From: Sinquefield, Robyn (FTA)
To: Day, Elizabeth (FTA)
Sent: 10/19/2010 10:11:10 AM
Subject: RE: Honolulu Precast Yard Write Up

It's fine.

From: Day, Elizabeth (FTA)
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2010 4:06 PM
To: Sinquefield, Robyn (FTA)
Subject: RE: Honolulu Precast Yard Write Up

I changed it Robyn because I thought it was too long. Here's what I have. Let me know if it is OK.

Honolulu High Capacity Transit Corridor Project: NEPA and Precast Yard(s)

The Honolulu project will be constructed in four contract segments. According to the project sponsor, the design-build contract signed in December 2009 with Kiewit for the initial West Oahu Farrington segment provided Kiewit discretion on where to site a precast yard. A precast yard is a site where concrete posts are fabricated that are needed to support the aerial guideway. According to the project sponsor, Kiewit is responsible for acquiring all necessary agreements and permits needed for any precast yards. Several months ago, Kiewit initiated a review under the State (not Federal) environmental process for a 30-acre precast yard located on former military land on Oahu. The proposed site had not been included as part of the project scope in the FEIS.

Ideally, the FEIS should include a review of the entire project scope, including precast yards, to avoid potential issues of "segmentation." Since learning of this issue, FTA has repeatedly asked the City for additional information about all of precast yard sites that might be used for the project, but the City has resisted providing information on the grounds that the precast yard site selection is the responsibility of the contractors. Yesterday, FTA finally received some information from the City, albeit limited, that provides a summary of potential environmental impacts associated with locating the precast yard at two potential sites: the alternative maintenance and storage facility site and the former military site proposed by Kiewit.

The New Starts team proposes three options for moving forward with the NEPA review for your consideration. The first two options could possibly delay the date that a Record of Decision (ROD) could be issued for the project. Recall that the ROD will not be issued before December 6th, and then only if the new Governor will immediately signs off on the State FEIS upon taking office. According to TCC, Options 1 and 2 below are recommended since they would have the lowest risk of litigation due to potential segmentation issues.

- **Option One: Review of Two or More Potential Precast Yard Sites Prior to the ROD**
  This option would involve conducting a supplemental environmental document, likely an Environmental Assessment (EA), on two or more potential sites prior to the issuance of the ROD. Under this option, the City could select a preferred site either as part of the supplemental environmental document or after the supplemental environmental document is completed.
  Time to complete: 2-3 months
- **Option Two: Review of One Selected Site Prior to the ROD**
  This option would involve performing an environmental review of a selected site for the precast yard prior to the issuance of the ROD. If the City selects the alternative maintenance and storage facility (MSF) site as the preferred site, the environmental review could be conducted as an internal evaluation incorporated in the ROD. This is because the impacts of the MSF site have already been reviewed in the FEIS. If the City selects the existing industrial facility on Oahu that was advertised by Kiewit, a supplemental environmental document, likely an Environmental Assessment, would need to be completed, similar to Option 1.
  Time to complete: 30 days if MSF site; 2-3 months if industrial site advertised by Kiewit
- **Option Three: Review of Selected Site After the ROD**
  This option would involve conducting a review after the ROD is issued. Time to complete: 2-3 months

---

From: Sinquefield, Robyn (FTA)

Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2010 4:05 PM
To: Day, Elizabeth (FTA)
Subject: FW: Honolulu Precast Yard Write Up

Hi Beth,
I just worked with Liz to ensure that all edits are incorporated and to address Chris' one comment. I cleaned it up to remove the strike-through (deleted) text.
Thanks,
Robyn

Honolulu High Capacity Transit Corridor Project: NEPA and Precast Yard(s)

The Honolulu project will be constructed in four contract segments, only one of which has been awarded to date. The contract documents for each of the construction segments provide the contractor with discretion on where the precast yard would be sited and state that the City of Honolulu (the City) would not provide areas for the yard. A precast yard is a site where concrete posts are fabricated that are needed to support the aerial guideway structure for the project. Also according to the contract documents, the contractors are responsible for acquiring necessary agreements and permits needed for any precast yards.

To date, one of the four construction segment contracts has been awarded. The West Oahu Farrington Guideway Design Build contract, the westernmost segment of the project, was awarded in December 2009 to Kiewit. Several months ago, Kiewit initiated a review under the State (not Federal) environmental process for a 30-acre precast yard located on former military land on Oahu. The proposed site had not been included as part of the project scope in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). Ideally, the FEIS should include a review of the entire project scope, including precast yards, to avoid potential issues of "segmentation."

FTA has repeatedly asked the City for additional information about precast yard sites for the project, but the City has resisted providing information on the grounds that the precast yard site selection is the responsibility of the contractor. Yesterday, FTA finally received some information, albeit limited, from the City that provides a summary of potential environmental impacts associated with locating the precast yard at two potential sites: the alternative maintenance and storage facility site and the former military site proposed by Kiewit.

At some point in time, it will be necessary to prepare some type of additional Federal environmental analysis and/or documentation addressing the precast yards needed for the project. The New Starts team proposes three options for consideration, described below. The first two options could possibly delay the date that a Record of Decision (ROD) could be issued for the project, which currently could not be issued before December 6th, when the new Governor comes into office, assuming that the new Governor immediately signs off on the State FEIS.

- **Option One: Review of Two or More Potential Precast Yard Sites Prior to the ROD**
  This option would involve conducting a supplemental environmental document, likely an Environmental Assessment (EA), on two or more potential sites prior to the issuance of the ROD. Under this option, the City could select a preferred site either as part of the supplemental environmental document or after the supplemental environmental document is completed.
  Time to complete: 2-3 months

- **Option Two: Review of One Selected Site Prior to the ROD**
  This option would involve performing an environmental review of a selected site for the precast yard prior to the issuance of the ROD. If the City selects the alternative maintenance and storage facility (MSF) site as the preferred site for the precast yard, the environmental review could be conducted as an internal evaluation incorporated in the ROD. This is because the impacts of the MSF site have already been reviewed in the FEIS. If the City selects the existing industrial facility on Oahu that was advertised by Kiewit, a supplemental environmental document, likely an Environmental Assessment, would need to be completed, similar to Option 1.
  Time to complete: 30 days (if MSF site); 2-3 months (if former military land advertised by Kiewit)

- **Option Three: Review of Selected Site After the ROD**
  This option would involve conducting a review after the ROD is issued.
  Time to complete: 2-3 months

According to TCC, Options 1 and 2 would have the lowest risk of litigation due to potential segmentation issues.