

CITY COUNCIL
CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU
530 SOUTH KING STREET, ROOM 202
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813-3065
TELEPHONE: (808) 768-5010 • FAX: (808) 768-5011

TOM BERG
COUNCILMEMBER
HONOLULU CITY COUNCIL • DISTRICT I
PH (808) 768-5001
FAX: (808) 768-5011
EMAIL tberg@honolulu.gov

October 18, 2011

Aloha Chair Teruya and Members of the Nanakuli-Maili Neighborhood Board No. 36,

I am pleading with your Board to add to your agenda tonight this subject matter. Please help me advocate and protect funding to save our Waianae Coast secondary access road.

MAHALO,
Tom Berg

**HOW TO TESTIFY TO SAVE WAIANAE
SECONDARY ACCESS ROAD**

OVERALL WORK PROGRAM FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012

The FY 2012 Overall Work Program (OWP) was approved by the OahuMPO Policy Committee on June 14, 2011. It was approved by the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration on July 15, 2011.

NEWS

Draft Revision #2 to the FY 2012 OWP is available for public review. Written testimony and comments may be submitted to the OahuMPO via email (oahumpo@oahumpo.org), fax (587-2018), or mail to:

Oahu Metropolitan Planning Organization
707 Richards Street, Suite 200
Honolulu, HI 96813-4623

You may also visit their website (www.oahumpo.org) or contact their office at 587-2015. Written testimony and comments must reach the OahuMPO by November 30, 2011.



MEMORANDUM

To: OahuMPO POLICY COMMITTEE

Representative Marilyn Lee, Chair
Councilmember Breene Harimoto, Vice Chair
Councilmember Tom Berg
Councilmember Romy Cachola
Councilmember Stanley Chang
Councilmember Nestor Garcia
Representative Karen Awana

Representative Joseph Souki
Senator J. Kalani English
Senator Will Espero
Senator Carol Fukunaga
Glenn Okimoto, DOT Director
Wayne Y. Yoshioka, DTS Director

From: Executive Director

Subject: Draft Revision 2 to the FY 2012 Overall Work Program


Enclosed for your review is draft Revision 2 to the FY 2012 Overall Work Program (OWP). The OWP identifies transportation-related planning studies (work elements) as part of the metropolitan planning process. Many of these studies are conducted in order to ensure compliance with Federal metropolitan planning regulations. Other studies – addressing current local transportation issues, problems, and priorities facing City and State agencies – are also included in the OWP.

Revision 2 to the FY 2012 OWP consists of three proposed components:

1. Addition of the Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Sustainability Grant (inclusion contingent upon Hawaii being awarded the grant)
2. Deletion of the Waianae Coast Transportation Security Study
3. Changing the scope-of-work for the Honolulu Urban Core Parking Master Plan

The public review period for Draft Revision 2 is currently underway. OahuMPO staff anticipates bringing a final draft before the Policy Committee in December for its consideration and approval.

I hope this information is helpful to you. If you have any questions, please contact me at (808) 587-2015.


BRIAN GIBSON

Enclosure

OVERALL WORK PROGRAM Fiscal Year 2012

Revision #2

DRAFT FOR REVIEW
October 3, 2011

FTA Section 5303 Metropolitan Planning Program
HI-80-X020
FHWA Project PI-052(33)



Prepared by

OAHU METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

In Cooperation with
Its Participating Agencies

State of Hawaii Department of Transportation
State of Hawaii Department of Business, Economic Development, and Tourism
City and County of Honolulu Department of Transportation Services
City and County of Honolulu Department of Planning and Permitting



Revision #2 to the FY 2012 Overall Work Program (OWP) consists of three proposed components:

1. Addition of the Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Sustainability Grant (inclusion contingent upon Hawaii being awarded the grant)
2. Deletion of the Waianae Coast Transportation Security Study
3. Changing the scope-of-work for the Honolulu Urban Core Parking Master Plan

The specific changes incorporated in each of these components are detailed in the "Proposed Planning Study or Project" forms that follow, but a short description of each proposed change is provided here for the reader's edification.

