

HONOLULUTRAFFIC.COM

SEEKING COST-EFFECTIVE SOLUTIONS TO TRAFFIC CONGESTION

April 13, 2007

Dept. of Transportation Services
City and County of Honolulu
650 South King Street, 3rd Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
Attn: Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project
VIA email: mkaku@honolulu.gov

Dear Mr. Kaku:

Following are our our comments on the Notice of Intent (NOI) and Scoping Information Package (SIP), issued March 15, 2007.

We have attached to the cover email for your convenience, the Transit Advisory Task Force Final Report (TaskForceReport.pdf), Dr. Stone's letter to the Advertiser (StoneTampa.pdf) and your letter to me dated June 20, 2006 (cliffslater.pdf), which are files referenced in the comments.

These comments on the latest NOI and SIP should be read in conjunction with our earlier comments on the first NOI and SIP of December 5, 2005, attached to the cover email as [scoping_comments_3.pdf](#).

We would appreciate it if you would ask Parsons Brinckerhoff to prepare responses for you that address the issues we raise. The comments that we received on January 27, 2007 (dated June 20, 2006) did not address the vast majority of our concerns.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
HONOLULUTRAFFIC.COM



Cliff Slater
Chair
CDS/rrs
Att:

cc: Ms. Donna Turchie
Federal Transit Administration, Region IX
201 Mission Street, Room 1650
San Francisco, CA 94105
VIA email: Donna.Turchie@fta.dot.gov

Comments on the 2nd Scoping Information Package and 2nd Notice of Intent

We find the second Notice of Intent (NOI2) and the second Scoping Information Package (SIP2) issued jointly on March 15, 2007, by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and the City and County of Honolulu (City) to be unsatisfactory for the following major reasons:

- The issuance of two NOIs and SIPs is not understandable.
- They contain unsatisfactory purpose and needs statements.
- They have excluded the Managed Lane Alternative (MLA) without good cause.

The issuance of two NOIs and SIPs.

Neither the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) nor the City and County of Honolulu (City) has made any attempt to clarify why FTA issued NOI2. While the NOI of December 7, 2005 (NOI1), initiated the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) process, the NOI2 of March 15, 2007, informs us that the NEPA review is “initiated through this scoping notice.” Does this mean the old NOI is cancelled? Have we not been in the NEPA process since December 2005?

We also see from SIP2 that scoping under Hawaii Revised Statutes 343, the Hawaii Environmental Protection Act (HEPA), was completed in 2006 and that this new scoping, NOI2 and SIP2, is only to satisfy NEPA. However, NOI1 and the Scoping Report of April 6, 2006, both stated that the scoping at that time was being done under NEPA. We have asked the City for clarification without result.

There has obviously been insufficient “public involvement,” as required by SAFETEA-LU, if we cannot even find out whether the NEPA process started on December 5, 2005, or March 15, 2007.

Further, we did not receive any response to HONOLULUTRAFFIC.COM’S 13-page comments on NOI1 and SIP1, dated January 9, 2006, until February 22, 2007. Even then it was, for the most part, the usual Parsons Brinckerhoff (PB) boiler plate with few of the specifics addressed.¹

Unsatisfactory purpose and needs statement

NOI2 and SIP2 have failed to comply with SAFETEA-LU in that they have not involved the public in explaining the importance of the purpose and need statement and that the statement should be what the alternatives must be measured against.

“PARTICIPATION- As early as practicable during the environmental review process, the lead agency shall provide an opportunity for involvement by ... the public in defining the purpose and need for a project.”²

“Local officials may choose a different approach, so long as it is technically sound and can accurately measure project merit relative to the purpose and need for the project.”³

The frustration with the lack of public participation was evident from the coverage of the scoping meetings by our newspapers. As the head of the Outdoor Circle’s environmental committee said, “It seems to have been designed in a way to limit public interaction”⁴

¹ Letter signed by Mr. Melvin Kaku, DTS Director, sent to me on 2/26/2007 by Mr. Lawrence Spurgeon of Parsons Brinckerhoff but dated 6/20/2006, attached to the cover email.

² SAFETEA-LU, Sec. 6002, (d)(7)f(1).

