From: Bausch, Carl (FTA)
To: Borinsky, Susan (FTA)
CC: VanWyk, Christopher (FTA); Zelasko, Elizabeth (FTA)
Sent: 5/19/2010 1:02:25 AM
Subject: NEXT STEPS FOR HONOLULU...

Susan -

I've given a good deal of thought to the situation in which we finds ourselves. Chris and Liz and the team have worked very hard to find the "holes" in the City's process/document (and there are a great many--certainly many more than we anticipated). We will complete our critique this afternoon and be prepared to return the documents to the City with instructions. I believe we should do just that this afternoon or early tomorrow and schedule a call with the City tomorrow at 2 o'clock our time to make certain the City understands where it fell down and what it must do; we should put the onus back on the City. The Administrator reminded everybody that FAA went out of its way to accommodate our schedule and we (well, Headquarters staff) are doing our best to stick to it. I think we should press ahead. I realize that Toru and the Mayor may be a little upset; that's too bad. Before the Mayor has an opportunity to call the Administrator and complain, we can brief the Administrator regarding where matters stand; the Administrator can then remind the Mayor, should he call, that he advised the Mayor at our last face-to-face get-together that meeting a tight schedule is going to require sacrifice on everybody's part--we've done our part, now it's the City's turn.

What do you think of this approach? Thanks. Carl

From: Zelasko, Elizabeth (FTA)
Sent: Tue 5/18/2010 5:54 PM
To: Bausch, Carl (FTA); Borinsky, Susan (FTA); VanWyk, Christopher (FTA); Matley, Ted (FTA); Sukys, Raymond (FTA)
Subject: FW: draft email

FYI.

I did speak to Elaine. While I was on the phone with her, Faith forwarded me the email that she sent to the consulting parties. I think FTA should respond or comment to inform the consulting parties on how we responded to the NPS's questions. I think it is fairly easy to respond to the Section 106 questions. The Section 4(f) would be tougher because the NPS reviewed an old draft and Chris has a number of comments on the current draft. My inclination is to respond with the Section 106 information, say that there was a lot of discussion between NPS and FTA on the Section 4(f) comments, the NPS had reviewed an old version of the chapter, and that we are working on revising that current version of the chapter and it will reflect the discussion we had with the NPS.

I do not want to sound secretive, but I think it would just be really confusing to delve into those issues with the consulting parties.

Liz

-----Original Message-----
From: Zelasko, Elizabeth (FTA)
Sent: Tuesday, May 18, 2010 5:42 PM
To: 'Miyamoto, Faith'
Subject: RE: draft email

Thank you, Faith. Elaine called and left a message a bit before sending out the email, but I was not able to talk to her before she forwarded the comments. I would have requested that she let FTA send out the NPSs comments so that we could include revised responses to their questions to reflect our conversation. I would still like to send out an email to respond, but I need some time to look at the responses.

If I sent the responses out now as they are written, I just think it would lead to confusion among the consulting parties.

We are still working hard on reviewing the administrative FEIS. We will send you comments as soon as we can.

Thank you!

Liz

-----Original Message-----
From: Miyamoto, Faith [mailto:fmiyamoto@honolulu.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 18, 2010 5:00 PM
To: Hogan, Steven; Spurgeon, Lawrence; Zelasko, Elizabeth (FTA); foell@pbworld.com
Subject: FW: draft email

Hi Everyone -

Since you were not on the email list, forwarding you this message for
your information.

Faith

-----Original Message-----
From: Elaine_Jackson-Retondo@nps.gov
[mailto:Elaine_Jackson-Retondo@nps.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 18, 2010 10:54 AM
To: kiersten@historichawaii.org; elizabeth_merritt@nthp.org
Cc: bsemmer@achp.gov; deepak@hcdaweb.org; keolal@oha.org;
malamapono@aol.com; lani@aukahi.com; brian_turner@nthp.org;
jeff@jn-architects.com; amy@aiahonolulu.org; aspencer@hawaii.edu;
katie@historichawaii.org; chazinhawaii@aol.com;
sherry_campagna@hotmail.com; frank_hays@nps.gov;
elaine_jackson-retondo@nps.gov; Melia_Lane-Kamahele@nps.gov;
taahine.hina@gmail.com; keabad@ksbe.edu; kawikam@hawaii.rr.com;
Pua.Aiu@hawaii.gov; Nancy.A.McMahon@hawaii.gov;
susan.y.tasaki@hawaii.gov; john.muraoka@navy.mil;
pamela.takara@navy.mil; Ware, Terrance; mmcdermott@culturalsurveys.com;
arakimataemon@aol.com; halealoha@wave.hicv.net; Ted.Matley@dot.gov;
Raymond.Sukys@dot.gov; Leslie.Rogers@dot.gov; Miyamoto, Faith;
Aranda@infraconsultllc.com; zaref@pbworld.com; Edward.Carranza@dot.gov;
Carl.Bausch1111@dot.gov
Subject: Fw: draft email

Kiersten & Betsy,

Per you request, I am forwarding you and the other consulting parties
NPS
comments on the draft final PA and preliminary comments on the October
2009
revised administrative draft 4(f) evaluation that NPS sent to FTA 2
weeks
ago. FTA already has responded to some of our comments; however, I will
defer to FTA for distribution of their response.