Addition of the HUD Sustainability Grant

In mid-September, OahuMPO was asked to support a competitive grant application for sustainable communities being awarded by HUD. On September 21, OahuMPO Policy Committee voted to support the grant application. The program will award \$67 million nationwide for regional planning that considers:

1. Economic competitiveness and revitalization;
2. Social equity, inclusion, and access to opportunity;
3. Energy use and climate change; and
4. Public health and environmental impact

The State of Hawaii is submitting a grant application with the University of Hawaii named as the project lead and fiscal agent. The application requests the maximum grant award of \$5 million. If the grant is awarded to Hawaii, OahuMPO staff would assist in the governance and management of the project which would supplement the Hawaii 2050 Sustainability Plan by defining how the State would reach the goals and vision established in that plan. Additionally, OahuMPO would receive a sub-grant to conduct a sustainability planning project that is related to the statewide plan. The grant awards are expected to be announced in mid-December 2011.

This revision adjusts the allocation of staff time for OahuMPO to account for participation in this project by assigning the hours that would have been used to support the Waianae Coast Transportation Security Study (see below).

Deletion of the Waianae Coast Transportation Security Study

The Hawaii Department of Transportation has determined that pursuing this project would not be the best use of limited state funding, and has withdrawn its support for the project. The attached "Proposed Planning Study or Project" form shows the project as it was specified in the approved FY 2012 OWP, however the reader should note that the proposed change is to delete this project.

Changing the scope-of-work for the Honolulu Urban Core Parking Master Plan

The City & County of Honolulu has requested a change to the scope-of-work for this project. Task 2, as originally defined, involved the formation of a project advisory committee. The requested change is to instead use Task 2 to identify parking meter technologies to enhance efficient operations and enforcement. The revision also increases the project budget from \$500,004 to \$572,004, the additional funds to be used in Task 3.



Proposed for Addition to the Overall Work Program

Oahu Metropolitan Planning Organization Overall Work Program
Proposed Planning Study or Project
Fiscal Year 2012

I. Identification			
WE Number	205.03-12	Time Period	Jan 1, 2011 – June 30, 2012
WE Name	Sustainable Communities Regional Transportation Planning Study		
Agency	OahuMPO	Phone Number	587-2015

II. Objectives
<p>The purpose of this three-year study is to assist in the development of a sustainable, long-range, regional transportation plan to the year 2040 that provides a roadmap for ensuring Oahu is positioned to assess its options for adapting to climate change and addresses the six key livability principles set forth by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, which are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide more transportation choices • Promote equitable, affordable housing • Enhance economic competitiveness • Support existing communities • Coordinate policies and leverage investment • Value communities and neighborhoods

III. Planning Study or Project Information	
A.	<p>Work Products</p> <p>The work products that will be produced as a result of this project include, but are not limited to, those identified in Work Element 301.16-12 in the approved FY 2012 Overall Work Program (OWP). The following is a list of the work products that will be completed during the three-year period of this grant:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A detailed Project Management Plan. It is anticipated that the majority of work on the ORTP 2040 will be completed by OahuMPO staff and that the use of consultants will be limited to tasks that require supplementary resources and specific technical expertise 2. An inclusive and robust Public Participation and Outreach Plan as well as early involvement meetings across Oahu's planning districts in cooperation and coordination with the Department of Planning and Permitting 3. An inventory of studies conducted by State, City, and other agencies that have bearing on community needs and policies 4. Development of the vision, goals, and objectives 5. Establish performance measures consistent with the goals and objectives and identify the baselines for each measure against which the outcomes of the plan may be measured 6. Update the Transportation Demand Forecasting Model to 2040 conditions and conduct model runs as may be needed to determine the impacts of various scenarios that may be proposed for consideration by the communities or staff 7. Conduct a statistically-valid telephone survey of Oahu residents (including cell phone users) to identify issues and clarify public preferences



Work on many of these products will begin in FY 2012, but it is not clear which, if any, may be completed in FY 2012.

B. Description.

This is a three-year project that would begin within 120 days of the University of Hawaii being notified that their grant application was successful. The staff time and resources shown here are only for FY 2012. Future OWPs will detail the time and resources needed for each year.

The resources made available by this grant will be used to supplement OahuMPO's already established goal of developing a long-range transportation plan for Oahu to the year 2040. This description identifies key tasks and milestones for year one of the three-year process.

