From: Matley, Ted (FTA)
To: Zelasko, Elizabeth (FTA); Bausch, Carl (FTA); VanWyk, Christopher (FTA)
CC: Marler, Renee (FTA); Sukys, Raymond (FTA); Rogers, Leslie (FTA)
Sent: 4/21/2010 6:17:07 PM
Subject: RE: Honolulu activities

Hi Liz, Ray and I were in Las Vegas all Wednesday so we're just catching up now.

We planned to send the hard copy with hard copy attachments to SHPO. It's all printed and ready to go once we finalize the letter. I also have the email list for the 106 consulting group so we can prepare to send that email hard after.

I think the concern with the NPS was only that we don't know the schedule for their approval of SHPO signing it. Hopefully it won't be an issue, I wouldn't think so since as you note they got it a while ago, but it is an uncertainty, I know Faith is nervous about it.

The City has a very different impression as to the importance of the ALP, which they got from Hawthorne, and has been communicating this urgency to the State since they must submit the ALP. I think we may be getting somewhat different messages from FAA HQ and FAA Hawthorne. Again, FAA has said they can do conditional approvals and concurrent reviews to allow the FEIS to proceed, but they do need an adequate submission from the State, as the City understands it. It may in the end not be an issue to the timeline, but until we get a consistent statement from FAA it has the potential to be an issue hanging out there.

thanks for the fast response!

Ted

From: Zelasko, Elizabeth (FTA)
Sent: Wed 4/21/2010 2:48 PM
To: Matley, Ted (FTA); Bausch, Carl (FTA); VanWyk, Christopher (FTA)
Cc: Marler, Renee (FTA); Sukys, Raymond (FTA); Rogers, Leslie (FTA)
Subject: RE: Honolulu activities

Ted,

My responses are below. I am taking a look at the letter you attached and will send some revisions shortly. Thank you!

From: Matley, Ted (FTA)
Sent: Tuesday, April 20, 2010 6:24 PM
To: Zelasko, Elizabeth (FTA); Bausch, Carl (FTA); VanWyk, Christopher (FTA)
Cc: Marler, Renee (FTA); Sukys, Raymond (FTA); Rogers, Leslie (FTA)
Subject: Honolulu activities

Hi Liz (and others),

1. The City is sending us an up to date email list for all the 106 consultation parties for our future distribute of the 106/APE/ impacts email update.
2. The City confirmed that the format for the eligible forms is the same as used previously with HI SHPO, including with this project.
3. The City has loaded the attachments to the SHPO letter as submitted to FTA for transmittal to SHPO (APE maps and eligibility forms) to a website where they can be downloaded. This website link can be transmitted via an email to the consultation group without overburdening their email systems. Is this sufficient information or should there be more sent to the consulting parties? Here is the website link: https://ftp.pbworld.com/GetFile.aspx?fn=84782666.zip

I think this should be fine since we are sending it as an email. For the SHPO, we should email them a PDF of the letter and reference the above attachments in the email. However, we should also send a hard copy of both the letter and

attachments to SHPO.

4. Attached is the previous draft of the transmittal letter to SHPO requesting their concurrence on the APE and the eligibility issues. Please advise if this needs to be changed.

I am going to be tweaking the letter to include language on the Hawaii Employers Council Building.

5. IMPORTANT – the City has a clear understanding from FAA Hawthorne, consistent with the Regions original understanding, that the Airport Layout Plan needs to be at least conditionally approved by FAA before they can make a final signoff on the FEIS. FAA has discussed that the ALP review can be done concurrent with FEIS review, but this is contingent on the State submitting the ALP for review. The City has approached the State on this issue and is offering assistance on preparing the ALP, but we are uncertain of the timeline for a State submission. **We should confirm the facts on this requirement with FAA.**

Our impression is that this is no longer a concern. See correspondence between FTA and FAA below.

6. The City does not know the status of the National Park Service Review of the 106 PA, as the NPS has to give SHPO permission to enter into the PA before SHPO can sign. The PA was transmitted to SHPO by Jim Barr before he left with the clear understanding that the SHPO should contact the NPS to initiate review. As FTA has been in the lead on the PA at this point, the City has not tracked the status of the NPS review. Should we contact NPS to determine if there are any timing issue on their review that might affect the concluding of the signed PA?

The NPS is an invited signatory to the PA. On March 24th, Elaine Jackson-Retondo of NPS sent Jim an email requesting a copy of the draft PA. Jim sent her a copy to review on March 25th. She had some additional questions on the alignment adjustment that I am not sure Jim addressed. But they have had a copy of the PA for a few weeks now. Our process is going to be sending out the letter to the SHPO requesting concurrence on the revised APE and determination of eligibility and providing that same information to the consulting parties (which includes NPS) for disclosure purposes. We had discussed throughout of when we send items to the SHPO or the signatories that we would follow up with a phone call to express urgency and request that they sign the documents quickly. That would include NPS and their oversight role for the SHPO. My preference would be for us to send the APE and the determination of eligibility forms to the SHPO before we call them.

Thanks,

Ted

Ted M Matley
FTA Region IX
201 Mission Street, Suite 1650
San Francisco, CA 94105
(415) 744-2590
fax (415) 744-2726
ted.matley@dot.gov