In my inaugural newsletter message to our San Diego members, I would like to take us back to where we left off in our last newsletter. Fresh off of our 2015 Awards program in November, we had our annual Holiday Party at the Bali Hai. Our Vice President at the time, Ryan Zellers, did a stellar job setting up the venue, bringing in Samba-dancing and drumming entertainment, and the tropical holiday decorations (If I do say so myself). Did I mention the open bar with free-flowing Mai Tais and the Bayfront skyline views? It was a great time and I think we’ll get even more people there this year!

The following week we gathered with other San Diego Transportation groups for our Annual Holiday Luncheon at the Prado. Money raised was donated to Toys For Joy, donating gifts and services to children in need in the San Diego area. There, a busy and rewarding 2015 led by Mark Jugar came to end for us. The new officers and chairs gathered for a board meeting and set our sights for 2016.

In January, we headed north to Escondido for our traditional North County lunch meeting. Ali Shazad took the role of both Treasurer and presenter while Teala Cotter assumed her new Secretary duties. It’s definitely a moment of panic for new officers trying to make sure everything goes well at the first meeting - and of course it did. No causalities to report, so I believe we’re in good shape for the remainder of the year.

In case you missed it, the SB 743 revised draft guidelines were circulated at the end of January and asked for responses by February 29th. I could go on about what it all means and why it’s important to you, but I’d rather just direct you to our website’s Transportation Capacity and Mobility Task Force page: [http://www.sandiegoite.org/about-us/tcm-task-force/](http://www.sandiegoite.org/about-us/tcm-task-force/) Erik Ruehr thanks you. Knock yourselves out. This occurrence pushed our planned volunteer social mixer back several weeks, so stay tuned when that will go down. It’s still being worked out by myself and Walter Musial, but it shall be soon!
Also, a special thank you to Mr. Dennis Wahl who showed up to our February lunch meeting to receive a Life Member Award! Get this: his son, who is a friend and former coworker of mine, Chris Wahl, was there to present on Sky trams in San Diego at this very meeting. It’s almost like we planned for it all to happen that way. Congratulations to both of you!

By the time this message goes out, we will have been to the Joint Workshop and Lunch with Southern California and Riverside San Bernardino Sections (March 11th). This is the first time all 3 sections have gathered for a meeting like this, so something feels bigger about this one. The meeting has an excellent program on new technologies, orchestrated by new Technical Chair Dawn Wilson. Proceeds for San Diego will go towards the Western District Student Endowment Fund. Looking into the future, I think I’ll be able to say: “I was there – what was your excuse?!?”. All kidding aside, I was really there, along with about 15 others from our Section we tamed the I-5 northbound AM peak traffic. We know it’s not an easy drive, so we hope to reach out to make carpooling easier by adding weblinks like this: https://www.groupcarpool.com/t/i39sr6. Join a carpool or offer a ride to long distance meetings! Isn’t technology great?

Thanks for reading and look for the next issue in June!

Cheers,
- Ryan
February 4, 2016 - Monthly Luncheon at the Sheraton Mission Valley – The meeting had a presentation on “Urban Aerial Ropeways” by Jeff Howard and Chris Wahl of WSP / Parsons Brinckerhoff. The topic covered not only plans for an aerial tram from the convention center downtown to Balboa park, but also discussed possible other applications around the region for mass transit. Coincidentally, an ITE Lifetime Member certificate was presented to Dennis Wahl (Chris Wahl’s father) - Transportation apparently runs in the family! – Congratulations Dennis!

January 14, 2016 - Monthly Luncheon at the City of Escondido (Michell Room) – Our first meeting to kick off 2016 was our official “North County” meeting, attended by approximately 60 people (including 2 students). Everyone chowed down on a Mexican-style buffet while listening to the feature presentation: “Maple Street – A Complete Streets Project” by Robb Zaino, Kevin Brickley, and Ali Shahzad of the City of Escondido. Afterwards, Ali hosted a quick walking tour of the site, just across the street.

December 14th, 2015 - Members from ITE, SDHDA, APWA, WTS and ASCE came together again for the annual joint holiday lunch at the Prado. The event began with an outdoor mixer on a beautiful Monday in the park. After brief cocktails and mingling, Gary L. Gallegos, Executive Director of SANDAG, presented to roughly 300 people that were in attendance. Thousands of dollars in raffle prizes were donated, with much of the event proceeds going to Toys for Joy. It was a huge congregation of professionals from around the transportation industry - gathering to network and participate in the luncheon’s philanthropic efforts. ITE plans to keep the tradition going by being one of the organization sponsors of the event in 2016.

