

Appendix A: Disposition of Public and Intergovernmental Review Comments

Appendix A: Disposition of Public and Intergovernmental Review Comments						
OahuMPO's intergovernmental and public review period of the draft 2045 ORTP ran between March 1-29, 2021 and received a total of 75 comments. Comments and responses received during the review period may be viewed below in Table A.1 . Any comments received after March 29, 2021 are documented in Table A.2 .						
Table A.1 Public and Intergovernmental Comments Received During Review Period						
Comment Number	Chapter, Section, and Page Number	Project	Commenter	Comment	Agency Response	Notes
1	Chapter 1, Public Participation, Phase 1, p.9	General	HDOOT	Page 9 – minor typo, first word of first sentence is missing "T."	OahuMPO: Thank you for catching this error, we have made the correction.	
2	Chapter 2, Performance Measures, p. 13	General	HDOOT	Difficult to read which planning factors are relevant to which goal without constantly scrolling back and forth.	OahuMPO: Thank you for your note. The table has been redesigned by our graphic designer, and it has the FAST Act Planning Factors written out, and graphics of the ORTP goals to help improve readability.	
3	Chapter 2, Goal #1, p.15-17	N/A	HDOOT	The following statements are very misleading: Hawaii is ranked 4th highest in the nation for impaired driving related to fatal crashes--no year or source given. Hawaii is ranked 5th highest in the nation for speed related fatalities--2016, but no source given. Hawaii was ranked highest in the nation for the rate of older pedestrian fatalities--this statement was made in a document released in 2015 by the City and therefore the date is from at least 2014 or earlier. It would be best to have the data comparable from the same year or at least cite the year the crash data came from--not the year that a plan was released that cited the data. Using the older pedestrian data from 2014 or prior is especially inaccurate because it is at least 7 years old. Since 2014 (or earlier) both HDOOT and the City have been working hard to make improvements for pedestrians and this discounts that. It makes the public believe that we are still leading the nation. This is not responsible data reporting.	OahuMPO: Sources added for statistics on impaired driving and speed related fatalities. Data on older pedestrian fatalities and all pedestrian fatalities has been updated using the Web-based Injury Statistics Query and Reporting System, with a reporting period of 2015-2019. Hawaii has the third highest rate of older pedestrian fatalities (ages 65+) in the nation (Web-based Injury Statistics Query and Reporting System, 2015-2019). The state is 14th in the nation for pedestrian fatalities among all age groups (Web-based Injury Statistics Query and Reporting System, 2015-2019).	
4	Chapter 2, Goal #1, p. 15	N/A	HDOOT	Page 15 – Clarify if the following statement is referring to national or local data? "Speed-related crashes account for 47% of all traffic fatalities over a 10-year span from 2008 to 2017."	OahuMPO: Added "In Hawaii" to clarify that the statistic is Statewide	
5	Chapter 2, Goal #1, p. 16	N/A	HDOOT	Page 16 – The last sentence is very hard to follow--we are not sure if we are understanding it correctly. "Even with over 6,000 individuals arrested every year in Hawai'i (Hawaii Uniform Crime Reports, 2013-2017), 1 out of 20 drivers or (5%) who survived, admitted to driving after they consumed too much alcohol in the past month (2012, 2014, 2016 Hawaii Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance Survey)."	OahuMPO: This sentence has been deleted.	
6	Chapter 2, Goal #1, Table 2.2, p. 18	N/A	HDOOT	Starting on page 18 of the document, the way the objectives and performance measures are labeled could be misleading. To me it reads that all the performance measures are federally required from the FAST Act. This could be resolved by placing an asterisk or some other type of denotation on the ones that are federally required from the FAST Act.	OahuMPO: All of the performance measures listed in this table are federally required. We added the asterisk to indicate this in the table, and have done this for the other tables as well.	
7	Chapter 2, Goal #2, p.20	N/A	HDOOT	Is the 2011 data still accurate? Similar comment as Comment #3 above. Using data that is almost 10 years old could be very inaccurate/misleading.	OahuMPO: Email sent to DTS asking about whether they have updated transit access data to include in the ORTP.	
8	Chapter 2, Goal #5, p. 32	N/A	HDOOT	"extending the life cycle facilities" should be changed to "extending the life of facilities."	OahuMPO: Thank you for catching this error. The correction has been made.	
9	Chapter 2, Goal #6, p.35	N/A	HDOOT	The 81% here could be misleading. It should be clarified by adding an absolute number of commuters--e.g., this could be 100 people to 181 or it could be 100,000 to 181,000.	OahuMPO: Thank you for the suggestion, we added "(100 people to 181 people)" to this sentence.	
10	Chapter 2, Goal #7, p.39	N/A	HDOOT	Page 39 – We recommend citing a year and source for this data: "Ground transportation produces 20% of all carbon pollution on O'ahu."	OahuMPO: Thank you for the suggestion, this change has been incorporated.	

11	Goal 7 • On Page 39 of Draft ORTP 2045,	M/N	William Reese Liggett	<p><u>Suggested changes to the Draft Oahu Regional Transportation Plan 2045: Change the paragraph about Environmental and Cultural Resources to read as follows (suggested changes in red): Environmental and Cultural Resources O'ahu is home to a unique variety of plant and animal species. Often nicknamed the "Endangered Species Capital of the World," the State of Hawai'i is home to 437 threatened and endangered species (U.S. Fish and Wildlife). Given that O'ahu is the most developed and populated island in the Hawaiian chain, plant and animal species often face greater threats of the loss and degradation of habitats, due to the existence of transportation systems or construction of transportation projects near sensitive environments, and the negative impacts of such transportation systems and their users or of stormwater runoff. These concerns may also apply to impacts on our cultural resources. Rationale: The theme of this plan, ORTP 2045, is Ke Ala I Mua, "the path forward" for State transportation systems on Oahu according to its Page 2. Such a theme indicates and requires a comprehensive approach by the Oahu Regional Transportation Plan 2045. Goal 7, as drafted, seems to attempt to address FAST Act # 2 on page 3 of ORTP 2045: "Protect and enhance the environment..."; 2. However, draft Goal 7 fails to adequately address the potential negative impacts of the existing HDOT transportation systems and therefore is not a comprehensive plan for "the path forward" for Oahu. It is completely inadequate because it only addresses "construction of transportation projects", a comparatively small subset of State transportation systems, while ignoring the much larger subset that is the existing transportation systems. 3. For instance, Goal 7 as stated in the draft, does not meet the requirements of the Hawai Revised Statutes 205A-2* and 205A-26, directives for all State agencies. These directives apply to existing transportation systems as well as the construction of transportation projects. 4. On our state's islands, because there are often State transportation systems close to our shorelines, it is natural that such existing transportation systems could be negatively impacting protected, fragile coastal environmental resources and such should be addressed. 5. Therefore the ORTP 2045 should acknowledge such and its Goal 7 should highlight the need for such considerations and appropriate steps to alleviate negative impacts of the existing transportation systems as well as construction projects.*Note: HRS 205A-2 at https://dlnr.hawaii.gov/occl/files/2013/07/205a.pdf. The coastal zone management program objectives and policies, is very specific concerning State Agencies' responsibility to coastal ecosystems: "Protect valuable coastal ecosystems, including reefs, beaches, and coastal dunes, from disruption and minimize adverse impacts on all coastal ecosystems." HRS 205A-26 also applies.</u></p>	OahuMPO: Thank you for the great comment and suggestion. We have incorporated language about impacts of our existing transportation system in this section.
