

Region 4 Park and Ride Lot Plan
Technical Committee Meeting 2 (Conference Call)

Conference Call-in Number: 800-392-9139

Code: 489537

February 27, 2013

1pm-3pm

NOTES

Material

1. (1:00-1:10) Introductions

Present (by community)

Lower John Day Area – Brad DeHart (ODOT), Scott Turnoy (MCEDD)

Central Oregon – Scott Aycock (COIC), Tami Geiger (COIC), Tyler Deke (Bend MPO), Jeff Monson (Commute Options), Devin Hearing (ODOT)

Klamath and Lake Counties – Bill Adams (Klamath County Planning Department), Sandra Fox (City of Klamath Falls), Beverly Leigh (Klamath County Public Health)

The group did not have any additional comments or agenda items to add.

2. (1:10-1:30) Review/Discuss/Revise Memo #1

Memo #1

Scott A. reviewed Memo #1 (tables of formal and informal Park & Ride Lots) and the methodology for determining utilization and system access for bikes, pedestrians and transit. Jeff Monson asked why there were locations listed as 'No' for pedestrian access, when anyone can walk anywhere. Scott A. explained that the pedestrian rankings were based on greater connectivity to residential centers or commercial districts. Jeff proposed and Scott A. agreed that the ODOT Park & Ride Lot (20340 Empire Blvd) should have a 'Yes' for pedestrian access. Jeff also proposed that 'No' answers to pedestrian access should be changed to 'Needs improvement.'

Action Item: Change the ODOT Park & Ride Lot pedestrian access from 'No' to 'Yes' and to change pedestrian and bike "access" wording from 'No' to 'Needs Improvement.'

Bill suggested including footnotes that provide additional information about each site. Scott A. explained that richer information about each site will be provided for the locations that are

determined to be higher priority. There are too many locations included in Memo #1 to gather additional information about each one. He continued that the possibilities listed in Memo #1 will be cross-tabbed with the demand estimates to determine the suggested priority sites within the prioritized areas.

Scott T. suggested that overhead map photos and/or pictures of the priority locations should be included in the final plan to visually present the context of each lot. The group agrees that this will be an important part of the final plan.

Action Item: Include photos and aerial maps for priority locations in the final P&R Lot Plan.

Brad DeHart asked why the “Roundabout Lot” (Location: Base of Brewery Grade, Lower John Day Area) is included. He explained that to his knowledge the lot is owned by the City and is intended for customers not Park & Ride. He asked whether anyone had spoken to the City about using the lot as a Park & Ride. Scott T. explained that it is included in Memo #1 because stakeholders said people were using the lot for Park & Ride activities and that he had not consulted with the City to determine whether or not it was okay with them. Scott A. explained that the table includes where stakeholders perceive Park & Ride behavior to be occurring, regardless of the opinion of the parking lot owners. This is only raw data.

3. (1:30-1:50) Review/Discuss/Revise Current Demand Estimate

P&R Current Demand

Scott A. explained the Current Demand Estimate table and how the different regional trip pairs were chosen. Brad asked if the pairs were restricted to within ODOT Region 4. Scott explained that each trip origin is within Region 4, but the destination may be outside.

He continued to explain that trip pairs were only included if there were 30 or more individuals commuting between the two locations. He also explained that the Qualitative Rating was based solely on LEHD data, only the La Pine to Bend commute was bumped up to a Medium because of a high poverty rate and high demand for the one existing P&R Lot.

Scott A. asked if there are any other potential trip pairs that may be missing. Devin suggested investigating Crooked River Ranch which could be a generator. He suggested asking Joni Bramlett about data because she has been working with CRR. Brad suggested that there may be people traveling from The Dalles to work at the wind farms in Sherman County. Scott asked whether they were traveling to one point or if they were dispersed across the county. Brad wasn't sure (maybe dispersed, maybe meet at a central office first), but he suggested that there could be as many as 100-200 people working out there. Scott T. said he should have access to

some data on employment numbers through his office, but he was under the impression that the numbers may not be as significant.

Scott A. also asked the group to review the qualitative rankings. Devin proposed looking at Lakeview. Scott recommended double checking that Lakeview was included in the original data and to check if combining directional trips may make it qualify (increase number of directional trips over 30) – even though it didn't appear to initially.

Additionally, Scott suggested looking at all of the trips eastbound and northbound from The Dalles to see if accumulating some trip pairs with the smaller towns would change the rankings.

Action Item: Tami to review Lakeview and The Dalles LEHD data.

4. (1:50-2:10) Discuss Forecast P&R Lot Demand Estimate

P&R Forecast Demand

Scott A. explained that we don't anticipate the relative rankings (High, Medium or Low) to change much with forecast information. All populations are forecast to grow (none explosively) so the relative rankings should stay the same. Brad agreed that the greatest demand areas are also those expecting the greatest growth – so the priorities will stay the same. Scott only anticipates the rankings changing if there is a large residential or commercial development expected for an area. He asked the Technical Committee if they had any suggestions for how to improve the Forecast Demand (currently just includes population forecast).

Tyler suggested checking the Transportation Systems Plan for each area and looking at the Travel Demand Models (they may also have some forecast population and employment figures that are more up to date).

Action Item: Review regional TSP's to determine whether there is information to include in the Final P&R Lot Plan.

5. (2:10-2:30) Review Final Plan Outline

Plan Outline

Scott reviewed the Final Plan Outline with the Technical Committee. He explained that COIC is having the hardest time with item #3 Cost and Funding Estimates. Brad suggested ODOT as a good resource that should be able to come up with some "cost per unit" estimates that are scalable for different sized lots. Scott explained that COIC had received a figure from ODOT but the total cost was unbelievably high, \$8 million for a 20 space lot.

Action Item: Send current ODOT figures to Brad and Devin for their review and technical assistance.

Scott asked the group for feedback about how to define the priority locations. He suggested two potential methods: profile priority locations or profile priority areas and list some potential specific locations within those areas. Tyler explained that taking into account the recent 1518 STIP process, it seemed like having some development work complete (partial planning) made projects more attractive for funding. Brad explained that his hope was for this Regional Park & Ride Lot Plan to validate the scope of the projects that have been selected for the 'Enhance It' process. He added that if a funded 'Enhance It' project is not in a High priority location, then the scope of the project may be changed. Scott suggested including the list of 'Enhance It' projects during prioritization to see where they correspond and where they don't, and to perhaps include the projects in an informational appendix.

Action Item: Review list of 'Enhance It' projects, include in prioritization process.

6. (2:30-3:00) Action Items and Next Steps

Scott explained that before the next Technical Committee call, the PMT would be meeting to determine Prioritization criteria and the prioritization process. The next Technical Committee meeting (probably in April) will include a review of the draft Final Plan.

Adjourn