

Mr. Abraham Y. Wong

HWY-TO 2.0259

Page 4

MAY 15 2003

Please note that the Draft Plan will be distributed for public review in May and we will be sending you a copy at that time.

Very truly yours,



GLENN M. YASUI

Administrator

Highways Division

VL:ss



NA ALA HELE
Hawaii Trail & Access System

February 5, 2003

Vincent Llorin
Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator
Hawaii Department of Transportation
601 Kamokila Boulevard, Room 602
Kapolei, Hawaii 96707

Dear Mr. Llorin:

Thank you for your team's hard work and dedication. The effort put in to creating the Bike Plan Hawaii, Master Plan was well worth the effort. Good job!

Please notify our office if any State Lands within the Maui DOFAW jurisdiction are in any way affected by your plans.

If you have any further questions, you may contact me at (808) 873-3508.

Sincerely,

Torrie Haurez
Na Ala Hele Trails and Access Specialist

TRAFFIC BRANCH
HIGHWAYS DIVISION
DEPT OF TRANSPORTATION

2003 FEB -7 A 9:00

RECEIVED

February 11, 2003

Mr. Vincent Llorin
Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator
Hawaii Department of Transportation
601 Kamokila Boulevard, Room 602
Kapolei, Hawaii 96707

Dear Mr. Llorin:

OMPO Comments to Preliminary Draft of *Bike Plan Hawaii*

OMPO has reviewed the January 2003 Preliminary Draft of *Bike Plan Hawaii* and have the following comments:

General Comments

- The text and concepts are well written and easy to understand.
- The organization of the document is a bit awkward. Suggestions:
 - An executive summary and a conclusion chapter would be helpful to open and close the document.
 - The goals and objectives might have more of an impact if put in the first chapter rather than in chapter 4.
 - Is there a timeframe for implementation of the plan (besides the three priority levels for each project) that is being targeted? If so, perhaps it could be stated in the first chapter along with the goals and objectives.
 - The project listing (along with criteria/selection methodology) is the “plan” portion of the document and could be put upfront (before the background information) rather than in the back of the document.
- The figures and pictures are very helpful to visualize the subject matter and put it into its proper perspective. Note that a few of the pictures are blurry and might be distracting to the reader (Pages 2-2, 4-5, 5-14, and 5-10).

- The island maps are clear and easy to read.

Specific Comments

Page viii

STIP - State Statewide Transportation Improvement Program

Figure 1-1

Should “Country Transit Planning” be “County Transit Planning”?

Figure 1-2

On the Round 1 graphic, there is a “2” missing on one of the islands.

Table 8-2

It would be helpful to have a “total” row at the bottom to see how much Transportation Enhancement funding has been spent since 1995.

Section 1.5

- What is the difference between a workshop and a meeting? The two terms seem to be used interchangeably and is a bit confusing.
- How will HDOT respond to comments? How will people know that their comments have been received and considered?

Section 8.3 Public Involvement

- How are the needs to Title VI/Environmental Justice populations addressed? What public involvement methods were used to ensure that low-income and poverty populations were able to comment. The response to questions #15 and #17 of the telephone survey could be used for a Title VI/Environmental Justice analysis.

Text Suggestions (Paragraphs 2 and 3):

“The Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) is the official document required for approval of federal funds in surface transportation projects. It is a three-year programming document that identifies and establishes the implementation priority for state and county transportation projects to be funded in part with federal highway or transit funds. As the state’s only metropolitan region, the City and County of Honolulu works through a metropolitan planning organization (the Oahu Metropolitan Planning Organization or OMPO) which oversees preparation of the ~~TH~~ Oahu Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). When approved by the OMPO Policy Committee ~~or~~ (the decision-making body of OMPO) and the Governor, the entire Oahu TIP is incorporated, without modification, as the Oahu element of the STIP. The other three counties go through a similar, but less rigorous, process led by

HDOT. The outcomes of their deliberations are incorporated directly into the STIP-as well. Projects in the STIP must be consistent with each county's respective long-range transportation plan. The STIP is updated at least every two years and may be amended as necessary. The ~~STIP/TIP~~ STIP and Oahu TIP are closely related to the State's and counties' capital improvement programs.

Public input can be made in the development of the regional transportation plans and in development of the ~~STIP/TIP~~ STIP and Oahu TIP. Public comments may be solicited at scheduled meetings of the OMPO Citizen Advisory Committee or other forums. Interested parties also have an opportunity to comment on the Review Draft and significant revisions prior to approval of the final documents."

8.4.7 Transportation Enhancement

- In the fourth paragraph, it is stated that HDOT issues a request for proposals in the Spring. If this is not done, perhaps this statement should be deleted.