12	Goal 7 • Cont. pg. 40	N/A	William Reese Liggett	<p>Goal 7 cont. • On ORTP 2045 Page 40: Objectives and Performance Metrics, make the following suggested changes in red: Performance Measures 7.2.1 through 7.2.3 to, besides DLNR, include County Preservation/Conservation Areas. Rationale: This State plan needs to also consider proximity to environmentally sensitive areas that belong to the Counties in order to "Enhance and protect cultural and natural resources". Add a new 7.2.5 to read: 7.2.5 Number of projects that are contiguous to State and County Preservation/Conservation Areas. Rationale: This State plan for transportation must address situations where existing or projected transportation systems are contiguous to sensitive environmental Areas in order to "Enhance and protect cultural and natural resources". Add a new 7.2.6 to read: 7.2.6 Existing transportation systems (principally roads and highways) proximate to State and County preservation/conservation land. And new 7.2.7 to read: 7.2.7 Existing transportation systems (principally roads and highways) proximate to State and County shorelines. Rationale: Necessary in order to establish Goal 7, FAST Act Planning Factor(s), Performance Measures, and Objective(s) for existing transportation systems.</p>	OahuMPO: Thank you for your comment. The GIS shapefiles used to evaluate this metric for watershed protection priority areas and natural resources areas reflect all land owners and managers. However, the conservation resource management areas, only reflect DLNR managed areas. We will continue to look for county data to evaluate conservation resource management areas.
13	Chapter 3, p.42-70	N/A	Carolyn Weygan-Hildebrand	<p>The Draft's Chapter 3 should not be silent on new trends during the last year (COVID-19). Around the world and in Oahu, many will agree that urban life changed. The Draft Plan therefore should either state that it is ignoring thoughts about trends that are unfolding or include them and evaluate projects along scenario planning contexts. The APA Hawaii Chapter brought attention to the Transportation research Interdisciplinary Perspective Journal's insights of the global impacts of COVID-19 on transportation planning and transport operations. While the articles are not on Oahu, they shed light on what Oahu might want to look into further. The Plan should be flexible to allow for the inclusion and prioritization of projects that will prove to be important but have yet to be conceived. I suspect for example that if trends are examined further, suburban life in oahu will show that more are walking and biking in their neighborhoods and more will notice what they need more than before, and that need will be for more safer and pleasant routes to go around within their neighborhoods.</p>	OahuMPO: Thank you for your comment. We hope to study these trends further and collect data to understand how travel patterns have changed during COVID-19.
14	Chapter 3, p.44-69, Figures 3.2, 3.5, 3.8a, 3.10, 3.19, 3.20, 3.21, 3.22, 3.23, 3.24	N/A	HDOT	<p>Figures 3.2, 3.5, 3.8a, 3.10, 3.19, 3.20, 3.21, 3.22, 3.23, and 3.24: Why not put the population density ranges rather than 1-5? Also why are the dots different sizes?-- is a legend needed? Why highlight the interstate freeway locations?</p>	done

15	Chapter 3, Figure 3.4, p.45-46	N/A	HDOOT	Why is Figure 3.4 showing a decline at 2045 while Figure 3.3 doesn't?	under review		
16	Chapter 3, Figure 3.11a, p.53	N/A	HDOOT	Very difficult to read the city names. Perhaps could resolve by overlaying the transit map over the density maps with transparency.	done		
17	Chapter 3, Figure 3.15, p.58	N/A	HDOOT	Scaling the y-axis from 0 will show the double relationship better. Currently makes cars look like almost no time while transit is 5 times worse.	disagree		
18	Chapter 3, Environmental Justice, p.62	N/A	HDOOT	This section should be titled Title VI and Environmental Justice. Title VI is different from Environmental Justice. After reading this section, it is not clear how equity is being assessed. It seems like a bunch of existing conditions statistics but does not appear to say how the ORTP is being equitable. Title VI and Environmental Justice equitability is a difficult task, but we feel there should be something that leads to a statement that summarizes... "and therefore, the ORTP is not disproportionately benefiting or impacting Title VI and Environmental Justice populations".	The essence of the section is to have a bunch of statistics. The goals in the existing conditions is not to assess the performance of the plan- see chapter 5 for that.		
19	Chapter 4, Roadways, p.71	N/A	HDOOT	For existing conditions (starts on page 71), it might be good to expand on the role of the Transportation Asset Management Plan (TAMP) and how it should theoretically integrate with the programming of the ORTP. How it is supposed to identify the needed projects to meet the targets. Also, a discussion on what the penalties are for not meeting specific targets and what an uncertified TAMP means might be good as it affects federal funding.	DahuMPO was not involved in setting targets. How projects are programmed to achieve the goals and objectives of TAMP is a question for HDOOT. This something we need to look at in the future.		
