California First To Require Localities to Consider Complete Streets

Not a Mandate, but Requires Local Officials to Explore Options to Implement Complete Streets

With the passage of Assembly Bill (AB) 1358, California became the first state in the nation to incorporate complete streets principles into the design of all local streets and roadways. Beginning January 2011, any substantive revision of the circulation element in the general plan of a California local government must include complete streets considerations.

Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger signed AB 1358, known as the California Complete Streets Act of 2008, on September 30. The bill was authored by Assemblyman Mark Leno (D-San Francisco) and co-sponsored by the California Bicycle Coalition (CBC) and AARP California.

The purpose of the bill is to make roads safer and more convenient for bikes, pedestrians, and seniors while helping to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and ease traffic congestion.

AB 1358 requires a city or county legislative body, when making revisions to the circulation element of the general plan, to identify how they will balance the needs of all users of the roadway, including motorists, pedestrians, bicyclists, children, seniors, individuals with disabilities, and users of public transportation.

The plan also must address the multimodal circulation component of the transportation system to ease congestion and aid in the flow of traffic. Such accommodations may include sidewalks, bike lanes, crosswalks, wide shoulders, medians, bus pullouts, raised crosswalks and audible pedestrian signals, among others measures.

“Streets aren’t just for cars, they’re for people and AB 1358 will ensure our roadways are safe and convenient for everyone—young or old, riding a bike or on foot, in a car or on a bus,” said Assemblyman Leno.

New TMIP Virtual Mentoring and Technical Support Center Opens

Earlier this month the Travel Model Improvement Program (TMIP) announced a new phase in the Travel Model Mentoring Program. The Virtual Mentoring & Technical Support Center (VMTSC) represents an effort by TMIP to expand the reach of the mentoring program by offering weekly one-hour online virtual office sessions via the TMIP web conferencing system. These virtual office sessions are designed to enhance the exchange of technical knowledge, provide wider opportunities for new travel demand modelers to gain knowledge from experienced modelers, and more widely communicate the breadth of experiences within the travel modeling community.

As currently envisioned, these weekly virtual office sessions will involve dialogue between mentors and the modeling community through responses and
Atlanta Creates Regional Transit Vision

For the First Time All Stakeholders are Involved; Network Will Connect the Region Through an Integrated Series of Transit Infrastructure Investments and Service Enhancements

The Atlanta Transit Planning Board (TPB), a temporary planning entity, was formed in 2006 to create a regional transit vision for the Atlanta metropolitan area. Guided by the leadership of the Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC), the Georgia Regional Transportation Authority (GRTA), and the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA), and with representation from all the stakeholders in the Atlanta region, the TPB was charged with establishing a unified vision for public transportation throughout the region.

The TPB board of directors includes the county chairs from the 11 counties in the region, the mayor of Atlanta, and three appointees from the Governor as well as the board chairs from the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT), GRTA, MARTA and the MARTA general manager.

The Transportation Planning Board developed a vision for a regional transit system in metro Atlanta known as “Concept 3,” because it builds upon the strengths of two earlier concepts developed by the TPB. In August, the TPB board of directors unanimously voted to adopt “Concept 3” as its vision for the future of metro Atlanta transit.

“The Transit Planning Board was created specifically to craft a vision for transit in the metro Atlanta region,” says Cheryl King, staff director of the TBP. “By assigning this task to a temporary entity with a well-defined purpose and limited authority, the existing agencies decoupled the need for better planning from politics.”

According to Sigele Winbush of the Transit Planning Board, the effort to create a regional transit plan got underway between late 2006 and early 2007 with a comprehensive review of existing transportation and land use plans. Equipped with a solid understanding of prior planning efforts and projected transportation demands facing the region, the next task was developing a conceptual framework for a regional transit plan.

Two concepts were presented to the board in September 2007. The board responded by directing the staff to develop and refine the two concepts to create a third framework, which would become Concept 3.

Concept 3 represents a new milestone in regional collaboration towards a unified vision for transit in the metro Atlanta region. The effort is unique because, for the first time in the region’s history, all of the key players have come together to develop a comprehensive transit plan.

Since early 2007, TPB has engaged the public to more accurately gauge and reflect public opinion about transit issues. TPB used a scientifically-based, statistically significant regional phone survey as well as an online survey to explore interests and attitudes regarding transit and transportation and to inform key stakeholders and elected officials about public opinion of Concept 3.

A telephone survey of 4,123 residents of the metro Atlanta region was conducted for TPB by Ayres McHenry and Associates from March 13-24, 2008. The survey revealed broad-based support for a regional transit network and provided important feedback about Concept 3 that will help planners in meeting metro Atlanta’s future transit needs.

Winbush says that “as proposed, Concept 3 connects the region through an integrated series of transit infrastructure investments and service enhancements that build upon the existing transit network. Through a combination of heavy and light rail, commuter rail, bus rapid transit, express buses, vanpools, arterial buses and a network of regional suburban buses, TPB suggests building upon this foundation of transit service to establish a regional transit network.”

MARTA already has adopted the regional transit vision and GRTA and ARC are expected to do the same in the next few months. Winbush explains that the ultimate goal is for Concept 3 to be included in ARC’s long-range regional Aspirations Plan. Through this process, officials hope the plan can overcome any political and financial obstacles and move toward implementation and construction.

The members of TPB recognize that the solution to metro Atlanta’s traffic problems must be multi-modal and include transit as part of a well-planned, data-driven, cost-effective, balanced and tailored approach.

For more information, visit www.ftp.ga.gov or contact Sigele Winbush, Transit Planning Board, at tel. (404) 736-3558 or swinbush@ahmann.com.
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Montreal Tests Wireless, Solar Powered, Bicycle Rental Pay Stations; Provides Bike Share Locations in Most of Its CBD

The City of Montreal is implementing a pilot program, called BIXI(i), to test wireless, solar powered bicycle rental pay stations. Montreal’s bicycle sharing system is the first to be managed together with street parking, through the same wireless payment terminals that can also interconnect with public transit systems. It is also one of the first bike sharing systems in North America to offer a bike-share program to its citizens in most central areas, as a complement to public transit and an alternative to cars.

The Montreal pilot project offers 40 self-service, exclusively designed BIXI (derived from BIcycle and taXI) bikes available at four stations. Users can rent a bicycle from one station and leave it later at the most convenient point of the network. The pay stations process all payment functions (cash and electronic) as well as the locking and unlocking of bicycles at docking facilities, and also manage all interactions and monitoring within the network. The current trial will be followed by a large scale installation of 2,400 bicycles and 300 pay stations in the spring of 2009.

The pay stations are provided by 8D Technologies. The company provides the only system that can manage both parking and bicycle rental from a single network of interrelated payment terminals. Other connections, with transit systems for instance, can be implemented, opening the way for integrated solutions, such as a single user card for all transit solutions and public parking. The bicycle pay stations are modular. This makes it easy to add bicycles at a particular pay station.

Montreal currently has the world’s largest pay-by-space installation with close to 1,700 pay stations, based on 8D’s platform.

For more information, contact Isabelle Bettez, president and CEO, 8D Technologies Inc., tel. (514) 906-1212 ext. 222, e-mail: ibettez@8D.com. Stationnement de Montreal is in charge of the BIXI(i) project and more information about the project is available from their website at http://www.publicbikesystem.com.

Smart Traffic Light Technology May Revolutionize Traffic Management; Aldis Showcases GridSmart at Congressional Roundtable

Aldis, Inc., a leader in next-generation traffic management systems, demonstrated new traffic light technology at a recent roundtable discussion on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) for members of the U.S. House of Representatives Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee on Highways and Transit.

The patent-pending GridSmart™ solution is a single camera with an ultra-wide lens that can see horizon to horizon, explains Bill Malkes, Aldis chief operating officer. Malkes told UTM that the GridSmart™ system uses panoramic imaging to capture the full view of the intersection, and then creates vectors of all vehicles, bicyclists and pedestrians to track real traffic flow patterns and demands. The location, direction and speed of all the individual parts feeds into heuristic and genetic algorithms at the local intersection level to create an automated, proactive real-time traffic management system. This creates the best signal control for an intersection, independent of any central authority and free of the need to tie multiple intersections together, he said.

