

September 3, 2009

**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Section 106 Consultation Process Participants  
**FROM:** Leland Chang  
**SUBJECT:** Notes From Today's Session

Aloha. I am forwarding the notes from this morning's (Thursday, September 3<sup>rd</sup>) session. I look forward to continuing with our process at our meeting next week.

Mahalo.

**Brainstorming Potential Responses  
to Outstanding PA Elements and Issues**

Main Street

Valuable because it would address cumulative individual effects and overall impact on Oahu; it would help with managing historic resources; bigger picture approach; represents a package of tools

- a. Need for tools and analysis on front end. What's happening to these resources?
- b. More discussion regarding cumulative effects and possible mitigation
- c. Collective approach – multiple resources in one area
- d. Documentation and education for property owners regarding National Register
- e. Main Street is a resource for businesses in historic preservation and economic development

Certified Local Government

Allows counties to define important properties. CLG reviews permit applications and design guidelines. Honolulu has a historic preservation program (planned but not implemented). With the database of defined important properties, when a permit is submitted for a defined property, it is red flagged early and mitigation can be approached right away. Provides local involvement and city-level management. It is proactive.

- a. Additional assessment; ongoing monitoring, investigations
- b. The advantage of a PA is that it provides for ongoing consultation

### Delay in Executing PA until after consultation on identifying resources to be studied

Important not to delay because each day of delay adds costs. 106 process has been moving along for some time. Need PA to obtain ROD

- a. City scopes studies with Concurring Parties
- b. Finish studies expeditiously
- c. PA - develop SOWs by time certain; then execute the PA and engage in consultation as studies proceed
- d. PA states the process
- e. Arrange study plans according to phases

### Height of the Line

Flexibility in adjusting height for parts of the route would have greater benefit for historic resources.

- a. 106/NEPA (EIS) process – alternatives have been addressed
- b. Elevated some places, at-grade for others
- c. PA is for the project as planned. Significant changes would mean going back to the beginning

### OIBC - Invited signatory [OIBC was not present at the time this was discussed]

- a. FTA amenable to involved parties signing as concurring parties
- b. FTA will consult with ACHP and SHPD re. the request by OIBC to be an invited signatory

### Define alternatives suitable for discussion

- a. Other kinds of mitigation (relates to item re. balance of documentation and other forms of mitigation)

### Public access to database

- a. City will provide all materials and data
- b. Offers to any appropriate body which can maintain a searchable database
- c. Researchable
- d. Need to partner with another agency and City will assist transfer.
- e. City maintains database
- f. Some information is sensitive. Need to screen. Not all should be publicly available.
- g. Create protocol for what to make available (DPP-DLNR)

Creative Zoning

- a. CLG could help with this
- b. DPP has architectural guidelines for special districts; TOD will be treated in a similar way with new overlay zoning
- c. Ordinance 0904