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NEITE’s mission is to serve its members, the transportation profession, and the public by facilitating professional development and education, promoting the exchange of ideas, and enhancing the professional practice to provide safe efficient cost-effective and sustainable transportation solutions.

A Message from the New England Section President

JOSEPH SEGALE, P.E., PTP
Policy and Planning Manager
Vermont Agency of Transportation

Dear NEITE Members:

We are more than half way through a busy year for the New England Section of ITE and it’s clear our members are meeting the challenges and exceeding expectations.

Congrats Are In Order

In May, the New England Section hosted a successful Annual Meeting for the Northeastern District in Northampton, MA. Congratulations to the Local Arrangement Committee, led by Joe Balskus and Mike Knodler. All of the LAC did a great job delivering a fun, informative event in a vibrant New England downtown. Congratulations are also in order to Samuel Gregorio, the Editor of the New England Chronicle newsletter and the New England Section webmaster. The New England Chronicle newsletter will receive the District/Section Newsletter Award from ITE International next week as the top newsletter with a distribution greater than 500 members. Last but not least, the New England Section would like to recognize our Section’s own John Kennedy for his recent run for 2014 ITE International Vice President. Votes are still being tallied by ITE and the next VP will be announced on August 5th at the ITE International Annual Meeting. Good Luck John.

Since We Last Met

In June, the New England Section Executive Board met in Wells, Maine in conjunction with a joint meeting of the New Hampshire and Maine State Chapters. To implement a goal in the NEITE strategic plan to increase involvement of public sector members, funding was provided for meeting participants from public agencies. The Board approached this as a pilot program. The funding successfully attracted a significant number of public sector members to the day long workshop, but not the evening program. A similar public sector incentive program will be implemented for the joint meeting with the Massachusetts State Chapter this September in Waltham with some refinements based on lessons learned from the pilot. More information will be provided with the meeting announcement.

Committee Chair Opening

NEITE is a volunteer driven organization and there are always opportunities to get involved. There is a current need for a person to serve as the Chair of the Legislative Committee. This committee tracks and reports on transportation issues addressed by legislatures in the six New England states. Please contact me if you have an interest.

If you are interested in serving on the ITE New England Section Executive Board, nominations for the next two NEITE Junior Director positions are due by the September meeting. Please contact Ken Petraglia, chair of the New England Section Nomination Committee, if you would like more information, to be considered, or to nominate a fellow member.

ITE Annual Meeting

By now, you are all aware that the ITE International Annual Meeting and Exhibit will be in Boston next week from August 4th-7th. As expected, the Local Arrangement Committee has been hard at work to make this a memorable and fun event with an exceptional technical program. Please consider attending the meeting as it is a great experience.

Closing

I continue to be inspired by the contribution and support of our members. Thanks for everything you do, and please contact me at joe.segale@state.vt.us or 802-477-2365 with any questions, comments or suggestions.

Sincerely,

Joe Segale, P.E. / PTP
New England Section President
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Greetings New England Section and the entire ITE Community:

Just a little over three months removed from the bombings that left Boylston Street and the City of Boston in a disarray, the international community of ITE will be descending on the City of Boston over the next week for the first time since 1997. The New England Section and the Northeastern District would like to welcome you all to the “Hub of the Universe.”

Welcome to the Hub!
Growing up just 28 highway miles out of the Boston city limits in Chelmsford, MA, America’s oldest city is a second home and a melting pot of not only sports, history, and culture; but of transportation. Boston is home to North America’s first subway system. The city is the home of the now completed and infamous “Big Dig” Project. Boston is the terminus of the longest interstate highway in the United States. Boston is also a city that has embraced the viewpoint of multi-model transportation.

Once a small New England town connected to the mainland by one heavy-fortified dirt roadway, Boston has move forward by leaps and bound to become one of the largest cities in the United States. The city of over 600,000 people has stressed one of the nation’s oldest transportation system to new challenges, but new opportunities. It didn’t start off easy either as Revolutionary Boston was a peninsula without the traditional American grid-like roadway system. Even looking at a roadway and railway map of Boston in the present can cause headaches. Some two-way roads in Boston are not only narrow, but manage to incorporate on-street parking. Those from the city would not have it any other way.

It’s Already the Third Issue of 2013
Time flies when your designing roads I guess and we have already burned through half of the calendar year here in 2013. With the third issue of the New England Chronicle this calendar year, I have tried to put together articles and transportation related information highlighting the City of Boston and the metro-Boston area transportation.

In this quarterly issue, our feature article focuses on the funding of transit; specifically, the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA). MBTA funding has become a priority issue for the greater Boston area as the several commuter rails, subways, trolley, ferries, and buses move more than 1.3 million riders daily.

In addition, our second feature article overviews mobility for an aging society. A reminder that we as a transportation community must incorporate many aspects of senior living into our designs; whether it is roadways, sidewalks, or signals.

Contributions to the Section
As always, I encourage all members of the New England Section both student and professional to comment, contribute, and share their experiences with the New England Chronicle. I hope you enjoy the latest issue of the 2013 calendar year.

Samuel White Gregorio, E.I.T.
Chronicle Editor
sgregorio@tecmass.com

Please remember to visit the New England Section website at http://www.neite.org and our updated Section Directory for information on the New England Section.
Funding for Transit: Past, Present, and Future
What it Means for the MBTA

WILLIAM F. LYONS JR., P.E., ESQ
President / Principal
Fort Hill Infrastructure Service, LLC

Overview
The history of funding for public transit systems in the United States is a roller coaster of a story. The economic and financial cycles that have carried our transit systems from their earliest days to the present day have been a mirror of our society as a whole. These cycles have had a profound effect on the ownership and funding of our transit systems, which are the lifeblood of our economy.

This article examines the history of funding for what is truly a subset of public transportation. It is easier to enumerate those parts of our public transportation system that are not covered in this article. This article excludes the funding of highways, air travel, long distance/intercity passenger rail, ports and ferries, and public busses (although public transit busses are currently generally funded within the same programs as rapid transit). This article focuses on the history of funding for fixed rail transit systems.

Ever since horses were attached to trolleys moving large quantities of people, urban Americans have had a love for fixed rail transit. Over the years, fixed rail systems have proven themselves to be efficient, effective, and very popular. However, our funding of these systems has not always reflected our level of need and desire for public transit. We have often underfunded our transit systems, and they have suffered as a result.

This article travels through time to review how the earliest transit properties were capitalized and funded; how these systems were expanded through private and sometimes public investment; how they fell upon hard times in the post-World War II years; how they were taken over by public agencies; how public agencies recapitalized the properties through direct federal aid; and where they stand today. Then this article will look into the future to evaluate current trends and consider what lays ahead for the funding of public transportation systems.

Pre-World War II Era
Although the City of Boston lays claim to the first public transportation system in the United States, the transit systems that we think of as “public transit” were pioneered in the early 1800s. The evolution of motive power for rail transit systems moved from horse drawn cars in the 1830s to cable cars in the 1870s to electric cars in the 1880s. After the 1880s, these systems were constantly refined and expanded over the next 130 years.

Transit systems were initially constructed as private enterprises by investors seeking a profit. As profit generating enterprises, these properties were constantly seeking to innovate to improve profit margins and ensure shareholder returns. From an economics perspective, the transition from horses to cable and then electric cars was driven by the cost to house and feed the fleet of horses needed to pull the cars, including some 8,000 horses used in Boston alone.

At the turn of the century, another major change in the industry was caused by economic factors. Private street car companies figured out that they could boost their ridership if they offered free transfers from other street car companies. The resulting cooperation among competing streetcar companies to provide transfer fares, combined with a saturation of the marketplace, caused a major consolidation of the private streetcar companies.