³ Excerpt from the [FTA Evaluation of Evaluation of Alternatives 9.4.3](#) :

⁴ <http://the.honoluluadvertiser.com/article/2005/Dec/14/In/FP512140342.html>
<http://starbulletin.com/2005/12/14/news/story02.html>

The City and FTA have not provided a purpose and need statement in clear English even though the SAFETEA-LU statute requires that,

“The statement of purpose and need shall include a clear statement of the objectives that the proposed action is intended to achieve ...” (emphasis added).⁵

Instead,

“A mass of Latin words falls upon the facts like soft snow, blurring the outline and covering up all the details. The great enemy of clear language is insincerity. When there is a gap between one's real and one's declared aims, one turns as it were instinctively to long words and exhausted idioms.” George Orwell. *Politics and the English Language*.

Statements used in NOI2 and SIP2 are ambiguous at best, and, at worst, give the impression that they were designed to mislead. Take, for example, the following two sentences:

“Improved mobility for travelers facing increasingly severe traffic congestion.” SIP2

“Implementation of the project, in conjunction with other improvements included in the ORTP, would moderate anticipated traffic congestion in the corridor.” NOI2 & SIP2.

This jargon lulls the average citizen into believing that the primary purpose of the Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project (Project) is to reduce traffic congestion from current levels. When does one hear the ordinary citizen use words like “mobility,” “travelers,” and “moderate anticipated traffic”?

If the intent was to involve and enlighten the public, the writer would quite clearly state, “It is not the intent of the Project to reduce traffic congestion in the future to be less than it is today.⁶ When the Kapolei to UH rail transit line is up and running, traffic congestion will be worse than it is today, though somewhat less than what it might be without the rail line.” No statement of such clarity exists in NOI2 or SIP2.

Beginning with NOI1 and SIP1, followed by the Draft Oahu Regional Transportation Plan (Draft ORTP), the Alternatives Analysis (AA), the final ORTP, and now NOI2 and SIP2, our City transportation officials, and PB have misled the public into believing that rail transit will relieve congestion. Further, PB and the City have been aided in their endeavors by the ‘strategic misrepresentations’ of our local and federal elected officials.⁷

Far from “aggressively supporting proactive public involvement,” our elected officials, have continually alluded to the idea that building rail transit will result in traffic congestion relief even though the Alternatives Analysis clearly shows that traffic congestion will get significantly worse with the rail transit alternative.⁸

The net result of the current ‘purpose and need’ statement is that the public misunderstands the purpose of the rail transit proposal in the Project corridor. They believe it is to reduce the current traffic congestion to a more bearable level.

“SAFETEA-LU requires a clear statement of identified objectives that the proposed project is intended to achieve for improving transportation conditions. The objectives should be derived from needs ...” Question 33. Sec. 6002 final guidance.

⁵ SAFETEA-LU, Sec. 6002, (d)(7)f(3).

⁶ “Projects with the purpose of providing roadway mobility for automobiles and commercial vehicles are outside of the authorization of Act 247; therefore, they will not be considered for the Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project.” Kaku to Slater letter of 6/20/2006.

⁷ See Appendix A, p. 10.

⁸ See AA, tables 3-12 & 3-13.

The net result of Parsons Brinckerhoff and DTS's outreach efforts is that the public believes that the 'need' is to significantly reduce traffic congestion and that the 'purpose' of the rail transit Project is to do just that. Neither the City nor PB has made any effort to dispel this myth. A survey of public opinion would make this quite clear.

MLA denied fair and equitable treatment

We object to your failing to include the MLA in NOI2 and SIP2 and ask that they be amended to include a properly defined MLA, modified to satisfy Professor Prevedouros concerns together with the concerns expressed in Appendix 3 of the TATF Report, and then it should be republished.

While FTA does not evaluate the City's AA, it uses the AA's conclusions to eliminate the MLA from NOI2 and determine that it was "eliminated for good cause on the basis of the Alternatives Analysis ..."

In fact, the MLA was denied fair and equitable treatment in the AA by the City and PB. As a direct and intended result, the MLA was unjustly eliminated — not for "good cause" but rather for political cause. We submit that this was a blatant violation of the spirit and intent of the regulations that govern the environmental process; we further submit that only by reinstating the MLA into the NOI2 and SIP2, can Honolulu ever aspire to reducing its traffic congestion. The following supports these claims.