20	Chapter 4, Roadways, p.71	N/A	HDOOT	Starting on page 71 (throughout Chapter 4), the NHS/federal aid transportation system is inaccurately described.	done		
21	Chapter 4, Roadways, p.71	N/A	HDOOT	I think the first sentence of the second paragraph should be revised to "Federal-aid and State highways serve the region and constitute its main roadway network." Federal highways would be under the jurisdiction of a federal agency.	done		
22	Chapter 4, Figure 4.1, p.73	N/A	HDOOT	The title of Figure 4.1 is incorrect. The NHS does not include rural minor collectors or local roads. By local roads, do you mean roadways under the jurisdiction of the City and County of Honolulu that are federal aid? Local roads as defined by federal function classification are defined specifically and differently.	done		
23	Chapter 4, Pavement Conditions on National Highway System, p.74	N/A	HDOOT	Paragraph 3, the sentence should be revised to: "All pavements on the Interstate or non Interstate NHS are required to be classified in good, fair, or poor condition."			
24	Chapter 4, Federal Performance Measures, p.74	N/A	HDOOT	The federal performance measures are inaccurately described. The correct performance measures are: Percentage of pavement of the non-Interstate NHS in good condition; and Percentage of pavement of the non-Interstate NHS in poor condition.	done		
25	Chapter 4, Federal Performance Measures, p.75	N/A	HDOOT	The federal performance measures are inaccurately described. The bottom left box should be "non-Interstate NHS"	done		
26	Chapter 4, Figures 4.2-4.3, p.76 and 78	N/A	HDOOT	Figures 4.2-4.3 on Pages 76 and 78 - the maps are missing legends	done		
27	Chapter 4, Bridge Conditions, p.77	N/A	HDOOT	That definition of deficient for bridges does not look familiar to me. If this is not the official FHWA definition, replace with the official FHWA definition. The second paragraph should refer to Figure 4.3.	done		
28	Chapter 4, Federal Performance Measures, p.79	N/A	HDOOT	The federal performance measures are inaccurately described. The bottom left box should be blank or say NHS.	done		
29	Chapter 4, Federal Performance Measures, p.79	N/A	HDOOT	The 2nd paragraph, last sentence says, "Based on available and latest bridge performance data shown in Table 4.2, the State of Hawaii either meets or exceeds set targets." We do not think you can conclude whether targets are being met or exceeded from the table. Consider revising the text.	done		
30	Chapter 4, Travel Time Index, Level of Service and Level of Travel Time Reliability, p.80-87	N/A	HDOOT	Starting on page 80 - TTI, LOS, and LOTTR should fall under the congestion and reliability section and not be their own sections.	done		
31	Chapter 4, Level of Travel Time Reliability, p. 85	N/A	HDOOT	According to the FHWA's website, our 4 year Interstate target was 74% and our baseline non-Interstate NHS was n/a.	done		
32	Chapter 4, Freight, p.96	N/A	HDOOT	The freight network includes more than just the Interstate roads. Should include the entire freight network in this analysis.	done		
33	Chapter 4, Figure 4.17, p.102	N/A	HDOOT	What is the "motor crash locations" map trying to depict? Motor vehicles? That would seem duplicative with the previous map.	done		
34	Chapter 4, Figure 4.18, p.103	N/A	HDOOT	Should the text say that the performance targets are on a 5 year rolling average?	no. the column shows the review period		
35	Chapter 5, Short-Range Projects and Programs	N/A	HDOOT	To assist with consistency of short-range STIP projects with the ORTP, it might make sense for us to create a "safety improvements at Various Locations" line item in the Short Range ORTP. There are always HSIP projects that get programmed in a few times within the life of a STIP. This is because, you can't really program HSIP projects out too far since the threshold is accident data. Sometimes, there are places where accidents consistently happen... Other areas have spikes that smooth out to the point where other places become the priority.	DahuMPO: If HDOOT would like this to be included in the short-range list of projects, that would require the submission of an application. The ORTP will be amended anytime that a project is added to the TIP, if that project is not listed in the ORTP. We would need clarification on whether a project is being funded from an existing ORTP program, or if it is a stand alone new project.		

36	Chapter 5, Short-Range Projects and Programs	N/A	HDOOT	As far as the accuracy of the short-range projects...FHWA funded projects with costs that equal \$0. The cost is not zero. Those projects have a cost and have already begun in previous years. What was pulled was the total for AC conversions (cash flow needs in future years), which is represented as a cost of \$0. One of the issues with listing TIP projects... For AC conversions, it might make sense to reverse calculate the total amount that is associated with the AC conversion (all of them). For example, if there are 2 years of AC for an 80/20 project... both years with \$800K in fed aid... the portion of cost shown in the STIP for that project would be $800/0.8 = 1000$ or \$1 million... then times 2 since there are 2 years with the same numbers... = \$2 million. Unless this is explained somewhere that I missed... an appendix?	OahuMPO: N/A was added instead of zero.
37	Chapter 5, Short-Range Projects and Programs	N/A	HDOOT	Along the lines of #35... Does it also then make sense to add the following DRTP projects for Short term? I guess this all depends on how FHWA will define consistency... Rackfall protection at various locations; Resiliency program (included as mid and long-range program) Highway lighting improvements at various locations	OahuMPO: If HDOOT would like this to be included in the short-range list of projects, that would require the submission of an application. The DRTP will be amended anytime that a project is added to the TIP, if that project is not listed in the DRTP. We would need clarification on whether a project is being funded from an existing DRTP program, or if it is a stand alone new project.
38	Chapter 5, Potential Federal Funding Sources, p.108-118	N/A	HDOOT	Starting on Page 108, focus on the funding eligibility seems like too much information for the DRTP... better suited for the TIP. Should focus more on the annual amounts of each funding category... which I suppose is included in Appendix C...	OahuMPO: Thank you for your comment. We've peer reviewed other MPOs, and many include this level of information, so we're choosing to keep this information in there.
39	Chapter 5, Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP), p.110	N/A	HDOOT	HSIP funded projects must also be prioritized through the HSIP program based on accident statistics. Scope of these projects are determined through the project development process and are limited as described.	OahuMPO: Thank you for this comment. We've added verbiage in this section to clarify.
40	Chapter 5, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ), p.111	N/A	HDOOT	In the CMAQ definition, text should be added to explain that the entire state is an attainment area and that allows us to use CMAQ funds more flexibly, however, we would still program CMAQ funds to CMAQ eligible projects.	OahuMPO: Thank you for this comment. We've added verbiage in this section to clarify.
