



Minutes of the
Oahu Metropolitan Planning Organization

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Friday, April 8, 2016, 9:00 a.m.
Honolulu Authority for Rapid Transportation Board Room
1099 Alakea Street, Room 105, Honolulu, Hawaii

Members Present:

HART Jesse Souki – <i>Chair</i>	DTS Marian Yasuda
HDOT Ken Tatsuguchi – <i>Vice Chair</i>	HART Ryan Tam
DBEDT Joseph Roos	HDOT Dean Nakagawa
DPP Lori Arakaki	OP Rodney Funakoshi
DPP Kathy Sokugawa	FHWA Liz Fischer (non-voting)
DTS Eileen Mark	

Members Absent: Daniel Orodenker (DBEDT), Kyle Oyasato (non-voting) (DFM), Ted Matley (non-voting) (FTA), Gareth Sakakida (non-voting) (HTA), and Tim Trang (non-voting) (DDC)

Guests Present:

Whitney Birch (HART)	Nicola Szibbo (DPP)
Ralph Rizzo (FHWA)	Marlene Young (HDOT)

OahuMPO Staff Present: Brian Gibson, Chris Clark, Randolph Sykes, Mike Galizio, Amy Ford-Wagner, Taylor Ellis, and Veronica Schack

The meeting was properly noticed in accordance with State law.

I. CALL TO ORDER BY CHAIR

It was determined that a quorum was present and Chair Souki called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Members introduced themselves.

III. APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 12TH AND 22ND, 2016 MEETING MINUTES

Chair Souki called for members to review the minutes that were included in the meeting packets mailed to the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) seven (7) business days in advance of the meeting.

Lori Arakaki cited the reference on page 3, second paragraph of the minutes to having incorporated the slide presentation given at the April 8th meeting and asked where that document could be found. That presentation is on the OahuMPO Web site at the following link:

http://www.oahumpo.org/?wpfb_dl=1035

Kathy Sokugawa made a motion, that was seconded by Ryan Tam to have the link(s) included in the minutes when they are incorporated by reference into and made part of the minutes.

Rodney Funakoshi motioned and Ms. Sokugawa seconded that the minutes be adopted. The Chair, hearing no objections, stated that the minutes were adopted.

IV. REPORTS

A. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Executive Director Gibson advised that the Policy Board had met on February 24th at which time it considered and took action to approve Revision #8 to the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), and to approve for public and intergovernmental comment the drafts of the Oahu Regional Transportation Plan (ORTP) 2040 and the FY2017 Overall Work Program (OWP). The Policy Board will meet on April 13th to consider approval of the ORTP 2040 as well a Revision #9 to the TIP.

The Citizen Advisory Committee met on March 16th at which time it received an update on the Honolulu Rapid Transit Project from Daniel Grabauskas, discuss comments received concerning the ORTP 2040, and discussed the Complete Streets Checklist.

The Executive Director announced that Taylor Ellis would be leaving OahuMPO on April 14th to continue his military career. He has served on an interim basis as both community planner and technical analyst, and handled both positions with exceptional aptitude.

Executive Director Gibson previewed a financial report that will be provided to the TAC on a monthly basis. The preview included only those projects that are internal OahuMPO work elements (from the 300 Series). Future reports will include all work elements.

He announced that the United States Department of Transportation had issued performance-based planning guidelines for safety and that OahuMPO would be working in coordination with the planning agencies on setting performance measures.

In terms of future items to be brought forward for the TAC's consideration will be a Revision #2 to the FY2016 OWP and, in July, a new OWP.

OLD BUSINESS

A. CONSIDER FORMATION OF PERMITTED INTERACTION GROUP FOR OAHU PLANNING PROCESS REVIEW

Chair Souki presented an explanation of the mechanics of a Permitted Interaction Group (PIG) under the Sunshine Law and recommended that it be considered as a means of expediting discussion of the Oahu Planning Process Review (OPPR).