Elaine

Elaine Jackson-Retondo, Ph.D.
National Register & National Historic Landmarks Program
National Park Service . Pacific West Regional Office

1111 Jackson Street, Suite 700 . Oakland, CA 94607-4807
510 817 1428 (v) . 510 817 1484 (f)
----- Forwarded by Elaine Jackson-Retondo/OAKLAND/NPS on 05/18/2010
01:25
PM -----

Elaine

Jackson-Retondo/O

AKLAND/NPS

To

elizabeth.zelasko@dot.gov

04/30/2010 07:47

cc

AM Ted.Matley@dot.gov, Jeffrey

Durbin/WASO/NPS@NPS,

Deborah.Bardwick@exchange.sol.doi.g

ov, Frank Hays/Honolulu/NPS@NPS,

Melia

Lane-Kamahele/Honolulu/NPS@NPS,

Stephanie Toothman/Seattle/NPS

Subject

Fw: draft email

Liz,

I am forwarding you questions and comments about the Honolulu High Capacity
Transit Corridor draft final PA and preliminary comments on the administrative copy of the revised 4(f) document. These comments and questions are from the regional office in our capacity as an invited signatory to the PA and in our role in the 4(f) process.

The majority of our comments and questions reiterate questions we have previously asked during the consultation that remain unanswered and questions that arise from the partial realignment near the airport. We have also included a few comments/questions about what appear to be errors,
omissions, or inconsistencies in the documents that should be reconciled prior to issuance of the final documents. If you have any questions, please email me or we can schedule a time to talk.

Regards,
Elaine

PA -General Issues:
We remain concerned about the City's and FTA's response to the OIBCs concerns about whether the timing of the phased archeological inventory adequately protects the possibility of avoiding burials, if the OIBC determines that encountered fields of burials must remain in situ. Under Identification and Protection of Archeological Sites

and
Burials III.B.4, avoidance is limited to " . . . relocation of columns, change of column design to or from a center alignment to straddle bent or other alternatively-supported design, modification of span length, and alternate utility locations" - realignment is not included as an avoidance measure. How is this resolved, if there is a large field of burials, since the area where there are known burials is in phase IV and the survey would occur after the other three construction phases are well underway or complete? This question also applies to Burial Treatment under III.E.2.b.

The OIBC has consistently expressed these concerns and NPS has expressed concerns regarding this issue in at least two sets of correspondence, September 24, 2009 and October 19, 2009 and during consultation conference calls. We strongly recommend that The City and FTA take the concerns of the OIBC seriously.

We suggest adding the following clause to the PA: Although this agreement appears to meet the technical requirements of Section 106, it does not fully take into account the intent of Section 106.

There are more than a dozen 30-day reviews identified in the PA. This does not include instances where more than one report may be sent as part a of 30-day review submission. We suggest that the City develop a schedule to coordinate these reviews so that consulting parties are not simultaneously reviewing multiple submissions from this one PA or at least a provision that will accommodate a request for additional review time? This is not a new request from NPS; we reiterated this suggestion in our October 19 correspondence.

PA- Adverse Affects:

We have not received a revised Historic Effects Report that reflects the revised findings of adverse effect that are addressed in the PA. The number of adversely effected properties has increased from 5 to 22 then, from 22 to 33. NPS raised this question during the consultations meetings in Sept. 2009.

Apparent Omission- Little Makalapa is included in the Historic Effects document and the first draft 4(f) document, but not in the current PA or revised administrative draft 4(f). It is a historic property within the APE. Also, it is not clear how it is that there is an adverse effect to Makalapa and No Adverse Effect to Little Makalapa. They are right beside one another in a linear fashion adjacent to the guideway and well within the APE. Is there a revised site plan for this area?

Apparent Omission and Inconsistency- It is unclear why Boulevard Saiman is identified as a direct use 4(f) historic property and it is not listed as an adversely effected property in The PA. If it is a historic property 4(f) property with a direct use, then it should be included in the PA as property with an adverse effect.