In addition to the consolidation at this time, many street car companies expanded their lines to leisure destinations often just outside the city. This allowed them to make use of cars and personnel on off peak times, thereby making the systems more efficient overall. As a result of this innovation, suburbs were born, creating more riders and generating even more fares.

The first significant down cycle in the economics of transit systems was caused by the advent of the mass produced automobile. Although much blame has been placed on a scandal that alleged that car manufacturers and tire manufacturers had conspired to eliminate the transit competition, the mass manufactured automobile was the real cause of transit lines’ demise. The mass produced automobile gave the average person freedom from the transit system. Most of the smaller systems in the United States went out of business in this time period.

In between the world wars, urban transit systems tried to compete with the automobile, despite heavy investments by the federal government in road construction. The transit companies raised fares, using the fares to expand their system to accommodate...
18, the capital plants and equipment were operation of their transit system as early as 1891 and their transit systems as early as 1947.

World War II and Post War America

World War II was a boon for the transit industry. The rationing of gasoline and full employment resulted in a significant boost in overall ridership. The cash starved transit properties received a significant influx in fare revenue. However, the properties were overwhelmed by new ridership and unable to keep up with the impact to the maintenance and repair of their facilities. By the end of the 1940s, most transit systems were nearly bankrupt.

After World War II, America’s love affair with the automobile resumed. Suburban America grew by leaps and bounds, with residents moving out of the cities and becoming less dependent on the transit systems that had helped grow the cities. Still largely in private ownership, the systems were undercapitalized, experiencing significant declines in ridership, and in a state of poor repair.

As the 1940s led into the 1950s, America’s cities began to take ownership of their transit systems. Although individual municipalities such as Boston had assumed oversight over their transit systems as early as 1891 and operation of their transit system as early as 1918, the capital plants and equipment were typically owned by private corporations. As the late 1940s and 1950s were ushered in, local governments were finally required to assume complete control over their urban transit systems. In Boston, the Metropolitan Transit System assumed ownership of the Boston transit system in 1947.

The Interstate Highway Era

Former General of the Armies Dwight David Eisenhower was sworn into the Office of President of the United States in January of 1953. Soon after taking office, President Eisenhower proposed the Interstate Highway System, which was a federally funded construction program designed to connect the country with high speed highways to facilitate defense and commerce. The federal interstate highway program was signed into law in 1956. The act did not include any funding for transit systems, which were by then largely owned and operated by municipalities, and experiencing significant decline.

By 1960, urban cities that owned large public transit properties were clamoring for federal assistance to recapitalize their transit systems in an effort to rejuvenate urban centers. Federal aid for urban public transit systems was first authorized in 1961, and then again in 1964. These first programs were authorized as loans and capital grants through the U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development (HUD), as opposed to the U.S. Department of Transportation.

New authorizations were approved, through the new Urban Mass Transportation Administration (formed in 1968 in the Department of Transportation), in 1970, 1973, 1974, 1978, 1982, and 1987. Federal funding for operating costs was first approved in 1974 and in each subsequent authorization. These programs radically altered the complexion of public transportation in America.

One subtle change in the way federal funding was allocated was included in the 1974 authorization bill. This bill included funding formulas. The formulas were used to determine the amount of federal funding each state would receive based on a number of factors, such as the lane miles of interstate highways within a state. This concept of using a formula to determine how much each state will receive in federal transportation funding resulted in the establishment of donor states and donee states. Donor states collect more gas tax revenue than they receive in federal transportation funding. Donee states collect less gas tax revenues than they receive in federal transportation aid. This dynamic has created long-standing tension between donor and donee states and has resulted in many impasses as the Congress has negotiated new transportation authorization acts.

During this time of deepening federal investment and commitment to public transit in the early 1970s, ridership was plummeting and receipts were diminishing for most systems. Congress responded by increasing the federal share of construction costs from 67% to 80% (consistent with highway funding formulas) in 1973. They also provided the states with the flexibility to use highway funds for transit projects. Significant emphasis was placed by the Congress on maintaining viable public transportation systems.

Continued from Page 5
Continued from Page 6

The late 1970s saw a resurgence of ridership due to fuel shortages, rising energy costs, urban congestion, and environmental concerns. However, the transit properties also experienced these problems, especially rising energy costs, along with soaring inflation and labor costs. As a result, new financial problems were created for these evolving publicly owned properties.

These challenges set the stage for a wave of reform in public transportation agencies which occurred in the 1980s. Capital planning, strategic plans, transparency, and oversight were instituted to control operating and capital costs, while at the same time ensuring the efficient and effective delivery of transit services. The planning tools that were instituted at this time were suggestive of things to come in the early 1990s.

By 1980, fare box revenue represented only 31% of overall revenues, a far cry from the 70% of 1970, just a decade earlier. The federal investment in public transit grew from just $400 million per year in 1970 to $6 billion in 1980. Spurred on by federal investments and federal matching funds, state and local government investments rose from $1.4 billion per year in 1970 to $4.1 billion per year in 1980.

Although federal aid briefly declined by 20% in the 1980s during the Reagan administration, the cut in funding was contemporaneous with a new dedicated funding source in the form of one cent of every five cents of a gas tax increase. In the 1982 authorization, federal transit funding was also split into various accounts limiting the amounts to be spent on particular programs (expansion, modernization, bus programs, etc.). This was a significant shift in federal policy, limiting how states and transit agencies could spend federal funding.

Although federal funding was reduced in the 1980s, state and local funding increased to more than make up for the lost federal funding. State and local spending on transit programs more than tripled in the 1980s. This represented another major shift in the funding and operation of public transit systems in the United States. At the end of the 1980s, state and local governments were shouldering 52% of transit spending while the federal government was responsible for only 20% of transit spending.

The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA) and its Progeny

In 1991, the Congress passed the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991, also known as ISTE. ISTE reflected a completely new approach to the planning of urban transportation systems. The Congress recognized that the planning of federal investments in highways, transit systems, ports, railroads, sidewalks and bicycle paths, and the cause and effect of these investments on safety and land use, were uncoordinated at best. Among other things, ISTEA mandated that states coordinate these activities through a planning process, which was to be entrusted in large metropolitan areas to new regional agencies called Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs). The MPOs would have the authority to program federal funds, using their planning capacities to coordinate federally funded investments and to ensure that federal investments were programmed based on modern planning principles. This shift represented yet another significant change in policy at the federal level.

In addition to requiring that planning processes be used by MPOs in the programming of federal transportation investments, ISTEA also provided states with far greater flexibility in deciding how to spend federal transportation dollars. It allowed the states to spend more of their federal transportation dollars on transit versus highway projects if that is what the region required. The Act further required that states make investments based on multi-modal and intermodal considerations, as the name of the act implies. This mandate gave states and the MPOs within large urban areas a mandate to improve transit systems as they deemed appropriate.

Further, ISTEA also returned federal investments in public transit to their pre-1982 funding levels. The combination of a new approach to programming and increased funds to be programmed resulted in a significant shift in decision making away from the states and towards regional MPOs. This shift in power was very noticeable across the various levels of government at the state level and required some calibration among state, regional, and local governments.

In 1998, the Congress passed the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st century (TEA-21). This legislation continued the trend of increased federal funding and increased spending on transit programs. However, TEA-
Awards Update

Committee Chair: Douglas Prentiss, P.E., PTOE

The NEITE Awards Committee is always soliciting nominees for the following awards: Transportation Leadership; William P. McNamara Distinguished Service Award; Young Professional & Transportation Engineer of the Year. To nominate, please contact Doug Prentiss at dprentiss@fstinc.com.

Find The New England Section Online

The New England Section of the Institute of Transportation Engineers is tuning into social media. In order to provide quick updates on events and notices, past and present, the Section is now on both Facebook and LinkedIn.

