Hawaii, California to Create Electric Car Networks

Will Provide Charging and Battery Exchange Stations Using Renewable Energy

Earlier this month Hawaii was the latest location to announce that it will create electric car networks. California announced its intention to do the same last month. Both states have agreements with Better Place, a venture capital company started last year to put together electric car networks. Hawaii governor Linda Lingle announced that the state will create a statewide electric car network. The network in California will initially be limited to the Bay Area.

Better Place plans to begin issuing permits for the Hawaii network within the next year and introducing vehicles within 18 months, with mass-market availability of electric cars in 2012. Hawaii currently spends up to $7 billion a year on oil imports and drivers pay some of the highest gasoline prices in the nation. Gasoline consumption now accounts for nearly 20% of the state’s greenhouse gases. According to Julie Mullins, spokesperson for Better Place Hawaii, the governor’s office is now working on legislation that would create incentives for citizens to purchase electric cars.

Hawaii is an ideal location to develop a model program to reduce foreign oil dependence because of its readily available renewable energy resources like solar, wind, wave and geothermal. The program seeks to reduce dependence on foreign oil, develop renewable energy options and create an infrastructure to stabilize the national economy.

Hawaiian Electric Companies and Better Place Hawaii also signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to
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Chicago Receives $1.2 Billion Bid for Lease of Its Metered Parking System

First Lease of Major Publicly Owned Parking System in the U.S.

Mayor Richard M. Daley has announced that the city of Chicago received a winning bid of $1.2 billion from Chicago Parking Meters, LLC, for a 75-year concession agreement to operate Chicago’s metered parking system made up of approximately 36,000 parking spaces.

According to the mayor’s office, the lease transaction – which must be approved by the City Council – would make Chicago’s the first major publicly-owned parking system in the United States to be subject to a long-term concession.

“At the very time that some cities and states are asking the federal government for help in balancing their budgets, we’re creatively working to protect our taxpayers for years to come,” Daley said earlier this month.

The 75-year lease deal would be a benefit for the city treasury but a hardship for motorists who would see parking rates climb at the city’s 36,000 metered spaces starting January 1. Neighborhood hourly meter rates would climb from 25 cents an hour to $1 an hour next year and $2 an hour in 2013. Daytime downtown hourly parking rates would rise from $3.00 to $3.50 next year and to $6.50 in 2013. After that, rates would be adjusted annually by inflation.

Daley said that his administration was taking innovative steps to cushion taxpayers from the bad economy and keep the city moving forward. “This agreement is very good news for the taxpayers of Chicago because it will provide more than $1 billion in net proceeds that can be used during this very difficult economy,” he said.

The winning bidder, Chicago Parking Meters, LLC, consists of Morgan Stanley Infrastructure Partners A Sub LP (76%)
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Feasibility Study of Congestion Charging in San Francisco to Be Completed by Next Spring

Pending Results of Study, an Implementation Plan Will Be Developed, and Final Approval Will Be Sought

The San Francisco County Transportation Authority recently released the results of a Mobility, Access, and Pricing Study (MAPS) to evaluate the feasibility of a congestion pricing plan to reduce congestion and improve mobility in the city of San Francisco.

Drivers would pay a $3 fee when traveling through the congested northeastern part of the city during peak weekday hours. The purpose of the charge would be to encourage drivers to consider public transportation, bicycling or walking as alternatives to driving in the city.

Public transit already is well utilized in San Francisco, accounting for 770,000 passenger trips each day and over 40% of trips to the downtown area, but traffic congestion remains a significant problem in the city.

Studies show that San Francisco sacrificed more than $2 billion to congestion-related problems in 2005 alone. A decrease in available resources from the federal highway trust fund and a reduction in fuel tax revenues, along with a decline in economic competitiveness caused by traffic congestion, prompted planners to consider innovative strategies to manage vehicle traffic.

Growing demand in the city for transportation options, coupled with increasingly limited road and parking space, also fueled an interest in creative approaches to congestion management. The environmental and health costs of heavy congestion also increased interest in new strategies to combat gridlock.

Reducing congestion will significantly improve the efficiency of the entire local transportation system, decrease commute times, increase reliability, improve productivity and save time and resources for travelers and businesses.

The Authority began exploring congestion pricing schemes in 2004, as part of the Countywide Transportation Plan. During the past two years, a study team undertook a detailed evaluation of the concept and how it might be applied in San Francisco.

The study was funded primarily by a $1 million grant from the Federal Highway Administration’s Value Pricing Program. Matching funds were provided by San Francisco’s Proposition K transportation sales tax program and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission.

The focus of the study was on the technical and economic feasibility of congestion pricing and the impact such a plan would have on the public. The study evaluated various design concepts and pricing options and examined successful model programs in London, Stockholm, Singapore and other smaller cities.

The study also considered the potential impact of congestion pricing on public transit, carpooling, bicycling, and walking, and the possible financial benefits of the plan in funding mobility programs throughout the city.

Realizing the importance of public participation in the planning process, the study team relied on the input of several advisory committees throughout the process. Public workshops also are being held to share and receive information with shareholders.

This month, the study team is hosting an online session and two public meetings in San Francisco to review the results of the evaluation and to examine various congestion pricing program scenarios.

The team is in the final stages of the feasibility study and will continue to refine and develop its final recommendations into next spring. An implementation plan will be created in 2009 and the team will seek final approval from the mayor and the Board of Supervisors.

For more information, visit www.sfcta.org or contact Zabe Bent, SFCTA, at tel. (415)522-4819 or mobility@sfcta.org.
Results from Existing Congestion Charging Schemes Show Benefits Must Be Clearly Explained to Ensure Public Support

Congestion charging schemes in Stockholm, London and Singapore provide useful information to cities considering such plans to address traffic congestion, environmental concerns and revenue shortfalls.

Primary concerns about cordon congestion charging schemes are the following perceptions:

- That the burden is greatest on lower income earners.
- That neighboring communities are negatively impacted at a disproportionate rate.
- That retail businesses and overall economic activity will suffer.
- That the revenues may not provide direct benefits to appropriate programs.

Steffen Kallbekken, a researcher at the Center for International Climate and Environmental Research in Oslo (CICERO), conducts research on environmental taxation. He cites the Stockholm congestion pricing trial program as the best case to illustrate how challenges of public opposition to congestion charging are best addressed.

Kallbekken explains that initially the congestion tax in Stockholm was very controversial but, after the initial trial period in 2006, drivers and residents experienced the positive effects of the plan and adopted a more favorable view.

He explains that the congestion charge in Stockholm is an example of “how an environmental tax can result in certain benefits. During the trial period, traffic to the city fell by 22%, travel times during rush hour dropped by nearly a third, accidents with injuries fell, and emissions fell by 10 to 14%.”

Polls found that the number of people likely to vote in favor of permanently introducing the congestion tax increased by 18% during the trial period. In the referendum after the trial, the tax received a 52.5% majority and the tax was permanently implemented.

The Stockholm example shows that demonstrating the benefits of environmental taxes can substantially increase public support, Kallbekken says. By directly linking the tax to concrete goals, officials were able to demonstrate clearly the value of the scheme.

He advises cities considering congestion charging to provide the public with thorough information about the resulting benefits.

In London, the original Congestion Charge Zone (CCZ) was established in 2003 and was extended in 2007 to include a “western extension.” The key objectives of the charge are to reduce congestion throughout the city and raise funds for investment in the local transport system. The charge was originally £5 ($7) but the fee was increased to £8 ($12) in July 2005.

Earlier this fall, London’s new mayor, Boris Johnson, announced his intention to remove the tax from the western extension, thereby reducing the full scheme by almost half. The decision is controversial because Transport for London (TfL) will lose £70 million (US$102 million) annually and funding for public transport will be significantly impacted.

Johnson and his supporters argue that the public clearly supports an elimination of the tax and they are simply following the will of the people. A recent five-week consultation was held to solicit input from Londoners on the matter and over two-thirds of citizens and business owners expressed support for its removal.

Almost 28,000 people responded and the majority favored removing the tax from the western zone. A total of 67% of individuals and 86% of businesses responded in favor of removal. Only 19% expressed a desire to see it continue as is and another 12% said they would like to keep it but make changes to improve the way it operates.

The mayor’s office also surveyed Londoners and 1,000 London-based businesses to gauge the accuracy of the consultation. Their responses and the results of the survey confirmed the findings of the consultation. According to mayor Johnson, “Londoners have spoken loud and clear, and the majority of people have said that they would like the scheme scrapped.”

Although TfL estimates that traffic returning to the western extension would result in a small increase in emissions of air pollutants and carbon dioxide, the mayor’s office says the increase would be unlikely to have any material effect on measured air quality within the western extension or on the boundary route because of the number of different factors that affect local air quality.

