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BACKGROUND

Senate Concurrent Resolution #48, passed during the 2005 Legislature, requested the Oahu Metropolitan Planning Organization (OahuMPO) to study the feasibility of an alternate route of ingress to and egress from Mililani Mauka (see Attachment 1). The need for this alternate route, as cited by the resolution, was prompted by the existence of only a single route of ingress and egress for emergency and peak travel periods.

In early 2004, the OahuMPO began to update the Oahu regional transportation plan (ORTP) to the year 2030. The ORTP is recognized by federal, state, and city governments as Oahu’s official transportation plan. This plan provides a guide for the development of major surface transportation facilities and programs. Transportation projects seeking federal funds must be consistent with this plan.

This resolution was passed midway through the development of the ORTP 2030. Although the resolution stated that the possibility of constructing an alternate route had not been addressed or included the ORTP, a second access roadway from Mililani Mauka to Waiawa was addressed during the development of the plan and is now part of the ORTP 2030. The ORTP 2030 identifies a total of four second access projects (Central Mauka Road, Makakilo Drive, Wahiawa Second Access, and Waianae Second Access). This report will focus on the ORTP 2030 analysis of the Central Mauka Road.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The ORTP 2030 was endorsed by the OahuMPO Policy Committee on April 4, 2006. Included in this plan is the Central Mauka Road project, which provides a second access to Mililani Mauka. This project is described as the construction of a new 4-lane arterial from Mililani Mauka to Waiawa. The Central Mauka Road connects Meheula Parkway in Mililani Mauka to Kamehameha Highway in Pearl City and runs parallel to and mauka of Interstate Route H-2 (see Figure 1). This project is estimated to cost $160 million (year 2005 dollars).
Figure 1
Central Mauka Road
Mililani Mauka to Waiawa

Construct a new four-lane roadway, parallel to the H-2 Freeway, mauka of the H-2 Freeway between Mililani Mauka and Kamehameha Highway at Waiawa.
ORTP 2030 ASSESSMENT

The assessment of the Central Mauka Road project will utilize analyses developed during the ORTP 2030 effort. This involves components of the Congestion Management System (CMS) and the community outreach program.

Congestion Management System
The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 required metropolitan planning organizations to incorporate CMS into its planning process, which includes the development of its regional transportation plan. The recently passed Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users still maintained this requirement, but changed the name of the CMS to Congestion Management Process. For this report, this process will be referred to as the CMS.

The CMS is a technical process used by the OahuMPO to assist decision-makers in selecting ORTP projects. The CMS identifies congested surface transportation facilities, evaluates projects proposed to mitigate congestion, and prioritizes these projects using quantifiable performance measures. Project evaluation is done primarily through the use of the OahuMPO travel forecasting models.

The analysis of proposed ORTP projects is documented in the report entitled Congestion Management System – Analysis of Proposed Projects in the 2030 Oahu Regional Transportation Plan, dated December 2005. Analysis results for the Central Mauka Road are taken from this report.

In the Year 2030, over 1000 vehicles are projected to use the new roadway in the southbound direction in the morning peak period, with another 300 in the northbound direction. During the morning peak period, the roadway is forecasted to be at Level of Service (LOS) A in both directions. LOS A is an excellent service level for roadway users and represents free flow conditions due to the relatively low projected traffic volumes when compared to the capacity of the roadway.

As can be seen in Tables 1, 2 and 3, the Central Mauka Road is forecasted to encourage more auto trips while decreasing transit trips. Tables 4, 5, and 6 presents vehicle miles traveled (VMT), vehicle hours traveled (VHT), and vehicle hours of delay (VHD); and show that, from an island-wide perspective, VMT, VHT, and VHD are projected to show a net increase including the morning peak period. Table 7 shows that the overall morning peak period mean speeds are projected to decrease.
Table 1

2030 Daily Resident Trips to and from Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Without Project</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>With Project</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Automobile Trips</td>
<td>1,000,700</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>1,001,300</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Trips</td>
<td>89,900</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>89,300</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle and Walk Trips</td>
<td>74,400</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>74,400</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,165,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,165,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

