From: Miyamoto, Faith
To: Raymond.Sukys@dot.gov; Hamayasu, Toru
CC: Spurgeon, Lawrence; Hogan, Steven; Renee.Marler@dot.gov; James.Barr@dot.gov; Edward.Carranza@dot.gov; Catherine.Luu@dot.gov; Ted.Matley@dot.gov; Souki, Jesse K.
Sent: 1/5/2010 2:29:09 PM
Subject: RE: Items that we need information on

Hi Ray -

To follow up on your December 22, 2009 email message, see my responses embedded in your message.

Will get you the remainder of the information as soon as possible.

Faith

-----Original Message-----
From: Raymond.Sukys@dot.gov [mailto:Raymond.Sukys@dot.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, January 05, 2010 7:31 AM
To: Hamayasu, Toru; Miyamoto, Faith
Cc: Spurgeon@pbworld.com; Hogan@pbworld.com; Renee.Marler@dot.gov; James.Barr@dot.gov; Edward.Carranza@dot.gov; Catherine.Luu@dot.gov; Ted.Matley@dot.gov
Subject: FW: Items that we need information on

Toru,

We are planning to discuss the airport access issues with FHWA. Dave Kessler of the FAA indicated that when the ramps were built for the airport, provisions were made to include transit access. Also, per the e-mail below, it would help if we had more information on your avoidance options especially in light of the call with the FAA last month.

I have yet to receive any response from my request on December 22nd.

Ray

----- Original Message -----
From: Sukys, Raymond (FTA)
To: Miyamoto, Faith <fmiyamoto@honolulu.gov>; toru.hamayasu@honolulu.gov <toru.hamayasu@honolulu.gov>
Cc: Barr, James (FTA); Matley, Ted (FTA); Luu, Catherine (FTA); Marler, Renee (FTA); Carranza, Edward (FTA)
Sent: Tue Dec 22 11:19:07 2009
Subject: Items that we need information on

Faith,

The airport call yesterday made it clear that we do not have enough enough information on the feasibility of the section 4(f) avoidance option. We have yet to receive anything in writing, other than the limited explanation in the FEIS, that would explain why it should not be an alternative. Please provide us with an explanation of the alignment issues and impacts, describe the constructibility issues, list the property acquisitions, describe the business relocations, and give the details of your cost-estimate. Last October the marginal difference in cost was $70M, now it is $100M, please provide an explanation. If we are to proceed with the decision to maintain the alignment as described in the FEIS, FTA needs additional information to support our Section 4(f) decision.

As you know, we had a teleconference last month with Chris Van Wyck regarding his comments on the Section 4(f) section of the FEIS. In his comments, Chris questioned why the impact on Keehi Lagoon Park was not de minimus. We responded that originally RTD proposed that the

impact on Keehi Lagoon Park was de minimus. However, in response to FTA comments, it was changed to a 4(f) impact in the DEIS. After further discussion with Chris, it was decided that de minimus is the appropriate determination for Keehi Lagoon Park. Chris related that he would discuss this matter internally after our conference call.

Please provide an explanation of the limitations of the Navy Drum site for the design of the facility. What is the schedule and, if applicable, the results of the Phase 1 and 2? It seems that you should have a Phase 1 by now. Please send it.

Lawrence Spurgeon of PB emailed you a link on 12/22/09 to the Phase 1 site assessment for the Navy Drum site and a copy of the summary of the Navy's closure site assessment.

Please provide the language in your Kiewet contract about how you will evaluate billing, the standards that are in place to pay an invoice, to ensure that NEPA-related activities are conducted and not construction-related activities such as mobilization during NTP number I do not understand how $27M can be spent prior to the ROD.

Response will be provided separately.

Thank you,

Ray