From: Ossi, Joseph (FTA)
To: Matley, Ted (FTA); Barr, James (FTA)
Sent: 9/3/2009 10:15:53 AM
Subject: RE: draft of letter OIBC

My understanding is that mandatory signatories and invited signatories are full signatories. Consulting parties may or may not sign, and as long as the full signatories sign, the agreement is valid.

Joe Ossi
FTA Office of Planning and Environment
(202) 366-1613

From: Matley, Ted (FTA)
Sent: Thursday, September 03, 2009 3:47 PM
To: Barr, James (FTA); Ossi, Joseph (FTA); Bausch, Carl (FTA)
Cc: Sukys, Raymond (FTA)
Subject: RE: draft of letter OIBC

So what's the process for conferring with ACHP and SHPD on this decision? Call, letter, email?

From: Barr, James (FTA)
Sent: Thu 9/3/2009 9:49 AM
To: Matley, Ted (FTA); Ossi, Joseph (FTA); Bausch, Carl (FTA)
Cc: Sukys, Raymond (FTA)
Subject: RE: draft of letter OIBC

OK
Barrister for a day!

From: Matley, Ted (FTA)
Sent: Wednesday, September 02, 2009 7:57 PM
To: Ossi, Joseph (FTA); Barr, James (FTA); Bausch, Carl (FTA)
Cc: Sukys, Raymond (FTA)
Subject: draft of letter OIBC

Gentlemen, attached is a draft of a letter to the OIBC on our denial of their request to be an invited signatory. Also attached is their request letter. Please provide comments.

Also, maybe you guys can clear something up. The draft PA from Honolulu has three categories: Signatories (also listed in the opening paragraph as the parties to the agreement) which are FTA, ACHP, and SHPD; Invited Signatories, which are the Navy, the NPS, and the City/County of Honolulu; and concurring parties. Are there 3 categories? Or is it just 2, parties to the agreement/signatories and concurring parties?

Thanks,

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