

U.S. Department
of Transportation
**Federal Transit
Administration**

REGION IX
Arizona, California,
Hawaii, Nevada, Guam
American Samoa,
Northern Mariana Islands

Mr. Wayne Yoshioka
Director, Department of Transportation Services
City and County of Honolulu
650 South King Street, 3rd Floor
Honolulu, HI 96813

Re: Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project

Dear Mr. Yoshioka:

Thank you for your letters dated October 20, 2009, and November 3, 2009, concerning the Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project in Honolulu, HI (the "Project"). ~~Before responding to your letters, I want to reiterate that~~ The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) is committed to assisting the City and County of Honolulu (the "City") ~~in to~~ advancing this project, in compliance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the Federal Transit Administration's (FTA's) New Starts process. FTA and the City share a mutual goal, a project that will well serve the ~~citizens of area~~ Honolulu transit riding public. To that end, this letter responds to your letters in detail. In addition, FTA is currently reaching out to ~~its sister U.S. Department of Transportation modal administration,~~ the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), to understand more fully its position regarding the proposed alignment and the NEPA issues associated with any potential mitigation at the Honolulu International Airport (the "Airport").

Your initial letter references the proposed Programmatic Agreement under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, a proposed agreement by the FAA concerning mitigation for operational impacts at the Airport, and proposed procurement activities, including the award of the ~~proposed p~~Project's first Design – Build (D-B) contract, which ~~the~~ FTA understands has already taken place. Your second letter, dated November 3rd, proposes an approach to address mitigation related to the Airport, and has a concurrence signature by a Program Manager from ~~the~~ FAA. Before addressing the substance of the second letter, please let me clarify an important point. Although you represent that FTA agreed to the proposed approach at a meeting ~~which was held on October 19, 2009,~~ FTA **has not** agreed to any specific mitigation approach. Any representation or understanding to the contrary is incorrect. FTA's concurrence with an agreement of this type must be demonstrated by a written statement or by inclusion of any proposed agreement in the official environmental documents, neither of which has ~~not~~ occurred.

~~This My current~~ response addresses the proposed mitigation plan in the November letter and clarifies what is necessary with respect to the ~~NEPA~~ Federal environmental review process for the Project's proposed alignment and mitigations in the vicinity of the Airport. It also clarifies FTA's policies and procedures related to automatic pre-award authority, Letters of No Prejudice (LONPs), and D-B contracts executed before the completion of the NEPA process. Finally, this

response asks for information about the City sponsor's authority to sign the anticipated Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the Project.

Federal Aviation Administration Agreement on Mitigation at the Airport

FTA is aware that the currently proposed alignment for the Project, absent mitigation, would be within the Runway Protection Zones (RPZs) for two runways at the Airport. ~~If it is the City's intent~~ to keep use the currently proposed alignment ~~on and near the Airport~~, the FEIS must address the runway issue in order to satisfy the NEPA process. It must describe not only the alignment and all environmental impacts and necessary mitigations of the alignment within the RPZs, but also any additional environmental impacts and mitigations that would result from making the project alignment compatible with the RPZs for the runways. As part of the mitigation plans, FTA would need a more definitive agreement from FAA about the relocation of the runways and environmental impact mitigations. An agreement merely to study possible runway relocations, as is described in the November 3rd letter, without greater resolution on the alignment or mitigations, is not acceptable for purposes of NEPA.

[I DELETED SOME OF THIS PARAGRAPH AS ORIGINALLY DRAFTED BECAUSE I THINK THIS PARAGRAPH SHOULD FOCUS ONLY ON WHAT'S NEEDED FROM FAA TO MAKE THE CURRENTLY PROPOSED ALIGNMENT WORK FOR NEPA. BELOW WE GET INTO ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES. SB]

Should the City decide to choose an alternative to the currently proposed alignment ~~as currently proposed~~ on and near the Airport, the environmental review process must inform the public about that alternative. Possible alternatives could include a design option modifying the currently proposed alignment in order to avoid the RPZs, or an entirely new alignment option and mitigations that would avoid the RPZs totally or in part. Any ~~alignment~~ option must be analyzed fully, including environmental impacts, and include a fully detailed mitigation plan, and cost estimates. To be clear, the approach that is proposed in your November 3rd letter does not resolve the issue satisfactorily for NEPA purposes. FTA staff is available to discuss with you any options you wish to consider for moving forward with the NEPA review.

