San Francisco SFpark Pilot Aims to Improve Parking Availability

Uses Sensors to Monitor Demand, Adjust Meter Rates

In 2011, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) will launch SFpark, a new approach to parking management. It will use sensors, new parking meters, and real-time parking data to take the guesswork out of finding a parking spot.

Circling for parking currently accounts for approximately 30% of city driving, according to the SFMTA. Reducing traffic through more parking availability will yield benefits for drivers, transit riders, bicyclists, pedestrians and merchants. On San Francisco’s narrow streets, cars that double-park or make right or left turns while circling cause traffic congestion. Less circling means less traffic, which means fewer car, bicycle and pedestrian collisions. Transit service will be more able to stay on schedule. Meters that accept credit cards will reduce frustration and, along with longer time limits for parking, will reduce the need to issue parking tickets. Reduced circling will mean less wasted fuel and better air quality.

Three main components comprise the SFpark project—new meters to make it easier to pay, sensors to record parking availability, and a data feed to process and distribute information about where parking is available. Funding for 80% of the SFpark project is provided by a $19.8 million grant from the U.S. Department of Transportation’s Urban Partnership Program with the remaining 20% coming from the SFMTA.

Asked if SFpark is a way for the city to raise revenue, the SFMTA said that making it easier to park by improving availability is the primary goal. Hourly parking rates may increase in high-demand areas and at high-demand times, but rates will also decrease where and when demand is low. On balance, parking meter revenues are likely to increase somewhat, but parking ticket revenue will decrease because longer time limits and new meters that make it easy to pay.

The SFpark pilot, which started in July 2010, will run for two years. It includes Hayes Valley, Civic Center, the Financial District, SOMA, the Mission, Fisherman’s Warf, the Marina and the Fillmore District. Approximately 5,100 metered parking spaces and 12,250 SFMTA-managed garage spaces are included in the pilot. Through October 2010, the SFMTA will replace existing parking meters with new state-of-the-art meters that allow drivers to pay with coins, credit/debit cards, and soon with SFMTA parking cards. In early...
EC Outlines Program to Halve Traffic Fatalities by 2020

In U.S., Group Urges Ambitious Target Be Included in Highway Reauthorization Bill

U.S. Lags Behind European Union in Fatality Reduction

The European Commission (EC) has announced an ambitious Road Safety Program that aims to cut road deaths in Europe in half in the next decade. The program sets out initiatives at the European and national levels, focusing on improving vehicle safety, infrastructure safety, and road users’ behavior.

More than 34,000 people died in 2009 on the roads of the European Union — the equivalent of a medium town, the EC said in a July 20 press release. No fewer than 1,500,000 persons were injured. The estimated economic cost to society is huge — 130 billion euro a year.

The proposed policies build on the results of the 2001-2010 Third Road Safety Action Program. The program’s target of halving fatalities by 2010 has not been completely met, but significant progress has been made. For example, the number of EU fatalities is expected to fall by more than 40% (compared to a 25% drop in the preceding decade). Also, the average level of road deaths per one million inhabitants fell from 113 in 2001 to 69 in 2009 for all current 27 Member States. “The Road Safety Action Plan was a strong catalyst for EU and national efforts to improve road safety,” the EC said. But more remains to be done.

By comparison, highway deaths in the United States dropped about 19% from 2001 to 2009, according to preliminary statistics released by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) in March 2010. If the same percentage of fatality reduction was achieved in the United States as was achieved in the EU, there now would be over 7,000 less lives lost annually. A group of highway safety officials and advocates are urging Congress to adopt ambitious targets for cutting highway deaths as part of the next surface transportation authorization bill.

In March 2010, the members of the State Highway Safety Alliance – the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators, the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), the Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance, the Governors Highway Safety Association (GHSA), and the National Association of State EMS Officials – along with the International Association of Chiefs of Police, wrote to key House and Senate committees urging that the new U.S. transportation reauthorization bill include a national strategy for cutting highways deaths in half over the next two decades as well as increased funding for safety programs to enable states to reach that goal. But action on the bill has been stalled.

The EC set out detailed measures aimed at meeting the Road Safety Program’s seven strategic objectives:

**Improved Safety Measures for Vehicles:** In 2001-2010, the focus was on passive" safety devices such as seatbelts and airbags. In 2011-2020, new “active safety” measures will come into force including mandatory electronic stability control for vehicles, mandatory lane departure warning systems and mandatory automatic emergency braking systems for trucks and buses, and mandatory seat belt reminders for cars and trucks. The EC will advance measures setting technical standards for safety in electric vehicles, and examine the possibility of extending the implementation of advanced Driver Assistance Systems, such as anti-collision warnings, by retrofitting them to vehicles. The Commission will strengthen EU legislation on roadworthiness tests to gain mutual recognition of inspections among Member States, and examine the need for further legislation to reduce injury risk for pedestrians and cyclists.

**Building Safer Road Infrastructure:** European funds will only be granted to infrastructure compliant with road safety and tunnel safety directives. The EC will examine extending EU legislation on infrastructure safety management to rural roads of Member States. This legislation requires that safety requirements be considered in the planning, pre-design and construction process.

### Reduction in Traffic Fatalities: European Union Compared to the U.S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>European Union</th>
<th>United States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Fatalities, 2001</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>42,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Fatalities, 2009</td>
<td>34,500</td>
<td>34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Change</td>
<td>-36%</td>
<td>-19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities per 1,000,000 Population, 2001</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities per 1,000,000 Population, 2009</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Change</td>
<td>-39%</td>
<td>-25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources:
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MnDOT Uses a Multimodal Approach and Technology to Combat Congestion in Minneapolis

_Goal is to Reduce Congestion by 20%_

Transportation planners in Minnesota are combating traffic congestion in the Minneapolis area with a four-pronged assault utilizing the “Four Ts”: transit, tolling, telecommuting, and technology.

This initiative, which uses federal and local funds in a multi-year approach, has made Minneapolis a recognized leader in the effort to ease urban traffic congestion. According to Nick Thompson, director for policy analysis, research and innovation at the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT), this approach relies on employing the latest technology to utilize the existing transportation system better so that commuters have more transportation choices.

“Our goal is a 20% reduction overall [in congestion] and, most importantly, that individual users have the choice to avoid it whenever they want via transit, tolled dynamically priced express lanes and telework,” Thompson said. “Performance will be measured in an evaluation that will be completed in 2012.”

Most of the approximately 25 projects included in this initiative were started in 2007 and completed by December 2009. A few will be completed later this year. In September 2007, Minnesota was awarded $133.3 million through the U.S. Department of Transportation’s Urban Partnership Agreement (UPA) program for a comprehensive initiative to improve traffic flow by reducing congestion on Interstate 35W, Highway 77/Cedar Avenue and in downtown Minneapolis. The state was required to provide a local match of $50.2 million. Thompson said that the projects are valued at about $288 million. The $288 million is a mix of federal and state funds including the UPA grant and a 2008 state transportation funding package, which provided the local matching funds and is expected to generate more than $6 billion dollars over 10 years for transportation projects.

Thompson told UTM that transit improvements have included investments in customer information systems, new buses, expanded service (including express bus service), and the rebuild of downtown streets to expand capacity. The first project completed provided buses with a special bus-only turn lane and signal priority to help improve transit time and maintain transit schedule. The bus-only lane and signal are used only during peak periods, but according to MnDOT, allow transit riders to save 5-10 minutes during peak times.

Single bus lanes were expanded to two bus lanes on Marquette Avenue and 2nd Avenue in downtown Minneapolis to nearly triple the capacity for buses while reducing travel time through a 16-mile downtown area. Nearly 2,900 new parking spaces were constructed at six new or expanded park and ride facilities.

In terms of tolling, MnDOT converted high occupancy vehicle lanes on busy I-35W from Burnsville Parkway to I-494 into high occupancy toll lanes. Solo motorists with a MnPASS account can pay a toll to access the express lanes while carpools with two or more occupants, motorcycles and transit buses can still use the express lanes free of charge during tolling hours.

On northbound I-35W from 46th Street to downtown Minneapolis, bus-only shoulder lanes were replaced with priced dynamic shoulder lanes (PDSLs) that are used during peak periods by buses, carpoolers and single-occupant vehicles willing to pay the toll.

PDSLs enable bus speeds to increase to 50 mph from bus-only shoulder lane speeds of 35 mph or less. The plan is for the PDSLs to link up with the I-35W MnPASS Express Lanes and also to extend these HOT lanes between I-494 and 46th Street, with the extension scheduled to open in fall 2010. The end result will be a new 15-mile, dynamically-priced managed-lane corridor, providing motorists a new option to experience a fast and reliable trip.

In terms of telecommuting, MnDOT started a program called eWorkPlace aimed at increasing the number of telecommuters, particularly those that use the target freeway (I-35W) to get to their workplace. The eWorkPlace program is a collaboration between the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) and Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota and is funded by a state appropriation of $3.2 million.
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HNTB’s America THINKS Survey Finds Americans Prefer Tolls Over Taxes; They Also Prefer a Focus on Fixing Existing Infrastructure Over Building New Facilities

Kansas City, MO

Despite a growing awareness that America’s aging network of highways, bridges and tunnels is in failing health, congressional action on a new national transportation bill has been stymied by a lack of adequate funding sources and disagreements about how to plan, prioritize and pay for U.S. infrastructure. A new America THINKS survey from HNTB Corporation suggests the answer may lie in a solution that financed U.S. roads and bridges prior to the national gas tax: tolling.

“Tolling is a proven source of alternative funding, already used in a variety of locations across the country. Its primary appeal – as a user fee – means those who use the road pay for the road,” said Jack Finn, HNTB national director of toll services, in a July 22 press release. “Many states without legislation to support tolling have a keen interest in advancing such initiatives and understanding the benefits.” The America THINKS survey will help transportation professionals and elected officials better understand public perceptions and the potential acceptance of increased tolling.

America THINKS is a series of surveys from HNTB Corporation that explores how the United States can plan, prioritize, and pay for its infrastructure. “As part of that debate, the nation needs to determine a vision that will guide federal surface transportation policy and funding,” said HNTB spokesman John O’Connell. “It comes at a time of economic turmoil, calls for political change and an increasing awareness that the gas tax is no longer sufficient to pay for the roads, bridges and rails this country needs.” O’Connell told UTM that HNTB is trying to encourage a dialogue among industry professionals, elected and appointed officials and the general public.

According to the new survey, in which a random nationwide sample of 1,005 adults were polled between June 25 and July 1, 2010, most Americans support tolls on roads and bridges to generate transportation revenue, especially on roads that save motorists drive time. Moreover, they prefer a focus on fixing existing infrastructure over building new facilities.

Given a choice between new roads funded by an increased gas tax, by new tolls or no new roads at all, Americans prefer tolls (41 percent) or no new roads at all (41 percent) over increased gas taxes (18 percent). Eighty-four percent of those surveyed say tolls should be considered project-by-project or as a primary source of transportation revenue. Only 16 percent say tolls should never be used.

Asked where they would be willing to spend more money to support long-term transportation improvements, Americans ranked tolling ahead of other options. Thirty-nine percent chose additional road and bridge tolls, 29 percent - public transportation fees, 23 percent - vehicle registration fees, 20 percent - sales taxes, 18 percent - gas taxes, 11 percent - income taxes, and 9 percent chose property taxes.

Forty-seven percent believe the most important function of a toll facility is to generate transportation revenue, versus reducing congestion (25 percent) or providing a higher level of customer service (13 percent). Most surveyed would support tolls that fund improvements for either the road on which it’s paid (53 percent) or other existing roadways (45 percent); only 18 percent would want toll revenues to be devoted to new construction.

Sixty-eight percent don’t think about tolls without considering convenience – they would be willing to pay a higher toll fare if it saved them time on the road. A slight majority (52 percent) think it is acceptable to be charged a toll to use a high occupancy toll lane. In fact, HOT lanes are the most popular form of tolling, with about half (51 percent) of Americans believing they are worthwhile - more than road and bridge tolls managed by local or state governments (37 percent), those managed by private companies (21 percent) or even congestion pricing (20 percent).

Seventy-six percent of Americans who drive on roads and bridges with tolls say they are satisfied with most tolling systems they use. But 61 percent of drivers admit they have purposely avoided a road or bridge with tolls at least once. Forty-three percent feel that tolls are generally too costly, and 24 percent view most toll plazas as high-traffic areas. Fifty-seven percent say the ideal future of tolling would be a combination of cash and electronic collection on local roads and bridges.

“Technology now allows us to use video cameras and transponders to conduct transactions at highway speeds,” Finn said. “We’re generating revenue, reducing congestion and saving time.”

HNTB’s America THINKS survey was conducted by Kelton Research, which used an e-mail invitation and online survey. Quotas were set to ensure reliable and accurate representation of the total U.S. population ages 18 and over. The margin of error is +/- 3.1 percent. HNTB Corporation is an employee-owned infrastructure firm serving federal, state, municipal, military and private clients.

For more information, visit http://www.hntb.com/ or contact John O’Connell at (816) 527-2383 or joconnell@hntb.com

Survey Finds Parking Rates Hold Steady Despite Downward Pressure on Prices

Seattle, WA

Parking rates in North American central business districts (CBDs) held firm over the past 12 months despite overall downward pressure on sale prices and leasing rates in other segments of the commercial real estate market, according to Colliers International 10th Annual Parking Rate Survey.
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Colliers’ Survey indicates that, even in the face of economic hardship, parking garage owners and operator have held rates steady, providing little relief to businesses or consumers. U.S and Canadian parking rates registered little change, highlighting the high degree of stability in this often overlooked sector.

Despite a loss of eight million jobs and a challenging business environment, only a few U.S. cities saw a significant pullback in parking rates during the June 2009-June 2010 period. Daily and monthly parking rates in the U.S. largely held steady in the 44 CBDs surveyed, with the median daily parking charge dropping only 1.4% to $16.36. This small decrease reverses a 1.2% increase last year. In contrast, the median monthly parking rate for the 44 U.S. CBDs surveyed crept up by 1.1%, reaching $161.56 and reversing a 0.9% drop in rates last year.