Rodney Funakoshi stated that this topic had been raised at prior meetings and his feeling was that the critical path in determining whether a PIG was warranted depended upon the disposition of comments received about the OPPR, so the TAC would have a better understanding of the concerns raised. He requested a status and recommended that discussion be deferred to the next meeting since the TAC would be looking at OahuMPO's planning processes in general.

Executive Director Gibson indicated that the matrix prepared by OahuMPO would be provided to the TAC members in advance of the next meeting.

Ms. Sokugawa sought clarification that the matrix would also respond to questions as well as comments. The Executive Director indicated that they would be included.

Ms. Sokugawa reiterated her concern that much of the TAC's work in support of the OahuMPO throughout the past year had been done in a rush in order to meet essential Federal deadlines. She expressed that having a PIG would provide an opportunity to review the planning processes without a Federal deadline.

V. NEW BUSINESS

A. REVIEW FINAL DRAFT OAHU REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN 2040

The Chair read the description of this action item directly from the agenda. He advised that the TAC was being asked to make its recommendation on acceptance of the ORTP 2040 to the Policy Board, which would be considering it at its April 13th meeting.

The Chair ceded the floor to Senior Planner Chris Clark who emphasized that, as had been discussed at earlier meetings, the approval of the ORTP 2040 was time sensitive. The forthcoming update must be approved by the Policy Board in April 2016. If it is not approved by then, there would be significant impacts to both the implementing agencies as well as the OahuMPO. Failure to have the ORTP 2040 approved in April would freeze Federal reimbursements from both FHWA and FTA, as well as changes to the TIP and OWP until such time as the ORTP 2040 was approved by the Policy Board.

Mr. Clark gave a slide presentation that is incorporated by reference and made a part of these minutes. That presentation may be found on the

OahuMPO Web site at the following link:
http://www.oahumpo.org/?wpfb_dl=1036.

Mr. Clark indicated that OahuMPO was extending its long-range plan by five years, to 2040. The requirements for the long-range plan are included in the Federal regulations as well as the Comprehensive Agreement among OahuMPO and its participating agencies.

Developing the plan had included early public input, stakeholder discussions, consultations with resource agencies and other agencies with an interest in the plan, as well as an additional 60 stakeholders, who were identified in Appendix B. OahuMPO also made a presentation to members and guests at the March American Planning Association lunchtime meeting.

Mr. Clark explained that the project list was nearly the same as that shown in the draft public review document. One project had moved from long-range to mid-range. In response to other comments, the revenue for existing plus committed projects had been added to the project totals, developer costs were inflated based on the agreed-to formula, and OahuMPO had double checked the funding shares with both City and State.

A public comment period (that included intergovernmental resources) was undertaken between February 26th and March 28th during which 104 comments were received. An additional 41 comments were received after the March 28th deadline. OahuMPO staff had developed a matrix identifying all comments received and their disposition.

Mr. Clark emphasized that the ORTP is a planning document and is not to be perceived as NEPA or other permitting processes necessary to move a project to the TIP and onto construction. He was responding to a request to move a mid-term project to the short-term. The short-term projects were limited to those that had already gone through the NEPA and permitting processes, had all funding in place, and were ready to go to construction.

Ken Tatsuguchi called the TAC's attention to page 55 of the document as a good means of setting expectations and educating the public concerning the number of steps required to bring a project to completion.

Mr. Clark addressed five specific modifications, including:

1. Consistent with a recent Hawaii Supreme Court decision as well as the developer's timetable, the Pineapple Road project was moved from long-range to mid-range;
2. While additional funding was being provided for the Interstate H-1 Corridor Study, feedback from FHWA was that because the study is underway and specific scopes for projects are not completed, projects that may result from the study are not included in the ORTP 2040;
3. The description for project 351 (Farrington Highway) modified based on input from HDOT;

4. While they are identified as developer-funded projects the ownership of projects 305 and 354 has not been established. They are shown as State projects but are not ones contemplated by HDOT. Since they appear in the Kalaeloa Master Plan, OahuMPO will confer with both HCDA and DHHL to determine whether they may be owners; and
5. The cost of some of the developer-funded projects was inflated for consistency.

