

TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH BOARD
The National Academies

Executive Committee Meeting

June 11-12, 2010

J. Erik Jonsson Woods Hole Center

Woods Hole, Massachusetts

MINUTES

PRIVILEGED INFORMATION

Minutes of all TRB Executive Committee Meetings shall be regarded as privileged and not for public release, except by special action of the Executive Committee

TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH BOARD
Executive Committee Meeting and Policy Session Discussion Minutes
June 11-12, 2010
J. Erik Jonsson Woods Hole Center
Woods Hole, Massachusetts

Table of Contents

ATTENDANCE	3
JUNE 11, 2010	4
WELCOME	4
BIAS/CONFLICT-OF-INTEREST DISCUSSION	4
PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES	4
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT	4
TECHNICAL ACTIVITIES DIVISION (TAD).....	5
<i>Technical Activities Division and Council Report</i>	5
<i>Conference, Workshop, and Project Approvals</i>	5
SUBCOMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND POLICY REVIEW (SPPR)	6
TRB STRATEGIC PLAN MILESTONE REPORT	6
MARINE BOARD REPORT	6
COOPERATIVE RESEARCH PROGRAMS (CRP).....	7
SECOND STRATEGIC HIGHWAY RESEARCH PROGRAM (SHRP 2).....	7
UPDATE ON TRAFFIC SAFETY LESSONS FROM BENCHMARK NATIONS—NEW TRB REPORT.....	8
LUNCH BREAK	8
AFTERNOON SESSION.....	8
POLICY SESSION: DEFINITIONAL ISSUES RELATED TO THE CONCEPT OF LIVABILITY (PART 1 OF 2).....	8
CERVERO COMMENTS	9
FOY COMMENTS.....	9
DUNCAN COMMENTS	9
POLZIN COMMENTS.....	10
POLICY SESSION DISCUSSION	10
BREAK FOR EVENING.....	11
JUNE 12, 2010	11
POLICY SESSION: DEFINITIONAL ISSUES RELATED TO THE CONCEPT OF LIVABILITY (PART 2 OF 2).....	11
<i>Policy Session Rapporteur Summary</i>	11
FUTURE POLICY SESSION TOPICS	13
SUBCOMMITTEE FOR NRC OVERSIGHT (SNO).....	13
ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE DIVISION	13
STUDIES AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS DIVISION	13
INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES	14
NEW BUSINESS.....	14
NEXT MEETING AND ADJOURNMENT	14

**TRB Executive Committee Meeting Attendance
June 11-12, 2010
Woods Hole, Massachusetts
Attendance**

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Michael Morris	Chair
Peter Appel	Ex Officio
Barry Barker	
Allen Biehler	
Rebecca Brewster	Ex Officio
Larry Brown	
Deborah Butler	
William Clark	
Eugene Conti	
Nicholas Garber	
John Horsley	Ex Officio
William Millar	Ex Officio
Debra Miller	
Neil Pedersen	
Peter Rogoff	Ex Officio
Sandra Rosenbloom	
Gerry Schwartz	
C. Michael Walton	
Steven Scalzo	
Beverly Scott	
Daniel Sperling	
Kirk Steudle	
Douglas Stotlar	

MARINE BOARD CHAIR

Malcolm MacKinnon

TECHNICAL ACTIVITIES

COUNCIL CHAIRS

Jeannie Beckett
Robert Johns
Edward Kussy
Peter Mandle

TRB STAFF

Cindy Baker
Ann Brach
Stephen Godwin
Neil Hawks
Russell Houston
Christopher Jenks
Michael LaPlante
Mark Norman
Suzanne Schneider
Robert Skinner

GUESTS

Lisa Aultman-Hall	U of Vermont
Robert Bertini	RITA
Robert Cervero	UC Berkeley
Douglas Duncan	CivicUS
Douglas Foy	Serrafix
John Gray	AAR
Kevin Knight	USACE
Greg Nadeau	FHWA
Jeffrey Paniati	FHWA
Steven Polzin	U of South Florida
John Porcari	U.S. DOT
Nan Shellabarger	FAA
Michael Trentacoste	FHWA
Vincent Valdes	FTA
Martin Walker	FMCSA

TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH BOARD
Executive Committee Meeting and Policy Session Minutes
June 11-12, 2010

Woods Hole, Massachusetts

Highlighted areas indicate Executive Committee action.