41	Chapter 5, National Highway Freight Program, p.112	N/A	HDOOT	FHWA's website says the federal share payable is 90% for a project on the Interstate System (including a project to add high occupancy vehicle lanes or auxiliary lanes but excluding a project to add other lanes). DRTP says "the Interstate system receives funding at 90/10 ratio when a project adds HOV or auxiliary lanes. This is not the same thing. DRTP is saying only Interstate projects adding HOV or auxiliary lanes get 90% fed-aid. FHWA says any project on the Interstate system gets 90% fed-aid, even the ones adding HOV and auxiliary lanes. The other thing to keep in mind is that the 90% is a maximum eligible federal share. We do not always program at 90%. Sometimes we purposefully program at 80% to stretch the federal funds. National Highway Performance Program (NHPP) - FAST Act Fact Sheets - FHWA Federal Highway Administration (dot.gov)	OahuMPO: Thank you for this comment. We've added verbiage in this section to clarify.
42	Chapter 5, Demonstration of Financial Constraint, p.118	N/A	HDOOT	Why is the short-range component not broken down into FHWA and FTA revenues? It is unclear in this section where the projected "revenues" are coming from. Should at least re-reference Appendix C here. It is unclear how the "expenditures" in table 5.1 add up to the listed projects. Perhaps a summation of funds required for the short-, mid-, and long-term project lists that can be compared to Table 5.1 would make it more transparent	OahuMPO: Thank you for your comment. We've re-referenced Appendix C in this section, which includes revenues broken down by FHWA and FTA revenues.
43	Chapter 5, Table 5.1 Demonstration of Fiscal Constraint: Forecasted Funding Compared to Project and Program Costs, p.121	N/A	HDOOT	Page 121 - "Table 5.1 demonstrates that \$33,967.0 BILLION of funding will be available..." Feels like that should be MILLION... \$33,967 billion = \$33.9 TRILLION... That seems high. Same comment for the sentence after that with costs.	OahuMPO: Thank you for noting this error. This has been corrected.
44	Chapter 5, Prioritizing Our Investments to Meet Our Most Urgent Needs, p.121	N/A	HDOOT	Starting on Page 121 - Related to the scoring of projects, we still have concerns that the scoring process developed does not align well with the HDOOT's existing priorities of safety and system preservation and does not align with the federally required performance measures for safety, system preservation, and congestion. During the development of the scoring process, our comment was that we were concerned that system preservation, safety, and resiliency were not allocated much weight in the scoring. At the time, for example, bridge and pavement preservation only received a total possible of 3.9 points out of the possible 100. Bridge and pavement preservation are the core of our transportation system--without them, it doesn't really exist and safety would be jeopardized. We still feel that extremely important projects/programs (e.g., system preservation, safety, and resiliency) score very low in the evaluation process.	OahuMPO: Thank you for your comment.
45	Chapter 5, Short-Range Projects and Programs, p.123	N/A	HDOOT	Constrained list of projects and Programs - Why is the short-range (TIP) list of projects in the back? Seems like it would make more sense to start with them in the short-range.	OahuMPO: Thank for the suggestion. The short-range projects have been moved to the front.
46	Chapter 5, Table 5.3 Mid-Range Roadway Capacity Projects and Programs, p.125	O-21-9 Kapolei Parkway, Extension & Widening, Aliinui Drive to Kalaheo Boulevard	Kathleen Moses Benson	I am in favor of the projects (except for one) and feel that the improvements are long overdue; in fact I think the timeline should be shortened. I disagree with extending Kapolei Parkway to Aliinui Drive Ko Olina. Doing so will ruin the resort and kill the jobs provided by the west side's largest employer. Also, this project needs to add a second route over the Waianae mountains between the west side and H2 since most jobs are still in Hanolulu.	OahuMPO: This comment has been forwarded to OTS for response, and the response will be updated as soon as we hear back.

47	Chapter 5, Table 5.3 Mid-Range Roadway Capacity Projects and Programs, p.125	O-21-10 Makakilo Drive Extension	Dr. Joseph T Page Jr	There is only one way in/out of the Upper Makakilo area. The proposed Makakilo Drive Extension would provide an alternate enter/exit opportunity for residents not only on a routine basis (saving both time and fuel)...but most importantly an alternate route in the event of potential emergencies.	DTS: Thank you for your comment. The original Final Environmental Assessment (FEA) for the Makakilo Drive Extension project noted that the project would provide an alternative transportation route for residents, emergency vehicles and equipment requiring access to the Makakilo community. This comment will be used in the development of this project.		
48	Chapter 5, Table 5.11 Long-Range Roadway Capacity Projects and Programs, p.130	O-21-28 Fort Barrette Road (Route 901), Widening, Farrington Highway to Barber's Point Gate	John Rogers	Projects O-21-28 Fort Barrette Rd: the 2045 ORTP Map indicates that the boundaries are between Farrington Hwy and Roosevelt Rd, the project and program application indicates the boundaries are between Roosevelt Rd and Saratoga Rd. In any case Fort Barrette Rd should be widened between Farrington Hwy and Roosevelt Rd to include bike lanes. The Oahu Bike Plan Project ID 1-24 has it as a priority one project. Including bike lanes on Fort Barrett would enhance an already in place or being built bicycle network created by connecting Fort Barrette to bike lanes on Farrington Hwy, Kapolei Pkwy, and Kamaaha Ave. This will provide a safe route to the schools in the area and increase the commute mode share of bicycles reducing congestion.	OahuMPO: This comment has been forwarded to HDOT for response, and the response will be updated as soon as we hear back.		