There was consensus that the list of projects was complete except for 305 and 354, pending follow-up by OahuMPO. At minimum, Mr. Tatsuguchi said, if those projects remain in the plan, they should be identified as "State-Non-HDOT."

Mr. Clark called the TAC's attention to a spreadsheet that listed all of the technical, non-substantive changes that had been made and acknowledged that OahuMPO had developed an executive summary based on earlier feedback from the TAC.

The following discussion ensued:

- Mr. Funakoshi questioned whether there was a public meeting held to present the final draft plan. Mr. Clark explained that the public meeting would be held by the Policy Board in April; that public meetings/listening sessions were held in 2013; a presentation had been given to the APA; a thirty-day public comment period was provided, and multiple opportunities for public testimony had occurred at both the Policy Board and CAC meetings.
- Mr. Tam commented that his understanding was that this was a stopgap plan and the intention was to start immediately with the next 2045 plan; OahuMPO would follow both the OahuMPO Policies and Procedures as well as TAC guidance in preparing it.
- Ms. Sokugawa asked what the impact would be if the TAC did not take action today. Her concern was that the TAC members did not have a final draft in front of them and she was not comfortable making a recommendation on a document that was still in the process of being drafted. Chair Souki indicated that if TAC did not take the vote he would share that with the Policy Board along with whatever concerns the members may have.
- Marian Yasuda raised a procedural question. It had been the practice to share technical and intergovernmental comments with the TAC and public comments only with the Policy Board. Since many of the comments provided to the TAC were from the public she wondered if the TAC's role was changing. Mr. Clark replied that OahuMPO's concern was that some public comments may result in changes to the plan and it was important for the TAC to see why those changes had been incorporated. Mr. Tam

commented that HART had provided technical responses to several questions from the community.

- Ms. Yasuda indicated that the participating agencies did not have sufficient time to consider the comments or the consequence of not approving the ORTP in April.
- Mr. Tatsuguchi referred to the percentages shown in the table on Page 57 and questioned how those percentages were determined. Mr. Clark replied at the funding levels had been given to the TAC early on and an explanation of the Federal uses of those funds was provided.
- Mr. Tatsuguchi questioned further how the goals and objectives articulated in the plan influenced project selection. He felt that an explanation was necessary so that the public would understand the prioritization process. Mr. Clark replied that in next 18 month's OahuMPO would be working with both the TAC and Policy Board to define a quantitative way of making decisions. He emphasized, however, the need to have the ORTP project list first.
- Mr. Funakoshi sought to confirm that the Congestion Management Process (CMP) needed to be input to ORTP. Mr. Clark responded that there was a need to lock down projects so analyses can be done per policies and procedures.
- Chair Souki proposed to make a recommendation for the Policy Board to approve and reiterated his commitment that he would be at the meeting and convey to the Policy Board members any concerns that the TAC may have.
- Ms. Sokugawa emphasized that she does not want to endorse the ORTP 2040 without having a final draft; she said it was "hard to say we endorse something we don't have"; she suggested additional meetings, for however long it may take.
- Ms. Yasuda indicated that even approval to revise the ORTP once approved was not benign; cost is still there and there is no easy solution. Separately, she referenced Figure 6.1 – one of the projects had moved from long to mid-range. She also indicated concern with projects 201, 202, 203, and 208 as they were represented in that Figure.
- Chair Souki asked the TAC members what they wanted to have for the Policy Board, whether that included a final draft for its consideration; public review draft comments; or other elements.
- Ms. Sokugawa wants to see a final draft. Chair Souki clarified that Sunshine Law does not require having a final when the announcement and agenda for a meeting is issued.