June 11, 2010

Welcome

Transportation Research Board Executive Committee Chair Michael Morris called the meeting to order at approximately 8:30 a.m. Chairman Morris welcomed everyone in attendance. Self-introductions were made. Morris announced that a nominating committee is being established to identify candidates to fill the seats of Executive Committee members whose terms will expire at the end of the year.

Bias/Conflict-of-Interest Discussion

A bias/conflict-of-interest discussion was held, in which members of the Executive Committee were given the opportunity to disclose potential biases or conflicts of interest they could have related to areas that might be discussed at this or future Executive Committee meetings. No members reported any conflicts of interest related to the Executive Committee's duties.

Previous Meeting Minutes

The minutes of the January 13-14, 2010, meeting of the Executive Committee were approved.

Executive Director's Report

Robert Skinner provided a report on a number of items concerning TRB as detailed in the Executive Director's Report (Tab 2 of the agenda book). During his presentation, Skinner highlighted the following:

- TRB's programs continue to be strong technically and financially, and taken together, they constitute TRB's largest program level ever.
- TRB has several high-visibility studies under way. These include studies on electronic vehicle controls and unintended acceleration; federal funding of transportation improvements in base realignment and closure cases; the offshore oil and gas platform inspection program of the Minerals Management Service; and causes of the Deepwater Horizon explosion, fire, and oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico. (Steve Godwin, director of the Studies and Special Program division, provided more details on these studies during his presentation.)
- Short-term extensions of the existing federal-aid surface transportation program have provided additional funding for the second Strategic Highway Research Program (SHRP 2). The extra funding has essentially funded the program at the originally authorized level.
- SHRP 2's naturalistic driving field study, which will instrument about 2,000 vehicles, is about to get under way.
- Significant effort and emphasis has been placed on international coordination within SHRP 2, and it is paying off with loaned staff and attention from other countries.
- The Airport Cooperative Research Program is really hitting its stride now with the release of a steady stream of completed research results.
- After several years of discussion, the prospects for the Department of Homeland Security becoming a sponsor of TRB are good. (*Subsequent to the meeting, the Research and Science Directorate of DHS become a sponsor of TRB.*)
- Skinner asked that members of the Executive Committee send him suggestions for individuals who should be considered to receive the Turner Medal for Lifetime Achievement in Transportation.

- The restoration of the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) building is scheduled to begin on June 15, 2010. As a result of the closing of the NAS building, the SHRP 2, Synthesis, and Innovations Deserving Exploratory Analysis (IDEA) programs have had to temporarily relocate to the Arnold and Porter building—about 5 blocks from the Keck building, which houses the rest of TRB’s staff.
- An extension of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) is in effect until December 31, 2010. Skinner warned that in a highly charged election year, the prospects for a federal surface transportation reauthorization bill this year are dim.
 - In a subsequent discussion on the topic, members of the Executive Committee generally agreed with Skinner’s assessment.

Technical Activities Division (TAD)

Technical Activities Division and Council Report

Robert Johns and Mark Norman reported on activities of the Technical Activities Council (TAC) and Technical Activities Division as detailed in their report (Tab 4A of the agenda book). Their presentations highlighted the following:

