
From: Matley, Ted (FTA)
To: Zelasko, Elizabeth (FTA)
CC: Marler, Renee (FTA); Zusman, Nancy-Ellen (FTA); Sukys, Raymond (FTA); Bausch, Carl (FTA)
Sent: 4/15/2010 7:25:53 AM
Subject: RE: Honolulu Rail Project - APE modification

Liz, your comments hit on a good point about this letter. This letter is the standard letter format informing the SHPO of an APE designation (a change in the APE in this case) and seeking concurrence on the APE and the impacts, such as we would send at the start of the process, before we have an PA or a PA development process.

If I get your comments correctly, this letter would essentially be changed to an informational letter regarding the potential APE change (even though the changes are a given) and impacts (or lack thereof) and proposing that we deal with it under the soon to be signed PA.

If that is correct, we'd remove any reference to seeking any concurrence from SHPO at this time and keep it focused as information only.

Is that where we going with this? I just want to confirm since that's a different letter than the City originally proposed , but of course it's our process and letter. I just want to be able to explain our decision to the City when they ask about it.

Also, if this letter is informational only, who else gets copied?

Thanks!

From: Zelasko, Elizabeth (FTA)
Sent: Tuesday, April 13, 2010 1:44 PM
To: Sukys, Raymond (FTA); Bausch, Carl (FTA); Zusman, Nancy-Ellen (FTA)
Cc: Matley, Ted (FTA)
Subject: RE: Honolulu Rail Project - APE modification

Sorry it has taken me a day to respond. I have a few comments on the letter.

First, I would recommend modifying the first sentence to read *The Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and City and County of Honolulu Department of Transportation Services (DTS) are considering a modification to the Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project in the vicinity of Honolulu International Airport to avoid encroachment into the center portion of the runway protection zone of Runway 22L/4R.*

As far as process goes, we had discussed internally saying that we would follow the programmatic agreement and what it says regarding project modifications. In their recent comments, the ACHP added in red in stipulation XIII.B.:

B. Project Modifications—Should the Project alignment be changed in any way that FTA determines results in a change to the APE, the City shall update the APE maps, and FTA and the City, **in consultation with other consulting parties**, shall ensure that the requirements of this PA are met, after further consultation and assessment of effects, with regard to the new portions of the APE.

Consulting parties, of course, include SHPO, Indian tribes and Native Hawaiian Organizations, and the other parties listed on page 1 and 2 of the PA. My question now is do we consult with them? In my opinion, I think it would be sufficient for now to have the PA finalized and work on the project modification through the 106 process during the preparation of a supplemental or final environmental analysis and have it resolved before the ROD. If that is what we do, then I think the letter should be changed to inform the SHPO of the modified APE and provide information on the buildings within the APE. We can say that the likely determination of effect would be No Historic Properties Affected for the proposed alignment shift, however, FTA would work with consulting parties before making a final determination.

Liz

From: Sukys, Raymond (FTA)
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2010 6:35 PM
To: Bausch, Carl (FTA); Zelasko, Elizabeth (FTA); Zusman, Nancy-Ellen (FTA)
Cc: Matley, Ted (FTA)
Subject: FW: Honolulu Rail Project - APE modification

Here is a proposed letter to SHPO due to the proposed Ualena alternative. Should we proceed?

From: Miyamoto, Faith [mailto:fmiyamoto@honolulu.gov]
Sent: Wed 4/7/2010 7:22 PM
To: Rogers, Leslie (FTA)
Cc: Matley, Ted (FTA)
Subject: Honolulu Rail Project

Hi Leslie –

Attached is a draft letter for your finalization and transmittal to the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO).

The attached letter requests concurrence from the SHPO on eligibility and effect for properties affected by the guideway on Ualena Street. The determinations were made by a qualified architectural historian, and were reviewed by Mason Architects, a firm recognized and respected by the Hawaii SHPD. The attachments to the letter are the materials previously shared with FTA to support the review of the Ualena alignment. The attachments may be downloaded from:

<https://ftp.pbworld.com/GetFile.aspx?fn=84782666.zip>

We would be happy to print and deliver a copy of the letter to the SHPD office with a set of the attachments as soon as FTA finalizes and signs the letter. The findings would not result in any changes to the Programmatic Agreement.

Thanks.

Faith Miyamoto
808 768 8350

NOTICE: This communication and any attachments ("this message") may contain confidential information for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, disclosure, viewing, copying, alteration, dissemination or distribution of, or reliance on this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, or you are not an authorized recipient, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message, delete this message and all copies from your e-mail system and destroy any printed copies.