49	Chapter 5, Table 5.11 Long-Range Roadway Capacity Projects and Programs, p.131	O-21-31 Kualaka'i Parkway Extension	Steven Vendt, Hawaiian Railway	The Hawaiian Railway Society is totally opposed to the Kualaka'i Parkway extension. road would go into our private property. If the road is a straight line, it would go thru our train yard. Unless they build an overpass, the road would wipe us out. Our property is on the State Register of Historic places. The road would also cross the Historic Oahu Railway tracks. They are on the National Register of Historic Places.	The alignment for the Kualaka'i Parkway extension would be determined as part of the project development process and include coordination with stakeholders and take into consideration existing conditions. (In the Draft ORTP, the Kualaka'i Extension is listed as O-21-30, not 31)		
50	Chapter 5, Table 5.4 Mid-Range Highway, Road, and Bridge Operations and Maintenance Projects and Programs, p.125 & Table 5.12 Long-Range Highway, Road, and Bridge Operations and Maintenance Projects and Programs, p.131	O-21-11 City Operations and Maintenance (O&M) - Roadways	Dylan P. Armstrong	Issues of pothole rehabilitation, wear and tear (especially on Nipo Street) speeding on Mānoa Road and Lowrey Avenue, have been brought to Mānoa Neighborhood Board from 2017-2021.	OahuMPO: This comment has been forwarded to DTS for response, and the response will be updated as soon as we hear back.		
51	Chapter 5, Table 5.4 Mid-Range Highway, Road, and Bridge Operations and Maintenance Projects and Programs, p.125-126 & Table 5.12 Long-Range Highway, Road, and Bridge Operations and Maintenance Projects and Programs, p.131-132	O-21-11 City Operations and Maintenance (O&M) - Roadways, O-21-13 State Operations and Maintenance, and O-21-14 System Preservation Program	Darlene Wade	I am not sure if you are the appropriate person to address the roads condition on our island from Waialae Nui Ridge to Downtown Honolulu. It is so dangerous! Even the freeway has potholes in the fast lane. What is the plan to repair these roads? Mahalo for your attention to this critical matter.	OahuMPO: This comment has been forwarded to HDOT and DTS for response, and the response will be updated as soon as we hear back.		
52	Chapter 5, Table 5.5 Mid-Range Safety Projects and Programs, p.126 & Table 5.13 Long-Range Safety Projects and Programs, p.132	O-21-15 Safety Program	John Rogers	The Intersection of Kualakai Pkwy and Kapolei Parkway: The intersection pedestrian crossing in both directions is very wide. When crossing Kualakai Pkwy east to west as a pedestrian, vehicles turning right from Kapolei Pkwy do not have a clear view of pedestrians entering the crosswalk. The same is true when crossing the western side of Kapolei Pkwy north to south. This intersection would be safer for pedestrians if right on red was not allowed or somehow redesigned.	OahuMPO: This comment has been forwarded to HDOT for response, and the response will be updated as soon as we hear back.		
53	Chapter 5, Table 5.4 Mid-Range Highway, Road, and Bridge Operations and Maintenance Projects and Programs, p.126 & Table 5.12 Long-Range Highway, Road, and Bridge Operations and Maintenance Projects and Programs, p.132	O-21-14 System Preservation Program	John Rogers	Fort Weaver Rd: Repair the shared use path between Renton Rd and Farrington Hwy. Extend the pathway on to Farrington Hwy to the Ho'ae'oe Rail Station.	OahuMPO: This comment has been forwarded to HDOT for response, and the response will be updated as soon as we hear back.		
54	Chapter 5, Table 5.5 Mid-Range Safety Projects and Programs, p.126 & Table 5.13 Long-Range Safety Projects and Programs, p.132	O-21-15 Safety Program	John Rogers	Roosevelt Ave has become a major connector road between Ewa, the Ka Makana Ali'i Mall, Kalaehoa Beaches, Schools, and Kapolei since the closing of the Barbers Point Naval Base. To make the roadway safe for all users a Complete Streets study should be planned, implemented and included in the ORTP 2045.	OahuMPO: This comment has been forwarded to HDOT for response, and the response will be updated as soon as we hear back.		
55	Chapter 5, Table 5.8 Mid-Range Pedestrian and Bicycle Projects and Programs, p.128-129 & Table 5.15 Long-Range Pedestrian and Bicycle Projects and Programs, p.134 & Table 5.21 Short-Range FHWA Funded City Projects and Programs - 2022-2025, p.146, & Table 5.5 Mid-Range Safety Projects and Programs, p.126 & Table 5.13 Long-Range Safety Projects and Programs, p.132	O-21-22 Alternatives Projects, O-21-23 Oahu Bike Plan, OC2 Bikeway Improvements Program, OC2B Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Program, and OC26 Transportation Alternative Program (State), O-21-15 Safety Program	John Rogers	Safety Program and Transportation Alternatives Program HDOT Fort Weaver Rd Southern Section: A shared use path should be completed between Keaunui Dr and its terminus at Pu'ulua Beach Park. This is a safe route to school, safe routes to parks and major equity issue in this old section of Ewa Beach. The Oahu Bike Plan has this section of roadway having a shared use path Project ID 1-26 as a priority one project.	OahuMPO: This comment has been forwarded to HDOT for response, and the response will be updated as soon as we hear back.		

56	Chapter 5, Table 5.8 Mid-Range Pedestrian and Bicycle Projects and Programs, p.128 & Table 5.15 Long-Range Pedestrian and Bicycle Projects and Programs, p.134	0-21-22 Alternatives Projects	John Rogers	Transportation Alternative Program HDOT The Oahu Regional Transportation Plan (ORTP) 2045 Project List should include Leeward Bikeway Phase 2 (Philippine Sea Road to Luululei Naval Road). In 1980 the Federal Government deeded land to the State of Hawai'i for the express purpose of "bike lanes or paths and pedestrian walkway." The deed stipulates that if it is determined that the land is no longer needed for use as an active transportation corridor then it should be returned to the Federal Government. It is important that this transportation corridor be maintained in Oahu's long range transportation plan. Building a shared use path along the entirety of the deeded corridor will undoubtedly increase the commute mode-share for pedestrians and bicyclists accessing workplace, retail and public transportation services as well as providing an outstanding recreational resource for residents and the visitor industry.	The HDOT previously responded to this comment on February 2, 2021. The HDOT is currently constructing Phase 1 of the Leeward Bikeway. Due to significant feasibility issues, the HDOT does not have short term plans to move forward with Phase 2 at this time. A small segment of Phase 2 was recently completed as part of a larger transportation project. This project constructed a shared use path on the makai side of Farrington Highway from Nanakuli Avenue to Heleluu Street (~0.6 mi).		