2030 Daily Resident Vehicle Trips

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Without Project</th>
<th>With Project</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Percent Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AM Peak</td>
<td>516,700</td>
<td>517,000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Peak</td>
<td>894,600</td>
<td>895,000</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM Peak</td>
<td>644,900</td>
<td>645,200</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,056,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,057,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>1000</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

2030 Daily Resident Transit Trips

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Without Project</th>
<th>With Project</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Percent Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peak Period</td>
<td>138,700</td>
<td>138,000</td>
<td>(700)</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Peak Period</td>
<td>64,100</td>
<td>63,800</td>
<td>(300)</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>202,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>201,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>(1,000)</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.5%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

2030 AM Peak Vehicle Miles Traveled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>AM Peak VMT</th>
<th></th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Without Project</td>
<td>With Project</td>
<td>Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeways</td>
<td>1,178,400</td>
<td>1,182,100</td>
<td>3,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressways</td>
<td>304,100</td>
<td>303,100</td>
<td>-1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>970,700</td>
<td>979,100</td>
<td>8,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>302,900</td>
<td>300,800</td>
<td>-2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,756,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,765,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5
2030 AM Peak Vehicle Hours Traveled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>AM Peak VHT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Without Project</td>
<td>With Project</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>Percent Difference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeways</td>
<td>75,400</td>
<td>76,100</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressways</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>17,600</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>56,200</td>
<td>56,300</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>15,900</td>
<td>15,700</td>
<td>-200</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>165,700</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6
2030 AM Peak Vehicle Hours of Delay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>AM Peak Hours of Delay</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Without Project</td>
<td>With Project</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>Percent Difference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeways</td>
<td>55,900</td>
<td>56,500</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressways</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>29,800</td>
<td>29,700</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>5,800</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>104,100</td>
<td>104,500</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7
2030 AM Peak Mean Speeds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>AM Peak Mean Speeds</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Without Project</td>
<td>With Project</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>Percent Difference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeways</td>
<td>15.629</td>
<td>15.534</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressways</td>
<td>17.377</td>
<td>17.222</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>17.272</td>
<td>17.391</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>19.050</td>
<td>19.159</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16.704</td>
<td>16.687</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A total of 10 second access projects were evaluated through the CMS process as part of the ORTP 2030. A point system based upon the following performance measures was utilized (see Table 8):

- change in traffic volume to roadway capacity ratio
- if the project is on the CMS list of congested roadways
- impact to transit mode share of work trips
- additional number of vehicles forecasted to use the facility
- impact to system-wide change in VMT during the morning peak period
- impact to system-wide change in VHT during the morning peak period
- impact to system-wide change in VHD during the morning peak period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Possible Points</th>
<th>Additional Vehicle Volume (increments of 500)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in V/C Ratio</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of Congested Roadways</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Mode Share</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Volume</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Miles Traveled</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Hours Traveled</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Hours of Delay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total Points Possible: 23 (or more based on increase in Vehicle Volume)*

The CMS rankings of the ten tested second access projects are shown in Table 9. Using the CMS point system, the Central Mauka Road received 7 points, ranking this project in the bottom half of the ten tested projects.
Table 9

Rankings of Second Access Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second Access Project</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waianae Mauka Highway – Makaha Valley Road to Kunia Road</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauka Frontage Road – Makakilo to Ko Olina</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeward Community College Second Access – Ala Ike Road to Waipio Point Access Road</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makakilo Drive – Extension to H-1 at North South Road</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waianae Mauka Road – Waianae to Ko Olina</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halawa Valley Second Access</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Mauka Road – Mililani Mauka to Waiawa</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Palisades Second Access – Komo Mai Drive to Kaahumanu Street</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wahiawa Second Access – Between Whitmore Village, Wahiawa Heights, and Mililani Mauka</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mililani Second Access – Mililani Mauka to Pineapple Road</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that the CMS analysis attempts to evaluate projects from a congestion relief perspective. For a second access project, congestion relief may not be the sole focus. Residents have requested a second access route when natural disasters, traffic accidents, congestion, hostage control, or other incidents restrict access to or from their community.

Community Outreach Program

As part of its community outreach program, the OahuMPO conducted two random telephone surveys of Oahu residents. The first survey was conducted in September 2004 and explored attitudes about transportation issues. The second survey was conducted in January 2006 and explored public reactions to alternative solutions and ideas proposed for the ORTP 2030. The second survey had a maximum sampling error of ± 4.9% at the 95% confidence level.