Excessive MLA capital cost projection

The City and PB projected initial costs of \$2.6 billion for the *two-lane* reversible elevated MLA in the AA. Here are some indicators of excessive projected costs:

- If PB's projected costs are correct, the MLA would cost seven times that of Tampa's comparable new ten-mile *three-lane* elevated reversible expressway.
- The MLA would cost 50 percent more than the H-3 freeway – even allowing for inflation.⁹ At such a cost the MLA would replace H-3 as America's costliest highway, despite H-3 being twice the size, built over difficult terrain, and with extensive tunneling.
- Dr. Stone AICP, Planning Director of the Tampa-Hillsborough Expressway Authority, wrote in a detailed four page letter to the Honolulu Advertiser that, "It is completely dishonest to say the elevated HOT lane in your transit alternatives analysis is similar to our elevated reversible lanes. And, it is this dishonesty that results in your HOT lanes costing \$2.6 billion instead of the less than \$1 billion that a true copy of our project would cost."¹⁰
- The soft costs alone (consultants, management, administration, etc) for the MLA are projected at \$549 million,¹¹ which is 30 percent more than the cost of the entire Tampa Expressway, even including the error by the geotechnical subcontractor that cost over \$100 million. Had the contractor not erred the cost of the Tampa Project would have been \$320 million.
- The lack of even a soupçon of diligence, leave alone *due* diligence, being applied by the Transit Advisory Task Force (Task Force) to verify the reasonableness of PB's projected cost.

To assist in evaluating the AA, the City Council appointed a seven-member TATF, six of them politically connected people who could be relied upon to support the City's agenda. The seventh member was Panos Prevedouros, Ph.D., Professor of Traffic Engineering at the University of

⁹ H-3 cost was \$1.3 billion at its opening in 1997. Inflation brings it up to \$1.63 billion today.

¹⁰ Attached to covering email as StoneTampa.pdf.

¹¹ Capital Costing Memorandum, App. A, Alternative 3.

Hawaii, whose views are based on his engineering training and experience, not politics. The TATF presented their final Report to the Council on December 14, 2006.

The Chairman had appointed two TATF members to a Technical Review Subcommittee to evaluate the reasonableness of the projected construction costs of both the MLA and the rail transit alternative. One had been a long time employee of the state DOT and the other was the recently retired Director of Honolulu's City Department of Transportation Services (DTS).

After the subcommittee's first report to the Task Force, we asked them who they had contacted in order to reconcile the Tampa Expressway cost of \$320 million (exclusive of the design error) with PB's estimate of \$2.6 billion for the MLA. They told us they had only talked to PB, but had been assured that the projected costs were accurate.

We found this response unacceptable. We urged them to contact the Tampa-Hillsborough Expressway Authority and, more particularly, the nation's 10th largest construction company, PCL Construction, Inc. PCL had built both the Tampa Expressway and the Hawaii Convention Center, maintains offices in both Tampa and Honolulu and is familiar with the costs and construction difficulties in both cities. One of the subcommittee members made a single phone call to Tampa; no one bothered to contact PCL.

The final subcommittee report shows the lack of due diligence warranted by a multi-billion dollar project and may reflect a breach of the fiduciary duty to investigate and verify the facts and take the necessary steps commensurate with the amounts involved.

For example, the sub-committee report justifies greater costs for the MLA, in part, by arguing,

Because the elevated structure for the Managed Lane Alternative would be 36 feet wide for its two travel lanes, whereas the structure for the fixed guideway would be only 26 feet wide, different diameter piers are necessary for each (8 feet versus 6 feet in diameter).¹²

The sub-committee members totally ignored the fact that the Tampa Expressway is nearly 60 feet wide yet has only 6-foot wide piers. It gives one pause to think that this is the extent of construction knowledge of the sub-committee and the local office of PB.

After consulting with many industry professionals, we have projected a cost of \$900 million for the MLA, including a 25 percent allowance for cost overruns. This is twice the cost of the Tampa Expressway, including the \$100 million error, or three times without it.

At \$900 million, the MLA would surely have been the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA), and that is the reason, we submit, for the exaggerated capital cost estimates.

Another reason given for the rejection of the MLA appears to be that contained in the DTS response to my comments on SIP1,

The Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project analysis is meant to evaluate project alternatives that may be constructed within the authorization of Act 247, enacted by the Hawaii state legislature in 2005. The act prohibits the construction of a non-transit project with the authorized excise-tax surcharge.¹³

However, we note that with a good faith projection of costs, these Act 247 funds would not be needed since the MLA toll revenues would pay for half the project and the federal government the balance.

¹² TATF Report, p. A-20

¹³ Kaku letter to Slater, 6-20-2006.