December 5, 2015 - Our 2015 ITE Annual Holiday Party was a chance to celebrate the Holidays with Family, Friends & Colleagues. About 75 people were in attendance at the Bali Hai outdoor pavilion... as drinks flowed, music played, dancing commenced, and all of this while taking in downtown San Diego views along the bay. We also gave away over a $1500 in raffle prizes, including a folding bike and a large flat-screen TV! Special entertainment set the tone of the evening with an outstanding performance from the Dancers and Bateria of Super Sonic Samba and the energy stayed until we had to wrap the event up! Thanks to all that came – and check out some of the pictures we have on our website with guests and samba dancers striking a pose! See you next year!
TEALA COTTER

WHERE DID YOU GROW UP?
Bay Area, Woodside and Santa Cruz Mountains

WHAT/WHO INFLUENCED YOU TO CHOOSE TRANSPORTATION ENGINEERING?
Growing up, my plan was to go into photolithography and wafer processing. However, after moving to southern California, the job I was offered was for a technician position in traffic engineering for the City of Carlsbad. I was hired by Bob Johnson who provided me the opportunity to explore the realms of traffic engineering. With the knowledge I obtained at the City of Carlsbad, I was able to expand my knowledge and career in this field with the City of Oceanside where I climbed the ladder and currently hold the position of Associate Traffic Engineer. Since being at the City of Oceanside, I have successfully obtained my TE license, as well.

WHAT SCHOOLS DID YOU ATTEND FOR YOUR DEGREES?
Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo: Bachelors in Materials Engineering

WHAT DO YOU VALUE MOST ABOUT YOUR ITE MEMBERSHIP?
What I value the most is the opportunities to learn and meet/network with people. It was at an ITE luncheon where I was able to introduce myself to Paul Pace with the City of Oceanside. At that time, I was applying for an opening at the City of Oceanside in traffic engineering.

WHAT INTERESTING TALENT DO YOU POSSESS?
I won best of show at the Santa Clara County Fair for a 4’x5’x3’ hutch I made in high school. Other than that, my family did not share any of their awesome talents with me…. all I have is the power of “responsibility” and multitasking. Oh, and I can hold my left pinky in my left hand.

Describe a memorable/unusual experience/event in your life
Memorable moments that are at the top of the list are getting married to my husband and giving birth to my two awesome kids. Other memorable moments range from living in Honduras for six weeks to help build latrines for a community health service program, to getting engaged at the Cliffs of Moher in Ireland, to swimming with dolphins in New Zealand, to one of our taxi drivers getting into an accident with a vehicle full of nuns in Panama, and to there being that one time I am driving down Highway 17 in the Santa Cruz mountains in a Geo Metro with two wolves and an Emu in the back seat cuddled up together.

WHAT ARE SOME OF YOUR HOBBIES OR INTERESTS?
When I am not working and doing chores at home (which is all the time), I like hanging with my kids and creating memories, hiking (being outside), reading, and just plain relaxing (but only for 10 minutes because I always have to be doing something).

WHAT IS THE CRAZIEST THING YOU HAVE EVER DONE?
When in New Zealand, my husband and I bungee jumped off a bridge, went paragliding, and then jet boating in shallow water near rocky cliffs. If you ask my husband the same question, he would say marrying me.
ITÉ INTERNATIONAL VICE PRESIDENT CANDIDATE

Michael Sanderson, P.E., PTOE, LEED AP, FITE
President/CEO, Sanderson Stewart, Billings, MT USA
msanderson@sandersonstewart.com / @mpsanderson1 / Facebook / LinkedIn

The world of transportation is transforming before our eyes. Big advances in technology, generational demographic shifts, and globalization are among the many forces that will transform our profession. This type of change can either be a threat, or it can present great opportunities. To seize the opportunities, ITÉ must take a leadership role to ensure that our members have the right information, the right connections, and the right opportunities to succeed.