Residents’ reactions to six second access routes to Oahu communities were investigated in the second survey. The following question was asked:

"Some communities on Oahu have asked for a second route to their areas for various reasons, such as evacuation from natural disasters, traffic accidents, congestion relief, and hostage control. I’ll read a short list, and if there were only enough money to build one project, which of the following would provide the most benefit: A second access to ...?"

- The Waianae Coast
- Mililani Mauka
- The North Shore
- Makakilo
- Pacific Palisades
- Wahiawa”
A second access route to the Waianae Coast ranked first by a large margin, with 46% of Oahu residents indicated that it will “provide the most benefit”. This was followed by Mililani Mauka and North Shore with 11% each, Makakilo with 7%, Pacific Palisades with 6%, and Wahiawa with 5% (“no response” or “don’t know” accounted for the remaining 14%).

Support for the Mililani Mauka second access came primarily from Central Oahu (18%) and urban Honolulu (13%) residents. The Mililani/Waipio/Melemanu Neighborhood Board No. 25 adopted a motion at its regular meeting of March 22, 2006 to request that this project be included in the ORTP.

During the technical deliberations on this project, concerns were raised as to the difficult terrain the roadway would traverse, degree and location of development(s) along the alignment, the potential for developer funding, and cost. Community support played a major role in the Policy Committee’s decision to include the Central Mauka Road into the ORTP 2030. As also cited in SCR No. 48, Mililani residents are concern about the existing and projected traffic congestion as the area continues to grow.

**POST-ORTP DISCUSSION**

The ORTP 2030 represents a vision of what major regional transportation projects and strategies are programmed for Oahu through 2030. Before it can be constructed, projects identified in the ORTP must still go through a more detailed analysis as part of its project development process. The ORTP is part of the metropolitan planning process that typically precedes the project development process.

It is important to note that being identified in the ORTP does not guarantee a project’s ultimate construction. During the more detailed evaluations, where a project proceeds into its project development phase, a project could be modified, postponed, or terminated for any number of reasons, such as environmental impact, cost, or lack of public support. A major project such as the Central Mauka Road would probably go through a fairly extensive project development phase.

The ORTP is also required to be updated every five years to reflect changes in land use policies and development, community priorities, funding assumptions, or other factors. Almost all of the ORTP projects programmed in the 2016 to 2030 time period of the ORTP, which includes the Central Mauka Road project, are expected to be re-evaluated at the next update cycle.
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POLICY COMMITTEE

Tuesday, April 4, 2006, 9:15 a.m.
Honolulu Hale, Council Committee Room, room 205
530 South King Street, Honolulu, Hawaii

Members Present:
Representative Marilyn Lee, Chair
Councilmember Todd Apo, Vice Chair
Councilmember Romy Cachola
Councilmember Ann Kobayashi
Councilmember Gary Okino
Representative Joseph Souki
Representative Mark Moses
Senator Brian Kanno
Rodney Haraga, DOT Director
Melvin Kaku, DTS Director

Members Absent: Councilmember Charles Djou and Senators Lorraine Inouye and Will Espero

Invited Resource Guest Present: Laura Thielen (DBEDT-OP Director)

Guests Present:
Dennis Galolo (Clmbr Cachola staff) Michael Golojuch (NB #34, CAC)
Grant Kawaguchi (Cl Chair Dela Cruz staff) Richard Kane (Pacific Resource Partnership, CAC)
Stan Fichtman (Clmbr Djou staff) Michael Costa (Teamsters Local 996, CAC)
Dean Nakagawa (DOT) Gladys Quinto (Land Use Research Fndtn, CAC)
Ronald Tszuki (DOT) Dick Kaku (Kaku Associates)
Brennan Morioka (DOT) Mark Scheibe (Parsons Brinckerhoff)
Robert Finley (NB #9, CAC) Emily Reed (WRA)
Charles Carole (NB #10, CAC, Vice Chair) Jon Tamayori (Ward Research)
Karen Awana (NB #24, CAC)

OMPO Staff Present: Gordon Lum (Executive Director), Lori Arakaki, Shevaun Low, Pamela Toyooka

Chair Marilyn Lee called the meeting to order at 9:18 a.m. A quorum was present. Chair Lee recognized Laura Thielen, representing the Office of Planning.

