

DRAFT

HONOLULU HIGH-CAPACITY TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROJECT

Participating Agency/Section 106 Consultation – State Historic Preservation Division

SHPD Offices, Kapolei
10:00 a.m. September 19, 2008

Attendees: Faith Miyamoto and Elisa Yadao (City); Lawrence Spurgeon, Stephanie Roberts, and Steve Hogan (PB); Nalani Dahl (Dahl Consulting); Wendy Wichman and Dee Ruzicka (Mason Architects); Hal Hammatt and David Shideler (Cultural Surveys Hawaii); Lani Lapilio (Kuiwalu); and Dr. Pua Aiu, Paula Creech, Coochie Cayan, Dr. Astrid Liverman (SHPD)

Ms. Miyamoto led introductions of participants. She then noted that the State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD) has been sent documents to review based upon their Participating Agency and Section 106 consulting party status. An overview of the Project handout was distributed for their reference.

Ms. Miyamoto then described the overall Project schedule and how that related to the Section 106 process. Handouts of the overall schedule and a more detailed Section 106 proposed schedule were distributed. She also stated that it was the Project's hope that the City would receive a concurrence of eligibility on the historic resources eligibility forms from SHPD soon. Ms. Liverman stated that SHPD should be responding in the next week so that SHPD can incorporate any notes from this meeting that would be relevant, but that SHPD will probably need more photos of some of the buildings. Ms. Miyamoto stated that the project would be happy to have a follow-up meeting to discuss eligibility or any specifics if needed.

Mr. Spurgeon stated that after concurrence on the eligibility forms, the Project would work with the SHPD on the effect determinations in parallel with the MOA and mitigation commitments. The tightness of the overall project schedule was mentioned. Ms. Miyamoto will verify if the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) must be signed before issuance of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) or if it must be done by the time the Record of Decision is issued.

Ms. Liverman asked if Table S-10 in the DEIS was an accurate accounting of effects. Mr. Spurgeon detailed that unless an agreement of effect is decided on prior to issuing the Draft EIS that the information, as presented, would go out in the DEIS as a proposed finding of effect. However, if SHPD concurs with the determination, it will be noted in the document to provide assurance to the public. Ms. Miyamoto stated that the Project proposes the preparation of two MOAs; one for historic resources and one for

archaeological and cultural resources. This proposal can be discussed in future meetings between the Project and SHPD.

Mr. Spurgeon then reviewed the overall Project schedule and 106 Schedule. He reiterated Ms. Miyamoto's statement about two types of mitigation agreements the Project is proposing. The archaeological and cultural resource agreement would be a Programmatic Agreement (PA) and the historic resources agreement would be a MOA.

He then handed out information on Construction Impacts to the participants. Ms. Miyamoto noted that the Project plans phased construction. Mr. Spurgeon expanded on that topic by explaining construction is planned to begin in 2009/2010 and extend to 2019. Construction will be in 5-6 contracts in probably 4 phases. Several contracts (+2-3) will be started initially, including at least one guideway section and the maintenance and storage facility. Mr. Spurgeon then handed out aerial maps that provided a more detailed view of the Project to show the proposed construction phases. It was noted that a decision on the location of the maintenance and storage facility is between two sites. The preferred site is the Navy Drum site. However, if there are issues obtaining that site, there is a second site identified.

Methods of construction were then discussed. It was stated that drilled shafts would be used for foundations. Foundation holes would be 6-8 feet in diameter and approximately 150 feet apart. If drilled shafts are not able to be used, then pile foundations would be utilized with pile caps. It was noted that the maximum span of columns would be 150 feet. Most would be between 120 – 150 feet. Ms. Cayan asked where the prefabrication work would be done. Mr. Spurgeon said he did not know and that casting could be done either locally or off island. Ms. Aiu proposed the Project consider testing no matter what type of drilling technique is used.

Mr. Spurgeon described that discussions need to be had regarding the extent and degree the MOA and PA need to be worked out and proposed that this was a topic for future meetings. Ms. Liverman asked if there has been a decision between the Salt Lake and Airport alternatives. Mr. Spurgeon stated that all three alternatives are in the Draft EIS; however, the Final EIS will identify the agency preferred alternative. City Council selected the Salt Lake alignment as the Locally Preferred Alternative, but there has not been a NEPA decision on a preferred alternative. Ms. Miyamoto stated that the Salt Lake alignment would probably be the alternative carried out. Ms. Liverman asked if the MOAs would reflect all alternatives. Mr. Spurgeon stated that the Project would wait until after public comment on the Project.

Mr. Spurgeon went over our idea for a sampling plan. A plan for archaeology for the first phase would be later this year and inventory would be completed for approximately the first six miles of the Project. There is a slight overlap between segments to allow for adjustments to the Project pending what is revealed. It was noted that the schedule reflects Oahu Island Burial Council (OIBC) comments to conduct inventorying sooner rather than later in the process. It was also noted that although the Area of Potential Effect is rather narrow the Project does not have a good idea on exact column locations in

the more Diamond Head areas of the Project. The Project is proposing staged sampling in concert with geotechnical work needed on the project. Then detailed sampling would be conducted once geotechnical input and further engineering is conducted. However, this proposal is up to SHPD's final decision.

