STAKEHOLDER WEBINAR #2 – JANUARY 24, 2013

Question Log

The following questions were asked during the TRIP97 Stakeholder Webinar #2 held on January 24, 2013. The majority of the questions were answered during the webinar but written responses are provided here along with responses to those questions that were not able to be answered during the webinar due to time constraints.

How will you measure travel time reliability?

We are proposing to measure travel time reliability by determining the standard deviation of travel times along the corridor. The standard deviation of the travel time distribution will be used to evaluate how reliable the system is. Another travel time reliability evaluation approach that has been used in practice is the calculation of a travel time index, which is the calculation of the index between the average congested travel time compared to free-flow conditions.

Why was intersection density removed from consideration as a performance measure? Intersection density may be a good measure of route directness for pedestrians and bicyclists.

The partnership determined that, overall, intersection density as a performance measure does not provide information that is useful to an analysis. Potential bicycle and pedestrian impacts can be better addressed through MMLOS evaluations or through a Use Case evaluation.

Are multimodal LOS measures good for evaluating impacts of plan amendments and/or developments?

Yes, multimodal level of service can be used to evaluate the impacts of plan amendments or developments. In addition, these metrics can be used to determine the benefits of proposed mitigations directed at the multimodal system. A use case analysis can also inform these decisions.

I suspect non-97 cities are going to be concerned about funding (especially when the diagram refers to existing funding sources) when such intensive data analysis and metrics serve to make Trip 97 projects seem better analyzed than projects in non-97 cities.

TRIP97 is not intended to monopolize transportation funding within the region. Rather, the partnership is striving to better allocate funds that have been historically spent on the highway.

How would business relocation to another city within the corridor be accounted for; say Redmond to Bend or Bend to Redmond? Trips will likely change.

Business relocation will be dealt with in much the same way that such action is today. For example, a business relocating to Redmond from Bend would need to assess its impact based on its trip generation potential at its new location.

It seems to me that a lot of the metrics really average short term high impact moments over the larger time & area. But we aren't really looking at how bad it's going to get at particularly bad point during the day. How are we not just allowing for a few really bad traffic snarrles?

It is true that part of the proposed evaluation approach and the TRIP97 effort is to broaden the view of the transportation system and move towards a more corridor-based system perspective. However, it is not intended to "relax" transportation standards. The most direct way this is proposed to be accomplished is through the establishment of "stop gap" thresholds for each performance measure. The purpose of these stop gap thresholds is to establish a level for each performance measure beyond which would be considered unacceptable for the transportation system. The stop gap measures ensure that, even though a specific location or element of the transportation system may reduce its performance level in a particular measure, it would never be allowed to do so to a level that would be unacceptable or intolerable based on these thresholds set by the partnership.

How are major off-corridor developments that impact corridor mobility such as destination resort development or expansion accounted for?

The impact of a major off-corridor development would be assessed in the same way as any development both on or off the US 97 corridor. First, it would be reviewed to determine if it is accounted for in the established TRIP97 Plan (i.e., if the land use assumptions for the TRIP97 Plan accounted for the proposed development). If so, then the impacts of that proposed development should already also be accounted for in the recommendations and strategies outlined in the Plan. Provided that the development contributed a proportional fair share or trip-based fee as will be outlined in the Plan, then no additional analysis or contributions to the US 97 corridor should be required. If the development was not accounted for the TRIP97 Plan, then the next steps of the evaluation screen process would be explored. The development would be evaluated to see if it triggered the determined trip threshold on the US 97 corridor (i.e., will it generate a certain number of trips on the US 97 corridor). If the answer is not, then again the impacts of that proposed development should already also be accounted for in the recommendations and strategies outlined in the Plan and, provided that the development contributed a proportional fair share or trip-based fee as will be outlined in the Plan, then no additional analysis or contributions to the US 97 corridor should be required. If, as the question

alludes, the development was not accounted for in the Plan and generates a significant number of trips on the US 97 corridor, then the full evaluation methodology would be required and the applicant would have to evaluate the performance measures along the corridor both with and without the development in place to determine the specific impact that it has on system performance (similar to what happens today but with an expanded set of performance measures beyond just volume-to-capacity).

How we will use alternative mode LOS for situations where US 97 is more of an expressway and where we have other routes that are likely preferable for bicycles and pedestrians?

The partnership understands that the highway is not always the best location to provide service to bicycle and pedestrian users. In such cases, off-highway alternatives would be considered. The general approach of TRIP97 is to look at the corridor as a north-south movement of people and goods. Parallel routes may provide reasonable alternatives to the highway in certain situations for specific users.

New developments in City "A" can have significant pass-through impacts in City "B"- will Trip97 analysis account for all impacts throughout the corridor or only at origin/destination locales?

The proposed TRIP97 methodology will account for impacts throughout the corridor, not just at origins and destinations.