
From: Sukys, Ray (TRO-09)
To: Ossi, Joseph (TPE)
CC: Turchie, Donna (TRO-09)
Sent: 10/23/2003 10:42:10 AM
Subject: Honolulu - Letter from Ed Case
Attachments: Honolulu IOS ROD .doc

Hi Joe,

Below are some excerpts from the ROD that might help with 3 of his points. I have attached the entire draft of the ROD as well. Also, I think it would be useful to point out to the Congressman that the decision to fund this project is in the hands of local government officials since a STIP amendment must occur to program the IOS into the next biennial element. The current federally-approved STIP lapses tomorrow on the 24th.

First:
Comment Topic 17 - Ala Moana-Kakaako Neighborhood Board No. 11, E Noa Corporation, and Mr. Slater questioned the travel time savings of the IOS. NB No. 11 stated that the transit benefits of the IOS would be small, and that inappropriate comparisons were made, in particular that the analysis did not take into account Routes B and 2. In response, the IOS was compared to the local routes that use the same approximate alignment (i.e. the Ala Moana Boulevard corridor). Trips will be made to destinations all along the route not just from one end of the IOS to the other end. For example, common intermediate pairings are expected between Kakaako Makai (UH Medical School) to Downtown and to Waikiki, which serve the project objectives. The travel time comparison in the FEIS is a more representative comparison of the options that most IOS users will have than comparing the IOS to Routes B and 2, which have different routings using the King-Beretania couple. The IOS is projected to save up to 10 minutes per trip for users compared to the local routes (Routes 19, 20, and 42) that travel in the same makai corridor. Even if we compared the IOS to Route B the travel time would be less via the IOS than with Route B between the two closest end points in common, Chinatown and Kapiolani Park in Waikiki. The total travel time on Route B with the average wait time would be 29.5 minutes versus the 28 minutes for the IOS from Aala Park to Kapiolani Park. The IOS to Route B comparison of total travel time is 1.5 minutes shorter. In summary and most importantly, the IOS provides direct transit linkages to and from Kakaako Makai, which currently does not have such service, thus satisfying a project objective.

Second:
Comment Topic 30 - E Noa Corporation requested that the City consult with Professor Prevedouros of the UH Civil Engineering Department to analyze traffic impacts on Ala Moana Boulevard. In response, the IOS is not anticipated to cause added delay to motorists on Ala Moana Boulevard because BRT vehicles will operate in mixed traffic with no changes in roadway configuration on the section analyzed by Dr. Prevedouros.
Comment Topic 31 - E Noa Corporation stated that the reduction of general purpose lanes on Kalakaua Avenue from four to three would contribute to congestion. In response, the IOS will designate the existing curb lane on Kalakaua Avenue between Saratoga Road and Uluniu Avenue as a semi-exclusive lane, which will be available for other private transit vehicles, and vehicles turning right. The de facto usage of the existing curb lane is similar to what is proposed for the IOS plan. Therefore, the impact of the IOS will be the introduction of between six to ten BRT vehicles per hour to this lane, which is not projected to have a significant impact on operations in this lane or with Kalakaua Avenue as a whole.
Comment Topic 32 - Mr. Teshima commented that it is the intention of the City to worsen traffic congestion in Waikiki so that people will use BRT. In response, little delay to motorists is anticipated with the IOS as compared to the No-Build condition. However, transit riders will benefit since service will be improved between Aala Park and Waikiki via the Ala Moana corridor.
Comment Topic 33 - Mr. Teshima questioned why the City would be committing to building and operating the IOS when the City has difficulty financially supporting the current bus system. In response, the matter of affordability is for the City Council to decide. In September 2003, the Council chose to raise bus fares and to keep current levels of service. Further, annual system-wide operations and maintenance costs will be less with the IOS than under the No-Build condition since the IOS will replace some local bus service.
Comment Topic 34 - Mr. Orr commented that the reduction in regular bus service in Waikiki under the IOS is much less than the projected reduction of bus service under the Refined LPA. In response, the IOS is the first phase of the larger Refined LPA. As such, the benefits will be proportional.

AR00152032

Third:
Comment Topic 14 - E Noa Corporation and Dr. Panos Prevedouros, a civil engineering professor at the University of Hawaii, questioned the project's traffic analysis for the IOS. E Noa stated that the analysis did not take into account "cumulative vehicle back-ups", and Dr. Prevedouros stated that the methodology selected is not state-of-the-art, and is not appropriate for the conditions found in the study area. In response to the E Noa comment, as was noted in Chapter 4 of the FEIS, the intersection traffic impact analyses provided in the FEIS did take into consideration cumulative downstream traffic congestion. In response to Dr. Prevedouros' comment, the macroscopic analysis technique utilizing the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM 2000) used in the FEIS is appropriate for the evaluation of alternatives and their relative traffic impacts. It was applied in conjunction with the officially adopted Oahu Metropolitan Planning Organization (OMPO) travel demand models that forecast future year regional traffic volumes, which are used for all highway and transit projects on Oahu. The abbreviated application of the microsimulation indicates that software such as INTEGRATION would require much more specific operational data. To properly calibrate a microsimulation analysis, parameters such as traffic queue length, traffic queue delay, vehicle travel time, and roadway geometry must be collected for each traffic movement at each intersection included in the model. Because of this data intensive requirement, microsimulation is more typically applied during final design or as a current year operational tool. The microsimulation technique presented by the commenter does not appear to take into consideration all of the proposed operational improvements included in the Refined LPA and its first operating segment, the IOS. For example, additional semi-exclusive lanes are part of the IOS, but they were not included in the commenter's microsimulation analysis. The added road capacity of the semi-exclusive lanes would not increase the delay as indicated in the simulation. Additionally, it is proposed that the predictive transit priority signal operation will be used to enhance the BRT operation. This type of signal operation is more sophisticated than a simple queue jumping as modeled in the commenter's analysis.

Ray