As of this issue of the Chronicle, our Facebook group has more than 50 “Likes”. Here you can get updates on future and current events, and even see photos from many of our past events. Feel free to post any discussions or comments on our wall.

Our LinkedIn group is also growing fast. We already have over 230 members. Search for “New England Section of the Institute of Transportation Engineers” or follow the link from the NEITE webpage and join the group. We will be posting info on future events here as well. While we can’t post photos here, there are areas for discussions, notices, and even job postings.

Please remember to receive all your updates, news, and Section information at the New England Section website:

http://www.neite.org

Continued from Page 7

21 did discontinue federal subsidies of transit operating costs30.

The Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) of 2005 continued the policies of ISTEA. The Act also further increased transit funding and created new programs aimed at smaller properties31. SAFETEA-LU is regarded largely as an extension of the policies of ISTEA and TEA-21 and resulted in new record levels of federal transportation spending.

Although federal funding increased in dollar amounts between 1991 and 2005, the federal share of funding transportation agencies continued its decline. By the end of the 1990s, federal funding represented only 15% of overall transit spending while state and local governments were responsible for more than 60% of overall transit spending32. This trajectory demonstrates a continuing and deepening decline in federal transportation funding and a substantial shift away from a central federal role towards a dominate state and local role.

When SAFETEA-LU expired in September of 200933, the Congress passed multiple extensions of the Act for short durations to continue federal funding from 2009 to 2012. Unable to agree on a national federal funding policy, and facing significant disagreement on such matters as the role of the federal government in transportation funding, the use of formulas to allocate federal funds, and the role of earmarks in federal legislation, the Congress passed its most recent authorization legislation in July of 2012. The Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) largely continues past transportation policies. When the next authorization is passed, it is likely to signal another significant change in federal transportation funding policy – one that is not likely to be favorable to the public transit industry.

Summing up federal transportation funding in the ISTEA era, it is important to note the significant investment in federal transportation systems made by the federal government. Under ISTEA, signed into law by President George H.W. Bush, the federal government spent approximately $123.2 billion on highways and $31.5 billion on transit. Under TEA-21, signed into law by President Bill Clinton, the U.S. government spent approximately $177 billion on highways and $41 billion on transit. Finally, under SAFETEA-LU, signed into law by President George W. Bush, the U.S. government spent $210.2 billion on highways and $45.3 billion on transit34. These are significant expenditures.

However, it is important to place these expenditures in historical context. In California, for instance, federal spending on transportation in real dollars has decreased from a high of $60 per thousand vehicle miles traveled in the late 1950s to $4 per thousand vehicle miles travelled in the year 200035. This signals a precipitous decline in the role of the federal government in the funding of transportation systems.

Evolving State and Local Funding Role

With state and local governments becoming more and more prevalent in the funding of transportation systems, including public transit systems, it is worth reviewing how state and local governments raise funds for public transit on a nationwide basis. State and local governments generate funding for public transit improvements from five general sources of revenue36:

1. Traditional tax and fee-based revenue;
2. Business and activity related funding;
3. Revenue streams from specific projects; and
4. User or market-based funding sources; and
5. Financing mechanisms.

These funding sources are used in various degrees across the U.S. and are not universally applied. A further explanation of each category is as follows.

1. Traditional revenue sources include general revenues, sales taxes, property taxes, lease revenues, vehicle registration fees, advertising revenue, and concessions revenue37.
2. Business and activity related funding includes employer payroll taxes for specific service areas, rental car fees, parking fees, realty transfer taxes/fees, and room occupancy taxes38.
3. Revenue streams from projects include transit oriented development (TOD) revenues dedicated to specific improvements, special assessment districts, business improvements districts, impact fees, tax increment financing districts, and right-of-way leasing revenues39.
4. User or market-based fees include fees

Continued on Page 9
On the other hand, research indicates that transportation programs general funds and gas taxes to fund their $1.8 billion dollars. States rely most heavily on governments increased from 2000 to 2004 by increase in transit funding by state increase of transit systems had more than doubled. Between 2000 and 2004, 27 states increased for transit systems had more than doubled. Of the remaining funds from regional and local funding sources, local general appropriation funds (10%) and other funding sources (5%) complete the funding picture. As can be seen from these amounts, regional and local governments are heavily reliant on local taxes to pay for transit systems. Looking more broadly at how transit systems are funded as of 2005, federal funding paid for approximately 5% of operating costs and 25% of capital costs. State government paid for 23% of operating costs and 16% of capital costs. Local and regional governments pay for 29% of operating costs and 46% of capital costs. Other sources of income represent 7% of operating costs and 14% of capital costs. Finally, fare revenue and other earned income makes up 33% of operating costs but pays for no capital costs.

It is important to note that local and regional governments pay the largest percentage of operating and capital costs (excluding fares and other earned revenue, which are local and regional funds anyway). This is indicative of a very strong national trend away from federal and state roles in funding and towards local funding of transit systems. This trend is significant and growing.

Current and Future Trends
Current trends in transportation funding and finance point to an ever increasing role for regional and local governments. However there are obstacles to local financing of transit systems. First and foremost, local governments are generally the least empowered to raise revenue. This is certainly the case in Massachusetts, where municipalities and regional governments have limited taxing authorities, mostly focused on real estate taxes. In addition, regional and local governments have traditionally not had the experience to navigate the complicated process of programming projects or financing them. However, on a national level, regional and local governments are overcoming these obstacles.

The most significant national trend in the local funding of transit systems is the adoption of local option tax transportation taxes (LOTTs). LOTTs are a type of tax adopted by individual local governments under the authority of the state government. LOTTs vary by locality; not every locality is permitted by state law to adopt a LOTT, nor is every locality required to adopt a LOTT. When a LOTT is adopted, all revenues from the LOTT are used to fund or finance transportation improvements.

The most common use of LOTTs is the implementation of a local sales tax. Other forms include local income or payroll taxes, fuel taxes, or property taxes. Still other variations on the LOTT theme are congestion pricing, tolling, and the use of TIFs. The type and extent of the tax will vary considerably from state to state because individual states vary considerably in their delegation of taxing authority to regional and local governments.

The advantages of LOTT funding are numerous. First, a LOTT provides a dedicated source of funding for transportation systems, eliminating or reducing the need to compete with other government general services such as public safety, education, and human services. In addition, having a dedicated funding source can eliminate the drastic fluctuation of funding that can result from being part of a general budget, where annual budgets are tied to economic conditions, resulting in significant changes in funding on an annual basis. Finally, the strategic use of LOTT authority can provide disincentives to unwanted single occupant vehicle use, as is the case in congestion pricing, high occupant toll lanes, and other creative funding approaches.

One potential disadvantage of LOTTs is that the planning and programming of the project typically occurs outside of the purview of the local MPO. By not participating in typical MPO processes, the project risks being inconsistent with regional goals and may even be contrary to regional goals. However, it has often been said that local democracy is the purest form of democracy because it is closest to the people. LOTTs are often adopted at the ballot box, as

Continued from Page 8

for vehicle use on a vehicle miles traveled (VMT) basis, tolling, congestion pricing, and other similar strategies. Financing includes general obligation bonds, private activity bonds, tax credit bonds, grant anticipation notes, and state infrastructure bank loans. Often, financing is combined with one of the other sources of revenue to complete the funding plan for general or specific transit improvements. For instance, general obligation bonds may be sold to finance the operations of a large transit property for a year, with the principal and interest on the bonds to be paid using broad based sales taxes. In the alternative, private activity bonds may be sold to finance the construction of new systems to service new development, with the interest and principal of the private activity bonds paid using a portion of the newly generated property taxes through a tax increment financing agreement. State and local governments have demonstrated themselves to be very creative in the use of funding programs to finance their capital and operating requirements. Perhaps one of the most creative financing measures is the use of Grant Anticipation Notes (GANs) to finance a project. This funding scheme allows a public transit agency to borrow funds to pay for current operations against a promise to pay using future federal transportation aid in the form of grants. Such funding schemes were common in Massachusetts during the era of constructing the Central Artery/Third harbor Tunnel Project, also known as the Big Dig. Such funding schemes are clearly risky and are not sustainable, but can be useful under certain circumstances. They are eligible for approval by the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) under limited circumstances.