57	Chapter 5, Table 5.4 Mid-Range Highway, Road, and Bridge Operations and Maintenance Projects and Programs, p.126 & Table 5.12 Long-Range Highway, Road, and Bridge Operations and Maintenance Projects and Programs, p.132 & Table 5.8 Mid-Range Pedestrian and Bicycle Projects and Programs, p.128 & Table 5.15 Long-Range Pedestrian and Bicycle Projects and Programs, p.134	0-21-14 System Preservation Program & 0-21-22 Alternatives Projects	John Rogers	Alternative Projects and Preventive Maintenance Oahu Bike Plan DTS West Loch Bike Path and Honouliuli Stream Bridge (A two-mile portion of the Leeward Bikeway): The West Loch Bike Path pavement between Kapapapuhi Park and Asing Park has been in service with little maintenance since the late 1980's. The pavement is in deplorable condition displaying just about every type of pavement defect known, e.g., various types of cracking, depressions, rutting, upheaval, and ravelling. In or around 2005 the wooden Honouliuli Bridge was replaced by a narrow medal catwalk type bridge. The community was told that this medal bridge was temporary. The bridge is just over one meter wide and is not safe to ride bicycles over as it is easy to get the handlebars of the bicycle caught up in the handrails of the bridge. The bridge should be replaced with a proper width pedestrian and bicycle bridge and this pathway should be repaved.	OahuMPO: This comment has been forwarded to HDOT for response, and the response will be updated as soon as we hear back.		
58	Chapter 5, Table 5.18 Unfunded Roadway Capacity and Operational Improvements Projects and Programs (No Timeframe), p. 135	0-21-37 Waianae, Second Access, Farrington Highway to Kunia Road (ILLUSTRATIVE)	Eric Fleckles	The leeward community has been asking for a second access road that is FUNCTIONAL for over 30 years. It is on here, and yet only illustrative. Why is there no funding?	OahuMPO: This comment has been forwarded to HDOT for response, and the response will be updated as soon as we hear back.		
59	Chapter 5, Short-Range Projects and Programs, p.137	N/A	HDOT	Starting on Page 137—the short range projects. We are confused as to why short range (TIP) projects are listed in the ORTP. The long-range plans are typically a needs assessment that show generally where certain kinds (safety, capacity, preservation, etc.) of improvements are needed, it usually does not spell out the specific treatment. What will the definition of TIP project consistency with the long-range land transportation plan be? Project must be listed? Project meets goals? If the latter, why list the Short-term projects? If the former, does that mean the ORTP must be amended every time we amend the TIP to add a project? That doesn't sound efficient. This needs assessment would be the backbone of the T6/EJ analysis. See comment 5 above.	OahuMPO: The ORTP must include projects that are planned and/or programmed through the horizon year of the plan (2045), thus it must include TIP projects. Consistency means that a project must be listed in the ORTP. The ORTP will be amended every time there is a project added to the TIP.		
60	Chapter 5, Table 5.20 Short-Range FHWA Funded State Projects and Programs – 2022-2025, p.138	OS4 Farrington Highway (Route 93), Bridge Replacement, Makaha Bridges #3 & #3A	Patricia Likos	We live west of the bridges that are in need of replacement. I strongly support completion of the Farrington Highway realignment feasibility study BEFORE moving ahead with any rebuild of these existing bridges, due to concerns re ongoing and progressive coastal erosion and seasonal flooding in the area, as well as safety issues for users of this world renown and popular beach park that currently has a state highway dissecting it.	OahuMPO: This comment has been forwarded to HDOT for response, and the response will be updated as soon as we hear back.		
61	Chapter 5, Table 5.20 Short-Range FHWA Funded State Projects and Programs – 2022-2025, p.138	OS4 Farrington Highway (Route 93), Bridge Replacement, Makaha Bridges #3 & #3A	Charlene Holani	If the current bridges are rebuilt as planned at their current location, such an investment (current cost of \$23 M) would jeopardize the preferred mauka reroute and the Makaha Beach Park project until these new bridges need replacement 70-100 years from now. It is extremely unlikely that anyone would be willing to tear them down for many years from now to build the mauka route and park. The community has voiced its concerns since the mid-1980s. If the current Makaha Bridges replacement project proceeds as planned, the placing of the PROJECT's temporary bypass road on the makai side of Farrington highway will place the Makaha Beach ecosystem in immediate peril, especially if the "five-year flood level standard" temporary bridges are washed into the bay by inland flooding or ocean surge. If the mauka route is constructed, there will be no need to construct a temporary bypass route because the current route would be fully available. The existing bridges have been recently repaired and reinforced by the State DOT; there are no posted limitations on either of the bridges, they have withstood multiple 100-year floods (including the most recent in 2008). These bridges should have 2 more years, giving plenty of time for the State DOT to reevaluate alternative #4 (the mauka route) and modify the current design to accommodate the community's needs and desires. Please stop and take the time to continue research and studies that would better suite this communities physical, mental and spiritual well being.	OahuMPO: This comment has been forwarded to HDOT for response, and the response will be updated as soon as we hear back.		

62	Chapter 5, Table 5.3 Short-Range FHWA Funded State Projects and Programs - 2022-2025, p.139	OS5 Freeway Management System, Interstate H-1, H-2, H-3, and Moanalua Freeway (Routes H-201 and 7B)	HOOT	As far as the accuracy of the short-range projects. Page 139, OS5: Add H-3 to the title so it says Freeway Management System, Interstate H-1, H-2, H-3, and Moanalua Freeway (Routes H-201 and 7B)	OahuMPO: Thank you, the correction has been made.		
63	Chapter 5, Table 5.12 Mid-Range Pedestrian and Bicycle Projects and Programs, p.140	O-21-23 Oahu Bike Plan	HOOT	Page 140 - Oahu Bike Plan is listed as an HOOT project. Please correct to the City and County of Honolulu.	OahuMPO: Thank you for the correction. This has been changed.		
64	Chapter 5, Table 5.13 Mid-Range System Management and Operations Projects and Programs, p.142 and Table 5.14 Mid-Range Transportation Demand Management Projects and Programs p.142 & Table 5.20 Long-Range System Management and Operations Projects and Programs, p. 147 and Table 5.21 Long-Range Transportation Demand Management Projects and Programs, p.148	O-21-24 Intelligent Transportation System and O-21-25 Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program	HOOT	Project list area -TDM and ITS also fall under congestion rather than their own category	OahuMPO: We currently don't have a "congestion" project type in our project list. Thus, TDM and ITS fall into their own categories.		