- **Develop a strong ITÉ brand.** ITÉ needs to clearly define its space among transportation organizations and then provide decisive leadership where it can be most effective.
- **Leverage technology and social media.** ITÉ must modernize its approach to service delivery and communication by better utilizing technology, fully embracing online and cloud-based platforms, social media, and mobile technology.
- **Embrace & encourage diversity.** In our changing profession, ITÉ must position itself as the organization of choice for professionals of all diverse origins and backgrounds.
- **Define ITÉ’s global role.** A global economy more strongly dominated by Asia and other emerging economies is impacting the transportation industry, even for those that never work outside North America. ITÉ needs to identify how it can best engage and support transportation professionals globally.
- **Leadership.** In our own organizations, in our profession, and in society, ITÉ members need to be the technical experts and the advocates leading the conversations and delivering the solutions to the transportation challenges of the 21st century.

ITE is the organization that I have devoted my career to serving for the last 20 years. I have served ITÉ as an elected leader at the chapter, section, district, and international levels, and I have served on many committees, task forces, and technical councils. I love ITÉ for what it has done for me professionally and for the many personal relationships I value so much. ITÉ is at a crossroads and change is needed for ITÉ to be successful into the future. With your help and collaboration, I look forward to applying my knowledge of ITÉ, along with my education and experience as a business leader, to effectively lead our Institute through this transformative time.
JONATHAN HOFERT
PE | TE | PTOE

I am honored and excited to be selected as a candidate for ITE Western District Secretary-Treasurer. This is an exciting time to be in the transportation profession. The industry is changing rapidly, and with it comes many opportunities to make ITE better. I will help the District seize those opportunities. I believe we can do this by having a “Four M” approach—Move ITE and Manage More Modes to be in front of the cutting edge. I will promote ITE as the organization with the most innovative membership, on the cutting edge of engineering and transportation.

HofertITE2016.org
I am thankful to my Section and the District Board for their confidence in me and for selecting me as a candidate for Western District Secretary-Treasurer. I am excited to continue serving our members and hope to receive your support. ITE has been an integral part of my career and I hope to help make our organization accessible for others.

**GOALS**
- Better communication between Section and District leadership
- Continue to finalize current District Board initiatives and implement guidance.
- Engage the next generation of engineers and planners – younger member recruitment & retention – growth of Annual Meeting programs for young professionals.

**SECTION/DISTRICT INITIATIVES**
- SoCal Section Student Traffic Bowl (now in its 7th year)
- Joint (SoCal, RSBITE, and OCTEC) Holiday Mixer Casino Night (now in its 3rd year)
- Western District Annual Meeting Career Guidance Sessions (now in its 3rd Year)

**RECOGNITION**
- SoCal Section Young Transportation Engineer of the Year 2010
- Western District Young Professional Achievement Award 2015
- ITE International Rising Star Class of 2015

**ITE LEADERSHIP ROLES**
- UC Irvine Student Chapter President (2007)
- SoCal Section Student Chapter Liaison (2008–2012)
- District Student Traffic Bowl Aid (2011, 2014–now)
- Southern California Section Board (2012–serving as Past President)
- District Student Endowment Fund Volunteer (2012 – now)
- District MiteY Race Coordinator (2012 – now)
- District Career Guidance Chair (2012 – now)
- International Young Member Committee (2014 – now)
- International Local Arrangements Committee Member (2016)
- Co-Chair for the potential 2020 District Annual Meeting in Hawaii

Neelam Dorman
Secretary-Treasurer

[https://www.facebook.com/NeelamforITE/](https://www.facebook.com/NeelamforITE/)
LET’S GET SOCIAL
UPCOMING MEETINGS & EVENTS

MONTHLY LUNCHEON
APR 7 – 11:30 AM
@ SHERATON MISSION VALLEY
DOWNTOWN MOBILITY PLAN PROJECT

ITE SD ANNUAL GOLF TOURNAMENT
APR 29 – 11:30 AM
@ TWIN OAKS GOLF COURSE

WESTERN DISTRICT CONFERENCE
JULY 10-13
@ ALBUQUERQUE, NM

2016 ITE ANNUAL MEETING & EXHIBIT
AUG 14-17
@ ANAHEIM, CA

SB 743 COMMENT LETTER

At the request of the Western District of ITE, San Diego Section TCM Task Force Chair Erik Ruehr once again led efforts to coordinate and draft a formal letter to California’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR). The letter was a collection of considerations from ITE members from around the Western District responding to the draft revised guidelines in January of 2016 and made focused concerns that remained for OPR to address on their policies and guidelines. The comment period ended on February 29th, 2016 and the latest letter was supported by the presidents of each ITE section in California as well as other SB 743 Task Force members. Additional comments can still be forwarded to OPR, but they are under no obligation to respond to them outside of the official comment period. The letter in its full form is here:
February 29, 2016

