the historic districts. To confirm, the SHPO provided suggested amendments to this section for additional language in the PA that sounded as if they would be acceptable by the City. These include:

- **The City is open to discussing providing contractors to perform the SHPO's PA review responsibilities.** To confirm, this could also be one of the approaches described in the example PAs, correct? Such as hiring a contractor to be a project conservator?
- **The City identified a need for an architectural historian to supervise the implementation of the PA in close cooperation with the SHPD.** This historian would be on the City staff and would supervise consultants performing the work.
- **Specify that the design standards for the transit facilities including stations within the Historic shall conform to the existing zoning and design criteria for these Districts with specific exceptions enumerated by the City. We recognize that the City will likely require some exceptions due to height restrictions and the like, and therefore can provide for specified exemptions in the PA.**
- **Require the two neighborhood design workshops for the transit facilities within the two Historic Districts include architectural renderings of proposed design shown in two or more view planes of the Districts.**
- **Provide the consulting parties with 90 days for review and comment on the preliminary and final plans for the transit facilities within the two Historic Districts.** However, in this bullet, we would request revision to say "if it occurs concurrently with the design process?"
- **City update the Chinatown Historic District National Register Nomination form.** --- This is already included in the PA under stipulation VI.C.
- **Comments on TOD ordinance.** The response says that clarification will be made to avoid misunderstanding. What is the clarification? Where is the clarification going to be made? In the PA or within the zoning ordinance?

There is disagreement on the following suggested amendments or they have already been addressed in other places.

- **City dedicate a separate fund for each of the Historic Districts.**

- **City dedicate a fund specifically for exterior improvements to historic structures within districts**
- **City create a Main Street Program for the historic districts.** This was discussed, but the mitigation fund and the formation of the associated committee to oversee its use with direct relationship to the Project effects were included instead.
- **City dedication of increased and sustained services to prevent, reduce, or remove the foreseeable impacts of homelessness....** This is already addressed in the EIS the Project safety and security plan and will provide funding (how much?) to maintain and enhance safety and security at the stations which will help prevent homeless use and vandalism. There are also special treatments and plants on columns to reduce vandalism.

-----Original Message-----

From: Miyamoto, Faith [mailto:fmiyamoto@honolulu.gov]

Sent: Wednesday, July 07, 2010 12:05 AM

To: Zelasko, Elizabeth (FTA); hogan@pbworld.com; foell@pbworld.com; Zaref, Amy; Judy Aranda; Souki, Jesse K.; vanepps@pbworld.com

Subject: FW: Response Comments to Thielen

Importance: High

Hi Liz -

Attached is a draft response to Laura Thielen's comments for internal use only. This is to provide you with some background as to the history of some of her comments.

Please call if you have any questions.

Faith

---

NOTICE: This communication and any attachments ("this message") may contain confidential information for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, disclosure, viewing, copying, alteration, dissemination or distribution of, or reliance on this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, or you are not an authorized recipient, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message, delete this message and all copies from your e-mail system and destroy any printed copies.