In Canada, the median daily rate in the 12 CBDs surveyed climbed by 2% in the past year to $14.83 CAD after increasing 9.9% in 2008-2009. Monthly parking rates in Canada increased to a median parking rate of $224.10 CAD. This represents a 2.0% gain over the past year, compared with a 9.9% increase in 2008-2009.

With the economic recovery unfolding slowly, parking rates are expected to show little change over the next 12 months, reports Colliers. Rates are expected to trend upward beginning in the second half of 2011.

This year’s survey found that New York City’s two CBDs were the most expensive U.S. cities for parking, with Midtown Manhattan’s monthly median price tag at $538 and Downtown Manhattan’s at $529. Both were more than three times the national average. After these CBDs were Boston at $425, San Francisco at $375, and Chicago at $320. The five most expensive parking districts in Canada (as represented by monthly median rate in Canadian dollars) were Calgary ($453), Toronto ($336), Montreal ($280), Edmonton ($275) and Vancouver ($267). All of these parking rates seem like a bargain when compared to those of cities in Europe, Asia and even Australia. London – City was the most expensive place in the world to park, with $933 median price for a monthly spot, followed by London’s West End at $874 per month. In Asia, Hong Kong and Tokyo both topped New York’s median monthly parking cost at $745 and $654, respectively. Sydney, Australia also topped New York with a median monthly parking cost of $591.

The five cities in the U.S. with the least expensive median monthly parking rates were Phoenix, Arizona at $40; Reno, Nevada at $45; Walnut Creek/East Bay, California at $48; Ft. Lauderdale, Florida at $53 and Bakersfield, California at $55. Canada’s least expensive monthly parking spots include Kitchener-Waterloo, Ontario at $117 CAD and Saskatoon, Saskatchewan at $147 CAD.

The continued tight balance between supply and demand for parking – even with the economy still far from operating at capacity – helps stabilize the parking rates. “Parking availability in only four of the 56 Central Business Districts surveyed were described as ‘abundant’ with the remainder being ‘fair’ or ‘limited,’” said Ross J. Moore, Executive Vice President and Chief Economist for Colliers International in the U.S. “That situation is not expected to change much, with only six new garages containing less than 4,000 spaces to be added in the next two years in the U.S. and 10 new garages with 1,800 spots to be added in Canada.”

Other key findings of the survey for the United States include:
- Extremes in monthly parking rates range from a high of $1,200 in Midtown Manhattan to a low of $20 in Memphis, TN.
- Continuing a trend seen last year, 11.6% of parking garages had a waiting list with an average wait of 6.2 months, compared with 12 months ago when 13.6% had a waiting list with an average wait of 3.7 months. Two years ago 20.9% had a waiting list.
- Under three quarters (70%) of cities surveyed described the supply of parking as “fair” (parking garages are 60-80% full Mon-Fri and on weekends during special events), while 20% indicated parking was “limited” (parking garages are usually full Mon-Fri and on weekends during special events) and 10.0% said “abundant” (parking garages are consistently less than 60% full). By these measures, parking pressures have increased modestly.
- Just 15% of cities survey indicated new garages will be constructed in the next 24 months.

Data for the 2010 Parking Rate Survey was collected during the month of June 2010. Survey data includes only covered or underground parking garages in prime CBDs.


For more information, contact Parke Chapman, The Marino Organization, at (212) 889-0808 or by e-mail at parke@themarino.org.
San Francisco SFpark Pilot Aims to Improve Parking Availability

2011, the time limits on many meters will be extended.

SFpark will periodically adjust meter pricing up and down to match demand. Demand-responsive pricing encourages drivers to park in underused areas and garages, reducing demand in overused areas. Currently, city meters charge from $1.00 to $3.50 an hour. But parking on high-demand blocks costs the same as parking on low-demand blocks, and parking in garages usually costs more. SFpark will track via sensor how often each space is used and adjust hourly rates accordingly to even out parking availability to about 20%.

Rates can fluctuate by time of day and day of week, but prices will be adjusted by increments of no more than 50 cents an hour, no more frequently than once a month. In pilot areas, meter pricing will range from 25 cents to a maximum of $6.00 an hour. Rate changes will also affect city-owned garages and, since many of these are underutilized, the prices are likely to decrease. The SFpark meters will communicate wirelessly with the SFpark data feed. When pricing changes, new rate information will be sent directly to the meters.

During the pilot, 8,300 parking sensors will be installed; the vast majority of these will be at metered parking spaces. Sensors will also be placed in unmetered parking to supply supplemental data and in three control neighborhoods to provide baseline data. As the SFpark data hub collects information from the sensors, parking managers can see where and when parking tends to be available. This information, combined with data supplied by new SFpark meters, will power the entire project. The SFpark data feed will allow real-time information to reach drivers directly. In addition to parking availability maps accessible at SFpark.org, information will be dispersed via the 511 system, mobile devices, text messaging, and through new electronic display signs at high-traffic locations in the city. Static wayfinding signage will also help guide drivers to city garages.

The SFpark data feed will help the public find available parking. Parking managers can regularly view and assess this data to discover where and when they need to help make parking more available through the adjustment of meter rates. Over the pilot phase of SFpark, the SFpark data feed will track how parking in the pilot areas evens out in terms of availability. This is a key element in determining the success of SFpark, SFMTA said.

The SFMTA, a department of the city and county of San Francisco, oversees the Municipal Railway (Muni), parking, traffic and taxis. Over 35,000 extra vehicles enter San Francisco on any given business day, and rely on the SFMTA to keep the flow of traffic moving smoothly. For more information, visit, www.SFpark.org or contact the SFMTA’s Jay Primus at jay.primus@sfmta.com.

Hoboken Launches Own Car Sharing Program

Hoboken has an operation in Hoboken that is doing fine, with 23 of its cars located in municipal garages, Sacs added. However, all four municipal garages with ZipCar operations are in the southern part of the city and therefore not conveniently located for all Hoboken residents.

Sacs said that the city studied car-sharing bid specifications for other municipalities including Baltimore, MD; Philadelphia, PA; Portland, OR; Seattle, WA; and Washington, D.C., and then customized its specifications to account for a program in which cars would be spread throughout the city. The city advertised a competitive bid process, he said. ZipCar submitted a bid but Hertz had the highest competitive bid and the city was bound to take it.

How does Corner Cars work? A resident signs up for the program online and enters his license, billing and contact information. Applicants must have a good driving record to qualify for membership. Residents pay one-time only fee of $25 to join and get a $75 credit that can be applied to reserving cars on an hourly basis. During the week, rates start from $5 an hour for a Smart Car to $14 an hour for higher tier vehicles. Weekend rates are slightly higher, with a maximum of $16 an hour.

After receiving a membership card, an individual can check car availability and reserve cars online or by phone. Then the member can walk to the car’s parking space on the street to access the reservation. The individual waves the membership card over the windshield to unlock the doors, and the keys are already inside. When the reservation is over, the car has to be returned to the same location. Then the individual is billed automatically. Hertz owns, maintains and insures the cars.

Sacs said that the first phase of the car sharing program is expected to remove 750 cars from the city’s streets, having the same effect on Hoboken’s parking situation as building millions of dollars of structured parking but at no cost to taxpayers.

For more information, visit http://www.hobokennj.org/departments/transportation-parking/corner-cars/ or contact Ian Sacs at i.sacs@hobokennj.org.
The Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) is considering constructing a diverging diamond interchange in an effort to cut traffic congestion at Illinois 59 and Interstate 88 at Naperville. If implemented, it will be the first location in Illinois for this innovative design.

Jason Salley, the head of the Illinois Department of Transportation’s Geometrics Studies Unit, told UTM that a diverging diamond interchange (DDI) is being considered “as a potential solution to alleviate the safety and capacity problems that exist and will get worse at the subject location.” Compared to the conventional interchange design, the DDI offers many benefits, including fewer conflict points, reduced vehicle delays, and reduced environmental impacts.

According to the Federal Highway Administration, the main difference between a DDI interchange and a conventional diamond interchange is the way in which left and through movements navigate between the cross street intersections with ramps. The DDI accommodates left-turning movements at signalized, grade-separated interchanges of arterials and limited-access highways while eliminating the need for left-turn phasing. On the arterial, traffic crosses over to the left side of the roadway between the nodes of the interchange. Two-phase traffic signals are installed at the crossovers. Once on the left side of the arterial, vehicles can turn left onto limited-access ramps without stopping and without conflicting with through traffic.

Until a few years ago, the only known diverging diamond interchanges were in France. In the United States, the first diverging diamond interchange was completed in July 2009 in Springfield, Missouri, at the intersection of Route 13 and I-44. Springfield’s second diverging diamond interchange opened in July 2010.

The DDI has been shown to be less costly than other interchange designs, Salley told UTM. Moreover, the DDI has been shown to reduce crashes. “The first DDI that opened in Springfield, Missouri showed approximately a 35% reduction in crashes when compared to standard/conventional diamond interchange that was in place before the DDI,” he said.

According to IDOT, the benefits of the DDI include that it does not have left turns that pass in front of opposing traffic and that it improves traffic movement with more green time. A DDI is recommended when an intersection has a heavy left turn movement, a bridge skew angle, an over-capacity intersection, [or] a tight construction time frame.

IDOT is expected to finalize its evaluation of the DDI for this interchange before the end of 2010.

For more information, visit http://www.ci.naperville.il.us/route59expansion.aspx or contact Jason Salley at (847) 705-4085 or by email at Jason.Salley@illinois.gov.

Preliminary geometry of the DDI being evaluated for implementation in Naperville, IL. (Photo: Courtesy of IDOT)
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IBM Study Measures Emotional and Economic Toll of Traffic Congestion in Key International Cities; Need Identified to Look Beyond Traditional Remedies

The daily commute in some of the world’s most economically important international cities is longer and more grueling than before imagined — reflecting the failure of transportation infrastructure to keep pace with economic activity, according to IBM’s first global Commuter Pain study.

IBM surveyed 8,192 motorists in 20 cities on six continents. A majority of the motorists surveyed believe that traffic has gotten worse in the last three years, with 49% of drivers saying that it has gotten worse and 18% saying it has gotten “a lot” worse.

The company compiled the survey results into an index that ranks the emotional and economic toll of commuting in each city on a scale of one to 100, with 100 being the most onerous. The index is comprised of: 1) commuting time, 2) time stuck in traffic, agreement that: 3) price of gas is already too high, 4) traffic has gotten worse, 5) start-stop traffic is a problem, 6) driving causes stress, 7) driving causes anger, 8) traffic affects work, 9) traffic so bad driving stopped, and 10) decided not to make trip due to traffic. The results vary widely from city to city. Stockholm had the least stressful commute of the cities studied, followed by Melbourne and Houston (tied) and New York City.

The 20 cities and their scores are:


Overall, the results paint a picture of metropolitan-area commuters in many cities struggling to get to and from work each day. For example, 57% of all respondents say that roadway traffic has negatively affected their health, but that percentage is up to 96% in New Delhi and 95% in Beijing. Similarly, 29% overall say that roadway traffic has negatively affected work or school performance, but that rises to 84% in Beijing, 62% in New Delhi, and 56% in Mexico City.

IBM conducted the Commuter Pain survey to better understand consumer thinking toward traffic congestion as the issue reaches crisis proportions nationwide and higher levels of auto emissions stir environmental concerns. These events are affecting communities around the world, with governments, citizens and private sector organizations looking beyond traditional remedies to reverse the negative impacts of increased road congestion.

“Traditional solutions — building more roads — will not be enough to overcome the growth of traffic in these rapidly developing cities, so multiple solutions need to be deployed simultaneously to avoid a failure of the transportation networks,” said Naveen Lamba, IBM’s global industry lead for intelligent transportation. “New techniques are required that empower transportation officials to better understand and proactively manage the flow of traffic.”

The congestion in many of today’s developing cities is a relatively recent phenomenon, having paralleled their rapid economic growth during the past decade or two, IBM said. By contrast, traffic in places like New York, Los Angeles or London has developed gradually over many decades, giving officials more time and resources to address the problem.

For example, IBM pointed out that the middle class in China is growing rapidly, with the number of new cars registered in Beijing in the first four months of 2010 rising 23.8% to 248,000, according to the Beijing municipal taxation office. The study did offer a number of bright spots, however. Forty-eight percent of drivers surveyed in Beijing reported that traffic has improved in the past three years — the high for the survey — reflecting substantial initiatives to improve the transportation network in that city. In addition, the commute for drivers in Stockholm seems to be largely pain-free. Only 14% of Stockholm drivers surveyed said that roadway traffic negatively affected work or school performance.

Moscow was notable for the duration of its traffic jams. Drivers there reported an average delay of two-and-a-half hours when asked to report the length of the worst traffic jam they experienced in the past three years.

Other key findings include:

• Five percent say traffic has improved substantially, with only Beijing (16%) and New Delhi (17%) reaching double digit scores.

• There are seven “trouble spots” based on the bottom two box scores (ranking traffic as “somewhat” or “a lot worse”): Johannesburg (80%), Moscow (64%), Toronto (64%), Mexico City (62%), Sao Paulo (61%), Milan (59%) and Buenos Aires (57%).

• 87% have been stuck in roadway traffic in the last three years. The average delay is one hour.

• The “best” cities for commuting are Melbourne, Stockholm and Buenos Aires, where 25% or more say they have never been stuck in traffic.

• 31% overall said that during the past three years traffic has been so bad that they turned around and went home, with a high of 69% in Beijing and a low of 15% in Berlin.

IBM conducted the Commuter Pain survey in the United States only in 2008 and 2009. The company is actively working in the area of Smarter Transportation to research, test and deploy new traffic information management capabilities in cities around the world. Findings from the Commuter Pain survey will be used to assess citizen concerns about traffic and commuter issues; expand solutions like automated tolling, real-time traffic prediction, congestion charging, and intelligent route planning; and serve as a basis for pioneering innovative new approaches to traffic mitigation.

For more information, contact IBM spokesman John Buscemi at 914-766-2607 or by e-mail at jbuscemi@us.ibm.com
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**Illinois DOT Deploys BlueTOAD™ by TrafficCast to Monitor Road Speeds; Technology Provides Travel Time Information During Highway Resurfacing**

*Madison, Wisconsin*

The Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) has deployed BlueTOAD™ by TrafficCast to monitor travel times and road speeds during the resurfacing of Interstate 290 - the Eisenhower Expressway through fall 2010.