Christopher Calfee, Senior Counsel
Governor’s Office of Planning and Research
1400 Tenth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Revised Proposal on Updates to the CEQA Guidelines on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA – Implementing Senate Bill 743 (Steinberg 2013)

Dear Mr. Calfee:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments and suggestions regarding your efforts to amend CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) Guidelines, as required by Senate Bill 743 (SB 743). This letter specifically responds to the report titled “Revised Proposal on Updates to the CEQA Guidelines on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA – Implementing Senate Bill 743 (Steinberg 2013)” written by the Office of Planning and Research (OPR) dated January 20, 2016 (hereafter called the “Revised Proposal”).

We represent over 2,000 California members of the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), an international society of transportation engineers and planners. These members prepare transportation analysis for environmental documents under CEQA, and in some cases the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and we understand the purpose of these analyses to identify potential environmental impacts.

This is our third comment letter to OPR since the SB 743 process started in the fall of 2013. In addition to seeking written comments, we appreciate OPR’s spirit of openness and cooperation throughout this process. OPR staff have spoken at numerous ITE events and OPR has conducted numerous individual conversations with ITE members.

We believe that the implementation of SB 743 will involve significant challenges and we look forward to OPR’s continued cooperation during the implementation process.
Our purpose in writing this letter is to provide recommendations for revisions to the Revised SB 743 Guidelines in order to achieve a more successful implementation of SB 743. Included are overall comments as well as detailed comments relating to specific aspects of the Revised Proposal.

OVERALL COMMENTS

The revised proposal represents a step forward since it addresses many (but not all) of the concerns raised after preparation of the draft guidelines in August 2014. The Revised Proposal provides for a two-year opt in period which will be helpful in reducing the disruption that is expected to be caused by the transition to a very different way of evaluating the transportation impacts of projects under CEQA. Many aspects of the Revised Proposal reflect consideration of important details not considered in previous draft guidelines. Our comments, as described below, are designed to assist OPR in continuing to make improvements while working toward a final set of SB 743 guidelines.

DETAILED COMMENTS

Our additional comments are as follows:

1. General, Goods Movement: The Revised Draft does not include information on how to handle VMT analysis with respect to goods movement. We would like to take this as an indication that goods movement operations would not need to be analyzed with respect to VMT analysis and would not cause a significant VMT impact. However, a statement to this effect in the guidelines would be helpful. Our assumption would be that employee trips and other passenger vehicle trips related to goods movement would be analyzed for VMT considerations.

2. Page 1, Second Paragraph: The comment that the guidelines can be updated as needed is welcome as experience in conducting CEQA transportation analyses after the incorporation of SB 743 may lead to a need for adjustments.

3. Page 1, Third Paragraph: The statement that traffic studies “will now typically take days rather than weeks to prepare” is questionable, given the uncertainty in how lead agencies will respond to the implementation of SB 743. We would recommend saying that this is OPR’s expectation.

4. Page 2, Second Paragraph: This paragraph provides the first of many references to the Caltrans Statewide Travel Demand Model. The first two case studies shown at the end of the Revised Proposal also rely heavily on data from this model. ITE agrees that the Statewide Travel Demand Model can be a useful tool in VMT analyses, particularly in cases where local models are not may not be available or appropriate for use on a particular project. However, this
model is not easily available to most transportation analysts and it is not practical to run the model for most projects. Therefore, what is needed are tables, figures, and or a database that allow analysts to determine average vehicle trip lengths for residential and office land uses by travel analysis zone and by region for the entire state. In the case of residential land uses, this information is also needed by City and for the unincorporated areas of each County. We would request OPR’s assistance in making sure that this information can be made available to analysts who conduct CEQA transportation analyses for land development projects.

5. Page 3, Item 3 and Page 23, Third Paragraph: For residential developments in unincorporated areas, VMT impacts should be determined using a threshold that is 15% below the average of all the unincorporated areas in the county (in addition to the regional average), not the incorporated cities. It is not fair or reasonable for unincorporated/rural areas to be compared to more densely developed incorporated areas.