They argue that ongoing investment in technology such as hybrid and hydrogen buses, encouraging the uptake of low-carbon vehicles and fuels, and reducing power consumption all are helping offset transport related emissions across the Capital. They also point out that TfL is working on a series of other measures aimed at easing congestion and smoothing traffic flow, including rephrasing traffic signals and improving the planning and execution of road works projects. The agency also is setting up a task force with external experts to review other ways traffic can be mitigated.

A 12-week statutory public and stake-
Intelligence

New Jersey Increases Gas Card Money for Large New Carpools

Trenton, New Jersey
The New Jersey Department of Transportation is enhancing its ridesharing program by offering commuters gas cards for new carpools and increasing the monetary value of the gas card according to the size of the carpool.

The program, called Carpooling Makes Sense, was started in 2006, says Khalid Shaikh, a principal engineer at the NJDOT and a contact for the program. Until now, he said, the program offered a $100 gas card to commuters who formed a carpool regardless of the number of riders. Now $100 gas cards are being offered to new carpools of two people, $150 gas cards to new carpools of three people, and $200 gas cards to new carpools of four or more people.

New Jersey governor Jon Corzine announced the expanded program on December 1 and it went into effect the same day, Shaikh said. He told UTM that the enhancements were designed to promote formation of larger carpools. The use of carpools can help reduce traffic congestion, alleviate parking problems, reduce energy consumption and improve air quality, he said. It can also save commuters money and reduce wear and tear on their vehicles.

According to the NJDOT, carpooling can substantially reduce a commuter’s gasoline costs. The driver of an average midsize car traveling 30 miles roundtrip to work and paying $2.00 per gallon of gasoline can save approximately $3,000 per year by carpooling five days a week.

With gas prices of $3.00 per gallon, the savings would be closer to $3,500 per year.

As originally instituted, the program set aside $500,000 for individual $100 debit cards to be used for gasoline purchases by participants in new carpools. According to Shaikh, approximately 3,900 carpools were registered under the original Carpooling Makes Sense program.

Shaikh said that, to the best of his knowledge, the NJDOT gas card incentive program for carpools is the only program of its kind.

All New Jersey residents and workers are eligible for the Carpooling Makes Sense program, subject to the program requirements for the gas cards. First, a member of a new carpool fills out and submits the Carpooling Makes Sense program registration form. Then, the appropriate Transportation Management Association (TMA) for the carpool’s location contacts the carpool regarding procedures for verification and tracking. To qualify for the gas card a new carpool must carpool at least 24 days in a two-month period. The TMA will track and verify the use of the carpool and the additional rider program. Carpools also must submit their carpool log within 120 days of registration in order to be eligible to receive the gas cards.

Transportation Management Associations are non-profit, public/private partnerships that have been established to form partnerships with businesses and local government to provide commuter information and services. There are eight TMAs in New Jersey, and each handles a certain geographic region. They are Cross County Connection, Greater Mercer, Hudson, HART, KMM, Meadowlink, Ridewise and TransOptions.

According to Dominic Palladino, commuter services coordinator at Cross County Connection, the gas cards for new carpools were marketed heavily during this past summer when gas prices were at a record high. Cross County Connection is the TMA that promotes transit and ridesharing options for commuters in southern New Jersey.

For more information, visit http://www.state.nj.us/transportation/commuter/rideshare/gascard.shtml or contact Khalid Shaikh at (609) 530-2476 or NJDOT press officer Timothy Greeley at timothy.greeley@dot.state.nj.us

Dubai Public Transport Agency Approves Biggest Bus Procurement Deal in History; Will Acquire 1,600 Buses

Dubai, UAE
In November, the Roads and Transport Authority (RTA) of the emirate of Dubai approved the largest bus procurement deal ever made. After soliciting bids last year, the RTA’s Board of Directors approved an agreement with five bus suppliers worldwide to supply 1616 brand new, highly sophisticated buses for the agency at a total cost of AED8.6 billion ($2.3 billion).

Growth in the UAE, and in Dubai in particular, where tourism is a key industry, has contributed to an increased demand for public transportation services. The emirate has become a hub for commercial and economic activity in the region as well as a destination for global investors and international businessmen.

The number of person trips made by mass transit modes in Dubai is expected to increase by 30% by 2020.

RTA Public Transport Agency CEO Essa Abdul-Rahman Al-Dosari, describing the interior of the new buses as “roomy, comfortable, sturdy and safe,” noted that they provide the key features the agency considers necessary for upgrading the quality of service offered to bus passengers in Dubai. The new fleet will include standard, double-deckers and articulated buses and will represent a variety of size and design choices.

Al-Dosari noted that all are fitted with the highest safety and security features and onboard modern technology applications. Other features of the new fleet include next bus stop announcement capabilities, a statistical system of bus commuters, a GPS to track buses linked with RTA Control Center, and internal and external display monitors.
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Emergence of Personal Rapid Transit Systems – A New Revolution in Urban Transport,” Tamana stressed that the key challenge for PRT is gaining constant political, economic and technology support. A lack of constant support may result in a lack of government funding, she said.

Frost and Sullivan also concluded that because PRT vehicles can be battery operated and offer a non-stop service, PRT systems theoretically use less energy per passenger per kilometer than all other modes of urban transportation.

“Why is PRT needed to overcome today’s transportation challenges?” Tamana asked. The main reason for PRT introduction, she said, is that it has an environmental advantage of zero emission use. Other reasons include that it is a flexible service designed to meet on-demand expectations. It is also safe and easy to use and offers a quiet operation. Some market experts say it is cheaper to build than roads.

According to Tamana, the advantages of PRT systems can drive the market forward. However, Tamana noted that other factors restrain the market for PRT development. These include the lack of specific regulations or safety standards for PRT systems as well as a view of some transportation professionals that PRT is unproven and a high risk mode of transportation.

Tamana said that there is an urgent need to formally establish design, operation and maintenance protocols for PRT systems. There is also the need for education to help more people to fully understand the PRT concept. But the biggest challenge is the need for constant political, economic and technology support, she said.

The latest PRT installation, the ULTra PRT system marketed by ATS Ltd, is due to start operation at Heathrow Airport Terminal 5 in 2009. According to Tamana, the future of PRT is looking to be most dominant in airport applications. Other key applications are expected to be tourist attractions, shopping malls, “Eco Towns” and new urban city developments.

According to Tamana, market demand analysis shows that Europe and North America are the two key regions for PRT development. The PRT concept is designed to offer the comfort and convenience of the personal transit vehicle with the efficiency of public transit. At the same time it offers the potential to reduce energy use, land use and the environmental impact of transportation. “PRT is so flexible it can help by improving urban congestion, sustainability and livability all in one system.”

However, current technical feasibility provides insufficient capacity in high density areas, which means that current forms of PRT would provide insufficient capacity in areas such as central London. This means that investment costs for the tracks and stations are comparable to building new roads. “Realization of transportation opportunities can be maximized by developing value added products and services in line with the governmental strategy or aiding segment challenges,” Tamana said.

In the past, governments have backed out of PRT proposed projects at the initiation stage. “There is an inability for PRT projects to follow through on long term engineering developments, which inhibits making a commitment to a PRT system,” the Frost and Sullivan analysis concluded.

For more information, contact Anna Anlauf, Frost and Sullivan, Corporate Communications Automotive and Transportation Europe at tel. 49-69-770-33-12 or anna.anlauf@frost.com.

For more information, visit www.rta.ae/wpsv5/wps/portal or contact the RTA Public Transportation Agency at info@rta ae.

Frost and Sullivan: PRT Can Help Overcome Today’s Transportation Challenges

London, England

Personal rapid transit (PRT) is emerging for the future because it has the potential to contribute significantly to the solution of fundamental problems of modern society including congestion, global warming and dependence on a decreasing supply of cheap oil, says Frost and Sullivan analyst Poonam Tamana.

Tamana has completed extensive analysis for the Automotive and Transportation Group at Frost and Sullivan about the personal rapid transit market. In a December 2 teleconference entitled “The Global

The ULTra PRT vehicle to be used at
Heathrow Airport in England.

(Photo: Courtesy of the BAA)
Transportation Tort Liability: Case in Review

Louisiana DOTD Liable in Wrongful Death Action

The Louisiana Court of Appeals recently affirmed a District Court judgment, based on a jury verdict, that found the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development (DOTD) liable for damages exceeding $1 million, resulting from a fatal accident on a state highway on New Year’s Day 2001. As the driver of the vehicle was found to be intoxicated, the jury allocated fault in the proportion 70% to the DOTD and 30% to the driver.

