
From: Tahir, Nadeem (FTA)
To: Borinsky, Susan (FTA); Carranza, Edward (FTA); Ryan, James (FTA)
CC: Sukys, Raymond (FTA); Luu, Catherine (FTA); Barr, James (FTA); Day, Elizabeth (FTA); Rogers, Leslie (FTA); Marler, Renee (FTA); Zusman, Nancy-Ellen (FTA); VanWyk, Christopher (FTA)
Sent: 2/26/2010 8:49:43 AM
Subject: RE: PMOC Assessment of Honolulu's NTP #1 and NTP #1A

I have reviewed the NTP's and arrived at essentially the same conclusions as the PMOC. I have viewed the activities as PE activities in accordance with our PE approval and not as "FTA guidance on pre-NEPA DB contract activities". I am available if any further engineering evaluation is required on my part.

From: Borinsky, Susan (FTA)
Sent: Fri 2/26/2010 11:45 AM
To: Carranza, Edward (FTA); Ryan, James (FTA)
Cc: Sukys, Raymond (FTA); Tahir, Nadeem (FTA); Luu, Catherine (FTA); Barr, James (FTA); Day, Elizabeth (FTA); Rogers, Leslie (FTA); Marler, Renee (FTA); Zusman, Nancy-Ellen (FTA); VanWyk, Christopher (FTA)
Subject: RE: PMOC Assessment of Honolulu's NTP #1 and NTP #1A

Ed, Have you gotten indication from the New Starts HQ and Regional Team Members whether they concur with the PMOC's recommendations to FTA that the Honolulu-Kiewit contract and NTPs are essentially consistent with FTA guidance on pre-NEPA DB contract activities. (I recognize that the PMOC notes the absence of pre-contract and pre-RFP concurrences and the need for additional information on certain activities. The Region questioned whether these activities were consistent with NEPA/FTA guidance and, for the most part, the PMOC recommends a finding that the City's actions either were acceptable or need clarification. Ultimately this is a call for the Regional Administrator under his NEPA authority.

If the Team and the Region consider the PMOC recommendations to be correct, and Leslie agrees, I agree that TCC should recast the letter. Leslie and I will need to mention this to Peter at 12:30 today.

Regarding the lack of FTA concurrence before the City signed the contract, or issued NTP#1 or the RFPs: Is this a real problem at this point? I indicted my thinking on this matter in a recent phone call. We should discuss if anyone thinks any action is necessary on this matter. Susan

From: Carranza, Edward (FTA)
Sent: Thursday, February 25, 2010 1:56 PM
To: Ryan, James (FTA); Borinsky, Susan (FTA)
Cc: Sukys, Raymond (FTA); Tahir, Nadeem (FTA); Luu, Catherine (FTA); Barr, James (FTA); Day, Elizabeth (FTA); Rogers, Leslie (FTA); Marler, Renee (FTA); Zusman, Nancy-Ellen (FTA); VanWyk, Christopher (FTA)
Subject: RE: PMOC Assessment of Honolulu's NTP #1 and NTP #1A

Susan/Jim: Please note the attached assessments of both NTP #1 and NTP #1A as recently "informally" submitted by the Honolulu project sponsor. This is very timely and will require a rewrite of our draft letter currently with the Administrator. To focus your attention, I point you to page 6 of the first attachment which addresses the PMOC's conclusions, and which are for the most part favorable towards meeting the 1/19/07 DB FR for pre-NEPA completion authority AND the intent of our PE approval of 10/16/09. I believe Renee and Nancy-Ellen had in mind a more simpler "acknowledgement/thank you/stick to the 2007 Federal Register" response letter to Honolulu in light of this weeks most recent submittals. Please advise of suggested next steps.