65	Chapter 5, Table 5.3 Short-Range FHWA Funded State Projects and Programs - 2022-2025, p.143	OS80 Traffic signal Modernization at Various Locations, Ph2	HOOT	As far as the accuracy of the short-range projects. Page 143, OS80: Change Ph1 to Ph2	OahuMPO: Thank you, the correction has been made.		
66	Chapter 5, Table 5.21 Short-Range FHWA Funded City Projects and Programs, p.147	OC25 Transportation Alternatives (MPO) at Various Locations - Ala Wai Bridge Project	Charles Hoffman	I am an older resident of walkiki and attended the last online mtg although they were not going to address the ala wai pedestrian bridge until just before 8 PM. It started at 6 PM so I left. please let me know what the latest status. i am a young senior who bikes & i must say from the light at pa'u st on the ala wai headed west (ewa) there should be a painted bike lane or allow up to use the dirt path between road and sidewalk. currently it is a ticktebale offense. there is a street sign as well as painted bikes in the road but vehicles still beep and cut it close from that light to mcclully. very dangerous and threating. i am an home owner, business professional, tax payer, voter and state income tax payer. thank you, c hoffman	OahuMPO: This comment has been forwarded to DTS for response, and the response will be updated as soon as we hear back.		
67	N/A	Project Not Included in the DRTP	Pieter Meinster	Safeguard Makaha beach infrastructure against erosion, sea level rise and traffic congestion (with associated safety implications) by implementing the changes encapsulated in the Makaha Beach Park Master Plan report, prepared for the department of Parks and Recreation by Pacific Architects, Inc. On March 1998 - https://oahumpo.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/Makaha-Beach-Park-Master-Plan-Report-1998.pdf Ensure adequate emergency egress for the community in this region, should we be faced with a catastrophic event. In accordance with recommended scope described in Waialae Coast Emergency Access Road EA - https://oahumpo.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/Waialae-Emergency-Access-Road-EA-2002.pdf Plan and execute the Master plan to optimize and affect lasting improvement to our infrastructure in an organized, accountable and fiscally responsible manner that truly develops resilience of our transportation infrastructure to safeguard against the impacts of climate change. The master plan already conforms with the framework that was developed under these auspices and impact studies and engineering analysis has already been completed.	OahuMPO: This comment has been forwarded to HOOT for response, and the response will be updated as soon as we hear back.		
68	N/A	Project Not Included in the DRTP	John Bond	Best Traffic Connectivity Master Plan for the Honolulu WWTP with Appropriate Historic Ewa Battlefield APE and Army JTS Cable Network Mitigations; Full pdf provided by respondent can be found here: https://www.oahumpo.org/?wpfb_dj=2158	DTS: This comment will be forwarded to the City Department of Environmental Services. The Environmental impact statement (EIS) for the proposed Honolulu Wastewater Treatment Plant Secondary Treatment and Support Facilities was published on 4/26/2016. The Ewa Plain Battlefield was listed on the National Register of Historic Places on 5/23/2016.		
69	N/A	Project Not Included in the DRTP	Frances Spohn	It would really help town-bound traffic if there was a left turn lane at Luualaei Navel Road because of the shopping center there, especially at morning drive time. A left arrow means everyone has to wait until it turns on and allows a few cars through. Left turn lane would clear the mess it causes. Thank you.	OahuMPO: This comment has been forwarded to HOOT for response, and the response will be updated as soon as we hear back.		
70	N/A	Project Not Included in the DRTP	Department of Parks and Recreation	The City and County of Honolulu Department of Parks and Recreation supports the realignment of Farrington Highway in accordance with the 1998 Makaha Beach Park Master Plan. It is our belief that the highway realignment will resolve numerous safety, environmental, and park usability issues. In addition, we are absolutely willing to work with the Hawaii Department of Transportation in this effort.	OahuMPO: This comment has been forwarded to HOOT for response, and the response will be updated as soon as we hear back.		
71	N/A	Project Not Included in the DRTP	Eric Fleckles	Please consider the Makaha Beach Master plan, that has been on the books and approved since 1989, instead of this quick fix. This is a long time issue that continues to fester, and will greatly improve the safety of the area	OahuMPO: This comment has been forwarded to HOOT for response, and the response will be updated as soon as we hear back.		

72	General - Planning Process	N/A	Adam Hori	I appreciate the long term thinking this transportation plan is encouraging our community to do. A major question that i would like to understand better with this report is how much weight did climate change have in ordering the prioritization of projects and which projects were deemed to be the most needed because of climate change.	OahuMPO: The project and program prioritization process included consideration of climate change in a number of ways: encouraging mode shift (Goal 2 - Support Active and Public Transportation, Maximum 24 points), preparing our transportation system for sea level rise and extreme weather events (Goal 4: Improve the Resiliency of the Transportation System, maximum 10 points), and reducing ground transportation emissions, (Goal 7: Improve Air Quality and Protect Environmental and Cultural Assets, maximum 5 points). All projects and programs could score a maximum of 100 points. To read more about our project and program prioritization process, please visit: https://www.oahumpo.org/?wpfb_dl=1935 . New projects and programs were evaluated and scored. To view these in their context of the criteria above that touch on climate change, please visit: https://www.oahumpo.org/?wpfb_dl=2001 .
73	General - Planning Process	N/A	Carolyn Weygan-Hildebrand	Historically marginalized communities. The Draft is to be commended for recognizing that there are historically marginalized communities. However, it should have a more profound and broader analysis of marginalization (e.g. historical investments, historical engagement and community participation, history of transportation). Clearly the Plan cannot simply address the matter along affordability of transportation for community residents. See for example: http://www.staradvertiser.com/2021/03/28/hawaii-news/state-agencies-urged-to-prioritize-farrington-highway-realignment-in-makaha . The issue raised in Waianae Coast calls for better capacity building, including not only the provision of training but the necessity of having an in-house team of experts on climate change and coastal areas as well as experts on equity within OahuMPO and DDT. The Plan should include a special section on the issue of historically marginalized communities. The Plan should be flexible to allow for the inclusion of projects that are yet to be conceived with the perspectives and insights of these experts. The Plan should be flexible to allow for the inclusion and prioritization of projects that will prove to be important but have yet to be conceived.	OahuMPO: Thank you for your comment. We hope to develop a more robust analysis to measure the benefits and disbenefits of transportation investments, and how that may impact what investments we make.