Shortly before midnight on December 31, 2000, the vehicle, travelling at between 40 – 45 miles per hour, went into a slide, crossed the highway and opposite shoulder, and hit a tree. The front-seat passenger was ejected through the rear window and thrown approximately 45 feet and died at the scene.

As the accident involved a fatality, the driver was routinely tested for alcohol and drugs; he was later arrested for driving while intoxicated, but this charge was dismissed because he completed a pretrial diversion program. The DOTD claimed the jury “committed manifest error” in apportioning only 30% of fault to the driver. However, at appeal, both judges found that the evidence presented was insufficient to establish the degree of intoxication or impairment of the driver, and hence affirmed the jury’s decree.

The major issues regarding the dangerous condition of the roadway were whether the drop-off from the roadway to the shoulder presented an unreasonable risk of harm, and whether a pecan tree, on the opposite side of the roadway and in DOTD’s right-of-way, posed an unreasonably dangerous condition.

Plaintiffs’ expert witness alleged the occurrence of the accident was due to a number of factors related to the design and maintenance of the highway, including:

- the pecan tree struck by the automobile was situated too close to the travel lane;
- there was no evidence of appropriate curve warning signs in place at the time of the accident;
- the driver would have had difficulty regaining the roadway due to the drop-off’s severity;
- the narrowness of the shoulders (which he estimated at 1.2 to 1.5 feet wide) and steepness of the ditch foreshores (estimated at a 2 ft slope) would have inhibited recovery after the vehicle left the roadway.

At appeal, the judges found that the proximate cause of the accident was the defect in the shoulder of the roadway, and that addressing the pecan tree issue was not necessary. One judge stated “I am not prepared to require DOTD to remove all trees from rights of way along all the state highways in this state.”

Regarding the construction and maintenance of the highway, the court found that the highway is classified as a rural minor collector roadway, which had been in existence, first as a gravel road, since 1930. It had been the subject of five projects from 1950 through 1994, although not all projects were implemented due to lack of funding.

At issue was whether the fifth project, the last assigned and completed prior to the accident, could be defined as a “total reconstruction”, and what duties it would impose on DOTD. This project had involved the placement of a new asphalt surface over the control section in which the accident took place.

Plaintiffs’ witness claimed that project, approved in March 1994, required DOTD to reconstruct the highway in accordance with design standards and AASHTO guidelines in effect at the time. He showed the existing base of the highway was completely replaced with a soil cement base, eight and a half inches thick, on top of which two and a half inches of new asphalt paving was placed. According to the witness, such construction met the definition of a “reconstruction” in DOTD’s highway plan preparation manual, and was consistent with a “3R” (resurfacing, restoration, and rehabilitation) reconstruction as defined in AASHTO guidelines operating from 1997.

Further, he alleged that the last two curves encountered by the driver immediately before the accident met the criteria of a “broken-back” curve, which an AASHO publication of 1954 recommended against. He also criticized DOTD’s failure to widen the pavement in those curves, recommended in the AASHO document with regard to older highways with sharp curves.

Last, he pointed out that in terms of Functions 442 and 443 of the DOTD’s maintenance planning manual dated 1991, maintenance and repair of non-paved shoulders, as on the highway in question, should have been carried out. These Functions require that edge runs reaching five inches in depth should be assigned “first priority” on the work schedule, and be scheduled “as soon as resources are available, interrupting previously scheduled routine work, if necessary.” However, his evidence showed that in the six months prior to the accident there were no notations related to Function 442 or 443 maintenance in the prescheduling inspection reports, although there were notations about spot surface replacement and removal of tree limbs.

A DOTD engineer in the district design, water resources and development department, testified the fifth project involved an initial analysis of the functioning of the highway, from which it was decided reconstruction or new alignment for the section was not needed. As the soil borings were relatively intact it was decided to simply “cold plane” or mill the upper two inches of the existing surface, reduce it to gravel, stabilize with cement, and cover with three and a half inches of asphalt. Therefore he characterized the project as an overlay, not as a reconstruction.

DOTD’s rebuttal expert witness agreed that the curves were a “broken back" curve, but as the straight tangent separating them was 600 feet in length, he considered the “broken back” curve irrelevant as a cause of the accident.
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Chicago Receives $1.2 Billion Bid for Lease of Its Metered Parking System

ownership), Morgan Stanley Infrastructure Partners LP (23%) and several other entities sharing 1% ownership. LAZ Parking will serve as the operator for Chicago Parking Meters, LLC, according to a December 2 press release.

The request for qualifications (RFQ) for companies interested in overseeing the city’s extensive parking meter system was issued on February 8. The RFQ showed gross operating revenue collected from Chicago’s metered parking system in 2007 amounted to approximately $22.9 million, demonstrating an increase of 16.5% since 2003.

Mayor Daley said he proposes allocating the nearly $1.2 billion in net meter proceeds into four distinct funds, including:

- $400 million in a long-term reserve/revenue replacement fund, similar to the $500 million long-term Chicago Skyway reserve;
- $325 million in a mid-term budget relief fund to help balance city budgets through 2012, consistent with the 2009 budget plan;
- $100 million human infrastructure fund to support for programs helping those most in need; and
- The balance – approximately $324 million – in a budget stabilization fund that may be used to help bridge the period until the nation’s economy begins to grow again.

As part of this agreement, the city will implement graduated meter rate increases over a period of five years that will bring rates closer to market level. After that, any increases will be subject to the approval of the city council and are expected to be at the rate of inflation. These increases will be the first in more than 20 years for more than 25,000 of the 36,000 meters.

This agreement also mandates the private operator to make system upgrades in the near future that will provide cashless payment options far sooner than the city would be able to complete. And by the middle of 2011, all meters must have both cash and cashless payment options.

According to Lisa Schrader, deputy chief of finance for the city of Chicago, the advantage of a private lease is that the city generates up-front payments and offers greater value for taxpayers. A private operator with core business experience can manage the system and make enhancements while offering improved services and greater efficiency.

Under the agreement, the City Council retains the right to revise the meter increases, change the number of meters or the hours of operation. But to the extent the city takes action that negatively impacts meter revenue, it will be obligated to make the private operator whole.

For more information, visit http://egov.cityofchicago.org/city/webportal/home.do or contact Lisa Schrader at tel. (312) 744-1835 or lschrader@
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Louisiana DOTD Found Liable in Wrongful Death Action

With regard to the highway edge drop-off, while acknowledging it difficult to discern the vertical height of the drop-off from photographs, he concluded that the drop-off shown was probably two to three inches, and would not have presented an obstacle to a driver attempting to regain the roadway from the shoulder.

Regarding the AASHTO guidelines and their relationship to DOTD’s duties, he claimed that none of the projects could properly be considered major reconstructions, although the first project in 1950 met some of the criteria for an earlier definition of reconstruction, short of a major reconstruction.

The court found that while DOTD has no duty to correct unreasonably dangerous conditions existing on old highways. It concluded DOTD was liable by negligently failing to discover that which was easily discoverable; that the drop-off had existed at the time of the accident; was a contributing factor to the driver’s loss of control of the vehicle, and presented an unreasonable risk of harm to the travelling public.

Although it stated that the evidence revealed significant factual dispute as to whether the fifth project was an overlay or rehabilitation, a reconstruction, or a major reconstruction, it found that the jury may legitimately have concluded that it constituted a major reconstruction of the highway and therefore imposed certain attendant duties on DOTD.
Product and Industry News

Pay Parking by Cell Phone Is Tested at Single-Slot Facilities in Decatur, Georgia

StreetSmart Technology LLC announced earlier this month a pilot project in Decatur, Georgia to allow single-slot parking patrons to post their parking time and pay using cell phone technology.

The cell phone payment pilot project combines StreetSmart’s single space parking capabilities and pay by cell technology. While pay by cell service is available in some locations with multiple space parking facilities, this is the first time it is being used at single parking locations.

StreetSmart’s SmartMeter pay by cell system is being tested at two of downtown Decatur’s most popular parking locations. Motorists simply dial the number included on the meter’s sticker, follow the automated prompts to punch in the space number, also on the sticker, and see their time post on the meter. Live operators are available to assist with any questions and the first session is offered free of charge.

The system then sends drivers a text message to visit the pay for parking website and fill out the form that will create their account. Motorists fill the account in $20 increments, and it is drawn down automatically every time they park at a SmartMeter. The system will even send a text message to drivers before the meter expires and allow them to post more time, up to the two-hour limit, if they underestimated the length of their stay.

Initial response to the program has been positive for both motorists and local merchants. Drivers appreciate the convenience of a cashless payment option and businesses in the area are relieved from ongoing requests for change.

StreetSmart, which offers the first fully integrated parking space control and management information system, installed the basic technology in Decatur last year and expects to expand throughout the city in the near future.

