**2017 TRB Annual Conference ABE30 Major Cities Committee Meeting Minutes**

Tuesday, January 10, 2017

**Welcome and Introductions |** Steve Buckley, ABE30 Committee Chair

Steve welcomed all attendees and ran through the agenda. He noted that this committee touches on a lot of things, but just through an urban lens. It is good to know what is going on – which is what our guest speakers are doing – and avoid duplication.

The attendees in the room introduced themselves. See the attendee list for names.

The committee has grown substantially over the last few years: we’ve gone from 17 friends and \_\_ members to a full roster (with 1 opening) and over 600 friends.

**Update on TRB Initiatives |** Bill Anderson

Bill is the staff person assigned to our committee and about 15 other committees

The Annual Meeting has continued to grow: there are 13,722 registrants for the conference as of Friday, 5% increase over last year; the # of papers and presentations increased over last year

With the growth however, is the issue that the quality of papers is going down – and has been for a few years. Treat this as a challenge: when you are reviewing papers, don’t be afraid to turn down papers that don’t clearly communicate what they did or their conclusions.

4 subject areas to focus on for the next year (from NAS President)

1. Diversity within the committees is still an issue.
2. Workforce skillsets – right skills, right people. DOTs are seeing more competition for the skills they need with tech companies that are moving into the autonomous/connected vehicle spaces
3. Long distance freight movements and megaregions
   1. Bill is also the international partnerships staff person – want to do more cross-border information sharing
4. Sustainability – we are not steering clear of climate change because of the administration change, the National Academies of Science are independent.
   1. Also a social equity and social sustainability element: we need to get people. AASHTO realigning to better match how DOTs operate, for example.

2018 International Economic Development Conference – planning committee meeting on Wed, welcome to join

Smart cities: there is an interest in getting more committees involved in Smart Cities – proposing this committee or the section set up a cross-cutting subcommittee to talk about that subject.

**Sub-Committee Updates**

Communications | Stephanie Dock

New website! [www.trbmajorcities.org](http://www.trbmajorcities.org) This has been awhile in the making, but with many thanks to Ray Chan, the site is ready to go. We have also launched a Twitter handle: @TRBCities. Matt Kroneberger is spearheading that.

The site looks a lot like our existing Google site, but with one major improvement: we now have a blog that you can comment on the posts. This will allow us to continue the conversations that happen in our committee outside our periodic meetings. The Google Group will continue to be used to send announcements about committee activities (calls, webinars, calls for papers, paper reviewer requests, etc.), but the blog will hopefully open up more of a conversation.

If you would like to help with the blog or other communications activities, please contact Stephanie – stephanie.dock@gmail.com. Things happen because our members and friends want to see them. If you have communications ideas, join our little subcommittee and we can run with it!

Paper Reviews | Julia Salinas

23 paper submissions, 97 willing reviewers so we did at least 3 and often 4 or more reviews per paper

Paper recommendations:

* 9 papers for poster session
* 5 papers for presentation
* 3 being reviewed and resubmitted now for publication
  + *Data-Driven Urban Performance Measures: A Case Study Application in the District of Columbia* by Kevin Lee et al ((top paper))
  + *Assessing the Night Time Deliveries in Stockholm* by Anastasios Koutoulas
  + *Assessing the State of Practice of the Role And Siting Issues Related to Curbless Streets in an Urban Context* by Carrie Sauer

Steve noted that for friends who want to be on the committee, volunteering to review papers is a very good way to demonstrate interest and involvement. Committee members are expected to participate.

Webinars | Steve Buckley

Ivana Tasic could not be here to present, so Steve spoke on her behalf

Our committee put on 3 webinars this year with up to 400 attendees per webinar:

* Vulnerable Road Users: What Cities Can Do to Make Things Better
* Mega-events Helping Urban Growth Through Sustainable Transportation Solutions
* Cities Beyond Driving

3 webinars planned for next year:

* Multimodal accessibility
* Collaboration between cities and DOTs
* Smart cities initiatives

A special thanks to Ema Yamamoto for great ideas and her participation.

If you would like to get involved or volunteer as a speaker, reach out to Ivana.

Annual Meeting Organization | Fred Dock/Jamie Parks/Aimee Jefferson

Sponsored or co-sponsored 6 podium sessions, 2 webinars, and 1 poster session

First podium session this morning was well attended – a lot of people were impressed and thanked the speakers and moderator.

