
From: Borinsky, Susan (FTA)
To: Ryan, James (FTA)
CC: Day, Elizabeth (FTA); Bausch, Carl (FTA); Barr, James (FTA)
Sent: 2/19/2010 4:26:55 AM
Subject: RE: Honolulu - NTP#1A

Jim R., sorry I was unable to get back to you yesterday. I agree that the letter needs editing. (Like you, I did not see Ray's original letter.) My understanding is that we agreed to respond to the letter on NTP#1a, but that we would also seek information from the sponsor on some of the line items in NTP1 about what mechanisms the sponsor is using to ensure that the work underway is limited to PE, rather than being final design, in order not to impinge on the ongoing NEPA process (i.e., no commitment to any alternative being evaluated in NEPA, and ability of the sponsor to "off ramp" from the contract if the outcome of NEPA is the No-build).

Are you in a position this morning to edit the letter? I'd like to get the draft back to Leslie ASAP as he is meeting with Peter today. Susan

From: Ryan, James (FTA)
Sent: Thursday, February 18, 2010 2:01 PM
To: Borinsky, Susan (FTA)
Subject: RE: Honolulu - NTP#1A

Susan:

As is often the case, I'm not sure who's in charge of this. And, since I didn't see Ray's draft, I can't tell whether the problem is his or Nancy-Ellen's. But in any case, the current draft of our letter confuses the work that the City intends to authorize in NTP#1a (the three items listed in the body of the City's February 8 letter to Leslie) with the work that the City has already authorized in NTP#1 (the 35 "activities" listed in the attachment to that letter). Our letter says that we need more information about some of the activities listed in NTP#1a before we can complete our review and decision regarding approval of NTP#1a. But then it lists activities that are exclusively from the 35 activities that comprise NTP#1.

So, if our problem is with the activities that we enumerate in the draft letter, then our letter is NOT about reviewing and approving the new work in NTP#1a; rather, it's an after-the-fact inquiry into the appropriateness of some activities in NTP#1. And if that's the case, our letter does not actually deal with the review and approval of the work items planned for NTP#1a.

I guess that someone should clean this up.

Jim

From: Borinsky, Susan (FTA)
Sent: Thursday, February 18, 2010 1:21 PM
To: Ryan, James (FTA); Day, Elizabeth (FTA)
Subject: FW: Honolulu - NTP#1A

From: Zusman, Nancy-Ellen (FTA)
Sent: Thursday, February 18, 2010 12:15 PM
To: Sukys, Raymond (FTA); Borinsky, Susan (FTA); Barr, James (FTA); Rogers, Leslie (FTA)
Cc: Carranza, Edward (FTA); Matley, Ted (FTA)
Subject: RE: Honolulu - NTP#1A

Redacted

From: Sukys, Raymond (FTA)
Sent: Thursday, February 18, 2010 10:06 AM
To: Zusman, Nancy-Ellen (FTA)
Cc: Carranza, Edward (FTA); Matley, Ted (FTA)
Subject: Honolulu - NTP#1A

Redacted