Delcan Corporation, which administers the IDOT Traffic System Center, has integrated BlueTOAD Travel Times into the center’s operations, TrafficCast said in a July press release. IDOT uses the center to communicate directly to drivers through overhead signs and the regional traveler information website (www.gcmtravel.com) for the Gary-Chicago-Milwaukee Corridor. The IDOT Center also supports road network management and congestion mitigation.

“The Eisenhower resurfacing project was a high priority, and we needed to help drivers deal with the expected congestion,” said Jeff Galas, manager of the IDOT Center. “This BlueTOAD technology plan came together quickly, and it works. I’ve driven the route often, and the travel times are correct.”

Normally, Chicago-area road speeds and travel times are derived from inductive loop sensors embedded in expressways. These are disabled for the duration of the Eisenhower resurfacing project. With its independent operation on the cellular network and flexibility in installation, BlueTOAD enables IDOT to maintain the communication of vital driver information throughout the project. It is anticipated that the units will be redeployed on other projects when the Eisenhower is completed.

BlueTOAD combines advanced wireless technology with sophisticated data processing to directly measure travel times and route behaviors. It detects anonymous Bluetooth signals broadcast by mobile devices and in-vehicle electronics. Travel times and routing decisions are determined through a real-time data filtering and processing platform which matches signal detections of subsequent BlueTOAD receivers along the road. The BlueTOAD name is an acronym for Bluetooth Travel-time Origination and Destination.

Bluetooth-enabled devices, such as cell phones, headsets, music players and navigation systems, connect with each other by connecting their MAC (Media Access Control) addresses. These MAC addresses are unique and therefore ideal as identifiers. Bluetooth identifiers are not tracked through the production and sales cycles, so the MAC addresses are not associated with any specific user account (as is the case with cell phones) or any specific vehicle (as with automated toll tags or license plate recognition systems). Privacy concerns typically associated with alternative probe systems are minimized, if not eliminated.

In practice, BlueTOAD only detects the unique IDs that pass the sensor in a 75-foot radius. The detected MAC addresses are then uploaded to a server (through a cellular modem or an available Ethernet interconnection), filtered for usability and processed to match detections of unique IDs along with their time stamps. Since the road distance between devices is known, travel time can be calculated directly. Average road speeds are derived from travel time in contrast to speed sensors, which calculate spot speeds, and then derive travel times.

MAC addresses received by a sequence of two or more BlueTOAD receivers can be matched and used to develop a sample of travel time across multiple segments of the roadway, as well as across alternate route options, based on the relative detection times recorded by the various units. While only a 1% sampling of vehicle flow is necessary to accurately report travel times, up to 20% of all vehicles are currently estimated to emit Bluetooth signals. According to TrafficCast, BlueTOAD is more cost effective as a probe data system to determine travel times than more specialized...
EC Outlines Program to Halve Road Deaths by 2020

design stage when infrastructure is being developed.

**Boost Smart Technology:** The EC will propose new technical specifications, under the Intelligent Transport Systems Directive, so that data and information can be easily exchanged between vehicles and between vehicles and infrastructure. The EC will accelerate the deployment of e-call and examine its extension to motorcyclists, heavy duty trucks and buses.

**Strengthen Road User Education and Training:** The EC will work with Member States to develop a common education and training road safety strategy. This will include strengthening the licensing and training system by widening the EU Driving License Directive to establish:
- Minimum criteria for driving instructors,
- Integration of accompanied driving/apprenticeship in the pre-licensing period,
- The possibility of introducing probation periods after the driving test,
- The possibility of introducing eco-driving into theoretical and practical tests for safer, clean driving.

**Better enforcement:** Measures to strengthen EU-wide and national enforcement controls for speeding, “drink driving” and failure to wear a seatbelt will include the development of national implementation plans and EU-wide awareness campaigns. The EC will consider penalties to be accompanied by preventative measures for drink driving, such as legislative measures requiring mandatory use of alco-locks for specific professional cases after drink-driving offences. The EC will prioritize the adoption of legally binding measures on the cross border exchange of information to allow for the identification and sanctioning of foreign offenders for seatbelts, speed, alcohol and traffic light offences.

**Establishing a Road Injuries Target:** The EC will develop the elements of a comprehensive strategy of action concerning road injuries and first aid, including:
- Establishing common definitions of serious and minor injuries with a view to establishing common EU-wide injuries target.
- Promoting exchange of best practices between Member States on emergency service response to accidents, and establishing EU-wide data collection and analysis on injuries.
- Examining the added value of developing and installing event data recorders, particularly on professional vehicles, to improve accident investigations and analysis.

**A New Focus on Motorcyclists:** While other vehicle transport modes have shown significant decreases in fatalities and serious injuries, those for powered two-wheeler (PTW) riders have not. At the EU level, measures for PTW will be proposed including introducing functional vehicle safety measures such as mandatory fitting of advanced brake systems and updated anti-tampering measures (so speed controls cannot be removed); developing technical standards on protective equipment such as clothing, and to studying the feasibility of equipping motorcycles or protective clothing with an airbag; extending EU legislation on road worthiness testing/inspections to motorbikes and other powered two wheelers.


Product and Industry News (continued)

recognition systems.

BlueTOAD implementation offers:
- Granular speed data on road sections where traditional sensors are impractical, such as entrance ramps, tunnels and bridges;
- Real-time and forecast comparisons of travel times between designated origin & destinations, to build travel patterns for road planning;
- Comprehensive data sampling of driver actions, which can be collected over time periods far beyond that which is economically feasible through traditional methods like car counts and rubber strips.
- Permanent or temporary installation of BlueToad also can monitor expressway exit/entrance patterns, destinations after exit, backup queues and other conditions to more effectively support planning and operations of the road network.

“BlueTOAD has shown to deliver accurate travel times in difficult travel conditions, without the complications of cost, privacy and infrastructure impact involved with other technologies,” said Neal Campbell, CEO of TrafficCast.

The Eisenhower project consists of resurfacing 27 miles along I-290 from Thorndale to the Circle Interchange (90-94) near downtown Chicago, and from I-355 from Army Trail Road to I-290, within Cook and DuPage counties. It includes repairs to 37 bridge structures. The project will be completed in weather permitting in fall 2010.

For more information, visit [http://trafficcast.com](http://trafficcast.com) or contact Nick Kiernan at [n.kiernan@trafficcast.com](mailto:n.kiernan@trafficcast.com).
Copenhagen Launches Global Call to Pilot Future Bicycle Technologies

"Summit on Service Innovation in Cities" to Be Held in Copenhagen in November 2010

The city of Copenhagen and Living Labs Global have issued a worldwide call for innovative mobility solutions aimed at integrating bicycles fully into an intelligent and integrated transport system for the city. Living Labs Global is an international non-profit association based in Copenhagen aimed at promoting innovation in services and mobility in cities.

Already, more than 55% of Copenhagen’s residents use the bicycle each day. Copenhagen seeks to evaluate new applications of intelligent technology not only in entertainment and safety, but also to address the barriers that continue to exist between the public transport system and bicycle uses. Three solutions will be selected and piloted in Copenhagen in autumn 2010. The selection will coincide with the "Copenhagen|Barcelona | Kaohsiung Summit on Service Innovation in Cities" to be held at the Copenhagen City Hall on November 24-25, 2010. The cities of Copenhagen, Barcelona and Kaohsiung, Taiwan and Living Labs Global will co-host the summit which is expected to be attended by 30 global cities and more than 100 companies. The pilot projects and a showcase of the latest innovations from around the world will spur discussions among cities, companies and experts.

Living Labs Global’s General Director Sascha Haselmayer said that the goal of the call to pilot future bicycle technologies is threefold. It seeks to ensure that:

- Copenhagen continues to be one of the best cities for bicyclists in the world;
- The best solutions are taken into consideration - independently from where they are invented,
- International and domestic SMEs (small and medium enterprises) meet and build stronger cooperation at the “Copenhagen | Barcelona Summit on Service Innovation in Cities.”

Haselmayer told UTM that submission for the pilot program is free. (There is a small registration fee for participation in the “Copenhagen|Barcelona| Kaohsiung Summit on Service Innovation in Cities,” however.) The deadline to submit a solution for the pilot was initially August 31, 2010, but it was extended to September 30, 2010. The city of Copenhagen and Living Labs Global will notify the winners on October 31 and announce the results publicly at the Copenhagen | Barcelona | Kaohsiung Summit on Service Innovation in November. Successful individuals and/or companies will enter discussions with the city on implementation of the pilot immediately after selection and get the opportunity to present and exhibit their solutions at the summit. Pilots should be running by or before January 31, 2011 and run for around one to six months.

Submissions for the pilot should meet any of the following challenges:

- Smarter bike paths that indicate dangers (such as frost) or congestion, or incorporate sensors to monitor activities and respond to usage needs and link to traffic light systems offering green waves for cyclists.
- Technologies in bicycles such as health sensors, location information, theft protection, or entertainment and fitness monitors that can be applied for entertainment, wellbeing, security and other purposes.
- Mobile services that link bicycles and riders to social networks, provide news and updates, to pre-book bikes or reserve parking, to plan routes and other activities.
- Integration of bicycle rides with other modes of public transport to give more inter-modal options for commuters.
- Improved bicycle parking around key intersections and meeting points.
- Improved health and well-being monitoring and impact of bicycles in the city.
- Improved security and safety in relation to bicycles.
- Bicycles that replace “service vehicles” for craftsmen in the inner city.
- Services to support bicycle tourism.

Haselmayer said that the submissions will be judged by the city of Copenhagen with technical support from Living Labs Global. Different city departments will review the submissions depending on whether they relate, for example, to health, climate, transport, urban planning or tourism.

Criteria for evaluating the submissions will focus on the relevance of solution to the challenges of Copenhagen, innovation in technology in a service or business model, sustainability of a service/business/investment model, benefits of the project for residents, benefits of the project for the city, benefits of the project for the local business fabric, and the scalability of the solution to other cities.

The city of Copenhagen, has one of the world’s most ambitious local climate policies, striving to become a zero-emission community by the year 2025. Living Labs Global is working with more than 35 global cities and 290 companies providing solutions to meet the service and technology challenges of cities. The Living Labs Global Showcase presents more than 350 service innovations from 140 cities around the world as a free resource to improve decision-making, procurement and give visibility to innovative businesses.

For more information about this call for submissions, please visit http://www.livinglabs-global.com/pilot.asp, or contact Sascha Haselmayer at +34 627 299 588 or by e-mail at s.haselmayer@interlace-invent.com.
FHWA Announces $9.7 Million in Grants to Fund Innovative Approaches to Relieve Congestion

Funds Will Help Seven States Improve Livability for Residents

Seven states will receive more than $9.7 million as part of a national program to encourage innovative strategies to relieve congestion. California, Florida, North Carolina, Minnesota, Texas, Virginia and Washington received grants for 10 projects under the Federal Highway Administration’s Value Pricing Pilot Program (VPPP), the Federal Highway Administration announced last month. “Value pricing” refers to varying price levels by time of day or traffic volume in order to manage congestion. It can significantly improve traffic flow by encouraging people to choose to drive at different times of the day, thereby spreading out demand and reducing congestion at peak hours.

“These projects show that states are developing new ways of thinking about how to manage congestion,” U.S. Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood said. “Money from this program continues to support innovative solutions that will provide better results for the American people. Ultimately, people will be able to spend more time doing what they like and less time stuck in traffic,” Federal Highway Administrator Victor Mendez added.

The grants include:

- $1.9 million for the Texas Department of Transportation to test a pay-as-you-drive (PAYD) insurance plan that allows drivers to buy insurance by the mile;
- $1.8 million for the California Department of Transportation and the city of Berkeley to implement a parking pricing plan that includes real-time information on available spaces;
- $900,000 for south Florida to develop a priced-lanes network in the Miami-Ft. Lauderdale area that will improve the travel reliability for commuters, including transit and carpool users.

The VPPP was initially authorized in the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) as the Congestion Pricing Pilot Program and renewed with the passage of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). For more than a decade, the program has supported over 70 projects in 15 states to improve travel through pricing.

According to the FHWA, value pricing concepts that have become mainstream undertakings and are now common practice, such as high occupancy vehicle (HOV) conversions to high occupancy toll (HOT) lanes will not be funded. But VPPP projects do include road-use tolls that vary by demand. Charges may vary on a pre-scheduled basis or dynamically in response to real-time changes in demand. Unlike rates on conventional toll facilities that are set primarily to achieve certain revenue targets, congestion-priced toll rates are set to achieve a specific reduction in demand or to maintain specific levels of performance on the priced facility. Congestion-pricing projects involving tolls include:

- **Priced lanes**, in which pricing is applied on a limited number of lanes of a roadway;
- **Priced roadways**, in which pricing is applied on all lanes of a roadway facility;
- **Zone-based pricing**, in which pricing is applied within a limited zone involving several roadway facilities;
- **System-wide pricing**, in which pricing is applied within an entire metropolitan region, state, or country.

Other types of VPPP projects that are funded include innovative parking pricing.