Text suggestions (Paragraphs 5 and 6):

"In order to be eligible for funding, a project must meet certain requirements, including (bullet #4):

On Oahu, proposed TE projects are prioritized using OMPO procedures. The list of prioritized projects must be approved by the OMPO Policy Committee before being submitted to HDOT. ~~they are prioritized using OMPO procedures.~~ On the neighbor islands, proposed TE projects are prioritized using procedures adopted by the respective Countywide Transportation Planning Process (CTPP) Policy Committee.

Ultimately, the HDOT Director prepares and updates the statewide prioritized list of proposed TE projects. All TE proposals prioritized under adopted OMPO and CTPP procedures ~~are eligible~~ can be considered for federal funding. In order to receive federal funds, these projects must be programmed into the current Oahu TIP and/or STIP. ~~included on the statewide prioritized list (i.e., the TIP/STIP).~~ In the development of the Oahu TIP and STIP, OMPO and CTPP priorities are followed to the maximum extent practical. However, the Director may deviate and give higher priorities to projects required by FHWA, State initiatives, unique projects with time constraints, and/or multi-agency projects with strong community support."

Page 9-2

The OMPO Guide to Public Involvement can be found at the following website:
www.OahuMPO.org/GPI/gpi.html.

Appendices C and D

There is no legend for the letters "S", "C", and "P" (in the *Jurisdiction* column) for the tables in these appendices.

Mr. Vincent Llorin
February 11, 2003

Page 4

If you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact Michelle Kurisu at 587-2015 or mkurisuompo@hawaii.rr.com.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Gordon", written in a cursive style.

Gordon G.W. Lum
Executive Director

VL

HWY-TO
2.0257

MAY 15 2003

TO: GORDON G. W. LUM
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
OAHU METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

FROM: RODNEY K. HARAGA 
DIRECTOR OF TRANSPORTATION

SUBJECT: UPDATE OF *BIKE PLAN HAWAII*

Thank you for reviewing the Preliminary Draft of *Bike Plan Hawaii*. Your comments helped us to rethink what we wanted to accomplish in the plan and to address its shortcomings. I am writing to let you know what actions were taken with respect to your concerns and suggestions.

General Comments:

1. *Organization of the Document*

1.a *An executive summary and a conclusion chapter would be helpful to open and close the document.*

After the bike plan has been finalized, we will prepare an executive summary as a stand-alone document. This approach was also used in the 1994 bike plan update and we have found that a separate document gives us greater flexibility. As an attachment to the primary document, it provides a succinct overview (satisfying the executive summary purpose), and because it is a scaled-down version of the plan, we can reproduce it more economically for wider distribution.

Bike Plan Hawaii ends with a chapter on implementation, in lieu of a conclusion chapter. We felt it appropriate to conclude by discussing how to make the plan a reality. In this chapter, therefore, we explain the responsibilities of State government versus County governments, the role of citizen advocacy in the political decision-making process, and various funding options. Are there any other topics that should be covered in a concluding chapter?

MAY 15 2003

- 1.b *The goals and objectives might have more of an impact if put in the first chapter rather than in chapter 4.*

We agree that the goals and objectives presented in Chapter 4 are one of the core elements of the plan; however, we also feel that it's important to provide a context for this material—especially for a lay audience. Therefore, we begin by explaining the purpose of the plan in Chapter 1, educating readers about key bicycling terms and concepts in Chapter 2, and providing background information about bicycling conditions in the State in Chapter 3. Thus we end up with goals and objectives in Chapter 4. Fortunately, we are no longer locked into a linear logic thanks to new media formats, such as CD-ROMs and websites. Where possible, we will be utilizing bookmarks and hyperlinks to enable readers to jump ahead to the topics of most interest to them.

- 1.c *Is there a timeframe for implementation of the plan (besides the three priority levels for each project) that is being targeted? If so, perhaps it could be stated in the first chapter along with the goals and objectives.*

The implementation timeframe is limited to proposals for facility improvements.

- 1.d *The project listing (along with criteria/selection methodology) is the “plan” portion of the document and could be put upfront (before the background information) rather than in the back of the document.*

To maintain the flow of the narrative, we attached the longer tables to the back of the document, except for near-term proposals that are listed in Chapter 6.

2. *Figures and Pictures – Note that a few of the pictures are blurry and might be distracting to the reader.*

Some photos contain strong visual images, but were available only in low-resolution formats. The final layout is able to compensate for some of the deficiencies by adjusting frame sizes and cropping.

