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**8:00 | Welcome and Introductions | Steve Buckley, ABE30 Committee Chair**

All attendees introduced themselves

Steve went over the NAS Harassment-Free Policy

**8:15 | Sub-Committee Updates**

***Communications | Stephanie Dock***

The committee’s twitter account is @TRBCities and Stephanie encouraged attendees to follow and tag the handle when attending our session. The sessions we sponsored are also listed on the website.

***Paper Reviews | Julia Salinas***

Julia thanked everyone who weathered the new review system and Julia’s first year as coordinator and got their paper reviews in. We did get through all our papers. We are currently working through our last round of review for publication.

Big thank you to Melissa Ruhl who assisted Julia and was very helpful.

Our committee reviewed 43 papers, 80-100 reviewers – the numbers are getting up.

We got our call for papers out earlier this year and that helped. Will try for even earlier (April/May)

***Webinars | Ivana Tasic (delivered by Steve)***

Ivana is looking to step back from her role since she is now a professor in Sweden and timing is harder. This is a good way for friends to serve the committee!

We try to do 2/year, submitting on TRB’s cycle. Would be pulling together 2-4 speakers for each

We had 2 webinars ready for next year, but we could not get the speakers available on the same date. These could try to go forward again this next year.

* Next generation cycling solutions
* Urban freight in major cities

***Annual Meeting Organization | Aimee Jefferson/Fred Dock***

3 podium sessions based on the papers received and 1 poster session

We coordinated with other committees quite a bit and co-sponsored 4 sessions this year

Looking to volunteer? Talk to Aimee (aimeejjefferson@gmail.com) or Fred (fdock@cityofpasadena.net) about volunteering

***Research | Wes Marshall***

Strategic plan critical issues – 7 areas we are focusing on for the 3-year period

Every year we use these to guide our calls for papers – this year we had 5

Will be reaching out in Feb/Mar for new ideas. Reach out to [wesmars@gmail.com](mailto:wesmars@gmail.com) if you have ideas.

***2018 Initiatives | Steve Buckley***

We rotated our membership this year, but due to a glitch the wrong list is showing on myTRB. We will post the correct list on the website in the meantime.

Expect to have about 6 openings over the course of the next year. Looking for diversity – particularly racial and ethnic, and geographic (almost half the membership is Northeast, lots of West Coast, but need Southeast, Central, and Texas/Mountain).

Looking forward to 2019, typically do quarterly phone calls. NACTO will be where we do our midyear meeting, September 9-13 in Toronto.

We are looking to restart the webinars this year – see the notes above on webinars and the need for a new volunteer(s)

**8:40 | Update on NACTO Initiatives | Matthew Roe**

Matthew gave a quick overview of what NACTO is – the National Association of City Transportation Officials, with 63 member cities and 11 transit agencies in North America. Their mission is to make urban streets better.

History: ABE30 and NACTO emerged around the same time with a lot of the same players. NACTO was more focused on on-the-ground challenges, ABE30 on the research

NACTO is interested in learning about the committee’s research interests

Some recent highlights:

* Setting urban speed limits
* Safety & vision zero
* Shared Active Transportation Guidance (managing docked and dockless shared fleets)
* First annual member survey – found diversity in their members in terms of staffing, funding (some lots of capital, little operating; other have lots of operating, little capital)
* NACTO Leadership Program, now in its 2nd year, to raise up leaders in cities and prepare the next generation of leadership (hard to find replacements that are ready)

Research initiatives:

* Urban lane reduction on urban and suburban arterials – submitted to NCHRP and hope will be funded
* Bike intersection designs – working with Chris Monsere at PSU, Portland organized a city pooled fund
* Two-way signal progression (or signal progression generally) for speed management – hoping to submit to NCHRP. Most cities do not know how to do in-house at this point.