- Executive Director Gibson indicated that the public comments on the draft plan were not substantive and reiterated that there was a month available for the public and both intergovernmental and participating agencies to comment. Ms. Sokugawa commented that DPP provides for four public hearings not including those involved in the adoption process. She said she was not concerned about projects. Rather, her concern was that “a lot of stuff” was not complete or well described. She said that no one has any problems with the fundamental substance of the document.
- Mr. Tam commented that it sounded as if what was being discussed would be a much longer process to get all completed.
- Randolph Sykes indicated that Policy Board Chair Yamane had set the Policy Board meeting date on April 13th based on Legislature’s schedule and commented that the consequence of not providing an approved document by the end of April is OahuMPO would be to miss the Federal deadline set forth in the Corrective Actions.
- Mr. Tatsuguchi concurred with Ms. Sokugawa that it was hard to endorse a document that was not completed. He recommended approval with reservations. He stated that, in general, “the guts are fine but it’s the nuances of who should, could, would, or certain things like that” which are important to review especially as an implementing agency; spending time now is important and it is unfair to the stakeholders if there are misunderstandings.
- While Mr. Tatsuguchi would like a chance to improve it; he did not advocate holding the ORTP 2040 up. Again, he recommended it be approved with reservations.
- Following those comments, Chair Souki outline potential next steps.
- Ms. Sokugawa said she was not sure how to frame a motion. She stated that for purposes of establishing the projects, the mid-range and long-range priorities, etc., the TAC stands by the document but “as a plan it’s lacking.”
- Ms. Yasuda again raised questions about ownership of the projects for which HCDA was being confirmed; she asked how much effort would be involved in removing them from the plan. Mr. Clark indicated that it would be significant; about five days of work for modeling projects.
- Ms. Sokugawa recommended leaving the projects in question and Mr. Tatsuguchi indicated he was ok if they were described as “State-Non-HDOT.”
- Chair Souki, Ms. Sokugawa, Mr. Tatsuguchi, and Mr. Clark spoke further of the fiscal impacts of postponing recommendation and the consequences.

- Mr. Tam asked if the TAC could set a timetable for completion of the document; perhaps a six-month option to incorporate comments.
- Ms. Sokugawa pined that “we’re constantly in a rush” with a mandatory follow-up and that product quality has been impacted. She asked what the timeline would be for OahuMPO to make the changes and that the TAC should talk about whether the Policy Board meeting is actually a public hearing. She wants a more sustainable process, especially the ability to get ahead of the curve with these tasks.
- Mr. Clark indicated that “another month” was not feasible; instead, he proposed six months as long as the changes being made did not include substantive changes, like adding projects or significantly changing costs.
- Mr. Tam expressed his understanding that there was a need to go through all of the policies and procedures and make changes, and recommended that it would be appropriate to create a PIG to prioritize what it should consider.
- Chair Souki stated he did not want to jeopardize funding. If the TAC is wanting more involvement, would six months be sufficient to do an amendment?
- Mr. Sykes remarked that adding the time to reexamine the policies and procedures to ensure that the ORTP 2040 was what the TAC wanted, it would increase the elapsed time to a period greater than six months.
- Ms. Yasuda indicated that the last update to the ORTP in 2006 was a year-long process. The amendment was done to accommodate the rail alignment, a change that was made shortly after the ORTP 2030 plan was approved in 2005.
- Mr. Clark reminded the TAC that OahuMPO is facing the need to have the new TIP in place, as well as the CMP, so six months should be considered an outside time frame if that is how the TAC wanted to proceed.
- Mr. Tam said it would be good to have the edit done in as short-term process. Both Mr. Tam and Ms. Yasuda indicated that HART and the City have items pending on the upcoming TIP revision. In addition, the City is applying for TIGER grant at end of the month and it would be beneficial to say that it is in the adopted in ORTP.
- Chair Souki agreed to maintaining the current project list and correcting the map; Mr. Tatsuguchi said he wanted the Chair to comment about the length of time that nuances may follow a project if they are not handled up front.