The system includes space-by-space vehicle detection, digital parking meters, and wireless radio telemetry. It is unique in that it connects parking maintenance, enforcement, and collections operations through cellular SMS messaging.

By constantly monitoring the status of every parking space, it offers automation, greater workforce efficiency, and enhanced meter functionality. Also, by enforcing turnover and creating more parking, the system reduces “cruising” and offers fuel savings and environmental benefits.

SmartMeter encourages meter turnover, which increases revenue but also provides valuable information about the average length of stay, peak use hours and meter violations for strategic planning and better management of resources. Parking officials benefit from better management and greater efficiency as well as cost savings.

Payment, maintenance and occupancy information all appear in real time to a central location as well as to handheld devices of local enforcement. Enforcement becomes more efficient because the technology enables the city’s parking management team to determine the location of the most expired meters and respond quickly to violations.

StreetSmart manages the parking meters and has the ability to clear and reset them between occupants, which can account for a 30% increase in revenue. The system also can enforce the time meter by prohibiting additional time beyond the maximum limit, which can account for an additional 10% revenue savings.

Installation costs vary depending on agreements with individual cities and licensing fee arrangements but the negotiation license fee is approximately $30 per month per space and the installation fee is between $25 and $35 per month per space.

According to the company’s chief information officer, Eric Groft, StreetSmart expects the combination of added revenues and cost reductions to offset the expenses of the system and leave the city ahead financially.

If the pay by cell pilot program is successful, the SmartMeter system eventually could be expanded to all of Decatur’s parking meters. StreetSmart also is in discussions with other municipalities to make the technology available to those cities.

For more information, visit www.streetsmarttechnology.com or contact Kirby Andrews at kandrews@streetsmarttechnology.com.

Visa Offers a Range of Advanced Transit Payment Options Including Visa payWave

Visa, Inc. is merging electronic payments technology and transit agency fare collection capabilities to fulfill the demands of both transit passengers and operators.

With Visa payWave, a payment card in which a tiny chip is embedded that communicates securely with contactless card readers over short distances, the company has eliminated the need for passengers to purchase a dedicated ticket for transit travel and replaced it with more convenient and functional payment options.

As transit system efficiency becomes increasingly important due to growing demand but limited financial resources, the availability of electronic payment options offers promising solutions. In combining greater convenience, lower operations costs and increased transaction volume, Visa now is offering a range of solution strategies ideally suited for transit systems. Commuters are looking for speed and convenience, transit system agencies and operators want to reduce the challenges pre-
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sent by fare collection and managing payments and accounting, and Visa is developing the technology to meet these requirements. The company currently is offering four different transit payment options now in use in North America, Europe and Asia.

According to Visa, Inc., spokesperson Elvira Swanson, “these vary in their level of integration from those that offer a more convenient choice for paying for existing transit fare media, through dual-technology cards combining the advantages of Visa with proprietary fare media, to a completely integrated Visa solution that eliminates the need for any proprietary media on the operator’s part.”

The first option is known as “acceptance and reload.” In San Francisco, Singapore and Seoul, South Korea, transit users use their existing Visa accounts to purchase or “top up” proprietary transit fare media, such as magnetic-stripe paper fare cards. These can be purchased on demand or automatically.

The second, the “shared card” option, is used in London where the dual-use Visa and Oyster cards are available (including VisaPayWave technology). A shared card program also is underway in Los Angeles and in cities in Europe and Asia. In this case, the transit system’s fare card technology and Visa financial payment are integrated on a single card. As a dual-purpose solution, transit passengers have one fewer card to carry and transit operators have less fare media to distribute.

With the “payment at the gate” option, transit systems that do not yet have proprietary contactless fare collection technology can take advantage of the Visa payWave solution for fare collection without needing a separate fare application on the card. This approach allows a single card to be used on a variety of distinct transit systems within a region and relieves the consumer of requiring multiple fare media for each system they use. It also helps to relieve transit operators from worrying about managing fare media and technology.

This approach is being used by ferry passengers in Istanbul, Turkey as well as in the KLIA Express program in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. Visa is also working with regional transit authorities in the New York metropolitan area to allow commuters to use their Visa payWave cards and mobile devices to pay for subway, bus and commuter train trips in Manhattan and New Jersey.

Finally, the “Visa Fare Media” option is the most highly integrated transit payment method and recognizes Visa as the fare media itself. These include dedicated cards, co-branded and prepaid Visa cards that function as system-branded fare media that can also be used for Visa purchases.

Visa payWave technology allows fast and convenient fare media to be issued and serviced by issuing banks so that the transit operator does not have to handle fare collection. According to Swanson, transit agencies eventually will move beyond card acceptance to become important co-brand partners.

The cards can be reloaded at many ATMs by accessing the ReadyLink network so that passengers can avoid an additional stop at a transit facility, and prepaid Visa cards can provide access to other forms of electronic commerce as well. The technology also enables co-branded Visa credit, debit or pre-paid cards to be linked with transit-related rewards and perks for heavy transit users.

Currently, Visa Europe is working with RATP in Paris to evaluate and develop the concept of Visa payWave acceptance directly at the fare gate. The purpose of the partnership is to assess how Visa payWave can address the more sophisticated ticketing challenges presented in a mass transit environment.

Working with Citibank, Visa also will be the exclusive payment partner supporting transit applications on local cards for key transit programs in Hong Kong and Delhi, and Visa payWave cardholders in Turkey can use their card to pay for travel domestically or abroad.

In Malaysia, domestic Visa contactless cards are accepted at the fare gate to board the express train from the airport to the central bus station. Rather than purchase a ticket or dedicated transit enabled Visa card, passengers simply use the contactless card provided by their issuers.

In Korea, Visa cards are commonly used to pay for transit services. Almost a quarter of all Visa cards from 18 different issuers in the country support domestic transit applications of some sort. Cardholders can even use the same card to ride transit and to go shopping. And for the first time, commuters can use their Visa account to add value to their balances automatically on the phone’s SIM card.

In the United Kingdom, a Barclaycard Visa credit card features Visa payWave for transit payment and a contactless Oyster smartcard application which allows customers to make low-value purchases and travel throughout the public transport network with a single card. Visa Europe is also working with Transport for London (TfL) to determine how Visa payWave cards might be accepted directly at the fare gate throughout the city’s transit system.

In New York, Visa is participating in a pilot program at the New York Metropolitan Transit Authority (MTA) which will allow commuters to use their Visa payWave enabled cards and mobile devices to pay for subway, bus and commuter train trips. The cards are accepted at turnstiles and fare terminals throughout the transit system.

In Los Angeles, Swanson says that Visa is working with LA Metro to offer special Visa payWave cards that also incorporate the transit system’s TAB fare application. These dual-use, prepaid Visa cards will let riders pay their fares, “top up” their fare accounts using their Visa account, and make purchases anywhere a Visa is accepted.

For more information, contact Elvira Swanson, Visa, Inc., at tel. (650)432-8352 or elswanso@visa.com.
collaborate on the infrastructure and energy needs to power the network. Better Place’s two primary concepts for the network infrastructure consist of battery switch stations and changing stations, both of which would extend the range of the vehicles and make them more functional for traveling longer distances.

“Because Better Place will manage when vehicles are recharged, they can provide a market for renewable energy output in off-peak hours when it might otherwise not be needed,” said Hawaiian Electric executive vice president Robbie Alm.

California has defined a plan for a sustainable transportation model in which state and local government are working in partnership with the private sector to move the state from greenhouse gas-emitting cars that run on fossil fuel, toward clean, electric cars fueled by renewable energy, supported by an open network infrastructure. Better Place estimates the network investment in the Bay Area will total $1 billion when the system is fully deployed. The main components of the network are charging stations, battery exchange stations, and the provision of electricity by means of renewable sources at times outside peak consumption.

Better Place provided the following descriptions of their charging stations and exchange stations:

Each charging station is about the same size as a standard parking meter. When an electric vehicle pulls up and parks, on-board software instructs the vehicle to link-up with the charging station until the battery is charged. The driver doesn’t have to do anything to begin the process. All vehicles within the Better Place model will have the same plug which will allow them to charge at these spots, regardless of the make, model or power requirements of the electric car being driven. The charge spots function at 3.3 kW and 6.6 kW. In terms of voltage, the trickle charge is the same as a standard wall outlet in a home.

Each exchange station is roughly the size of your average living room. Like the charging spots, they are fully automated. A driver pulls in, puts the car in the neutral gear, and sits back. The battery exchange station does all the work. The depleted battery is removed, and a fully-charged replacement is installed. In under three minutes, the car is back on the road. It’s just like an automatic car wash—a quick, effortless, drive-through experience.