The poster sessions are:

* Measuring Urban Mobility: Bridging the Gap Between Policy Objectives and Performance Measures
* Translating "Aspirational Policy" into "Getting Stuff Done": Challenges to Implementing Vision Zero
* Experiments and Innovations in Urban Environments
* Confronting the Fear Factor of Change: Risks and Rewards
  + Co-Sponsors: ABC10: Strategic Management / ABC20: Management and Productivity / ABC30: Performance Management
* Smart Cities, Smart Organizations
  + Co-Sponsor: ABC10: Strategic Management
* On a Path to Equitable Transportation Access for All People
  + Co-Sponsors: ADD50: Environmental Justice / ABE70: Women’s Issues / ABE80: Native American Issues / ABE90: Developing Countries / ADD30: Land Development

Workshops Co-Sponsored by ABE30:

* Help Wanted: Agency Leaders Speak Out on Critical Research Needs to Support a Dramatically Changing Industry
  + Co-Sponsors: ABC10: Strategic Management / ABC20: Management and Productivity / ABC30: Performance Management
* Neighborhood Greenways: Applications, Research, and Effectiveness
  + Co-Sponsors: ANF20: Bicycles / ANF10: Pedestrians / AHB65: Operational Effects of Geometrics

Poster session

* Transportation Issues & Solutions in Major Cities
  + Co-Sponsor: AL010: Transportation Law

Steve noted that our sessions can be very good for highlighting where we are practicing. Our committee does not necessarily follow the papers solely – we pick topics of interest and find speakers, whether we have a paper or not. Reach out to Jamie or Fred if you’d like to suggest a good topic.

Research | Steve Buckley

2017 Calls for Papers – we went for a broader set of calls this year

“Transportation Issues and Solutions in Major Cities”

1. Vision Zero & Multimodal Safety
2. Changing Cities (i.e. how the confluence of changing demographics, shifting preferences, and evolving technologies impact urban transportation issues)
3. Rethinking the Use of Public Right-of-Way
4. Increasing Innovation & Experimentation (i.e. relying upon empirical data over “standards”)
5. Rapidly Improving Technology & A Wealth of “Big Data”
6. Urban Transportation Innovations

We will do a call for papers this next year, probably a bit more specific. Typically put the call out in April.

Suggestions: urban parking technology and policy (possibly joint sponsorship with the parking subcommittee)

It is also time to begin updating our research needs statements – and good to know that this is what helps feed into the NCHRP process. This includes editing/removing our existing statements and preparing new ones. You can find our current statements by searching rns.trb.org

* Bringing Public Bike Share to All People (2014)
* Transportation Resiliency in Major Cities (2014)
* Bicycle Transportation Strategies (2012)
* Comparative Investment Strategies in Cities (2012)
* Expanding the Toolbox for Building Better City Streets (2012)
* Summary of City & Metropolitan Transportation Infrastructure Needs (2012)
* How Major Cities Can Optimize Public Street Space (2010)
* Major Cities’ Adaption to Global Climate Change (2010)

Possibilities for new statements:

* Designing cities for changing populations & conditions
* Multimodal safety
* Providing equal access and mobility for all users
* Best practices sharing on innovative urban solutions
* Balancing competing demands on the streets, including parking & freight
* Opportunities through technology and data
* Developing urban transportation performance measures
* Improving relationships with partners, such as MPOs, transit agencies, state DOTs, and federal agencies
* Others…?

Synthesis Topic Submittals are due for highways Feb 17th and transit on Mar 17th.

Note that synthesis topics are compilations of existing research. For example, a synthesis on multimodal performance measures might be based on the lectern session we sponsored earlier today.

**Update on NACTO Initiatives** | Linda Bailey

This committee has a strong relationship with NACTO, and we compare notes to try not to duplicate efforts. NACTO is often a bit more nimble, so things with more immediacy often go to them.

NACTO is the National Association of City Transportation Officials. Has been growing over the last few years: 50+ cities and transit agencies. Members in nearly all major metro areas in the country now.