- o Ms. Sokugawa asked what could be done by next week. Mr. Clark said OahuMPO would be able to incorporate the TAC's non-substantive comments.

Based on Mr. Tam's recommendation, the TAC agreed to recess the discussion of the ORTP 2040 until Tuesday, April 12th, 2016 at 4:00 p.m. in the HART Board Room; at that time OahuMPO would have provided a final document; he confirmed a quorum would be available.

B. REVIEW FINAL DRAFT FY 2017 OVERALL WORK PROGRAM

Executive Director Gibson that the TAC had the final draft of the OWP for FY2017. The Executive Director's presentation is incorporated into and made part of these minutes. The presentation is on the OahuMPO Web site via this link: http://www.oahumpo.org/?wpfb_dl=1036.

The Executive Director indicated that the FY2017 OWP will not go to the Policy Board until May because the City Council has not yet approved inclusion of the City's projects.

Mr. Tatsuguchi wanted to confirm that the balances shown in the final are as of September 2015. The Executive Director confirmed it and indicated that he had received an update of expenses through January 2016 the day prior to this meeting. He reiterated his statement that OahuMPO was moving to a process of presenting future financial balances on a monthly basis.

The Executive Director indicated that both public and intergovernmental review comments had been incorporated but that agency comments were not received in time to incorporate them into the document. Therefore, they are shown on the disposition matrix.

Ms. Yasuda clarified DTS' comment that the funding table should appear before and Tables 9a and 9b should come after the Appendix.

Chair Souki asked for a motion to approve. Mr. Tam motioned and Mr. Nakagawa seconded; Ms. Yasuda said she would like to have the motion to recommend approval of the "final draft pending City Council approval on April 20th." Ms. Sokugawa said that because DPP comments are not being addressed, she will abstain. **The motion carried.**

C. REVIEW DRAFT FFYs 2015-2018 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM REVISION #9

Mr. Clark introduced Mike Galizio and Amy Ford-Wagner and recognized their contribution to the previously discussed ORTP. In his presentation, provided at the following link and incorporated into and made part of these minutes: http://www.oahumpo.org/?wpfb_dl=1036.

In summary, Mr. Clark indicated that about 75% of projects in the TIP are being modified; there is a new project for Joint Traffic Operations Center;

there is a request to transfer FHWA funds to HART; adding funds to the Interstate H-1 corridor study; and several projects are being deleted, deferred, merged, and/or costs are being inflated.

New projects include addition of maintenance lights; a truck weigh station on Sand Island; additional traffic counting stations; the Transportation Assistance Program added for City (HART and DTS); additions to TheBus, and FTA training.

The Title VI, Environmental Justice, and CMP analyses were completed and results were discussed with the TAC.

Ms. Sokugawa motioned and Ms. Yasuda seconded the recommendation for the Policy Board to approve Revision #9 to the TIP as presented. The motion passed.

VII. INVITATION TO INTERESTED MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC TO BE HEARD ON MATTERS NOT ON THE OAHUMPO TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

There being no comments, the meeting moved on to Announcements.

VIII. RECESS AND CONTINUATION

Chair Souki closed the meeting at 11:00 a.m. for continuation as stated in item VI,A, above.

Written by: Randolph Sykes
Reviewed by: Brian Gibson

Minutes of the
Oahu Metropolitan Planning Organization

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Continuation of the Meeting of
Friday, April 8, 2016, 9:00 a.m.
on Tuesday April 12, 2016, 4:00 p.m.
Honolulu Authority for Rapid Transportation Board Room
1099 Alakea Street, Room 105, Honolulu, Hawaii

Members Present:

HART Jesse Souki – <i>Chair</i>	HDOT Norren Kato
HDOT Ken Tatsuguchi – <i>Vice Chair</i>	HART Ryan Tam
DPP Kathy Sokugawa	OP Rodney Funakoshi
DTS Eileen Mark	FAA Kimberly Evans (non-voting)
DTS Marian Yasuda	FHWA Liz Fischer (non-voting)