Excessive operating cost

Since we lack sufficient detail about the operating costs for the MLA, what may well have driven up the cost are a) maintaining the 5,200 parking stalls (AA, p. 3-8) built into the project, and b) the cost of operating a bus station, and c) the number of buses allocated to the MLA.

The parking stalls are almost entirely unnecessary. We have failed to find any significant parking associated with an MLA elsewhere in the country.

The high bus operating cost for the MLA is mainly caused by an excessive number of buses projected for it. The following bus fleet data is taken from the AA, table 2-1, and the daily trips data from the AA, table 3-7. The percentages shown are calculated from these data.

Alternative	Bus Fleet	% change in buses			thous trips daily	% change in trips		
		from exist	From NB	from TSM		from exist	from NB	from TSM
Existing	525	0.0%	N/A	N/A	178.4	0.0%	N/A	N/A
NB	614	17.0%	0.0%	N/A	232.1	30.1%	0.0%	N/A
TSM	765	45.7%	24.6%	0.0%	243.1	36.3%	4.7%	0.0%
MLA	906	72.6%	47.6%	18.4%	244.4	37.0%	5.3%	0.5%
Rail-Halek	540	2.9%	-12.1%	-29.4%	294.1	64.9%	26.7%	21.0%

Note that the MLA is projected to have a bus fleet nearly 50 percent greater than the No-build alternative, yet gain only five percent more trips. This small increase is projected despite the MLA offering bus users the advantage of a congestion free ride from the Leeward end of the MLA to downtown.

The 906 buses projected are far too many buses for the projected MLA ridership. It should be anticipated that more riders per bus would be achieved by the MLA option in the Corridor since buses using the MLA would be operating at far higher speeds than either the No-Build or the TSM and thus able to make more trips per bus; buses can make the round trip by returning on the relatively uncongested regular freeway.

The MLA should project significantly more riders than the No-Build or TSM Alternatives since it will offer motorists, who may be potential bus riders, a significant time savings. Currently, buses (and autos) take 39 minutes to travel 13 miles at 20mph on the regular freeway. Using the MLA, buses would take 13 minutes to travel the 13 miles at 60 mph, a savings of up to 26 minutes versus automobile travel on the regular freeway.

Killing the MLA advantage

The AA version of the MLA allowing free passage to HOV2s significantly reduces the advantages of the MLA over rail transit by eliminating the zipper lane.

To add insult, PB said in a letter to us that “A two-lane reversible option for the Managed Lanes Alternative, matching what you have proposed, has been added to the range of alternatives being evaluated in the Alternatives Analysis.”¹⁴

¹⁴ Kaku to Slater letter of 6/20/2006.

What we actually proposed in our comments on the original Scoping was, “On the HOT lanes, buses and vanpools would have priority and travel free, other vehicles would pay a toll ...”¹⁵ What resulted was a 16-mile facility, unnecessarily lengthened to presumably drive up costs, with HOVs allowed free.

First, allowing HOV-2s at no charge on the MLA means that the zipper lane will no longer be needed. Thus, by deleting the zipper lane, PB was able to reduce the two-lane gain to a single lane gain.

Second, allowing HOV autos on the MLA greatly increases the costs of policing as staff attempt to determine whether or not autos have the requisite number of automobile occupants. On the other hand, pre-registered buses and vanpools would be outfitted with transponders signifying their legitimacy and take little policing.

Third, this policy reduces the revenues available to fund the project, thus necessitating a tax increase.

PB showed the MLA option operating at LOS B to D in the morning peak hour. Since dynamically priced MLAs are operated to keep them congestion free, we do not understand why they should not be LOS B, or better, at all times.

FTA funding may be allowed for the MLA

FTA New Starts funds cannot presently be used for the MLA Alternative (AA, p. 6-10). However, the FTA has been revising its policies on funding tolled highways such as the recent one allowing funding for HOT lane conversions from existing HOV lanes. While FTA’s policy still holds that managed lanes built *de novo* cannot be funded with New Starts funds, it places this policy in conflict with recent changes in FTA policy favoring tolled highways.

One might reasonably expect that an MLA that met certain conditions, such as giving buses and other high occupancy vehicles priority over automobiles, would, in time, be eligible for New Starts Funds and therefore should be studied further in the Environmental Impact Statement process.

PB has under-engineered the MLA

The rail transit alternative in the AA had five different alignment options that survived the process. The reversible MLA, on the other hand, had only one.