Malkes stressed that the focus of the GridSmart technology is on maximizing the smooth flow of traffic, reducing stops and starts. GridSmart functions like a “self-tweaking algorithm,” he explained. Initially, it responds to circumstances based on a predetermined baseline. Then it
Bicycle Commuter Benefits Signed Into Law Through “Piggyback” Action
Washington, D.C.
As part of the so-called pork add-ons to the $700 billion Wall Street bailout package (HR 1424) that passed the house earlier this month, and was signed into law by President Bush, Congressman Blumenauer of Oregon included a bike commuter benefit provision.

The $20 per month (maximum) benefit, becomes effective on January 1, 2009 according to the Congressman’s website http://blumenauer.house.gov. Under this law employers may reimburse employees, tax free, for “reasonable” expenses related to their bike commute, including equipment purchases, bike purchases, repairs, and storage if the bicycle is used as a “substantial part” of the commuter’s trip to work for the month.

Below is the wording of relevant parts of the bicycle commuter benefits:

Transportation Fringe Benefit to Bicycle Commuters.
(i) Qualified Bicycle Commuting Reimbursement
The term ‘qualified bicycle commuting reimbursement’ means, with respect to any calendar year, any employer reimbursement during the 15-month period beginning with the first day of such calendar year for reasonable expenses incurred by the employee during such calendar year for the purchase of a bicycle and bicycle improvements, repair, and storage, if such bicycle is regularly used for travel between the employee’s residence and place of employment.

(ii) Applicable Annual Limitation
The term ‘applicable annual limitation’ means, with respect to any employee for any calendar year, the product of $20 multiplied by the number of qualified bicycle commuting months during such year.

Miami Airport To Get Second Automated People Mover System
Miami, FL
A second Automated People Mover (APM) system is to be built at Miami International Airport (MIA).

The new APM system will run between the airport and an off-airport, multi-modal transportation center known as the Miami Intermodal Center (MIC).

In September, the Miami-Dade County Board of Commissioners awarded the contract to Parsons Odebrecht Joint Venture (POJV). The POJV Team, which includes Mitsubishi Odebrecht Joint Venture (MHIA) and Sumitomo Corporation of America (SCOA), was awarded the $259 million contract following a competitive bid process and the formal notice-to-proceed was issued earlier this month.

The first phase of the contract includes the full turnkey delivery of eight state-of-the-art Crystal Mover APM vehicles.

The second phase of the contract provides for a 15-month period beginning with the first day of such calendar year for the purchase of a bicycle and bicycle improvements, repair, and storage, if such bicycle is regularly used for travel between the employee’s residence and place of employment.

The $20 per month (maximum) benefit, becomes effective on January 1, 2009 according to the Congressman’s website http://blumenauer.house.gov. Under this law employers may reimburse employees, tax free, for “reasonable” expenses related to their bike commute, including equipment purchases, bike purchases, repairs, and storage if the bicycle is used as a “substantial part” of the commuter’s trip to work for the month.

According to Greg Chin, media relations manager of the Miami-Dade Aviation Department, the MIA Mover will have the capacity to transport more than 3,000 passengers per hour on six cars, with two additional cars on standby, for a total initial fleet of eight cars.

The same team, SCOA/MHIA, was awarded a $109 million contract in 1999 to construct an APM system at MIA’s North Terminal. All the vehicles for the North Terminal system have been delivered and construction of the system is nearing completion.

As with the North Terminal APM system, the MIA Mover APM system will utilize cutting-edge Crystal Mover vehicle technology. That technology is now or soon will be in use at other airports in the U.S. including Washington-Dulles International and Atlanta Hartsfield-Jackson International Airport and international locations including Changi (Singapore), Incheon (South Korea), Dubai (UAE) and Hong Kong International Airports.

In addition to APM systems, SCOA has developed, managed, and delivered transit systems for Chicago’s METRA, the Northern Indiana Commuter Transportation District, the Maryland Mass Transit Administration, California’s CALTRANS Peninsula Joint Powers Board, the Los Angeles County MTA, the New York City Transit Authority and
the Virginia Railway Express.

For more information, contact Greg Chin, Miami-Dade Aviation Department, at tel. (305) 869-3809 or gchin@miami-airport.com.

Plan to Lease Pennsylvania Turnpike Fails
Harrisburg, PA

The plan to lease the Pennsylvania Turnpike to foreign investors for 75 years, which had been pushed by Governor Ed Rendell as a better way to raise money for state transit needs, has fallen apart – at least for now.

Pennsylvania Transportation Partners (PTP), the consortium led by Abertis Infraestructuras with Citi Infrastructure Partners and Criteria CaixaCorp, has decided not to extend its offer for the lease of the turnpike, which expired on September 30. The group had won the May bidding to lease the turnpike with an offer of $12.8 billion.

The group had extended its offer twice to help comply with the legislative process in the Pennsylvania General Assembly. According to Abertis, “The decision [not to extend the offer] was based on the timetable and situation of the legislature in the state of Pennsylvania that should grant the turnpike’s concession, the financial uncertainties and the opportunities offered by the infrastructure market at present.”

Abertis and its consortium partners still believe that the concession model for the Pennsylvania Turnpike is the best way for the state to meet its infrastructure financing needs, the press release said. Research conducted for the project, including work with the Pennsylvania authorities and members of the state legislature, leave Abertis and its partners “in excellent shape to reconsider the project when the time is right,” the statement said.

According to Bill Capone, director of communications for the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission (PTC), it is hard to predict what might or might not happen in the future. Currently, he said, toll revenue is down on the turnpike, most likely as a result of the current downturn in the economy and the high price of gas. This probably means that drivers are driving less, avoiding toll roads, and using the turnpike for a shorter portion of their trips to save money, he said.

An alternate plan to raise money for state transportation needs by introducing tolling on Interstate 80, a major east-west route in northern Pennsylvania also recently fell apart when the Federal Highway Administration rejected an application submitted by the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation and the PTC. Pennsylvania’s current transportation funding law, Act 44, called for the PTC to lease I-80 from PennDot and convert it into a toll road. Asked if the PTC would be resubmitting the application for tolling on I-80, Capone said that no final decision has been made.

For more information visit www.abertis.com/en/ or contact Bill Capone at tel. (717) 939-9551.

Los Angeles Metro Addresses Demand for Safe, Convenient Bike Parking; Insufficient Facilities Result in Bikes Chained to Trees, Benches
Los Angeles, CA

Responding to a significant increase in the number of commuters combining bicycling with public transportation usage, Los Angeles Metro is developing new strategies to accommodate bicycles at Metro stations throughout the system.

Funding for bike programs has not always been readily available but, according to Metro spokesman Dave Sotero, this definitely will be a priority in the near future. Metro’s budget for the next five years includes $100,000 per year for bike facilities and accommodations.

Metro is experiencing systemwide record ridership this year, boosted by the high cost of gasoline combined with a sluggish economy, and the increase in bike usage mirrors this trend. As a result, bicycle parking has been very difficult at some rail stations lately.

At many designated Metro bike parking facilities, space has been at a premium in recent months. Commuters also report an increase in the number of bikes chained to trees, benches, and other solid structures surrounding the stations. Sotero notes that at the North Hollywood Station in particular, because it is a high traffic junction between the Orange and Red lines, racks have been full to overflowing almost everyday.

The Los Angeles transit agency has actively promoted the use of bikes to get to and from stations for several years. Metro buses are outfitted with bike racks and officials are looking at ways to improve bike facilities at rail stations throughout the system.

Racks and lockers are currently available at many locations but the additional funding will enable Metro to expand bike parking options and improve storage accommodations. Metro is working with commuters to ensure that bike storage options are available, convenient and safe.

On the Orange line, which runs alongside a bike path, 15 bicycles have been reported stolen this year. Sotero says Metro is sympathetic to the victims of bike theft but does not consider bike stealing a major problem at this point.