A 2004 survey of state governments found that between 1990 and 2004, state funding for transit systems had more than doubled. Between 2000 and 2004, 27 states increased their transit funding, 6 states level funded their transit programs, and 12 states saw a decline in transit funding. The overall increase in transit funding by state governments increased from 2000 to 2004 by $1.8 billion dollars. States rely most heavily on general funds and gas taxes to fund their transportation programs. On the other hand, research indicates that regional and local governments raise about 51% of their transit funding from fare revenues. This revenue is usually dedicated to operations. Regional and local taxes pay for about 18% of transit systems, of which sales taxes represent approximately 57.5%; property taxes represent 5.8%; gas taxes represent 3.8%; income taxes represent 2%; tolls represent 2%; and all other funding sources represent 28.8%. Taxes directly related to a specific project represent approximately 16% of regional and local funding for transit, with sales taxes representing 45.5%; property taxes representing 7%; tolls represent 5%; gas taxes represent 0.2%; and other sources represent 42.1%. Of the remaining funds from regional and local funding sources, local general appropriation funds (10%) and other funding sources (5%) complete the funding picture. As can be seen from these amounts, regional and local governments are heavily reliant on local taxes to pay for transit systems. The most common use of LOTTs is the implementation of a local sales tax. Other forms include local income or payroll taxes, fuel taxes, or property taxes. Still other variations on the LOTT theme are congestion pricing, tolling, and the use of TIFs. The type and extent of the tax will vary considerably from state to state because individual states vary considerably in their delegation of taxing authority to regional and local governments.

The advantages of LOTT funding are numerous. First, a LOTT provides a dedicated source of funding for transportation systems, eliminating or reducing the need to compete with other government general services such as public safety, education, and human services. In addition, having a dedicated funding source can eliminate the drastic fluctuation of funding that can result from being part of a general budget, where annual budgets are tied to economic conditions, resulting in significant changes in funding on an annual basis. Finally, the strategic use of LOTT authority can provide disincentives to unwanted single occupant vehicle use, as is the case in congestion pricing, high occupant toll lanes, and other creative funding approaches.

The most significant national trend in the local funding of transit systems is the adoption of local option transportation taxes (LOTTs). LOTTs are a type of tax adopted by individual local governments under the authority of the state government. LOTTs vary by locality; not every locality is permitted by state law to adopt a LOTT, nor is every locality required to adopt a LOTT. When a LOTT is adopted, all revenues from the LOTT are used to fund or finance transportation improvements.

The most common use of LOTTs is the implementation of a local sales tax. Other forms include local income or payroll taxes, fuel taxes, or property taxes. Still other variations on the LOTT theme are congestion pricing, tolling, and the use of TIFs. The type and extent of the tax will vary considerably from state to state because individual states vary considerably in their delegation of taxing authority to regional and local governments.

The advantages of LOTT funding are numerous. First, a LOTT provides a dedicated source of funding for transportation systems, eliminating or reducing the need to compete with other government general services such as public safety, education, and human services. In addition, having a dedicated funding source can eliminate the drastic fluctuation of funding that can result from being part of a general budget, where annual budgets are tied to economic conditions, resulting in significant changes in funding on an annual basis. Finally, the strategic use of LOTT authority can provide disincentives to unwanted single occupant vehicle use, as is the case in congestion pricing, high occupant toll lanes, and other creative funding approaches.

One potential disadvantage of LOTTs is that the planning and programming of the project typically occurs outside of the purview of the local MPO. By not participating in typical MPO processes, the project risks being inconsistent with regional goals and may even be contrary to regional goals. However, it has often been said that local democracy is the purest form of democracy because it is closest to the people.

LOTTs are often adopted at the ballot box, as
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are many other local transportation funding plans. The ballot box is emerging as the weapon of choice in the funding of local projects that are overwhelmingly popular. These projects are also generally planned and programmed outside the MPO process. A recent study revealed that from 2000 to 2005, over 200 transportation funding ballot measures were proposed in 33 states. Of those proposed, 130 were successful; a 65% success rate. In 2006 alone, 47 such ballot measures were approved, and 29 were successful, continuing a success rate over 60% \(^5\). The failure of the recent ballot initiative in Atlanta may signal that ballot initiatives are losing their luster as a means of raising revenue for transportation programs.

Ultimately, LOTTs will pose a challenge to MPOs and the process embodied in ISTEA that calls for regional multimodal planning to drive investments in transportation infrastructure. The trend away from federal funding and towards local funding indicates a potential for the marginalization of MPOs after two decades of driving the programming process. Such a shift will send shock waves throughout the transportation funding world.

As local governments are forced to bear a greater share of funding and financing our transportation systems, it should be expected that more and more ballot referendums and LOTT plans will be proposed and adopted. This trend suggests the decline of the MPO as the regional planner and programmer for transportation improvements, especially transit improvements. It suggests a reduction in the power of MPOs and a commensurate rise in the power of local governments.

Conclusion
The evolution of public transportation funding has been a long and winding road. At first, public transportation systems were private enterprises organized and operated for a profit. Over more than a century, privately owned transit systems evolved technologically and shaped the urban landscape as our cities grew. As a result of the advent of the mass produced automobile, private transit systems experienced a half-century slide toward unprofitability and bankruptcy.

The next phase in the life of public transit systems saw the gradual takeover of transit from the private sector by government. After World War II, local governments interceded and took control of transit systems to save them from complete bankruptcy. Gradually, federal and state governments assumed a larger and larger role, peaking in the 1960s but continuing through the end of the 20th century into the very beginning of the 21st century.

Now, old debates about the appropriate role of the federal government in local infrastructure funding are prompting a rethinking of federal funding for transit systems. After a steady decline of federal funding over three decades, the federal government seems poised to get out of the transit funding business. That would leave the states and local governments to make up a significant shortfall in the transit funding picture.

Although states have consistently played a role in the funding of transit systems, local governments are increasingly playing the largest role in transit funding. This trend is reminiscent of the status of transit systems in the 1950s. In order to fulfill the requirements of capitalizing, maintaining, and operating the transit systems of our largest cities, local governments will increasingly turn to creative approaches and direct democracy to raise the necessary funds. Direct ballot initiatives and LOTTs are sure to play a role in how local governments raise the funds they need to keep transit properties operating.

Finally, the increasing reliance on direct ballot initiatives and LOTTs portends a significant decrease in the power and authority of MPOs. It also signals a decreased reliance on the metropolitan planning process, one of the most hailed features of ISTEA and its progeny. How and to what extent these trends in transportation funding and financing will affect MPOs is yet to be determined. But current trends do not bode well for the MPO and its processes.

Here in Boston, the funding of public transit is at a cross-roads. It is apparent that federal funding will continue to decline. The Commonwealth will need to act to shore up the MBTA and hopefully will develop a long term funding plan for transportation programs, especially transit. Will the legislature dare to consider such untested concepts as LOTTs to fund our systems? Will local governments be afforded the opportunity to take a greater role in transportation funding at the expense of MPOs? Or will the Commonwealth of Massachusetts eschew these approaches and fund transportation more traditionally? These questions will be answered in the coming months. In the meantime, we will all be eagerly awaiting the answer.
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Leadership ITE

The Future of ITE
At the heart of great organizations are great leaders. One of the first obligations of leadership is to secure the future of the organization, and developing the next generation of leaders is among the most important ways to accomplish this. To this end, the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) has established LeadershipITE, a program to identify, develop, and engage leaders for the future of ITE and the transportation profession.

