From: Zaref, Amy
To: elizabeth.zelasko@dot.gov
CC: Miyamoto, Faith; Hogan, Steven; Foell, Stephanie; Souki, Jesse K.; Ted.Matley@dot.gov; Raymond.Sukys@dot.gov; Renee.Marler@dot.gov; Christopher.VanWyk@dot.gov; Carl.Bausch1111@dot.gov; NancyEllen.Zusman@dot.gov; Aranda@infraconsultllc.com; Spurgeon, Lawrence; Zaref@pbworld.com
Sent: 5/10/2010 6:49:31 AM
Subject: HHCTCP -Responses to NPS - OIBC coordination and Bridge over Halawa Stream.
Attachments: 050810 Response to National Park Service Comments on Programmatic Agreement Revised OIBC.doc; Halawa Bridge Kam Hwy.jpg; OIBC-Process.doc

Hi Liz, Attached is a revised response related to the archeological inventory approach as you have requested. The next text is highlighted in yellow. We have also attached a separate summary of the City's coordination with OIBC throughout the process. Page 5 of this document includes additional information related to the archeological inventory approach.

In your email from Wednesday May 5, 2010 you asked about Kamehameha Highway Bridge over Halawa Stream. We have also attached a picture showing the construction on Kamehameha Highway which has changed the setting of this bridge.

We will be sending you additional information today in a separate email to address your other questions.

Please let us know if you have questions.

Amy

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

From: elizabeth.zelasko@dot.gov [mailto:elizabeth.zelasko@dot.gov]
Sent: Friday, May 07, 2010 6:47 AM
To: Zaref, Amy
Cc: fmiyamoto@honolulu.gov; Hogan, Steven; Foell, Stephanie; jsouki@honolulu.gov; Ted.Matley@dot.gov; Raymond.Sukys@dot.gov; Renee.Marler@dot.gov; Christopher.VanWyk@dot.gov; Carl.Bausch1111@dot.gov; NancyEllen.Zusman@dot.gov; Aranda@infraconsultllc.com
Subject: RE: HHCTCP - Revised responses to NPS

Thank you for sending the response based on our conversation on Wednesday. We had a very productive call and I really appreciated the detail and information that you provided on the City and FTA's consideration of the archeological surveys for Phase 4. In addressing the National Park Service's concerns (shared by many other consulting parties) I think we could go a long way by responding in writing in detail our consideration of the OIBC's concerns related to archeological surveys. If we respond thoughtfully now, then we will have a better relationship established for future work with the OIBC, National Park Service, and other consulting parties in implementing the PA.

As soon as you can provide it, I want an expanded response to the National Park Service's first comment on the phased archeological inventory approach. In our phone call on Wednesday, you described how your approach has changed to doing the archeological surveys in phase 4 after consultation this past fall. Rather than planning to start the survey work 2 to 3 years from now, I heard you mention that you are committed to starting immediately to give you

flexibility in making design change. This is in the programmatic agreement, but it would be helpful to see a to have some commentary on how that developed. It would not hurt quoting specific language in the PA to help emphasize the commitment.

It would be helpful to go into more detail as to why Phase 4 surveys would occur at a later point. Phase 4 is in a downtown urban area. Surveying that area would consist of removing pavement, using heavy machinery that would cause disruption to the downtown area and could potentially disturb potential iwi kupuna unnecessarily. Once the City is able to move forward on final design, could minimize the impact by only testing in the 10X10 foot areas where piers may be. The response should also mention the specific levels of flexibility that you have in avoiding the iwi kupuna.

These are suggestions on content from someone who has been outside of the process until recently. I may have misunderstood your description of the issues and concerns.

Thank you,

Liz

Sent: Thursday, May 06, 2010 1:23 PM
To: Zelasko, Elizabeth (FTA)
Cc: fmiyamoto@honolulu.gov; Hogan, Steven; Foell, Stephanie; jsouki@honolulu.gov; Matley, Ted (FTA); Sukys, Raymond (FTA); Marler, Renee (FTA); VanWyk, Christopher (FTA); Bausch, Carl (FTA); Zusman, Nancy-Ellen (FTA); Aranda@infraconsultllc.com; Zaref@pbworld.com
Subject: HHCTCP - Revised responses to NPS

Hi Liz, Attached is a word file of our revised the responses to National Park Services' comments on the Programmatic Agreement and the Section 4(f) Evaluation based on our telephone call yesterday. The new text is highlighted in yellow. We will be sending you the rest of the information that you requested in a separate transmittal.

