From: Zelasko, Elizabeth (FTA)
To: Bausch, Carl (FTA)
Sent: 5/7/2010 9:45:26 AM
Subject: RE: Honolulu

We have spent a lot of time on their concerns, but it could have been better documented. Responding in writing will help the process. Faith said they understand and agree the documentation would help. They are working on it. I told her I hoped to send an email to Elaine on Monday.

I spoke with Faith. She's been in touch with the SHPD. The architect that would be taking a look at the materials was planning to review them today. Faith is going to give her a call to see if she needs anything else. Hopefully that will be resolved soon.

From: Bausch, Carl (FTA)
Sent: Friday, May 07, 2010 3:20 PM
To: Zelasko, Elizabeth (FTA)
Subject: RE: Honolulu

Thank you, Liz. Jim Barr and some others thought we had satisfied OIBC about as much as we could in the circumstances, although he believed that OIBC will never be fully satisfied. We have devoted a lot of time to OIBC's concerns; I hope we can settle this quickly. What about the SHPD's concurrence on our determination? Carl

---

From: Zelasko, Elizabeth (FTA)
Sent: Fri 5/7/2010 2:35 PM
To: Bausch, Carl (FTA)
Cc: Borinsky, Susan (FTA)
Subject: Honolulu

I wanted to give you an update on the PA.

When we had the call with the City on Wednesday, we had a long discussion on the OIBC and the City provided a lot more information verbally on the consideration of the OIBC's request for Phase 4 archeological surveys. We requested that information in writing. Yesterday, the City sent back some information, but it did not expand on this issue. This morning, I sent an email back to the City requesting more information. I feel that this is THE concern of the park service and that we have made progress in responding to the other concerns. This is something that I do not see as fully developed in the Section 106 record and something that has not been communicated well to the consulting parties. Regardless of the Park Service, this seems to be something that should be expanded on.

I spoke with Blythe from the ACHP this morning. She provided a good objective perspective and gave me her thoughts on some of the specific issues. After my conversation with her, I thought that the best approach would be to respond via email in writing to the Park Service's concerns based on the materials that the City is providing us. Blythe recommended that we also consider providing an update to the consulting parties on our response to the Park Service. This update would include responding on other issues that the FTA and the City have not yet send out such as issues in the response letter from the National Trust.

So now I am modifying the PA slightly based on some of the issues discussed with the Park Service and Blyth. I am waiting for a response from the City on my question and other items they said that they would get to us and have not yet. I hope that they will send the information over the weekend so that I can send an email on Monday to the Park Service, copying the other signatory and invited signatories. If needed we could set up a teleconference on Tuesday or Wednesday to review a final version of the PA.

Liz

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