The pace of change in transportation, technology, and the world at-large is accelerating. Many of the issues created by these relentless changes will impact society and people’s quality of life in ways we can hardly attempt to predict. Often we find those outside the transportation industry leading the conversation on these issues instead of knowledgeable transportation professionals. It is certain, however, that engineers, planners, and technologists, the core of ITE’s membership, will need to provide solutions to these challenges. LeadershipITE will ensure that our Institute and its members are positioned to engage and shape that future.

At its core, LeadershipITE:
- Recognizes the importance of leadership to the profession.
- Transforms ITE members into high-level leaders.
- Seeks individuals with a desire to make the profession better.
- Connects and engages leaders from across the globe.
- Tasks participants with solving issues vital to the future of transportation.

Program Description
A class of approximately 30 members who reflect the diversity of the future of the Institute and the profession will be selected. These individuals will engage in an intensive 9-month program of workshops, conferences, team projects, and other activities that address the challenges and opportunities facing ITE and the transportation profession. Through this program, LeadershipITE participants will explore current issues in transportation, develop and hone leadership competencies, and build the professional network required to succeed as leaders in ITE, in their organizations and in their communities.

The primary components of the program include:
- 3 multi-day workshops.
- A kick-off retreat and workshop will be held in conjunction with a meeting of the International Board of Direction at ITE Headquarters in Washington, D.C. (November 7-9, 2013).
- A second workshop will be held in conjunction with the ITE Technical Conference in Miami, Florida (March 8-12, 2014).
- A third workshop and graduation will be held in conjunction with the ITE Annual Meeting in Seattle, Washington (August 9-13, 2014).
- Professionally facilitated team-building and leadership development exercises.
- Small team projects addressing real-world issues facing ITE and its members.
- Networking opportunities with international transportation leaders and decision makers.
- Ongoing alumni activities and networking events.

Eligibility
To be eligible to participate in LeadershipITE the applicant must:
- Be an active ITE Member or Fellow in good standing with the ITE.
- Be able to demonstrate contributions to ITE through volunteer activities.

Application Process
The application period for LeadershipITE is open through August 12, 2013. A completed application packet includes:
- A completed application form submitted by the due date,
- Responses to short essay questions,
- Nomination letter from current or past ITE District or Section officer,
- Support letter from non-employer, and
- Support letter from current employer.

Tuition
Tuition for the 9-month program is $2,995 USD. The tuition includes registration at the ITE Technical Conference and Annual Meeting held during the program year and some meals. Travel and lodging are not included.

Questions
Contact: leadership@ite.org

Quarterly Images

District Collegiate Traffic Bowl
Northeastern Student Chapter Team

Lining Up The Shot
NEITE Secretary Joseph Hallisey lines up his next shot at the Annual Joint CT-WTS / CT-ITE Golf Outing held on June 26th in Wallingford, CT.

Taking Home Some Hardware
Ian McKinnon, Cole Fitzpatrick, and Keith Wenners accept Student Service Award from Professor Mike Knodler for their service to the UMass Amherst ITE Student Chapter.

Leadership ITE
Northeastern Student Chapter Team
Fellow ITE Members:

The New England Section of the Institute of Transportation Engineers would like to welcome you to the City of Boston and the ITE International Annual Meeting and Exhibit. The Hynes Convention Center and Sheraton Boston are strategically situated in the heart of the city’s Back Bay neighborhood just a block away from the Prudential Center.

Boston is a city of diverse transportation system and options. Although outside the limits, the Big Dig and traffic congestion come to mind, Boston possesses the oldest running subway in the United States, a network of bicycle and pedestrian friendly roadways and walkways, and is the terminus of the longest interstate highway in the country; Interstate 90.

Although the ITE Annual Meeting is four days long, we hope you all take time to see the city. Boston is not that big and is known as a walking city. Just minutes away from the Hynes Convention Center sits Fenway Park, Boston Common, the Freedom Trail, and the Boston Harbor.

Thank you all for joining us!

How do I Get to the ITE Annual Meeting and Exhibit?
- Take the Green Line to Hynes Convention Center Station if you're on a “B”, “C”, or “D” train.
- Take the Green Line to Prudential Station if you're on an “E” train.
ITE Annual Meeting Overview Schedule

Saturday August 3:
2:00pm - 5:00pm................. Registration

Sunday August 4:
8:00am - 5:00pm................. Registration
8:00am - 4:00pm................ Council & Committee Meetings / Seminars
10:00am - 11:30am............. Boston DUCK Tour
12:00pm - 5:00pm............. Freedom Trail Tour
4:15pm - 5:45pm............. Annual ITE Business Meeting

Monday August 5:
7:30am - 5:30pm................. Registration
8:00am - 9:30am............... Opening Plenary
9:30am - 4:30pm............... Exhibits Open
10:30am - 6:00pm............... Technical Sessions, Meetings, & Guest Tours
7:00pm - 9:00pm............... Beantown Beach Party

Tuesday August 6:
7:30am - 5:30pm................. Registration
8:00am - 6:30pm............... Technical Sessions, Meetings, & Guest Tours
9:30am - 2:30pm............... Exhibits Open
7:00pm - 10:00pm............ Collegiate Traffic Bowl Reception & Competition

Wednesday August 7:
7:30am - 2:30pm................. Registration
8:00am - 3:30pm............... Technical Sessions
12:00pm - 2:00pm............... Awards Luncheon
2:15pm - 3:30pm............... Closing Plenary

Follow the Annual Meeting on Twitter:
@ITE2013AM
A Special Thanks to the Corporate Sponsors

Northampton Was the Place to be This May!
A Special Thanks to the Local Arrangements Committee

Co-Chairman:  
Michael A. Knodler, Jr.  
Joseph C. Balskus

Finance Committee:  
John Mirabito

Awards and Gifts:  
Thomas A. Errico  
Douglas Prentiss

Venue and Social:  
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Beth Knodler

Publicity:  
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Industrial Support:  
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Kenneth J. Petraglia
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John Diaz

Emerging Professionals:  
Jason DeGray

Bicycle Tour:  
Gary Roux  
Stacy Metzger

Student Posters:  
Radha Gomez

Bouncers/Tickets:  
Nicholas Lapointe  
Craig Yannes

2012-2013 Northeastern District Awards

Harvey B. Boutwell Award:  
Gary L. Hebert, P.E., PTOE

Past President Award:  
Michael R. Wieszchowski, P.E., PTOE

Student Paper Award:  
Cole Fitzpatrick, UMass Amherst

Student Poster Recognition:  
Jessie Yang, Rutgers

Student Chapter Award:  
Northeastern University

Section Activities Award:  
MET Section

Student Chapter Award:  
Northeastern University

Student Poster Recognition:  
Jessie Yang, Rutgers

Past President Award:  
Michael R. Wieszchowski, P.E., PTOE

Student Paper Award:  
Cole Fitzpatrick, UMass Amherst

Student Poster Recognition:  
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**Planning for Mobility in an Aging Society**

**WILLIAM L. SCHWARTZ, AICP**
Vice-President
The Collaborative, Inc.

---

**Introduction**

According the Census Bureau, New England will see a 52 percent increase in the number of seniors (65+) by 2030, profoundly impacting our future transportation needs. While the region’s population will grow by about 700,000 (+ 5 percent), the population of seniors will grow by about 1.2 million. Seniors, who represent 15 percent of New England’s population today will account for 22 percent in 2030, when the youngest Baby Boomers (those born between 1946 and 1964) will be between 66 and 84. This number of seniors will far exceed the capacity of our current transportation programs, and now is the time to plan for innovative solutions.

