

Long Range Transportation Plan Task Force
May 23, 2011 Meeting Recap

Welcome & Introductions

PC – Richard Martin, Susie Johnson
TAC - Lew May, Jane Fleig, Adrian Reid
CAC - Ted Miller, Jack Baker, Sarah Ryterband
Staff - Josh Desmond, Scott Robinson, Raymond Hess, Vince Caristo

Peer Community Research

Raymond Hess shared his findings of the Lawrence/Douglas County MPO serving Lawrence, KS. He spoke with Todd Girdler, Director of the LDCMPO and learned the following:

Travel Demand Model

- Traditional 3 step (Trip generation, distribution, and assignment model)
- It is acknowledged the plan does not account for other modes of transportation but the need exists to improve this deficiency. Under implementation of the Plan (p 224) it states,
“In addition to the actions identified from the individual chapters of T2030, the Lawrence/Douglas County MPO should implement a coordinated data collection and development process, known in other communities as a Mobility Report Card. This would include emphasis on the Lawrence Travel Demand Model, which relies on traffic counts for its calibration. Transit ridership and data, bicycle counts, and possibly a local household travel survey would provide important information to support the MPO’s ongoing planning activities and the city and county’s engineering efforts.”
- Pedestrian trips? The model does not account for ped trips. However, (similar to our plan) there is a section of the Plan dedicated to the Pedestrian Plan (p p 133-147). It recommends: 1: Develop Pedestrian Level of Service Standards 2: Inventory Pedestrian Facilities, Identify Needs, and Prioritize a Plan for Improvements 3: Notify Property Owners of Responsibility to Repair Sidewalks 4: Fund Pedestrian Improvements 5: Develop Street Design Standards 6: Develop Pedestrian Standards for New Developments 7: Coordinate Pedestrian Planning Issues 8: Develop Pedestrian Education Program
- Bicycle trips? The model does not account for bike trips. However, there is a section of the Plan dedicated to “Bicycle Facility Needs” (pp 123-131). It references the local adopted Bike Plan. It mentions the factors which go into bicycle level of service and makes the following recs: 1) Implement 2004 Lawrence-Douglas County Bicycle Plan Recommendations; 2) Update the Lawrence-Douglas County Bicycle Plan and Bicycle Facilities Plan Every Five Years; 3) Adopt Bicycle Standards and Guidelines for New Developments; 4) Implement a Bicycle Demonstration Project; 5) Consider Bicycles in Development Review; 6) Implement Douglas County Rural Bicycle Plan Elements; 7) Plan and Construct Bicycle Amenities; 8) Develop a Bicycle Education Program and Enforce Traffic Laws; 9) Implement the Bicycle Plan of the Lawrence-Douglas County Bicycle Plan; 10) Adjust Short-Term Funding Allocations for Bicycle Facilities

- Transit trips? The model does not account for transit. However, Chapter 7 (p 111) is the Transit System Plan. It makes the following recs: 1: Ongoing Monitoring of Transit Performance and Service 2: Establish an off-street location for a regional transit hub. 3: Develop Pedestrian and Land Development Standards to Promote Productive Transit Service 4: Study Transit Productivity and Coverage Issues 5: Develop Transit-Friendly Roadway Design Standards 6: Pursue Transit Consolidation Opportunities 7: Develop a Long-Term Transit Funding Strategy 8: Develop a Long-Range Transit Plan 9: Develop a Long-Term Funding Strategy for Capital Improvements 10: Investigate the Potential for Regional Transit Connections along I-70
- Freight and Intermodal. Same as above. Chapter 11 is dedicated to Intermodal, Freight, and Other Transportation (pp1616-167). It recommends: 1: Coordinate Freight Issues 2: Participate in the Development of the Statewide Freight Plan 3: Consider Adjacent Land Use 4: Consider Needs of Trucks in Roadway Design and Access Management 5: Designate Truck Routes 6: Pursue Commuter Rail 7: Establish a Multimodal Passenger Hub 8: Implement the Recommendations of the Airport Master Plan
 - Opted not to do modal split – maybe looking at transit for some TAZs
- How is land use factored into the model?
 - How many land use categories did you use for your model? 3 – Households, Retail Employment, and Non-Retail Employment
 - Don't anticipate expanding. Land use and transportation integrated into planning depts. joint development services for city and county.
- Please list the sources of data used in the creation of your model?
 - NHTS, Census, ACS, were used. Housing permit data was looked at and made adjustments accordingly.
- Did you conduct supplemental surveys (add-ons)? Don't think so. Staff left and LRTP was developed quickly in 8 months so as to avoid TIP being frozen.
 - Were surveys statistically significant (confidence)?
 - Were surveys done in-house or handled by a consultant?
 - May we have access to the questions of your survey?
- When was your model developed (date)? Approved March 2008. Base year data 2006. Developed May 2007
- How much did it cost to develop your model? Approximately \$100-150,000 includes writing of plan based on Topeka plan.
- What consultant did you use? Parsons Brikerhoff Lenexa KS - Andrew Coe and Jim Tobabon– COEA@pbworld.com & David Cronister KDOT worked on it 785-296-0347
- How was the consultant selected (RFP, RFQ, other)? In 2006 did RFQ followed up by RFP. Prequalified list of 45 firms from KDOT.
- What software program was used to develop your model? TransCAD
- Are you able to regularly maintain/use your model in-house? No modeling capabilities. Next iteration will require training. Maybe have Kansas City do modeling in future since they are adjacent.

Plan Development

- How is land use addressed in your Plan (e.g. is there a linkage to transportation projects and density or land use types)? Chapter 3 deals with Land Use and Transportation (pp 69-73). The Following action recommendations are made: 1: Combine Planning Cycles 2: Encourage Land Development Patterns to Promote Transportation Efficiency 3: Encourage Access Management Standards 4: Enhance Streetscapes and Gateways 5: Consider Street-Land Use Relationship in the Planning of Developments (Building permit information gets factored into subarea plans and feed into LRTP as well)
 - How were jurisdictional issues addressed (did local land use authorities object to the MPO's role in land use issues)?
- How long did it take to develop and adopt your plan? 8 months.
- What role did the old plan or other plans (comp plans, transit plans, corridor plans) play in the development of your new plan. Not with this update. Next update will include transit consolidation plan (Bob Nugent – Transit Administrator for the City rnugent@lawrenceks.org) for merged system. Transit section will be completely overhauled. Road issues will remain to fill in missing link.

Project Selection – relied heavily on model. Model validated already known issues. Model helped show how the network would operate if implemented. Many projects had been batted around for a long time locally.

- How did you deal with project identification and selection:
 - Scenario - As noted earlier in this section, three roadway improvement scenarios (combinations of roadway projects) were developed and analyzed using the region's travel demand model. Evaluation criteria were carried forward from the T2025 Long Range Transportation Plan. The criteria were designed to respond to goals of reduced traffic congestion, cost effectiveness, and safety.
 - ***Congestion Relief (weight = 30%)*** – The ability of the scenario to reduce congestion delay is measured with this criterion through application of the regional traffic model.
 - ***Cost Effectiveness (weight = 35%)*** – While congestion relief is important, the cost associated with the reduced congestion delay benefit is another notable consideration. Cost effectiveness measures this in terms of daily congestion reduction per \$1 million investment in the scenario.
 - ***Consistency with T2030 Goals and Objectives (weight = 30%)*** – This category is aimed at examining the scenario's compatibility with T2030's objectives, such as supporting the economic vitality of the region, promoting accessibility and mobility options, protecting the environment, and promoting efficient system management.
 - ***Safety Benefits (weight = 5%)*** – Statewide average accident rates for various roadway classifications were used, in conjunction with the predicted vehicle-miles traveled on those road classes, to predict the number of accidents likely to occur with each scenario. The estimated numbers of accidents were then compared with the estimated number from

- the “existing plus committed projects” model to determine the safety benefits.
- Who proposed projects for consideration in the plan (MPO staff, Committees, LPAs, citizens)?
 - Local governments (City and County) typically propose projects from their capital improvement projects. Compared against regional planning goals of the LRTP. MPO proposes projects through the TAC and through coordination with local govts. Project ideas typically come up at TAC meeting. STP funds are suballocated to cities and counties (not MPOs).
- How do projects move from the Long Range Plan to the TIP (MPO driven vs. LPA driven)? Driven by LPAs – they are the grant recipient. In the process of revamping TIP project submittal process – new form, new database structure. Each project must complete all fields to meet all federal reqs for project identification. “How does the project implement the Plan?” tie between TIP and Plan

Public Participation

- What methods were used to engage the public, at what point in the process, and frequency?
 - Online: some web presence.
 - In-person: a couple of workshops and then a hearing
- Did you have a steering committee or task force? Yes
 - A Steering Committee - the T2030 Committee. Members included representatives from different facets of transportation including the Lawrence/Douglas County MPO, the cities of Lawrence, Eudora, and Baldwin City, Douglas County, Lawrence Transit, the Kansas Department of Transportation, the Federal Highway Administration, and the Federal Transit Administration, citizens, bicyclists, staffers.

Other Thoughts

- Did your Plan have any progressive measures (BRT, light rail, alt. trans. LOS) – pretty close to a standard document. Next Plan in 2 years will talk a lot about complete streets, livability, land use/transportation linkage.
 - Regional commuter rail (p 119), ITS (p 147), Energy Conservation (219), Livable Communities (220)
 - “WHAT ARE THE IMPORTANT TRANSPORTATION ISSUES? T2030 recognizes a number of emerging trends that will impact travel patterns and mode choice through the year 2030. These include fuel availability, fuel price, the development of alternative fuels, changes in vehicle fuel efficiency, and the desire to reduce green house gases as well as the impacts of population growth and the aging of the region’s population. Through T2030’s community involvement process, many concerns, desires, ideas, and issues were brought forth for consideration in the planning process. Among these are:

- enhancing transit options through expanded services that reflect the needs of a mature city, fleet modernization, connections to other cities, and transit facility and other infrastructure needs;
 - serving the needs of regional travelers by providing better roadway connections around Lawrence;
 - constructing sensible and effective roadway improvements that maintain the character of the City, address congestion, provide for multimodal travel, and are environmentally sensitive;
 - managing congestion through lower-cost solutions, including travel demand management, transportation system management, technology, and intelligent transportation systems;
 - addressing the growing volume of truck traffic through identifying future trends in freight movement and planning for appropriate improvements to the transportation system;
 - increasing bicycle travel opportunities by constructing more bike trails, paths, and lane facilities, as well as providing missing connections in the bicycle system;
 - providing a pedestrian-friendly community by constructing missing segments in the sidewalk network, increasing pedestrian safety at crosswalks and intersections, and implementing amenities and facilities in activity areas consistent with walkable community objectives; and,
 - balancing land use, transportation, and environmental needs to enhance quality of life, minimize the effects of sprawl, and promote the economic competitiveness of the region.”
- How would you gauge your success in implementing the LRTP? Recommended system are being designed and implemented. Got ARRA money for bike/ped stuff.
 - What would you do differently? More focus on: transit, bike system planning (county wide now), pedestrian planning, intermodal. 5 county transportation study (\$2mil) high level planning effort on economic region. Issues cross county boundaries. Developed a 5 county model (can expand model to county wide = upgrade).

Visioning Process

Mr. Desmond reviewed the public participation process used to develop the last Long Range Transportation Plan. Initial workshops were held at the beginning of the process to get opinions on big picture issues. A second round of workshops was held later in the process to help guide project selection through the use of a non-scientific survey. Workshops were held in Bloomington and Ellettsville. Staff worked with the MPO Committees throughout the process as well. The CAC developed their own Vision Statement. Several Task Force members expressed interest in a single vision statement.

Ms. Johnson expressed interest in conducting a more scientific survey. Mr. Desmond said the MPO is looking at that as a possibility. Mr. Martin suggested that the importance of the survey rests with the question that is being asked: general funding priorities vs. ranking of specific

projects. It will also depend if the Vision Statement is desired to be process driven or outcomes oriented – it is easier to use process and agree upon the outcomes. Mr. Martin also said it is important to understand what the new limits of the MPO will be. Mr. Desmond replied the Long Range Transportation Plan is expected to cover the entire County, as it has in the past. Ms. Ryterband stressed the importance of multiple public meetings at different times and days to accommodate people's schedules. Mr. Martin suggested stakeholder groups be identified (e.g. freight, ADA, bike/ped, emergency) and that their input should be solicited as to what the MPO can do to help them. Mr. May expressed interest to included questions asking people what it would take for them to use transit. He said surveys could be conducted on buses. Mr. Martin also suggested we consider getting input from people who live outside of the County but who come here to work and vice-versa. He said we also need to understand what we can accomplish with the funds we are expected to get. We should have an understanding of certain long-term and short-term trends which might affect our decisions – Vehicles Miles Travelled, fuel taxes, fuel consumption, fund distribution. It was suggested staff start to identify firms capable of doing survey work.

Scott Robinson quickly reviewed the findings of the FHWA Certification Review. Four of the six recommendations relate to the Long Range Transportation Plan. Mr. Martin noted that there is a disconnect currently between land use and transportation. He also suggested we look performance measures and possibly use California as an example.