Metro also has launched an effort to teach people how to better protect their parked bikes. The agency provides information about good quality locks and riders are discouraged from using simple cable or chain locks in favor of more effective U-shaped, steel locks. Officials also recommend locking the frame and both tires to enhance security.

For more information, visit www.metro.net or contact Dave Sotero, LA Metro, at tel. (213) 922-3007.
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California First to Require Complete Streets

cars and riding bicycles or the bus can improve air quality and reduce greenhouse emissions. This bill provides a unique opportunity to help cities and counties meet standards set by AB 32, the landmark legislation capping greenhouse gas emissions in California.”

Caltrans has had a Complete Streets policy in place for several years but it is limited to state highway projects. The new statewide law will compliment the existing policy, which directs Caltrans to “fully consider the needs of non-motorized travelers (including pedestrians, bicyclists and persons with disabilities) in all programming, planning, maintenance, construction, operations and project development activities and products.”

Jim Brown, communications director for the CBC, explains that AB 1358 is a call to cities and counties, as they update elements of their general plans, to determine if streets adequately accommodate the needs of cyclists, pedestrians and all other users as well as motor vehicles. The law does not mandate anything but instead requires officials to look at their options and see what can be done to implement complete streets policies.

California Governor Schwarzenegger has stated his opposition to legislation that imposes mandates on cities and counties without providing appropriate funding. He supported the complete streets legislation because it simply requires that complete streets policies be considered during the updating process rather than mandating a specific policy or action.

Five other states, Washington, Oregon, Massachusetts, Virginia, and Illinois, also have some form of complete streets legislation or internal policies in place, and more than 70 jurisdictions have adopted complete streets measures. These include not just state laws but local ordinances, internal policies and transportation agency policies.

For more information, visit www.completestreets.org or www.calbike.org or contact Jim Brown, CBC, at tel. (916) 446-7558.
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responds to information over time based on how efficiently vehicles get through the intersection, he said. Local control of traffic is dynamic and adaptive.

“If the camera sees you coming and there is nothing in the other direction, it changes the signal so you don’t have to stop,” Malkes said. By reducing the time that cars spend idling, the cameras can help improve fuel-economy and lower pollution from emissions.

According to the Aldis website, weighting in GridSmart™ algorithms is applied to trucks and buses to optimize their flow through intersections. Creating traffic vectors allows the system to enhance intersection safety, anticipate red-light runners, sense emergency vehicles, and extend the intersection timing to mitigate intersection crashes.

Malkes said that the two main products under the GridSmart umbrella are Spectra 360 and Ultra 360. Spectra 360 uses a 360-degree fish eye lens to see the entire intersection and several hundred feet beyond in all directions. Its software integrates multiple data streams to make intelligent, real-time intersection management calculations. By calculating the amount, types and speed of all traffic at the intersection, and optimizing signals accordingly, Spectra 360 maximizes traffic flow and reduces wait times at the intersection. Spectra provides traffic data that can be used for synchronization of signals, Malkes said.

Ultra 360™ utilizes Spectra 360’s advanced tracking power to enable adaptive traffic management and advanced safety features. Ultra 360™ options include vehicle speed, turn and pedestrian counts, emergency vehicle preemption modes, machine-enabled red light running mitigation and real-time video feeds. Asked if GridSmart does real-time signal timing like SCOOT, Malkes said that Ultra 360 is like SCOOT in that it makes the best decision at each intersection. However, he pointed out that it uses a different approach: It is a decentralized solution that is adaptive to traffic at the individual intersection.

Malkes said that the commercial release of GridSmart is scheduled for December 2008. It is currently in beta testing in 16 locations, he added. The base unit will cost about $10,000, and the cost of a software enhancement package is yet to be determined.

According to Malkes, the benefit of these systems is that they are no more expensive than in-road sensors that now operate many intersection signals and don’t require tearing up the street for installation or repair.

For more information, visit http://aldiscorp.com/ or contact Bill Malkes at tel. (865) 680-6758.
Flexible, Actively Managed Highways

Achieving High Performance on Metropolitan Highway Systems by Combining Active Traffic Management and Peak-Period User Fees

By Patrick DeCorla-Souza

Shoulders on the right side of limited access highways could be used as “dynamic” rush hour travel lanes to create a high-performing “flexible” highway network in major metropolitan areas. The shoulder lane would be open for travel only during peak periods, in conjunction with active management of all lanes on the highway, e.g., using overhead lane controls to harmonize speeds and keep traffic flowing freely and safely. Variable user fees and ramp metering would be deployed to keep demand for use within the capacity of the system. Revenues from rush hour user fees would likely be sufficient to pay for the capital costs for new emergency pull-off areas, tolling infrastructure, active traffic management systems and new transit services, as well as annual costs for operation and maintenance expenses.

Such a flexible, actively managed highway network would involve a relatively small capital investment, would require little or no new rights-of-way, could be financed from the rush hour user fee revenue stream, and could be implemented in a relatively short period of time. In the Netherlands, such flexible, actively managed highways have proven to be safe. Should an incident occur in any lane, overhead lane controls (see photo) are used to shut down the appropriate lane(s) in advance of the incident location.

User fee rates could be pre-scheduled according to time of day and location to manage demand based on observed traffic patterns, and ramp metering could be used as a back-up to control access in case user fees by themselves do not ensure free flow of traffic on any segment. All vehicles, except authorized buses and vanpools assigned special transponder IDs, would pay the fees. Vehicle occupancy enforcement would be thus be greatly simplified. Carpools would still have monetary incentives, because carpoolers could share the toll. Vehicles without valid transponders could be charged using license plate recognition, also known as “video tolling.”

Flexible, actively managed highways could increase both person throughput as well as freeway vehicle throughput during rush hours. Vehicle throughput would increase because an extra lane (i.e., the dynamic shoulder travel lane) would be available during peak periods and active management of traffic would reduce the loss of vehicle throughput that occurs on unmanaged highways due to breakdown of traffic flow at bottlenecks. Person throughput could increase due to increased use of transit and ridesharing.

Freeways could be re-striped and the lanes reduced from 12 ft. width to 11 ft. to accommodate a 13-ft.-wide dynamic shoulder travel lane on the far right. If extra pavement width is needed, some pavement could be added, or taken from the left shoulder. It is estimated that a 300-mile existing network of 6-lane freeways in a major metropolitan area would require about $3.4 billion in capital costs for conversion to a flexible, actively managed system. The system could generate almost $1.0 billion in toll revenue annually, allowing such a system to be fully financed through rush hour user fees after accounting for costs for operation and maintenance. Several public opinion surveys conducted in recent years have found that the public prefers tolls to taxes to pay for highway improvements.

Metropolitan areas will need to conduct more detailed feasibility studies of concepts such as this, and develop them more fully. The Federal Highway Administration is soliciting applications for region-wide pricing studies of pricing concepts that can be deployed in a relatively short time frame, through its Value Pricing Pilot Program. Applications are due by November 7, 2008. The solicitation is available at: http://www.ops.fhwa.dot.gov/tolling_pricing/index.htm.

A paper describing the concept in this article as well as other concepts is available at: http://www.fightgridlocknow.gov/docs/Combining%20Pricing_and_ATM.htm.

For more information, contact: Patrick DeCorla-Souza, AICP, Federal Highway Administration, Washington, DC, Phone: 202-366-4076; E-Mail: patrick.decorla-souza@dot.gov
Unprecedented Toll Rate Reduction on California’s OCTA 91 Express Lanes

Policy to Increase and Decrease Toll Rates Based on Demand

The Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) on October 1, 2008 reduced toll charges on the 91 Express Lanes for the first time since OCTA took ownership in 2003.

The toll rate adjustment reflects a decrease in toll-paying vehicles of 8 percent this year over the same time last year. In fiscal year 2008, 13.4 million trips generated $39.6 million in toll revenue compared to 14.6 million trips and $49.8 million in 2007. Revenue in 2006, 2005 and 2004 was $37.5 million, $32.5 million and $27 million respectively.

