



United States Department of the Interior

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Pacific West Region
1111 Jackson Street, Suite 700
Oakland, California 94607-4807



IN REPLY REFER TO:

H34 (PWR-CR)

December 6, 2010

Ms. Elizabeth Zelasko
Federal Preservation Officer
Federal Transit Administration, E45-340
1200 New Jersey Ave. SE
Washington, DC 20590

Dear Ms. Zelasko:

This letter is a response to the November 5, 2010, draft programmatic agreement for the Honolulu High Capacity Transit Corridor (HHCTC) project that was distributed via an email sent by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) on November 19, 2010. It is in our capacity of monitoring National Historic Landmark (NHL) properties, providing technical assistance to NHL owners, and as the manager and steward of Valor in the Pacific National Monument that we have participated in this consultation.

Congress has delegated to the National Park Service monitoring and technical assistance responsibilities to ensure that National Historic Landmarks retain the highest degree of integrity possible. These monitoring responsibilities are carried out by NPS staff in our regional offices. Five NHLs are located within, adjacent to, or in close proximity to the Honolulu High Capacity Transit Corridor Project – Pearl Harbor NHL, Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet (CINPAC) NHL, the USS Bowfin NHL, USS Arizona NHL and the USS Utah NHL. Additionally, the Area of Potential Effect for the HHCTC includes a portion of the World War II Valor in the Pacific National Monument, a unit of the National Park System.

The National Park Service continues to support the concept of a transit system with a primary or alternate route that includes a station with convenient access to the WWII Valor in the Pacific National Monument, which receives over 1.5 million visitors annually. We look forward to our continued participation in the Section 106 consultation.

Over the course of the last year, National Park Service staff has participated in a series of conference calls organized by FTA for the signatory and invited signatories to further discuss the draft programmatic agreement for the HHCTC. During this time, NPS has offered comments as a call participant and via email; we also have encouraged FTA to further engage the other consulting parties. The ongoing consultation has been productive and has resulted in changes



that improve the resolution of adverse effects to historic properties; nonetheless, NPS remains concerned that FTA's efforts to address the Oahu Island Burial Council's (OIBC) concerns with the phased approach to the archeological inventory survey has failed to produce a solution that is acceptable to the OIBC.

The NPS offers the following additional comments for FTA's consideration as you move forward in the consultation process:

- The Historic Effects Document should be updated to include all 33 properties identified in the Programmatic Agreement as properties adversely effected by the undertaking. The nature of the adverse effect to each property should be included in the updated document. Documenting the baseline of the identified adverse effects is a necessary precursor to Stipulation XII.A of the draft PA, which states:

Post-review discoveries are not anticipated for built historic properties. Notwithstanding, the City agrees to cease all work in the vicinity of the discovery should an unanticipated adverse effect on a built historic property be found during construction.

Absent a baseline document that describes the anticipated adverse effect to a property it will be nearly impossible to determine whether or not the nature or intensity of the adverse effect was anticipated.

- Questions about the boundary of the Makalapa Historic District(s) and the assessment of adverse effect to the property(ies) continue to be posed by consulting parties. NPS believes there is still a need for clarification on these questions. The record is somewhat unclear regarding the boundary of the district(s). There seem to be two issues that need resolution:
 1. The first question is whether there is a single Makalapa historic district that encompasses both Little Makalapa and Big Makalapa or whether the two areas constitute separate unrelated historic districts/properties. A January 2008 letter that was shared by the Navy during the Pearl Harbor Preservation meetings in November suggests that the Makalapa Historic District is a single district with Little Makalapa and Big Makalapa constituting areas within the district, which is how the area has been documented in the Navy's Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan. However, the Historic Effects document addresses the two areas as separate districts, with the green area where a rail station is planned to be located, carved out and excluded from either district.
 2. If Little Makalapa and Big Makalapa have been evaluated as separate historic districts with the area between them outside the boundary of either district, why the departure from the 2008 ICRMP and the 2008 draft CLR?

While updating the Historic Effects document, FTA has an opportunity to resolve these questions. We recommend that the update to the Historic Effects document include a clear delineation of the Makalapa Historic District(s). If Makalapa is evaluated as two separate districts, a clear explanation grounded in National Register criteria and guidelines of why the eligibility assessment for this project departs from the 2008 ICRMP and the 2008 draft Cultural Landscape Report also should be included in the



Historic Effects document. We believe that this information would provide everyone who is participating in this consultation, currently and in the future, with sufficient information and hopefully a clear understanding from which to move forward and to assess whether adverse effects have been adequately identified and resolved.

- Navy Region Hawaii was recently added as a signatory to the PA; however, the Navy has not, to our knowledge participated in the consultation thus far and the role and responsibilities of the Navy are not defined in the agreement document. The Navy's role and responsibilities need to be clearly identified and stated in the PA per the ACHP's comments on this matter in their December 3, 2010 letter.
- The addition of a Kako'o (PA project manager) should greatly benefit implementation of the programmatic agreement. In accordance with the draft PA, the Kako'o is an entity with "independent monitoring, reporting, and advisory role" (Section I.G. Nov8 Draft PA). Are there adequate parameters contained within the PA to help ensure that the Kako'o will have the independence necessary to carry out their responsibilities and to eliminate potential conflict of interests?
- All appendices to the PA need to contain complete, accurate, consistent and up-to-date information. The maps need to be revised to:
 - eliminate project elements/alignments that are not part of the subject undertaking,
 - ensure that the maps are presented at the same scale,
 - accurately show the alignment of the guideway and station locations
 - show the limits of the APE on each map.

We look forward to our continued participation in the Section 106 consultation. If you have any questions please call or email Frank Hays, Pacific Area Director (808-541-2693 ext 723; frank_hays@nps.gov), or Elaine Jackson-Retondo, Pacific West Region, NHL Program Manager (510 817 1428; elaine_jackson-retondo@nps.gov).

Sincerely,



Christine S. Lehnertz
Director, Pacific West Region

cc:

Leslie Rogers, Regional Administrator, Federal Transit Administration Region IX, 201 Mission St. Suite 1650, San Francisco, CA 94105-1839
Patty Neubacker, Deputy Regional Director, Pacific West Region
Frank Hays, Pacific Area Director, Honolulu
Paul Deprey, Superintendent, World War II Valor in the Pacific