PB should have also examined five options for the MLA alternative. They should have considered the three-lane option as built by the Tampa Expressway since it offers a 50 percent greater lane capacity at only a 20 percent increase in cost. They should also have considered both two and three lane options in combination with more options for ingress/egress along the lines suggested by Dr. Prevedouros.¹⁶

Dr. Prevedouros examined the MLA’s treatment in the AA from an engineering perspective and submitted his report¹⁷ to the Transit Advisory Task Force. He finds PB’s treatment of the MLA significantly lacking and concludes,

“Based on substantial evidence of ML being under-engineered, its performance statistics of are not representative of what a new 2-lane reversible expressway can do for this corridor ... In short, the ML provides extensive regional traffic management possibilities, none of which were explored.”

The TATF Report itself says, “... it may well be that operational variations of this alternative [MLA] could make it more attractive and/or feasible than the specific version considered.” The

¹⁵ Scoping Report, Appendix B. page 46 of 100.

¹⁶ [A Design for a HOT Expressway and Other Traffic Relief Projects for Oahu](#).

¹⁷ TATF Report, pp A-8 to A-18.

Report then refers to its Appendix 3, “Suggestions for further development of the Managed Lane Alternative,” written by the former Chief Counsel of the USDOT’s Volpe Center, David Glater, acting as the Transportation Analyst for the TATF. Essentially, this report admits to the under-engineering in producing this list of suggested modifications.¹⁸

FTA must give weight to traffic congestion reduction

“... in current evaluations of proposed New Starts projects, FTA considers directly only those user benefits derived directly from changes in transit service characteristics.”¹⁹

At the Pearl Ridge screenline, the only freeway is H-1 and for the peak period inbound provides five regular lanes, a zipper lane and an HOV lane.

A properly defined MLA would provide an additional two lanes to the above. More importantly, it would be the equivalent of four new lanes since the MLA is a more efficient conveyer of vehicles. As shown in the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) *Congestion Primer*,²⁰

Vehicle “throughput” on a freeway is the number of vehicles that get through over a short period such as an hour ... The number of vehicles that get through per hour can drop by as much as 50 percent when severe congestion sets in ... each variably priced lane in the median of State Route 91 in Orange County, California, carries twice as many vehicles per lane as the free lanes during the hour with heaviest traffic. Pricing has allowed twice as many vehicles to be served per lane at three to four times the speed on the free lanes.

Therefore the two lanes of the MLA would take the equivalent of four lanes of traffic off of five regular lanes of the H-1 freeway, providing significant traffic relief in the Corridor.

Dr. Prevedouros calculated “that in 2030 and with a properly designed 3-lane Managed Lane expressway, traffic congestion on the H-1 freeway will be almost the same as in 2003 while still using the AA’s growth forecasts. Congestion on H-1 freeway will be incomparably worse with any of the Rail options.”²¹

We do not understand why traffic congestion reduction is not being taken into account by FTA. In announcing a war on traffic congestion as the new policy, Secretary Mineta announced that,

The Administration’s objective must be to reduce congestion, not simply to slow its increase. Congestion is not an insurmountable problem ... The Federal Government’s most important role is to establish mechanisms to ensure that the right investments get made ... We must end the era of complacency about congestion. The **National Strategy to Reduce Congestion on America’s Transportation Network** provides the framework for government officials, the private sector, and most importantly, the citizen-user, to take the necessary steps to make today’s congestion a thing of the past. (original emphasis)

Furthermore, SAFETEA-LU states that, “... the Secretary shall analyze, evaluate, and consider ... factors such as ... congestion relief.”

Traffic congestion reduction is critically important to Oahu citizens and the bias shown by the AA against the MLA needs to be addressed.

Other matters to be studied

The City must examine the experiences of other cities to justify what it will propose as the result of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process.

¹⁸ TATF Report, pp. A-32 to A-33.

¹⁹ http://www.fta.dot.gov/documents/Discussion_1_CE_Allowances.doc

²⁰ [US DOT Congestion Primer](#)

²¹ TATF Report, p. A-12.

The City must compare our present and projected future highway capacities relative to that of other U.S. cities in order for the public to judge whether or not we have shortage of highway mileage.

Population forecasts used by PB from state forecasts are clearly in error and should be reexamined. Resident population growth rate for Honolulu for the 25 year period, 1980-2005, was 0.69 percent annually. For the period 2000-2005, the actual growth rate was 0.67 percent and this at a time of a booming economy and no real unemployment. The state forecast for this period was 0.8 percent annually. The difference led to a population shortfall of 7,600 for the five-year period. Continued shortfalls of this magnitude will lead to a shortfall from the state's population estimates of around 45,000 by 2030.