Year One:

1. Develop the vision, goals, and objectives of the ORTP 2040
2. Establish performance measures consistent with those goals and initiate the steps necessary to set baselines for those measures, including but not limited to, determining what data are available and the quality of those data and determining strategies appropriate for filling data gaps and improving data quality
3. Hire a data analyst as part of the OahuMPO staff
4. Define the public involvement and outreach process in consultation with the Citizen Advisor Committee; set-up a standing CAC Working Group to serve as a sounding board and source of ideas relative to public involvement
5. Hire and work with a public relations consulting firm to assist in framing the message, promote meetings and events, and supplement staff as may be necessary during public outreach occasions

C. Project Justification.

This project is specifically to ensure that the Oahu Regional Transportation Plan update to 2040 results in a plan consistent with the goals established in the Hawaii 2050 Sustainability Plan and that builds on lessons learned during the development of the ORTP 2035. The ORTP is required to be updated every five years. OahuMPO has determined that an approach that is ongoing, community-based, and sustainable will provide better value to the citizens of Oahu.

D. Previous or Ongoing Work Related to Proposed Planning Study or Project. Identify any activities associated with the proposed planning study or project. Include prior year-funded OWP activities and directly relevant activities not funded by OWP. Supporting documentation must be available if so requested.

Oahu Regional Transportation Plan 2035
 OahuMPO Transportation Asset Climate change Risk Assessment
 Land Use Model Development
 Household Interview Travel Survey and Demand Forecasting Model Refresh



IV. Work Element Tasks and Schedule

List all the expected tasks and expected completion dates for one project year (State fiscal year). This must be tied to the written description provided in III.B above.

Task #	Task Description	Start Date (Mo/Yr)	Expected Completion Date (Mo/Yr)	Cost
1	Develop the vision, goals, and objectives of the ORTP 2040	10/2011	01/2012	\$1,586
2	Establish performance measures consistent with those goals and initiate the steps necessary to set baselines for those measures, including but not limited to, determining what data are available and the quality of those data and determining strategies appropriate for filling data gaps and improving data quality	12/2011	3/2012	\$51,983
3	Define the public involvement and outreach process in consultation with the Citizen Advisory Committee; set-up a standing CAC working group to serve as a sounding board and source of ideas relative to public involvement	10/2011	02/2012	\$2,380
4	Hire and work with a public relations consulting firm to assist in framing the message, promoting meetings and events, and supplement staff as may be necessary during public outreach occasions	03/2012	06/2012	\$59,186
5	Provide staff support for the statewide sustainability project	01/2012	06/2012	\$3,173
TOTAL WORK ELEMENT COST				\$118,308

V. Work Element Budget

A. Staff Labor Expenditures

Task #	Position/Agency	LABOR			Total	FUNDING SOURCE	
		Hrs	\$/Hr	Additive %		Federal FHWA	Non-Federal
1-5	Planning Staff	270	39.66		\$10,708	\$8,566	\$2,142*
TOTAL LABOR EXPENDITURES					\$10,708	\$8,566	\$2,142*

*Staff time for FY 2012 consists of hours made available by the deletion of another work element from the OWP. Local match has already been provided to OahuMPO, so no additional local match is required.

B. Non-Labor Expenditures (excluding contract services)

Task #	Description	Total	FUNDING SOURCE	
			Federal HUD	Non-Federal
4	Portable computing equipment	\$3,000	\$3,000	0
4	Printing costs	\$5,000	\$5,000	0
4	Translation costs for printed material	\$5,000	\$5,000	0
TOTAL NON-LABOR EXPENDITURES		\$13,000	\$13,000	0



C. Consultant Services & Scope of Work

Task #	Description	Total	FUNDING SOURCE	
			Federal HUD	Non-Federal
2	Establish performance measures consistent with those goals and initiate the steps necessary to set baselines for those measures, including but not limited to, determining what data are available and the quality of those data and determining strategies appropriate for filling data gaps and improving data quality	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$0
4	Hire and work with a public relations consulting firm to assist in framing the message, promoting meetings and events, and supplement staff as may be necessary during public outreach occasions	\$57,600	\$57,600	\$0
TOTAL CONTRACT SERVICES EXPENDITURES		\$107,600	\$107,600	\$0

VI. Overall Budget

Provide the total project budget for each State fiscal year (if multiple fiscal years) in which the proposed activity is to take place. Highlight **in bold** the current fiscal year.

FY		Total	FUNDING SOURCE		
			Federal		Non-Federal
			FHWA	HUD	
2012	Current Fiscal Year	\$131,308	\$8,566	\$120,600	\$2,142*
2013	Estimated Year 2 of HUD Grant	\$214,700	\$20,000	\$189,700	\$5,000
2014	Estimated Year 3 of HUD Grant	\$227,200	\$30,000	\$189,700	\$7,500
TOTAL WORK ELEMENT COST		\$573,208	\$58,566	\$500,000	\$14,642

*Staff time in FY 2012 consists of hours made available by the deletion of another work element from the OWP. Local match has already been provided to OchumPO, so no additional local match is required.