Commuters now will pay less to travel in the lanes because tolls have been reduced by 50 cents during numerous periods throughout the day. The peak toll of $10 will drop to $9.50 and 13 other time slots will see adjustments as well. Toll rates will now vary depending on hour, day and direction of travel from $1.25 to $9.50. The OCTA congestion management pricing policy that has been in effect on the 10-mile toll road since 2003 calls for dropping and raising tolls based on demand. The toll is designed to reflect market realities and to keep traffic free flowing.

According to Joel Zlotnik, toll authority spokesman, the formula in place automatically increases or decreased tolls based on changes in traffic volume. Traffic volume is monitored on a daily basis and adjusted quarterly.

Zlotnik explains that if the number of cars traveling in any given period increases beyond 3,200 cars per hour in 6 of 12 segments, the rate is adjusted upward to keep traffic moving. Conversely, if the rate decreases below 2,720 cars per hour in 6 of 12 segments, the rate is adjusted downward to maximize traffic lane usage.

Factors such as high gas prices, a slowing economy and concern about the environmental impact of driving all have contributed to a decrease in toll road usage. Zlotnik notes that increased unemployment in the area also has impacted traffic volume.

There are 20,000 fewer jobs in Orange County right now than at this time last year. Unemployment in the Inland Empire reached 9.2 percent in August compared to 6.4 percent a year ago. In Orange County, unemployment in August was 5.8 percent, up from 4.2 percent last year.

The reduced tolls are not expected to negatively impact operations of the 91 Express Lanes. OCTA purchased the toll lanes in 2003 without taxpayer dollars and to date revenue and traffic have both increased by approximately 50 percent, surpassing original projections.

To learn more, visit www.octa.net/91tolls or contact Joel Zlotnik, 91 Express Lanes, at tel. (714) 560-5713.
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New TMIP Virtual Mentoring and Technical Support Center Opens

related to pre-submitted questions from the travel modeling community. The goal of the virtual office sessions is to provide answers to as many questions as possible along with elaboration on the issues raised by questions within the allowable time. The online virtual office will be set-up to allow attendees to come and go as needed. The virtual office sessions will be recorded and, when feasible, made available via podcast.

The format is likely to involve responses from volunteer mentors to the pre-submitted questions, followed by a short follow-up discussion among those who login to the virtual office. Issues and questions that can be dealt with within the parameters of the one-hour virtual office sessions will make-up the content of these online chats. The schedule for the virtual office hours will be alternating Mondays and Fridays each week. At any one time a maximum of 20 logins to the office will be available on a first-come, first-served basis there. As users logout, new users will be able to login and participate in the virtual office session.

The virtual office sessions will not replace the TMIP webinars. They represent a new first level of TMIP support to the travel modeling community by offering a regular weekly opportunity to submit questions, receive guidance and discuss issues with other travel modeling professionals. Questions and issues that require more detailed dialogue and/or are of wider interest will be candidates for a TMIP webinar. Issues which are location specific and could benefit from intense review will be considered for a Peer Exchange or Peer Review.

The key staff member for the center will be Mr. Andy Mullins. Andy is a research scientist with the Texas Transportation Institute. His activities are focused on travel demand forecasting as well as transportation planning. He has more than 20 years of experience in transportation planning and 18 years experience in travel demand modeling. Over the course of his career he has worked in transportation research, private consulting and with an MPO.

The VMTSC is scheduled to open on October 2, 2008 with the first weekly virtual office to follow soon thereafter.

For more information, visit http://tmip.fhwa.dot.gov/ or contact Andy Mullins tel. (713) 686-2971, e-mail: a-mullins@tamu.edu, or Sarah Sun at tel. (202) 493-0071, e-mail: sarah.sun@dot.gov.
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Editorial

This week’s survey on “Reducing Off-Street Parking Requirements” provided useful information particularly for those cities interested in implementing fewer parking requirements. What is encouraging is that, of the six cities responding to the survey, five indicated that they consider their implementation of reduced off-street parking requirements a success, at least thus far.

 Probably the most valuable information from the survey are the answers to a question “What advice can you provide to those contemplating a reduction in parking requirements?” The key themes of the advice provided are as follows:
- Public education and participation are crucial. Identify all stakeholders and determine their concerns. Address these concerns through education and an open dialogue. It is helpful for acceptance if the parking reductions form part of a broader strategy/plan that has been adopted by the location’s elected officials and is seen as in the best interest of the community. Emphasize the benefits to the stakeholders.
- Quantitative data on existing parking demand by land use category and supply is essential.
- Be prepared for the reality that it can take a considerable amount of time to implement.

Furthermore, the reasons for implementing reduced parking requirements are what should be carefully considered. Here are the main reasons provided in this survey:
- Increase the modal split in favor of transit
- Reduce the physical impact of parking
- Promote adaptive reuse of older buildings
- Support a pedestrian friendly environment

It can be concluded from this survey that the reduction of off-street parking requirements is a tool to consider in certain locations in urban areas, that the experience has so far been positive, and that it is a strategy that offers valuable benefits. Finally, it should be recognized that the implementation of such a measure might be difficult and time-consuming, but not impossible if executed in a transparent way with the involvement of all stakeholders.

Daniel B. Rathbone, Ph.D., P.E.
Publisher/Editor

This Week’s Survey Results

Reducing Off-Street Parking Requirements

The Urban Transportation Monitor conducted a nationwide survey on “Reducing Off-Street Parking Requirements” during the last two weeks. Survey forms were sent to eleven cities where parking reductions were implemented. Information was obtained from six of the eleven cities. The results of the survey are published here.

Contacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF CITY</th>
<th>CONTACT</th>
<th>TEL. NUMBER</th>
<th>E-MAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh, NC</td>
<td>Kenneth Bowers</td>
<td>(919) 516-2633</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Kenneth.bowers@ci.raleigh.nc.us">Kenneth.bowers@ci.raleigh.nc.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>Joshua Switzky</td>
<td>(415) 575-6815</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Joshua.switzky@sfgov.org">Joshua.switzky@sfgov.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>Travis Parker</td>
<td>(202) 741-5243</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Travis.parker@dc.gov">Travis.parker@dc.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>E. David McDonald</td>
<td>(704) 336-6900</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dmcdonald@ci.charlotte.nc.us">dmcdonald@ci.charlotte.nc.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose, CA</td>
<td>Carol Hamilton</td>
<td>(408) 535-7837</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Carol.hamilton@sanjoseca.gov">Carol.hamilton@sanjoseca.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td>Mary Catherine Snyder</td>
<td>(206) 684-8110</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Marycatherine.snyder@seattle.gov">Marycatherine.snyder@seattle.gov</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultants!