Members Absent: Daniel Orodener (DBEDT), Kyle Oyasato (non-voting) (DFM), Ted Matley (non-voting) (FTA), Jon Nouchi (HART), Gareth Sakakida (non-voting) (HTA), and Tim Trang (non-voting) (DDC)

Guests Present:

Nicola Szibbo (DPP)	
---------------------	--

OahuMPO Staff Present: Brian Gibson, Chris Clark, Randolph Sykes, Amy Ford-Wagner, and Veronica Schack

The meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee held on April 8, 2016 was continued on Tuesday, April 12, 2016 at 4:00 p.m. to complete discussion of Agenda Item VI.A. Although there was no statutory requirement to notice the continuation of the meeting, the continuation was, in fact, noticed in accordance with State law.

I. CALL TO ORDER BY CHAIR

It was determined that quorum was present and Chair Souki called the meeting back to order at 4:05 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Members introduced themselves.

III. Item VI.A. from the April 8, 2016 Agenda

REVIEW FINAL DRAFT OAHU REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN 2040

Chair Souki indicated that this continued meeting was for the TAC to consider further the review and approval of ORTP 2040; copies of final draft that had been transmitted to both the TAC and Policy Board on April 11, 2016.

Chris Clark opened the comments by indicating that there had been further discussion with FHWA concerning non-approval. He corrected his earlier statement of consequences beginning July 1st and provided that, if not approved as of May 1st, payment of reimbursement requests would be stopped and that there would be cash flow issues for agencies.

Liz Fischer elaborated further that FTA had delegated decision making concerning this Corrective Action to the FHWA Hawaii Division Office and that FTA concurs with its assessment.

Mr. Clark indicated that the map was changed. OahuMPO had reached out to HCDA by both phone and email but had not received a response so the convention of "State-Non-HDOT" was used concerning the two projects.

Mr. Clark provided a presentation the slides of which are incorporated into and made part of these minutes. The presentation may be found on the OahuMPO Web site at this link: http://www.oahumpo.org/?wpfb_dl=1036.

Chair Souki asked if there were questions from members on the final draft.

Mr. Tam asked Ms. Fischer to confirm that FTA funding would be affected if the approval was delayed and her response was affirmative.

Ms. Fischer further provided that the disposition of comments, which was a Tier 3 Corrective Action, represented one of the best examples of addressing public input in the country; the Correction Action is considered met by the ORTP as presented.

There ensued a discussion of the comments and whether the TAC would still have the opportunity to review the whole document; 24 hours was insufficient for some of the reviewers. Mr. Tatsuguchi recommended approving with reservations because, although the TAC now has the full document, review is not complete; as an implementing agency he wants to see if there is any language that may cause a burden as the implementation goes forward.

Chair Souki reminded members that the Policy Board meeting was the following afternoon.

Mr. Clark indicated that, assuming Policy Board approval and before delivering the document to FHWA/FTA, OahuMPO will make technical, non-substantive changes.

Ms. Sokugawa said she needs to see a schedule so she's not rushed again; could six months be allotted to the continued review by TAC?

Mr. Clark had prepared a potential schedule for a Modification #1; in his estimation six months would be sufficient; however, within 18 months OahuMPO needs to have the next TIP done; also, if the desire is to have

community meetings it would add three months. The decision on a recommendation to the Policy Board is up to the committee.

Mr. Clark indicated that if the Policy Board wanted to adopt a schedule like this: comments to OahuMPO in 30 days; reply to comments in 30 days, it would be doable.

Chair Souki said it did not sound like a PIG was needed and the TAC could handle all comments at its meetings if the schedule was kept.

Ms. Sokugawa asked whether they should be reviewing something new, implying substantive plan changes. Ms. Arakaki said this plan and timetable would not include addition or deletion of another run. As Mr. Clark explained, this is the difference between modification and amendment.