Better Place initially starting working with officials in Israel, Denmark, and Australia to create electric car networks. The company will activate networks on a country-by-country basis with initial deployments beginning in 2010.

For more information, visit www.betterplace.com or contact Julie Mulins, Better Place, at tel. (650)387-0486 or julie.mulins@betterplace.org.

Supporters of congestion charging argue that people will always vote against taxation unless the immediate benefits of the tax are made clear and apparent. As Kallbekken demonstrates, public support for environmental taxation requires that a clear and strong case be made that the charges will have a significant and positive impact.

For more information, visit www.tfl.gov.uk/roadusers/congestioncharging or contact Steffen Kallbekken at steffen.kallbekken@cicero.uio.no.
Editorial

The results from this week’s survey show that the traffic impact study process provides an opportunity to implement a number of measures that go beyond the conventional way of doing business. The process, for example, can be used to create a small revenue stream to cover some of the costs of personnel involved in the review of traffic impact studies and allow for the implementation of desirable transportation programs. Here are some examples:

- Simulation analysis can be required to be conducted for each new development over a certain size. In this way a simulated network can be expanded with each impact study.
- Implementation of an aggressive transportation demand management (TDM) program for developments over a certain size can be required. The program should have some teeth, such as providing for an annual contribution to an account to use for the application of appropriate TDM measures such as encouraging carpooling, making telework easier to implement, providing incentives to use public transportation, etc.
- The requirement for the developer to pay for the review of the impact study by the staff of the local jurisdiction.
- The ability to implement, where appropriate, desirable strategies such as roundabouts, ITS measures, etc.

There are more measures that are new, or innovative, or unconventional, or just plain different. Of course they are not applicable to all locations. However, it is difficult to imagine that there are not some that are applicable in nearly every local jurisdiction. While it is not to say that “bread and butter” measures such as adding a signal here and a turning lane there, are not necessary, there are other measures such as those listed above that might be worth considering for traffic mitigation. Some of these applications might be more cost-effective than what typically was applied in the past to mitigate congestion.

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

This Week’s Survey Results

Traffic Impact Studies - Current Practices

Earlier this month, The Urban Transportation Monitor conducted a survey among city and county traffic engineers to obtain their opinion and information about current practices in Traffic Impact Studies. Altogether 600 traffic engineers were contacted via e-mail. Replies were received from 72 cities and counties. This represents a return rate of 12%.

The results of the survey are published here.

The cities and counties were divided into small cities/counties (less than 100,000 population) and large cities/counties (equal or more than 100,000 population).

At present, when does your city/county require traffic impact studies?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>greater than specified no. of trips generated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>large cities/counties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents who indicated that they require traffic impact studies when a development generates more than a certain amount of trips per day provided the following threshold values:

Trips per peak hour: ranged from 20 to 150, average = 88

Other reasons/criteria used by respondents to determine if a traffic impact study is necessary (in no particular order):

- Both a threshold of peak-hour trips and a Congestion Management Plan Intersection.
- When there are more p.m. peak-hour trips than traffic model assumptions for the site.
- Location, type and size of development (in terms of square footage, parking spaces, number of subdivisions, etc) and equivalent traffic.
- Based on zoning code and land use.
- Required for nearly all new development and redevelopment.
- When congestion, safety or other conditions (documented) are present.
- When the proposed development is not consistent with the land use in the city's transportation model.
- According to County Congestion Management Plan guidelines.
Does your city/county charge a developer in filing fees and/or review fees for a traffic impact study?

Respondents who indicated that they charge a developer filing fees and/or review fees provided the following amounts charged:

Fees ranged from $500 to $20,000, average $7,900

Other procedures for charging developers as reported by respondents:

- Include overall review fees, such as application or environmental review fees.
- Development application fee is the same with or without a study.
- City/county does the study and the developer is charged.
- Developer is charged if in-house review would be too cumbersome.
- A fee based on trip generation.
- A fee based on cost of consultant.
- Fees are paid to the planning board because review is part of its submission.

How is the size for a traffic impact study determined (i.e. the distance from the development site within which capacity analysis should be conducted)?

Respondents who indicated that they include streets, intersections where site-generated traffic as a percentage of total traffic is larger than a specified minimum provided the following as minimum percentages:

Ranged from 1% to 10%, average = 6%

Other ways of determining size of study area as specified by respondents (in no particular order):

- The size is determined by the amount of traffic projected to be generated by the project. Examples provided:
  - 10 trips per lane added to an intersection
  - 25 additional peak hour trips added to critical intersections.
  - 50 peak hour trips added to any intersection
  - Any intersection where project trips exceed 100. Any intersection at LOS D where project trips exceed 40. Any intersection below LOS D where project trips exceed 10.
  - Actual capacity analysis requirement starts at 100 peak hour trips generated and scope of intersections increases from that.
  - 50 or more peak hour directional trips, 20 peak hour trips at metered freeway on-ramps.
  - Intersections that have 1% or more proportional share of impact.
- Determined by the city on a case by case basis, depending on conditions including:
  - Need for improvements, known areas of sensitivity.
  - Engineering judgement
  - Scale of the project. Area should include all intersections that could be significantly impacted.
Please indicate whether your city/county allows reductions in trips generated for each of the following and, where possible, the maximum percentage or amount of reduction allowed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Trip Reduction</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents Allowing Trip Reduction</th>
<th>Maximum Percentage Reduction Allowed (range of maximum percentages provided by respondents from both large and small cities/counties)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large cities/counties</td>
<td>Small cities/counties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For transit usage</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For TDM (excluding transit)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For passer-by trips</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the internal capture of trips</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For bicycle/walking trips</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For other reductions</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other comments by respondents regarding reductions in trips generated (in no particular order):
- City engineer considers reasonable and factual trip reduction study arguments.
- Development-sponsored shuttles.
- Depends on project specifics including land-use mix, type of TDM program, and land-use type next to type of transit stop or station.
- Depends on location and if there’s a substantial mix of retail, office and residential uses on-site.
- TDM, transit, walk/bike reduction are allowed on a case by case basis - so far only for large master plan development.
- TOD trip reduction allowed for range of 15-25%, depending on proximity to transit.
- Have allowed applicants to use ITE internal trip worksheet.
- All reductions must have analytical support.
- The transportation impact study includes all modes, not just traffic. In areas of the city with existing high rates of transit use, up to 80 percent of the work trips are assumed to arrive by transit. However, the study needs to address the project’s impact on the transit system. Will the transit system be able to carry these additional passengers? Most developments must contribute to a transit impact development fee.

Does your city/county follow up later to see if reductions allowed in traffic impact studies actually have been realized?

Does your city/county, through a binding agreement, and where appropriate, restrict a developer to a certain amount of trips generated in future years?
Do you recognize additional capacity “created” through the optimization of signals that are not optimized presently — for the benefit of the developer’s traffic?

![Graph showing percentage of respondents for large and small cities/counties answering “yes” or “no” to the question.](image)

Do you allow a reduction in traffic generation rates when redevelopment takes place (eg. deduct the “old” development’s trips)?

![Graph showing percentage of respondents for large and small cities/counties answering “yes” or “no” to the question.](image)

How often over the past year have you been forced to relax traffic impact mitigation requirements because of political/economic considerations (“to attract business to the city/county”)?

![Graph showing percentage of respondents for large and small cities/counties answering “never”, “sometimes”, or “frequently” to the question.](image)

What is your opinion about the following statement regarding consultants who do traffic impact studies for private developers?

![Graph showing percentage of respondents for large and small cities/counties answering “yes, most are like that”, “maybe some are like that”, or “no, most are objective” to the question.](image)
What major changes if any, have been made to your traffic impact study process during the past few years? (in no particular order):

- Access management
- We developed a citywide Visum model for analyzing the effect of projects.
- Developer no longer chooses the consultant. City issues a Request for Proposals and selects the traffic consultant. Developer submits a deposit to the City to cover the costs of preparing the traffic impact study.
- Consultant identifies the scope based on preliminary trip generation and analysis. The consultant must make a finding that no additional intersections will get 25 additional trips.
- Using the HCM methodology for intersection capacity analysis rather than ICU method.
- Require consultant to develop conceptual design layouts for impacted roadways and generalized cost estimates.
- Revisions to the intersection location methodology. Inclusion of a “safety” section that identifies necessary pedestrian and bicycle improvements.
- Analyzing impacts to individual turning movements at an intersection, and requiring mitigation if related to project traffic, in addition to looking at average LOS at an intersection. Performing queue length analysis at driveways, and pocket length analysis to determine appropriate lengths of turn pockets, incorporating traffic calming measures.
- Through a competitive process, we have retained two consulting firms, through on-call service agreements, to perform all traffic studies.
- Our Access Management Plan spells out access requirements as well as the requirements for scope for traffic impact studies. We also use our city-wide travel demand model to do 10-20 year forecast conditions for the developer’s consultant to review the long-term effects of their site, mostly on the adjacent arterial intersections and access drive intersections.
- We are more actively promoting roundabouts as traffic control devices.
- We have developed a set of guidelines for engineering consultants to follow when preparing a Traffic Impact Study.
- Developed and published specific guidelines as to who can perform a traffic impact study as well as the contents of the study and the base assumptions to be used in the analysis and to determine an “impact.” Use a pre-approved list of consultants to prepare Traffic Impact Studies.
- We’re in the process of implementing transportation impact fees. Because of that, we are conducting more planning work and identifying projects for assessing the fees.