6. Page 4, Item 7: Is there a way to re-word this without use of a double negative?

7. Page 7, Item (b) (1): Given that some development projects will fall partly within and partly outside the specified distances to transit, guidance for projects in this situation may be helpful. One suggestion would be to use language similar to Public Resources Code 21555(b), e.g., something similar to "A project shall be considered to be within one-half mile of a major transit stop or high-quality transit corridor if all parcels within the project have no more than 25 percent of their area farther than one-half mile from the stop or corridor and if not more than 10 percent of the residential units or 100 units, whichever is less, in the project are farther than one-half mile from the stop or corridor."

8. Page 8, (c) Applicability: The two-year period from adoption to implementation statewide is appropriate and should be retained. In order to achieve as smooth an implementation process as possible, lead agencies will need time to review their current laws and policies, conduct relevant studies, and implement new laws and policies that are consistent with the implementation of SB 743.

9. Page 8, XVI (a): The Appendix G checklist item (a) is proposed to read "Would the project conflict with a plan, ordinance or policy addressing safety or performance of the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle lanes and pedestrian paths (except for automobile level of service.)?" We believe this checklist item is not needed. Safety is adequately addressed under current item (d) that reads "Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?" Performance of the circulation system, which had typically been measured with level of service, no longer needs to be mentioned. Furthermore, a mere conflict with unspecified documents should not be considered an environmental impact. With so many design documents
available, there are certain to be conflicts, so defining a conflict as an impact would trigger many EIR's.

10. Page 8, XVI (c): Checklist item (c) should make clear that induced demand would be significant only if a transportation project is of a scale large enough to affect California's attainment of long term greenhouse gas emissions goals.

11. Page 18, Recommendations Regarding Significance Thresholds: Clarification should be given as to whether the baseline/existing conditions should be the average VMT at a fixed point in time. If the goal is to reduce VMT by 15% from today's existing conditions, then the baseline should not need to be re-established at the beginning of project analysis as practice currently dictates for evaluation of LOS impacts.

12. Page 18, Recommendations Regarding Significance Thresholds: It would seem to make sense that long-term or phased projects would analyze VMT impacts at the time the proposed development is expected to be implemented. This raises the question of whether a project could calculate its VMT impacts using the transportation network that would be expected to be present on its opening day and whether any proposed improvements in the transportation network would need to be funded or only planned without an identified funding source.

13. Page 21, First Paragraph: While it is useful to provide a minimum threshold for the consideration of VMT impacts in the SB 743 guidelines, we believe that a higher threshold would be more appropriate. In our experience, the most commonly-used thresholds for current traffic impact studies are 50 peak hour trips/500 daily trips or 100 peak hour trips/1,000 daily trips. We believe these thresholds would also be appropriate for VMT analysis. Consideration could also be given to using a higher threshold for projects that are consistent with an agency’s General Plan or the regional RTP/SCS. For comparison, there are many agencies that use higher thresholds for screening projects. For example, the Orange County CMP uses a threshold of 1,600-2,400 daily trips, San Bernardino County uses 250 peak hour trips, and the San Diego Regional Traffic Impact Study Guidelines use 2,400 daily trips or 200 peak hour trips. It should be noted that the threshold of 100 daily trips could require a project as small as ten dwelling units to conduct a full Environmental Impact Report if a significant VMT impact is determined.

14. Page 23, Office Projects: In some cases, it may be appropriate to compare office VMT generation per employee to City or unincorporated County averages rather than regional averages. Individual lead agencies may want to consider this and it would be helpful if the draft guidelines would acknowledge this possibility.
15. Page 23, Office Projects: Office projects that improve jobs/housing ratio balance may act to reduce VMT if they provide jobs for local residents who would otherwise commute long distances. This effect should be taken into account when evaluating the VMT impacts of office projects.

16. Page 24, First Paragraph: For retail developments, assessing the total change in VMT would require use of a model to determine the existing VMT for the project area. This may place a significant burden on projects just above the recommended screening threshold of 50,000 square feet.

17. Page 24, Other Project Types, Second Paragraph: We would recommend deletion of this paragraph. The paragraph currently says "Strategies that decrease local VMT but increase total VMT, for example strategies that forego development in one location and lead to it being built in a less travel efficient location, should be avoided." This is implying that a project may push other development to a location such that future overall VMT is increased. However, it may be likely that no such diversion will ever occur. The logical approach would be to analyze the impacts of the diverted project when that project is proposed.

