
From: Barr, James (FTA)
To: Ryan, James (FTA)
Sent: 12/28/2009 3:20:59 AM
Subject: FW: Honolulu Rail Transit Project - follow up to telecon

FYI

-----Original Message-----

From: Dave.Kessler@faa.gov [mailto:Dave.Kessler@faa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, December 23, 2009 4:53 PM
To: Sukys, Raymond (FTA)
Cc: Matley, Ted (FTA); Barr, James (FTA); Pete.Ciesla@faa.gov; Ron.V.Simpson@faa.gov; Steve.Wong@faa.gov; debbie.roth@faa.gov; mia.Ratcliff@faa.gov; Joseph.Manalili@faa.gov
Subject: Honolulu Rail Transit Project - follow up to telecon
Importance: High

Hi Ray - this is a follow up to our telecon earlier this week. FAA has contacted the Hawaii Department of Transportation about the proposed rail transit line that is proposed to use airport property. HDOT has indicated to us that they need to discuss the situation internally before they can visit with FAA to tell us of their decisions relative to the use of airport property for the proposed project. They anticipate being able to discuss the situation with FAA during the first full week in January 2010.

We have also discussed the transit project's potential effects on the proposed Mauka Concourse on the west side of the terminal building. HDOT-A indicates the proposed transit project does not affect any of the alternatives they are considering for the Mauka Concourse. We would need to have text in the cumulative impacts section of the Final EIS to this effect.

I wanted to also follow up on some information to see if there is any validity to it or if it was considered. It is FAA's understanding the elevated portion of the H1 and Nimitz Freeways were designed by FHWA to be able to accommodate a rail transit project either on the existing structure or between the east and west bound lanes of Nimitz Freeway and the H1. Can you tell me is there any validity to this information? Has FTA discussed a possible alignment of the transit project in the center of the Freeway with the Federal Highway Administration? If not, we should explore this to ensure the administrative record is complete to indicate we've considered all possible planning, under Section 4(f).

If it is possible to do this, then it would be another alternative that would eliminate a Section 4(f) taking on the part of FTA and FAA as the project moves through the airport area. The Metro Greenline, here in Los Angeles is on its own separate elevated structure in the middle of the Century Freeway (I-105).

Another question that came from our discussions, is could the Section 4(f) alternative avoidance route be extended to the west beyond Paiea Street so it only makes a loop into the Terminal area for the airport? That way you would avoid taking of property east of Paiea Street, there by reducing the overall cost of that portion of the project.

We think these are some discussion items that need to be included in the Alternatives analysis and Environmental Consequences discussion portions of the Final EIS.

Thanks.

David B. Kessler, AICP
Project Manager, Southern Nevada Supplemental Airport
Environmental Impact Statement
Western-Pacific Region

AR00119373

Telephone: 310/725-3615

FAX: 310/725-6848