---

**The Role of Housing**

As we (and our parents) grow older, many of us want to stay in our homes and “age in place.” Generally seen as a positive choice, aging in place keeps us connected to established social networks with potentially less costly housing. While many of our homes are not suitable for people with limited mobility and may require costly retrofits, fixing our homes will be easier than meeting our mobility needs, which generally include three options: continuing to drive, riding in a vehicle, and walking.

---

**Senior Mobility – A Critical Need**

Mobility is essential to having a good quality of life. While most of us can expect to drive well into our 80s, what will we do when it is no longer possible to drive? Gerontologists say that seniors that can get around on their own are more independent, more social and generally happier. Those that cannot feel isolated and can easily become depressed.

---

**Driving - As Long as it is Safe**

For those who now drive, the goal is to keep us driving as long as it is safe. According to AARP, “Aging is a highly individual process. Challenges that frequently affect people’s mobility as they age include declining vision, decreased physical fitness and flexibility, decreased ability to focus attention, and increased reaction time.” Most seniors compensate for these changes by driving on lower-volume roads and not driving during high-traffic periods. For seniors who can continue driving safely, our profession is responding by implementing new standards to increase nighttime visibility of signs and other important measures. Vehicle safety has dramatically improved and technologies that were once limited to luxury cars are becoming standard features on many vehicles.

---

**Medications Play an Important Role**

Age is not the only factor in driving ability. In a 2009 AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety study on the impact of medications on older drivers, nearly all respondents to a survey of residents in 55-plus communities reported having at least one medical condition; with about two-thirds using one or more prescription medications that were potentially driver impairing (PDI). Overall, only 27.6 percent of respondents indicated some awareness of PDI medications; awareness among younger respondents was higher.2

---

**Walking**

When driving is not an option, walking can be a viable alternative for some trips, particularly in areas with good walking infrastructure (accessible sidewalks and curb ramps, properly designed street crossings, etc.). When weather conditions are right (i.e., not too hot or cold) and when sidewalks are properly maintained (i.e., clear of snow, ice or other hazards), walking is also a way to maintain physical health. Much more can and should be done to make walking both safer and available, particularly in terms of continuous accessible sidewalks and well-designed intersections.

---

**Vertical Transitions**

While much effort is going into making the right infrastructure investments to improve walking (e.g., Complete Streets), how we navigate vertical transitions - both indoors and outside - remains a major challenge. Because falls are a leading cause of death for those 85+, avoiding them can be a life or death issue. While falls in homes can be addressed by good home design and the use of assistance devices, falls also occur when people get into and out of vehicles and step on and off sidewalks. Anyone who has tried to assist a senior out of a passenger car has experienced the anxiety these challenges can pose.

---

**Getting Rides from Others**

Riding in a vehicle with someone else is the main option for those who cannot drive and for trips that cannot be made on foot. Riding includes a range of options, and the most popular choice is riding with family or friends. When relatives and friends are not close by or available to meet our mobility needs, we can become isolated.

---

Our options vary by where we live and how well we can manage on our own, among other factor such as availability, familiarity, and cost. Table 1 lays out these options and their main advantages and disadvantages. Among these, volunteer driving programs show tremendous promise in terms of scalability.

---

**Volunteer Driving Programs**

Volunteer driver programs pair seniors with volunteers (often seniors themselves). Volunteers are trained and their services are organized through non-profit organizations, such as ITN America3, based in Portland,

*Continued on Page 17*
Table 1: Transportation Options when Seniors Can No Longer Drive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Option</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rides with Others</td>
<td>Often the best option when available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Drivers</td>
<td>Service is often combined with caregiving but can be costly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transportation</td>
<td>A viable option when service is convenient, but many seniors are unfamiliar with riding a bus or train and bus stop access can be an issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Paratransit</td>
<td>Origin-to-destination service with eligibility limited to individuals with disabilities and usually within ¾ mile of fixed route service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Shuttles</td>
<td>Valuable component of community-based senior services but with limited service hours and limited destinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxis</td>
<td>Origin-to-destination service but costly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Paid Transportation</td>
<td>New models such as Uber and Lyft are changing the dynamics of paid transportation services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Driver Programs</td>
<td>Trained volunteers provide rides (free or paid) to seniors as a door-through-door service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility Management Programs</td>
<td>Emerging transportation service programs run by local governments that leverages public funds and volunteer resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued from Page 16

Maine. With affiliates operating throughout the country, ITN America is now operating in Connecticut and Massachusetts with a Rhode Island affiliation in the works. This door-through-door service is an excellent resource that can meet seniors’ more complex mobility needs. For those who cannot easily walk, volunteers accompany seniors for the entire trip, not just to the front door of the building. Another nice feature of ITN and other such organizations is that one can earn credits for volunteering, depositing the credits into an account, and either draw down from the account when you need the services yourself or donate the credits to someone else. This even if the recipient lives in another city.

Membership-driven, grass-roots organizations (known as villages) also provide rides to seniors. According to the Village-to-Village Network, villages are run by volunteers and paid staff that coordinate access to affordable services including transportation, health and wellness programs, home repairs, social and educational activities and trips.\(^4\)

An important sociological benefit of these volunteer programs is the way they make seniors feel. Most seniors prefer to arrange for services through organizations rather than asking (and potentially imposing on) friends or neighbors.

Young Seniors Helping Older Seniors
Some characterize volunteer programs for seniors as “people aged 65-79 helping those over 80.” In other words, younger retirees have the time and stamina to volunteer and help those who are less able to perform tasks or to travel.

With the rapidly growing number of seniors resulting from aging Baby Boomers and advances in healthcare, the potential exists to address our mobility needs by recruiting large numbers of volunteers among younger retirees. This might be seen as “paying it forward,” with the hope that someday we will receive rides from volunteer drivers when we need them.

Government Programs
While volunteers are critical to successfully addressing this growing challenge, additional resources will also be needed to help fund programs that fill in the gaps. Today, federal transportation funding for seniors is available through the Departments of Health and Human Services and Transportation. While the available federal programs are important, they fund limited senior transportation options. For example, municipal senior shuttles typically operate on weekdays for 6-8 hours per day. While these programs can and should grow larger as our population ages, far more is needed to address our anticipated mobility needs.

Mobility Management Programs
An emerging and very important trend is the implementation of mobility management programs at the city and regional level. Such

Continued on Page 18

Emerging Professionals Event - Portland, Maine

The Emerging Professionals Group is pleased to announce its next event in Portland, Maine on Wednesday August 21st. The event will be held jointly with American Society of Civil Engineers.

We will be joined by Tom Errico, Traffic Engineering Director of T.Y. Lin International, for a discussion of the recently completed Veterans Memorial Bridge project, a signature project for MaineDOT. Afterwards all are invited to the Sebago Brewing Company to share in some refreshments with our fellow engineers.

Please circulate this notice to any of your co-workers that are not currently members of ITE but who may be interested in this event. It will be a great opportunity for them to be introduced to the ITE community.

Registration for this event is $10, payable at the event.

To RSVP, contact: LFarrington@LouisBerger.com
Continued from Page 17

programs focus on developing solutions for the needs of individual travelers, effectively serving as mobility clearinghouses. At present, while many government entities are working hard managing mobility for seniors, the scale of services is insufficient to meet our growing demand. This is mostly due to limited funding availability.

Other Planning Considerations
Most regional transportation plans look at mobility from the perspective of major investments in roads, transit, railroads, and ports. These plans, which are now looking to 2035, minimally consider aging populations and often do so as a transportation equity issue. Given the demographic forecasts, such a limited focus is plainly insufficient. Far more planning (with associated resources) is needed in our planning process.

