



MEMORANDUM

Date: October 8, 2010 Project #: 9260.0
To: State Street Transit and Traffic Operational Plan Technical Advisory Committee
From: Andy Daleiden, PE, and Katie Pincus
Project: State Street Transit and Traffic Operational Plan
Subject: Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #2 Minutes

The following is a summary of the State Street Transit and Traffic Operational Plan (TTOP) Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting #2 on August 26, 2010. The meeting began around 9:00 a.m., ended at approximately 1:00 p.m., and was held at the Ada County Highway District (ACHD) Auditorium. The meeting minutes are summarized by key topics presented at the meeting followed by the TAC discussion during the presentation and regarding the alternatives for each segment.

ATTENDEES

Don Matson, Carl Miller	COMPASS
Shawn Martin, Sabrina Anderson, Jim Larsen	ACHD
Kathleen Lacey	City of Boise
Kelli Fairless, Mary Barker	VRT
Fred Kitchener	McFarland Mgmt.
Jeff Lowe	City of Eagle
Mark Wasdahl	ITD
John Cullerton	URS
John Ringert, Andy Daleiden, Katie Pincus	KAI

Ed Keener (Northwest Neighborhood Transportation Committee), Kevin Sablan (ITD), Jenah Thornborrow (Garden City), and MaryAnn Waldinger (COMPASS) were not in attendance for this meeting.

PRESENTATION TO TAC

KAI and URS presented the following information at the meeting.

- Study Update
- Examples of Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) and High-Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Systems
 - Preferential Treatments

- On-Street Running Ways
- HOV Lanes on Arterials
- Advantages and Disadvantages
- VISSIM Videos on State Street (Curbside and Median Running Ways)
- Scenario and Alternatives Evaluation (*Due to time constraint, this information was presented under each segment in the breakout session.*)
 - General Process
 - Screening of Scenarios
 - Alternatives Analysis Methodology and Evaluation Criteria
 - Alternatives Analysis Results for Each Segment
- Confirm Next Steps

The TAC members then participated in a discussion about the alternatives for each segment along the corridor.

DISCUSSION ITEMS DURING PRESENTATION

The following key items and comments were discussed by the TAC members during the presentation.

BRT Systems: Contraflow Lanes

Kathleen – How do the contraflow lanes work for the EmX system?

Andy – The contraflow lane segments have a single transit lane for buses traveling in both directions.

Kathleen – Can contraflow lanes serve buses traveling in one direction only?

Andy – Yes, but they usually serve buses traveling in both directions. State Street between 23rd Street and 11th Street is an example of where a contraflow lane could be used on this corridor.

BRT Systems: Characteristics of Mixed Traffic Running Way

Mary – How is the York system considered BRT if it is operating in mixed traffic along the whole corridor?

Andy – The system is characterized as BRT based on the vehicle type, stations, fare collection, and transit signal priority along the corridor.

Kelli – Branding is also different with BRT.

John Cullerton – The spectrum of systems that are considered BRT is very large.

Don – They could also use low-floor vehicles.

Kathleen – Is there an upstream signal near the bus bays shown in the photo in the presentation? Is it difficult for buses to merge back into traffic from the bus bay? Does this affect the efficiency of the system?

Andy – They have a “yield-to-bus” law requiring motorists to yield to buses merging back into the traffic lanes. There is a signal upstream of the bus bay in the photo. Some locations can have a bus-only signal for the bus bay.

Mary – How long would it take for that cultural shift?

Sabrina – Are yield-to-bus laws passed at the state or local level?

Andy – The City of Missoula, Montana just passed a yield-to-bus law.

Sabrina – That would have to be passed by multiple cities here, or pursued at a county level.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Issues

Kathleen – Do the systems work well where bicycles share the lane with vehicles?

Andy – Most of those systems are at low speeds for vehicles.

Sabrina – We would not have striped bike lanes at low speeds.

Kathleen – The CAC will be concerned about the spacing of pedestrian crossings.

Sabrina – If the crossings are only at signalized intersections, is there a median? Will there be mid-block crossings?

HOV Systems

Fred – Conflicts with right-turning vehicles also affect the capacity of HOV lanes.