Prepared by: Brian Gibson

Date: 23 September 2011

Approved by: Brian Gibson

Date: 23 September 2011



Proposed for **Deletion** from the Overall Work Program

Oahu Metropolitan Planning Organization Overall Work Program
 Proposed Planning Study or Project
 Fiscal Year 2012

I. Identification			
WE Number	203.01-12	Time Period	July 1, 2011-June 30, 2012
WE Name	Waianae Coast Access Alternatives Study		
Agency	OahuMPO	Phone Number	587-2015

II. Objectives
To identify, analyze, and compare all feasible methods to improve access to and from the Waianae coast, especially during and following major weather events which, in the past, have resulted in the closure of Farrington Highway.

III. Planning Study or Project Information	
A.	<p>Work Products A document comparing the various potential access improvements to the Waianae coast, to include, for each alternative, a planning-level evaluation of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical feasibility • Social acceptability • Environmental sensitivity • Economic viability

B.	<p>Description This project responds to Hawaii House Bill 200, Line Item 115.</p> <p>Access to and from the Waianae coast of Oahu is served by only one major roadway: Farrington Highway. In the past, severe storm events have resulted in Farrington Highway being closed or capacity on the highway being restricted, cutting the area off from the rest of the island. As a result, the existing transportation network has a track record and reputation of being unreliable for serving Waianae residents and businesses. This project will examine potential alternatives to improving access to and from the Waianae coast, especially following severe weather events, thereby providing a measure of transportation security for residents. The alternatives may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A second access road to and from Waianae • The potential to armor Farrington Highway to make it more resilient (including the possibility to underground utilities, since fallen power poles is one reason Farrington has been closed in the past) • "Emergency only" second access, such as the Kolekole Pass Road or other possible alignments • A secondary access road located mauka of Farrington Highway • Other reasonably feasible alternatives not yet identified <p>The assessment of the technical feasibility of each alternative should include (at a minimum):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conceptual design • Right-of-way needs
----	---



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alignment and geometrics • Intersection treatments and/or improvements to existing intersections • Determination of whether the section will be urban (curb-and-gutter) or rural (drainage ditch) • Preliminary investigation of grade, cross slope and/or drainage issues (if any) • Typical cross-sections • Possible utility relocations • Impacts to structures (bridges, etc.) and/or the need for new structures • Traffic Impacts (using the OahuMPO Regional Travel Demand Model) • Vulnerability to weather impacts, rockfall, slope instability, storm surge, sea-level rise, or other naturally occurring event <p>The assessment of the social acceptability of each alternative should include (at a minimum):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A public input plan to provide reasonable opportunity for public involvement in the study at key decision points • Working with land owners in areas where right-of-way may be needed and determining their willingness to provide the necessary right-of-way • A guided process to explain both the trade-offs inherent in each alternative and to help identify public consensus (if it exists) as to the preferred alternative • Working with utility companies to determine their willingness to relocate their assets if it has been identified as a possible impact of the alternative • Working with the U.S. military in those instances (if any) where their cooperation would be critical to the success of the alternative <p>The assessment of the environmental sensitivity of each alternative should include (at a minimum):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preliminary identification of possible historic or cultural impacts • Evaluation of possible noise, air, or water pollution resulting from the alternative • Initial evaluation of possible impacts from resource agencies <p>The scope of this project does NOT include the preparation of an environmental document. This evaluation is only intended to be an initial planning-level assessment of potential concerns designed to inform a NEPA process that would occur later.</p> <p>The assessment of the economic viability of each alternative should include (at a minimum):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning-level FY 2015 cost estimates • Reasonable maintenance and life-cycle cost estimates <p>The proposed alignment from the 2002 DTS Emergency Access Study must be one of the alternatives evaluated in this study.</p> <p>The purpose of the document is to compare all reasonable alternatives and recommend one of them based on the four areas of evaluation identified above. Then that recommended alternative should be more fully developed (if necessary) into a typical corridor study concept that will provide direction to planners, engineers, designers, the public, and policy-makers as they move toward project construction/implementation. The recommended alternative should also be evaluated in light of the State's Complete Streets policy so that the needs of all users are considered.</p>
--	--

<p>C.</p>	<p>Project Justification</p> <p>SAFETEA-LU, the most recent Federal transportation authorization, made transportation security a primary goal. This project will provide greater transportation security for Waianae residents and businesses by developing a concept that will result in more reliable transportation access to and from Waianae.</p>
-----------	---