- The Technical Activities Council met on June 10. A major portion of the meeting was devoted to brainstorming on critical and cross-cutting issues. The TAC came up with about 90 issues - with policy, finance and funding, and institutions as the driving forces. The list will now go to the committees for their use in targeting activities. It is expected that the list will also eventually be used in helping to update the TRB critical issues document and in developing cross-cutting sessions for the TRB Annual Meeting.
- TAC is implementing actions to address comments on data for decisions and performance management made at the January 2010 TRB Executive Committee meeting.
- Pilot efforts are being initiated to provide more formal mechanisms for younger standing committee members to provide input to the TRB Technical Activities Division.
 - Nick Garber encouraged increased effort to involve graduate students in standing committees.
- The 2010 TRB 89th Annual Meeting attracted more than 10,100 registrants, which was a slight increase over last year. The program included 3,000 presentations. The exhibit space was sold out - the equivalent of 200 booths.
- Planning for the 2011 TRB 90th Annual Meeting is under way. The spotlight theme for the 2011 meeting is “Transportation, Livability, and Economic Development in a Changing World.”
- TRB implemented additional measures to bring more of the 2010 Annual Meeting to state department of transportation employees and other TRB supporters who could not travel. This included making available all the presentation slides and approximately 45 sessions recorded as e-sessions.
 - Neil Pedersen suggested that the TAD work closely with committees within the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials to enhance the effort of getting the word out to state employees on what they receive from TRB.

Conference, Workshop, and Project Approvals

The Executive Committee approved TRB sponsorship or cosponsorship of the following conferences:

- 14th International Conference on HOV/HOT and Managed Lanes (sponsor)
- Strategies for Meeting Critical Data Needs for State and Metropolitan Transportation Agencies (sponsor)
- 6th International Driving Symposium on Human Factors in Driver Assessment, Training and Vehicle Design (cosponsor)
- TRANSED 2012 -- The 13th International Conference on Mobility and Transport for Elderly and Disabled People (cosponsor)
- 13th National Transportation Planning Applications Conference (sponsor)
- Emerging Issues in Safe and Sustainable Mobility for Older People (sponsor)

- This conference was approved with the understanding that the transit community would be involved in this event.
- International Symposium on Pavement Surface Characteristics of Roads and Airports (SURF) (cosponsor)

Subcommittee on Planning and Policy Review (SPPR)

Michael Morris presented the SPPR report in the absence of Adib Kanafani, SPPR chair. Morris described the role of the subcommittee (Tab 3B of the agenda book) as the group charged with providing guidance and input to TRB between meetings of the Executive Committee.

- Morris noted that the SPPR met on May 3, 2010. Topics addressed in the meeting included the following:
 - Review of the third milestone report on implementation of the TRB Strategic Plan.
 - The process the U.S. Department of Transportation is using to develop a new 5-year research, development, and technology (RD&T) strategic plan.
 - The development of a proposal to initiate either a conference or study that would develop a strategic assessment of the many transportation data assessment activities under way.
 - A review of how the Marine Board focuses on strategic initiatives.
 - Development of a prospectus for a study to explore how to pay for the operating costs of intercity passenger rail, and discussion on how TRB might draw on international experience in that study.
- Morris noted that other items discussed by the SPPR are to be addressed during later parts of this meeting.

TRB Strategic Plan Milestone Report

Suzanne Schneider summarized major activities taking under way in implementing the objectives of the TRB Strategic Plan, as detailed in her report (Tab 5A of the agenda book). During her presentation she highlighted the following item:

- The bold and italic items in the report highlight the most recent accomplishment in each area.
- The current plan was adopted in June 2007, and it is time to begin thinking about an update. That effort has been put on hold based on the uncertainty surrounding the federal surface transportation reauthorization process, as well as other political and economic uncertainties in the current climate.
- In the interim, however, there may be some issues that should be given more focus/priority in implementing the Strategic Plan. Those include:
 - Strengthen the portfolio of funding sources for TRB's core program.
 - Increase the private sector's connections with and involvement in TRB.
 - Identify ways that TRB can preserve/strengthen the relevance of services offered under its core programs to its traditional public-sector sponsors.
 - Secure outside funding to enable continuation of the TRB Minority Student Fellows Pilot Program.
 - Schneider noted that two sponsors have been identified for the 2010-2011 program. The organizations are supporting students from colleges in their vicinity, which may be a good model for attracting other sponsors.
 - Identify future transportation challenges and explore means of addressing them.
 - Focus some of TRB's enhanced communications tools on reaching out to more elected and appointed officials and decision makers concerning the benefits of participating in TRB and the value of research.