Mr. Spurgeon stated that the Project is in the process of putting together the framework of elements and commitments that would be included in the PA/MOA. Ms. Aiu requested this information be brought to the upcoming SHPD meeting on archaeological resources the following week. ~~It was discussed that~~ The extent of coordination on the PA/MOAs was discussed. Potentially bi-weekly meetings may be needed.

Mr. Spurgeon stated that the OIBC has requested to be an invited signatory on the MOA PA developed for archaeological resources. He noted that the City has discussed this with FTA and the agency has possible concerns about this. Ms. Aiu stated that SHPD has concerns with OIBC being a signatory on the MOA-PA as they do not have the ability to fulfill their responsibilities per statutory requirements. She stated that the process is not meant to let one signatory hold up the entire process and that as a consulting party the OIBC would be allowed to voice their concerns and SHPD will listen to their input. Mr. Spurgeon stated the Project would let FTA know of SHPD's concerns. He also stated that the Army and Navy may be invited to be signatories but that is not known for sure at this time.

Ms. Aiu asked if the Project went through DHHL property. She was told no. She then asked about the large impacts of the stations. Mr. Spurgeon stated that the sampling plans and MOA would include stations and other elements of the Project.

Ms. Liverman asked if a list of historic buildings that will be demolished or fall under eminent domain will be included in the MOA for historic resources. Mr. Spurgeon stated that the document lists all properties that will be acquired for the Project (clarify what document is being referenced. Is it the MOA or DEIS?). Mr. Spurgeon stated that the Project's only adverse effects are eligible historic buildings-resources being demolished or physically altered. ~~Mr. Spurgeon also stated that stations, traction power substations, the storage and maintenance facility, and other Project elements will also be included.~~

Comment [ay1]: Kamani trees are being removed, so "resources" is better word to use.

Comment [ay2]: The meaning of this sentence is not clear. Does not seem to be related to rest of paragraph.

The question of Cultural Monitoring was presented, as OIBC has requested using cultural monitors. Ms. Aiu stated that the current rules do not address cultural monitors as SHPD has no way to permit the monitors. However, the City has used Cultural Monitors on other project and it was up to the City whether they wanted to use a Cultural monitor or not.

Traditional Cultural Practices-Properties (TCP) were discussed. It was noted that some work has been done; however, a complete synthesis of TCPs has not been completed. A question as to who performed the Cultural Resources Technical Report. Ms. Lapilio stated that Ku'iwalu coordinated the report in collaboration with Ka'imipono (Maria Orr and Dr. Lynette Cruz). She stated that coordination is on-going. Ms. Aiu asked for the project to look at plantation culture, i.e. infrastructure and landscape.

Mr. Spurgeon asked about the historic resource eligibility forms provided previously to SHPD. Ms. Liverman stated that, in general, they look good; however, a few would need more photos. Mr. Spurgeon stated that would not be a problem. He also noted that the effect determination would look at the entire effect on not only property effects but on the Project corridor as a whole. The Project would look at the broad effect of the system as well as various resources. This would be done in conjunction with the MOA. Cumulative and indirect impacts would also be considered during discussions of mitigation in the MOA. It was noted that Historic Hawaii Foundation sent a letter to the Project stating their concerns and possible mitigations; however, the City only has authority to do three of the proposed mitigations requested.

Mr. Spurgeon offered to be available regarding any questions about the Project and offered SHPD personnel a tour of the corridor at their convenience.

Ms. Miyamoto stated that the City would continue to coordinate with SHPD and all Section 106 consulting parties. She also asked SHPD for any ideas on how the Project could help with the workload this Project presents.

Dr. Liverman stated that the National Trust has indicated their interest in the Project. Mr. Spurgeon stated that information is being sent to the National Trust, and Advisory Council for Historic Preservation has received information and requested that they be consulting parties for both Sec 106 and NEPA. In addition, Hawaii's Thousand Friends and The Outdoor Circle are HRS 343 consulting parties and will be contacted soon.

Mr. Spurgeon stated that he did not have a copy of SHPD's response letter regarding the Area of Potential Effect the City has previously sent. Ms. Liverman stated she will look into it.

Ms. Aiu asked if there was a plan for the re-interment of burials. Mr. Spurgeon stated that it would be part of the proposed [MOA-PA](#) and all parties could talk about it in future meetings. Ms. Aiu stated that it would be a good idea to identify possible areas for re-interment and also to think about contingency plans as well. Mr. Hammatt stated Cultural Surveys would do research into existing re-interment areas. Ms. Cayan stated the cultural preference is to re-inter near the area found (same ahupua'a) and to be prepared to deal with the issue correctly.