
From: Barr, James <FTA>
To: Matley, Ted <FTA>; Ossi, Joseph <FTA>
Sent: 2/13/2009 3:37:46 AM
Subject: RE: ACHP Letter on Honolulu

Ted:

ACHP also requested an update on the consultation process. Maybe we should e-mail Faith for the latest info. Also, ask Faith specifically about Native Hawaiian coordination since the ACHP requested that info.

Finally, we should tell them that we are having a big pow-wow in SF in March and maybe invite them to participate.

Jim

From: Matley, Ted <FTA>
Sent: Friday, February 13, 2009 12:34 AM
To: Barr, James <FTA>; Ossi, Joseph <FTA>
Subject: RE: ACHP Letter on Honolulu

Jim, Joe,

Here's a draft response to ACHP. It's very bare bones. They basically had the following requests:

1. Confirm that a finding of effect has not been circulated
2. That there won't be 2 agreements
3. Update on Section 106 consultation and info on how FTA is providing oversight

The letter briefly deals with 1 and 2, I'd have to get a written update from Honolulu to provide a detailed status on the consultation process and I'm not sure how to provide info on how we provide oversight - it's basically just calls and emails as needed.

Let me know where you think this should be augmented and I'll revise.

Ted

From: Barr, James <FTA>
Sent: Wed 2/4/2009 6:15 AM
To: Matley, Ted <FTA>
Cc: Ossi, Joseph <FTA>; Sukys, Raymond <FTA>; Bausch, Carl <FTA>; Smith, Julie
Subject: RE: ACHP Letter on Honolulu

Ted:

I'm assuming that HTS have seen the ACHP letter - they were not CC'd.

We have a meeting scheduled for March 9 - that should be adequate.

Recall that in its letter, ACHP requested "...an update on the status of the 106 consultation...as well as information on how FTA is providing oversight to the city regarding the coordination [and consultation] process." So, it looks like they want a response from us. My feeling is that it should just be a *pro forma* "our coordination process is ongoing, blah, blah, blah, and welcome to the process" - since it is clear from their letter that they are now "assisting" and intend to continue to "assist."

Jim

From: Matley, Ted <FTA>
Sent: Tuesday, February 03, 2009 12:33 AM
To: Barr, James <FTA>
Cc: Ossi, Joseph <FTA>
Subject: RE: ACHP Letter on Honolulu

Jim, should we setup a call to discuss this with Honolulu, as well as any comments on the draft mou's they sent, or can I just craft an email you can review? I'm not wild about more calls but it might be good to discuss this since they always need such clear direction to get it right.

Let me know what you think.

Ted

From: Ossi, Joseph <FTA>
Sent: Fri 1/30/2009 1:00 PM
To: Matley, Ted <FTA>
Cc: Barr, James <FTA>
Subject: ACHP Letter on Honolulu

Ted:

I saw the letter from ACHP. The ACHP expects a very step-by-step process. Before you begin circulation of the draft MOA (and there should be only 1, not 2 agreements), make sure that the following steps are done:

1. DTS has sent to all Section 106 consulting parties (including the Native Hawaiian Organization):
(a) the identification of historic properties (i.e., the evaluation of historic significance of properties within the APE), and
(b) the FTA/DTS determination of effects on properties deemed eligible for the Register or on the Register.

The SHPO transmittal should request concurrence in both (a) and (b);

2. FTA has sent a letter to the ACHP informing ACHP that the undertaking will have adverse effects and transmitting (a) and (b), for information, but ACHP may decide that they want to participate in the consultation. After they are informed by FTA that the project has adverse effects, they have 15 days to inform us if they want to participate [36 CFR 800.6(a)(1)];

3. Only after the SHPO concurrence in (a) and (b) has been received, and the ACHP's concurrence, too, if they are participating, should the draft MOA be circulated to all consulting parties for review and revisions.

Joe Ossi
FTA Office of Planning and Environment
(202) 366-1613

From: Matley, Ted <FTA>
Sent: Tuesday, January 27, 2009 6:04 PM
To: Barr, James <FTA>
Cc: Sukys, Raymond <FTA>; Rogers, Leslie <FTA>; Ossi, Joseph <FTA>
Subject: FW: Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project, Honolulu, Hawaii

Jim, as expected, attached is the letter from ACHP. I just sent you the draft of the 2 MOU's, Honolulu asks that we look at the drafts and discuss with them whether to go with two or one MOU. These said 2 made sense to them but they're open to discussion.

Also looks like ACHP wants some sort of briefing and feedback on the process. Lets discuss how to proceed when you return to the office.

AR00140433

thanks,

Ted

From: Rogers, Leslie <FTA>
Sent: Tue 1/27/2009 1:44 PM
To: Matley, Ted <FTA>; Sukys, Raymond <FTA>
Subject: FW: Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project, Honolulu, Hawaii

FYI and appropriate action. We may want to coordinate response with TPE. Thanks!

Leslie

From: FPLA [mailto:FPLA@achp.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, January 27, 2009 1:34 PM
To: Rogers, Leslie <FTA>
Cc: Puaalaokalani Aiu; Julie Atkins
Subject: Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project, Honolulu, Hawaii

From: Office of Federal Agency Programs

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation

Attached is our letter on the subject undertaking (in Adobe Acrobat PDF format)

If you have any questions concerning our letter, please contact:

Blythe Semmer (202) 606-8552
bsemmer@achp.gov

Note: Please do not reply to this email.

A free copy of Adobe Acrobat Reader can be downloaded from: www.adobe.com