Apparent Omission- Kamehameha Highway Bridge over Halawa Stream is identified in the 4(F) discussion (page 5-63) of visual effects as incurring moderate to significant high level visual impacts. The bridge is identified in the April 14, Historic Effects Report as eligible for listing on the NRHP and with a No Adverse Effect determination, yet the 4(f) indicates significant visual impacts. This would seem to constitute an adverse effect and therefore would be listed in the PA. The bridge also is not included as a 4(f) property in the table (Table 5-2) of 4(f) properties in the 4(f) chapter and should be included.

PA-Stipulations:

The HABS HAER HALS documentation stipulation V.C should state that documentation will be completed and submitted prior to commencement of the project or the phase in which a historic property is located. As currently written, the document could be submitted after resource is impacted, which does not allow for additional field work or photographs if needed after draft review of the reports. This comment is not new. The suggested language that we are requesting was included in our September 25, 2009 comments on the draft PA.

Also, 30 days is not enough time to review multiple HHH submissions; a 30-day window also does not take into consideration for what else is in our queue for review request a minimum of 60 days.

We suggest the following changes to Section III.D:

> Treatment Plans-Based on the results of the AIS fieldwork and in consultation with the SHPD, the City shall develop a specific treatment plan to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects to archaeological sites and burials pursuant to the applicable state laws, including Hawai'i Revised Statutes, Chapter 6E and HAR, Title 13, Subtitle 13, Chapter 300, for each all construction phase phases. Treatment plans shall be submitted to the SHPD for approval. Upon approval by the SHPD, the City shall implement the treatment plan.

4(f) -Least Harm Alternative

Is the Airport Route, with the new alignment around the airport, still the least harm alternative compared to the Salt Lake Route? There are more displaced businesses; however no longer a direct use of Ke'ehi Lagoon Park. The alignment at the airport that is now the new alignment was dismissed as an avoidance measure in the administrative draft 4(f) because it required 15 full and 21

partial
acquisitions of commercial properties , as well as a
double-stacked
guideway and an additional cost of $75,000,000 (2007 dollars).
The
analysis will need to be revised both because of the realignment
and
due to the following omissions and errors:

Apparent Omission and Error- The Impacts to Section 4(f) Resource
section of the 4(f) chapter includes the following statement and
assessment:

-The Airport Alternative was also determined to have adverse
Section 106 effects related to setting and feeling at five
historic resources (U.S. Naval Base Pearl Harbor National
Historic Landmark, CINCPACFLT Headquarters National Historic
Landmark, Potential Makalapa Navy Housing, Historic
District,
Ossipoff's Aloha Chapel, and the Hawai'i Employers
Council).
The constructive use evaluation, described in Section 5.6,
however, determined that none of these Section 4(f)
properties
will experience impairment severe enough to constitute
constructive use from the Project.

and

-The Visual Effects section of the 4(f) chapter only mentions
visual effects to Pearl Harbor, Kamehameha Highway Bridge
and
Ke'ehi Lagoon Beach Park.

There were 33 identified adverse effects and 20 of these
properties were evaluated for constructive use due to visual
impacts and impacts to the setting, feeling and association.
The
analysis in the two aforementioned sections omits most of these
impacts when comparing the Airport alignment with the Salt Lake
alignment.

The Impacts to Section 4(f) Resources section of the 4(f) evaluation
includes the statement:

In a letter dated September 8, 2008, the State Department of
Accounting and General Services considered both alignments and
indicated a preference for the Airport Alternative (Project),
noting that "the impact on the stadium would be further
mitigated
if the system ran past the airport ..."

This evaluation was based on an earlier assessment of adverse
effects
that amounted to approximately 5 properties and now the number of
adverse effects is 33. It is not clear whether the AGS has made a
new
assessment. If a new assessment has not been made of the revised
alignment and in consideration of the increase in adversely
affected
properties, NPS requests FTA to omit this statement or request a
new
evaluation from the AGS.

Apparent Error - Some properties that are identified as individual
historic properties in the Historic Effects Document are grouped
in
the 4(f) chapter with a single direct use for both properties,
when
it should be two instances of direct use - This is the case for
the

Oahu Railway & Land Company Terminal Building and the Oahu Railway & Land Company Office/Document Storage Building and it may be the case for the Oahu Railway & Land Company basalt paving blocks and the Oahu Railway & Land Company former filling station. If some of these resources constitute a district, then they should be identified as such and the use should be evaluated for the district as well.

4(f) - NR status of historic properties

Apparent Error - There are a few properties identified in the 4(f) document as eligible for listing on the NRHP that are actually listed on the NRHP. This is the case for the Merchant Street Historic District, Aloha Tower, and Dillingham Transportation Building. The text should be revised to state that the properties are listed on the NRHP.

