

---

**From:** Scheibe, Mark  
**To:** Jim Ryan (james.ryan@fta.dot.gov)  
**CC:** Toru Hamayasu (thamayasu@gmail.com)  
**Sent:** 1/5/2007 7:55:47 AM  
**Subject:** Phone Message  
**Attachments:** Bill 79 FD2.pdf

Jim,

I got your phone message. I assume you're not in your office today so I'll call you next week. Briefly, in response to the points you raised in your message --

I'm not sure which newspaper statement was of concern to you about the Mayor saying that PE would start in February. Perhaps it was the December 31 Advertiser article which said "Mayor Mufi Hannemann said he plans to brief Federal Transit Administration officials in mid-January on the city's progress and select the first leg of the line by month's end. By February, the city wants to begin preliminary engineering and an environmental impact statement, all with an optimistic eye to starting construction by the end of 2009." I wouldn't be concerned about this. The Mayor has a general understanding of the next steps that need to be taken but I doubt he clearly understands the order. As stated in the article, the City's intent is to identify its recommendation for a project to go forward into PE, i.e. an MOS this month and have the Council confirm that choice next month. Assuming that happens the intent would be to have an NOI issued shortly thereafter followed by a scoping meeting(s), probably in March. The plan remains to get an application into FTA by Spring/Summer this year, hopefully followed shortly thereafter by receipt of permission to enter PE.

With respect to the definition of the mode and alignment, the Council's action (see attached Bill 79 FD2) comes close. Clearly the Council chose the "Fixed Guideway Alternative" as defined in the Alternatives Analysis Report. Two alignment questions remain open (in Ewa and Salt Lake/Airport) but responsibility for deciding is left to the City Administration. The definition of the MOS will settle which Ewa route and whether Salt Lake or Airport is the priority, though the possibility of eventually having two alignments (branches) in Ewa may still remain.

The "technology" part of "mode" is a bit more confused, at least in the media. As you know the Alternatives Analysis was carefully in not defining a specific fixed guideway technology but left the door open for several that would fit within the physical and operating envelope assumed for the Fixed Guideway Alternative, which the assumption that the technology might be selected via a performance specs based procurement process. The confusion, as best as I remember, came about as follows. An early version of Bill 79 identified the LPA as "rail" rather than "fixed guideway." Since the AA had included a broader definition of fixed guideway DTS suggested to Council that rail be replaced with fixed guideway, which raised the question of what was included in fixed guideway besides "rail." DTS responded by identifying a range of fixed guideway technologies that could "fit" including steel wheel on steel rail, various rubber-tired technologies including monorail, and, potentially, technologies such as mag lev. Which then raised the question of how about bus. The response was that if a "bus" technology fit within the physical and operating envelope assumed for the Fixed Guideway Alternative then it could be considered. DTS noted that a "traditional" "busway" would not be consistent with what was assumed for the Fixed Guideway Alternative because, among other issues, it would have wider station footprints to allow buses to pass each other. A councilmember then asked why buses would need to be able to pass each other since we didn't assume that rail trains would be able to pass each other; she stated she wasn't asking to change the definition of the Fixed Guideway Alternative just asking whether a bus technology could meet the requirements. My impression is that this Councilmember is interesting in the potential choice of a guided bus technology. She mentioned an example in China that she'd seen. I believe the only guided bus facility in China is in Tianjin, an application of the Translohr technology (see attached brochure). Translohr is in the category often marketed as tram on tires or similar terminology. From looking at the brochure it appears that if could "fit" into our Fixed Guideway Alternative, though its top speed (70 kph) is a bit low. The vehicles can be coupled and are bi-directional so there wouldn't be the need for turnarounds at the ends of the line. So that's where we are with regard to technology.

Mark