---

**Value Pricing Pilot Program Awards 2009/2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Caltrans / Santa Clara County</td>
<td>Stanford U Parking Pricing w/ Off-Peak Commuting Incentives</td>
<td>$2.4 million</td>
<td>Strategies to manage traffic and parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Caltrans / City of Berkeley</td>
<td>Berkeley Parking Pricing and Real-time Guidance for City &amp; University</td>
<td>$1.8 million</td>
<td>Strategies to manage on-street parking and reduce congestion from circling vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Caltrans / Santa Barbara County</td>
<td>Dynamic Ridesharing with Pricing Incentives</td>
<td>$158,400</td>
<td>Testing of carpooling system that uses participation incentives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Florida DOT</td>
<td>Network of Priced Managed Lanes in S. Florida</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>Initiative for a regional priced managed lane network that can serve as a model for other regions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Tampa-Hillsboro Expressway Authority</td>
<td>Regional Bus Toll Lanes Study</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>Advancement of first regional network of bus toll lanes in the Tampa area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>NCDOT and Charlotte MPO</td>
<td>Regional Priced Lanes Study</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>Advancement of first regional network of priced lanes in the Charlotte area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>MnDOT</td>
<td>Parking Pricing Alternatives to Monthly Parking Passes</td>
<td>$24,800</td>
<td>Expansion of project to test incentive alternatives to monthly parking passes and discourage daily driving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Texas DOT</td>
<td>MileMeter/NuRide Pay-Per-Mile Insurance &amp; Incentives</td>
<td>$2.0 million</td>
<td>Usage-based insurance pricing and additional incentives for efficient travel choices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Virginia DOT and Washington Council of Governments</td>
<td>Public Acceptance Study of Regional Pricing in DC</td>
<td>$320,000</td>
<td>Advancement of regional pricing in DC including pricing existing facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Washington DOT and King County</td>
<td>Incentives to Reduce Amount of Parking</td>
<td>$1.0 million</td>
<td>Implementation of incentives as alternatives to parking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: FHWA
strategies, such as surcharges for entering or exiting a parking facility during or near peak periods and parking cash-out policies. Examples of parking cash-out policies are policies in which employees are offered cash in lieu of subsidized parking, parking operators reimburse monthly patrons for unused parking days, or renters or purchasers in multi-family housing developments are provided direct financial saving for not availing of car parking spaces.

Funded VPPP projects also include projects that make auto use costs variable. Fixed costs of auto ownership, such as insurance costs, auto lease costs or registration fees generally do not depend directly on the amount the auto is driven. Projects in this category are designed to convert those fixed costs into costs that vary according to the miles the auto is driven, thus giving the driver the incentive to recognize these costs when making the decision to drive. Projects include mileage-based insurance, lease charges, taxes and fees.

The FHWA provided the following additional information in response to questions provided by the UTM:

**What are some of the most successful projects funded under the Value Pricing Pilot Program?**

The first Value Pricing Project was implemented in 1995 Orange County, California on State Route 91 (SR-91). Since that time seven HOT lane projects have been implemented under the VPPP and are operating successfully in six states. They include I-15 in San Diego, I-25 in Denver, I-95 in Miami, I-394 in Minnesota, I-10 and US 290 in Houston, and SR 167 in Seattle. The purpose of the VPPP is to demonstrate to what extent roadway congestion may be reduced through application of congestion pricing strategies.

**What distinguishes these projects?**

- **Pricing-Related Transit Improvements Support Livable and Sustainable Communities:**
  Congestion pricing reduces travel times for buses that currently operate on congested roadways. While the San Diego I-15 project supports operation of a commuter bus route, the financial investment in transit for the Miami project was significant. The “95 Express” project supported the development and operation of premium express transit facilities and services. Improving access to transit also helps limit the extent to which newly priced travelers decide to divert their trips to other toll-free routes. A high-quality transit alternative also addresses equity concerns by providing mobility to low-income travelers and by reducing the toll levels that would be necessary to reduce highway use by a certain amount. The use of the public transportation system was made more attractive through improvements in travel time, frequency of service (which reduces wait time), improved parking availability at park-and-ride lots, and more comfortable rides.

Please turn to Page 14
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Why are they successful? Examples of Successful Projects:

I-15 HOT Lanes
The San Diego’s I-15 reversible HOT lanes have been in operation for 14 years. Under this program, customers in single-occupant vehicles (SOVs) pay a toll each time they use the HOV lanes. The toll is based on the time of day and the number of passengers. The Express Lanes carry over 40 percent of the weekday traffic during the p.m. peak period (4 p.m. to 7 p.m.) and operates above 45 mph 100 percent of the time.

SR-91 Express Lanes
The SR-91 Express Lanes opened in December 1995 as a four-lane toll facility in the median of a 10-mile section of one of the most heavily congested highways in the U.S. The facility provides congestion free, high-speed travel at 60-65 mph to paying customers during peak periods, while the traffic on adjacent free lanes crawls under heavily congested stop-and-go conditions averaging no more than 15-20 mph. The Express Lanes carry over 40 percent of the total SR-91 traffic during heavily congested periods, even though they comprise only one-third of the total freeway capacity. The use of the Express Lanes has continued to grow over time, without reducing traffic speeds. SR-91 generates gross annual toll revenues of over $40 million. This amounts to about $1 million per lane mile annually. Revenues are used to pay for operations and maintenance, and for debt service for the facility. Excess revenues are proposed to be used for highway improvements in the corridor extending into Riverside County.

Miami 95 Express Lanes
In 2006, the VPPP partnered with the Department’s Urban Partnership Agreements (UPA) program in order to encourage broader applications of congestion pricing. The “95 Express” project is using a phased approach to convert a single HOV lane in each direction into dual HOT lanes on 21 miles of I-95 from Fort Lauderdale to downtown Miami. The “95 Express” project uses several traffic management techniques to reduce congestion and provide commuters with more reliable travel options on the highway. It combines tolling, transit, technology and telecommuting components together to effectively reduce congestion and improve the reliability of travel on I-95, particularly during the weekday rush-hour periods. The “95 Express” is also unique in that it is only the second project in the nation (after the Houston QuickRide project) to increase the occupancy requirement on HOV lanes, in this case from HOV 2+ to HOV 3+. The new occupancy requirement ensures that the lanes remain free-flowing as HOV demand increases in the future, and will create some excess capacity for priced vehicles.

The express lanes generated monthly toll revenue of $1.1 million in June 2010 bringing the total revenue in 2010 to approximately $6.6 million and the total since opening in December 5, 2008 to $11.8 million. Tolls ranged from $1.64 during the peak to the highest toll for the month of $5.50. In cases of severe congestion, tolls in the express lanes have reached $7.25. The average off-peak toll was only $0.55. Approximately 85 percent of the customers were charged $2.00 or less. The facility operates at 15 mph above the adjacent toll-free lanes during the p.m. peak period (4 p.m. to 7 p.m.) and operates above 45 mph 100 percent of the time.

For more information, visit http://ops.fhwa.dot.gov/tolling Pricing/value_pricing or contact USDOT spokesperson Nancy Singer at (202) 366-0660.

MnDOT Uses a Multimodal Approach and Technology

million. The goal is to increase the number of telecommuting workers by 500 individuals by 2011.

Finally, technology underpins all aspects of the initiative. Real-time electronic commuter information signage along the I-35W corridor alerts motorists about the estimated time of the trip by auto and bus, and how many parking spots are available at park and ride facilities. Real-time signage also alerts transit customers about arriving and departing buses. Technology allows for MnPASS dynamic tolling in the express lanes, active traffic management (called Smart Lanes), dynamic shoulder lanes that are open in peaks, transit signal priority, and on-board bus technology to better utilize driving on shoulder lanes.

Asking what advice he would give to other DOTs when trying to reduce congestion along a freeway corridor, Thompson said, “A mixed multimodal approach, using the latest in technology to utilize the existing space better, and linking to improvements at the beginning and end of the trip (off the corridor but connected to it) can provide commuters with choices to avoid congestion and be an effective strategy for a region.” Our success to date has been very good, he added.

For more information, visit www.dot.state.mn.us/upa or contact Nick Thompson at (651) 366-3152 or by e-mail at nick.thompson@state.mn.us.
The Court of Appeals of Indiana recently clarified this question in a case relating to injuries sustained in a sidewalk fall.

Two months after the city of Indianapolis had received a complaint about the condition of a sidewalk, and had inspected it, declared it a “tripping hazard” and issued a work order for its repair but had failed to carry through the repairs, plaintiff did indeed trip, fall and injure herself. She filed for damages against the city alleging negligence for failure to repair the sidewalk.

City responded by filing for summary judgment, claiming it was entitled to discretionary function immunity in terms of the Indiana Tort Claims Act (ITCA). At trial this motion was denied, resulting in the city’s appeal.

At trial the city’s operations manager for the Department of Public Works (DPW) presented evidence that
- the city had limited budget, funds and manpower to repair sidewalks and that at the time of the accident it had 93 sidewalks with a Priority 1 rating and over 350 open Priority 1 projects;
- these limitations had resulted in the city instituting policies to prioritize sidewalk repair and renovation, using a scale of 1 to 3 to distinguish between “severely defected” (Priority 1) and “slightly damaged” (“Priority 3”) sidewalks;
- sidewalks with the same priority rating were typically repaired in the order in which they were entered into the DPW system, but this could be altered at the discretion of the operations or district manager according to cost-benefit analysis, budgetary concerns and consideration for competing DPW projects;
- the city had consciously empowered the operations manager with the discretion to prioritize sidewalk repair;
- the same day it received the complaint about the sidewalk at issue it filed a service request for the sidewalk. The next day a city inspector assessed it, determined it was a “tripping hazard,” and issued a work order for its repair with a “Priority 1” rating.

Plaintiff argued that, according to the city’s website, there was a different priority rating system in place at the time of the accident, called the Present Serviceability Rating (PSR) which rated projects from 0 to 5, with “0” designating “totally deteriorated sidewalks” and “5” designating “brand new sidewalks.”

City later filed supplemental evidence which clarified that the PSR rating was used exclusively by the DPW’s Engineering Division, which received projects only after they were already classified under the “1-3” priority system.

At appeal the court held that the sidewalk repair decisions were discretionary because they met the “planning-operational test” for determining whether a function is discretionary for purposes of the ITCA. Previously the Indiana Supreme Court had ruled that a governmental entity would not be held liable for negligence arising from decisions which are made at a planning level, as opposed to an operational level.

Citing legal precedent, the Appeals Court held that functions such as weighing alternatives, assessing competing priorities, weighing budgetary considerations, and allocating scarce resources constituted “planning activities,” were discretionary and, therefore, were immune from tort liability. It found the city’s broad prioritization scheme to be the product of budgetary and cost-benefit policy decisions, which are discretionary under the “planning-operational” test.

At trial, plaintiff had contended that certain delegated prioritization decisions were more a matter of professional judgment than a discretionary policy decision and that decisions based upon professional judgment were not entitled to discretionary immunity.

The Appeals Court clarified that decisions involving the formulation of basic policy are entitled to immunity, but decisions regarding only the execution or implementation of that policy are not.

Further, the critical issue was whether the nature of the judgment calls for policy considerations, not whether it is made by a single government delegate or employee. It reiterated that a single employee could engage in policy formulation, and found that cost-benefit analyses and budgetary considerations were policy decisions in nature, and therefore discretionary.

Plaintiff had also argued that the city needed to substantiate its policy with official documentation such as records or minutes, and affidavits submitted by employees were not adequate.

The Appeals Court found that in Indiana boards and commissions speak or act officially only through the minutes and records made at duly organized meetings. However, policy decisions entrusted to a single employee are distinguishable from boards and commissions, and that requiring official records and/or minutes in all cases would be unduly restrictive. Therefore, it found that the affidavits submitted were adequate to establish discretionary immunity.

Finally, the Appeals Court ruled that city was not required to demonstrate that its sidewalk repair policy extended to the specific segment of sidewalk at issue. It found that in the case of omissions, conscious balancing was demonstrated when the governmental entity considered improvements of the general type, as evidence by the broad prioritization scheme. Therefore, there was no need for the entity to demonstrate that it considered and rejected specific improvements.
This Month’s Survey Results (Survey 1)

Ethics in the Transportation Profession

The Urban Transportation Monitor conducted a nationwide survey last month to obtain opinions from practicing transportation engineers on various ethical situations. Questionnaires were sent to 800 randomly selected transportation professionals. A total of 71 responses were received, for a response rate of 9%. Respondents had an average of 24 years working experience. Adaptations from actual case studies cited in Opinions of the Board of Ethical Review, published by the National Society of Professional Engineers (NSPE), were described in the survey; respondents were asked to make a judgment on whether each situation was ethical or not.

It should be recognized that all the information of a particular case could not be included because of space limitations. However, we endeavored to include all the relevant facts. The purpose of the survey was to see how uniform opinions among practicing transportation professionals are with regard to ethical issues and how their opinions compare with those of the NSPE’s Board of Ethical Review. When giving an opinion about a particular case, the Board explained its reasoning behind its opinion. That discussion is not included in the survey results published here, again because of space limitations.

The Board requests that the following statement be included regarding its opinions:

“The opinions are based on data submitted to the Board of Ethical Review and do not necessarily represent all of the pertinent facts when applied to a specific case. These opinions are for educational purposes only and should not be construed as expressing any opinion on the ethics of specific individuals.”

The adapted case studies are reprinted by permission of the National Society of Professional Engineers, Copyright, 2009. For more information about engineering ethics, licensure, legal issues, professional practice, and membership in NSPE, please visit www.nspe.org.

SITUATION 1
Transportation Engineer A, the president of a professional transportation engineering society, is invited to address a gathering of engineers and engineering students associated with the transportation program at a college of engineering where engineering students, engineering faculty, and university administration are present.

During Transportation Engineer A’s presentation, she makes some general comments that could be interpreted as critical of certain research, instructional, and educational methods employed by some college transportation engineering programs, including the program at the university hosting the event. Following her remarks, Transportation Engineer A is criticized by some of the engineering faculty and university officials for what are perceived as Transportation Engineer A’s critical remarks. Some of the engineering faculty contact Transportation Engineer A and request an apology or a retraction of her remarks. Transportation Engineer A refuses to issue an apology.

Question 1a:
Was it ethical for Transportation Engineer A to make her comments critical of certain research, instructional, and educational methods employed by some college transportation engineering programs, including the transportation engineering program at the university hosting the event?

Survey results:
Respondents who answered yes: 77%
Respondents with <15 years experience who answered yes: 74%
Respondents with ≥15 years experience who answered yes: 79%

Typical comments from respondents who answered yes:
- It is ethical to honestly state one’s professional opinion.
- Honest, professional criticism can be useful feedback and serves to advance the development of the profession. Even if the remarks were delivered in a manner or tone that was confrontational, that is a matter of professionalism not ethics.
- While the remarks may have been insensitive to the audience in this case, she offered a professional opinion that needed to be heard. Academia doesn’t always prepare the student well for the real-life situations they may face.
- She was there as a representative of a professional society. If the comments were in regards to how programs such as the one at this particular university did not prepare the students for their professional careers, then as a representative of that society, she should be spreading the word on how things may need to change.
- As long as Transportation Engineer A is presenting the criticisms as her opinion, then it is ethical to present them. If the opinion contained inaccuracies or slander, then it would not be ethical.
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- If Transportation Engineer A’s comments are supported by relevant facts, this evidence is referenced, and there is no personal bias apparent in the remarks, then yes. In the interest of academic debate she should have informed the host researchers of the comments/concerns to be made at the event and offered an opportunity for rebuttal.
- It is the responsibility of the persons that invited Engineer A to speak to have vetted her views prior to issuing the invitation.
- Rather than an apology, the university should seek to understand the criticism and to enter into a dialogue with the industry to increase awareness of issues on both sides.

