

**Peer Review Letter from Elizabeth Deakin  
Associate Professor of City and Regional Planning  
Director, University of California Transportation Center**

January 17, 2005

Michael Replogle  
Environmental Defense  
1875 Connecticut Avenue NW  
Washington, DC 20009

Dear Michael:

At your request, I have reviewed the draft report, "The Intercounty Connector: Impacts and Alternatives". You asked me to assess both the formulation of the alternatives and the methodology used to analyze them. I have read the report carefully, including the appendices

Based on my review I conclude that the alternatives the report develops are reasonable and offer valuable options for consideration. Transit investment combined with transit-oriented land use planning and development, toll lanes, and HOT lanes are being considered in analyses across the country and are apt in this context. The formulation of the particular transit-oriented land use alternative analyzed in this report seems to have been carefully done, building upon general plans for the affected counties.

The modeling approach taken in the report is reasonable and in accord with standard modeling practices. The reliance on the COG/TPB model allows the alternatives posited in the report to be directly compared to the alternatives developed in the ICC DEIS. While the model itself has a number of serious limitations, as noted in the report and many other studies, the direct comparability of results is important enough to justify its use here. In addition, the corrections made in this report to balance trip productions and attractions are proper and should be done in any analysis.

I hope these comments will be useful to you.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Deakin  
Professor of City and Regional Planning  
Director, UC Transportation Center

### **Elizabeth Deakin: Brief Biography**

Associate Professor of City and Regional Planning  
Director, University of California Transportation Center  
UC Transportation Center  
108 Naval Architecture Bldg.  
Berkeley, CA 94720-17282  
510/642-4749  
edeakin@ix.netcom.com

### **Current Positions**

1. Associate Professor, Department of City and Regional Planning, University of California, Berkeley (UCB) 1992-
2. Director, University of California Transportation Center (half time), March 1999-
3. Affiliated faculty, Energy and Resources Group, University of California, Berkeley, 1996 -
4. Affiliated faculty, Master of Urban Design Program (College of Environmental Design), UCB 1998 -

### **Former Positions**

1. Acting Director, Institute of Urban and Regional Development, UCB (1997-98- half time)
2. Associate Professor, Department of Civil Engineering, UCB (1992-96) (without salary)
3. Assistant Professor, Department of City and Regional Planning; Assistant Professor, Department of Civil Engineering; Assistant Research Engineer, Institute of Transportation Studies, University of California, Berkeley (UCB) (1985-1992)
4. Lecturer, UCB Dept. of Civil Engineering (without stipend) (1983-87)
5. Lecturer, Stanford University Infrastructure Planning & Management Program (part time; 1980-84)
6. Specialist, Institute of Transportation Studies, UCB (part-time 1979-1980; full-time 1981-1984)
7. Cambridge Systematics, Inc. (CSI), Senior Associate and Manager, Berkeley Office (1976-79)
8. Research Associate, Center for Transportation Studies, MIT (1974-77)
9. Adjunct faculty, Northeastern University Dept. of Political Science, Public Administration Program (part-time; 1973-76)
10. Research Engineer, Urban Systems Laboratory, MIT (1972-74)

### **Education**

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, S.B., (Political Science) 1971; S.M., (Civil Engineering Transportation) 1972, J.D., Boston College Law School, 1975

### **Interests**

Transportation policy, planning and analysis; land use policy and planning; legal and regulatory issues; institutions and organizations; energy and the environment, information technologies.

**For more information**, see <http://www-dcrp.ced.berkeley.edu/facbios/Deakin.html>

**Peer Review Letter from Keith Lawton**  
***Keith Lawton Consulting***  
**20990 NE Kings Grade | Newberg | Oregon 97232**  
**Tel: 503 538 6508 | Fax: 503 217 6178 | Mobile: 503 453 7630 | e-mail:**  
**lawtonk@centricata.com**

Michael Replogle  
Environmental Defense  
1875 Connecticut Ave NW Suite 600  
Washington, DC 20009  
United States of America

SUBJECT: The Intercounty Connector: Performance and Alternatives; Draft Report, Dec 2004: Environmental Defense et al.

I have reviewed this document in full, in the limited time available. My area of expertise is in modeling travel, and in the use of integrated land-use and travel models. I have worked in this field since 1966, and thus have nearly forty years of experience.

Smart Mobility Inc. carried out the travel modeling work done for this study. I am familiar with the Principal, Norm Marshall, and consider this firm to be both competent and professional.

The models used are standard trip-based “4-step” models as used by MWCOG, and as such treat all the alternatives in a consistent manner.

The results are not surprising, and indeed, with the lack of an integrated land-use forecasting model, may well understate the differences among the alternatives. The results are, in general, consistent with modeling theory in terms of response to both more balanced population and employment, and to tolls applied in a “value pricing” context. Studies that I have been involved in, in Portland, Oregon, have consistently shown the positive effects of a more balanced location of population and employment in terms of VMT, VHT, and VHD.

The results certainly show that a more measured analysis of alternatives such as suggested by your necessarily quick study and analysis, would be in order before embarking on construction of the Intercounty Connector.

I have a few minor quibbles with measures used in your study, p 41 – a higher transit share, by itself, does not necessarily mean less congestion as compared with a less transit oriented solution. I also find that the O-D pair analysis, using shortest paths, (pp 52-53), is not necessarily useful, aggregate and average analysis, which constitutes most of the report, is more robust.

The report conclusions seem to be well justified.

In terms of details on network coding and so on, it is not possible to comment on possible inadvertent errors. The results do not suggest anything major is wrong.

Sincerely,  
T. Keith Lawton, Principal

## **T. Keith Lawton: Brief Biography**

1966 to 1973: Transportation Engineer, De Leuw Cather & Assoc., Durban, South Africa

1975 to March 2004: Transportation Planner, Metro, Portland, Oregon.

Last Position Held: Director of Technical services, Metro Planning Department

March 2004 - to date: Keith Lawton Consulting

He has led the development of a comprehensive set of transportation models for use by all jurisdictions in the Portland area. These models have many innovative features including the explicit estimation of walk and bike trips, and consideration of density, mixed use, and explicit inclusion of some urban design effects on the propensity to own cars, walk, bike and use transit. He has also led the development of activity/tour-based models, and the development of interactive transportation and land-use models. He is currently involved in the first implementation of TRANSIMS at Metro.

He has been a member of numerous model review and expert panels at Metropolitan Planning Organizations around the US.

BS (Civil Eng.), University of Natal, South Africa, 1963

MS (Civil & Environmental Eng.), Duke University, 1975

Transportation Research Board: Committee on Travel Demand Forecasting, (past Chair);

Transportation Research Board: Task Force on Moving Activity Models into Practice;

Transportation Research Board: Member of the Task Force on Transportation Modeling Research Needs (now inactive);

Past member of the Editorial Advisory Board of Transportation.