I. OAHU REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (ORTP) 2030

Handouts:
- Draft ORTP 2030 Mid-Range Plan and Long-Range Plan Project List (includes proposed modifications)
- Table 1: Revenue Estimate Summary – Traditional Revenue Sources – 2006 to 2030
- Table 2: Estimated Revenue Versus Cost – 2006 to 2030
- Illustrative Project List
- Tally of Public Comments Received on the Draft ORTP 2030

Gordon Lum gave a PowerPoint presentation of the Draft ORTP 2030 proposed modifications. The draft plan, with the proposed modifications, is compliant with Title VI and Environmental Justice principles; projects have been analyzed using the congestion management system; and intelligent transportation system (ITS) projects included in the draft plan are consistent with the Oahu Regional ITS architecture.
Mr. Lum stated that public comments on the proposed modifications suggest that Project 34,289 (Central Mauka Road) be included in the ORTP 2030, rather than on the Illustrative List. This would result in an overall shortfall of $105.6 million (Year 2005 dollars). The financial plan presented to the Policy Committee in January 2006 and summarized in Tables 1 and 2 does not address this shortfall.

Four possible options to include Central Mauka Road in the ORTP 2030 were presented:

- **Option 1: Change Waianae 2nd Access** – This option includes adding two projects to the 2016-2030 time period, #34,298 (Central Mauka Road) and #357 (Waianae Second Access, Waianae to Kapolei), and deletion of Project #509 (Waianae Second Access, Vicinity of Maili to Kunia Road). All other proposed modifications would be included in the ORTP, as circulated to the Policy Committee. Modifications to the financial plan would be unnecessary.

- **Option 2: Increase developer funding assumption** – This option includes the addition of Project 34,289 (Central Mauka Road) and incorporates all other proposed modifications to the ORTP, as circulated to the Policy Committee. To financially constrain the ORTP, the assumption with respect to developer funding is increased from 34% to 49%, resulting in a revenue increase of over $105 million.

- **Option 3: Increase taxes** – This option includes the addition of Project 34,289 (Central Mauka Road) and incorporates all other proposed modifications to the ORTP, as circulated to the Policy Committee. To financially constrain the ORTP, taxes will be increased. Two possible scenarios were provided, resulting in a revenue increase of between $103 and $110 million.
  
  - **Scenario 1:** Increase fuel tax
    - Increase: 2 cents per gallon
    - Start Date: 2010
    - Revenue: $103M
  
  - **Scenario 2:** Increase vehicle registration fee
    - Increase: $10 per vehicle
    - Start Date: 2010
    - Revenue: $110M

- **Option 4: Delete other projects** – This option includes the deletion of projects included in the Draft ORTP 2030 and proposed project modifications list, as circulated to the Policy Committee. Potential projects that could be deleted were identified using the results of the projects’ rankings as calculated using the congestion management system:
  
  - Wahiawa 2nd Access, Wahiawa to Mililani Mauka (#352)
  - Likelike Highway, Widening, Kamehameha Highway to Kahekili Highway (#278)
  - H-2 New Interchange, Pineapple Road Overpass (#145)
  - Piikoi-Pensacola Couplet Reversal (#507)

It was noted that the majority of these projects received support from the public for their inclusion in the ORTP 2030.

Mr. Lum asked the Policy Committee for direction about whether or not to include Central Mauka Road (#34,289) in the ORTP 2030 through selection of one of the four options presented, or through identification of another option.

**Discussion**

- Representative Joseph Souki stated that, with respect to the four options provided, he is leaning toward Option 3, increasing taxes. This option will provide additional revenue through automobile ownership and/or use; because of this, it will be an incentive to use rail.
• In response to a question from Representative Souki, Mark Scheibe, ORTP subsconsultant, stated that the calculation to increase the gasoline fuel tax by two cents per gallon used the State’s gas tax as a base and would be applicable only to Oahu.

