

TAMC Board of Directors, Agenda item #7

Route 68 corridor project update

It is difficult to even respond to the very brief, 3 page agenda update, without any backup data listed to support the summary chart. Todd and the staff have not yet even responded to the public's previous questions regarding summary claims in the new "Fact Sheet" that were given to the Board weeks ago, so we are still waiting for that response.

The board originally requested Performance Comparison between Adaptive versus Roundabouts at all 9 intersections in terms of decrease in peak transit times and now staff is changing the criteria to "Throughput" which is not the same and hard to understand by the traveling public. Further, Doug states that the evaluation of the Phase 1 roundabouts is completed but does not list the detail on how that was done and how it differs from the original Caltrans analysis that showed very little if any improvement with roundabouts? Does the roundabout evaluation come from computer simulation with Roundabouts at all 9 intersections and if not, why?

The board should see the actual video any Computer Simulation to understand exactly how results are obtained and if they are reasonable. Why should the board and the public accept computer simulation done by an outside agency that differs from the original Caltrans simulation and was significantly incorrect on previous analysis of Emergency response times using the same Computer Simulation method? What why does the Board still not have a simple report from staff or Caltrans that states that an actual installation of a series of roundabouts was installed on a busy highway to improve peak commute in _____ (location) and produced actual _____ minutes or _____ percentage of decreased peak commute time.

The Board needs to ask the following questions of TAMC staff:

1. Is the Summary of peak travel time comparison based on 9 roundabouts versus 9 adaptive as requested by the board or 3 roundabouts with the other 6 intersections being operated by adaptive? If the latter, why was that done instead of following the Board's direction
2. Since adaptive has not yet been studied thoroughly for performance, what is the basis for the travel time numbers given for adaptive versus roundabouts?
3. How can staff say that roundabouts will improve peak travel time by 6 minutes when adaptive has not been thoroughly studied yet, so what is the basis for that claim?

4. What is the basis for the claim that roundabouts will improve safety when Caltrans own data shows there is not an historical intersection collision problem in any of the 9 intersections?
5. Why does staff continue to ignore the data that shows 2 lane roundabouts increase Collisions by 62% and have failed to also report on the 3 recent fatalities in local 2 lane roundabouts ?
6. Where is the data that shows the transit delays that are caused by roundabouts during non peak times (20 hours per day), that have been acknowledged but not measured and reported on? What are the throughput numbers for non peak times of travel in the corridor ?
7. Can staff translate the estimated Throughput improvement to Actual transit time experienced by actual Drivers In the corridor during peak times ?

It is not clear as to why this incomplete and very abbreviated data was even presented when adaptive has not been thoroughly evaluated to form a benchmark for comparison. Any premature evaluation is potentially misleading and is not based on facts. The Board should require staff to answer the questions from the public and present complete and thoroughly studied comparisons.

What is clear is that even the preliminary data comparing the performance of adaptive versus roundabouts, shows that Roundabouts do not offer any significant improvement compared to initial adaptive performance, especially when compared to the significantly higher cost of roundabouts. What the board should address now is delaying any further final design work on Phase 1 roundabouts at the rate of at least \$150,000 per month of taxpayer money, on an option that is looking more and more as a inferior option in reducing peak travel time on Highway 68

Thank you,

Dwight Stump