Marine Board Report

RADM Malcom MacKinnon (ret), Chair of TRB's Marine Board, briefed the Executive Committee on recent Marine Board activities and initiatives (Tab 3D of the agenda book). Highlights of his presentation include the following:

- The Marine Board's mission is to serve the national interest by providing evaluations and advice concerning the ability of the nation's marine transportation system and marine industries to operate safely, efficiently, and in an environmentally sensitive manner.
- The Marine Board has been active over the years in the area of oil spills. Before the Deepwater incident, the board was already engaged in a review of the Minerals Management Service's offshore oil and gas platform inspection program.
- The Marine Board is also working on offshore issues related to wind energy turbine structural and operating safety.
- MacKinnon suggested that the complexity and importance of the marine transportation system warrant the development of a marine cooperative research program.

Cooperative Research Programs (CRP)

Christopher Jenks provided a status report on the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP), Transit Cooperative Research Program (TCRP), Airport Cooperative Research Program (ACRP), National Freight Cooperative Research Program (NFCRP), Hazardous Materials Cooperative Research Program (HMCRP), and the pending National Cooperative Rail Research Program (NCRRP), as detailed in the Cooperative Research Programs report (Tab 4D of the agenda book). In addition, he highlighted the following items:

- NCRRP - The Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008, enacted in October 2008, authorized establishment of a National Cooperative Rail Research Program (NCRRP). Initially the program will be funded at \$5 million per year through FY 2013 and will address freight rail, intercity passenger, including high-speed rail; and commuter rail that is under the jurisdiction of the Federal Railroad Administration. The U.S. DOT Secretary has responsibility to select the members of the governing board. So that projects can get into the pipeline as soon as possible, CRP is working with several TRB rail standing committees to develop a list of potential first-round projects that can be presented to the governing board.
- NCHRP - The American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Standing Committee on Research has recommended an FY 2011 program comprised of 18 continuations and 40 new projects. The program was approved for funding by the Federal Highway Administration and is currently being voted on by the AASHTO Board of Directors. FHWA has initiated collection of FY 2010 funds from the state DOTs. The reconciliation of previous funds and the collection of new funds are the highest priorities for the continued, uninterrupted operation of NCHRP.
- TCRP - The governing board will be meeting June 12-13 as part of their annual status meeting. The first panel meetings for FY 2010 projects have been completed and the problem statement solicitations for the FY 2011 program are under way.
- ACRP - This was a break-out year for the ACRP program, with the release of 10 publications in the first half of the year. The oversight committee will meet in July to select the FY 2011 projects. The U.S. Government Accountability Office's review of the ACRP program is expected to be released shortly.
- NFCRP - Although the FY 2010 projects were selected in October 2009, TRB has been reluctant to aggressively pursue the new projects until assured of continued funding through FY 2010. We are awaiting word from the Research and Innovative Technology Administration on whether funding will be forthcoming for the program.
- HMCRP - First panel meetings to refine scopes and issue requests for proposals for the FY 2010 projects will be completed by late June. A solicitation for FY 2011 problem statements has been released. In the coming months, TRB staff will schedule agency selection panel meetings, finalize the reconfigured Technical Oversight Panel, schedule the next annual meeting for the Technical Oversight Panel, and continue to manage individual contracts for research.

Second Strategic Highway Research Program (SHRP 2)

Neil Hawks directed members of the Executive Committee to the Strategic Highway Research Program 2 (SHRP 2) report (Tab 4E of the agenda book).