Please visit

www.consultant-advantage.com
to obtain RFPs on a weekly basis.
## Reducing Off-Street Parking Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the name of the jurisdiction where parking requirements were reduced?</th>
<th>City of San Francisco</th>
<th>Washington, D.C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What type of parking reduction measure(s) were implemented? Please indicate the new requirement. (e.g., &quot;the minimum parking rate for office buildings was reduced from 3.5 spaces per 1,000 square feet to 2 spaces per 1,000 square feet.&quot;)</td>
<td>In central, transit-rich neighborhoods, all minimum parking requirements were eliminated for all uses, including residential. Maximum limits were imposed for all uses that are generally equivalent to (or in some cases lower than) the previous minimums. Maximum limits for dwelling units range from 1 space per 2 units to 1 space per unit, depending on district and size of unit. Maximum limits for non-residential uses vary by district. Retail limit is generally 1 space per 1,500 square feet. Parking for offices in central districts is limited to 7% of the gross floor area of the office space, or roughly 1 space per 5,000 square feet. Some pedestrian-oriented neighborhood commercial street frontages are now prohibited from having garage access, so mid-block parcels with no alternatives frontage (e.g., alley) cannot have any parking.</td>
<td>Not implemented yet. Recommendations pending are for elimination of all parking minimums except in non-residential uses in single family areas and office and retail uses in commercial corridors near single family areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At which type of locations were these parking reduction measures implemented?</td>
<td>Downtown; neighborhoods near downtown; transit-served neighborhoods.</td>
<td>See above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For what purpose(s) were parking requirements reduced?</td>
<td>Accommodate growth while limiting growth of automobile traffic/ensure that growth is transit-oriented; reduce physical impacts of parking on neighborhood environment; increase housing affordability.</td>
<td>Housing affordability; improve transportation mode split; reduce traffic; avoid opportunity cost of unused parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How was the amount of reduction in parking requirements determined? (e.g. a study/survey was conducted to determine the percentage of individuals who have an alternative to single-occupant vehicle commuting; the amount of internal trip-making due to mixed-use developments, etc.)</td>
<td>Policy deliberation based on amounts of parking in older, existing housing stock and retail uses; census data on household vehicle ownership; policy goals for maximum auto ownership, use and commuting.</td>
<td>For the reasons stated above, parking minimums were removed entirely with exceptions. Standards were not changed in excepted areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was there significant opposition to a reduction in parking requirements? If so, who was opposed and how were the objections overcome?</td>
<td>No major opposition to elimination of minimums in most neighborhoods. Some moderate opposition in outlying neighborhoods. Most &quot;opposition&quot; came in regards to imposition of low, strict maximum limits.</td>
<td>There has been some neighborhood opposition to the proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were the parking reduction measures accompanied by an increase in alternatives to single occupant vehicle commuting? Partially. Most parking legislation was part of comprehensive area plans and rezonings for specific neighborhoods. These plans contain policies and impact fees to improve transit and other modes of transportation. But some of the parking legislation was simply stand-alone and was implemented on its own. All parking legislation included increased requirements for bicycle parking and parking for car sharing vehicles.</td>
<td>D.C. currently has a wide variety of transportation alternatives. There are additional measures underway to add light-rail, bicycle paths, and increased bus service.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In which year were the parking reduction measures implemented?</td>
<td>Planning for 2009/10</td>
<td>Planned for 2009/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the parking reduction measures considered a success?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please provide reasons for your answer to the previous question.</td>
<td>Thriving parts of the city have always been those that are least auto-oriented and those with the least amount of parking. The major growth of the downtown in the last 30 years was only possible with the parking restrictions, as congestion in the downtown has not grown much at all while the downtown has grown exponentially in the past few decades.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What advice can you provide to those contemplating a reduction in parking requirements?</td>
<td>Just do it. No great city is ever known for its abundant parking, and parking only strangles vitality, congests the roads needed by transit, and ultimately undermines any efforts to get people to use transit or other modes. In a city or neighborhood where transit, walking and other modes are viable, the primary determinant people consider in choosing whether to drive or not is whether they can expect to find cheap and easy parking. Getting people out of cars is both a push and pull activity. You can’t just provide the transit - you also have to reduce the capacity to drive. That’s why light-rail and other transit systems built in places and cities that still have lots of parking and auto facilities are not well-used. Transit has to be more convenient. People will choose to visit, shop and live somewhere that is a nice and exciting place to be and walk, and they will get there if there are other ways to get there. A city or neighborhood that tries to compete with others based on available parking is doomed to fail.</td>
<td>Public education and participation are crucial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you consider to be the best resource (report/book) on reducing parking requirements? If possible, please provide title, author(s), and organization that published the report/book.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>We had an excellent study/report done by Nelson/Nygaard Consulting Associates titled &quot;Washington D.C. Review of Zoning Requirements for Parking.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who do you consider as one of the foremost experts on reducing parking requirements? If possible, please provide name an affiliation.</td>
<td>1) Prof. Donald Shoup, UCLA 2) Nelson/Nygaard Consulting Associates</td>
<td>Prof. Donald Shoup, UCLA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N/A = not available
### Reducing Off-Street Parking Requirements (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Charlotte, NC</th>
<th>City of Raleigh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| What is the name of the jurisdiction where the parking requirements were reduced? | Parking maximums for Transit Station Areas:  
- residential maximum: 1.6 per DU  
- office maximum: 1 per 300 sq. ft.  
- restaurant/nightclub maximum: 1 per 75 sq. ft.  
Reduced minimums for Urban Centers:  
- residential minimum: 1 per dwelling unit  
- office minimum: 0.5 to 1.25 per 1,000 sq. ft.  
- hotels minimum: 0.5 per 1,000 sq. ft.  | Under the new regulations, all non-residential uses in the below-mentioned overlay districts are required to provide the lesser of one-space per 400 square feet or general code requirement. (This picks up specific uses such as hotels or bowling alleys which have a standard effectiveness less than 1 per 400.) Residential requirements are a minimum of one and maximum of two spaces per unit. There are also exemptions aimed at small buildings/projects: one for the first 16 units in a residential development, and for the first 10,000 square feet of non-residential use (in the DOD) or retail (PBOD). In the DOD, all retail is exempt up to 30,000 square feet provided that half of the street-level floor area is devoted to retail use. Also, theaters are exempt from parking in the DOD. |
| What type of parking reduction measure(s) were implemented? Please indicate the new requirement. (e.g. “the minimum parking rate for office buildings was reduced from 3.5 spaces per 1,000 square feet to 2 spaces per 1,000 square feet.”) | Yes for TOD/TSD. The construction of the LYNX Light Rail Line. No for UMUDD/MUDD. | | |
| How was the amount of reduction in parking requirements determined? (e.g. a study/survey was conducted to determine the percentage of individuals who have an alternative to single-occupant vehicle commuting; the amount of internal trip-making due to mixed-use developments, etc.) | Charlotte surveyed other cities’ parking requirements and best practices; utilized local examples of transit and pedestrian friendly developments and existing parking; identified and learned from local stakeholders. | We knew our downtown was being adequately parked at present, so we totaled up non-residential floor area versus parking spaces, and came up with the rough ratio of 2.9 spaces per 1,000 square feet. Imposing a flat ratio across most non-residential uses achieved the goal of maintaining a rough status quo with regards to parking. Additional exemptions were identified to encourage ground-level retail and to facilitate the adaptive reuse of smaller, old pre-war buildings with high site coverage. |
| Were the parking reduction measures accompanied by an increase in alternatives to single occupant vehicle commuting? | Yes for TOD/TSD. The construction of the LYNX Light Rail Line. No for UMUDD/MUDD. | | |
| In which year were the parking reduction measures implemented? | 1988 for UMUDD/MUDD. 2003 for TOD/TSD. | There are many long-term transit plans. In the short term, a downtown circulator is the only programmed improvement. 2008. |
| Are the parking reduction measures considered a success? | Yes for TOD/TSD. Limited success for UMUDD/MUDD. | So far, but it’s too early to tell. |
| Please provide reasons for your answer to the previous question. | TOD/TSD: Staying within maximums with no issues to date. UMUDD/MUDD: With no maximums most large developments have tended to greatly exceed minimums. This may change with implementation of LYNX Light Rail. | Development and business community is generally happy with the new regulations, but no projects of great significance have been built under the new regulations. |
| What advice can you provide to those contemplating a reduction in parking requirements? | Identify stakeholders and their concerns, then educate/address to ensure acceptance. Maintain an open dialogue to adjust if needed. If possible ensure implementation is part of a broader plan/investment, such as Integrated Land Use and Transportation Plan. | Quantitative parking data are essential. Don’t rely on demand projects, go out and survey actual occupancy. The results are often eye-opening. Be prepared with real answers for residents of adjacent neighborhoods as to how spill-over impacts will be monitored and addressed. |
| Who do you consider as one of the foremost experts on reducing parking requirements? If possible, please provide name an affiliation. | N/A | Prof. Donald Shoup, UCLA Todd Litman, Victoria Transportation Policy Institute. |