Group activity: The group talked in pairs about a research body of work that has not gotten enough implementation focus (could be design, policy) and then identify a gap in research. Report back:

Implementation/Best Practices

* New National Household Travel Survey (NHTS) data in 2017 – a wealth of information
* Curbspace management and real estate for all the private users that are now leveraging the public ROW for their business models
* How cities can most effectively adjust the curbline without full reconstruction, beyond using flexiposts (b/c moving the curb is expensive)
* What makes good transit – but doesn’t recognize the different actors who influence the reality on the ground
  + Big example: providing bus-only lanes on city streets – see ITE state of practice report and Feb 28 webinar
* Economic benefits of de-elevation or repurposing urban infrastructure
* Equity with emerging technologies – isolating more people who live in cities (aging in particular needs to be included, as does linguistics)
* Queue management at signalized intersections in saturated situations
* Asking for data to solve problems, privacy concerns vs. data sharing
* Predictive analytics for serious and fatal crashes

Gaps

* Economic impacts of doing livable streets
  + People for Bikes is doing a Street Improvements Study that seeks to get to some of this
  + NYCDOT did sales tax analysis
* Technologies around what data could we look at beyond collisions to understand safety – if you looked at people flows and directionality, would you do the treatment differently.
* Better before and after studies of capacity reduction projects and network effects
* Public transit and micromobility: first/last mile issues – are we actually fixing the problem and supporting public transit?
* KPIs vs lived experience on the street – translating performance management into real life impacts
* AV survey data – a lot is asking about AV use, but not asking what if you didn’t need a car at all [observation more than gap]
* Lots of dockless things: where they can operate, operating speed, what don’t we know yet

**10:25 | Update on TRB Initiatives | Bill Anderson, TRB**

Have been approaching 14,000 attendees, waiting on this year’s numbers until tomorrow given the snowstorm. Are also seeing a gaps due to federal shutdown – only 3% of sessions affected, but missing out on conversation

New in the exhibit hall: connected and automated vehicles demo in the exhibit hall – ride an actual vehicle (at 5mph) and see a Ford prototype. There is also a “live theater” going on where exhibitors can do more engaging presentations. TRB booth has headshots (portraits). Ends today – go!

6,100+ papers submitted. Looking to decouple presentation and publication review decisions to allow for better publication review. Could have a good paper that needs to be cleaned up and this approach could allow those to move forward.

* Wooten award – we should think about submitting our best paper for consideration

TRR – current impact factor .695, really improving (was less than .1 ~10 years ago). Helps that we’re putting in better papers, helps that Sage is now publishing. If you want to learn more about finding resources in TRR, stop by the TRR booth. They will also teach you how to “rate” papers – this helps give feedback before citations can roll in.

Key dates:

* Feb 19 – deadline for submitting NCHRP Synthesis topics
* March 15 – webinar submissions due for July-Dec 2019
* October 15 – webinar submissions for Jan-Jun 2020

Requests:

Assign 3 people on the committee to review proceedings from the 6th EU-US Symposium on Socioeconomic Impacts of AV and CV – present back to committee and give suggestions for research, sessions, etc.

Danielle Elkins, Andy Nash, Michael Flynn volunteered

Future of the Interstates – 12 recommendations, not really related to urban areas, economic/finance issues. Do a similar exercise for identifying suggestions for linkages, research to committee.

Matthew Roe – NACTO can lead

Theme for next year: A Century of Progress, \_\_\_\_. Jan 12-16

Announcements –

* TRID flyer – trid.trb.org, the best place to start your literature reviews
* Resilience conference Nov 13-15, 2019,
* Women’s Issues in Transportation international conference this year in Irvine. Call for abstracts open right now – traditional and non-traditional (like art!), closes Jan 31. Sept 10-13
  + [www.trb.org/conferences/wiit2019.aspx](http://www.trb.org/conferences/wiit2019.aspx)
  + Also a TRR special edition coming this summer.

Committee announcements

Bill presented Steve with a certificate of appreciation for serving as the committee chair for the past 3 years. Steve has asked to step down due to work demands, but we are very grateful for his leadership for the past three years!

Stephanie Dock will be the next committee chair.

Guest Presenters

**8:55 | Federal Update | Jeff Davis, Eno**

How are we going to pay for what we need?

* Step 1: get out of FY19
  + Shutdown is holding a lot back, since anyone reliant on annual appropriations is not working. FHWA is good until June but FTA and Office of the Secretary are shut down
  + Major agenda items are on “hold” pending a resolution of the shutdown
  + Everyone who is supposed to be writing budgets is furloughed
  + FTA shutdown will impact urban areas, but how it impacts is not clear – FTA outlays are lumpier than FHWA’s. Statewide rural transit providers appear to be feeling the pinch first on FTA operating subsidies because they have less cash on hand
* Mandatory vs. Discretionary – problems loom
  + Mandatory: highway trust fund (HTF) – largely stable
    - HTF runs out of funding halfway through FY21, need to find ~$20billion/year
  + Discretionary: everything besides HTF
    - Problem arrives in FY20 – need to cut all non-defense funding (by about $50 billion to keep current funding levels, really more like $60-70 billion for increases to continue) or find new revenues, or the sequestration will kick in and cut back spending
    - The spending cap impacts essentially all infrastructure funding not from HTF – the extra funds in the budget deals had put a lot to transportation infrastructure
    - This requires a new budget deal, will not necessarily get until run into debt issues (Jeff’s prediction)
    - HTF receipts flat, outlays continue to grow ($26.4B gap in 2028) – basically need an extra $300 billion for baseline infrastructure
* Can’t start talking about a new 6-year transportation bill until address these base issues are up