D.	<p>Previous or Ongoing Work Related to Proposed Planning Study or Project</p> <p>In 2002 a City and County of Honolulu Department of Transportation Services (DTS) planning study developed a conceptual alignment for a secondary access road. However, the roadway has never been built due to its cost.</p> <p>Additionally, agreement was reached with the U.S. military that allows civilians to use the military road over Kolekole Pass as an emergency access route. However, it has shown itself to be an unreliable route in severe weather. HDOT estimates that it will take between \$25 million and \$80 million to upgrade the road so that it is safer and more reliable.</p> <p>In 1967, the HDOT studied a proposal for a roadway around Kaena Point, but the proposal was dropped due to strong public opposition.</p> <p>In 1996, HDOT developed a Mauka Highway alignment connecting Farrington Highway to Kunia Road, but the road was never built due to its high cost and potential for severe environmental impacts.</p> <p>This planning study is not intended to repeat the work previously completed, but rather to compliment it and build upon the findings as the search for a cost effective solution to the issues on the Waianae coast continues.</p>
-----------	---

IV. Work Element Tasks and Schedule

List all the expected tasks and expected completion dates for one project year (State fiscal year). This must be filed to the written description provided in III.B above.

Task #	Task Description	Start Date (Mo/Yr)	Expected Completion Date (Mo/Yr)	Cost
1	Procure and manage consultant services			\$10,708
2	Research and evaluate previous planning studies			\$50,000
3	Identify alternatives			\$150,000
4	Evaluate technical feasibility			\$250,000
5	Evaluate social acceptability			\$150,000
6	Evaluate environmental sensitivity			\$150,000
7	Evaluate economic viability			\$150,000
8	Develop consensus on preferred alternative			\$50,000
9	Complete planning document			\$50,000
TOTAL WORK ELEMENT COST				\$1,010,708

V. Work Element Budget

A. Staff Labor Expenditures

Task #	Position/Agency	LABOR			Total	FUNDING SOURCE	
		Hrs	\$/Hr	Additive %		Federal	Non-Federal
1	Planner/OahuMPO	270	\$39.66		\$10,708	\$8,567	\$2,141
TOTAL LABOR EXPENDITURES					\$10,708	\$8,567	\$2,141



B. Consultant Services & Scope of Work

Task #	Description	Total	FUNDING SOURCE		
			Federal		Non-Federal
			FHWA	HI031	
2	Research and evaluate previous planning studies	\$50,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$10,000
3	Identify alternatives	\$150,000	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$30,000
4	Evaluate technical feasibility	\$250,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$50,000
5	Evaluate social acceptability	\$150,000	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$30,000
6	Evaluate Environmental Sensitivity	\$150,000	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$30,000
7	Evaluate Economic Viability	\$150,000	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$30,000
8	Develop consensus on preferred alternative	\$50,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$10,000
9	Complete planning document	\$50,000	\$19,410	\$20,590	\$10,000
TOTAL CONTRACT SERVICE EXPENDITURES		\$1,000,000	\$399,410	\$400,590	\$200,000

VI. Overall Budget

Provide the total project budget for each State fiscal year (if multiple years) in which the proposed activity is to take place. Highlight in "bold" the current Fiscal Year.

FY	Description	Total	FUNDING SOURCE		
			Federal		Non-Federal
			FHWA	HI031	
2012	Current Fiscal Year	\$1,010,708	\$407,977	\$400,590	\$202,141
TOTAL WORK ELEMENT COST		\$1,010,708	\$407,977	\$400,590	\$202,141

Prepared by: Brian Gibson

Date: May 17, 2011

Approved by: Brian Gibson

Date: May 17, 2011



Proposed Revision to Project Scope-of-Work

For purposes of this revision notice, new text will be italicized; deleted text will be shown ~~stricken~~

Oahu Metropolitan Planning Organization Overall Work Program

Proposed Planning Study or Project

State Fiscal Year 2012

I. Identification			
WE Number	203.79-10	Time Period	1 Oct. 2011 – 30 June 2012
WE Name	Honolulu Urban Core Parking Master Plan		
Agency	Department of Transportation Services	Phone Number	808 768-8310

II. Objectives
<p>The Honolulu Urban Core Parking Master Plan has conducted on-street and off-street "public parking" survey in the Honolulu Urban Core for the purpose of assessing the existing and future parking (on-street and off-street) supply and demand. The limits of the study area are Chinatown (River Street) to Keeaumoku Street and Beretania Street to Nimitz Highway/Ala Moana Boulevard.</p>