• In response to a question from Senator Brian Kanno, Chair Lee stated that the both Mililani neighborhood boards passed strong resolutions in support of Project 34,289 (Central Mauka Road) and in opposition of Project 145 (Interstate H-2, New Interchange at Pineapple Road Overpass). Referring to the copy of the resolution provided to all Policy Committee members, Chair Lee said that the addition of an interchange at this location would exacerbate existing and growing traffic congestion on H-2.

Chair Lee vacated the Chairmanship, turning the chairing duties over to Vice Chair Todd Apo.

• Representative Lee stated that the neighborhood boards’ comments on the development of an interchange at Pineapple Road are correct and asserted that the Central Mauka Road is critical to support development in Central Oahu.

• Senator Kanno said that he is open to the removal of Project #507 (Piikoi-Pensacola Couplet Reversal) from the ORTP 2030.

• Department of Transportation Director Rodney Haraga countered that Project #507 should be retained in ORTP 2030. He stated that the project cost of approximately $4 million is small compared to its benefits in increasing safety and negligible as part of the $13.4 billion total cost for the ORTP 2030.

• Mr. Haraga said that the Option 4 projects identified for deletion should also be retained for safety reasons.

• Representative Souki stated that he is concerned about Option 2, increasing the assumption with respect to developer contributions, because the costs will ultimately be passed onto homeowners.

Representative Lee moved and Representative Souki seconded that the ORTP 2030 include the Central Mauka Road through Option 4.

• In response to a question from Vice Chair Apo, Mr. Lum clarified that, if Option 4 is selected, additional public review will be required.

• In response to a question from Representative Mark Moses, Mr. Lum said that the last ORTP was endorsed by the Policy Committee on April 6, 2001. Federal regulations require the ORTP to be updated every five years. Should the ORTP 2030 not be endorsed by the Policy Committee by April 6, 2006, OMPO will ask the federal agencies for additional time.

• In response to a question from Vice Chair Apo, Mr. Lum said that, if the ORTP 2030 is not approved by April 6, 2006, a worst-case scenario is that the federal agencies could say that OMPO is not in compliance with the metropolitan planning process and could restrict federal transportation funds to the island of Oahu.

• In response to a question from Councilmember Romy Cachola, Mr. Lum said that there has not been any direct dialogue with developers on the increase in developer contributions from 34% to 49%. The ORTP 2030 would include a statement that says that the ORTP assumption of 49% developer contribution is used for planning purposes only. It was noted that the OMPO arena is not the forum where the actual developer contribution will be determined.

• In response to a question from Representative Lee, Mr. Haraga stated that, in speaking with Adjutant General Major General Robert Lee of the Department of Defense, the Kolekole Pass is a viable option.
for providing the Waianae Coast with a second emergency access. The Hawaii Department of Transportation (HDOT) is currently working with the Navy and the Army to use and improve the Kolekole Pass. This could reduce the cost estimate for Project #509 (Waianae Second Access, Vicinity of Maili to Kunia Road).

- Representative Moses stated that, with the exception of the two Waianae second access projects, the remaining second access projects identified in the Draft ORTP 2030 only serve the people who live there. Both Waianae second access projects being discussed support the entire Waianae Coast.

- In response to a series of questions from Representative Moses, Dick Kaku, ORTP consultant, said that the Mililani Mauka second access project (i.e., Central Mauka Road) was not evaluated separately in the technical evaluation by his firm. He added that, it is the opinion of his firm, when evaluating transportation issues from an islandwide perspective, that Option 1 provides the most overall benefit to the residents of Oahu.

- In response to a series of questions from Representative Moses, Mr. Lum said that preliminary engineering is not part of the development of ORTP projects and, therefore, was not done for either of the two Waianae second access projects being proposed (i.e., Projects #357 and #509). The previous iteration of the ORTP, “TOP 2025”, included identification of a Waianae second access project that traversed the Waianae Mountain Range as being the Policy Committee’s highest priority on the Illustrative list of projects. In addition, there is a Waianae emergency access project being constructed by the City at this time. The current Kolekole Pass emergency access to the Waianae Coast would not be available for use 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

- In response to a question from Senator Kanno, Mr. Lum said that, if projects are deleted from the Draft ORTP 2030 project list and were not previously identified for deletion to the public, it is the interpretation of the federal agencies that the public has not been informed of the deletion. Because communities and residents may support a project that is proposed for deletion, the federal agencies have strongly opined that additional public review time be provided such that the impacted communities and residents will have adequate time to be informed and provide comments.