The Role of ITE
To date, ITE has been involved at the national level through participation in studies and in development of some guidelines. Various ITE technical councils such as the Pedestrian and Bicycle, Transportation Safety, and Transportation Planning Councils at times consider issues that are important to seniors but do so in an indirect way. It may be time to consider establishment of a Senior Mobility Council or similar group to look into the challenges faced by older drivers and those who cannot drive at all.

At the same time, since many solutions are needed at the local level, ITE members in New England can also become involved in advocating for senior mobility. Those interested in joining me in this effort are encouraged to contact me at wschwartz@thecollaborative.com.

References
1 Planning Complete Streets for an Aging America, AARP Public Policy Institute Washington, D.C., 2009
2 Older Adults’ Knowledge About Medications That Can Impact Driving, AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety, Washington, D.C., 2005
3 See www.itnamerica.org
4 See www.vtvnetwork.org

Meet the Members of the New England Section Executive Board

Alan T. Cloutier, P.E., PTOE
Principal Engineer
Fay, Spofford, & Thorndike

State of Residence: Massachusetts

NEITE Positions Held:
Senior Director, 2013
Junior Director, 2012
Continuing Ed. Committee Chair, 2010-2013
Chronicle Editorial Team, 2004-2005

Education:
M.S., Civil Engineering, Northeastern University, 2003
B.S., Civil Engineering, UMass Dartmouth, 1998

Work History:
Alan is a licensed transportation engineer with over fourteen years of experience, having worked for multiple consulting firms, including: Bruce Campbell & Associates, BETA Group, Inc., Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc., and currently Fay, Spofford, and Thorndike. His work has involved a wide range of projects both for public agencies and private developments including studies, conceptual improvements, and design plans.

Goals on Executive Board:
1) Work with Committees to provide topics for training workshops and educational opportunities;
2) Attract more young members into joining and attending NEITE events;
3) Increase public sector attendance at NEITE events; and
4) Ensure that members are made aware of the events and opportunities that are offered.

Jeffrey R. Gomes, MCPPO
Assistant ABP Traffic Engineer
Massachusetts Department of Transportation - District 4

State of Residence: Massachusetts

NEITE Positions Held:
Senior Director, 2013
Junior Director, 2012
Program Committee Chair, 2010-2013

Education:
B.S., Civil Engineering, UMass Lowell, 2005

Work History:
Jeffrey is a traffic engineer as part of the Accelerated Bridge Program (ABP) for the Massachusetts Department of Transportation - Highway Division at District 4 in Arlington, MA. He holds certification as a Massachusetts Certified Public Purchasing Officer. Prior to MassDOT, Jeffrey worked as a transportation engineer for the City of Lowell, MA, a traffic engineer at Greenman-Pedersen, Inc. and a traffic technician for both Nitsch Engineering, Inc. and Bruce Campbell & Associates, Inc. in Boston, MA.

Recognitions:
Jeffrey has been recognized by the ITE New England Section as a recipient of the Young Professionals Group Award in 2009 for contributions to the New England Section.

Goals on Executive Board:
1) Reach out to others in MassDOT and other communities to increase membership in the public sector;
2) Get the word out to college students and present transportation materials in the classroom.

William L. Schwartz, AICP is a Transportation Planner and Vice President of Transportation at The Collaborative, Inc. in Boston, Massachusetts.
ATTENTION STUDENT CHAPTER MEMBERS!!!

The New England Chronicle is soliciting submissions by active student chapter members to the “Student Research/Project Spotlight” article. The New England Section would like to highlight the research and projects of our student chapters and student chapter members. Articles to be submitted should be 750-1,500 words, properly sourced, and include a bio of all participating authors. If you would like to submit an article or receive more details, please contact Chronicle Editor, Samuel W. Gregorio, E.I.T. at sgregorio@tecmass.com.

Applications for the future October 1 to 31, 2013 computer-based exams of Professional Traffic Operations Engineer (PTOE) and Professional Transportation Planner (PTP) are due August 15, 2013.

Please note that applications received after the deadline will require an additional $75 late fee to process the application in addition to the application and examination fee that must accompany the application. TPCB will try to accommodate late applications but there is no guarantee they will be able to do so.

For a list of available exam cities, please visit: http://castleworldwide.com/mainpage/ibtsites/default.aspx

SAVE THE DATE!!!

Massachusetts ITE Chapter Annual Meeting
Wednesday September 18th, 2013
Hilton Garden Inn
Waltham, MA
On Wednesday June 5th, the New Hampshire and Maine Chapters of ITE hosted their annual joint meeting at the Village by the Sea in Wells, Maine. The event was also hosted in conjunction with the New England Section who held its Executive Board Meeting mid-day.

The day program consisted of two professional development sessions; including: Bicycle & Pedestrian Design for All Users and Transit Priority Design. Both were presented by Dr. Peter G. Furth of Northeastern University. The evening program was highlighted by Scott Gorneau, President of the Maine Section of ASCE who spoke regarding the 2012 Report Card for Maine’s Infrastructure.

The Massachusetts Chapter of ITE is looking for abstracts for technical sessions at our September joint NEITE/MAITE Annual Meeting.

Changing the Way We Build

New England is in the midst of an extraordinary period of investment into its transportation infrastructure. These projects bring an enormous amount of construction on our roads and rails that affect all types of users. However, advancements in both means and methods have allowed engineers to be more innovative in their designs while still reducing the impacts during construction.

MAITE would like to solicit abstracts of presentations for the Technical Session portion of the joint MAITE/NEITE meeting in September that will explore this topic. Examples of presentation subjects may include:

- Innovative Construction Techniques
- Design and Use of Sustainable Infrastructure and Materials
- Accommodating Non-Motorized Users During Construction
- Minimizing Travel Delays During Construction

Presentations are expected to last between 20 and 30 minutes, with additional time for Q&A. The abstract should be no longer than 150 words.

Please reply to Ken Cram at kcram@baysideengineering.com by August 9, 2013.
On June 26, 2013, the Connecticut State Chapter of the Institute of Transportation Engineers, in conjunction with the Women’s Transportation Seminar Connecticut River Chapter, hosted its 2nd Annual Golf Outing at the Traditions Golf Club in Wallingford, Connecticut. The purpose of the golf outing was primarily to raise funds for the CT ITE student scholarship program. The Connecticut ITE scholarship awarded to a student who is working to achieve a degree in traffic engineering and/or related field.

This event was sponsored by Milone & MacBroom, Inc., Dewberry, Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc., VN Engineers, and Keville Enterprises. A total of 22 golfers grouped into six teams participated in the event which was played in a scramble format over 18 holes.

Following the golf outing, dinner was served during which prizes were given to various individuals and teams. A total of 27 people attended the dinner.