Typical comments from respondents who answered no:

- Engineer A should have notified the engineering society of her views before the speaking event.
- Know your audience. Even if the comments are correct, use a different forum for expressing an opinion contrary to what the organization is doing.
- A gathering that included engineering students was not the proper venue to voice such matters. Her concerns should have been directed to the school itself and accreditation board.
- If the comments made referenced specific schools/personnel, then no, it was not ethical.

Opinion of the Board of Ethical Review:

*It was ethical for Engineer A to make his comments critical of certain research, instructional, and educational methods employed by some college engineering programs, including the program at the university hosting the event.*

Main conclusions of the Board of Ethical Review:

There is nothing in the facts to suggest that Engineer A was expressing anything other than an appropriate and reasonable opinion on matters affecting educational institutions and those who work or who attend those institutions. Nor is there anything in the facts to suggest that Engineer A made the comments in an offensive or otherwise objectionable manner. Moreover, the fact that this presentation was made at an institution of higher learning, where academic freedom and the right to challenge conventional wisdom should be celebrated, contrasted with the offended response by the college and university faculty and administration gives one great pause. Rather than expect Engineer A to issue an apology for her comments, it would seem college and university faculty and administration should evaluate the legitimacy and the merits of Engineer A’s candid remarks. If following a consideration of those remarks, individuals within the college or university have concerns about Engineer A’s critical comments, those individuals should seek a forum to offer contrary viewpoints and, if appropriate, debate Engineer A regarding the merits of her views. The role of the university is to encourage legitimate debate—not stifle or inhibit dissent.

Question 1b:

*Was it ethical for Transportation Engineer A to refuse to apologize for her remarks?*

Survey results:

Respondents who answered yes: 81%
Respondents with <15 years experience who answered yes: 74%
Respondents with ≥15 years experience who answered yes: 84%

Typical comments from respondents who answered yes:

- Although Engineer A’s remarks may be described as rude, they do not warrant an apology.
- Standing by one’s principles and professional opinion is ethical. If Engineer A is not sorry, then the apology would be insincere anyway (and be dishonest). However, some contrition on tone, delivery, word choice, etc. could be diplomatically useful.
- Assuming the remarks were solely directed at the research, instructional and educational methods and not a personal attack on individuals, then no apology is necessary.
- If Engineer A truly stands behind the remarks, then it is ethical to refuse to apologize. It was unethical for the faculty to ask for an apology. They should have evaluated the critical remarks to see if there was something they should be doing differently.
- If the comments were true and well-founded, an apology for stating those comments would actually in itself be unethical.
- While it is ethical to refuse to apologize, it is probably not politic to do so. She could apologize for giving offense, but not for providing an opinion.
- While it could be appropriate for Transportation Engineer A to amplify or explain her remarks, it is not necessary for her to apologize for having an opinion that differs from the audience.

Typical comments from respondents who answered no:

- If an error or mistake has been made, an apology is due.
- Because the remarks were “general” in nature, I think Engineer A should provide an apology.
- She should not have apologized for the remarks or retracted the remarks. She should have apologized for possibly offending anyone and then reiterated why she made the comments and why she felt that way.
Opinion of the Board of Ethical Review:

Although it may have been appropriate for Engineer A to apologize, it was not unethical for Engineer A to refuse to apologize for his remarks.

SITUATION 2

Transportation Engineer A, a licensed professional engineer, has worked for Transportation Engineer B, the owner of a transportation and traffic engineering firm, as an employee, for 10 years. Over the 10-year period with the firm, Transportation Engineer A achieved two transportation engineering excellence awards for projects for which he had primary responsibility and he signed and sealed transportation engineering documents. The firm’s website depicts these two projects without Transportation Engineer A’s name associated with either one and includes photographs of Transportation Engineer B and other transportation and traffic engineers in the firm beside the project—implying, but not specifically stating, that these individuals were responsible for the projects.

Question 1a:

Was it ethical for Transportation Engineer B to fail to include Transportation Engineer A’s name in association with the two projects?

Survey results:
Respondents who answered yes: 38%
Respondents with <15 years experience who answered yes: 42%
Respondents with ≥15 years experience who answered yes: 37%

Typical comments from respondents who answered yes:
- Not nice but ethical.
- The project was performed by the company and carries the company’s name. The specific engineer of record does not need to be recognized.
- No ethical issue here. The firm can justly claim the awards and depict these for marketing purposes in the manner described. Engineer A utilized the resources, prestige, reputation, etc. of the firm, so the firm maintains an ownership interest in the awards even though Engineer A did most/all of the work.
- The website is for information purposes about the company as a whole, and not an individual employee. Therefore, the website is informing those who visit about the projects that the company has performed. Typically, excellence awards are to recognize the projects, not the individuals who worked on the project.
- The firm is a team and the individual work products of most firms are owned by the firm, not the individual engineers; therefore the firm takes credit for the awards. That is not to say that Engineer A cannot list his involvement with the projects on his resume that is used by the firm in proposals, or for his own use in finding a new job.
- It is a gray area in that it is Transportation Engineer B’s company and has overall responsibility for project work done buy the company. Not listing the lead engineer is not an issue; however, listing other that did not have the lead or anything at all to do with the project is misleading. It is bad business to leave off the lead engineer, and may have been an oversight.

Typical comments from respondents who answered no:
- Credit must be given where credit is due. Failure to give due credit is unethical.
- This I believe would be a matter of common courtesy - to have Engineer A’s name listed - but I do not believe it amounts to an ethical issue. When you work for an engineering firm, your work product becomes property of the firm.
- It would only be ethical if NO names other than the firm’s were attached to the project.
- The primary engineer should be listed for projects on a firm’s website. Otherwise, it makes it difficult to research a firm and the project teams listed on proposals.
- To imply that Engineer A had contributed nothing to these successful projects is wrong. His name should have been included as a “team member” at the very least if not a notation as lead or primary.
- This is borderline. It is certainly professionally inconsiderate but is it really immoral? Also, how much do people really infer about personal responsibility for a project from a website picture?
- Besides failing to give credit where credit is due, the website is misleading to potential clients. They should know who will be working on their projects.
- The employer is still responsible for the final product. Failing to recognize the staff in these situations is poor management practice.

Opinion of the Board of Ethical Review:

In the absence of some compelling reason, it was unethical for Engineer B to fail to include Engineer A in association with the two projects.

Main conclusions of the Board of Ethical Review:
Under the facts in the present case, there appears to be nothing to indicate any limitation on the ability of Transportation Engineer A to sign and seal the transportation engineering drawings and assume personal responsibility for the work in question. The salient ethical issue is the duty of the professional engineer to assume personal responsibility and be accountable for the work under his or her direct control and personal supervision. Issues related to credit given are considered a secondary matter. At the same time, it should be stated that on the basis of fairness and equity, it would seem reasonable and justified that a transportation engineer who has primary design responsibility and signed and sealed the engineering documents should be given due and appropriate recognition for the engineer’s contributions to the work.

Question 1b:
Was it ethical for Transportation Engineer B to include photographs on the firm’s website implying that Transportation Engineer B and other individuals were responsible for the projects?

Survey results:
Respondents who answered yes: 39%
Respondents with <15 years experience who answered yes: 47%
Respondents with ≥15 years experience who answered yes: 36%

Typical comments from respondents who answered yes:
- The firm has the right to advertise a successful project completed by one of its employees.
- It is ethical as long as they had some part in the projects.
- There is nothing wrong with having the team picture associated with a project. However, if the primary engineer is missing from the picture, it should be noted.
- Yes, but he should either recognize all of the firm’s individuals associated with the project or simply recognize the firm.
- Yes, with a caveat. Listing Engineer A’s name would be a matter of common courtesy, but in the end, Engineer A’s work product does not belong to him. He is getting paid to provide a service to the firm. Engineer B, as the owner of the firm has the right to include references to the firm’s website inasmuch as the firm is behind that project.
- The firm is a team. It may be that Engineer A would never have achieved the awards without the support of the folks in the photographs. Indeed, Engineer A might not have been assigned to the projects if not for the folks in the photographs performing the duties necessary to accomplish the other projects the firm was working on at the time. Not the best way for Engineer B to boost the morale of Engineer A, but in most firms, everyone works for the good of the team and reaps the joint benefits.
- Principals in firms are associated with all of the projects in the firm. Depending on the size of the project, it is usually understood that the executives were not involved in the day to day work, and that other people should be included. Again, depending on the scope of the project, it may look silly that the principals lay claim to it.

Typical comments from respondents who answered no:
- If only Engineer B’s picture appears as owner of the firm, then I see no issue; however, if others appear then there is a problem.
- False advertising.
- Without specifically referencing Engineer A’s contributions to these two projects, an implication that other personnel were responsible for these projects’ successes is unethical.
- If no names or images were associated with the project at all, this would be an ethical activity (to leave Engineer A’s name out). As the statement says, a strong implication exists that the names and images associated with the project are the persons involved in the successful and rewarded completion. Not associating Engineer A with the project is a breach of professional ethics.
- It is more of a maybe. Assuming the photograph was directly associated with the projects and not merely depicting the firm, then the photograph would appear to imply those in the photograph worked on the two projects along with Engineer A.
- It seems short sighted to list people for a project that did not do the work and have potential clients thinking that people competent in that type of project were available for future projects.

Opinion of the Board of Ethical Review:
In the absence of some compelling reason, it was unethical for Transportation Engineer B to include a photograph on the firm website implying that Engineer B and other individuals were responsible for the projects.

Main conclusions of the Board of Ethical Review:
Without attempting to get involved with specific personnel decisions, management prerogatives, or the unique circumstances that might be involved in this or similar matters, it would seem that Transportation Engineer B would want to provide appropriate visible recognition for Transportation Engineer A’s achievements and accomplishments for the benefit of the firm’s clients.

SITUATION 3
Ethics in the Transportation Profession (continued)

Traffic Engineer A is a Ph.D. student in traffic and transportation engineering at a state polytechnic university. She interviews at Prestigious Engineering College for an assistant faculty position in the transportation engineering program of the engineering department. Several weeks after the interview, while attending a conference at the state polytechnic university, Traffic Engineer A is informed by Traffic Engineer B, who is a visiting professor at Prestigious Engineering College, that she “did not get the position.” Traffic Engineer B thereafter, through his department, offers Traffic Engineer A a faculty position at his home university in Canada. Although flattered, after consideration, Traffic Engineer A declines the offer and accepts a position at the state polytechnic university. A month later, after submitting a contract for the purchase of a house near the state polytechnic university, Engineer C, dean of engineering at Prestigious Engineering College, calls Traffic Engineer A and offers her the assistant faculty position, indicating that she was the Prestigious Engineering College’s first choice.

**Question:**
*Was it ethical for Traffic Engineer B to inform Traffic Engineer A that she did not get the position and thereafter offer Engineer A the faculty position at his home university in Canada?*

**Survey results:**
Respondents who answered yes: 6%
Respondents with <15 years experience who answered yes: 11%
Respondents with ≥15 years experience who answered yes: 5%

**Typical comments from respondents who answered yes:**
- It was wrong of Traffic Engineer B to give Traffic Engineer A false information.
- It was misleading to let Engineer A think she did not receive the position she was applying for at Prestigious Engineering College, especially since it appears Engineer B was not appropriately speaking for PEC.
- Engineer B could tell Engineer A, but should have told A to contact the school for confirmation. This only holds true if B firmly believed A did not get chosen. If it was malicious, then B did not act ethically. Typically if you are on a board, you are not allowed to tell anyone the results. If this is the case, then, B was not ethical.

**Typical comments from respondents who answered no:**
- He did not tell the truth to Engineer A.
- Engineer B should not circumvent the official hiring process.
- Traffic Engineer B did not have the authority to notify Traffic Engineer A of the results of the hiring process at the Prestigious College and should not have done so. The offer of a position at his home university could and should have been made without reference to the status of the Prestigious College process.
- If Traffic Engineer B was either aware that she was the preferred candidate or did not know the disposition of her application for the position, it was unethical to tell her otherwise for the express purpose of offering her a position at his home university.
- Even if he believed he was giving accurate information, he should have said nothing or made it clear that it was just heard through the grapevine. If he wanted her as a faculty assistant, he could have offered it to her as an option if she didn’t get her desired appointment.
- Using one’s position for one’s own advantage is poor business. However, Traffic Engineer A should not have relied on Traffic Engineer B’s information without following up with the Prestigious Engineering College to verify information.
- This was an obvious attempt to “steal” a potential prime candidate from a competing university.
- Absolutely not! Engineer B should be stripped of any faculty position if his idea of “recruiting” extends to poaching based on insider information. It is difficult enough to find individuals with both a decent work ethic and personal integrity without having faculty (role models) of this ilk.
- That is completely unethical, both professionally and socially.

**Opinion of the Board of Ethical Review:**
It was unethical for Traffic Engineer B to inform Traffic Engineer A that she did not get the position and, thereafter, offer Traffic Engineer A the faculty position at his home university in Canada.