Please let us know if you have questions or if we can provide you with anything else.

Amy

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

From: elizabeth.zelasko@dot.gov [mailto:elizabeth.zelasko@dot.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, May 05, 2010 8:43 AM
To: Aranda@infraconsultllc.com

Cc: fmiyamoto@honolulu.gov; Hogan, Steven; Foell, Stephanie; Zaref, Amy; jsouki@honolulu.gov; Ted.Matley@dot.gov; Raymond.Sukys@dot.gov; Renee.Marler@dot.gov; Christopher.VanWyk@dot.gov; Carl.Bausch1111@dot.gov; NancyEllen.Zusman@dot.gov
Subject: RE: HHCTCP Teleconference Call: 5/75

Hello Judy,

Please see a general agenda of topics we would like to address during our teleconference this morning/afternoon. Before we dive into the NPS comments, we would like to discuss other general items first. At the end we have some preliminary comments on our review of the administrative FEIS.

Liz

General Environmental Process

- Have there been any comments yet from the cooperating agencies on the document or the review process?
- Has the City heard from the SHPO regarding the concurrence on the determination of eligibility? Discussion of Programmatic Agreement.
- Concerns on the proposed test borings.

Response to Park Service Comments

- Would like to have a word document of the NPS comments and response.
- TCPs.
- AIS Phase 4
- Comment matrix that I found only included comments up to 10/31/09. Is there a later version of the comment matrix? Is there a reason why specific comments from the Historic Hawaii Foundation on November 5th, The National Trust on November 23rd, and the Navy on December 30th were not responded to or incorporated into the PA?
- Schedule of deliverables and reviews in the PA. The NPS has requested a schedule. The City did not provide one. FTA would like to see a schedule or a matrix listed out of deliverables and review time period. The deliverables do not need to have specific dates associated with them. Would like a general idea of what the review process is going to be.
- Page 3 of comments – Response to Apparent Omissions of the Kamehameha Highway Bridge over Halawa Stream. Would like more specific information from the City. How are the effects from the transit-way different for this bridge than other bridges including the Hono'uli'uli Stream bridge and the Waiawa Stream bridge 1932 (westbound lanes). Would like specific reference to the letter.
    - Remove the phrase "Please note that an adverse effect under Section 106 is not necessarily identical to a NEPA impact."
    - On Page 7, description of the bridges. Should provide links and page numbers of the plans for each of the bridges. FTA would like the engineering staff of the City to confirm that it is feasible to span the historic bridges without affecting the historic bridges. We will provide a new Section 4(f) chapter and there needs to be page numbers. This response to the NPS in this section is not adequate.
    - Renderings of the bridges in the photographs would be helpful in demonstrating that there is no constructive use.
- HABS HAER HALS documentation review 30-day review. Recommend moving to 60 days to appease the NPS.

- On page 3 of the comments, the response says that FTA has notified the ACHP and the SHPO of its intent to make a de minimis impact determination on the two historic properties – Boulevard Saimin and O'ahu Railway and Land Company Basalt Paving Blocks and Former Filing Station. Did the City receive a concurrence response from the ACHP and the SHPO?
- Page 9, the response to the question about noise. The Section 4(f) chapter should provide page numbers to reference back on the noise analysis.
- Comment on the Section 4(f) use discussion of the Chinatown historic district.
- Other questions.

General observations on the admin FEIS

- Mitigation measures on page II of the admin FEIS. The City needs to take out any language on a phase ROD approach.
- Should include meeting notes from the consulting party meetings in the Appendix. Some consulting parties provided comments on the meeting notes. Preferably the meeting notes included in the appendix should incorporate those comments or those comments be provided in the same section as the meeting notes.
- The Section 4(f) chapter is long and complex. Would be very helpful for the Table 5-2 to include a column of page numbers on where these resources are discussed in the Chapter.
- In reviewing the Section 4(f) chapter, a temporary use of the Pearl Harbor Historic district is mentioned. The section is unclear from the text as to what is being used and whether it is part of the historic district.
- Under the Hawaii Employers Council Building in both the Section 4(f) and Noise and Vibration section, the proximity of the alignment to the Employers Council building should be mentioned. Should mention that preliminary review does not indicate that there would be operational vibration concerns, however, there will be further study during Final Design for construction vibration concerns. Could mention mitigation committed to in the PA related to noise and vibration.