[IS THERE THE POSSIBILITY OF THE CITY PROPOSING A NEW ALIGNMENT THAT COULD NOT BE ADDRESSED IN THE FEIS AND WOULD REQUIRE A SEPARATE SUPPLEMENTAL REVIEW? I AM UNCOMFORTABLE ABOUT PUTTING TOO MUCH SPECIFICITY IN THIS LETTER AND ENDING UP WITH A PAPER TRAIL THAT CAUSES MORE CONFUSION THAN CLARIFICATION. DO TRO-9 AND TCC RECOMMEND AN FTA-CITY DISCUSSION FIRST ABOUT REAL OPTIONS, OR WOULD SUCH A DISCUSSION BE COUNTER-PRODUCTIVE FOR SOME REASON AND OUR OBJECTIVES BETTER SERVED BY THIS LETTER FOLLOWED BY DISCUSSION? THE ADMINISTRATOR WANTS THIS LETTER TO GO OUT ASAP, SO WE NEED TO DECIDE ON THE BEST APPROACH QUICKLY. SB]

Pre-Award Authority, LONPs, and D-B Contracts Prior to Completion of the NEPA Process

As the proposed Honolulu Project would be the City's first New Starts project, it might be beneficial to summarize briefly the use of pre-award authority, LONPs, and D-B contracts for New Starts projects, which differs somewhat from their use for FTA formula-funded projects.

Pre-award Authority for New Starts Projects. FTA's approval for the Project to enter preliminary engineering (PE), dated October 16, 2009, provides automatic pre-award authority for PE activities, thereby maintaining eligibility of these expenses for reimbursement should Federal New Starts funding be forthcoming. FTA defines the amount of engineering and design work that fits within the definition of New Starts PE as follows:

All refinements to project scope and alignment should be finalized and major project uncertainties assessed during the New Starts preliminary engineering phase of the New Starts process. . . . [with the] expectation that the New Starts preliminary engineering phase will result in project scope and cost estimates and financial plans that have little, if any, need for change after approval of the project into final design. (2006 Final Guidance on New Starts Policies and Procedures, FTA)

Costs for activities other than those covered by this definition of PE may not be incurred and reimbursed absent explicit FTA approvals that trigger additional pre-award authority, such as the completion of NEPA, and approval into Final Design (FD), or and issuance of LONPs.

~~After Once the completion of NEPA occurs with issuance of FTA's the~~ Record of Decision (ROD), which completes the NEPA process, and in accordance with FTA's Federal Register Notice, dated September 2, 2009, *Additional Final Guidance on New Starts/Small Starts Policies and Procedures*, the City will have automatic pre-award authority, ~~that is the ability to incur costs using local funds and subsequently be reimbursed if future Federal funding is forthcoming,~~ for: right-of-way acquisition, utility relocation, and procurement of vehicles. Approval to enter FD will be required for pre-award authority for non-construction activities such as, but not limited to: the procurement of rails, ties, and other specialized equipment; the procurement of commodities; and demolition.

LONPs for New Starts Projects. After completion of NEPA, FTA will consider LONPs for activities not covered by automatic pre-award authority on a case-by-case basis. Absent pre-award authority or an LONP, no project costs can be incurred and subsequently reimbursed for any portion of the entire 20-mile alignment before FTA approves the project into the New Starts phase which by definition permits such actions.

[I DELETED THE SENTENCE SAYING NO LONP BEFORE FD. FTA HAS ISSUED LONPS BEFORE FD IN RARE CASES, BUT NEVER BEFORE COMPLETION OF NEPA. SB]

D-B Contracts for New Starts projects. With respect to D-B contracts for the project, FTA generally prohibits project sponsors from taking any action that would advance any particular "build" alternative under study prior to the issuance of an environmental ROD. There may be good reasons, however, to allow a sponsor to engage a single firm, prior to the issuance of a ROD, to conduct PE and FD final design.

FTA's position on award of D-B contracts for New Starts projects prior to the completion of NEPA is best described in its *Federal Register* notice dated January 19, 2007 (Vol. 72, No. 12, p. 2583). Although this notice deals specifically with the Public Private Partnership Pilot Program, it summarizes the contract provisions FTA expects in all pre-NEPA D-B contracts, and the permissible activities of the contracting parties. While FTA does not normally review a sponsor's third-party contracts, this is not the case for contracts executed before the completion

of NEPA. Accordingly, please provide FTA with a copy of the contract you recently signed ~~for so that~~ FTA ~~can review to~~ ensure compliance with NEPA.

Honolulu's Signatory Party on the Project's Final Environmental Impact Statement

FTA notes recent action by the Council for the City and County of Honolulu authorizing the Department of Transportation Services to sign the Programmatic Agreement under Section 106 of the Historic Preservation Act, committing Honolulu to carry out the mitigation included in that document. FTA and Honolulu will be required by Federal law (23 U.S.C. Section 139(c)(4)) to implement the environmental mitigation commitments made in the anticipated FEIS for the Project. FTA will require the FEIS to be signed by an official who has the authority to commit Honolulu to the mitigation required by the FEIS. Please provide FTA with the name, title, and scope of authority of the individual who will be signing the FEIS for Honolulu.

Thank you for your expeditious attention to these important issues. If you have any questions, please contact me at (415) 744-3133.

Sincerely,

Leslie T. Rogers
Regional Administrator

ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED DRAFT