**Main conclusions of the Board of Ethical Review:**
The Board is of the view that by his actions, Traffic Engineer B acted unethically. By virtue of Traffic Engineer B’s inaccurate statement to Traffic Engineer A that she did not get the position at Prestigious Engineering College, Traffic Engineer A was placed in an unusually difficult situation, both personally and professionally, since Traffic Engineer A accepted the state polytechnic university position thinking she had not gotten the Prestigious Engineering College position. In a sense, Traffic Engineer A’s world was turned upside down as a result of Traffic Engineer B’s regrettable comments. While it may also be true that it was Traffic Engineer A’s ultimate responsibility to verify what Traffic Engineer B told her concerning the position with Prestigious Engineering College and not to rely upon the statement of Traffic Engineer B, it is also understandable that Traffic Engineer A might implicitly trust Traffic Engineer B, since Traffic Engineer B was a visiting full professor at Prestigious Engineering College and presumably became privy to confidential information about the search committee’s activities.
Ethics in the Transportation Profession (continued)

It is not entirely clear what Traffic Engineer B’s actual motivation was in providing misinformation to Traffic Engineer A, and the Board can only speculate as to Traffic Engineer B’s intent. In view of the language of his comment to Traffic Engineer A, it is unlikely that Traffic Engineer B was engaging in conjecture or speculation in offering an opinion on the prospects of Traffic Engineer A gaining the position at Prestigious Engineering College. Instead, it would seem that Traffic Engineer B’s statement was intentional and was driven either by some ill-conceived or devious intent or was part of a clumsy effort to recruit Traffic Engineer A to his home university in Canada. Clearly, Traffic Engineer B’s actions constituted, at a minimum, a breach of confidentiality. In any event, Traffic Engineer B’s actions were wholly inconsistent with the NSPE Code of Ethics.

SITUATION 4
Traffic Engineer A is a principal in a medium-sized traffic engineering firm with expertise in traffic signal control systems. Engineer A’s firm is retained on a speculative basis by local Traffic Engineer B, to assist City X in applying for a federal grant for certain traffic signal systems upgrades. The application is successful, City X obtains the grant, and Traffic Engineer B is retained to commence with the traffic signal system upgrades. In recognition of Traffic Engineer A’s work in securing the grant, Engineer C, the chief city engineer, verbally promises to select Traffic Engineer A’s firm on a future traffic engineering project for City X.

Question:
Was it ethical for Engineer C to offer to select Traffic Engineer A’s firm on a future traffic engineering project for City X?

Survey results:
Respondents who answered yes: 20%
Respondents with <15 years experience who answered yes: 16%
Respondents with ≥15 years experience who answered yes: 22%

Typical comments from respondents who answered yes:
- As long as there were no violations of any contractual conditions in the original contract between Engineer B, Engineer A & City X, this would seem to be ethical.
- The city knows who was really doing the work for them on this project; it was Engineer A, not Engineer B’s firm. “Verbally promising” does not guarantee anything to Engineer A; the normal request for proposal, review, and contract negotiation process would have to be followed. This statement should be looked at more as a sign that the city is comfortable working with Engineer A and would like to give Engineer A an opportunity.
- Yes, as long as Traffic Engineer A is qualified to perform the future project, and Engineer C is in an authoritative position to offer the future project. This has nothing to do with “rewarding” Traffic Engineer A, it has more to do with being a “trusted advisor,” someone whose judgment Engineer C can trust.
- The city has a right to reward good performance with future projects in its discretion and subject to any regulations limiting its ability to sole-source projects.
- If Engineer C has authority to hire a firm directly without a bidding process, then it is ethical. However, if a bidding or RFP process is required, then it would be unethical to commit to selecting the firm from competing bids.

Typical comments from respondents who answered no:
- Not if city employs a quality-based system of selecting consultant resources through competitive bidding.
- Clear ethics violation. Public procurement should be based on price and qualification.
- Future contract awards should be based on merit.
- Engineer C may use his/her knowledge of Traffic Engineer A’s firm when evaluating firms during the process, but promising a future project to the firm undermines the process.
- Public funds must be evaluated competitively, not ‘given’ in a corrupt way. The proper way would be to promise an invitation for a future proposal.
- Key word I believe to be “speculative.” To secure a contract with inaccurate information, in my opinion, amounts to fraud.
- Creates a clear impression of favoritism, and that contracts are selected on personal relationships, not proficiency. Also, there could be equally or better-qualified candidates in future selections. “Pre-promising” can be cause for disciplinary action against C or litigation against X.
- Unethical and illegal if the project uses federal aid.
- Considering that City X will most likely have to award future projects to the lowest bidder, any premature selection of Traffic Engineer A’s firm is unethical.

Opinion of the Board of Ethical Review:
It was not ethical for Engineer C to promise to select Traffic Engineer A’s firm on a future traffic engineering project for City X.

Main conclusions of the Board of Ethical Review:
Ethics in the Transportation Profession (continued)

For purposes of this case, this Board is assuming that public procurement laws and regulations were in place that outlined the policies and the procedures for selecting an engineering firm. Assuming that was the case under the present facts, it is the Board’s view that Engineer C’s action in verbally agreeing to select Traffic Engineer A’s firm on a future Traffic engineering project for City X would constitute a subversion or a misuse of the existing procurement policies and procedures in place in City X. Regardless of the method of professional selection utilized in City X, one must assume that the method would, at a minimum, involve public announcement along with free and open opportunity for all qualified and eligible traffic engineers and traffic engineering firms to be considered for the contract. By promising Traffic Engineer A in advance that Traffic Engineer A would be selected for a future contract without considering the qualifications, experience, and other factors is not consistent with either the spirit or the intent of the NSPE Code of Ethics.

SITUATION 5
Traffic Engineer A is licensed in States B, C, and D. Traffic Engineer A participates in a business meeting in State E and hands out a business card indicating that he is a P.E. The business card lists Traffic Engineer A’s name, phone, fax, and e-mail address but does not list a mailing address, nor does it identify the states in which Traffic Engineer A is licensed.

Question:
Was Traffic Engineer A’s action ethical in this case?

Survey results:
Respondents who answered yes: 55%
Respondents with <15 years experience who answered yes: 37%
Respondents with ≥15 years experience who answered yes: 63%

Typical comments from respondents who answered yes:
- What kind of business card doesn’t have a mailing address? Engineer A is a PE and as such is not required to list every state he holds a license on his business card.
- The individual is a PE, just not yet in that particular state - she did not imply or represent that she was.
- The business card may have been handed out for a number of reasons other than for soliciting business as a PE.
- The information is by way of introduction, it is not a contract for services. Businesses may have work in numerous states. Even if TE-A were to get work in State E, he could be working as a sub to another firm or the state may have reciprocity for him to obtain his license if there is a need.
- Professionalism may dictate that he provide disclosure that he is not licensed in State E at the time of the meeting, but ethics would not. The contractor has to be responsible for some level of due diligence.
- The engineer should be able to market the fact that he is a PE. He just can’t offer to provide his own services in the state where he is unlicensed. He may be representing a firm that does have licensed engineers in State E. I believe this is a very common practice to pass out business cards in states where we may not be personally licensed, but other persons in the firm are licensed.
- The phone and fax identify the home states, so yes it is ethical.

Typical comments from respondents who answered no:
- The engineer should clearly state where he is licensed to practice. On a side note, clients should thoroughly research where their engineers are qualified to work.
- Most states have rules about this. If you don’t have a PE in that state, you can’t misrepresent yourself. With no address or list of licensed states, A is obviously trying to fool E into thinking he is licensed in E.
- Giving out misleading information. Handing out business cards in another state where the engineer is not licensed, for the purpose of generating business.
- This is a no-brainer - at least here in Florida. The state law regulating the practice of engineering expressly prohibits anyone without a valid state of Florida license to present himself as if he is registered in Florida. I imagine that other states have similar constraints.
- At the time Engineer A hands out the business card, he is not licensed as a PE in state E and cannot legally represent himself as a PE in state E nor practice engineering in state E; therefore, the business card misrepresents his licensing credentials in State E - which may, or may not, grant him a license to practice engineering in the future.
- The ethical thing to do in this case would be to clearly identify the states in which Engineer A has his license.

Opinion of the Board of Ethical Review:
Traffic Engineer A’s actions were not ethical.

Main conclusions of the Board of Ethical Review:
Ethics in the Transportation Profession (continued)

This situation presents a circumstance that could easily raise questions concerning Traffic Engineer A being perceived as a “professional engineer” in a state where he/she is not licensed, e.g., State E. In recognition that engineering licensure falls within the jurisdiction of the states, it is the opinion of this Board that, to avoid confusion or any appearance of deception about licensure, business cards should identify a physical address for the engineer. The business card in this situation does not identify a physical address, and for this reason the scenario is not acceptable.

GENERAL QUESTION
If you or your organization have been involved in an ethics question/situation recently, or if you have you heard of an interesting ethics question/situation, please briefly describe the situation and how it was resolved.

Situations Described by Respondents:

Situation A
The Inspections Division of the Engineering Department has been working with the same firms for years. Damages for exceeding contract length are not being charged and at the same time change orders for work after the fact are routinely approved. This has not been resolved.

Situation B
Pay to play - how ethical is this and does the blame rest with the elected officials or the professionals that play along? Also, how ethical is it to purposely skirt the law by having spouses and children donate to campaigns when the employee gets a big bonus later in the year (not officially a quid pro quo for the donations, but understood between employee and employer).

Situation C
Often a public agency will tell consultants how open they are, and how they welcome new companies, and then almost every contract they award goes to a local established firm. The only reason the agencies say this is to ensure they have enough bidders that they can award the contract to their favorite firm.

Situation D
State DOT person A meets with consultant person B at a bar after work once a week. They discuss ideas that then become a task order to B under an existing contract. No possibility of competition, even from the other on-call firms.

Situation E
State DOT person A suggests to consultant B that an upcoming RFP would be favorably reviewed if B had firms C, D, and E on his team. B puts together this team. Company F wins. During negotiations, F is asked to include C, D, and E on his team and ends up adding them.

Situation F
Firm A and Firm B are discussing the possibility of teaming on a project in City C. B asks A to give them a presentation on why A should be the prime. A does so. The next day, B calls A and says “we met with the mayor of City C, and he says we should be the prime”.

Situation G
Firm A and Firm B are working on a proposal together. A is priming. One week before the final proposal is due, and after both sides have reviewed drafts and discussed the project, the executives in B decide they should prime by themselves, leaving A without a major sub and their proposal in B’s hands.

Situation H
Person A is trying to recruit person B. Negotiations are going well, and a generous offer is being made. A lets slip at a professional event that he is trying to recruit a senior person in this region, and person C guesses it is person B. B declines the offer. Days later, C meets B and asks him if he accepted the offer. How wrong was A?

Situation I
Firms A and B bid on a job. Staff at agency C calls A and tells it “things are looking positive, but they need some approvals.” Firm B already has existing work with the client. B calls A to ask if they heard any results, and points out that some of the work in the new job is already covered in their existing job. A tells B that they have not heard anything official. Two weeks later, the board of C chooses B. Was C right to give some hope to A? Why did B call A and then pull politics?
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Situation J
As a part time engineer hired only to do air quality computer modeling, I was on an additional assignment preparing a traffic calming project for a member community of a planning commission. The project was similar to work I had done for the commission when I was a full time employee. There was no technical or politically acceptable answer to the supposed problem. The assistant director (a non-engineer under political pressure for a solution) took my draft report and rewrote it recommending that the town just place a jersey barrier across the road, thus creating a dead end road with no turn around. I told her that she made a very big mistake, and that I did not want to work on any future traffic engineering projects and would continue doing only the computer air quality modeling. She gave me a bad review. I wrote a counter reply to her review of my performance based on ethics. A few weeks later the owner of the property in front of the jersey barrier (after complaining to the town about people turning around on his grass) had a heart attack and died after another vehicle turned around on his grass. I also had previously told the director that the air quality modeling was a useless waste of government resources and the program should be sunset. I was told there was no longer any work for me at the planning commission. I very happily left. I now work full time in a non-political non-traffic engineering position (for much better pay) and only work part-time in traffic engineering.

Situation K
Engineers had a contract working for an architect. The architect had a contract working for a major corporation. The CEO for the corporation was directing the architect on how he wanted a certain marketing effort along a busy high-speed collector-distributor road to go using communication methods that were far beyond the limits of available research of the time. Engineers advised architect and owner rep that CEO’s ideas were outside the bounds of reasonableness. It was too much information for the motorist to digest while driving. Engineers’ objections were ignored. Engineers did not quit the job because competitors would have picked it up from the architect and finished it - maybe without considering all of the ramifications, and the engineers would have lost the client to the competition. Engineers worked to minimize architect and owner’s exposure to liability and completed the job. Engineers’ objections were subsequently proved right and the owner paid out millions to plaintiffs in a suit. Should the engineers have walked away from the job when their objections were ignored, or played Slim Pickens and ridden that bomb to its ultimate end?

Situation L
A Central Florida PW Director resigned due to his lack of a valid PE license.

Situation M
I personally have been challenged by our state board for not sealing a document I signed. The document requires no seal, includes no engineering; it is an insurance form. The state of insurance regulation has stated it need not be sealed, the state insurance company states it does not need to be sealed, the state engineering organization states that it does not need to be sealed, the board’s administration staff states that it does not need to be sealed, yet the attorney for the board continues to pursue it. His own expert witness stated in deposition the form does not need to be sealed. Yet after spending $25,000 in legal expenses to date, the board continues to pursue it, stating all documents must be sealed. I wonder if the board members seal their income tax statement. Is that ethical of our PE board?

Situation N
Daily we in the transportation industry are faced with ethical judgments in the execution of our analyses. Everything we do has a potential conflict of interest element. We do not want people working on projects that are not interested. It is how we address competing interests that identifies our character. The single biggest factor is to proceed in all efforts with as much transparency as possible.

Situation O
You might want to read my article, “The Tragedy of Angeles’ Flight,” published in a recent issue of the Sacramento Section ASCE “Engineerogram.”
This Month’s Survey Results (Survey 2)

Transportation Webinars

The Urban Transportation Monitor conducted a survey among transportation professionals primarily in the U.S. and Canada to obtain information and opinions about transportation-related webinars. Altogether 500 transportation professionals were contacted via email last month. Replies were received from 54 for a return rate of 10%. The results of the survey are published here.

How many transportation webinars did you attend over the past 12 months?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Avg. Number of Webinars Attended Over 12 Months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic engineers</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation planners</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit professionals</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is the general policy of your organization regarding employees attending webinars in terms of how many may be attended per year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No limits</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limits are set by budget</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval by management</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No policy</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What do you consider to be the essential elements of a good webinar presentation?