The EIS for the Project must also include a risk assessment or what may happen if we have another downturn in the State's economy as happened during the 1990s. Few, if any, of the projections made for the 1992 Final EIS for the Honolulu Rapid Transit Project were accurate. Population, jobs, transit tax revenues and transit riders all failed dismally to reach the numbers projected by Parsons Brinckerhoff.

We have significant numbers of young people moving out of the state, in large part because of the high cost of housing. And the full impact of the recent run up in prices has yet to be recognized in the demographic data. A partial view of the situation may be gleaned from a recent article the Wall Street Journal (www.honolulutraffic.com/WSJhomeless.pdf), which details the devastating effect on Hawaii service workers.

The high cost of housing is the primary cause of our having a net outflow of local young families to the Mainland who are being replaced by immigrants, many of whom are virtually unemployable. The result is a grave shortage of service industry people. The economic impacts of this situation together with the heavy financial burden of a rail transit system must be examined in the EIS.

Summary:

The public needs to know why a second NOI and SIP was necessary; otherwise, Heaven forbid, we might think that someone is trying to slide one by us.

The City needs to level with the public and provide a 'need' statement which is in clear language, does not mislead, and is what the public believes it to be, "to reduce traffic congestion below current levels." And the 'purpose' of the Project should be to do just that. With that 'purpose and need' in mind, our elected officials and the public can get on with deciding on what the Project should really be.

Our foregoing comments on the MLA is the most important evidence demonstrating the bias exhibited against the MLA by the City and PB, its "client-focused" consultant.

A disinterested reviewer could only conclude that, at the hands of the City and PB, the MLA has not been accorded fair treatment and that the MLA should be reinstated into the Scoping process — preferably with the MLA study being performed by a different, more "taxpayer-focused," consultant.

As Secretary Mineta said recently in announcing the new *National Strategy to Reduce Congestion on America's Transportation Network*, "Congestion is not a fact of life. It is not a scientific mystery, nor is it an uncontrollable force. Congestion results from poor policy choices and a failure to separate solutions that are effective from those that are not."

Final word

Rail transit may have some benefits but the evidence is clear from the experiences of other cities that reducing traffic congestion is not one of them and the public deserves to be told.

Choosing rail transit over managed lanes would not merely be a "poor policy choice," but rather it would be the definition of a "failure to separate solutions that are effective from those that are not."

Appendix A

This video of, Mayor Hanneman and Rep. Neil Abercrombie's city hall "Traffic sucks!" rally held on December 5th, 2005, typifies the grossly misleading statements emanating from our elected officials. <http://mfile.akamai.com/12891/wmv/vod.ibsys.com/2005/0707/4695365.200k.asx>

"Judging by how much traffic has worsened in just in the past few years, that's probably a conservative prediction. The only way to prevent it is to act now to address the problem. Our quality of life is at stake. Rail transit is a key element in the solution." Congressman Neil Abercrombie. [Honolulu Advertiser. April 17, 2005](#)

"Hannemann said the yet-to-be-determined form of transit would run from Kapolei to downtown and the University of Hawai'i-Manoa. He said the system will help all parts of the island, easing traffic overall because 'there'll be less cars on the road.'" <http://the.honoluluadvertiser.com/article/2005/May/12/ln/ln02p.html>

Mayor's Press Secretary: "Slater misrepresents just about everything Mayor Mufi Hannemann, Transportation Services Director Ed Hirata and other supporters of transit have said, from the timing of federal requirements to tax calculations, highway capacity and a rail system's potential to ease traffic congestion." <http://the.honoluluadvertiser.com/article/2005/Aug/10/op/508100321.html>

Transcript of Councilmember Barbara Marshall questioning U.S. Rep. Neil Abercrombie (D-Hawaii) <http://hawaiireporter.com/story.aspx?696a58e3-9a81-411e-b977-2688f5595685>

"Mayor Mufi Hannemann chided Lingle at the rally and said the city needs a rail system to alleviate increasing traffic congestion. U.S. Rep. Neil Abercrombie, D-Hawaii, also blasted a possible veto and said that he and the rest of Hawaii have had enough of the traffic problems. He said commuters are fed up and don't need anymore "Lingle lanes" filled with traffic congestion." <http://www.bizjournals.com/pacific/stories/2005/07/04/daily18.html?t=printable>