N/A = not available
Reducing Off-Street Parking Requirements (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the name of the jurisdiction where parking requirements were reduced?</th>
<th>City of San Jose</th>
<th>Seattle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What type of parking reduction measure(s) were implemented? Please indicate the new requirement. (e.g. “the minimum parking rate for office buildings was reduced from 3.5 spaces per 1,000 square feet to 2 spaces per 1,000 square feet.”)</td>
<td>Ground floor retail required 1 per 200 square feet of net floor area (based on 85% of gross) floor area. Restaurants 1 per 2.5 seats or 40 square feet of dining area, which ever was greater. Both Changed to 1 per 400 square feet of net floor area in Neighborhood Business Districts.</td>
<td>In January 2007, City of Seattle adopted new parking regulations in neighborhood commercial areas of Seattle. Generally, parking requirements were reduced throughout commercial areas based on Seattle-specific demand data, transit accessibility and City transit and walking goals. Minimum parking requirements were eliminated in designated Urban Centers and light rail station areas to reflect transit accessibility and to encourage new development. A one-acre surface parking maximum was established to reduce new impervious surfaces. Requirements for bicycle parking were revised so that the number of parking spaces doesn’t decrease when the number of required car spaces is reduced or eliminated. Car-share vehicle parking spaces were allowed to replace 3 normal spaces. Other parking regulations were changed to further support growth management and transit-oriented development goals. More information is available at <a href="http://www.seattle.gov/DPD/Planning/Neighborhood_Business_District_Strategy/Overview/">www.seattle.gov/DPD/Planning/Neighborhood_Business_District_Strategy/Overview/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At which type of locations were these parking reduction measures implemented?</td>
<td>13 Neighborhood Business District. Most have or seek pedestrian-oriented main street character.</td>
<td>Citywide, in commercial and neighborhood commercial zones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For what purpose(s) were parking requirements reduced?</td>
<td>- Facilitate reuse of older buildings with little or no existing parking. Prevent parking lots from interrupting retail street frontages. Facilitate pedestrian-oriented shopping districts and encourage alternative forms of transportation.</td>
<td>The code changes in general were crafted to advance Seattle’s urban village strategies and goals. The strategy is intended to: - Support job creation and business vitality - Protect and enhance neighborhood character - Improve the pedestrian environment - Provide for housing growth in neighborhood business districts - Achieve quality design through development flexibility - Support transit connections - Balance parking needs - Make the Land Use Code easier to use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How was the amount of reduction in parking requirements determined? (e.g. a study/survey was conducted to determine the percentage of individuals who have an alternative to single-occupant vehicle commuting; the amount of internal trip-making due to mixed-use developments, etc.)</td>
<td>The proposed parking rate was a compromise after the original proposal to eliminate the parking requirement altogether raised community concern.</td>
<td>The City conducted a parking study in eight neighborhood business districts by measuring parking demand at various land uses on a typical weekday and Saturday. For the most part, the average parking demand figures for land use categories was used to make changes to Seattle’s existing parking requirements. For instance, the study found that the average demand for general retail development was 1 space per 442 square feet, whereas the city’s parking requirement had been 1 space per 350 square feet. The City subsequently changed the parking requirement to 1 space per 500 square feet. More information is available in Chapter 5 of the report at <a href="http://www.seattle.gov/DPD/Planning/Neighborhood_Business_District_Strategy/ProjectBackground/default.asp">http://www.seattle.gov/DPD/Planning/Neighborhood_Business_District_Strategy/ProjectBackground/default.asp</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was there significant opposition to a reduction in parking requirements? If so, who was opposed and how were the objections overcome?</td>
<td>There was some opposition from single-family home owners living in the vicinity of the NBDs. The opposition was muted by the desire of other residents to see their NBD attract more restaurants and other active uses. They understood that a parking reduction could remove barriers to new restaurants and other uses with high parking requirements.</td>
<td>The City worked with community and business groups from around the city to develop these proposals. In addition to attending community meetings, the City held a public parking forum, bringing in experts from around the country to talk about parking management and the pros and cons of lower or no parking requirements. City staff emphasized the transit and pedestrian benefits of the parking changes, along with how these changes would support Seattle’s efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were the parking reduction measures accompanied by an increase in alternatives to single-occupant vehicle commuting?</td>
<td>Several of the NBDs are served by Light Rail transit; the others have good bus service. Some are strong pedestrian destinations for their surrounding residential neighborhoods. The City has worked to improve the pedestrian environment in these NBDs and put sidewalk bicycle racks in some of the NBDs to encourage bicycle use.</td>
<td>The parking regulations, along with many other changes to neighborhood commercial zoning, were adopted in January 2007. Also in 2006, the Seattle area voters approved Transit Now, an initiative to expand transit service with funds from a 0.1 percent sales-tax increase. The transit agency has added more than 52,000 hours of transit service in half of the King County’s most heavily used corridors, allowing buses to come more often or keep running longer into the day or evening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In which year were the parking reduction measures implemented?</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the parking reduction measures considered a success? It may be a bit early to tell, but there have been some positive effects.</td>
<td>In areas now with no minimum parking requirements, the sense is that new housing development is now possible, whereas with the previous parking requirements the costs were prohibitive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please provide reasons for your answer to the previous question.</td>
<td>The parking reduction has allowed more intense uses in some buildings that had little or no parking. It has not resulted in parking impacts on the neighborhoods - but we have not yet seen a large new development that has taken advantage of the parking reduction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What advice can you provide to those contemplating a reduction in parking requirements?</td>
<td>Getting the business owners and the neighborhood residents they serve to see their common interest in a successful pedestrian-oriented business district was important to the success of this proposal. Also, there is some advantage to dealing with the issue incrementally. Success in the NBD parking reduction will make it easier to provide reductions elsewhere.</td>
<td>City staff worked on the changes to the commercial code for three years, working closely with neighborhood stakeholders and other community organizations with an interest in parking management, transportation, growth management and environment policy. Emphasizing the transit and pedestrian benefits of the proposal helped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you consider to be the best resource (report/book) on reducing parking requirements? If possible, please provide title, author(s), and organization that published the report/book.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>City conducted our own parking study of land use parking demand in order to use local conditions to base parking changes. We also reviewed other cities parking codes as a general policy comparison.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who do you consider as one of the foremost experts on reducing parking requirements? If possible, please provide name an affiliation.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N/A = not available
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATES</th>
<th>CONFERENCE AND SPONSOR</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>VENUE</th>
<th>MAIN TOPICS</th>
<th>EST. ATTEND</th>
<th>REGISTR. COST</th>
<th>CONTACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 19-21</td>
<td>34th Annual Conference (Florida Public Transportation Association)</td>
<td>Sarasota, FL</td>
<td>Hyatt Regency Sarasota</td>
<td>The theme is &quot;creative energy fuels public transit.&quot; There will be sessions on Planning, Operations, Maintenance, Management, Marketing and Self Improvement. There will also be information from the Florida DOT and Federal Transit Administration.</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>$195 m gov't</td>
<td>FPTA at 850-878-0855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$250 m non-gov't</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2625 nm gov't</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$300 nm non-gov't</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 22-24</td>
<td>2nd Sustainable Development Conference “Making Tomorrow Today” (UITP)</td>
<td>Milan, Italy</td>
<td>Centro Congressi Fondazione Cariplo</td>
<td>Sustainable development and public transport are natural allies. This second conference on this subject will bring international experts together to debate how public transport is responding to some of the major global trends - such as climate change and energy - and making the business case to support this approach.</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1.020 € m 1.260 € nm On-site: 1.140 € m 1.380 € nm</td>
<td>Deborah Wery, Events Officer Tel: +32 2 663 66 64 Fax: +32 2 660 10 72 Email: <a href="mailto:deborah.wery@uitp.org">deborah.wery@uitp.org</a> <a href="http://www.uitp.org">www.uitp.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 22-24</td>
<td>57th Annual Illinois Traffic Engineering &amp; Safety Conference (Office of Continuing Education, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign)</td>
<td>Urbana, IL</td>
<td>Holiday Inn Hotel and Conference Center</td>
<td>Professionals from local, state and federal agencies, consulting/contracting firms, and universities discuss product development and testing, product evaluation, computer hardware and software developments and applications, government policies and regulations, transportation research results, and more. Conference is preceded by a workshop on Highway Safety Manual for Multilane Highways.</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Oct. 22 Workshop: $50 Oct.23-24 Conf: $120</td>