- Good topic. Good visuals - minimum of word slides.
- Very knowledgeable, enthusiastic speaker or panel.
- Clear agenda, crisp graphics (but not overdone), and real-life, practical examples.
- Unique information with supporting data. Discuss practical examples.
- Well-organized, relevant material, good technological delivery, opportunities to post questions and hear responses, and webinar available for replay afterward.
- Logical flow of information.
- Quick, to the point. The speakers should cover different aspects of the problem or issue.
- Presentation needs to be available for download right away so I can forward to others.
- Easy registration. Free or reasonably priced.
- Ability to read who is attending the webinar (sign in).
- Everything works! Nothing is more frustrating than wasting half the time with audio or video that isn’t working correctly. Only one or two presenters to keep it uncomplicated.
- Discuss something new and useful. Get into the meat of the subject: Why do we need to know this? Why do we need to apply this? What benefit will be accrued from implementing the subject of the webinar?
- Information that benefits by being presented rather than being read. The point of a webinar has to be more than just being handed some reading material.
- Access to the webinar slides/notes. Comprehensive list of follow-up references for self study.
Transportation Webinars (continued)

What do you consider to be the ideal length of time of a webinar?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Webinar Time</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45 min</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 min.</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 min.</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 min.</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which one or two webinars do you consider to be the most valuable that you attended thus far? Please state the name of the webinar and the organization that presented the webinar. Please provide reasons why you consider these webinars the most valuable to attend.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Webinar Name</th>
<th>Providing Organization</th>
<th>Reasons Why Webinar is Considered Valuable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reauthorization</td>
<td>National Association of Regional Councils (NARC)</td>
<td>Good timely information about reauthorization. Heard the latest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics by NSPE</td>
<td>NSPE</td>
<td>You need one ethics PDH per year to maintain licensure in most states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapeze - Blockbuster</td>
<td>Trapeze</td>
<td>This helps with background info on how the program works so we can better understand the results on the front end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAD/AVL - Scheduling Software</td>
<td>Route Match</td>
<td>Our agency is specifically interested in this product.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Marketing for Rideshare Programs</td>
<td>Association for Commuter Transportation (ACT)</td>
<td>I learned the most new information that can be used to immediately increase the number of rideshare participants at my worksite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Federal Financial Report</td>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>Provided information on how to complete new on-line TEAM form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1201(c) Reporting Guidelines</td>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>It helped to identify specific reporting needs for ARRA grants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation planning</td>
<td>ITE</td>
<td>They give an opportunity to discuss the challenges with the experts and practicing engineers from all over North America. Gives chance to discuss the things among own organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEED ND - A Point by Point Review</td>
<td>USGBC</td>
<td>The webinar featured good information on a topic that is very important to our project. It provided details of how we might apply LEED ND to new developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Routes to School</td>
<td>ITE</td>
<td>We got a lot of good information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition Plan</td>
<td>APBP</td>
<td>Learned a great deal about the ADA requirements to update the required Transition Plan and how to go about doing it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Safety Manual topics</td>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>Actually presented useful information about the topic that I did not know going into the webinar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crash Data Management Systems</td>
<td>a consultant</td>
<td>Technical presentation of a useful tool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Exp with Road Pricing</td>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>Relevant to my work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Modal School Site Planning Webinar</td>
<td>ITE</td>
<td>Provided the most comprehensive list of authoritative resources for that topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion Pricing</td>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>We are considering a managed lane program for the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressed Work Week Schedules to Reduce Vehicle Trips</td>
<td>Association for Commuter Transportation (ACT)</td>
<td>My site already offers compressed scheduling, but this webinar provided additional data for ongoing support of those programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARRA Reporting</td>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>Provided updates on ARRA reporting that is done quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometric Design</td>
<td>ITE</td>
<td>They are very focused and direct in approach and good way of learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Calming</td>
<td>ITE</td>
<td>We were able to get partner organizations, such as the school district there together with us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUTCD</td>
<td>ITE</td>
<td>A series of webinars about the new MUTCD provided highlights of changes and what they mean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management Training</td>
<td>TranSystems</td>
<td>Actually presented useful information about the topic that I did not know going into the webinar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future of High Speed Transit</td>
<td>Mass Transit</td>
<td>Timely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverging Diamond Interchange</td>
<td>Rhythm Engineering</td>
<td>Provided the most comprehensive list of authoritative resources for that topic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transportation Webinars (continued)

What do you consider to be common mistakes made when presenting a webinar?

- Not having good, real-time feedback, interaction among participants.
- Covering the same ground too many times.
- No data to look at while they are talking.
- Trying to get too much info into the time slot or webinar is too long.
- Hidden ‘advocacy’ or ‘government’ preaching.
- Aura of authority rather than open, objective discussion of various issues, suggesting that the webinar substitutes for familiarity with the literature or interaction of views.
- Having too many speakers or panel participants. Too much talk between moderators.
- Having participants of different experience levels all on the same webinar. It becomes hard to know at what level the topic will be discussed.
- Charging fees for attendance
- Not making the webinar slides/notes available on-line easily before or after the session.
- Not providing a comprehensive list of authoritative resources for follow-up.
- Straying off the subject. Not having good public speaking skills. Not having enough knowledge of the subject. Not having good examples.
- Bad technological delivery and not enough relevant or interesting material.
- High cost. The larger organizations or cities may have opportunities to do similar training locally, while smaller communities do not. Need to target areas of need.
- Spending too much time explaining general concepts. I attend webinars not only to gain knowledge in a topic, but also to gain more knowledge on some topics. Sometimes people leave webinars thinking they were a waste of time because they didn’t learn anything they didn’t already know.
- Getting bogged down in specific questions unique to particular agencies or personnel.

What do you consider to be useful and interesting topics to cover in future webinars?

- Transit agencies presenting new technology and new initiatives.
- Changes/updates in practices, rules, regulations, guidelines, standards, required reports.
- “How to” sessions, use of software, new research findings, data releases or summaries of major issues.
- Transportation Demand Management: how to improve the relationship of TDM and land use, using TDM tools to boost trip reduction in transportation projects.
- Transportation planning, roundabouts, access management, traffic calming.
- Keep looking for a wide variety - you attract different people to each.
- Any and all issues related to transit funding sources/grants and how to make the best out of transit spending.
- Fund application and reporting rules. Compliance with federal requirements such as ADA, Title VI, etc.
- Getting politicians out of engineering & planning decisions.
- Urban/social planning aspects as they pertain to Transportation Oriented Development.
- Bus/Rail/Bike/Pedestrian integrated programs.
- Pedestrian and bicycle facilities and policy impacts.
- IntelliDrive
- How to improve security for public transit sufficiently to attract choice riders, rather than accepting its current state as the last mobility choice for society’s lowest socioeconomic strata.

Are you attending less traditional conferences due to the availability of webinars?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REQUESTS FOR PROPOSALS

1. Measuring the Economic Impact of Passenger Rail Transportation Investments in Ohio
Agency: Ohio Department of Transportation
Deadline: 2010-09-27 22:00:00
Contact: All questions concerning RFPs, including technical clarifications of the projects and formatting and submission of proposals, should be directed to IRIS at research@dot.state.oh.us or 614-644-8135.
Description: The objective of this study is to investigate, develop and then implement performance measures and methodologies to capture the passenger rail service transportation investment being made in Ohio. This will allow DOT, ORDC, Ohio Department of Development (ODOD), and local governments to understand the impacts of a renewed passenger rail service on the economy within the eight (8) passenger rail station areas. The methodology and performance measurements created will also be used to measure the success of transportation projects along these future station locations within Ohio, the Ohio Hub area, and across the nation as additional passenger rail systems are started and/or improved.
Website: http://www.dot.state.oh.us/Divisions/TransSysDev/Research/RFP/Documents/2010-12Repost.pdf

2. Ohio Mobility Improvement Study
Agency: Ohio Department of Transportation
Deadline: 2010-09-27 22:00:00
Contact: All questions concerning RFPs, including technical clarifications of the projects and formatting and submission of proposals, should be directed to IRIS at research@dot.state.oh.us or 614-644-8135.
Description: ODOT’s ultimate goal is to develop a statewide system that integrates all HHST services and enables the efficient and effective allocation of resources to meet the needs of the traveling public while being fiscally responsible. This research project is considered the initial step towards meeting this goal.

3. Deployment, Use, and Effect of Real-Time Traveler Information Systems
Agency: Transportation Research Board
Deadline: 2010-11-02 16:30:00
Contact: Nanda Srinivasan Phone: 202-334-1896 Email: nsrinivasan@nas.edu
Description: The objectives of this research are to (a) produce a synthesis of transportation agency practices and rationales for delivering real-time information, (b) provide guidance on assessing the potential effect of real-time information on trip behavior of travelers, and (c) suggest potential agency practices to best facilitate the use of traveler information in the future. The results of the research are expected to be used by transportation operations and policy staff and other practitioners interested in establishing, enhancing, or developing future traveler information systems.
Website: http://apps.trb.org/cmsfeed/TRBNetProjectDisplay.aspx?ProjectID=2957

4. Pedestrian and Bicycle Transportation along Existing Roads
Agency: Transportation Research Board
Deadline: 2010-11-02 16:30:00
Contact: Christopher J. Hedges Phone: 202-334-1472 Email: chedges@nas.edu
Description: The objectives of this research are to: 1. Develop a methodology for transportation agencies to evaluate and prioritize the need to provide or improve conditions for pedestrians and bicyclists on existing roadways. The methodology should address pedestrian and bicycle facilities separately and should include the planning, funding, construction, and maintenance of pedestrian and bicycle facilities (including winter maintenance). 2. Conduct a validation of the methodology in at least one community. 3. Produce materials to convey the results of the research to various target audiences.
Website: http://apps.trb.org/cmsfeed/TRBNetProjectDisplay.aspx?ProjectID=2955

5. Design Guidance for Intersection Auxiliary Lanes
Agency: Transportation Research Board
Deadline: 2011-01-14 16:30:00
Contact: B. Ray Derr Phone: 202-334-3231 Email: rderr@nas.edu
Description: The objective of this research is to recommend improvements for the design of intersection auxiliary lanes in the AASHO Green Book for auxiliary lanes at intersections, leading to improved safety and operations.
Website: http://apps.trb.org/cmsfeed/TRBNetProjectDisplay.aspx?ProjectID=2952

6. Downtown Nashville Sign Regulations
Agency: Metropolitan Government of Nashville, TN
Deadline: 2010-10-01 15:00:00
Contact: Send all questions by email to Angie McDonald, CPPB, at the Procurement Division, via email at Angiemcdonald.nashvillegov.gov.
Description: The Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County (hereinafter, “METRO”) is soliciting competitive sealed proposals from qualified firms for the purchase of the following products and services: To obtain specialized consultant expertise to develop appropriate design standards and regulations for on-premise signage in Downtown Nashville given the recent adoption of new zoning regulations, the Downtown Code (DTC), and the changing and diverse character of Downtown Nashville. Consultants with expertise in developing sign regulations, especially in diverse downtown environments are needed to assess the current signage regulations applicable in Downtown Nashville and propose a complete signage code specifically tailored to Downtown Nashville. While the proposed regulations may lead to amendments to the Downtown Code, it will be important to consider the sign standards of the Metropolitan Development and Housing Authority (MDHA) applicable in redevelopment districts and the Historic Zoning Commission standards applicable in historic districts given the fact that these standards apply in the DTC area yet function independently from the zoning code and will not necessarily be changed as a result of this study. This project will determine the appropriate form of signage for each of the Subdistricts, or neighborhoods, within Downtown Nashville, as well as the appropriate procedures for requiring compliance with the standards, taking into consideration the reuse of existing buildings, conformance with the MDHA and Historic signage standards, the nature of property redevelopment, and protections afforded to nonconforming signs by the state.
Website: http://www.nashville.gov/bob/rfp/rfp_10108.asp

7. Intelligent Transportation System
Agency: Kalamazoo Metro Transit System, MI
Deadline: 2010-09-30 15:00:00
Contact: Questions relative to the scope of work shall be addressed to Carmine Lewis, Assistant Transportation Director, at (269) 337-8408 or Yuvra Grintsoun, IBP Group at 416-596-1930 (ext 226) ygrintsoun@ibigroup.com. Questions relative to the submission requirements may be addressed to Sylvia Pahl, CPPB, Senior Buyer, at (269) 337-8445.
Description: The Kalamazoo Metro Transit System (“Metro”) is seeking to prequalify consulting firms to deploy Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) technologies in order to enhance its capabilities in meeting its service demands.
Website: http://www.ci.kalamazoo.mi.us/other_files/12835_44861_FINAL_Kalamazoo_RFP_for_ITS.pdf

8. Coordinated Public Transit-Health and Human Services Transportation Plan
Agency: Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization, Austin, TX
Deadline: 2010-09-27 17:00:00
Contact: All requests for explanations or clarifications must be submitted by emailing CAMPO/CITY OF AUSTIN at stevie.greathouse@camptexas.org by 5:00 p.m., September 27, 2010.
Description: The Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization, hereinafter referred to as CAMPO, seeks offers in response to this Solicitation from public and non-profit agencies, private companies and other organizations to work in coordination with the Regional Transit Coordination Committee, and will provide a framework for funding transit projects under several categories of funding available through the Federal Transit Administration.
Website: http://www.camptexas.org/pdfs/RTCC_RFP_09072010.pdf

9. Comprehensive Operational Analysis and Short Range Transit Plan
Agency: San Bernardino Associated Governments, CA
Deadline: 2010-10-06 14:00:00
Contact: Mitch Alderman Director of Transit & Rail Programs malderman@sanbag.ca.gov
Description: SANBAG is the County Transportation Commission and as such is responsible for the planning and funding for the transportation agencies located within the County of San Bernardino. SANBAG is requesting proposals to conduct a Comprehensive Operational Analysis and Short Range Plan for fiscal years 2012 – 2016 and to provide strategic direction for Omnitrans through 2020. Omnitrans is the primary transit provider in the valley portion of San Bernardino County. SANBAG is responsible for evaluating and approving all transportation projects proposed for funding within the county under federal, Transportation Improvement Program, Transportation Development Act program, administering federal, technical planning and assistance to Omnitrans and other agencies with the County. SANBAG recently completed a Long Range Transit Plan, documents can be found under the Commuter Information on the SANBAG website (www.sanbag.ca.gov). The 2006 Omnitrans COA is available on the Omnitrans website (http://www.omnitrans.org/news/reports.shtml)
Website: http://www.sanbag.ca.gov/about/rfp/RFP11044-bk.pdf

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

PUBLIC AGENCIES — RFP notices are published here FREE OF CHARGE — call
## CONFERENCES

### Sept. 13-17

**Pro Walk/Pro Bike 2010** (National Center for Bicycling & Walking, FHWA Safe Routes to School and Recreational Trails Programs)
- Chattanooga, TN
- Chattanooga Marriott® at the Convention Center

At this forum, bicycle and pedestrian program specialists, advocates, and government leaders discuss a broad range of topics related to improving conditions for bicycling and walking and thereby improving the quality of life and health in their community.

