

## Our comments on Mr. Schneider's response to Dr. Prevedouros

The following are the more egregious of the misleading comments in the response and these comments certainly do not exhaust their full range

*EXCERPT: "Virtually every city in the U.S. with a population over 750,000 people has both buses and some form of rail technology in operation, construction, or in the advanced planning stage... Every major city in the world, whether a "capital city" or not, has some form of rail system. The size of the rail system planned for Honolulu is appropriate for the community's size."*

COMMENT: The spin here is to use the term "city" whereas all discussions of rail systems use "metro area" or "urban area," which are contiguous urban areas almost regardless of political division. Thus, the San Francisco Bay Area contains all of the contiguous urban areas within the Bay Area. Portland's urban area consists of Portland and the surrounding counties.

When we review Honolulu's size relative to other metro areas we find that we are the 56<sup>th</sup> largest in the U.S. and that if we were to build any kind of rail line we would be the smallest. In fact, most of the metro areas larger than Honolulu do not have rail lines.

[List of the 60 largest U.S. Metropolitan Areas from the 2000 Census.](#)

The next largest city that has a totally grade-separated rail line powered from a third rail, usually termed 'heavy rail,' is Miami whose population is more than four times that of Honolulu.

The other issue of appropriateness is that of cost. The cost of the rail line is out of all proportion to the population and tax base. The following table endeavors to show the relative tax burden falling on Oahu taxpayers as compared to other communities. Honolulu will only receive about 18 percent federal funding down from the 30 percent it might have received if the 1992 effort had been successful.

<b>The Rail Tax Burden for Honolulu:</b>					
Rail transit costs in comparison to population size					
<b>MSA</b>	<b>Cost in millions 2006\$'s</b>	<b>Metro area population (thous.)</b>	<b>Federal funding 2006\$'s</b>	<b>Local % cost burden</b>	<b>Cost per capita</b>
Honolulu	\$5,100	940	\$900	82%	\$4,468
Portland	\$1,643	2,265	\$1,035	37%	\$268
Salt Lake City	\$376	1,334	\$250	33%	\$94
Washington DC	\$13,473	5,790	\$11,365	16%	\$364

EXCERPT: "The Alternative Analysis for the project requires that the proposed transit system serve the entire corridor, not just the end points. The bus/HOT system proposed by the professor does not meet that criteria and could not carry the same number of trips projected for the rail system."

COMMENT: Once more we deal with the capacity issue. The rail line anticipates about 6,000 passengers per hour at the peak. That is about 110 buses. Given that one lane in the I-495 in New Jersey handles 750 buses during the peak hour we cannot see why Schneider finds this to be an issue.

EXCERPT: "The vast majority of rail systems opened in the past 10 years in the U.S. have far exceeded their projected ridership forecast, as is expected to happen in Honolulu. These include: Dallas, Houston, Denver, Sacramento, San Diego, Portland, Minneapolis, Salt Lake City, Los Angeles, Charlotte."

COMMENT: The latest official assessment of the Federal Transit Administration was their Contractor Performance Assessment Report of September 2007 the relevant excerpt of which is shown below.

Table 8: Predicted and Actual Ridership - Forecast vs. 2002 Actual

Project	Forecast Year	Forecast Average Weekday Boardings		Actual Average Wkdy Boardings - 2002	Ratio	
		AA/DEIS	FEIS		Actual vs. AA/DEIS	Actual vs. FEIS
Atlanta North Line	2005	57,120	57,120	20,878	37%	37%
Baltimore Johns Hopkins	2005	13,600	13,600	10,128 *	74%	74%
Baltimore LRT Ext.	2005	11,804	12,230	8,272 *	70%	68%
BART Colma	2000	15,200	15,200	13,060	86%	86%
Chicago Orange Line	2000	118,760	118,760	54,986 *	46%	46%
Dallas South Oak Cliff	2005	34,170	34,170	26,884	79%	79%
Denver SW LRT	2015	22,000	22,000	19,083	87%	87%
Houston SW Transitway	2005	27,280	27,280	8,875	33%	33%
Jacksonville ASE	1995	42,472	42,472	2,627	6%	6%
LA Red Line	2000	295,721	297,733	134,555	46%	45%
Miami Omni/Brickell	2000	20,404	20,404	4,158	20%	20%
Pittsburgh West B'Way	2005	23,369	23,369	9,000	39%	39%
Portland Westside-Hillsboro	2005	60,314	49,448	43,876	73%	89%
Salt Lake South LRT	2010	26,500	23,000	22,100	83%	96%
San Diego El Cajon	2000	21,600	21,600	24,950	116%	116%
San Jose Guadalupe	1990	41,200	41,200	21,035	51%	51%
San Jose Tasman West	2005	14,875	13,845	8,244	55%	60%
St. Louis Initial System	1995	41,800	37,100	42,381 *	101%	114%
St. Louis St. Clair Ext.	2010	11,960	20,274	15,976	134%	79%

\* Figures are for 2001 (2002 not available at time of preparation)

The latest major line opening was the Tren Urbano in San Juan, Puerto Rico. According to the San Juan Star, it has only achieved 31 percent of its projected ridership.