<td>Mtzi Orenda Greene Tel.: 217-333-2880 Fax: 217-333-9561 <a href="mailto:trafficsafety@ad.uiuc.edu">trafficsafety@ad.uiuc.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 26-28</td>
<td>Oregon Public Transportation Conference (Oregon Transit Association)</td>
<td>Seaside, OR</td>
<td>Seaside Civic and Convention Center</td>
<td>Learn about the ongoing effort to bring public transportation to a level of priority equal to that of highways as well as our search for an additional and sustainable source of income for senior and people with disability transportation.</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>$245 m $295 nm</td>
<td>Contact Kelsey Wilson (503) 636-8184 <a href="mailto:kw@oregontransit.com">kw@oregontransit.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 26-29</td>
<td>Rail-Volution 2008 (Rail-Volution)</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>Hyatt Regency Embarcadero</td>
<td>Rail-Volution is, first and foremost, a conference for passionate practitioners - people from all perspectives who believe strongly in the role of land use and transit as equal partners in the quest for greater livability and greater communities. This national transit and livability conference provides a perfect opportunity to apply new approaches and lessons learned in your own community.</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>$475</td>
<td><a href="http://www.railvolution.com">http://www.railvolution.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 26-31</td>
<td>53rd Annual National Transportation Management Conference (AASHTO)</td>
<td>Mystic, CT</td>
<td>Hilton Mystic</td>
<td>This conference provides new and updated skills that mid-level managers in transportation need to move from technical to managerial responsibility.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$1,495 (if space is available.)</td>
<td>Donna Tamburelli 202-624-5815 <a href="mailto:donnal@aashto.org">donnal@aashto.org</a> Fred Crawford, Project Director CMC &amp; Associates 888-320-6129 <a href="mailto:fcrawford@cmc-associates.com">fcrawford@cmc-associates.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 27-28</td>
<td>Impact of Changing Demographics on the Transportation System (TRB)</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>Keck Center of the National Academies</td>
<td>The conference aims to identify key knowledge gaps, develop a research agenda, inform transportation policy, and identify promising initiatives for university research. Papers will relate to the potential impacts on transportation in the next 20 years from four demographic forces, the priority themes of the conference: Aging and Demographic Transition; Immigration Internally and from Abroad; Changing Racial and Ethnic Mix; and Gender Differences.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$295 $245 speaker/TRB sponsor $180 student</td>
<td>Thomas Palmerlee at (202) 334-2907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 28-29</td>
<td>Rethinking Transportation for a Sustainable Future (Community Transportation Innovation Academy at the University of Kentucky and the University of Louisville)</td>
<td>Louisville, Kentucky</td>
<td>The Galt House</td>
<td>Conference goals include: - fostering communication between academics and professionals working on energy and transportation issues; - introducing new techniques and policies for energy and transportation sustainability; - contributing to the development of a common language and collective vision for a sustainable set of energy and transportation policies.</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>$125 On-site: $175</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@rethinkingtransportation.com">info@rethinkingtransportation.com</a> Carla Crossfield 859-257-4022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 28-31</td>
<td>Annual Conference (Association of MPOs – AMPO – and the Puget Sound Regional Council)</td>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td>Grand Hyatt Seattle</td>
<td>The AMPO Annual Conference is for MPO directors and staff, Policy Board Elected Officials, and those individuals or organizations (local, state, federal, contractors) that work with MPOs.</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Before Oct 10: $425m $480n $205 federal $355 elected official After: $455m $510n $3245 federal $385 elected official</td>
<td>Nicole Waldheim Association of MPOs 1029 Vermont Ave., NW #710 Washington, DC 20005 Ph: (202) 296-7051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dates</td>
<td>Conference and Sponsor</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Venue</td>
<td>Main Topics</td>
<td>Est. Attend</td>
<td>Registr. Cost</td>
<td>Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 4-7</td>
<td>California’s Public &amp; Community Conference &amp; Expo (California Association for Coordinated Transportation, California Transit Association)</td>
<td>Monterey, CA</td>
<td>Portola Hotel &amp; Spa at Monterey Bay</td>
<td>This year’s theme is Building Partnerships for the Future. The program is designed to benefit professionals from all aspects of transit. We are excited to offer Robert F. Kennedy Jr. as our keynote speaker, along with a diverse program of workshops and sessions. In addition, you will hear up-to-the-minute expert analysis of the results of the November 2008 General Election and its impact on transit in your community.</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>$330m</td>
<td>$380m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 8-12</td>
<td>2008 Fall Conference &amp; Trans-Expo (CUTA-Actu)</td>
<td>Windsor, Ontario</td>
<td>Caesars Windsor</td>
<td>Canada’s senior transit decision-makers will be meeting in Windsor for this conference &amp; Expo. CUTA will have educational sessions designed to promote new ideas, the latest industry information and networking with other transit professionals. The conference theme is “beyond borders.” Participants will discuss all aspects of public transit.</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$745m</td>
<td>$845m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 11-15</td>
<td>8th Congress of Cities &amp; Exposition (National League of Cities)</td>
<td>Orlando, FL</td>
<td>Orlando World Center Marriott</td>
<td>The National League of Cities is committed to strengthening and promoting the leadership capacity of our nations’ local elected officials. More than 3,000 mayors, council members, and local leaders participate in leadership seminars and programs designed to explore the nature and practice of local government leadership.</td>
<td>4,000-5,000</td>
<td>$525 cty</td>
<td>$525 Assoc. m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 12-14</td>
<td>CODATU XIII “Sustainable Development Challenges of Transport in Cities of the Developing World: Doing What Works” (CODATU – Cooperation for Urban Mobility in the Developing World)</td>
<td>Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam</td>
<td>Hotel Sheraton Saigon</td>
<td>By focusing the exchange of experiences and practices between developing, transition and industrialized countries, CODATU contributes to the development of urban transport worldwide. It will address ways to approach urban mobility to face the challenges of sustainable development and the competitiveness of cities, through case studies and analyses, both theoretical and practical. Topics: • The new context of urban transport • Urban transport in Vietnam’s major cities • Urban planning, transport and economic development • Financing transport infrastructure and services • Inter-modality challenges • Environmental concerns and solutions for clean urban mobility.</td>
<td>200-300</td>
<td>Nonmembers: € 600 participants € 300 speakers Members € 400 institutions € 500 individuals</td>
<td><a href="http://www.codatu.org">www.codatu.org</a> <a href="mailto:codatuw@wanadoo.fr">codatuw@wanadoo.fr</a> Tel. 0033 (0)4 78 62 23 09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 12-14</td>
<td>NY State Public Transit Fall Conference and Expo (NY Public Transit Association)</td>
<td>Albany, NY</td>
<td>The Holiday Inn</td>
<td>The theme is Transit Vision 2050: Trading the Competitive Advantage.</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Before Oct. 24 $225 After $305</td>
<td>Dianne Patterson, Association Manager, or Angela Johnston, tel. 518-434-9060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 14</td>
<td>5th Annual Conference, “Transportation Decision-making: Issues, Tools, Models and Case Studies” (Transport, Territory and Logistics Units of IUAV University of Venice)</td>
<td>Venice, Italy</td>
<td>University Iuav of Venice</td>
<td>The annual conference will discuss the theme of transportation decision making and focus on the following topics: • Demand Estimation, • Transportation Costs, • Measurement of Transportation Impacts, • Transportation Evaluation through Cost Benefit Analysis • Transportation Evaluation through Multiple Criteria Analysis, and • Transportation Programming.</td>
<td>60-80</td>
<td>Before Nov. 7: €300 €30 students On-site: €350 €50 students</td>
<td>Silvio Nocera –Alessandra Libardo Dipartimento di Urbanistica Università IUAV di Venezia Convento delle Terese - Dorsoduro 2206 I - 30123 Venezia Tel. +39 041 257 1370 E-mail: <a href="mailto:nocera@iuav.it">nocera@iuav.it</a> or <a href="mailto:alibardo@iuav.it">alibardo@iuav.it</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 15-18</td>
<td>19th National Trails Symposium (American Trails)</td>
<td>Little Rock, AR</td>
<td>Statehouse Convention Center</td>
<td>American Trails brings the worldwide trails community together for an inspirational and educational conference. The symposium addresses both nonmotorized and motorized issues and our vision for trails and greenways nationwide.</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>$375m</td>
<td>$425m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 16-20</td>
<td>ITS America’s 2008 Annual Meeting and 15th World Congress on Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS America, ERICCO - ITS Europe, ITS Japan)</td>
<td>N.Y., NY</td>
<td>Jacob K. Javits Convention center</td>
<td>The 15th World Congress on ITS and ITS America’s 2008 Annual Meeting is the largest event in the world for ITS professionals and policy makers. The Annual Meeting and World Congress events include more than 200 extraordinary education sessions, exciting tours, a grand-scale exhibit hall and opportunities to connect with an international audience.</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>$1375 (four days)</td>
<td>$500 (one day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 17-18</td>
<td>9th Annual Transportation Finance /P3 Conference, “Forced to Act: Reinventing Transportation Funding” (The Bond Buyer)</td>
<td>Denver, CO</td>
<td>Omni Interlocken Resort</td>
<td>At this event, transportation finance market participants address crucial issues facing the nation including: –The uncertainty of the future of federal funding and the gas tax fallout potentially offset by stimulus package. –How the credit crunch is impacting access to capital for municipal and private-sector participants. –Will a slowing economy reduce or change travel patterns?</td>
<td>200+</td>
<td>Before Oct. 17: Issuers $245, Institutional Investors $445, All Others $945. After Issuers $295, Institutional Investors $495, All Others $995.</td>
<td>Dan Tina at 212-803-8487</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REQUESTS FOR PROPOSALS