18. Page 25, Rural Areas Outside MPOs: This heading should be changed to “Rural Areas”. The important consideration is an area’s status with regard to reducing VMT, not whether it happens to fall within an MPO or not. Similarly, the first sentence should be changed to read “In rural areas (i.e. areas not near developed cities or towns)”. The definition of rural in relevant transportation engineering publications may be helpful. For example, the 2010 Highway Capacity Manual defines rural as “an area with widely scattered development and a low density of housing and employment”.

19. Pages 28 to 34, Induced Demand: Many ITE members disagree with the concept of incorporating induced demand into the analysis of transportation impacts of roadway projects. While it is recognized that new roadways or capacity-increasing projects can increase the desirability of development in areas served by the roadway in question, many of us would prefer to attribute any increases in VMT with the development rather than the roadway. To the extent that induced demand is included in the guidelines, we have comments that follow below on how this issue should be analyzed.

20. Pages 28 to 34, Induced Demand: The technical Advisory should make clear that the suggested induced demand elasticity rate of 1.0 is used only as an example. We recommend that OPR give EIR preparers discretion to select the appropriate elasticity.
21. Pages 28 to 34, Induced Demand: For most roadway projects, simple sketch planning tools will be the appropriate method to estimate induced demand. For example, page 29 of the Revised Proposal, first paragraph, refers to a range of elasticities for VMT from 0.6 to 1.0 (i.e. a 0.6 to 1.0 percent increase in VMT for every 1.0 percent increase in lane miles). The Roadway Capacity Expansion Project case study uses the midpoint of this range (0.8) and that would be a reasonable choice for most roadway projects. In addition, we would recommend that OPR include the checklist described below to allow analysts to screen out projects that would not be appropriate for induced demand analysis.

22. Pages 28 to 30, Induced Demand: Induced demand is only relevant if traffic congestion is a factor and if the geographic area served by the new or expanded roadway is appropriate for development. ITE recommends adding a checklist to the Revised Proposal that lead agencies would review prior to conducting an induced demand analysis. The checklist items include:

1. Are there alternative competing modes in the project corridor, and are travel times competitive with the existing/proposed auto travel times?
2. Is the economy of the area expected to grow significantly in the next 20 years?
3. Does the present zoning near the project allow for additional development?
4. Is there significant congestion on the roadway network now?
5. Are parcels suitably sized to provide for new development along the project corridor (i.e., no extensive assembly of parcels required for increased development)?
6. Are topography, land ownership, governmental services, absence of ground contamination, and other factors conducive to new development?
7. Is there community support and market demand for new development?
8. Is the project on the fringe, or just beyond, the existing urban area?
9. Is the project likely to generate significant travel time reductions (greater than 5 minutes during peak hours)?
10. Is the project likely to result in newly generated trips due to increased access to employment sites or shopping destinations beyond what would be expected through reassignment of traffic?

If most of the answers to these questions are "no," there is probably not a significant amount of induced demand likely in the long term.

23. Page 27, Fifth Bullet: Change the last part of this bullet to read “provided that the project includes appropriate facilities for pedestrians, cyclists, and, if applicable, transit”. A small roadway project would generally generate an insignificant amount of VMT because it is small, regardless of whether it can or cannot substantially improve conditions for pedestrians, cyclists, and transit. Such projects should include appropriate facilities for all modes of travel without the burden of requiring to demonstrate a substantial improvement.
24. Page 28, Evidence of Induced VMT, First Sentence: At the end of the sentence add “in congested areas”. A statement should also be included saying that the addition of lanes for safety or other reasons in uncongested areas will generally not lead to induced VMT.

25. Page 29, First Paragraph: It should be made clear that the elasticity values noted in this paragraph are just examples and elasticity should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. This paragraph includes a statement that “(An elasticity greater than 1.0 can occur because new lanes leverage travel behavior beyond just the project location.”) This statement should be deleted or should be accompanied by a more thorough explanation. What precisely does “leverage” mean? One way to solve this problem would be to simply delete the wording in quotes and let individual analysts look into the relevant research to determine how it could be applied to individual projects.

26. Page 29, First paragraph: We would like OPR as well as other readers of this letter to be aware of some of the characteristics of the Duranton and Turner research cited in this paragraph:

   (1) The authors (Duranton & Turner) focus mostly on interstate highways. Users of this report should consider the transferability of results to other types of streets (adding a lane to an arterial might have different impacts than adding a lane to an interstate). In California in particular, there is a fairly large system of non-interstate freeways (in 2013, FHWA Highway Statistics said 54% of the urban freeway+expressway mileage in California was non-interstate).

