
From: Barr, James (FTA)
To: Matley, Ted (FTA)
CC: Sukys, Raymond (FTA); Bausch, Carl (FTA)
Sent: 10/15/2009 10:12:11 AM
Subject: RE: Honolulu update

That's good.

I recommend that we request an outline of the issues (impacts) from FAA and we propose a menu of mitigation measures (maybe Faith can help us here) that they can review and maybe even sign-off on.

BTW – Faith just called shopping for draft PA in the FEIS and later CC sign-off.

Nice try – no cigar.

I told her that she could assist with the FAA by finding the appropriate signatories and also IDing the issues and proposed mitigation so that Ray could go to the FAA meeting prepared for a positive outcome.

I also told her that if everything got completed by the middle of November, we could have CC sign-off on the 18th – I get the doc to EPA on the 20th and we have a FR NOA on the 27th. I also emphasized that this was not an FTA “timeline” – it was a “good-case” scenario.

From: Matley, Ted (FTA)
Sent: Thursday, October 15, 2009 3:49 PM
To: Barr, James (FTA)
Cc: Sukys, Raymond (FTA); Bausch, Carl (FTA)
Subject: RE: Honolulu update

Ray is actually meeting with them in Honolulu at the airport next week so he can scope it all out with FAA

From: Barr, James (FTA)
Sent: Thursday, October 15, 2009 12:46 PM
To: Matley, Ted (FTA)
Cc: Sukys, Raymond (FTA); Bausch, Carl (FTA)
Subject: RE: Honolulu update

Ted:

It seems to me that if HRT wants to facilitate federal to federal communications and helps us to reach a mutual understanding then that is very supportive of our undertaking. However, HRT seems to take every opportunity to circumvent federal to federal communications.

My recommendation would be that the Region – because you are 3 hours closer to the action – initiate further communication with FAA. HRT can help us find the responsible party. I think that it is up to us to push this issue to its conclusion and not HRT. Why would we trust them to do the right thing anyway?

Carl is welcome to weigh in here.

As for the OBIC; we knew that they were never going to sign as a Concurring Signatory anyway. As long as the ACHP is on board then I think that the SHPO will come on board – unless the Trust tries to put the kibosh on us. Joe recommends mollifying the Trust because he says they will sue, and they usually win.

Jim

From: Matley, Ted (FTA)
Sent: Thursday, October 15, 2009 3:32 PM
To: Barr, James (FTA); Sukys, Raymond (FTA)
Cc: Bausch, Carl (FTA); Ryan, James (FTA); Carranza, Edward (FTA); Rogers, Leslie (FTA); Marler, Renee (FTA)
Subject: Honolulu update

All, just spoke to Faith, here's the latest from Honolulu:

1. Somewhat contrary to what we heard yesterday, The City is developing a letter regarding the Airport situation that

will outline the issues and mitigation discussed with FAA and HDOT. The letter will have a separate line for FAA signature to indicate that they are in concurrence with the statements in the letter. The city is working with FAA to determine who will sign the letter for FAA.

Question: Will this be sufficient for FTA, or do we need something only from FAA on FAA letterhead? It seems like this is an effort by the City to expedite the resolution of this by essentially writing the letter for FAA and just getting them to sign.

2. The City just met with the Oahu Burial Council. They will not sign as a concurring party. However, they have indicated that they will continue to work with the City on burial issues. Similar to the Native Hawaiian group Hui Malama I Na Kupuna O Hawai'i Nei, the Burial Council believes that there should be a full Archeological Inventory along the alignment or the alignment changed at this time to another alignment that reduces chances of disturbing burials. FTA has not concurred with this suggestion.

*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*