3. *Section 1.5*

- 3.a *What is the difference between a workshop and a meeting? The two terms seem to be used interchangeably and is a bit confusing.*

“Workshop” and “meeting” refer to the same event. The meetings were designed with some type of participatory activity (the mapping exercise in the first meeting and the “voting” exercise in the second meeting); therefore, the meetings took on a workshop feel. To minimize confusion, we have standardized the terminology in the document.

- 3.b *How will HDOT respond to comments? How will people know that their comments have been received and considered?*

MAY 15 2003

We will respond in writing to all written comments, including e-mails that identify sender's name and mailing address. Our responses will indicate how we have addressed the reviewer's comments.

4. *Section 8.3 Public Involvement*

4.a *How are the needs of Title VI/Environmental Justice populations addressed? What public involvement methods were used to ensure that low-income and poverty populations were able to comment?*

We added a new text box titled "Compliance with Title VI and Environmental Justice" under Section 1.5, How was Bike Plan Hawaii Developed? In addition, we will issue a Supplemental Volume on public participation which contains comprehensive documentation of all community outreach activities. This document will be included on the CD-ROM for the Draft Plan.

Please note that the Draft Plan will be distributed for public review in May and we will be sending you a copy at that time.

Specific Comments:

All copy editing suggestions that corrected errors or improved the clarity of the text were incorporated. We appreciate the careful reading given to the document.

VL:ss ✓

**COMMENTS FROM THE MAYORAL BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN
ADVISORY COMMITTEE, COUNTY OF HAWAII,
MEETING HELD FEBRUARY 10, 2003**

**To: Vincent Llorin, Bicycle Pedestrian Coordinator
State of Hawaii, Department of Transportation**

From: Ron Reilly, Chair (808) 967-8603

Date: Feb 11, 2003

GENERAL COMMENTS:

The projects in the list of Big Island Projects are excellent, and should assure that Hawaii Island continues to develop bicycle-friendly transportation infrastructure.

The use of CD-ROM to share this 284 page document is unprecedented in the experience of this committee and represents excellent use of the available technology. Our congratulations and appreciation are extended to both the State DOT and to Kimura International.

The committee had some difficulty understanding what the exact scope of work might be for many of the projects e.g. "Signed Shared Road" could be vertical signage only, or this plus on street pavement stripping for bicyclists.

The committee feels that implementation of many bicycle projects would be best, and most affordably, achieved if they were done at the time of routine road resurfacing and road maintenance.

The committee has a copy of a letter from former Maui Mayor Linda Lingle, to her Public Works Director, dated July 30, 1991, in which Mayor Lingle clearly articulates and implements a Maui County policy requirement of adding 4ft shoulders wherever feasible whenever a County road is repaved. The committee applauds this policy and hopes it can become a policy for Hawaii County also.

Inclusion of additional required pavement should be mandatory wherever a street which is to be resurfaced is already identified on the existing State/County Bike Plan as a future bike facility (lane/route).

An example of good practice is the recent resurfacing of Makaala St. which for the most part has smooth extra pavement to the outside of each traffic lane (however this treatment could have been extended for the whole project length).

An example of poor practice is the recent resurfacing of Ponahawai St which has been resurfaced with only 24ft of pavement, despite being identified on the 1994 Bike Plan as requiring a future bike lane. This could have been achieved with as little as 4 ft of additional paving and stripping in a 4-10-10-4 configuration (grass and gravel verge appears to be firm, flat and unobstructed).

Committee members feel that the long, narrow, often curved bridges along the Hamakua Coast north of Hilo are a hazardous barrier to bicycle travel. We urge consideration of retrofitting these bridges with bike/pedestrian walkways (perhaps a cantilevered clip-on) for the most egregious examples. The committee is aware of the State DOT policy of including wide shoulders on bridge replacement projects (such as recently in Ka'u and on Komohana) and applauds this policy.

The following comments focus on the Hilo side, however it is hoped that additional comments will be available soon from Kona side members, and we plan to get these additional comments to you by Monday, February 17th.

The committee intends to invite Hawaii County Public Works Director, Bruce McClure, or his designee, to attend our next meeting on Monday April 14th to discuss the priority list, project funding, scope of work, and shoulder additions at the time of resurfacing.

PROJECT SPECIFIC COMMENTS

The following list of projects is copied from the CD-ROM pages 273-283 and has committee comments added in italics.

Island of Hawaii (Big Island)

Proposed Bicycle Facilities by Priority Level

MapNo. Region Facility Location, Juris.*, Cost Class.**

Signed Shared Road: Length(mi.) Cost Estimate

Bike Lane: Length(mi.) Cost Estimate

Shared Use Path: Length(mi.) Cost Estimate

Priority I Proposals

7 Hilo

Waianuenu Avenue

Signed Shared Road Akolea Rd- Bayfront Hwy C B 3.3 \$163,700

Signage is minimal help. The real need is paved designated bike lane space for bicyclists.