- Guidelines were written down, with standards and criteria to be applied. See http://www.halifax.ca/traffic/documents/TISGUIDE8.pdf
- Environmental significance thresholds have been cut in half for LOS F relative to LOS E thresholds in response to a court case that held that the more congested the facility, the lower level of impact should be considered significant.
- Some sectors are now in the bylaw. (If you touch the zone you trigger a traffic impact study.)
- Implementation of the our concurrency permit process to meet state mandates that no development is permitted if inadequate capacity exists resulted in our providing the analysis for the vast majority of applications. We still use the traditional TIA to address safety, access standard deviations, and impacts over 100 peak hour trips outside of the evening peak hour, but this is less than 5% of the applications.
- Added a Rezoning Traffic Analysis requirement which can trigger the need for a study when a land use plan amendment or rezoning is requested without a specific development in mind; we also added a “Traffic Design Analysis” requirement to the TIR ordinance which calls for a design study evaluating safety, design of access points, pedestrian and bike facilities, cost assessment on plats or General Development Plans where a standard TIR are not exceeded.
- Residential street segment impacts.
- Currently adjusting to conform with the ITE recommended practice “Transportation Impact Analyses for Site Development.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents Applying Mitigation Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Install traffic signals</td>
<td>Larger Cities/Counties 84% Small Cities/Counties 87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide additional turning lanes</td>
<td>Larger Cities/Counties 74% Small Cities/Counties 91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access management restrictions</td>
<td>Larger Cities/Counties 71% Small Cities/Counties 83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left turn restrictions</td>
<td>Larger Cities/Counties 58% Small Cities/Counties 48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widening of roads</td>
<td>Larger Cities/Counties 55% Small Cities/Counties 57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop additional points of access</td>
<td>Larger Cities/Counties 39% Small Cities/Counties 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal coordination</td>
<td>Larger Cities/Counties 61% Small Cities/Counties 57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation demand management programs</td>
<td>Larger Cities/Counties 35% Small Cities/Counties 22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation of driveways</td>
<td>Larger Cities/Counties 55% Small Cities/Counties 57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions for unspecified street improvements</td>
<td>Larger Cities/Counties 26% Small Cities/Counties 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit floor area ratio</td>
<td>Larger Cities/Counties 10% Small Cities/Counties 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve transit service</td>
<td>Larger Cities/Counties 23% Small Cities/Counties 4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other measures as reported by respondents (in no particular order):

- Traffic signal excise tax, payable to at large arterial/collector intersections. Tax is approximately $.003 per square foot of plated property.
- Proportionate share cash contribution to specific off-site street/intersection improvements.
- Right-of-way contribution for future project in capital facility plan.
- Adequate off-street truck loading (height, width, length and turning radius), sidewalk improvements such as corner bulb-outs, electronic “FULL” signs outside parking garage entrances, changes in on-street parking regulations, reduction in the amount of parking provided, etc.
- Contributions for specified future improvements.
- Pedestrian connections, traffic signal phasing modifications.
- Contributions to traffic improvement district fees, which are directed to specific improvements.
- Contributions for unspecified streets on a selected number of TIF routes.
Are you satisfied with your city/county’s traffic impact study process in terms of its ability to negate the traffic impact of new developments?

![Percentage of respondents chart]

If “no”, please specify why you are not satisfied (in no particular order)

- Planning Commission will sometimes allow a developer to build without doing a traffic impact study.
- We still do not assess fees. We are working changes to our code through our system.
- In Virginia, unless the project requires a rezoning, no off-site improvements can be required of the developer.
- It is difficult to assess off-site improvement costs and force the developer to comply.
- The county’s Congestion Management Program is flawed in that it allows too many developments to occur which generate less than the required trip threshold triggering impact analysis, hence slowly impacting regional facilities over time significantly without a mechanism in place to mitigate the impacts.
- We have very limited options to mitigate traffic impacts due to terrain and right of way widths.
- Traffic impact study process is all right, but developers come in to try to have mitigation measures waived, reduced or altered in the plan check process.
- There is a lot of subjectivity.
- Yes and no. I believe our standards are well done—on paper, but the political environment of this city allows far too many concessions/waivers of the staff’s recommended mitigation improvements. We’re all about the “customer,” which in this city is the developer and not the citizens. I feel staff fights a two-front war with the developers on one side and city council/administration on the other. No less than 3 of the 7 council members, one is the mayor, is employed either in the banking business of development or as a real estate broker. I have a difficult time getting the decision-makers and developers to understand that the traffic impact of these development projects can actually extend past their property lines. Another KC metro city that I was employed at had a totally supportive view for staff—if the developer impacted the roads, they would be required to build the improvements. It’s truly amazing how the culture of communities can vary so much even though they’re in the same metro area.

If “yes”, please specify why you are satisfied (in no particular order)

- Generally satisfied - the one problem we struggle with is the interface of typical traffic impact issues, which tend to be more operational in nature, with system level issues such as (1) whether a development should be limited in order to reserve capacity for other future development in the area, (2) how to deal with timing or phasing issues (e.g., a road is planned for upgrading, but the work is not scheduled for a couple of years - do you let the proposed development proceed?) (3) cost-sharing of improvements to facilitate a current development that will benefit others.

What is your minimum Level of Service requirement for the following area types?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Area</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
<th>Minimum LOS Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large Cities</td>
<td>Small Cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transverse Development (TOD)</td>
<td>13% 65% 22% 14% 64%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infill areas</td>
<td>16% 68% 16% 16% 68%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment areas</td>
<td>17% 70% 13% 13% 63%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is the maximum total ITE trip generation rate reduction you allowed for each of the following area types?

![Percentage reduction of ITE trip rates chart]

Have you applied a multimodal LOS in traffic impact studies?

![Percentage of respondents chart]

Further comments by respondents on Traffic Impact Studies (in no particular order)

- We would like to apply multimodal LOS and reduction in trip generation but there are no sufficient data to determine reduction based on program elements.
- Some of the questions in this survey are general and would need to be refined. Also, each development is different and may require a different set of criteria. Finally, in a municipal/government environment, politicians play a major role in decision making for some major and controversial developments.
- We find LOS (A, B, C, etc.) can be abused or is misleading; therefore we rely on % ratios, delays, and queue lengths.
- I’m interested to know how other agencies assess the impact of new developments on residential street segments.
- Olathe, KS does not use a multi-modal LOS to impact studies, but I have reviewed the City of Kansas City (MO)’s Walkability Plan requirements, which does include guidance to conduct comprehensive pedestrian impact studies for development projects with LOS based for pedestrian uses. It is very interesting. This should be considered in evaluating development projects, but I think it’s going to take a very long time to change the cultural thinking that pedestrians/bicyclists are a nuisance.
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• UTMC - What Does It Mean in Delivering Effective ITS Solutions?
• A Strategic Vision to Empower Travelers: As the UTMC Community Prepares to Meet in Leeds, A Reflection on What a Two-Year Partnership Has Achieved to Date for Travelers in Leeds; F. MacDonald.
• Exciting Times for PIIG: A Report from Edinburgh where the Passenger Information Interest Group met in October to Discuss Recent Developments in Information and Ticketing.
• BIM is for Architecture - Now BIM is for Transportation: In the New Reuse and Extend Environment It is Important to Choose the Right Software; G. Jackman.
• A Seamless Service on Time and to Budget SignalPoint is about Delivering a Service, Not about Equipment; M. Tucker.
## CONFERENCES

