HONOLULU HIGH-CAPACITY TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROJECT

Stipulations Proposed by Section 106 Consulting Parties
Not Included in Programmatic Agreement

Mitigation	Proposer	Rationale for not including in PA
City Historic Preservation Program (Certified Local Government)	HHF	Requires establishment of a Historic Preservation Commission and operation of a program which meets state and federal standards; would be a new City program entirely outside of transit project FTA should agree that this is not an eligible expense.
Main Street Program (National Trust for Historic Preservation)	HHF	Would assist neighborhood-based organizations with revitalization of traditional neighborhood business districts; could provide technical and/or financial assistance to Main Street organizations; program previously existed as a State program; would be a new City program entirely outside of transit project. If project funds were provided for very specific revitalization projects within a station area where adverse visual impacts on the historic business district or building have been identified and where the revitalization cost is roughly commensurate with the adverse impacts of the project, this could be done.
Restoration of Historic Irwin Park	HHF	Project would not have a direct impact on park; park is currently a parking lot under State jurisdiction; This could be done, or partially done (removal of parking lot only), if: (1) the impermeable surface created by the project is roughly the same as the impermeable surface removed by the digging up the parking lot (as mitigation for floodplain/stormwater impacts); or (2) the sum of all uses of parkland over the entire project is roughly the same as the parkland to be restored (as Section 4(f) mitigation); or (3) as a combined mitigation action for impacts in both (1) and (2) above.
Rehabilitation Fund for Historic Resources	NTHP	Would require setting up of fund and rules regarding granting of funds; transit funds could be expended for actions that are not a direct impact of the project, such as rehabilitation of resources not adversely affected by the project; local funding source (GET surcharge $) limited to paying for construction and operation of system; questionable

		whether federal funds could be used, subject to FFGA approval. This is very similar to HHF's "Main Street" concept above. If project funds were provided for very specific rehab projects within a station area where adverse visual impacts on the historic district or building have been identified and where the revitalization cost is roughly commensurate with the adverse impacts of the project, this could be done.
Architectural historian on TOD planning staff	HHF/SHPD	TOD is not a Project activity; City Department of Planning and Permitting has responsibility for TOD planning. The project is going to need the expertise of an architectural historian during final design and construction. That person is usually employed by the contractors, but there is no reason why the person couldn't be employed by the city under the "Force Account." The person's term would end with the completion of project-related responsibilities, though during that time he/she could work on historic issues related to other development (TOD) that occurs in station areas where our project is having adverse effects.
Preservation/restoration of resources not within the APE	HHF	Requires mitigation for effects to historic resources by development that could occur in vicinity of stations; not a direct impact of the project. Not our problem, but see comment on preceding item.

HHF = Historic Hawaii Foundation
NTHP = National Trust for Historic Preservation
SHPD = State Historic Preservation Division