Minutes of the
Oahu Metropolitan Planning Organization

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Wednesday, April 15, 2009, 11:00 a.m.
Department of Transportation 5th Floor Conference Room
869 Punchbowl Street, Honolulu, Hawaii

Members Present:

Mark Au, Vice Chair	DTS	Kathy Sokugawa	DPP
Eugene Tian (alternate)	DBEDT	Eileen Mark (alternate)	DTS
Abe Mitsuda	DBEDT-OP	Steve Wong (ex officio)	FAA
Glenn Soma	DOT	Elizabeth Fischer (ex officio)	FHWA
Ken Tatsuguchi (alternate)	DOT	Gareth Sakakida (ex officio)	HTA
Randolph Hara	DPP		

Members Absent: A. Ricardo Archilla (UH, ex officio), (vacant, FTA, ex officio)

Guests Present:

David Shimokawa	DOT	Coby Lynn	NB #23, CAC
Dave Zevenbergen	DOT	Nick Roach	PB Americas
Charles Carole	NB #10, CAC		

OahuMPO Staff Present: Gordon Lum (Executive Director), Lori Arakaki, Randolph Sykes, and Pamela Toyooka

In the absence of Chair Glenn Yasui, Vice Chair Mark Au presided over the meeting until first adjournment. The meeting was called to order at 11:08 a.m. by Acting Chair Mark Au. A quorum was present.

I. APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 18, 2009 MEETING MINUTES

Glenn Soma moved and Abe Mitsuda seconded that the February 18, 2009 meeting minutes be approved as circulated. The motion was unanimously carried.

II. OAHU REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (ORTP) 2035

Handouts: ORTP 2035 Update – Proposed Vision Statement; Proposed Goals and Proposed Performance Measures

II.A. Recommendation to the Policy Committee on Vision, Goals, and Objectives

Nick Roach of PB Americas, ORTP 2035 consultant, presented the Vision Statement and the Goals and Objectives. At the request of Kathy Sokugawa, Mr. Roach highlighted those goals and objectives that were different than those in the ORTP 2030.

Discussion
With regard to the Vision Statement, Elizabeth Fischer felt that "travelers" referred to visitors, to those not of here or passing through. She suggested using "residents and visitors". Mr. Roach stated that in this context, "travelers" refers to all those who use the transportation system. Gordon Lum added that the verbiage used in the vision statement should be conversational, a bit inspirational, and concise. Charles Carole offered "users". Eileen Mark and Ms. Fischer both offered "people".

Ms. Fischer went on to offer her comments on other proposed Objectives:

- Objective 7: "All hazards event", an industry standard term that covers people and Mother Nature, should be used instead of including a laundry list of incident types.
- Objective 21: The use of both "landscaping" and "tree planting" is redundant.
- Objective 21 & 22: Nowhere in these is there specifically something about system design that respects place.
- Objective 23: Use "all hazards event" wording.

Ms. Sokugawa asked if #21 is an appropriate objective for the ORTP. She questioned if aesthetics will become a basis for selecting ORTP projects as this information will not be known as conceptual projects are proposed. Ms. Fischer stated that 23 CFR 450, Parts 200 and 300 discusses bringing in environmental considerations. Mr. Roach added that this objective might generate a qualitative assessment. Ken Tatsuguchi asked if this will be a ranking criteria, or a consideration or guidance when selecting projects.

Mr. Lum stated that the objectives would not be weighted or ranked as the ranking would be subjective. The Policy Committee members will apply their perceived weights to evaluate the need for a project.

Mr. Lum stated that the members should not worry about the degree to which the objectives will be used to rank a project. The main concern should be "Do we have the appropriate concepts?" Ms. Fischer stated that the 25 objectives are verbose and that many are duplicative. She recommended, particularly for the Policy Committee members, that the objectives be cleaned up and streamlined to be more refined and simple, to the point.

Acting Chair Au stated that the purpose of the objectives is to provide the Policy Committee with guidelines for the basis for which projects should be evaluated.

In response to Acting Chair Au, Mr. Lum stated that, following this meeting, OahuMPO and its consultant will attempt to condense these objectives. He added that the majority of the goals and objectives presented are a result of past updates which were used by the consultant as its foundation.

Regarding the last goal (land use and transportation integration), Ms. Sokugawa noted that there is a bill (HB 865) in the Legislature proposing that the Statewide Transportation Plan shall comply with County transportation-related and general plans, unless federal funds are at stake.