<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>Dec. 13-15</td>
<td>13th International Conference of the Hong Kong Society for Transportation Studies (HKSTS and Dept. of Management Sciences, City University of Hong Kong)</td>
<td>Kowloon, Hong Kong</td>
<td>Intercontinental Grand Stanford Hotel</td>
<td>This conference aims to foster excellence in transportation research and practice, and to provide a local and international forum for exchanging ideas on transportation developments. Ms. Eva Cheng, JP, Secretary for Transport and Housing, HKSAR Government, will give the keynote address.</td>
<td>100+</td>
<td>HK$32,500 (US$1 = about HK$7.8)</td>
<td>Contact: H.P. Lo, e-mail: <a href="mailto:mshplo@cityu.edu.hk">mshplo@cityu.edu.hk</a>; Stephen C. H. Leung, e-mail: <a href="mailto:msleung@cityu.edu.hk">msleung@cityu.edu.hk</a>; Susanna Tam, e-mail: <a href="mailto:susannat@cityu.edu.hk">susannat@cityu.edu.hk</a> <a href="http://www.easts.info/">http://www.easts.info/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 15-17</td>
<td>International Conference on Integrated Transport for Sustainable Urban Development (Ministry of Transport of the People's Republic of China)</td>
<td>Beijing, China</td>
<td>Catic Plaza</td>
<td>The workshop is part of the activities in the global dialogue of clean urban transport funded by the EU-supported PARAMOUNT project. The First EU-China Workshop on Sustainable Urban Transport was organized on May 27-28, 2006. In 2008, the workshop will be more focused on four themes, including transport institutional innovation, financing of urban transport infrastructures, transport demand management, and land use and transport planning.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Domestic –RMB 2200/person Overseas €800/person</td>
<td>Ms. Letlei Liu at <a href="mailto:letlei_xtm1@126.com">letlei_xtm1@126.com</a> or <a href="mailto:letlei_xtm@hotmail.com">letlei_xtm@hotmail.com</a>. Tel: +86-10-59279509 Fax: +86-10-64964252 <a href="http://huiyi.ctsdrc.org/index.asp">http://huiyi.ctsdrc.org/index.asp</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 15-18</td>
<td>Maglev 2008, The 20th International Conference on Magnetically Levitated Systems and Linear Drives (General Atomics (GA) and the University of California San Diego (UCSD) Jacobs School of Engineering)</td>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td>Manchester Grand Hyatt</td>
<td>This international conference covers all aspects of magnetically levitated, propelled, and guided transportation systems. It is the first time in 15 years that this prestigious conference will be held in the U.S. Topics of interest to industry, academia, and transportation planners in the field include world-wide maglev projects, vehicles, levitation, propulsion, controls, safety, linear motor applications and energy supply. Attendees are expected from 16 countries.</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>$800 $250 –student On-site $850 $250 –student</td>
<td>Carl Fisher Advanced Technologies Group (202) 496-8217 <a href="mailto:carl.fisher@gm.com">carl.fisher@gm.com</a> Dr. Sam Gurol Maglev Systems (858) 455-4113 <a href="mailto:Sam.Gurol@ga.com">Sam.Gurol@ga.com</a> <a href="http://www.maglev08.com">www.maglev08.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 11-15</td>
<td>88th Annual Meeting (TRB)</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>Connecticut Avenue Collection</td>
<td>The TRB Annual Meeting program covers all transportation modes, with more than 3,000 presentations in nearly 600 sessions addressing topics of interest to all attendees—policy makers, administrators, practitioners, researchers, and representatives of government, industry, and academic institutions. The spotlight theme for 2009 is Transportation, Energy, and Climate Change.</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>$790/person $685m</td>
<td><a href="mailto:TRBMeetings@NAS.edu">TRBMeetings@NAS.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 24-27</td>
<td>APTA Transit CEOs Seminar (APTA)</td>
<td>Santa Monica, CA</td>
<td>Loews Santa Monica Beach Hotel</td>
<td>The Seminar brings together public transportation chief executives and deputies in a forum for professional development and open dialogue. Come to this concentrated, skill-based seminar to gain insights for achieving a new level of excellence in your leadership role, providing high quality transit service and value to your communities.</td>
<td>100-150</td>
<td>$695</td>
<td>Program: Lynne Morsen, tel. (202) 496-4853 Registration: Heather Rachels, tel. (202) 496-4838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 1-5</td>
<td>39th Convention and Traffic Expo (American Traffic Safety Services Assoc. - ATSSA)</td>
<td>San Jose, CA</td>
<td>San Jose McEmery Convention Center</td>
<td>For 39 years, ATSSA's Annual Convention and Traffic Expo has been the premier meeting place for roadway professionals around the world. The program and exhibits are dedicated to issues and products related to all aspects of temporary traffic control and roadway safety.</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>$510 m – Committee $590 m – Non-Committee $780 nm $285 Public Official</td>
<td>ATSSA Meetings and Conventions Department: 1-800-272-8772 Phone: 1-540-368-1701 Fax: 1-540-368-1717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 5-7</td>
<td>Texas District Winter Meeting –District 9 (ITE)</td>
<td>Lubbock, TX</td>
<td>Holiday Inn Park Plaza</td>
<td>Special Focus on Complete Streets Initiative. Technical sessions will offer practical and innovative solutions to contemporary engineering and planning challenges, such as: Public Involvement and Outreach, Transit Planning or Operations, Transportation Safety Issues, Traffic Operations, ITS Design and Communications, Mitigating Construction Impacts, Planning Signs and Markings, Low-cost Congestion Solutions, Pedestrians and Bikes, Managing Special Events Resource Planning/Scheduling.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Coming soon</td>
<td>Chair: Shannon Owens Info: <a href="mailto:Jhart@ci.lubbock.tx.us">Jhart@ci.lubbock.tx.us</a> (806) 775-2130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 6-11</td>
<td>Annual Conference (Transportation Association of South Carolina)</td>
<td>Myrtle Beach, SC</td>
<td>Marriott Dunes Hotel</td>
<td>The conference and trade show provide a legislative, regulatory and industry update for transportation issues in South Carolina.</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>$375 $550</td>
<td>Transportation Association of South Carolina (864) 809-2546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 21</td>
<td>Washington Briefing (AASHTO)</td>
<td>Arlington, VA</td>
<td>The Ritz-Carlton Hotel</td>
<td>The AASHTO Washington Briefing has its focus on legislation and policy for the year ahead. It represents all five transportation modes: air, highways, public transportation, rail, and water. AASHTO’s primary goal is to foster the development, operation, and maintenance of an integrated national transportation system.</td>
<td>175-200</td>
<td>Before Feb. 12 $475 m $550 nm After: $550 m $625 nm</td>
<td>Monica E. Russell 202-224-3694 <a href="mailto:mrsuill@aashto.org">mrsuill@aashto.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N/A = Not Available; m = member; nm = non-member. To list your transportation conferences here FREE, send all information as above to: The UTM Conference Dept., P.O. Box 12300, Burke, VA 22009-2300, or call (703) 764-0512, or fax (703) 764-0516, or email: editors@lawleypublications.com.
<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>Feb.22-24</td>
<td>National Conference on Regions (National Association of Regional Councils)</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>The Ritz Carlton Hotel</td>
<td>The 2009 conference, “Building Regional Opportunities: New Administration, New Congress,” will focus on what is in store for regional councils and metropolitan planning organizations with the change in leadership. In addition to plenary sessions focusing on transportation reauthorization, national water policy, workforce development in the new economy, and climate change, the agenda will include four open sessions, committee meetings and the annual membership meeting and elections.</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>$400 m</td>
<td>Lindsay Riley, Member Services Manager, <a href="mailto:lindsey@NARC.org">lindsey@NARC.org</a> or 202.986.1030 x220.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 22-25</td>
<td>Marketing and Communications Workshop (APTA)</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>Hilton San Francisco</td>
<td>Intensive workshop focusing on all aspects of public transportation marketing and communications, including media relations, research, customer service, ridership initiatives, and best practices.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$425m - $775m</td>
<td>Program: Jack Gonzalez, tel. (202) 496-4824 Registration: Heather Rachels, tel.(202) 496-4838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 23-25</td>
<td>Texas Transit Conference &amp; Mini Expo (Texas Transit Association)</td>
<td>Austin, TX</td>
<td>Radisson Hotel North</td>
<td>Legislative focus. The Texas Transit Association (TTA) is a non-profit professional corporation. Its membership is composed of metropolitan transit authorities, small urban transit districts and rural transit districts in Texas as well as associate members of private and public entities from across the nation.</td>
<td>150-200</td>
<td>$200 TTA m and TxDOT $400 nm On-site $250TTA and TxDOT $450 nm</td>
<td>Gail Lord, Administrative Manager <a href="mailto:gallord@texastransit.org">gallord@texastransit.org</a>, tel.: (512) 478-8883 <a href="http://www.texastransit.org">www.texastransit.org</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 1-4</td>
<td>National Main Streets Conference (National Trust for Historic Preservation)</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>The Palmer House Hilton</td>
<td>Chicago will host the 2009 National Main Streets Conference, where we will emphasize the opportunities technology offers Main Street programs. In addition to sessions focused on innovative technology and web-based solutions to running a revitalization organization and building a vibrant commercial district, attendees will explore successful strategies in applying the Main Street Four-Point Approach.</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>$425 - $575</td>
<td>National Trust for Historic Preservation tel: 202.588.6219 fax: 202.588.6050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 3-4</td>
<td>7th Annual Transportation Summit (Strategy Institute)</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>Four Points by Sheraton/</td>
<td>Progressive transportation initiatives are enabling cities to boost their economies and realize a truly integrated and multimodal transportation system. Be part of this 21st century wave. Take back practical strategies you can implement. Conference will include world-renowned case studies: • Madrid • São Paulo • Prague • Atlanta • Halifax • San Francisco.</td>
<td>80-120</td>
<td>$1797 standard $897 gor/ngo After $987 standard $997 gor/ngo</td>
<td><a href="http://www.strategyinstitute.com/dsp_conferences.php">http://www.strategyinstitute.com/dsp_conferences.php</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 7-11</td>
<td>Legislative Conference, (National Association of Counties)</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>Marriott Wardman Park</td>
<td>Focus on restoring the partnership between the federal and local government. The conference affords members the opportunity to gather legislative information to help improve the effectiveness of their counties. Great opportunity for education and networking.</td>
<td>2,000-2,500</td>
<td>$490m - $740 nm On-site $625 m $825-$875 nm $745 gov't</td>
<td>National Association of Counties tel: (202) 393-6226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 8-10</td>
<td>34th Legislative Conference (APTA)</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>J.W. Marriott</td>
<td>Premier meeting for Board members/policymakers, transit operators, consultants, manufacturers and suppliers, government relations staff, and local coalition members. Covers wide range legislative issues for public transportation.</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>$575 m</td>
<td>Program: Homer Carlisle tel.: (202) 496-4810 Registration: Adam Martin tel.: (202) 496-4845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 9-12</td>
<td>2009 “National Traffic Management and Work Zone Safety Conference”</td>
<td>Orlando, FL</td>
<td>The Orange County</td>
<td>This event connects transportation design and construction industry professionals with government/safety industry experts to discuss safe flow of traffic in roadway work zones. The conference will include sessions on: accommodating pedestrians, cyclists and persons with disabilities in work zones; complying with new FHWA regulations on high visibility clothing and payment for temporary traffic control; challenges of night time construction; avoiding worker runovers and backovers; legal liabilities for traffic control; and new safety and health training programs. World of Asphalt 2009 features exhibits and education focused on the latest technologies in equipment, product, etc.</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>FREE</td>
<td><a href="http://www.workzonesafety.org">www.workzonesafety.org</a> Lisa McCluskey, 202-289-4434 or ARTBA-TDF Bradley Sant Matt Jannenert 202-289-4434</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N/A = Not Available; m = member; nm = non-member. To list your transportation conferences here FREE, send all information as above to: The UTM Conference Dept., P.O. Box 12300, Burke, VA 22009-2300, or call (703) 764-0512, or fax (703) 764-0516, or email: editors@lawleypublications.com.
1. Emergency Travel Study
Agency: Syracuse Metropolitan Transportation Council
Deadline: January 6, 2009 by 4 p.m.
Contact: Jennifer Deshaies, Senior Transportation Planner
Syracuse Metropolitan Transportation Council
100 Clinton Square
126 N. Salina St., Suite 100
Syracuse, NY 13202
(315) 422-5716 Ext. 311
(315) 422-7753 FAX jdeshaies@smtcmpo.org
www.smtcmpo.org
Description: As part of the 2008–2009 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), the Syracuse Metropolitan Transportation Council (SMT) has agreed to complete the ETS on behalf of the Syracuse-Onondaga County Planning Agency (SOCPA) in an effort to comprehensively plan for the safety of the population in an emergency. The final ETS will be sponsored by the Onondaga County Department of Emergency Management (OCDEM); this division of Onondaga County will be responsible for the implementation of the final ETS. The SAC has determined that the final ETS will be location specific. The area of concentration will be the University Hill area (residential, hospitals, businesses), possibly including a connection to downtown. The ETS should also include coordination beyond Onondaga County (into surrounding Central New York counties). There are many individual emergency-type plans currently in place for this general area that will need to be reviewed prior to creating the final ETS. The project will be completed utilizing SMT staff and a hired consultant (or team). The project will include input and participation from SMT’s member agencies. Citizen participation will be included via both the Study Advisory Committee (SAC) and a separate stakeholders group. The ETS will address the evacuation of people due to an emergency (to travel home or to an external destination), and may include a ‘shelter in place’ scenario. Both man-made and natural occurrences, categorized by level of threat (risk management assessment), that impact transportation and interstate access and are likely to occur in this geographic area should be addressed as part of the ETS. The types of emergencies that are most likely to occur will be chosen by the consultant. The ETS should identify scenario-based evacuation routes around the incident that will remove people from the affected area and minimize the travel time. The potential emergency scenarios may include limited or no access to the interstates, and evacuation routes should be planned accordingly. A phased evacuation, with options for evacuation routes and transportation issues, as well as a time-staged process, would be ideal. The ETS should also identify modes of transportation to move people and temporary shelter away from the site of the emergency (health and human needs assessment including special-needs populations). The ETS should address preparedness, response, and mitigation and also include a framework for re-entry and recovery. The ETS should be response based, and a designated group of people (lead by the OCDEM) should be able to assess the type of emergency occurring and put the most appropriate option from the ETS into place. The ETS should include adequate transportation strategies for the populations on the Hill, including students, hospitalized patients, residential and educational facilities.