- Representative Lee stated that there has been ample time for the public to comment on the Draft ORTP 2030.

- In response to a question from Mr. Haraga, Mr. Scheibe said that the revenue projections of the federal dollars available to Hawaii are conservative. They assume a decrease in the amount of federal dollars due to the assumption that donor/donee states’ contributions become balanced over time. Because Hawaii is a “donee state”, meaning that it has historically contributed less than it receives in terms of federal transportation dollars, this conservative approach is not beneficial to Hawaii.

- Representative Moses stated his support for Option 1.

- In response to questions from Councilmembers Cachola and Ann Kobayashi, Mr. Scheibe said that the City and County’s revenue forecast assumed the expected revenue from the general excise tax increase and current growth rates of the General Fund and the Highway Fund. General Fund allocation was assumed to remain at historical levels. Capital expenditures were assumed to continue as they are currently done.

- Councilmember Gary Okino stated that he does not like any of the proposed options, adding that Central Mauka Road will have a huge impact on the Aiea and Pearl City communities.

- Representative Lee said that she supports the deletion of Project #507 (Piikoi-Pensacola Couplet Reversal). In response, Mr. Haraga said that, while he recognizes the opposition to the project from Makiki residents, the project will benefit many East Honolulu residents.

- Representative Lee said that placing Central Mauka Road in the Illustrative category is not
sufficient. Central Oahu needs the Central Mauka Road.

Vice Chair Apo passed the Chairmanship back to Chair Lee.

- Vice Chair Apo clarified that, because the ORTP assumes a 49% contribution from developers, it does not mean that 49% will actually be exacted from developers. He asked what the down-side was of making this assumption, as proposed in Option 2. Mr. Lum responded that the developer contribution assumption of 34%, as originally proposed, is based on OMPO’s consultant’s technical judgement. This perspective is based on what has been realized from developers not only in Hawaii but from around the U.S., and what is thought to be realistic in these terms. The increase from 34% to 49% in overall developer contribution is being proposed primarily to adjust the ORTP revenues to allow for the inclusion of Central Mauka Road.

- Vice Chair Apo stated that, because the ORTP is updated every five years and the Central Mauka Road is in the 2016-2030 time period, the assumption with respect to the availability of developer funding can be re-evaluated at that time. Given Oahu’s tremendous transportation needs, he added that Options 2 and 3 allow more projects to be included in the ORTP 2030.

- Vice Chair Apo said that, of the two Waianae second access projects being discussed (Projects #357 and #509), Project #357 is the shorter of the two projects. It connects to Nanakuli Avenue, which is a two-lane residential road. There are considerable impacts to the abutting residential neighborhood with this project which do not make a lot of sense. Project #509 is located in a non-residential area; its location is in a more central area along the Waianae Coast. As a result, Project #509 will benefit a much larger population.

- Vice Chair Apo said that he supports Option 2.

- Representative Moses said that there are good reasons for Option 2; however, he expressed his concern that the developers may not necessarily support such a large increase with other impact fees that are being placed on them.

Senator Kanno called for the question.

Representative Souki requested that the motion be amended to replace “Option 4” with “Option 2.” Chair Lee withdrew her motion.

Representative Souki moved and Senator Kanno seconded that the ORTP 2030 include the Central Mauka Road through Option 2. The motion passed unanimously.

Testimony
Mary Cowing: Testified in opposition to Project 431B,440 (Rail Transit) and in favor of high occupancy toll lanes being included in the ORTP 2030.

Charles Carole: Testified in opposition to Project 507 (Piiikoi-Pensacola Couplet Reversal) being included in the ORTP 2030.

Approval of the ORTP Financial Plan
Representative Moses moved and Senator Kanno seconded that the financial plan of the ORTP 2030 include modifications to the transit operations and maintenance revenues and costs, as presented, and an increase in the assumption of developer contributions from 34% to 49%. The motion passed unanimously.

Approval of the ORTP Projects
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