

Prepared for the Joint Conference of the Oregon & Washington American Planning Association October 21, 2011

Presented by Becky Knudson Oregon DOT Transportation Planning Analysis Unit



Oregon Department of Transportation

Good Models Answer Questions...

- Models are designed to evaluate specific types of questions
- Imperative to have a clear understanding of the questions being asked
- Match information needs to the right modeling tool in the toolbox.
- Models do not provide "data," data inputs are processed and provide "information," analysts interpret information to tell "story"



Oregon Department of Transportation

Oregon Freight Plan

9



- First statewide freight plan
- Scope of analysis was well matched to SWIM2 model
- ODOT modeling staff served role as internal consultants

Oregon Department of Transportation

Freight Plan Analysis Purpose



- Forecast range of likely economic conditions to gain understanding of effects on freight movement
 - Illustrate variation in statewide and regional activity and commodity flows
 - Provide information to support development of freight strategies



Pessimistic: less economic growth (1.2%*) High Transportation Costs: Pessimistic scenario with 3-fold increase in variable operating costs

* Compound Annual Growth Rates





- statewide analyses
- Proved its value repeatedly
- Generated support for SWIM2 development
- SWIM2 has greater spatial acuity
 - more detailed inputs and components
 Can evaluate more policy options











- Helped identify core issues
- Reduced perception of bias









Oregon Department of Transportation

]|||

80

Conclusions

- Models are powerful tools
 - Effectiveness is determined by how they are usedEffective when the right tool is used

 - Good source of descriptive data
- Using them for long range planning takes time and forethought (both in development and use)
- Planners and modelers must work together to realize the full potential of using these tools
- The extra time used for analysis pays off in the end with a more productive outcome and smoother process



All Models Are Beautiful, but are they Super?

Erin Wardell, AICP, Senior Planner, Parsons Brinckerhoff Becky Knudson, Senior Transportation Economist, ODOT Michael Bufalino, AICP, ODOT Freight Mobility Unit Manager

Presented to the Cascadia Collaborative October 21, 2011



Why do we have models?

- To stimulate the brains of modelers?
- To annoy planners?
- To confound the public at meetings?







 $e^{\overline{\lambda^{*V_{a^{*,i}}}}}$

 $a \in A$

What kinds of questions do models answer?

- What is the effect of increasing highway capacity on congestion?
- How many people will ride a new light rail line?
- What population segments will benefit most from bus system improvements?
- Can we reduce greenhouse gas emissions with pricing policies?















Conclusion

- PB 199
- Models are powerful tools for the planning process
- It is important to understand the strengths and weaknesses of the tool
- New technology allows us to develop powerful new kinds of models
- New models are well-suited for planning applications





Why count bicyclists and pedestrians?

- Documenting bicycling and walking trends
- Determining where people are biking and walking, and why
- Travel demand models
- Calculating multimodal level of service
- Conducting safety analyses
- Funding nonmotorized projects
- Framing policy
- Supporting advocacy efforts

Why count bicyclists and pedestrians?

- Current data collection is inadequate...
- Census Journey To Work (ACS)
- National Household Travel Survey
- Constraints:
 - Only documents commute trips (15% of all trips nationally)
 Doesn't capture multimodal
 - trips – Covers a limited population
 - sample – Lacks route information
- American Communities Survey Question: How did this person usually get to work LAST WEEK? If this person usually used more than one method of transportation during the trip, mark the bax of the one used for most of the distance

Washington State Documentation Project Overview

- Modeled after the National Bicycle and Pedestrian Documentation Project
- Annual, statewide nonmotorized count using volunteers
- Started in 2008 (4 years)
- Conducted in fall
- AM/PM peak periods (7-9 am, 4-6 pm)



Washington State Documentation Project Goals

- Track trends in bicycling and walking at key locations around the state
- Begin to address nonmotorized data needs
- Inform non-motorized planning and funding decisions
- Better understand nonmotorized travel patterns



Collaborative Approach

Who's involved in the Counts?
 Volunteers – local residents

- Washington State DOT



- Cascade Bicycle Club (contractor)
- RTPO's
- Municipalities
- Advocacy groups
- Bicycle and pedestrian advocates



Pros/Cons of Collaborative Approach

- Pros: Local jurisdiction involvement
- Opportunity for local engagement
- Ability to select locally significant count locations
- More ownership of count process and data
- Higher volunteer coverage
- Provides an opportunity to train local volunteers, reducing count errors or inconsistencies
- Help to establish nonmotorized data collection efforts within local jurisdictions
- Potential Cons
 - Opportunity for scope creep
 - Changes to locations









Volunteer Process

- Initial "call for volunteers"
- Volunteers sign-up via online website
- Confirm shift/send materials via e-mail
- Volunteers conduct counts
- Online data entry or return count form via fax, e-mail, or mail for manual data entry







Volunteer Count Strengths Cost effective 2010: 386 2-hour counts conducted Approximately 772 volunteer hours worth of data collection in 3 days Community engagement Volunteer opportunity Communicate the importance of bike/ped data collection to the

public

Volunteer Count Challenges

- Short-term counts
- Shift cancellations
- Human error/data entry error
- Counting methodology discrepancies
- Catering to different needs/requests
- Data return
- Location discrepancy year to year





Future Count Expansion

- Background Report analysis
- Technologies suitable for WA State
- Spokane Case Study
- Data Sharing
- Expansion at Regional and Local levels



	Contact Inf	ormation
Ian Macek State Bicycle & Pedestrian Coordinator Washington State Department of Transportation maceki@wsdot.twa.gov 360-705-7596		Tessa Greegor Principal Planner Cascade Bicycle Club tessa: greegot @cascadebicycleclub.org 206-204-0913
Resources	WSDOT Bicycle & Pedestrian Documentation Site http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Bike/Count.htm	
	Cascade Bicycle Club http://cascade.org/Home/	
_		











The Need for NBPD

- Lack of consistent data
- Lack of support for non-motorized funding
- Measuring, monitoring, forecasting and modeling bicycle and pedestrian travel







Consistent Count Methodology

NBPD Methodology: Screenline Counts



Count everyone who passes





Count all movements at intersection (this shows 2 movements)





Consistent Dates and Times

- 2nd week of September (primary count dates)
- January, May, July supplemental dates
 1 weekday and 1 weekend day
- Weekday, 7-9AM, 5-7PM (primary)
- Saturday, 12-2PM (primary)









































NBPD Lessons Learned

- Counts can serve a variety of purposes
- What influences usage/causal relationships
- Grant funding



NBPD Lessons Learned

- Variability is key issue for bike counts
 - Daily variability decreases when count volumes are larger and weather is dry
 - While there is daily variability, annual data shows clear trends by hour, day and month
- Weather is the main cause of variability
- Temperature is the most predictive, reflective of seasonal trends
- Precipitation has a clear impact, though it depends on the amount of rain/snow.





