- As a result of continuing resolutions related to the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act—A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), SHRP 2 has had small incremental increases in funding. As a result, the total funds that will be available for SHRP 2 implementation activities will approximate \$60 million by December 31, 2010.
- All four SHRP 2 Technical Coordinating Committees met in April. The committees explored the implementation implications of known and prospective projects for their focus areas, developed an extensive array of potential implementation activities and projects, and identified a subset of those activities that can and should be implemented immediately. Implementation projects that will be initiated in the current year will be selected shortly.
- Focus area highlights include the following:
 - Safety – The National Academy of Sciences and TRB have executed contracts with all six of the research contractors who will be managing the field site operations for the naturalistic driving studies. Volunteer drivers are expected to be behind the wheel of instrumented vehicles by the end of September. (*Subsequent to the meeting, the instrumentation of the vehicles was delayed.*) The procurement of 2,000 data acquisition systems to be used in the in-vehicle driving study will be, at \$10 million, the largest single procurement in SHRP 2.
 - Renewal – Five of the renewal research projects have been completed and four final reports are available. With collaboration from SHRP 2, the Forum of European Highway Research Laboratories is sponsoring two sessions on long-lived bridges as part of the European TRA2008 conference in Brussels during the first week in June.
 - Reliability – Five of the 15 reliability projects are nearing completion. Project L17, A Framework for Travel Time Reliability, is currently in the proposal review stage. This project will gather the many threads of research ongoing in the SHRP 2 Reliability research focus area with findings from the other SHRP 2 focus areas and weave them together into a coherent tool kit for delivery to transportation agencies.
 - Capacity – In January, the beta version of the Transportation for Communities—Advancing Projects through Partnerships and the Transportation Project Impacts Case Studies websites were delivered. The final requests for proposals for the Capacity research focus are being released in 2010.

Update on Traffic Safety Lessons from Benchmark Nations—New TRB Report

Stephen Godwin briefed the Executive Committee on a report that is expected to be released this fall. This study report will document the experience of nations such as Sweden, United Kingdom, Netherlands, and Australia in sharply reducing traffic deaths and injuries through safety programs designed to alter driving behavior, and will focus on the strategies these nations used to build public and political support for such interventions.

Lunch Break

The Committee recessed at noon for lunch.

Afternoon Session

The Executive Committee reconvened at approximately 1:15 p.m.

Policy Session: Definitional Issues Related to the Concept of Livability (Part 1 of 2)

Chairman Morris welcomed the policy session panelists and expressed the committee's appreciation for their participation in the session. Members of the panel included Robert Cervero, Professor, Department of City and Regional Planning, and Director, University of California Transportation Center, UC Berkeley; Douglas Foy, President, Serrafix; Douglas Duncan, Senior Vice President, Research and Business Development,

CivicUS; and Steven Polzin, Director, Mobility Policy, University of South Florida Center for Urban Transportation Research.

Morris noted that the goal of the session would be to explore the various issues that need to be considered in defining the term “livability” as it pertains to transportation.

Cervero Comments

Key points from Robert Cervero included the following:

- Large cities with compact growth, mix of uses, and balanced transportation options are places where high housing costs are offset by affordable transportation.
- Older baby boomers are in the process of downsizing and moving to infill communities.
- Immigrants, both legal and illegal, are going to play an increasing role in the nation’s housing market. In 2006, immigrants made up 25% of the new entrants in to the housing market. They will flow to the larger suburban homes. Hispanic Americans will make up almost 25% of the population by 2050.
- Surveys indicate that those 55 and older have a stronger preference for attached townhomes than younger adults. Older adults want denser, more centrally located walkable areas.
- In the United States, transit-oriented development (TOD) has the potential to accommodate 25% of all new metro households. TOD is ranked by some as the top real estate investment prospect for the future.
- Seoul, South Korea, has completed several urban regeneration projects that incorporated bus rapid transit (BRT) to make up for lanes lost. The projects have reduced pollution, improved downtown mobility, helped reduce downtown average temperatures, and improved property values.
- BRT’s impact in Seoul included increased speed for both bus and passenger cars, higher passenger loads, and less travel time variation.
- Sustainability will require balance, variety, and choice.

Foy Comments

Key points from Douglas Foy included the following:

- Changing the development mindset is possible. Such an initiative succeeded in Massachusetts through the development of the Office for Commonwealth Development, which was charged with coordinating housing, transportation, energy, and environmental decisions within the state in order to encourage more sustainable development.
- All four agencies reported to Foy and he also had oversight of their capital and operating budgets. The commonwealth department developed a single context for how all the agencies worked together.
- Through Commonwealth Capital grants, Massachusetts was successful in breaking down the resistance to dense-use housing in traditionally less densely developed areas. The department was able to facilitate 600 zoning changes in one year.
- The program also included an evaluation process so that the state could measure the results of the changes.