Defining the “Infrastructure Bill”

* Appropriators say the annual Transportation-HUD bill is “the infrastructure bill”
  + With additional funds that have been given to transportation of late, expect to hear folks protest if return to “normal” funding levels (i.e. lower)
* Talk to transportation committees in House and Senate, the recurring highway/transit bill is “the infrastructure bill”
* Speaker Pelosi is drafting a large infrastructure bill from a variety of House committees, which includes a lot of different types of “infrastructure”
* “Green New Deal” will almost certainly have to change the highway funding program as it exists now since basing funding on gas sales doesn’t work for a decarbonized future
* Questions:
  + Last year’s approach – put money in, define how to use later
  + Will the Administration put its surface transportation reauthorization proposal out with the FY20 Budget? Or wait another year?
  + Will Congress deal with FAST reauthorization this year (a year before the deadline) or do a separate infrastructure bill this year?

Q&A:

* What should big cities be most concerned with over the next few years?
  + Program growth at the federal level needed to get better projects in the pipeline
  + Need to see how Congress might stand up to anti-urban bias in Trump administration (rural/ex-urban coalition got Trump elected, they have been rewarding them – can see in TIGER grants going 60%+ to rural/ex-urban areas)
  + NYC Gateway project issues

**9:25 | Dynamics of Change in Travel in the Largest U.S. Cities | Nancy McGuckin**

National Household Travel Survey defines big cities as metro areas with 3 million+

Biggest demographic trend is the aging population – means there will be relatively fewer households with children and a greater share of retired households

Long term trends have shown slight increase in % of households without vehicles, but now seeing slight increases in vehicle ownership in some of the lowest income households (e.g. Uber/Lyft helping with leasing)

Slowing growth in travel – a combination of factors - population growth and trip length have increased (but trip length growth is partly due to longer vehicle trips due to loss of smaller airport service); fewer trips overall, and more people stayed home.

Overall U.S. population growth is slowing. Nearly 1/5 of states displayed absolute population losses over the past two years. Not distributed evenly – emptying out the middle, filling in the coasts.

Largest cities are growing slower than the rest of the nation – most of the growth is going to small and medium sized cities

Travel rates are going down by nearly all measures, by nearly all age groups except over 65 \*huge impacts on safety

Work hasn’t changed much, biggest loss is in shopping and errands – because they are getting more deliveries

On an average day, more people don’t leave home, more work at home

Vehicle trip rates have decreased in urban areas, transit trip rates are up

Just completed a TCRP report (201) on understanding changes in demographics, preferences, and markets for public transportation

* Millennials aging are going to impact transit
* Gen Z (behind Millennials) are about 10% smaller than Millennials
* Understanding how new services can complement or compete with transit

Travel is changing

* Expect slowing growth rate and aging population to be reflected in travel rates in next decade
* Local trip-making for shopping and errands has declined while home deliveries have doubled, but also see more recreational trips because of time for that
* Questions about person-trip lengths for long-haul trips that we lack data about
* For transit, disruptive trends
* Revenue:
  + Lower VMT means lower gas tax receipts
  + More on-demand services mean less parking revenues (fees and tickets)

Q&A:

* NHTS survey questions do get updated?
  + Yes, but there are a core set of questions that have been asked for last 50 years, going through a big methodological review right now
* How confident in the data for active transportation modes?
  + Bicycle data is not very usable due to large error ranges from small sample. Walking has a better sample and is more reliable as a dataset
  + Nancy puts out briefs on her website