Overall, the event was successful and was able to raise money for the student scholarship program. The next Connecticut ITE scholarship will be awarded at the Annual CT-ITE Spring Meeting in 2014.
Professional Services Directory

Making bicycling and walking possible for every trip
www.teppll.com

TEPP LLC
TRANSPORTATION ENGINEERING, PLANNING AND POLICY
Kim Eric Hazarvardian, Ph.D., P.E., P.T.O.E.
Principal
93 Stiles Road, Suite 201, Salem NH 03079
800 Turnpike Street, Suite 300, North Andover MA 01845
Phone (603) 212-9133 and Fax (603) 224-4106
Email keh@teppllc.com and Web www.teppllc.com

OCEAN STATE SIGNAL CO.
William P. McNamara
27 Thurber St. • Smithfield, RI 02917
Tel: 401-231-0780 • Fax: 401-231-0860
email: bllmc@oceansatesignal.com

TELYN INTERNATIONAL
Falmouth, Maine
207-781-4721
jeff.andrews@tylin.com
Transportation Engineering, Planning & Design

FUSS & O’NEILL
Providing engineering services since 1924
www.fandl.com
800.266.2469
Connecticut • Massachusetts • Rhode Island • South Carolina

GPI Greenman-Pedersen, Inc.
Engineering and Construction Services
John W. Diaz, P.E., P.T.O.E.
Vice President
Director of Traffic Engineering
181 Ballardvale Street Suite 202 Wilmington, MA 01887
978.570.2893 main 978.570.2899 fax 978.855.3344
cell 978.921.9906 jdiaz@gpinet.com
www.gpinet.com
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Andrew Berthaume
Curt Harrington
David Posner

Congratulations to the University of Massachusetts Amherst Student Chapter of ITE

2013 Northeastern District Collegiate Traffic Bowl Champions

A Special Recognition to both the University of Connecticut & Northeastern University Student Chapters for Participating

Employment Opportunities

Toole Design Group
Traffic Engineer
Boston, Massachusetts

Toole Design Group is currently seeking a Traffic Engineer for their Boston, MA office. Work includes a wide variety of projects at the local, state, and national level—including roadway, trail, bikeway, and pedestrian facility design.

The person hired for this position will participate in all stages of project development including presentations and client meetings, fieldwork, conducting engineering analyses, and the preparation of construction documents and technical reports. This position will independently manage company projects, oversee the work of multidisciplinary project teams, and serve as the “face” of the company at public meetings, meetings with clients, conferences and other venues. This position has the opportunity for travel and advancement.

For more information pertaining to qualifications or to apply for this position, please visit our employment page at: http://www.tooledesign.com/careers/traffic-engineer-%E2%80%93-boston-office

Cape Cod Commission
Technical Services Planner
Barnstable, Massachusetts

This position offers an excellent opportunity for an energetic and motivated individual to gain experience in the transportation field and potentially advance into a project management role. The ideal candidate will have a four year degree in civil engineering with an emphasis in transportation preferred, plus one year of experience. Master’s Degree desired.

Work includes various tasks such as traffic counting, traffic impact analysis, traffic engineering and transportation planning.

Strong AutoCAD, GIS, quantitative, computer, public presentation, writing and communication skills needed as well as the ability to work well under pressure in team environment.

See www.capecodcommission.org for additional information.

Send resume to Human Resources, P.O. Box 427, Barnstable, MA 02630 or email humanresources@barnstablecounty.org

Position will be open until filled. EOE

New England Section of the Institute of Transportation Engineers
Employment Opportunities

Vanasse & Associates, Inc.
Senior Traffic Engineer/Transportation Planner
Andover, Massachusetts

Vanasse & Associates, Inc. (VAI), located in Andover, MA, is currently seeking a Senior Traffic Engineer/Transportation Planner with experience in the preparation of Traffic Impact Assessments and Functional Design Reports, with emphasis on traffic operations analysis and traffic modeling (SimTraffic and VisSim). Additional experience with traffic signal and roadway/intersection design is highly desirable. The qualified candidate should possess a B.S. or M.S in Civil Engineering from an accredited university and have a minimum of 5-years of progressive experience in the areas of Traffic Engineering, Transportation Planning and Traffic Signal Design, with EIT Certificate. Licensure as a P.E. is desirable. VAI offers a competitive benefit package including medical and dental insurance, 401K, and short and long-term disability insurance.

For more information pertaining to qualifications or to apply for this position, please contact Mr. Jeffrey S. Dirk, P.E., PTOE at idirk@rdva.com.

Nitsch Engineering

Nitsch Engineering provides civil engineering, land surveying, transportation engineering, planning, sustainable site design, and GIS services to public and private clients. We are one of New England’s leading civil engineering and land surveying firms. Nitsch offers competitive and comprehensive benefits including medical and dental insurance, flexible spending account, short-term and long-term disability and life insurance, tuition reimbursement, and an excellent matching 401(k) Plan.

Transportation Engineer
Boston, Massachusetts

Nitsch is seeking a dynamic Transportation/ Traffic Engineer professional with 5-10 years of hands on practical Transportation/traffic engineering experience. The successful candidate must have experience in performing traffic operational analysis using traffic engineering software applications (including Synchro, SimTraffic, and SiDRA), traffic data collection, safety analysis, Warrant analysis using MUTCD, roadway and highway design, signalized intersection design, traffic signal coordination, and arterial analysis; must be proficient in AutoCAD. The successful candidate must have experience in preparing traffic study reports for arterials, corridors, intersections, development impact studies, signal justification reports, etc.

For more information pertaining to qualifications and responsibilities for this position, please visit http://www.neite.org/Employment/
Nitsch_TransportationEngineering_07082013.pdf

Town of Framingham
Director of Transportation Engineering
Framingham, Massachusetts

The Town of Framingham Department of Public Works seeks qualified candidates for the position of Director of Transportation Engineering. The successful candidate will be responsible for managing and coordinating the provision of traffic and transportation engineering and planning work for the department’s operational programs and the Town’s capital improvement program. The candidate would assist and coordinate the development of a comprehensive long-range transportation plan for the Town.

Qualified candidates will possess a BSCE, registration as a Professional Engineer in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and 8 years exp. in civil engineering. Certification as a Professional Traffic Operations Engineer is desirable.

Mail cover letter and resume to Human Resources, 150 Concord St., Framingham, MA 01702, fax to (508) 424-3407 or email to human.resources@framinghamma.gov.

This position will remain open until a suitable candidate is chosen. AA/EOE

Senior Transportation Engineer/Project Manager
Boston, Massachusetts

Nitsch is seeking an experienced and dynamic Sr. Transportation Engineer/Project Manager to join our team in our Boston Office. The successful candidate should have construction administration services experience that includes interpreting design intent, evaluating construction for compliance with contract documents, and directing of engineering support personnel. He or she will be responsible for developing and overseeing all aspects of transportation engineering projects for local and state government clients. The candidate must have experience in proposal writing, business development, and have the ability to make public presentations. Strong verbal and written communication skills are essential.

For more information pertaining to qualifications and responsibilities for this position, please visit http://www.neite.org/Employment/
Nitsch_SeniorTransportationEngineering_07082013.pdf

Do You Want to Advertise in the New England Chronicle’s And NEITE Website Professional Service

Thank You For Your Continued Support
The New England Chronicle is interested in short articles on
innovative projects and cutting-edge solutions.

Please send articles, listings (ITE and other relevant), graphics
and photographs to the Editor: Samuel W. Gregorio, E.I.T. at
sgregorio@tecmass.com

The New England Section Chronicle staff thanks you and we
hope you enjoy the issue.

TEC, Inc. Contributing Staff:
Samuel W. Gregorio, E.I.T. (Editor)
Kevin R. Dandrade, P.E., PTOE
Rebecca L. Brown, P.E., PTOE
Douglas S. Halpert, E.I.T.

Special Thanks to:
Claire Choquette - Ocean State Signal Co.
Bill McNamara - Ocean State Signal Co.

REMINDERS

Those members of the New England Section that have not updated your
personal and/or business contact information recently should visit the ITE
website and do so. An updated contact directory allows the Section to
properly send information emails, election information, and other details
such as the NEITE calendar.

http://www.ite.org

For those members of the New England Section that would like to be
included on the Section email list for Google Groups, please contact
Nick Fomenko, P.E., PTOE at BETA Group, Inc.

nfomenko@BETA-inc.com

The New England Chronicle is the official publication of the New England Section of the Institute of
Transportation Engineers. The New England Chronicle is published quarterly. Opinions and articles
expressed within the Chronicle do not necessarily reflect official ITE or NEITE policy unless
specifically stated. Representations of sponsors and our Professional Services Directory via
business cards does not establish any official support of products or services.