TRB ABE30 Major Cities Fall Committee Conference Call, October 24, 2014

## Welcome and Introductions

In person:

Ema Yamamoto, Philadelphia

Jamie Parks, Oakland

Margi Bradway, Portland

Frank Murphy, Baltimore

Mark Simon

Paul Supawanich, Nelson Nygaard

Luann Hamilton, Chicago

Fred Dock, Pasadena

Chris Pangilinan, SFMTA

Vineet Gupta, City of Boston

Steve Buckley, Toronto

On the phone:

Stephanie Dock, DC

Catherine Cagle, City of Waltham

David Kuehn, FHWA

Jesse Taylor, Translink

Patrick Sable, Brookings Institute

Denise Goren, MAR&M Consulting

Eric Sundquist, Univ. of Wisconsin

Andrew Zalewski, Foursquare ITP

Julia Salinas, LA Metro

Danielle Elkins, CH2M

Praveen Pasumarthy, CDM Smith

[…and more - apologies to those whose names were missed]

## TRB Report

Ema gave an update on behalf of Monica Starnes. The Annual Meeting is Jan 11-15, 2015 in its new location at the Convention Center. Early bird registration closes Nov. 15th. When you are looking to book your hotel, TRB has created a great list that shows how close all the hotels are to the convention center.

MyTRB.org: if you have not signed up online, please do. This is TRB’s new platform and will be coordinating the friend lists for committees. If you are not a friend (not a member), you need to self-nominate as a friend of ABE30 since the system does not otherwise know you are affiliated. Stephanie will send more information.

## Sub Committee Reports

### Communication Coordinator (Stephanie Dock)

Hopefully everyone has been getting the emails from the committee. The committee website has a blog and if you have something you’d like to put up there, please contact Stephanie, [stephanie.dock@gmail.com](mailto:stephanie.dock@gmail.com). Stephanie has been sending updates from the blog and from around the research world every month to 6 weeks as a sort of committee newsletter.

We are also looking to create a logo for the committee – several committees have them and it would be nice to have our own. So put on your design caps and look for more information on this before the end of the year.

### Strategic Plan Coordinators (Steve Buckley, Karina Ricks, Andrea d’Amato, Julia Salinas)

Steve Buckley reported that the Strategic Plan was submitted but has not been officially approved. You can find it on the committee website.

### Paper Review Coordinators (Eric Sundquist, Christine Yager)

Eric reported that we received 50 papers, many of which were very good. The committee recommended 28 for presentation, 8 for papers, and 1 for an award. We have used nearly all our slots and it looks like all 28 papers have been scheduled (though we do not yet know how many are lectern vs. poster).

Over 219 reviewers were completed. Eric and Christine did great work coordinating this given that all papers need at least 3 reviewers. Thank you to all committee friends and members who reviewed!

### Annual Meeting Organizing Group (Fred Dock, Aimee Jefferson, Jamie Parks)

Jamie and Fred gave an update on our sessions.

We have a Sunday morning workshop on the Art of Urban Street Performance Metrics, co-sponsored with NACTO, with a great mix of speakers: Rina Cutler from Philadelphia, Seleta Reynolds from Los Angeles, Peter Koonce from Portland for signals, and Matt Rowe From NACTO. Note that workshops are already up on the website and you can see them.

Lectern sessions: 3 sponsored

* City Transportation Officials: First Year on the Job
* Understanding the Gender Gap in Urban Biking
* Livable Arterials: Urban Elixir or Oxymoron?

Poster sessions: at least 3

* Understanding the Gender Gap in Urban Biking (paired with the lectern session)
* Transportation Issues and Solutions in Major Cities
* Not Your Mother's Parking Meter: Parking in the 21st Century

Co-sponsoring 2 workshops:

* Funding and Financing Vital Corridors: A Workshop on the What, Why, How, and Who of Value Capture Methods
* The Urgent Need for Improved Pedestrian Infrastructure and Options: Issues, Solutions, and Gaps

Co-sponsored lectern session and poster sessions with Urban Freight Transportation Committee:

* Goods Movement in Vibrant Urban Communities [lectern]
* Urban Freight Parking Research: To Curb or Not To Curb [poster]
* Advanced Research and Practices in Urban Freight Transportation [poster]

This effort reflects what came out of the annual meeting last year: wanting to look at equity and freight.