From Hilo Medical Center down-slope to Kaumana urgently needs a paved shoulder.

From Kaumana down-slope to Komohana a 4-lane to 3-lane conversion (two down-slope and one up-slope) would allow bicycling space and give wider traffic lanes.

From Komohana down-slope to Bay Front is a discontinuous mix of two and four traffic lanes, some sections with or without on-street parking – a consistent treatment of either two or three traffic lanes would allow room for bicycle lanes.

10 Hilo

Mohouli Street

Komohana St- Kilauea Ave C B 1.0 \$44,500

Good existing paved shoulder, good to have bike lane designation which should include "share/yield to pedestrians" signage since there are no sidewalks.

14 Hilo

Civic Center Loop-- Aupuni/ Pauahi

Kilauea Ave- Kamehameha Ave C B 0.7 \$31,100

Sufficient existing pavement, good bike lane designation, serves county facilities which need bicycle locker for employees as a demonstration project.

15 Hilo

Bayfront Highway

Waianuenue Ave- Manono St S C 1.0 \$325,500

Vertical signage is not sufficient. This is a high bicycling traffic area and should have bike lanes to provide continuity of facility type with the existing State bike lanes (Wailoa Bridge to Hwy 11) and to connect with the existing County bike lanes (Kalaniana'ole to Richardson's Beach). From the broken up look of the existing pavement it appears that a complete resurfacing may be imminent and the associated restriping might achieve the desired results at little or now extra cost.

19 Hilo

Piilani Street

Manono St- Kanoelehua Ave C B 0.4 \$19,800

Lost cost item of questionable value. As with other Hilo City street additional pavement for bicycle lane/pedestrian use is the real need.

21 Hilo

Manono Street

E. Kawili St- Bayfront Hwy C C 1.2 \$1,507,500

This is a good priority and needs additional pavement for bicycle pedestrian use for part of the project length.

It provides good extended continuity with existing bike lanes and it serves Bayfront which is a common trip destination.

22 Hilo

E. Kawili Street

Kilauea Ave- Kanoelehua Ave C B 0.5 \$22,200

A good low cost (needed pavement already exists) extension of existing bike lanes.

23 Hilo

W. Puainako Street

Komohana St- Kinoole St S C 1.4 \$1,758,800

A good priority. This street will have increased traffic volume with the up-coming opening of the Puanako Extension. Bike lanes on this street will provide good bicycling connectivity to the shoulders on both Komohana and the new Puainako extension.

28 Hilo

Volcano Highway [Mamalaho Hwy]

Kanoelehua Ave- Keaau- Pahoa Rd S A 3.0 \$11,000

29a Hilo

Railroad Avenue

Leilani St (Hilo)- Kaaahi RD/ RR Ave end C B 4.0 \$198,400

Shoulder improvements and bike lane designation preferred over shared use signage. There are sections where existing smooth paved shoulders would allow bike lane designation without the cost of additional pavement.

29b Puna

Railroad Avenue Bikeway

Kaaahi Rd / RR Ave (end of pavement) -

Hawaiian Paradise Park Subdivision C/ P C 5.6 \$2,160,200

This project could be the most high use of any the Hilo project and therefore perhaps the most beneficial in terms of widespread community benefits. In the words of former Council man Dominic Yagong, "When we open this... people will flock to it!"

30a Puna

RR Avenue Bikeway connection to

Keaau schools complex

RR Ave Bikeway- Keaau- Pahoa Bypass C C 0.5 \$192,900

This project would, for the first time in East Hawaii, provide a safe road separated bike path for children to bicycle to school from a large residential community. The health, sustainability, and community enhancing benefits of this project in combination with 29b are difficult to quantify or even imagine. As with project 29b, there needs to be an action plan and a time line in order to initiate the various steps that will be required to bring both of these two outstanding projects to reality with a minimum of delay.

32 Puna

Keaau- Pahoa Road

Keaau- Pahoa Bypass Rd- Shower Dr S C 2.4 \$781,200

58a Kona

Kuakini Highway

Mamalaho Hwy- King Kamehameha III Rd S B 3.5 \$173,600

Signed Shared Road Bike Lane Shared Use Path

[end Page 1 of 11]

58b Kona

Kuakini Highway

King Kamehameha III Rd- Lako St S B 1.7 \$84,300

58c Kona

Kuakini Highway

Lako St- Hualalai Rd C C 2.3 \$2,889,400

60 Kona

Walua Road Pedestrian and Bicycle

Scenic Route (extension)

End of Walua Rd- Old Mamalaho Hwy C C 0.3 \$115,700