NACTO has been working for the last few years to help cities be able to innovate and sharing best practices

* Transit Street Design Guide – spread best practices like the Select Bus service in NYC
* Global Street Design Guide – bringing the ideas from north American cities to the rest of the world
* Bike Share Station Siting Guide – how to build a bikeshare system that is equitable, safe…

Through guides like these, NACTO is working on making sure ideas move into projects. Releasing the Urban Bikeway Design Guide caused a spike in protected bike lanes being built – took a good idea and spread it further, now part of the standard toolbox.

NACTO is also supporting stronger transit: they have started a new transit affiliate membership to help to bridge the divide between city and transit agencies. There is a new “transit accelerator” program starting up.

Leadership for safety is another focus area: road fatalities and injuries have unfortunately gone up. What are the concrete things cities can do to get to Vision Zero?

The Urban Street Stormwater Guide is coming in June 2017. This is an area that cities have been dealing with for a while, and also something that crosses agencies, between sewer/water and transportation

There was a question about partnerships to get the word out about the guide. Linda said they are working with ASCE, Green Infrastructure Exchange, and the water/sewer agencies in the NACTO cities

Looking forward, NACTO wants to provide a framework for the future. Looking at AV/CV, how can that be brought to bear on the urban issues we are dealing with.

Designing Cities Conference – Chicago in October. 800+ city transportation leaders for 125 cities; hands on workshops, trainings, “walkshops” to see what’s on the ground, and expert panels

Request: time to update our strategic plan, so need volunteers

Committee membership – currently pretty balanced in terms of gender, pretty northeast-heavy, could consider more minority representation (6 out of 35). All international and young member slots are full. Will be doing a call for applicants for the open slot, particularly looking at volunteer work with the committee.

*Guest Presenters*

**The Trump Transportation Transition |** Jeff Davis

Trump was elected based on an unexpected strength in Michigan, Wisconsin, and Pennsylvania. Population density is the single biggest indicator of how anti-Republican a US House district votes: before last round of redistricting 1600 people/sq. mile vs. 150 people/sq. mile for Democrats vs. Republicans.

For the 2018, the Senate election is the one to watch. Due to the mix of seats, the GOP is defending 8 seats in 2018 while the Democrats defend 25. Many of those seats are in areas that went for Trump this election.

The Trump Transition

Good news: Sec. Elaine Chao is one of the most experienced nominees of all Trump’s nominees

Bad news: not sure who’s making the final choices on who’s below her, it’s taking longer to approve those personnel – Sec. Chao will be dependent on OMB/White House for logistical support until personnel get approved.

Who’s Vision?

* Steve Bannon gave an interview with Hollywood Reporter that said he’s pushing the trillion-dollar infrastructure plan
* Mick Mulvaney, White House budget director: really opposed to raising debt ceiling
* Elaine Chao: didn’t commit to assuming new funds
* Trump: “Buy American, Hire American”, he’s into big, shiny “legacy” infrastructure projects

Someone in the NYC transition office drafted a list of 50 megaprojects – it’s not been officially released, but a lot of transit and city projects (e.g. in there, and city projects (e.g. 2nd Ave Subway, MD Purple Line), assume 50% or so from private equity. Campaign advisors produced a plan to leverage $1 trillion of private investment in US infrastructure via $140 billion of on-budget federal tax credits.

-Good news: wanting to do P3 means you need a revenue stream – benefits city megaprojects because they have massive VMT and freight movement, significant sales tax revenue, or some sort of revenue based on a large population base.

-if they really borrow from private markets, it won’t increase federal debt like TIFIA and RRIF P3s will. Has to do with how OMB handles loans from feds vs loans by private and how it counts against the debt ceiling

“Buy American, Hire American” – Buy America provisions longstanding, but “hire American” is new – currently only applies to direct federal contracts. Can expect to see an e-Verify requirement for all contractors with new funding; unclear if it could be applied to existing grant programs.

Republican Vision: very hostile to “stimulus” – hard to square their opposition to debt limit raises or increased public debt with increased federal funding or financing.

The GOP platform wants to cut the mass transit account of the highway trust fund. The GOP platform and House Republicans are not a fan of urban areas since those areas mostly vote Democratic.

For transit, there is a distinction between the big 6 “legacy” cities with their aging rail systems vs. the rest of the country that is mostly bus transit based – hard to write a plan that works for both of them.