Duncan Comments

Key points from Douglas Duncan included the following:

- As a former county executive he has spent his life trying to develop livable communities.
- Livable communities are simply responding to what people are demanding.
- “If I can walk somewhere I am in a livable community.”
- People are demanding mobility, but how to achieve mobility is changing. An example in the Washington, DC, area was the building of the arena in the 1960 on the beltway. In the 90’s, when Abe Pollen was looking for a site for his new arena, he wanted it downtown and on the subway line. The Verizon Center has helped revitalize that area of DC.

- Two jurisdictions that have set the standard for livable communities are Arlington County, Virginia and Montgomery County, Maryland. They embraced transit.
- Tyson’s Corner in Fairfax County, Virginia, and Georgetown in DC are communities that ignored transit and are now paying the price. Tyson’s is now, finally getting transit.
- Change is not easy and can bring intense opposition. You just need to keep plugging away.
- We have to put people somewhere; we don’t have the infrastructure to keep putting people further and further from the town center.

Polzin Comments

Key points from Steven Polzin included the following:

- Travel is fundamental to the human desire to interact and socialize. Travel enables economic interaction and the transportation of products and is fundamental to the functioning of the economy.
- We have supersized over the years. There are fewer service centers such as schools and hospitals than in the past. We have moved to larger facilities that are farther apart.
- Commuting to work is under 20% of all daily trips. Nearly 30% of households have no worker or no commuters. Property transaction fees, homestead tax rules, lack of portability of mortgages, high home ownership rates, etc., impede moving to minimize work trip length.
- The ability of “livability” initiatives to influence travel may be dampened by changes in context since the nostalgic days of neighborhood-centered social and economic relationships.
- “Livability” may be desirable but the impact may be less than hoped for in terms of transportation and land use impacts. Travelers may not take advantage of the opportunity to change travel behavior.
- When income increases, travel and the desire to travel goes up.
- Livability is the epitome of applying holistic thinking to transportation planning. We have learned that transportation affects everything, and we have tried to incorporate everything into our transportation decision making.
- Livability is not the totality of quality of life.
 - Waiting in stop and go traffic is bad but waiting for a bus or train is okay?
 - Alternative modes are dramatically slower, and if time has value this has a social cost.
 - More congestion, higher taxes, more controls on development, etc., are not perceived by everyone as desirable.
 - Are we forgoing fixing a deteriorating bridge so we can build a bike path (opportunity cost)?
- Is livability a rebranding or rebranding of long-recognized transportation policy issues? If so, is there any value in embracing it as a basis for defining a research agenda?
- Implementing livability
 - Can livability appeal to more than just core urban constituencies?
 - Can a political constituency be sustained long enough to realize some of the admittedly long-term hypothesized benefits of livability focused planning?
 - Livability benefits from multijurisdictional, multiagency collaboration or consolidation of agencies/functions.
 - What is the cost in governmental responsiveness?
 - What is the cost of equity?

Policy Session Discussion

General themes and key issues addressed during the discussion included the following:

- Even if one is not a fan of terms like livability and sustainability, the transportation community cannot operate in its own little vacuum – must think within the larger context, including land use/zoning.
- Current livability constituency is largely urban, transit, pedestrian/bike.
- The British use the term “time pollution” – eroding of time due to long commutes.

- One model would be large capital investments for trunk line longer-distance travel, supplemented by more localized neighborhood-scale systems that rely more on alternate choices.
 - Under this model, livability would be limited to the neighborhood level.
- Personal safety when walking is more of a concern than it was decades ago.
- Specialization in what we purchase makes the smaller local store more problematic (e.g., we don't just want a quart of "milk", but ½% lactose-free milk).
- Livability is a term that tries to capture a spectrum of related traits.
- Cities/communities do change over time, so it is not accurate to claim that things will always be just the way they are now.
- Many ExComm members noted that "livability" should only apply in the urban context.
- Livability concept can seem elitist to lower-income groups. Affordability is the key driver for them.
- In the real world, many local zoning ordinances are driven by prejudices and exclusiveness.
- Peter Rogoff (FTA) – DOT objective in livability is to encourage people to talk to each other who have not historically done so.
 - Total funding for livability initiative is less than \$2 billion – a small percentage of the overall program.
 - US DOT Strategic Plan is just a draft for comment.
 - Livability program does include highways, not just alternate modes.
- Rob Bertini
 - All livability is local.
 - Feds won't seek to define what this means to local jurisdictions.
 - DOT research strategic plan that matches up to priority areas in general strategic plan will be available for comment later this year.
 - TRB/RITA livability conference in October will generate a research agenda.