**9:45 | Making Room for Innovation on City Streets | Laura Schewel, CEO, Streetlight Data**

* StreetLight Overview
  + Big Data
    - Trends being applied to major cities
    - Overused term
    - Mobile device data from 23% if US and Canadian adults
    - Purchase, clean up, and turn into useful analytics
  + Supporting over 2000 projects throughout US and Canada
  + Best Practices and trends for how to put this to work:
    - Now covering bike/ped data
    - 3 step process
      * Save Time and Money – access to more data for same amount of money
      * Go Bigger – inform decisions with real-time information
      * Go Beyond - monitor and plan proactively in a dynamic world
        + Reacting to new mobility
        + Reacting to changing travel behavior (one person using many modes in 1 week)
* Case Studies from Pasadena
  + Cross-sectional look at before and after studies
    - Data based on a snapshot in time to compare improvements
      * How the road diet affected road travel in the community – volumns, etc
  + VMT as a metric to measure environmental impact in the past
    - Now able to see denser neighborhoods take shorter trips – better measurement
    - Better sample size and ability to finetune models
    - Changing signal timing and ID need for intersection improvements
    - Can track how long trips actually are and change signal optimization
    - First step for smaller cities to engage in data analytics before hiring full-time staff
  + Q&A
    - Analyzing street type versus use, distribution by trip length vs road type
      * Helps to show that we don’t always need only large arterials to move traffic
      * Potential research idea with NACTO
    - Data confidence?
      * White paper that shows validation study (link from Laura)
      * Errors: phone pings: are you walking or biking?, full trips
      * Goal is to be as good as a bike count or survey
    - Looking at fatalities?
      * USDOT data safety competition
      * Finalist with Ford
      * Combining car and ped data
      * Need to look at full numbers: bike crash on road with 10 riders vs. 100
    - Location cell phone tracking
      * Working with apps that collected the data you’ve opted to share
      * Not working with cell phone providers

**10:05 | Local E-Scooter Policies | Rachel Zach, Remix**

Surveyed 17 cities about how local regulators responded to new mobility – what precedents are being set?

4 Categories

* Vendor caps
  + Challenge: oversupply of vehicles may cause obstruction of the right of way, whereas undersupply may stifle adoptions
  + Lesson: caps based on performance allow the city to work with providers to achieve a balance
  + Caps do not seem to correspond to population – it’s really driven by cap size and number of vendors
  + Nashville set initial caps for first few months, then moved to performance-based
* Maintenance and safety
  + Challenge: determining the type of oversight and infrastructure investment necessary for safe operations
  + Lesson learned: writing clear guidelines to provides reinforced by infrastructure signals for users
  + Good example: Seattle’s policy around historical maintenance
* Fees
  + Challenge: establishing a fee schedule
  + Very standard to put a fee on the vehicle
    - Christchurch, NZ used their sidewalk café table fee to set their scooter fee
  + Portland did a per trip fee
  + Lesson learned: develop fee schedules tied to fleet size or trips
* Data sharing
  + Challenge:
  + Lesson learned: require access through an API and data in a standard format

Recommendations

* Establish performance caps
* Set clear rules
* Establish modest per trip fees
* Require digital reporting infrastructure
* Require MDS (mobility data specification, led by Los Angeles)

They have a summary on the policies they looked at

Q&A

* Would be very good to know best practices on legislative level – for state/regional focus that needs to bear on this. This is also a form of transit
* Safety – good to focus on space, but do need to respond to the fact that these modes are using space used by cars and that causes concerns
  + See synergies in building out the infrastructure to support all vulnerable road users
  + Per trip fees can build in a funding source to support infrastructure
* Did you look into equity policies?
  + Have a second report on this – “Micromobility’s opportunity to serve the underserved edges”
  + You can have policy intents – like requiring distribution geographically – but if people are not using those scooters, that doesn’t fix anything. Need incentives to use or removing barriers to access. Should also think about how things like fees might be unfair (e.g. require that fees for loading value not be transferred to users)
* Good synergies with EJ committee on research around equity questions
* Suggestions around managing the fact that the vendors are profit-maximizing and chasing certain market segments vs. desire on the part of cities to ensure access for all
  + As noted above, go beyond just geographic distribution requirements
  + May need to increase the cap size – let them have more vehicles so they can serve both objectives

**10:40 | Open Floor | All**

* Looking for communications solutions to communicate better as a committee
* Transportation 4 America Playbook Launch: Launched today
* NSF Civic Innovation challenge: January 31st deadline
* Remaining TRB sessions:
  + New Mobility Options Lectern
  + Transportation Equity Joint Subcommittee
  + Evolving Methods of Measuring Transportation System Performance Lectern
  + Balancing Cross-Agency Needs Lectern
  + Poster Session

**11:00 | Closing Remarks | Steve Buckley**