In response to a comment from Mr. Funakoshi about a public hearing, Ms. Fischer indicated that OahuMPO had followed its public process and it was available for public review on the OahuMPO Web site as well as with the CAC.

Ms. Yasuda again expressed concern about the two STATE-non-DOT projects.

Mr. Tatsuguchi asked Mr. Clark about the parallel schedule on the CMP. Mr. Clark commented that if there is no modification schedule, the CMP analysis would start immediately and the State of Congestion on Oahu report would be prepared.

Mr. Tatsuguchi raised a question about the projects that would be considered during the CMP analysis; his thought was that CMP would work off the ORTP 2040 project list and also recommend other projects based on need. For example, if a high-congestion area had not been identified; look at strategies, land uses in a systems approach; concern if CMP only uses old projects but no tool to identify problem; he wants the CMP to do a clear needs assessment. Mr. Clark indicated that OahuMPO wants the same outcomes; the process needs to have a broader look at the potential strategies.

Ms. Fischer commented that coming out of the Certification Review both USDOT and OahuMPO knew up front this was not going to be the best plan but it had to meet letter and spirit of the law. As soon as practical after approval of the ORTP 2040, the intention was to start on the 2045 plan.

Ms. Fischer also reminded those in the implementing agencies that highway projects needed to include route numbers, clearly identifying what termini had been selected. This information was crucial to both the public and politicians; needs to be kept in mind since performance measures will be tied to geophysical locations; long-range plan through the TIP. Mr. Clark thanked the Office of Planning for its assistance in hosting the various shapefiles that assist in that effort.

In response to a question from Ms. Sokugawa concerning the disposition of comments, Mr. Clark indicated that the remaining issues would be corrected before the Policy Board meeting.

The Chair questioned the value of making these changes.

Mr. Clark indicated there was an opportunity to make final comments by end of month. OahuMPO is not recommending this modification approach.

Mr. Sykes reiterated his earlier comment, confirmed by Ms. Fischer at this meeting, that the intention was to begin the ORTP 2045 upon completion of the ORTP 2040 since both USDOT and OahuMPO recognized the need for the ORTP 2040 to meet the letter and the spirit of the law. The ORTP 2045 would adhere to the approved ORTP Policies and Procedures.

Mr. Tam interjected that, if a project falls out then it could be revised during the next amendment or update; another potential option was to move projects to illustrative; would consider at next update; it is not a requirement

Ms. Sokugawa recommended that the TAC pass with reservations and allow the TAC the next nine months to make non-substantive changes. Again, the Chair questioned the value of that approach.

Mr. Funakoshi and Mr. Clark discussed that if the TAC wanted a modification then it would need to follow the schedule proposed by OahuMPO staff; any substantive changes – a change project or significantly changing a cost – would trigger the need for an amendment.

Ms. Arakaki spoke of the need for a model run even if a project is moved to the illustrative category. Mr. Tatsuguchi questioned what would happen if the CMP identifies changes to projects. Mr. Clark said that would trigger the need for an amendment if the goal was to add the project(s) to the TIP, e.g., H-1 Corridor projects would trigger the need for an amendment. Further, if the CMP identified other needs, consultation with implementing agencies and obtaining local match would be part of the process.

Mr. Clark emphasized that OahuMPO is not recommending Modification #1; the schedule was prepared and presented just to put things in perspective.

Mr. Tatsuguchi recommended that the Policy Board approve the ORTP 2040 with reservations; no need for a PIG; recommend following the schedule provided by OahuMPO; the CMP may induce an amendment; modification is fine simply with editorial comments.

Mr. Tam moved and Mr. Norren seconded a motion to recommend approval with reservations along with schedule provided by Mr. Clark but without either the PIG or public comments. The motion carried.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 5:00 p.m.

Written by: Randolph Sykes

Reviewed by: Brian Gibson