Break for Evening

Morris called a recess to the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

June 12, 2010

Morris called the Executive Committee back in session at 8:30 a.m.

Policy Session: Definitional Issues Related to the Concept of Livability (Part 2 of 2)

Policy Session Rapporteur Summary

Summary observations drawn by Dr. William A.V. Clark, Professor, Department of Geography, University of California, Los Angeles, from the previous day's presentations included the following:

- Declining to Define
 - What do we mean by livability?
 - The charge: explore definitional issues related to the concept of livability as it relates to transportation
 - Livability = walkability (Duncan)
 - DOT definition = livability defined as what the local community defines it to be.
 - Many backed off or declined to state, but some were willing to engage in definitions.
 - Livability is about addressing and responding to change (Nadeau).
- A work in progress – U.S. Department of Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood defined livability as "investing in a way that recognizes the unique character of each community. The era of one-size-fits-all transportation projects must give way to one where preserving and enhancing unique community characteristics, be they rural or urban, is a primary mission of our work rather than an afterthought."
- Reiterating Themes
 - Context of Demography

- Housing + jobs 50 percent plus of costs
 - Generational contexts (especially boomers and millenials) will define the new market
 - Activity changes are increasingly important – 1940 the doctor, 2010 doctor +
 - Economies of scale - everything is bigger
 - The workforce
- Cooperation
 - Integrate agencies
 - Encourage (require) transportation, housing, energy, and environmental organizations to talk to each other
 - Start at the top
 - Small grants can accomplish big payoffs
- Complexity
 - Livability is the epitome of applying holistic thinking to transportation planning (Polzin)
 - One size does not fit all – Bubba and his gun rack/pick up = livability in Mississippi but not in NYC
 - Land use and transportation are complex dynamic systems, which are highly influenced by context
 - Transportation has been inward-looking and does not engage with the wider connected network.
- Creating Livability
 - How to go about “livability” stimulus?
 - Demonstration projects?
 - Will the market do it--as Cervero suggests?
 - Are the demographic projections reliable? (Portland – the city grew 3%, suburbs in the county 12%, outlying counties 17%)
 - Where do crime and safety fit in?
- Implementing Livability
 - Whom does it appeal to?
 - What is the time frame of the political constituency?
 - What is the cost of government responses?
 - What is the cost of equity effects?
 - What are the data constraints?
- Where does diversity fit in?
- Does livability have a middle class bias?
 - Yes and No – Cervero yes, Foy not necessarily.
 - Rosenbloom suggested that we develop a more inclusive notion of livability – move away from keeping people out and consider the implications of an aging society.
 - No broad coalition because minority households are moving out to where they can afford housing and are not focused on inner-city regeneration, and aging households are moving to gated and “safe” communities.
- What might TRB and other stakeholders do about livability?
 - Demonstration projects.
 - Distinguish between individual and infra-structural approaches to livability.
 - Examine how fiscal austerity constrains (any/all) approaches to transportation /livability incorporation.
 - How to make policy when data are limited.
- Questions for Discussion
 - Does livability matter, is it truly a local matter, or does it have national legs?
 - How does livability matter for the 40+ million new residents in the United States?
 - What do we know about livability outside of the ivory tower?
 - Is it elitist and can it be made less (un) elitist?
 - Space and time (can we have both?)

Future Policy Session Topics

Russell Houston provided an overview of the SPPR's suggested topics for the January 2011 policy session (Tab 6B of the agenda book).

- The Executive Committee decided to examine multi-modal national freight policy, including corridor-level priorities and funding strategies, during its January 2011 policy session in Washington, D.C.

