
From: Matley, Ted (FTA)
To: Barr, James (FTA)
CC: Bausch, Carl (FTA); Sukys, Raymond (FTA); Marler, Renee (FTA); Ossi, Joseph (FTA)
Sent: 9/15/2009 4:18:29 AM
Subject: RE: FTA to OIBC response letter

I don't think anybody is cowed. I think most of the participants don't know what is going on with the process or the requirements (maybe that's our fault, but the City hasn't helped that) including the SHPD, who is content to let the NPS and the Historic Trust and ACHP carry the ball for them since they are aggressive and they like the idea of getting a lot of stuff paid for out of the project. I do believe the City that the SHPD as identified impacts without providing the City with full information on them despite repeated requests. The OIBC has a chip on it's shoulder about people not paying attention to them and putting them in tough situations regarding burial discoveries and project delays and wants the entire project run around their needs.

I think we need to be fair to the City in one aspect, there are a lot of entrenched unreasonable people here with their own agendas. Unfortunately the City has handled it really badly. It's also really unfortunate that the City keeps pushing their timeline, that has plagued this whole project. I've told them more than once their timeline is not an issue for this group, yes the process shouldn't go on indefinitely but their timeline isn't driving it. But they are under a lot of pressure so they get unreasonable with the group and with us, as with our recent call with them when they wanted us to tell them when they can stop the consultation - you can tell they are under pressure from their bosses to tell them when the consultation will be done.

I will talk to Faith again and remind her their timeline is not an issue to bring up with the consultation group, that it will continue as long as we feel it constructive.

If that's the consensus we can get the letter out as Jim suggested with the CC's.

From: Barr, James (FTA)
Sent: Tue 9/15/2009 6:47 AM
To: Matley, Ted (FTA)
Cc: Bausch, Carl (FTA); Sukys, Raymond (FTA); Marler, Renee (FTA)
Subject: RE: FTA to OIBC response letter

OK

My recommendation would be that Leslie sign the OIBC-return-letter as soon as possible and we get it out.

Cc the SHPD, ACHP, HTS and NPS (who have asked for a copy).

Carl is currently re-writing the draft FTA response letter to ACHP so that there is less parsing and more agreement to go forward with a more active involvement.

I'll have more on recommendations on FTA involvement later in the day.

I'm concerned that with the exception of the OIBC (who simply want veto authority) most of the rest of the participants appear to be cowed by HTS staff.

Jim

From: Matley, Ted (FTA)
Sent: Tuesday, September 15, 2009 9:38 AM
To: Barr, James (FTA)
Subject: RE:

we're good with it. I think we just had a minor change somewhere, I can't even remember what.

From: Barr, James (FTA)
Sent: Tue 9/15/2009 4:53 AM
To: Matley, Ted (FTA)
Subject: FW:

Did you review this?

From: Barr, James (FTA)
Sent: Friday, September 11, 2009 8:56 AM
To: Matley, Ted (FTA)
Cc: Sukys, Raymond (FTA); Ossi, Joseph (FTA); Bausch, Carl (FTA); Marler, Renee (FTA)
Subject:

Try this.

Jim Barr
FTA Office of Planning and Environment
East 45-130
1200 New Jersey Avenue SE
Washington, DC 20590
james.barr@dot.gov
T. 202-493-2633
F. 202-493-2470