### Research Coordinator (Wes Marshall)

Ema reported for Wes that we are looking at our current research needs statements. We have 8 on the TRB website. All are still relevant, with 2 added this last year. Looking to update those this year, and we have a discussion later in this agenda around research topics. See the powerpoint for a list of titles (or the research needs statement database: <http://rns.trb.org>)

## NACTO Update (Linda Bailey)

Linda was not able to join, but the committee meeting was held at the NACTO Designing Cities conference and Ema mentioned some themes of interest:

* Urban Design Guide: making it worldwide
* Vision Zero

## Brainstorming for Research Direction in 2015

**Critical issues from our strategic plan**

1. Changing cities with renewed growth in the core, changing demographics, changing travel patterns and demands

2. Rethinking the use of our public right of way, beyond just the curb space – also the sidewalks, etc.

3. Greater openness to grass-roots innovation and experimentation

4. Rapidly improving technology and wealth of big data

5. Increasing opportunities to fund transportation locally given that federal funding is so uncertain

6. Increased conversation between Federal DOT, State DOT’s, Local DOT’s, and MPO’s in order to create collaborative, unified, and place-specific urban transportation agendas

**Discussion**

Maintaining grassroots efforts – how do you handle maintenance and upkeep, negotiate contracts for that?

Larger question: Who would fund this research? Who would conduct it? The answers to these questions will influence how we approach these research needs. NCHRP is obviously one of the major sources. Stephanie noted that DC, as a State DOT, is able to submit and support research ideas from this committee in that process. However, the NCHRP process is not very quick. We should work to identify other funding sources – states all have research funds and some are quite interested in urban research topics, such as California. However, cities often move faster than these processes and our paper calls can help drive independent research on these topics.

Chris Pangilinan discussed the need for a discussion about the legal side/framework, with respect to the process of experimentation. In addition, looking for the relationship of cities with their advocacy groups and how those relationships can help or hinder an agenda. This also comes into the idea of needing to create a coherent message and really understanding how we push this message out to community groups, others.

A big theme that we saw at NACTO was that Vision Zero is becoming more of a universally recognized policy. As we begin to think about these policies, we also need to consider what kind of research we will need to best either (1) make the case for these policies in the future, and (2) how cities can then best allocate funding to implement these policies/practices to get at safer streets.

Frank Murphy from Baltimore noted that their police department very focused on guns, murder, and violent crime, so it is very hard to get them to do enforcement on pedestrian side. The national focus is good but needs to influence the culture of law enforcement at the local level.

Margi Bradway from Portland mentioned their pilot to collect EMS data on bike and ped injuries/fatalities – another way to get data than just from the police.

Frank also observed there seems to be better compliance with yielding out West with yield laws, etc. and suggested a study linking on enforcement and compliance. Margi added that you also need to look at outreach and education – how to balance those in terms of effectiveness. They have put a lot of money into outreach and education following a bicycle fatality several years ago.

## Research Presentations from Committee Members and Friends

Update on the national level: Patrick Sabol, The Brookings Institution, Metropolitan Policy Program

Contact information: 202.238.3595 (office)| 216.469.0258 (cell) | [psabol@brookings.edu](mailto:psabol@brookings.edu)

General trends:

* Changes in where we are going to spend our money: less discretionary funding (36% today, 24% in 2023).
  + Even at the height of transportation funding, only 27% of transportation infrastructure was federally funded – it’s really states and locals, at the end of the day, who pays for it

Made a little graphic on the likelihood of things happening.

* Definitely
  + Things the administration can lead on
    - PPP enabling unit – a lot more staff capacity to help with P3s
    - Private Activity Bond eligibility – Treasury can do on its own
    - Venture Fund – small grants to help with project planning, both administration and philanthropic community working together. $10-12k planning grants
* Likely
  + Streamlining around NEPA – have hit a critical moment where everyone involved admits that the process is not working
  + Booker/Wicker – allowing municipalities to control things more
  + Repatriating business taxes – tax holiday and using the money to fund transportation. There was talk of an infrastructure bank, but may also just patch the trust fund with it
* Unlikely:
  + New transportation bill – will just get reauthorization, just no appetite for funding conversations

## Open Floor for Announcements – 10min

Stephanie Dock with DC announced that they had finished their urban multimodal trip generation study and would be sharing more information on that going forward. There were two papers on the project submitted and accepted for the annual meeting, so more information coming.

ITE is working on looking to person-based trip generation project, rather than vehicle -based trip generation.

## Thoughts received after the call

Eric Sundquist noted by email that another source of research money can be foundations. They may not fund DOTs or other government agencies, but they fund universities and others to do work for those agencies.

Eric also added some thoughts on the research topics:

a) The big data papers we got this time were kind of disappointing, but the topic is ripe. Maybe we could come back with a more focused call on that. For example, 1) specifically asking to compare and contrast technologies (not being able to find such a thing for a meeting recently, I put together this), 2) asking for ways to use big data to relieve congestion through TDM/transit/connectivity improvements (see example paper summary) or 3) use of big data to produce/validate trip-gen or off-street parking assumptions. These are just some examples, but are the kind of specifics that might get us further than the general call we just had.

b) Livable, multimodal designs for state-owned highways -- specifically experience of a few early adopters in designing to target speeds and giving their people direction/flexibility to design for metro areas. Not a brand new topic, but our experience with Caltrans in particular is that we are far from a tipping point in practice.