From: Zaref, Amy
To: Zelasko, Elizabeth (FTA); Bausch, Carl (FTA)
CC: Hogan, Steven; Judy Aranda; Miyamoto, Faith; Souki, Jesse K.
Sent: 6/6/2010 8:49:21 PM
Subject: Administrative Final EIS Preface for FTA review and response to Liz's question number 5
Attachments: Preface to FTA 060610.doc

Hi, I hope that you all had a good weekend. Attached is the preface for your review. To expedite the FEIS review process we are sending you a word version and we will be putting this into our design program on Monday. The yellow highlighted text are the revisions based on your review comments (matrix comments 15, 16, 17). Please note that the text related to FAA was provided to us by FAA and is included verbatim.

Response to Question Number 5 (Liz 6/3/2010):
In reviewing the letter sent by Outdoor Circle, we noted that the commenter did not ask specifically about historic trees. We re-worded the comment response and an explanation is provided in the letter (letters are in a separate email).

The sentence about coordination with HDOT is in the Final EIS on page 4-176 and is now in the mitigation summary table. To tie the mitigation to the PA the second sentence in red has been added to page 4-176. Both of these sentences in red are now in the mitigation summary table.

T-2 from the Summary of Mitigation Commitments now says, "Existing street trees will be transplanted or new trees will be planted. Street tree pruning, removal, and planting will comply with City and County ordinances and requires supervision by a certified arborist. The City will coordinate with the State of Hawaii Department of Transportation landscape architect. The City will coordinate with SHPD for the removal of the group of 28 true kamani trees on the makai side of Dillingham Boulevard in accordance with the PA."

Please let us know if you have any comments or questions regarding this response or the Preface.

Thanks,
Amy

Amy Zaref, AICP
Parsons Brinckerhoff
801-201-2670
zaref@pbworld.com

From: Miyamoto, Faith [mailto:fmiyamoto@honolulu.gov]
Sent: Saturday, June 05, 2010 9:49 AM
To: elizabeth.zelasko@dot.gov; Carl.Bausch1111@dot.gov
Cc: Zaref, Amy; Hogan, Steven; Judy Aranda
Subject: FW: Admin FEIS Items

Hi Liz and Carl –

I have responded to your comments in your email.

Any schedule on when we will receive comments on the FEIS text?

Also, attached is the List of Preparers that we currently have in the FEIS. Please review and provide me with any updates as soon as possible.

Amy will send you a status report on the letters.

Thanks.

Faith

From: elizabeth.zelasko@dot.gov [mailto:elizabeth.zelasko@dot.gov]
Sent: Thursday, June 03, 2010 12:36 PM
To: Miyamoto, Faith; Zaref@pbworld.com
Cc: Carl.Bausch1111@dot.gov
Subject: Admin FEIS Items

Hello Faith and Amy,

I wanted pass on some additional comments on the document before I lose track of them.

(1) We have not received the preface of the administrative FEIS. We had concerns about the language in that text and would like to see a revision soon. You should receive the preface by the time you get into the office on Monday.
(2) FTA has also not yet received the addendums to the technical reports. Could you send those to use today? CDs with the technical reports were sent by FedEx yesterday (June 4, 2010).
(3) Chris is reviewing the Section 4(f) chapter. However, one item that I did not see mentioned in the write up on the Veterans Memorial was a discussion of vegetation removal at that site. Ray Sukys recalls being told that trees would need to be removed. The 4(f) discussion should mention the tree removal. I sent his comments on earlier this afternoon. Tree removal will be discussed in Section 4(f) chapter.
(4) We have been reviewing the mitigation table. We anticipate that this table would accompany any future ROD for the project. We would like the table to include the mitigation that would be included in the design criteria guidelines. For example, there is additional text at the end of the Visual Resources Chapter that is mitigation, but it is not in the mitigation table. Please clarify, "Should the mitigation table in the FEIS include the design criteria mitigation?"
(5) In reviewing the Outdoor Circle Comment letter, I noticed that language in the mitigation table on trees, T-1 through T-3, is not as specific as included in the PA. The letter also referenced consulting with the HDOT landscape architect for the project. It did not seem to be consistence with the mitigation table's related mitigation on Page 4. We will check on this.

In response to your comments on the letters.

I went ahead and accepted the changes on the Servco letter. Please see comments that need some more explanation.

The letters with TCC review were sent prematurely by me. We hope to have additional comments to you on that letter by tomorrow morning.

We found the Dale Evans, K Kupukaa, K Faulker, the Matson letters are fine. I will take a look the Native Hawaiian Legal over the weekend and get other folks to assist with reviewing the letters you sent this morning.

PA

Below is a summary of a discussion I had with Pua this afternoon on the PA. These are the concerns she mentioned.

(1) In reviewing the provisions on Historic Districts, the language in the PA relies on a City zoning "overlay districts" to preserve individual groupings of historic and cultural resources through the application of architectural and other design guidelines and standards for developments surrounding them. Overlay districts already established include Chinatwon, Merchant Street, and the Hawaii Capital civic center areas. This language is included in a whereas clause on page 4. However, the TOD zoning ordinance has language that it overrides any other zoning ordinance. The SHPO is concerned that the TOD zoning ordinance removes protections to the historic districts afforded through the zoning overlays.

(2) The SHPO also has some concerns about reinternment responsibilities for discoveries of Native Hawaiian burials. In the PA there are three options for deciding how to mitigate the disturbance of Native Hawaiian burials. First, the burial could remain in place and the column would be relocated. Second the burial could be reintered within the project boundaries near where the burial was discovered or lastly, it could be reintered at a location offsite. What has happened in the past, that the SHPO is concerned about, is that the responsibility of

identifying a suitable location for a burial falls on the SHPD. The SHPO wants to make sure that the PA clearly identifies the City as having that responsibility with language along the lines that it is the City's responsibility to identify a relocation site that is acceptable to the OIBC. This language would need to be added to two sections of the PA; Stipulation III.D.2 and Stipulation XI.C.

(3) As discussed previously, the SHPO would like some assistance from the City with the workload/staffing issues associated with the PA. One proposal is establishing a Certified Local Government. Part of this is request is related to pressure from the SHPD being under review by the National Park Service

I will be out of the office tomorrow. Please call my cell at 202-841-4912 if you have any questions.

Liz

Elizabeth Zelasko
Federal Transit Administration
Office of Planning and Environment
elizabeth.zelasko@dot.gov
(202) 366-0244

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.