She noted that the Hawaii Department of Transportation (HDOT) Director has consistently opposed this. Randolph Sykes stated that this goal originated from the ORTP 2030 plan.

As a matter of information, Mr. Soma explained HDOT's opposition to HB 865 by noting the multitude of City and County plans in the State and the potential for conflict between county plans. Soma stated that the considerations concerning HB 865 are that there are so many City and County plans throughout the State. Some of those plans will contradict each other, modify them or amend them. To make State plans subject to complying with those plans that conflict with each other puts the State in a difficult situation. If the State complies with a plan that conflicts with another plan, is that illegal? How do you enforce such a law? The State wrestles with compliance.

Ms. Sokugawa and Mr. Soma both agreed that Objective 24 should be kept as is.

II.B. Acceptance of Performance Measures
Mr. Roach gave a presentation on the Performance Measures.

Ms. Mark noted that many of the performance measures were qualitative in nature. She suggested that the performance measures should be quantitative, so that they are measurable and predictable. Qualitative measures open the door for a totally different set of performance standards and may be used by advocacy groups wishing to make a point. With regard to qualitative performance measures, Mr. Roach responded that the qualitative performance measures would utilize an array or scale of whether a project met a certain objective. He added that there were no viable means of quantifying some performance measures.

In response to Acting Chair Au, Mr. Roach stated that the majority of the ORTP 2035 performance measures are consistent with the ORTP 2030 performance measures. New performance measures were added for consistency with the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy For Users (SAFETEA-LU) requirements.

Mr. Roach continued with a presentation on steps in selecting and screening projects and programs for the ORTP 2035.

II.C. Presentation on Scenarios Evaluation Methodology
Mr. Roach gave a presentation on the Scenarios Evaluation Methodology.

In response to Mr. Mitsuda, Mr. Roach stated that scenarios would be tested on areas of concern or emphasis areas. Mr. Roach stated that, if the Windward side of the island is an area where there will be a lot of growth and planned investment, then that would be an area to be addressed. Mr. Roach noted that they would try to balance the entire island's transportation system projects, allocating them to one of the three emphasis areas.
In response to Randolph Hara, Ms. Fischer stated that the Waianae Coast emphasis has to be with Title VI/Environmental Justice. Mr. Roach added that this also included the Waianae Second Access Road, which has been in the last two iterations of the plan and has been of interest to the Policy Committee.

Mr. Lum added that, when the consultant was asked to develop the scenarios, they were told that these scenarios were needed to provide the Policy Committee with additional information so that they can make rational decisions with regard to project selection. Mr. Lum noted that we will probably not have the revenue to build all of the projects needed for 2035. He cited that money will be in short supply and the Policy Committee must be provided with information regarding the ramifications of funding two big-ticket projects of interest to the Policy Committee – Waianae Second Access Road and Central Mauka Road. This could result in a Waianae Coast and Central Oahu emphasis areas.

In response to Randolph Hara, Ms. Fischer stated that the Waianae Coast emphasis would also involve Title VI/Environmental Justice.

Mr. Hara asked if there is a scenario that would give us the biggest bang for the buck. Mr. Roach responded that a Degree of Financial Investment scenario approach may give some of the answers to those types of questions. Mr. Roach noted that the scenario approach will help to define what will be the final preferred plan and what performs the best. These are learning devices to provide us with project insights. For emphasis areas, what is the best mix-and-match of projects needed to serve those areas; compare its impacts; review its revenue needs; and identify revenue sources. That information will be used to develop the preferred plan and put those projects forward into the preferred planning evaluation. After evaluation, we determine how the ORTP 2035 will achieve these benefits.

Acting Chair Au expressed TAC's desire not to take action on the ORTP 2035 Vision Statement, Goals and Objectives, and Performance Measures until the after the consultant and OahuMPO has had a chance to consolidate, simplify, and streamline the objectives and performance measures and eliminate redundancies.

Mr. Soma moved and Ms. Sokugawa seconded that actions on the Vision Statement, Goals and Objectives, and Performance Measures for the ORTP 2035 be tabled until the next TAC meeting, to be held prior to the next Policy Committee meeting. The motion was unanimously carried.

Mr. Soma moved and Eugene Tian seconded that the presentation and action on agenda item III be tabled until the next TAC meeting. The motion was unanimously carried.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Fischer noted that May 8th is a key date for Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and Statewide TIP revision requests for the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 funds.

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:50 p.m.