1. Transit/TDM Performance Review Program: RFP 505-08-RR0001
   Agency: Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation
   Deadline: October 29, 2008 at 5:00 PM
   Contact: Eugene B. Coleman, Sr., Purchasing Manager, tel. (804) 786-6777, e-mail: eugene.coleman@drpt.virginia.gov
   Description: The Transit/TDM Performance Review Program is a new program being initiated by the Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT) for the purpose of assisting public transit operators and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) agencies in the Commonwealth with measuring and improving their performance and meeting local goals and objectives. The review will help transit operators, TDM agencies, and DRPT better communicate to decision makers and stakeholders the progress, impact and needs of transit and TDM services and programs. The program will also help serve in part DRPT’s objectives of improving technical assistance to transit operators and TDM agencies and seeking increased accountability. The performance reviews of transit operators and TDM agencies in the Commonwealth shall consist of a systematic review to determine the extent to which operators of public transit systems and TDM agencies have: Established local system goals and objectives; Developed performance measures and standards for service efficiency and effectiveness; Achieved desired program results.

2. Collection of GPS Arterial Travel Time and Speed Data
   Agency: Maryland National Capital Parks & Planning
   Deadline: October 30, 2008 at 11:00 AM
   Contact: Tina Baham, e-mail: Tina.Baham@MNCPPC.org, tel. (301) 454-1602
   Website: https://ebidmarketplace.com/
   Description: A Pre-Proposal Conference will be held at 1:30 P.M., Monday, October 20, 2008, at the Montgomery County Regional Office, Auditorium, located at 8787 Georgia Avenue, Silver Spring, MD 20910. This Pre-Proposal Conference is not mandatory, but is strongly recommended to all parties who intend to submit a proposal.

3. Road Pricing, Public Perceptions, and Program Development
   Agency: Transportation Research Board
   Deadline: November 01, 2008
   Contact: Nanda Srinivasan Phone: 202-334-1896 Email: nsrinivasan@nas.edu
   Description: TRB’s National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) has issued a request for proposals to develop a resource document to help state, regional, and local decision makers and others to understand transportation needs and challenges and the potential role that road pricing (RP) might be able to address. The project will also identify potential opportunities and conditions for integrating RP into projects and programs, and develop proposed communication and public engagement plans for RP projects and programs.

4. Feasibility Study for Dedicated Truck Lanes
   Agency: Indiana Department of Transportation
   Deadline: November 11, 2008
   Contact: Contractor Pre-qualification: tel. (317) 232-5095
   Website: http://www.trb.org/TRBNet/ProjectDisplay.asp?ProjectID=2499
   Description: The purpose of this feasibility study is to provide to the Departments of Transportation of Missouri, Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio the background, data, and analysis needed to make a determination as to whether to continue to advance the TRUCK ONLY dedicated lanes concept for an 800 mile corridor of I-70 through Missouri, Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio. The feasibility study is to evaluate the corridor as a whole and is not intended to produce a state by state analysis. The study is divided into two phases to allow for review, reconsideration, redirection, and re prioritization prior to proceeding with phase 2. The feasibility study may not necessarily proceed forward to Phase 2. Phase 1 is to look at critical issues such as: the impact/benefit of a dedicated truck corridor in an integrated multimodal freight movement system taking into account existing and future freight movement patterns from/to within the Upper Midwest from/to the East Coast and West Coast; a thorough assessment of commodities and distances moved through and between the Upper Midwest and the East and West Coasts; changes to commercial motor vehicle size and weight that would improve the movement of these commodities including heavier trucks and/or longer combination vehicles; potential diversion of commodities from parallel rail or highway corridors, and; major “fatal flaw” environmental constraints. High level political, public, and industry support or opposition will be identified as well as their priorities for further stakeholder education and input on concepts being proposed. Phase 2 Following the assessment on the impact/benefit of this dedicated truck lane corridor to freight movement through the heartland of the country would have, an analysis of potential size and weight changes, cross sections, bypasses, access points, operational considerations, and potential technologies to be applied, as well as determining the overall feasibility for developing, financing, constructing, operating, and maintaining TRUCK ONLY lanes on the I-70 corridor.

5. Guidelines for Evaluation and Performance Measurement of Congestion Pricing Projects
   Agency: Transportation Research Board
   Deadline: December 05, 2008
   Contact: Christopher J. Hedges, tel. (202) 334-1472, e-mail: chedges@nas.edu
   Website: http://www.trb.org/TRBNet/ProjectDisplay.asp?ProjectID=2501
   Description: The objective of this research is to create guidelines for evaluation and performance measurement of congestion pricing projects that are designed to optimize the use of available roadway capacity. The guidelines will help agencies select or develop appropriate performance measures, collect the necessary data, track performance, and communicate the results to decision makers, users, and the general public. For the purposes of this research, congestion pricing is defined as the application of variable user fees on roadways to manage available capacity and user demand. The main focus of this study is on improving operational efficiency, although it is recognized that there may be other goals and motivations to road pricing.

6. Marketing and Outreach Assistance
   Agency: Commuter Club, Atlanta, Georgia
   Deadline: November 7, 2008, 3:00 pm
   Contact: Jennifer Hammond (770)859-2331, fax (770) 690-4038, email: jhammond@commuterclub.com
   Website: www.commuterclub.com
   Description: Commuter Club was founded in 1996 as a community service of the Cumberland Community Improvement District (CCID) to assist and coordinate the efforts of interested parties in designing and implementing programs that support transportation demand management. Commuter Club serves the Cumberland Galleria office market (5.5 square mile area surrounding I-75/I-285 interchange in Cobb County, Georgia northwest of Atlanta). Commuter Club is seeking proposals from qualified firms to select a contractor to research and implement various outreach and marketing projects in the Cumberland Galleria area. The contractor selected under this RFP will enter into a contract with the CCID to research and implement outreach and marketing projects for a one year period. To request the full RFP, please use the contact information above to call or email.

NOTE: If you wish to receive these and other RFP notices in ADVANCE via THE INTERNET OR BY FAX, please call us at tel.(703)764-0512 for details.

PUBLIC AGENCIES — RFP notices are published here FREE OF CHARGE — call (703)764-0512 for details and deadline.