

Subject: Testimony on Bill 16 (2009)

To: Honorable Chair Todd Apo and Members of the City Council

From: Tienni Fang, Ph.D, P.E., 1645 Ala Wai Blvd, PH3A, Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
Mailing Address, P.O. Box 75158, Honolulu, Hawaii 96836,

At: June 10, 2009, Honolulu City Council Meeting

Council Chamber, City Hall, 30 S. King Street, Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

RECEIVED
JUN 10 8 01 AM '09
CITY CLERK
HONOLULU, HAWAII

Aloha, Honorable City Council Chair Apo and Members, this testimony is submitted in support of Bill 16 (2009), CD2, the original one passed by the budget committee; and oppose newly proposed Bill 16 (2009), CD2, FD1 (version A) and Bill 16 (2009), CD2, FD1 (Version B);

HHCTP (Honolulu High Capacity Transit Project) began 2½ years ago, based on Ordinance 07-001 where the city administration was authorized to move forward on the Locally Preferred Alternative of a fixed guideway system to be funded by the surcharge of general excise and user tax together with any available federal, state, or private avenues. While the city has been actively and earnestly seeking federal funding with some concrete results (FTA has already allocated for HHCTP \$15,190,000, in FY2008 Section 5309 New Starts Program, and \$19,800,000 in revised FY2009 Section 5309 New Starts Program), it will take considerable amount of time to secure additional and anticipated full federal and other funding, and long time to build the system. However, the project should nevertheless move forward to serve the urgent need of Hawaiian people and visitors without delay. It could be done because we have already secured solid local funding in the tax surcharge, and can start with the building of a system with moderate operating length under the current financial restraints; and extend it to the full or even longer lengths (such as to UH, Waikiki, Salt Lake, etc. with the arrival of additional funding. HHCTP is a long term project, we should not rule out the receipt of multiple FTA allocations and supports from other agencies such as DoE such as using sustainable energy to power the system. What we call system is the integrated system including operating system (vehicle, control, communication, power and energy, fare collection ...), fixed facilities (maintenance, storage ...), guideways, stations, etc. not just an isolated part such as the so-called "segment of guideway going nowhere". It will be useful to serve the people even if without additional extramural funding.

Therefore we support the city administration's new efforts in budgeting and moving forward the project with the issuance of RFPs (Request for Proposals) for open competition to select core operating system and fixed facilities contractors such as maintenance yards, etc. According to the time schedule, all contractors will be selected by early next year and Notices to Proceed will likely be issued in the fiscal year from 7-1-2009 to 6-30-2010. There will be a lot work to do which needs money. We support Bill 16, FD2 for this purpose. Obviously the arbitrary allocation cutting out in Version A is uncalled for in this regard. As to the conditions included in Version B; we oppose to it because it intends to postpone or deny the allocation of fund for the advancement of the project for invalid reasons: (a) This expenditure would not even come out of federal funding for federal approval, (b) What does Record of Decision for the DEIS and Supplementary DEIS mean? D(raft)EIS is only an intermediate step towards F(inal)EIS. (c) Letter of No Prejudice on what? (d) There have been plenty of opportunities for the neighborhoods to voice their concerns and they know how; why wasting tax payers' precious money to contract with "non-profit organization"?

Mahalo, and respectfully,
Tienni Fang

MISC. COM. 1199

COUNCIL