- **600+**
- **$650 m**
- **$750 nm**

[www.bikewalk.org/conferenc e.php](http://www.bikewalk.org/conference.php)

### Sept. 22-24

**12th National “Tools of the Trade Conference”** (TRB)
- Williamsburg, Virginia
- Crowne Plaza at Fort Magruder

Topics include: Transit planning; small urban system planning; livable communities; financial strategies; rural transportation; technology sharing; historic preservation; tourism; local transportation issues; project programming process; public involvement; transportation logistics; environmental issues; reauthorization; project planning and air quality issues.

- **250**
- **$260**

[www.trbtoolsoffthetrade.org](http://www.trbtoolsoffthetrade.org)

### Sept 26-29

**TAC Annual Conference and Exhibition**
- Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada
- World Trade and Convention Center

The theme is “Adjusting to New Realities.” Topics include road safety, sustainable transportation, traffic control measures that encourage a shift in travel modes, managing the risk of aging infrastructure, among others.

- **900+**
- **$860.00 m**
- **$1025.00 nm**

[www.tac-atc.ca](http://www.tac-atc.ca)

### Oct. 3-5

**2010 Bus Technical, Maintenance and Procurement Workshop** (APTA)
- San Antonio, TX
- Marriott Riverwalk

The focus is on new technologies and best practices in procurement and maintenance. Sessions will provide information on the successful implementation of new technologies through training, maintenance and procurement efforts.

- **125**
- **$475 m**
- **$975 nm**

[http://www.apta.com/mc/conf erences/90days/bustechnical /Pages/default.aspx](http://www.apta.com/mc/conferences/90days/bustechnical/Pages/default.aspx)

### Oct. 3-6

**APTA Annual Meeting**
- San Antonio, TX
- Grand Hyatt


- **1,500-1,800**
- **$650 m**
- **$1,150 nm**


### Oct. 3-7

**First African Public Transport Congress and Exhibition** (African Association of Public Transport, Executive Council of Dakar Urban Transport (CETUD), SENBUS Industries, UITP)
- Dakar, Senegal
- Le Meridien President Hotel

Urban mobility is becoming an increasing concern in Africa. The lack of: adequate transport infrastructures, institutional and regulatory framework, the increased CO2 emission, the fares fluctuation, and the proliferation of informal transport operators are among key issues to be addressed for the sustainable development of public transport in Africa.

- **N/A**
- **$520 m**
- **$700 nm**


### Oct. 10-13

**9th Conference on Access Management** (TRB, FHWA, MDOT)
- Natchez, MS
- Natchez Convention Center

This conference, dubbed “A Key to Economic Vitality,” is aimed at those interested in a sustainable approach to improving roadway safety and efficiency. Sample topics include: State DOT Access Management Programs, Stakeholder Involvement/Outreach, Corridor Access Management Plans, Safety and Economic Impacts, Land Development and Access, and A Developer’s Perspective

- **200-400**
- **$425**
- **$225 Students**

[www.accessmanagement.in fo](http://www.accessmanagement.info)

### Oct. 11

**8th ITS Conference** (PTV)
- Düsseldorf, Germany
- The Inter-Continental Düsseldorf

This year’s conference focuses on cooperative mobility and reviews smarter ways to plan and manage urban transport. It will bring together key players from various industry sectors (in particular mobile navigation experts and automotive OEMs), traffic management centers and public authorities.

- **N/A**
- **Before Sept 10: € 249.00 (plus VAT)**
- **After: € 299.00 (plus VAT)**

[http://www.itsconference.de/i ndex.html](http://www.itsconference.de/index.html)

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>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fee</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct 11-13</td>
<td>European Transport Conference (Association for European Transport)</td>
<td>Glasgow, Scotland</td>
<td>Crowne Plaza Hotel</td>
<td>The debate about transport and climate change and sustainability issues will be a major focus of the Conference but there will also be case studies of good practice and state-of-the-art papers.</td>
<td>500 €825 + VAT (individual m) €800 + VAT (organization m) €935 + VAT nm</td>
<td>Christine Carr: <a href="mailto:christinec@eaeurope.org">christinec@eaeurope.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 18-20</td>
<td>10th Light Rail Conference &amp; Study Tour (UITP)</td>
<td>Madrid, Spain</td>
<td>Hotel Meliá Princesa</td>
<td>The theme is “LRT – Good for People, Good for Cities.” Sessions will focus on measures for guaranteeing efficient light rail integration into the cityscape, looking at state-of-the-art safety and security measures as well as methods for modernizing and renewing light rail systems. Study tour to 5 LRT developments available for 25 UITP members before conference.</td>
<td>N/A (VAT included) By Oct 9: €1044 m €1334 nm After: €1180 m €1508 nm</td>
<td>Samira Mezghad: <a href="mailto:samira.mezghad@uitp.org">samira.mezghad@uitp.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 18-20</td>
<td>Research Perspectives on Transportation Systems for Livable Communities Conference (TRB, USDOT Research and Technology Administration)</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>The Keck Center of the National Academies</td>
<td>This conference focuses on common goals for researchers, planners, and implementers of transportation projects: the need for better definition and the need for measures of livability. Implementing transportation systems to support livability involves many challenges reflecting the need to integrate many things – transportation, land use, development in system design; planning processes and work efforts; and actual transportation facilities and services.</td>
<td>N/A By Sept 23: $345 After: $395</td>
<td>Matthew A. Miller, <a href="mailto:mamiller@nas.edu">mamiller@nas.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 18-20</td>
<td>Rail-Volution 2010Annua Research Perspectives on Transportation Systems for Livable Communities Conference — “Building Livable Communities with Transit”</td>
<td>Portland, OR</td>
<td>Hilton Portland &amp; Executive Tower</td>
<td>Workshops fall under three general themes – Core Curriculum, Livable Communities, and Partnering for Equity and Sustainability. Explore key principles, issues and techniques for building livable communities with transit. Discussions will include how to fund, design and implement TODs, collaboration between modes of travel, partnerships &amp; challenges etc.</td>
<td>1,200 Before Sept 27: $425 After: $475</td>
<td>Thomas M. Palmerlee, <a href="mailto:tpalmerlee@nas.edu">tpalmerlee@nas.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 19</td>
<td>ITS Minnesota Fall Industry Forum</td>
<td>St. Paul, MN</td>
<td>Continuing Education/ Conference Center, University of Minnesota</td>
<td>The keynote topic is “Climate Change and ITS: Opportunities and Issues.” Conference will span current ITS topics and emerging research.</td>
<td>80-100 By Oct 5: $100 After: $125</td>
<td>Nicole Freese: 612-624-3708 <a href="mailto:ccconfs5@umn.edu">ccconfs5@umn.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 19-20</td>
<td>64th Ohio Transportation Engineering Conference (Ohio Department of Transportation and The Ohio State University)</td>
<td>Columbus, Ohio</td>
<td>Greater Columbus Convention Center</td>
<td>The 2010 theme is “Igniting Ohio’s Economic Engine.” Investments in transportation and infrastructure lead to job creation, economic growth, and improved quality of life for all Ohioans. Sub themes are Structures, Pavements &amp; Materials, Traffic/Safety, Administration &amp; Management, Multi-Modal Planning &amp; Environmental Issues, Construction, GeoTechnical and Infrastructure Assurance.</td>
<td>2,600 $100</td>
<td>Terri Barnhart: (614) 387-3102 <a href="mailto:terri.barnhart@dot.state.oh.us">terri.barnhart@dot.state.oh.us</a> <a href="mailto:victoria.beale@dot.state.oh.us">victoria.beale@dot.state.oh.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 19-22</td>
<td>AMPO Annual Conference (AMPO and East West Gateway Council of Governments)</td>
<td>St. Louis, MO</td>
<td>Hilton St. Louis at the Ballpark</td>
<td>Topics to include travel modeling, funding and finance issues, efficient operation of transportation, land-use planning, among others.</td>
<td>250 $425 m $480m $205 U.S. gov’t</td>
<td>Maria Staunton: (202) 296-7051, ext. 4 <a href="mailto:mstaunton@ampo.org">mstaunton@ampo.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 25-27</td>
<td>Sustainable Transport and Quality of Life in the City (TRB)</td>
<td>Buenos Aires, Argentina</td>
<td>Sheraton Buenos Aires</td>
<td>Topics include: Policy of urban transport; the offer of services of the sustainable transportation; the individual motorized transport - agent of the sustainable urban mobility; how to improve the quality of public transport; and urban transport in major cities in Argentina.</td>
<td>N/A €600= OECD countries €200- Argentina €300- South America €400- Other Countries</td>
<td>Christine Carr: <a href="mailto:christinec@eaeurope.org">christinec@eaeurope.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Fee/Later Registration Fee</td>
<td>Contact Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 25-29</td>
<td>17th World Congress on Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS, ITE)</td>
<td>Busan, South Korea; Busan Exhibition Convention Center</td>
<td>Topics include: Policy and Decision Making; Research Design and Services (including traffic management, payment systems, traveler information, public transport, freight and commercial transport, intelligent vehicle safety, intelligent road infrastructure, vulnerable users and communications and technology); Global Concerns and Interests (including legal issues, environment issues, education, and architecture and standards).</td>
<td>$1,300; $900; $300; N/A</td>
<td>Ms. Okada, Ikuko; <a href="mailto:info@its-jp.org">info@its-jp.org</a>; Nicole Oliphant, <a href="mailto:Nicole.Oliphant@itsa.org">Nicole.Oliphant@itsa.org</a>; Valerie <a href="mailto:ymindlin@mail.itscongress.org">ymindlin@mail.itscongress.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 14-17</td>
<td>Green Streets &amp; Highways Conference (ASCE – in cooperation with FHWA and EPA and in collaboration with ITE and AASHTO)</td>
<td>Denver, CO; Renaissance Denver Hotel</td>
<td>Topics for this interactive conference on the state of the art and how to achieve sustainable outcomes include: Sustainable Transportation; Strategies and Project Development; Green Design, Materials and Specifications; and Green Construction and Maintenance.</td>
<td>N/A; By Oct. 15: $595 m; $695 nm; By 11/5: $675 m; After: $775 nm; $755 m</td>
<td><a href="http://www.green-streets-highways.org">www.green-streets-highways.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 15-19</td>
<td>International Conference on Public Transport Financing (UITP, MTR)</td>
<td>Hong Kong, China; AsiaWorld-Expo</td>
<td>Growth in demand for public transport and rising expectations in terms of quality of supply call for the mobilization of financial resources to increase capacity, train staff, develop innovations, and provide full portfolios of services. The financial and economic crisis that hit the world in 2008-2009 has brought to the fore the need for diversified revenues, stable funding schemes, innovative approaches and partnerships.</td>
<td>N/A; By Oct 1; $700; 00; €1,100; After: €850; €1,250; On-Site: €1,000; €1,400</td>
<td><a href="http://www.uitp.org/hongkong2010">www.uitp.org/hongkong2010</a>; Jerome Pourbaix; <a href="mailto:jerome.pourbaix@uitp.org">jerome.pourbaix@uitp.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 17</td>
<td>2nd UITP Combined Mobility Platform Workshop (UITP)</td>
<td>Brussels, Belgium; STIB Offices - Rue des Colonies 62</td>
<td>Workshop will address how car-sharing, bikes and taxis can support public transport and how a successful collaboration is mutually beneficial.</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td><a href="http://www.uitp.org/events/2010/combined_mobility/en/">http://www.uitp.org/events/2010/combined_mobility/en/</a>; Caroline Cerfontaine; <a href="mailto:caroline.cerfontaine@uitp.org">caroline.cerfontaine@uitp.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 12-15</td>
<td>Transpo2010 (ITS Florida, FDOT, FHWA, ITS Georgia, GDOT, and the Florida and Georgia Sections of the Institute of Transportation Engineers)</td>
<td>Ponte Vedra, FL; Sawgrass Marriott</td>
<td>The theme is “ITS—Now More than Ever.” Sessions will focus on the “now” of intelligent transportation, showcasing current projects, and demonstrating how to do more with cost-efficient ITS solutions which maximize roadway and transit capacity. They will also explore the “more” of ITS, focusing on solutions that reach far beyond standard deployments. Finally, they will examine long range planning solutions.</td>
<td>$375 m; $425 nm</td>
<td><a href="http://www.itstranspo.org/register.html">http://www.itstranspo.org/register.html</a>; Karen Crawford; 850-224-7775; <a href="mailto:krcrawford@omic-associates.com">krcrawford@omic-associates.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 23-27</td>
<td>2011 TRB 90th Annual Meeting</td>
<td>Washington, DC; Marriott Wardman Park, Omni Shoreham, and Washington Hilton hotels</td>
<td>The TRB Annual Meeting program covers all transportation modes, with more than 3,000 presentations in nearly 600 sessions. The 2011 theme is “Transportation, Livability and Economic Development in a Changing World.”</td>
<td>N/A; By Nov. 30: $580; $260 - Young professional (&lt;Age 35); After: $575; $325 Young professional</td>
<td><a href="http://www.trb.org/AnnualMeeting/2011/Public/AnnualMeeting2011.aspx">http://www.trb.org/AnnualMeeting/2011/Public/AnnualMeeting2011.aspx</a>; Russell Houston at <a href="mailto:RHouston@nas.edu">RHouston@nas.edu</a></td>
<td></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.