2. SR-91 Implementation Plan 2009 Update
Agency: Orange County Transportation Authority
Deadline: January 21, 2009
Contact: Procurement Administrator Sarah Strader E-Mail sstrader@octa.net
Phone Number (714) 560-5633
Website: https://www.octa.net/cammadnet/procurement1_0.asp?section=8137&1number=0&exts.pdf
Description: Request for Proposals (RFP) for consultants to develop the State Route 91 Implementation Plan 2009 update. A Pre-Proposal conference is scheduled for December 23, 2009, at 9:00 a.m. in Conference Room 103/104.

3. Multipodal Transit Corridor Alternatives Feasibility Study
Agency: County of Greenville, SC
Deadline: 2008-12-30 15:00:00
Contact: Nadine Chasteen, CPP0, CPP, Director, Procurement Services Division, County of Greenville, 301 University Ridge, Suite 100, Greenville, SC 29601. Fax: 864-467-7304, nchasteen@greenvillecounty.org.
Website: http://greenvillecounty.org/Purchasing/RFP/3809
PDF Description: The County of Greenville is seeking proposals from consultants to provide a multimodal transit corridor alternatives feasibility study for the Greenville County workforce economic development corporation.

4. Potential Suffolk County Intermodal Sites
Agency: University Transportation Research Center, Region II
Deadline: January 1, 2009
Contact: peickemeyer@utrc2.org
Website: http://www.utrc2.org/research/rfps/C0867.pdf
Description: The study will assess the work done that supports the recommendation of an intermodal terminal site on Long Island. It will focus on potential intermodal sites by: Evaluating the selection criteria used in the Long Island Truck-Rail Intermodal Draft Environmental Impact Statement (LITRIM DEIS); This statement is available at: https://www.nysdot.gov/portal/page/portal/regional-offices/region10/projects/long-island-intermodal. Alternatively the DEIS can be located at www.nysdot.gov, then click on “projects” and search on project identification number 03912.

5. Enhanced Safety Prediction Methodology and Analysis Tool for Freeways and Interchanges
Agency: Transportation Research Board
Deadline: 2009-01-29 00:00:00
Contact: Charles W. Niessner
Phone: 202-334-1431
Email: cniessner@nas.edu
Website: http://www.trb.org/TRBNet/ProjectDisplay.asp?ProjectID=2512
Description: The objectives of this research are to develop (1) an overall framework for the enhancement of safety prediction methodologies for freeways and interchanges to support decision making for planning, network, corridor analysis, and individual site analysis; (2) safety analytical models and procedures within that framework; (3) models and procedures for a corridor and individual site application tool (e.g., enhanced ISAT or successor); (4) a chapter for the future edition of the HSM; and (5) documentation for inclusion of the models in the IHSDM.

6. CDTA Saratoga Bus Facility Feasibility Analysis
Agency: Capital District Transportation Authority
Deadline: January 5, 2009 by 11 a.m.
Contact: Stacy Sansky, Director of Procurement
Phone: 518-437-8342
Fax: 518-437-8348
stacys@cdta.org
Description: CDTA-Business Development 09-200 CDTA Saratoga Bus Facility: Feasibility Analysis, Preliminary Environmental Documentation and Fiscal Capacity Analysis

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.