

From: Kaku, Melvin N
To: Hamayasu, Toru; Suzuki, Brian
CC: Torres, Richard F; Fasi, Gina
Sent: 11/28/2006 5:31:50 AM
Subject: Fw:

Redacted

-----Original Message-----

From: Quintal, Sidney A <squintal@honolulu.gov>
To: Ito, Char <cito@honolulu.gov>
CC: Kaku, Melvin N <mkaku@honolulu.gov>
Sent: Mon Nov 27 15:53:40 2006
Subject: FW:

Redacted

-----Original Message-----

From: Quintal, Sidney A
Sent: Monday, November 27, 2006 3:53 PM
To: 'Ken Hughes'
Subject: RE:

Thanks Ken,

I'll forward your comments to the Mayor. We do welcome comments with reason. You can't imagine the comments he has been getting without solutions.

-----Original Message-----

From: Ken Hughes [mailto:kenhughes@hughesdevelopmentlp.com]
Sent: Monday, November 27, 2006 3:49 PM
To: Quintal, Sidney A
Subject:

Dear Sid:

I just wanted to let you know my position on the proposed rail routes for Honolulu. While I am known as a TOD developer and would normally want to be on the route, I think that Nimitz is a bad option. I realize that the council is in the process of considering several alternatives, as is the process with Federal funding. So, I would not think the mayor has yet decided.

Here are my "two cents". If the rail were to come down Nimitz, then it clearly should go underground through downtown for many reasons. It's elevated plan is counterintuitive and against all other US cities' efforts to take down their elevated waterfront transportation systems (Seattle, Boston, San Francisco, New York). The reason is that those systems have historically isolated the waterfront from the residential and office population. I would support an at-grade system, by the way, but there just doesn't seem to be the right-of-way available.

Additionally, the Nimitz/Ala Moana option does not follow typical rail service objectives. When building rail, the general objective is to make it accessible to the largest population. I would argue that a route parallel and, where possible, hugging the freeway would satisfy that general pattern, as that is where the population is or is moving through. Light rail service will be insignificant and largely unused by the tourists, even if it were connected directly to the airport. That kind of mixed commuting is generally the pattern of business travelers or locals if closely accessible to housing. Neither will be significant customers in Honolulu, particularly if the line runs down Nimitz. There will not be enough residential

population along that route, even long term, to justify rail there as truly serving that population.

Finally, I would encourage the council to ask its planners to give it the costs for a phased project that works with only the first phase in place. The general public acceptance problems with these systems is that it seems like one has to continue to build in order to make the system successful. In Dallas, Atlanta, San Diego and Portland, to name a few, their successful first phases were what gave the voters courage to continue. In at least three of those cases, the first round of many more miles, much more money and difficulty in identifying how to pay for it caused the constituency not to support it. It is the middle class who don't always use mass transit that have to be convinced of its contribution, not the people who use it out of necessity.

There is another superficial benefit to locating high speed transit to slow speed freeways. Advertising the saved time.

Hope you had a great Thanksgiving.

Warm regards,

Ken