From: Judy Aranda [mailto:Aranda@infraconsultllc.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 04, 2010 1:11 PM
To: Zelasko, Elizabeth (FTA)
Cc: fmiyamoto@honolulu.gov; Hogan@pbworld.com; Foell@pbworld.com; Zaref@pbworld.com; jsouki@honolulu.gov; Matley, Ted (FTA); Sukys, Raymond (FTA); Marler, Renee (FTA); VanWyk, Christopher (FTA); Bausch, Carl (FTA); Zusman, Nancy-Ellen (FTA)
Subject: Re: HHCTCP Teleconference Call: 5/75

Great. I see the responses to NPS' was sent to you all in time for our call tomorrow at 3 pm EST.

Also, should I expect additional questions from you per your email below?
Thanks

Judy A. Aranda

On May 3, 2010, at 12:28 PM, "elizabeth.zelasko@dot.gov" <elizabeth.zelasko@dot.gov> wrote:

Judy,

That's alright. I understood that you meant this Wednesday. We would prefer to meet at 3 pm EST (9 am Honolulu) on Wednesday, May 5th. Would you be available at that time?
0
We can use our conference call line 1-877-336-1828 access code: 2282016#. Please send the materials that you are preparing to all FTA individuals copied on this email.

In my own review of the NPS questions and Section 106 correspondence in Appendix F, I may have additional questions in regard to the PA process. I will try to get those to you as soon as possible.

Thanks!

Liz

From: Judy Aranda [mailto:Aranda@infraconsultllc.com]
Sent: Monday, May 03, 2010 5:11 PM
To: Zelasko, Elizabeth (FTA)
Cc: fmiyamoto@honolulu.gov; Hogan@pbworld.com; Foell@pbworld.com; Zaref@pbworld.com; jsouki@honolulu.gov; Matley, Ted (FTA); ray.sukys@dot.gov
Subject: RE: HHCTCP Teleconference Call: 5/75

Sorry for any confusion. The meeting date we are attempting to coordinate is on Wednesday, 5/5 (not 5/7).

From: elizabeth.zelasko@dot.gov [mailto:elizabeth.zelasko@dot.gov]
Sent: Monday, May 03, 2010 9:48 AM
To: Judy Aranda
Cc: fmiyamoto@honolulu.gov; Hogan@pbworld.com; Foell@pbworld.com; Zaref@pbworld.com; jsouki@honolulu.gov; Ted.Matley@dot.gov
Subject: RE: HHCTCP Teleconference Call: 5/7

Judy,

Thank you for your message. I am checking with my FTA colleagues to see if they would be available to join me at 4 pm EST for the conference call. I will be in touch with you shortly.

Thanks –

Liz

From: Judy Aranda [mailto:Aranda@infraconsultllc.com]
Sent: Monday, May 03, 2010 3:12 PM
To: Zelasko, Elizabeth (FTA)
Cc: Miyamoto, Faith; Hogan, Steven; Foell, Stephanie; Zaref, Amy; Souki, Jesse K.; Matley, Ted (FTA)
Subject: HHCTCP Teleconference Call: 5/7

Liz: I left you a voice mail requesting a teleconference call with you on Wednesday, 5/7 at 10 am (Honolulu) to discuss our proposed response to the National Park Services' comments on the Project's Programmatic Agreement and Section 4(f). Faith will be back at the office and will join us for this discussion along with other project staff.

We will be sending you our proposed responses, via email, this afternoon for discussion on Wednesday.

Please let me know if this day/time is good.

Thanks.

Judy A. Aranda
City and County of Honolulu
DTS - Rapid Transit Division

Ali'i Place
1099 Alakea Street
Suite 1700
Honolulu, HI 96813

Direct: 808.768-6120
Cell: 808.291-5215
Fax: 808.587-6080
aranda@infraconsultllc.com

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.

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.