Final assessment: expect increased financing of megaprojects through P3s; but don’t expect any major funding for infrastructure. Might see another round of TIGER

Additional thoughts and Q&A:

* Jeff expects to see Chao bring back benefit cost analysis in a big way. But how do you square the fact that P3s and BCA will benefit urban areas mostly with the desire to spend in rural areas? Answer: take advantage of P3s not being on the books for OMB purposes. Might see reduced federal share for new projects, and focus on spending federal share on SOGR. SOGR projects are likely to have more money to blue collar, which does fit Trump’s message.
* Sen Chuck Shumer (D-NY) is a bit of an ace up the big cities’ sleeve, but Jeff thinks Shumer has a lot of competing demands. He expects to see the Gateway project happen, but that’s so expensive. There is the chance that Trump himself drives investment in NYC specifically because Trump wants to be adored by NYC residents, and it bothers him that he is not.
* 1st 100 days – ends April 28th, which is about the time the next spending bill needs to pass. Congress might try to put some things in there, up to the point where the Democrats will object strongly enough to shut the government down for a few weeks.
* What would a city with a transit agency want to keep an eye on? Don’t assume more funding for bike/ped/streetcar.
* Congress won’t reopen the FAST Act, but when they release the funds, they might rearrange some priorities.
* Prior presidents have all submitted a 100 page summary or so of the budget request in mid-Feb and the full budget in March. Curious to see if Trump will follow that trend or leave it all to Congress. If they do put a budget out, curious to see if “they put the money where the tweets are”
* Hope in the heartland for new small transit projects? Not sure.
* Putting the trust fund under discretionary budget caps? The main proposer of that is the proposed HHS secretary, so if he’s approved (not clear), that idea might be less clear.

**USDOT Pedestrian and Cycling Safety Resources |** Tamara Redmon/Gabe Rousseau

The committee brought these speakers in because as cities we have been talking a lot about VZ, looking for resources to help them do that. Steve had been talking to Gabe about the work USDOT has been doing in this area

Tamara Redmon is with FHWA in the Office of Safety, and she handles peds and novice drivers.

Gabe Rousseau, with FHWA, in the Office of Safety, Safety Team Leader, handles bike, ped, older travelers, motorcycles, and other users

Launching very soon will be a transportation pooled fund specific to pedestrian and bicyclist safety. Looking for funding partners.

Recent FHWA Ped/Bike Reports:

* Coming soon: Noteworthly Local Policies That Support Safe and complete Pedestrian and Bicycle Networks
* Road Diet informational guide – a few years old
* A Guide for Maintaining Pedestrian Facilities for Enhanced Safety –tried to set some best practices

Tools:

* Road Safety Audit Guidelines – for bike and ped – RSAs are done by outside experts who come in and look at a facility to make recommendations to improve safety
* PedBikeSafe – countermeasure selection system
* ScRAM: Scalable Risk Assessment methodology

Initiatives:

* Road diets in Every Day Counts (EDC) 3
* Safe Transportation for Every Pedestrian (STEP) in EDC-4

Q&A:

Is there good advice on how to figure out answers on effectiveness without waiting 5 years for assessing effectiveness?

Can use surrogate measures – do you see better yielding behavior, for example, that you can measure before you get to crash data over years

Suggestion: wealth of data at the cities (e.g. NYC) that can show that things we already want to do are there and working. Also, smart city devices make it easier to see the surrogate

**Technology Transfer (T2) Committee Liaison |** Bret Johnson

Shared flyers from the T2 and Conduct of Research Committees on resources for effective technology transfer, implementation, and research processes.

Looking at a joint paper session to highlight successful technology implementation between researchers and practitioners. Committee website has a link to “share your stories.” Could also point to failures, since there are lessons to be learned from that.

**Shared Use Mobility |** Sharon Feigon

Tracking Shared Mobility in North America: it just keeps growing, and becoming more interrelated

“Supersharers” report greater transportation cost savings and own half as many cars as people who use transit alone.