III. Planning Study or Project Information	
A.	<p>Work Products.</p> <p>A list of recommended traffic improvements, their associated cost estimates, and potential sources of funds.</p> <p><i>DTS will replace "Task 2 - Project Advisory Committee" with another task since the City already has an ad hoc committee to discuss the City's parking issues and directions. The new "Task 2 - Parking Meter Technology" will identify and evaluate suitable parking technologies for Honolulu and how such systems can support and improve efficiency measures in supply and demand goals, mobility, traveler information, and integration with other subsystems.</i></p>

B.	<p>SCOPE OF WORK</p> <p>Task 1 Project Management</p> <p>The CONSULTANT team will employ proven methods for controlling costs and managing the work in this PROJECT. The CONSULTANT shall prepare a project management and quality control plan. The plan will identify the interrelationships among the tasks and define the key project management activities as it relates to assignments, reporting, responsibilities, schedule and cost control. The plan shall also include a project summary, list of deliverables, work statement, task plan and schedule, procedures guide, budget and cost control summary, and organization plan.</p> <p>The CONSULTANT team shall initially meet with the CITY to discuss the following project related items.</p>
----	--



- Verify and if necessary refine the scope of work
- CITY protocols for meetings, communications, etc.
- Formation of a project stakeholders committee
- Key technical and administrative issues

On-going Project Management and Control

The CONSULTANT team's project manager will prepare bi-weekly progress reports describing the status and accomplishments of the PROJECT. These reports will be prepared weekly for the duration of the PROJECT (until PROJECT completion) and include:

- PROJECT accomplishments
- Highlight actual work progress with project schedule and management plan
- Identify any PROJECT problem areas needing special attention
- Show the current and cumulative financial status of the PROJECT

The CONSULTANT shall attend periodic project review meetings to discuss the progress of work, schedule, budget and PROJECT related topics. In addition, the CONSULTANT shall provide meeting notes of the review meetings. Using information from the project management system, the CONSULTANT team's project manager will prepare bi-weekly progress reports describing the status of the PROJECT. These reports will highlight significant accomplishments, update scheduling reports, indicate all progress to date and resources expended, and any changes in schedule, sequence or resource loading. The progress report will be distributed to the Department of Transportation Services (DTS) project manager to maintain effective exchange regarding PROJECT status, budget, and schedule.

The CONSULTANT shall participate in project initiation meetings to discuss and if necessary refine the scope of the project and to discuss PROJECT anticipated technical, procedural, and other related issues.

Task 2: Project Advisory Committee

~~The CONSULTANT working with DTS shall form and periodically convene a Project Advisory Committee ("COMMITTEE"). This COMMITTEE shall be comprised of project area stakeholders that shall include representatives of the State of Hawaii Department of Transportation (HDOT), the Department of Planning and Permitting (DPP), the Oahu Metropolitan Planning Organization (OMPO) and other affected government agencies.~~

~~The COMMITTEE will be advisory to the PROJECT and provide input on modifying, or revising the scope of work. The CONSULTANT working with DTS, shall consider any input or suggestions from the COMMITTEE if formulating revisions or modifications to the scope of work.~~

Task 2: Parking Meter Technologies

1. Identify Parking Meter Technologies that would boost revenues and bring more efficient operations and enforcement.
 - a. Identify appropriate technical solutions.



- b. *Identify, describe, and compare Single Space Meters and Multi-Station Meters.*
 - c. *Determine technical system and sub-system descriptions and specification to optimize rates, time limits, and operational hours.*
 - d. *Describe appropriate enforcement and detection systems and sub-systems.*
 - e. *Describe Central Management Systems for revenues reporting, parking and meter data, equipment monitoring, and space monitoring.*
 - f. *Analyze different financial plans to offset capital improvement costs.*
2. *Prepare Reports.*
 - a. *Submit a draft report in PDF format to CITY representatives for review.*
 - b. *Review comments presented by representatives of the CITY.*
 - c. *Submit final report in PDF format.*