74	N/A	N/A	Department of Design and Construction	No comment	N/A
75	N/A	N/A	Mike Galajuch, Palehua Townhouses Association	No comment	N/A
Table A.2 Public and Intergovernmental Comments Received After Review Period					
Comment Number	Chapter, Section, and Page Number	Project	Commenter	Comment	Agency Response
76	Chapter 2, Performance Measures, p.14	N/A	DTS	Performance measures: Oahu Metropolitan Planning Organization should also document the ORTP Implementation Plan's compatibility with and ability to achieve the Governor's energy goals and the City's climate action plan.	OahuMPO: Thank you for your comment. Verbiage has been added in the Plan Performance section of the plan to address this.
	Chapter 4, Transit Safety, p.105	N/A	DTS	Transit Safety: Add bullet point, "Safety measures are based on data reported to the Federal Transit Administration's National Transit Database."	OahuMPO: Thank you, this has been added.
	Chapter 4, Performance Measures, p.105	N/A	DTS	Federal Performance Measures: Change section title to "Federal Safety Performance Measures."	OahuMPO: Thank you, this has been changed.
	Chapter 4, Performance Measures, p.105	N/A	DTS	Federal Performance Measures, (3) and (4): Change to "number of injuries" and "rate of injuries" respectively.	OahuMPO: Thank you, this has been changed.
	Chapter 5, City and County of Honolulu Revenue Sources, p.117-118	N/A	DTS	City and County of Honolulu Revenue Sources: i. Change funding from the Public Transportation System..." segment to read, "Funding from the Public Transportation System capital project being constructed by the Honolulu Authority for Rapid Transportation include charges for services, capital grants/contributions, investment earnings, and intergovernmental transfers (that is, GET). Revenue sources for Public Transportation system operations include charges services and operating grants/contributions, with the predominant contributions coming from grants from the City and County of Honolulu, Highway Fund and General Fund which predominately fund wages and fringe benefits, fuel and energy, materials and services, and risk and insurance."	OahuMPO: Thank you for the suggested revision. This verbiage has been incorporated.
	Chapter 5, Table 5.8 Mid-Range Pedestrian and Bicycle Projects and Programs, p.128	0-21-22 Alternatives Projects	DTS	Pg. 128 Project No. 0-21-22, Alternatives Projects: Change Agency designation to "DTS", the project is incorrectly attributed to HDOT.	OahuMPO: Thank you for catching this error, it has been corrected.
	Chapter 5, Table 5.8 Mid-Range Pedestrian and Bicycle Projects and Programs, p.129	0-21-23 Oahu Bike Plan	DTS	Pg. 129, Project No. 0-21-23, Oahu Bike Plan: Change Agency designation to "DTS", the project is incorrectly attributed to HDOT.	OahuMPO: Thank you for catching this error, it has been corrected.
	Chapter 5, Table 5.9 Mid-Range System Management and Operations Projects and Programs, p.129	0-21-24 Intelligent Transportation System (ITS)	DTS	Pg. 129, Project No. 0-21-24, Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS): Change Agency designation to "DTS", the project is incorrectly attributed to HDOT.	OahuMPO: Thank you for catching this error, it has been corrected.

Chapter 5, Table 5.10 Mid-Range Transportation Demand Management Projects and Programs, p.129	0-21-25 Transportation Demand Management (TDM)	DTS	Pg. 129, Project No. 0-21-25, Transportation Demand Management (TDM): Change Agency designation to "DTS", the project is incorrectly attributed to HDOT.		
Chapter 5, Table 5.11 Long-Range Roadway Capacity Projects and Programs, p.130	0-21-27 Fort Barrett Road	DTS	Pg. 130, Project No. 0-21-27, Fort Barrett Road: Include a notation that this is a developer funded project.	OahuMPO: A note has been added that this project is developer funded.	
Chapter 5, Table 5.11 Long-Range Roadway Capacity Projects and Programs, p.130	0-21-29 Kamokila Boulevard	DTS	Pg. 130, Project No. 0-21-29, Kamokila Boulevard: Include a notation that this is a developer funded project.	OahuMPO: A note has been added that this project is developer funded.	
Chapter 5, Table 5.21 Short-Range FHWA Funded City Projects and Programs - 2022-2025, p.147	OC23 Salt Lake Boulevard Widening, Phase 3	DTS	Pg. 147, Project No. OC23, Salt Lake Boulevard Widening, Phase 3: i. Confirm that anticipated funding for this project has been lowered from DTS' requested amount of \$61.83 million to \$60.74 million; ii. Change description to read "Widen Salt Lake Boulevard from two to six lanes, between Maluna Street and Ala Lilikoi Street."	OahuMPO: Thank you for the note. OC23 currently states that the estimated total funding request is \$60.74 million. The description has changed to match what is requested.	
Chapter 5, Table 5.23 Short-Range FTA Funded City Projects and Programs - 2022-2025, p.150	0-21-58 Transit Centers, Various Locations	DTS	Pg. 150 Project NO 0-21-58, Transit Centers, Various Locations: Change description to read, "Construct transit centers and provide accessibility at various locations islandwide to support transit operations."	OahuMPO: The description has been changed to include the word, "islandwide".	
	Makaha Bridge Project	Carmen Guzman-Simpliciano, Kingdom Pathways	On behalf of the Waialanae Community, we are asking that the State Department of Transportation bring to a halt the bridge replacement of (Nos.3 and 3A.) along Farrington Highway, Route 93, between milepost markers number 13.95 and number 14.21 in Makaha, Waialanae District, Oahu, Hawaii. The portion of Farrington Highway that comprises the project site is located between Tax Map Keys (TMKs): (1) 8-4-002: Parcel 047 and (1) 8- 4010: Parcel 012. Both parcels are owned by the City and County of Honolulu. We ask that the State Department of Transportation delay this process and reconsider all options to create a feasible plan and investment. To also review, and do an engineering analysis to implement the 1998 Makaha Beach Park Master Plan.		Please view full comment here .