Uber/Lyft are used mostly for social trips, infrequently for commuting, mostly complementary except where the transit trips are hard

Upcoming research: doing a deeper dive into TNC data with transit data in 5 cities – Seattle, LA, Chicago, DC, and Nashville

Looking at private transit/microtransit providers

Continuing issues: labor, taxies, ride-hailing regulations, street space, and transportation equity

The Shared Use Mobility Center (SUMC) wants to do work in the public interest that helps both cities and the industry

* Resources: 700 policies/RFPs/Contract examples; benefits calculator to estimate impacts of mode shift goals
* Working with a number of cities on shared use mobility action plans – e.g. Shared Mobility Action Plan in LA County, to reduce 100,000 cars in coming years

Many new partnerships forming: people are testing out these strategies. All in the early stages, so no one clear leaders. But focused around first/last mile, payment integration (same through mobility on demand (MOD) sandbox), carsharing/ridesharing, and expanded services to address technology user gaps

Challenges of fare integration – need processes for handing information, equity and accessibility questions

AV Policy Issues – federal and state has a lot going on, but at the local level there are a lot of issues. How these are regulated and rolled out will have impacts on VMT, GHGs. Shared autonomous vs. owned AVs. Smaller transit agencies could benefit from AVs but labor issues.

Working with Seattle and LA on Mobility Hubs – physical manifestation in some ways of the app – it’s the place that makes room for all these services

Policy: Be Proactive and Set Goals, and fund a mobility manager to provide central coordination

Google, Waze, and startups are working on real-time carpooling – the more layers of a guaranteed ride home all the better.

4:00 | **Autonomous Vehicles |** Ginger Goodin

* 1. NCHRP Study 20-102: State and Local Policy Implications of AVs
  2. NLC – City of the Future Technology and Mobility Report <http://www.nlc.org/resource/city-of-the-future-technology-mobility>
  3. What should state and local governments do?
     1. Policy levers to use
     2. Policy actions can influence private choices for community benefit
  4. Assess policy and planning strategies – AV vs. CV (they only considered fully AV)
  5. USDOT Policy Guidance
     1. States retain power, cities silent
  6. Potential Benefits of Automation/What are they trying to accomplish?
     1. Goals
     2. Performance measures
     3. Business Case (CV Infrastructure)
     4. Economic Development
     5. Outcome: 18 strategies selected for local government
  7. Safety risks – resources into training and public education – need to increase public awareness
  8. Increase shared AV use – subsidize last mile, SAV use; transit benefits; landuse & parking policies
  9. Increase market demand – invest in CV infrastructure: dedicated lanes, parking & signal priority
  10. 1 pager for policy makers “Understanding the Strategies” <http://apps.trb.org/cmsfeed/TRBNetProjectDisplay.asp?ProjectID=3934>

4:20 | **T4America—Smart Cities Collaborative |** Russ Brooks

* 1. There was a lot of demand from the cities not chosen by the USDOT Smart Cities Challenge
  2. T4A spoke with 60 cities about moving forward with helping them implement their plans from the competition
  3. Key themes
     1. Cities asking for help, but unclear list of priorities
     2. Driven by vendors and not their goals
     3. Needed clearer outcomes
     4. Wanted technical help from vendors, not sales, and there aren’t enough real technical experts
     5. No emphasis on equity issues in applications
     6. Cultural shift
        1. Winner’s leaders were willing to test and fail
        2. Cities need to be deal makers and drive discussion
        3. Cities need to ask for more
        4. Drivers need to be regional and use MPOs and multiple cities
  4. 15 topical areas emerged for cities to get technical resources on
     1. 60 applied: 30 from DOT apps, 30 0ther cities
     2. T4A slected 17 cities to help with AV, shared mobility, data analytics
     3. Last meeting was in Minneapolis to introduce the cities to each other
        1. IDed long term goals and issues
        2. Developed action plans
  5. Goals
     1. Develop policy to implement
     2. Become pilot ready
     3. Launch pilot, bring back and share results
  6. All 17 ID pilots in 1 of the 3 areas included in work plans:
     1. Performance Metrics
     2. Impact on equity
     3. Existing pilot studies learned from
  7. Technical help
     1. GSA talking about modular procurements
     2. NACTO working on private data agreements
  8. Smart Cities framework coming out at the end of the process
  9. Bloomberg and Aspen Institute: AVs & Data sharing
  10. Want to collaborate with European cities to do a joint session next TRB Annual Conference and include a call for papers on the topic

4:40 | **Open Floor |** All

4:55 | **Closing Remarks and Certificates of Appreciation |** Steve Buckley

5:00 | **Adjourn**