Task 3: Feasibility Analysis of Monetization

1. *Develop a pro forma financial model that includes the following:*
 - a. *A valuation range of the CITY'S parking assets, including its garages, surface lots, and parking meters.*
 - b. *An analysis of various asset monetization structures (including, without limitation, the sale or lease of all or a portion of the CITY'S parking assets).*
2. *Analyze and report on the current demand for acquiring the CITY'S parking assets via various monetization structures.*
3. *Compare and contrast a prospective monetization of the CITY'S parking assets to other public entities that have successfully monetized parking assets.*
4. *Identify the monetization structure that is believed to yield the best return on the CITY'S assets.*
5. *Identify the monetization structure that is believed to provide the most efficient means of providing public parking.*
6. *Assist the CITY in determining whether it is economically feasible to take additional steps toward monetizing the CITY'S parking assets.*
7. *Prepare a draft report in PDF format for CITY review and comments. Finalize report and reissue in PDF format.*

Task 4 – Parking Market and Financial Analysis

1. *Collect Data.*
 - a. *Visit project site and obtain information necessary for developing a written description of the subject properties and parking operations including the following:*
 - i. *Location;*
 - ii. *Names and capacities of parking facilities;*



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> iii. Qualitative statement about the management and key personnel in charge; iv. Hours and days of operation; v. Staffing; and vi. Methods of security. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Visit parking structures owned by the CITY and perform a cursory review of conditions without any investigative testing. c. Finalize project parameters, discuss pertinent background issues, and obtain documents relevant to the study. d. Perform parking rate surveys and peak-hour occupancy counts of all parking facilities located within the Downtown Urban Core. Counts to be conducted during a midday on a weekday, during a weekday evening, during a midday on a weekend day, and during a weekend evening. e. Develop graphics showing the location of all parking facilities, and provide data on parking rates, inventories, and occupancies on a corresponding spreadsheet. f. Conduct a preliminary physical survey and literature review of local market conditions to determine the possibility of additional parking facilities being constructed. g. Research the community master plan to identify prospective development projects and project the impact that these projects could have on parking conditions. h. If available, obtain from the CITY a ten-year history of historical parking rates for all CITY owned parking assets. <p>2. Analyze Market Data.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Review previous parking study reports for this area. Reports to be provided by others. b. Review parking space inventory and usage data collected and determine parking occupancy rates for various time periods. c. Review parking rate data and determine market parking rates. Compare rates of assets controlled by the CITY to competitive facilities. d. Compare location, and operating characteristics of CITY-owned parking facilities to competitive facilities located within the study area. e. Review annual operating statements of CITY-owned parking facilities for the 2000-2009 time periods. (CONSULTANT will not audit or verify accuracy of statements but will take them at face value.) f. Develop rationale for changes in CITY-owned parking facilities' operating revenues and expenses from 2000-2009. g. Identify relevant developing parking market trends for the U.S., Honolulu, and the study area. <p>3. Conduct Financial Analysis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Identify those factors that could have a significant impact on parking revenues and expenses and comment on each factor. b. Review the operating statement from the latest fiscal year and opine line by line in terms of the reasonableness of the operating expenses. Identify expenses that
--	---



	<p>seem to be lower and higher than typical and comment on typical expenses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">c. Opine on capital expenditures budget.d. Utilizing information developed in Task B, identify a market parking rate structure for the subject facilities.e. Utilizing information developed in Task B, project income and expenses for the next twenty (20) years, including separate projections for each parking facility. <p>4. Prepare Report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Provide data tables in advance of the draft report.b. Submit a draft report in PDF format to CITY representatives for review.c. Review comments presented by representatives of the CITY.d. Submit final report in PDF format. <p>Task 5 – Update Honolulu Comprehensive Parking Study, 1973</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">1. Perform field studies, as required, to update the Honolulu Comprehensive Parking Study, 1973.2. Analyze short-term and long-term parking demand, compare demand with supply, and develop a conclusion regarding parking adequacy.3. Project future parking supply, demand, and adequacy considering land use forecasts, future employment, and future transit patronage. Interview CITY representatives and obtain available information from CITY to assist with these projections.4. Develop conclusions and recommendations relating to current and future parking adequacy, the parking element of the city's comprehensive zoning code, parking rates, and a ten-year implementation program.5. Submit a draft report in PDF format to City representatives for review.6. Review comments presented by representatives of the City.7. Submit final report in PDF format. <p>Task 6 - Condition Appraisal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">1. Meet with CITY representatives to review project objectives and to gain an understanding of the CITY-owned parking facilities subsequent to their original construction, including changes or additions to the facilities and any previous preventive maintenance, repairs, or evaluations.2. Review available original construction drawings, shop drawings, specifications, etc. to familiarize ourselves with the type of construction and waterproofing systems initially specified for the CITY-owned parking facilities.3. Perform a visual examination of the CITY-owned parking facilities' structural systems observing type, locations and approximate magnitude of deterioration observed, noting the following items:<ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Floor slab surface condition and finish variations.
--	---