VISSIM Simulation: Median Running Way

Mary – Farside stations are shown in the simulations. What about nearside stations?

Andy – Yes, you could implement split stations for the median running way to provide flexibility. We have constrained right-of-way, so we are showing a shared station at each location. The curbside running way provides more flexibility for station location since the stations are located outside of the roadway cross-section.

VISSIM Simulation: Curbside Running Way

Mark – Are HOV using the dedicated lane in the curbside running simulation?

Andy – This simulation just shows the buses and right-turning vehicles using the curbside running way.

Mark – Do the buses stop in the bike lane?

Andy – Yes, the buses pull into the bike lane to serve the stations, just like buses on State Street do today.

Scenario 5a: Mitigated Roadway Scenario

Mary – Emphasize the cost and why nine lanes are not feasible.

Kathleen – Articulate that there are similar investments in each alternative, but it is a choice about the vision for the corridor.

Mary – We are not going to be able to reduce congestion, but we can try to keep it from getting worse. Can you show a capital cost comparison of providing a dedicated transit lane vs. building additional roadway capacity?

John Ringert – You would not be able to widen the roadway to get to the same transit travel time as a dedicated transit lane. Using transit travel time as a performance measure for the roadway is difficult.

DISCUSSION OF ALTERNATIVES BY SEGMENT

Segment 1: SH 16 to Eagle Road

Where are the bus stops for Segment 1?

Stations will be located at signalized intersections and accessed through bus pullouts at some locations. Park-n-rides could also be used.

Segment 3: Glenwood Street to 23rd Street

Mary – Why is 23rd Street the end of Segment 3? We should push the entry into mixed traffic further in to Downtown Boise. For buses traveling inbound in the morning, there are mostly boardings at 17th Street, 23rd Street, etc. compared to alightings. VRT focuses more on reliability for inbound morning trips than outbound evening transit trips.

Alternative D: Curbside Running Way with HOV

Mary – There are no negative aspects of an HOV lane compared to a curbside lane because you have right-turning vehicles using both running ways.

Sabrina – Do we have single-occupancy vehicle data?

Andy – We performed a small study of the occupancy on State Street with existing conditions. However, occupancies can change in the future so it would be hard to use that data to predict things like HOV lane volumes.

The project team should provide a one-page HOV fact sheet to the CAC members and others who may have questions about that alternative.

Mary – The key issues with an HOV lane will be how many people per vehicle are required to use the lane and how to monitor the system.

Don – Can emergency vehicles use HOV lanes?

Andy – Yes, in some systems emergency vehicles are allowed to use the HOV lanes.

Jeff – How do HOV lanes relate to access management?

Don – There will be an Access Management Plan for SH 44 that is independent of this study.

Mary – It is important to have continuity along the corridor, especially with HOV lanes. If they are the preferred alternative for one segment, should look at implementing them in other segments too.

CAC Meeting #2: Figures and Presentation Considerations

On the cross-section alternative figures, add the existing right-of-way as a note and increase the font size of the required right-of-way.

Sabrina – Could have 6 ½-foot bike lanes and 11-foot inside travel lanes on cross-sections. Need to add specific language about cost-share agreements for landscaping the median and buffers. Also consider CCDC streetscape project near Downtown Boise.

Fred – Define the subcriteria within each category for the CAC members

Mary – We want to get a qualitative reaction from the CAC members about the running ways.

Sabrina – Show the cross-section for a bus pullout at an intersection. Note with information about the yield-to-bus law.

NEXT STEPS FOR PROJECT TEAM AND TAC

At the end of the meeting, KAI reviewed the next steps of the project with the TAC.

- August and September 2010 – The project team will address additional comments received from the TAC on technical materials to date.
- September 2010 – The Community Advisory Committee Meeting #2 will be held on September 9 at the Northgate Shopping Center at 3:30 p.m.
- September – October 2010 – The project team will develop a Draft Implementation Plan.
- October 2010 – The Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #3 will tentatively be held on October 28.

ATTACHMENTS

- PDF of TAC Meeting #2 PowerPoint Presentation, dated August 26, 2010