Subcommittee for NRC Oversight (SNO)

Michael Walton described the role and background of the SNO and some of its oversight activities, including its efforts to support the broadening of the representation of minorities and women on TRB committees and panels as detailed in the SNO report (Tab 3A of the agenda book).

- Walton noted that TRB has been making steady, incremental improvements related to the appointment of women and minorities on committees and panels.
- He mentioned that a new table (Table 3) was added to the report on involvement of minorities and women that highlights the dollar value of contracts awarded by CRP to minority- and women- owned companies. The table also shows the number of minorities and women who are serving as principal investigators on university teams awarded NCHRP contracts.
- Nicholas Garber requested that "Table 2. Women and Minority Participation as Chairs of TRB Committees and Panels" be amended in the future to include an explanation as to why percentages may go up or down, especially if those changes are dramatic.

Administration and Finance Division

Michael LaPlante summarized the Administration and Finance Division report (Tab 4C of the agenda book). During his presentation he reported that:

- The total level for all TRB program activities has increased from \$99 million in calendar year 2009 to an estimated \$111 million for 2010.
- The 2010-2012 triennium budget calls for level funding from TRB's major sponsors.
- TRB self-generated income such as affiliate fees, publications sales, and Annual Meeting registration has been steadily increasing for the past several years. TRB anticipates that these increases will more than offset any increased expenses attributable to inflation and minimal salary increases.
- In the current 2010-2012 triennium, the states collectively are financing about 47 percent of TRB's Core Program. At present FHWA, TRB's largest and original sponsor, contributes about 15 percent, other agencies finance about 7 percent, and TRB self-generated income covers the remaining 31 percent.
- The amount of annual core operating expenditures held in reserve is expected to increase to approximately \$10M during the current triennium. However, this increase will likely not keep pace with expected increases in Core Program expenditures. Therefore, the amount held in TRB Reserves as a percent of yearly operating costs is expected to drop slightly to ~62 percent.

Studies and Special Programs Division

Stephen Godwin noted that the Studies and Special Programs Division report (Tab 4B of the agenda book) provides an overview of pending studies, potential studies, policy studies under way, and reports completed in 2010. Highlights of Godwin's presentation include the following:

- The Executive Committee approved the three-year renewal of the Committee on Review of the Federal Railroad Administration Research and Development Program.

- The Executive Committee made the following suggestions related to a proposed self-initiated study focusing on the possible scale of operating costs of intercity passenger rail. The members asked that an updated prospectus be reviewed by the SPPR at its next meeting.
 - The project should also explore the cost of system preservation.
 - The prospectus should be revised to eliminate apparent bias.
 - Resolve whether existing AMTRAK service will be included as part of the study.
 - Acknowledge some of the other research that might be necessary on this subject.
 - Explore the state-to-state issues, the legal and guaranteed funding issues, and financing options.

International Activities

Sandra Rosenbloom provided a report to the Executive Committee as the Committee's International Secretary. Highlights of Rosenbloom's presentation included the following:

- There is a significant amount of international activities taking place within the international community of TRB.
- The SHRP 2 program has been very active on the international front, through its international loaned staff program, presentations at various international meetings, and a subcontractor "matching" program designed to ensure that the international community is aware of and can participate in SHRP 2 research activities.
- International participation on CRP panels also appears to be increasing. The CRP is also funding several international scan programs that are run by the FHWA and FTA.
- Four TRB webinars related to international issues are in the planning stages.
- TRB's forthcoming report on road safety lessons from benchmark nations is another example of TRB's effort to learn from international experience.
- The Technical Activities Council is going to continue to encourage committees to include international members on their rosters.
- With these varied activities taking place, it's unclear where the collaborations are going and what their ultimate relevance will be to TRB.

At the conclusion of Rosenbloom's remarks, Mark Norman noted that 1,500 individuals from outside the United States attended last year's Annual Meeting.

New Business

There was no new business.

Next Meeting and Adjournment

- The next meeting of the Executive Committee will take place January 26-27, 2011 (Wednesday and Thursday), at the Omni Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D.C.
- Morris adjourned the meeting at 11:30 a.m.