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Cracking of slabs. c. Condition of joints and sealant system. d. Condition of structural members such as columns, beams, and walls. e. Condition of ceilings including cracks and spalls. f. Drainage system. g. Electrical conduit. h. Light fixtures. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Compile and review all field data to assess the probable causes and effects of the documented deterioration of the CITY-owned parking facilities. 5. Prepare a condition appraisal report (excluding integral roadways) indicating findings conclusions, recommendations, and priorities of repairs, replacement, and maintenance. 6. Based on visual observations and experience, provide an opinion of probable construction cost for repairs and maintenance actions to correct the identified deficiencies for immediate, near, and long-term time frames. <p>Miscellaneous Incidental Services</p> <p>The basic services shall include but not be limited to the following miscellaneous incidental services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Attendance of Meetings and Conferences - Except for public hearings, the CONSULTANT shall provide a memorandum of each meeting or conference summarizing the discussions and decisions made within seven (7) working days following the respective meeting or conference. B. Reproduction of Documents - The CONSULTANT shall be responsible for the reproduction of various media such as drawings, maps, reports, and color boards unless otherwise specified or approved by the DTS Project Manager. The reproductions specified in the above tasks shall not be considered a reimbursable expense.
--	--

C.	<p>Project Justification.</p> <p>The last comprehensive parking study for Honolulu was done in 1973. Changes in parking demand, supply, and technology, as well as the impact of future transit plans, need to be assessed and integrated into a comprehensive parking plan for urban core. Because of this, the study needs to be updated.</p>
----	--

D.	<p>Previous or Ongoing Work Related to Proposed Planning Study or Project.</p> <p>Honolulu Comprehensive Parking Study, 1973 Honolulu Parking Management Study, 1981</p>
----	--



IV. Work Element Tasks and Schedule

List all the expected tasks and expected completion dates for one project year (State fiscal year). This must be tied to the written description provided in III.B above.

Task #	Task Description	Start Date (Mo/Yr)	Expected Completion Date (Mo/Yr)	Cost
1	Project Management		1/12	\$35,000
2	Project Advisory Committee Parking Meter Technology		1/12	\$60,500 \$22,500
3	Feasibility Analysis of Monetization		1/12	\$108,000 \$218,000
4	Parking Meter & Financial Analysis		1/12	\$145,000
5	Update Comprehensive Parking Study		1/12	\$77,500
6	Condition Appraisal		1/12	\$74,004
TOTAL WORK ELEMENT COST				\$572,004

V. Work Element Budget

A. Staff Labor Expenditures

Task #	Position/Agency	LABOR			Total	FUNDING SOURCE		
		Hrs	\$/Hr	Additive %		Federal FHWA	Non-Federal	
1	NA		\$		\$	\$	\$	
TOTAL LABOR EXPENDITURES						\$	\$	\$

B. Consultant Services & Scope of Work

Task #	Description	Total	FUNDING SOURCE	
			Federal FHWA	Non-Federal
1	Project Management	\$35,000	\$28,000	\$7,000
2	Project Advisory Committee Parking Meter Technology	\$60,500 \$22,500	\$48,400 \$18,000	\$12,100 \$4,500
3	Feasibility Analysis of Monetization	\$108,000 \$218,000	\$86,400 \$116,800	\$21,600 \$101,200
4	Parking Meter & Financial Analysis	\$145,000	\$116,000	\$29,000
5	Update Comprehensive Parking Study	\$77,500	\$62,000	\$15,500
6	Condition Appraisal	\$74,004	\$59,203	\$14,801
TOTAL CONTRACT SERVICE EXPENDITURES		\$500,004 \$572,004	\$400,003	\$100,001 \$172,001



VI. Overall Budget

Provide the total project budget for each State fiscal year (if multiple years) in which the proposed activity is to take place. Highlight in "bold" the current fiscal year.

FY	Description	Total	FUNDING SOURCE	
			Federal FHWA	Non-Federal
2012	Current Fiscal Year	\$600,004	\$400,003	\$100,001
		\$572,004		\$172,001
TOTAL WORK ELEMENT COST		\$500,004 \$572,004	\$400,003	\$100,001 \$172,001

Prepared by: Don Hamada

Date:

Approved by:

Date: