Community Planning Association of Southwest Idaho

Transportation Model Advisory Committee
August 31, 2004

MINUTES

Members Attending:
Vern Brewer, Holladay Engineers, Inc.
Dan Coonce, Idaho Transportation Department, District #3
Kendall Kemmer, Ada County Highway District
Kathleen Lacey, City of Boise
Ron Milam, Fehr & Peers Associates
Darrel Miller, Canyon Highway District #4 (for Casey Bequeath)
Jim Pline, Pline Engineering
Ted Reynen, Keller Associates
Joe Rosenlund, Ada County Highway District, **Chair**
Dave Szplett, Washington Group

Members Absent:
Jim Buffington, Nampa Highway District #1
Susan Graham, Parametrix, Inc.
Gary Inselman, Ada County Highway District
Leon Jensen, Canyon County Development Services
June Ramsdell, Department of Environmental Quality
Paul Raymond, City of Nampa, **Vice Chair**
Gary Sanderson, Idaho Transportation Department

Others Attending**:**
Cameron Waite, Washington Group
Mary Ann Waldinger, COMPASS
Steve Waldinger, Forsgren Associates
Jay Walker, Parametrix
Yancey Willis, COMPASS
Debbie Winchar, COMPASS
Jay Witt, COMPASS

Call To Order
Chair Joe Rosenlund called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

Introductions were made of all attendees.

Approve June 29, 2004 Minutes
Jim Pline moved and Vern Brewer seconded to approve the June 29, 2004 minutes as written. Motion passes unanimously.

Functional Class Changes for 2030 Limited Update

Mary Ann Waldinger reviewed the model network and roadway designations. Does the Committee want to continue with the model network using the functional classifications that are in the model? Or, make more of an effort to match the *Destination 2030 Limited Plan Update* Functional Classification map?

After discussion, recommendations were made to:

- Add a disclaimer within the general list of assumptions that this system does not represent functional classification.
- Clearly define the three maps.
- The network within the model has to represent where people are driving but does not have to match the 2030 planning map.

INFORMATION ITEMS

Status of the COMPASS Peak Hour Model

Mary Ann Waldinger stated the peak hour model is up and running and has been operating for about a month. Refinements and changes will continue to be made by using regional peak hour factors by area type. This is the first peak hour model in our area for the region. The peak hour model will be used for the Highway 44 Corridor Study and the US 20/26 Corridor Study.

Jay Witt added that in the next year between the peak hour model being operational and impact fee ordinance update, the model will continue to be validated. In the next fiscal year, beginning October 1, 2004, a task has been placed in the COMPASS budget to work with ACHD and make any required modifications that are going to be needed for the impact fee ordinance. Within the next couple months, this Committee will be asked to formalize a peak hour model policy.

Kathleen Lacey commented it is anticipated that the COMPASS Board will have questions and suggested placing this item on the COMPASS Board agenda as a brief informational item.

Dynamic Validation of the Peak Hour Model

Jay Witt reviewed the dynamic validation procedures and results.

Ron Milam stated the low estimates coming out of the model at this time are a direct result that the factors that were added were factors developed specifically for the Downtown Boise Mobility Study. These factors were compared to the overall survey for the region and there is a significant difference. These factors will be adjusted upward. The majority of the difference is a result of the initial factors. The peak hour model is stable and it performs in the right direction.

Status of Mode Choice Model

Jay Witt stated that initially, the peak hour model is part of this larger model development project in which a peak hour component will be added to the model as well as a mode choice component. Funds for this project came to COMPASS via Valleyride. What form the mode choice model will take is uncertain at this time. COMPASS staff will release a Request for Proposal (RFP) in September to hire a consulting firm to help design COMPASS' Mode Choice Model. A scope of work has been developed

for the RFP and it has been submitted to the Federal Transit Authority for early review. A consultant will be selected by October/November to define a scope of work to build the Mode Choice Model.

Kathleen Lacey commented that the focus is going to be more on regional aspects, however, Boise City has more mode choices at this point and would more correlate with the national statistics on walking trips being much greater than the number of transit trips. Boise City policy makers, and perhaps ACHD, would be interested in how all the other mode choices are going to impact transit decisions. How do we integrate these questions?

Ron Milam replied that going through a complete Mode Choice Model is a big endeavor. Most MPOs go through this process when qualifying for future federal funding. It depends on what types of technical questions need to be answered and what level of confidence is needed for project analysis. The challenge is identifying the technical questions; what do you want the model to tell you? Ron encourages TMAC as well as the COMPASS Board, to make sure they are clear on the questions before investing the money to develop that particular tool.

After further discussion, Kathleen Lacey stated that given the commitment that the COMPASS Board has made to the Mode Choice Model, TMAC might want to encourage the Board to hire additional help. The COMPASS Board needs to recognize all the implications for staff and *Communities in Motion*. If a recommendation is made to find additional funding to ensure *Communities in Motion's* needs are being met, it should be considered. MaryAnn replied that a deadline has not been missed and a commitment has been made to make this work. TMAC will be kept in the loop throughout this process.

Demographic Scenarios and CIM Update

Mary Ann Waldinger stated three demographic scenarios are under development: trend, moderate and high. The trend has been "approved" by DAC and is currently in use. These scenarios will be used in the model and 2030 Limited Update. MaryAnn tested an alternate scenario to pull in some densities. This scenario was presented to the Demographic Advisory Committee (DAC). Mary Ann has reworked the numbers for moderate and high. The moderate and high demographics will be run through the model as it is today, without the transit, etc. Charles Trainor has prepared a memo for the DAC that summarizes the purpose of the scenarios as a starting point and provides a quick *Communities in Motion* update. DAC 's meeting packets are posted on the COMPASS website.

Use of the Model for Congestion Management System (CMS) Analysis

Jay Witt stated that COMPASS staff is in the process of incorporating the Congestion Management System (CMS) into the long range planning process. The *Destination 2030 Limited Plan Update* is preceding *Communities in Motion*. Therefore, the Travel Demand Model will be used to give a sense of future congestion in comparison to the travel time collected with the CMS. Jay reviewed a sample of ascending travel time data.

After further discussion, Ron Milam suggested the inclusion of two or three other performance measures to capture some of the effects that may be missed. Demand to capacity ratios are commonly used, as well as vehicle hours of delay by roadway segment. A demand to capacity analysis may pick up something that a travel time (or Sanderson Index) would not. Because delay grows almost exponentially after you get above capacity, a roadway that is uncongested today that is forecast to be congested in the future, would not provide a proper estimate of future delay. However, a demand to capacity ratios will include delay. Travel time data could be used in conjunction with other performance measures and could probably identify segments that might be congested in the future.

Ted Reynen stated that an intersection level analysis along the identified arterials must be done. Jim Pline commented that a more detailed analysis is needed to determine the causes of congestion. Jay replied that the proposed analysis is intended to address congestion management in a long range planning context, not identify its causes. A different analysis may be included in *Communities in Motion*.

Jay asked the Committee if he should go forward with the proposed type of analysis and include it in the *Destination 2030 Limited Plan Update*; use collected and forecasted travel time data with the deficiency (volume to capacity) analysis that has already been done for 2030; or, add a couple of other model based performance measures?

Joe Rosenlund replied that because this is a limited update, a lot of effort should not go into this analysis. Jim Pline added that long-range in the CMS is ten years not 2030. Ted Reynen suggested using the list of identified congested facilities as a guide to qualitatively evaluate the future improvements. Did the planned projects take pressure off the congested roads? Ron Milam suggested keeping things in the regional context. Give a sense for why things are going to change or get worse in the future by using vehicles hours of delay or weighed Sanderson Index. Jim Pline added that work done on signals and intersections is ultimately needed to improve congestion. The CMS will help roadway and transit agencies to identify some of the areas that need improvement within the next five or six years.

OPEN DISCUSSION

Joe Rosenlund announced that he would no longer be with the Ada County Highway District after the end of September. He will begin working for J-U-B Engineers, Inc. A new chairperson should be elected at the next scheduled meeting.

NEXT MEETING

October at COMPASS, the date and time to be determined.

The meeting adjourned at 10:50 a.m.

T:\600transup\636model\TMAC\Minutes\minutes083104.doc