4(f) - constructive use analysis

Apparent Inconsistency- The 4(f) document includes a statement about how districts are treated under 4(f) analysis.

> "The FHWA Section 4(f) policy paper suggests that if a project has a Section 106 Finding of Adverse Effect on a historic district, as is the case here, the district and each contributing element should be considered for Section 4(f) use." (p. 5-34)

Does this mean that use is assessed for both the district as a whole and for each of the contributing resources? Either way there seems to be an inconsistency in how use is evaluated when the resource is a district.

The constructive use evaluation for the impact to historic bridges seems inadequate. As described in the documentation, the guideway will run parallel and above some historic bridges (Honouliuli Stream Bridge, Waikele Stream Bridge Eastbound Span and Bridge over OR&L SpurWaiawa Stream Bridge 1932 (westbound), Waimalu Stream Bridge, Kalauaa Springs Bridge, and Kalauaa Stream Bridge); however, the constructive use evaluation states the following in every case: "As the primary views of the bridge are from ground level, the elevated guideway will not eliminate primary views of this architecturally significant historic bridge nor alter its relationship to the existing transportation corridor." There are some plans in other chapters of DSEIS however, no plans or simulations are provided in the 4(f) to substantiate the assessment.

Similar questions arise regarding the constructive use analysis for the Institute for Human Services/Tamura Building. The Iwilei Station is with twenty feet of the Tamura Building, which has

been
identified as architecturally significant under Criterion C.

The FHWA Section 4(f) policy paper seems to suggest that there is precedent for finding constructive use in the case of the Tamura Building and perhaps in the case of some of the bridges.

4(f) -Miscellaneous

P5-18 Agency Coordination and Consultation 2nd column line 5:
The following is not an accurate statement: " . . . a Programmatic Agreement (PA) has been developed with the concurrence of all consulting agencies . . ."

P5-34 second paragraph
(This paragraph discusses the deminimis justification for direct use in Chinatown District). The following excerpt does not seem to be an accurate assessment of the impact and therefore does not support the deminimis finding:

> The 30- to 42-foot-high guideway will be placed in front of contributing pier buildings along the waterfront (Figure 5-25).
> It will pass between these elements and the harbor. The primary view of these structures is from a ground-level perspective from the mauka side of Kamehameha Highway, six lanes removed from the structures. Thus, the guideway and station will be behind and above the viewer and will not block or obstruct primary views of any architecturally significant buildings or substantially impair the characteristics of its National Register eligibility.

The next paragraph goes on to state that the:

> The district's NRHP eligibility is based on the relationship between the district's elements and Honolulu Harbor (as well as the architecture). The Project will not substantially impair that physical connection to the waterfront. However, it will be a dominant visual element contrasting in scale with the pedestrian environment and substantially changing makai views of Honolulu Harbor from Chinatown.

It seems that this last excerpt contradicts a deminimis finding. I have included the map below to show how the line goes through Chinatown District.

(Embedded image moved to file: pic04664.jpg)

P 5-42 thru 5-43 Regarding Noise:
Is it an overstatement that there will be no noise impacts for West Loch Golf Course, Neal S. Blaisdell Park, and Aiea Bay State Recreation Area?

P5-49 under US Naval Base Pearl Harbor NHL:
Apparent Omission - The Bowfin is a NHL and the USS Arizona is a NHL.

P 5-50 under US Naval Base Pearl Harbor NHL:

We have earlier requested that the following statement be omitted since it is from an outdated nomination that has been replaced:

> The NHL nomination specifically states that the national significance of Pearl Harbor stems from its continuing function rather than its physical facilities and those physical changes required to support this mission are "necessary, normal, and expected

In our May 10, 2010 letter, NPS provided extensive comment on the use of this phrase in the historic effects document

P. 5-63 Visual Effects

Apparent Error-The first paragraph includes the following statement:

> With the Airport Alternative, views of East Loch and the Pearl Harbor National Historic Landmark makai of the alignment will be partially obstructed by the guideway and columns in the residential area near Kohomua Street. The visual integrity of the national historic landmark will not be adversely affected, and the project elements will barely be visible in mauka views from the harbor (see Figure 4-42 in Chapter 4 of this Final EIS).

The adverse effect on the NHL is visual, so it is not clear why this statement is included here.

Elaine Jackson-Retondo, Ph.D.
National Register & National Historic Landmarks Program
National Park Service . Pacific West Regional Office

1111 Jackson Street, Suite 700 . Oakland, CA 94607-4807
510 817 1428 (v) . 510 817 1484 (f)