   (2) Despite some efforts to control for it, Duranton & Turner may be confusing correlation with causation (does capacity induce VMT? or does VMT induce areas to provide capacity?).

   (3) Duranton & Turner state unequivocally that, "...we find no evidence that the provision of public transportation affects VKT [VMT]." (page 2618). Doesn't that negate some of the suggested mitigations OPR lists later?

   (4) In their conclusion, Duranton and Turner note with 'surprise' that National Personal Travel Survey (NPTS) data show a decline in driving distances per person, per household, and per vehicle between 1995 and 2001 (page 2647). This despite the fact that lane-miles of interstate supplied increased in this period, which would seem to negate the other conclusions of the paper.

27. Page 30, Recommended Significance Threshold for Transportation Projects: This section provides a much-needed VMT significance threshold for transportation projects. It should be noted that while 2,075,220 is a comparatively large number compared to most numbers used in day-to-day discussions, it is really quite small when translated into its relation to roadway facilities. Assuming 365 days in a year and an equal distribution of VMT over the days, this is only 5,685 VMT per day. A roadway that is one mile in length that carries over 5,685 vehicles per day would exceed this threshold. Using this threshold, even moderately small roadway improvement projects would exceed the threshold requiring the identification of a significant VMT and a need to consider mitigation. Any efforts to reduce or eliminate this threshold should be resisted.

28. Page 34, Mitigation and alternatives, Fourth Bullet: Change this bullet to read “Implementing Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) strategies”. ITS strategies can achieve objectives other than increasing throughput and increases in automobile throughput would seem to be contrary to the objectives of the other bullets.

29. Page 34 to 45, Analyzing Safety Impacts Related to Transportation: The Technical Advisory on safety impacts starts off providing a little bit of guidance on thresholds, but beginning at the top of page 35 transforms into ten pages on how roadway and traffic ought to be designed. Within our industry, we would say OPR is overreaching. The fact that these opinions on traffic safety are placed in the Technical Advisory, rather than regulation, does not lessen the fact that they are still part of the CEQA Guidelines. The implication is that a project has an environmental safety impact unless lanes are narrowed, traffic signal cycles are reduced to less than 90 seconds, sprawl is reduced, and other strategies that ignore context and are not applicable throughout all parts of the state. Pages 35 to 45 in the Technical Advisory would become EIR and negative declaration triggers. They should be deleted.

30. Page 34 to 45, Analyzing Safety Impacts Related to Transportation: ITE has recommended deleting most or all of this information. The Technical Advisory would be much more useful with citations of case law regarding transportation impacts on safety rather than of controversial academic research. If our recommendation is not accepted, we have comments on how the current wording could be improved, as described below.

31. Page 34, Analyzing Safety Impacts Related to Transportation, Fourth Paragraph: Change “roadway users” to “travelers”. Change “guidance on how to approach” to “information that will be helpful in conducting”.

32. Page 34, Last Bullet: This bullet should be deleted. We are not aware of any transportation safety issues that affect just one individual.

33. Page 35, Second Bullet: Change “not undermine” to “avoid undermining”.

34. Page 36, Second Paragraph: Change “straightening roads does not increase safety” to “straightening roads may not increase safety”. Similar wording changes should be considered throughout the safety section to create an advisory that is factual rather than speculative.

35. Page 38, Second Paragraph: ITE recognizes the value of narrowing lane widths in certain cases to provide traffic calming and to allow roadway right-of-way to be used for non-auto uses. However, it should be recognized that safety depends on context. For example, a 10-foot curb lane raises the risk of conflict between pedestrians and transit buses with a mirror-to-mirror width exceeding 10 feet. Statements implying that wide lanes are an environmental impact are not helpful.

36. Page 38, Second Paragraph: Change “wider lanes hinder” to “wider lanes may hinder”.

37. Page 39, Protecting Vulnerable Road Users, First Paragraph, Last Sentence: Change “should not reduce active transportation” to “avoid reducing active transportation”.

38. Page 39, Last Paragraph: Delete “and the resulting ‘safety in numbers’”. This statement is considered to be controversial and unnecessary.

39. Pages 40 to 42, Reducing Overall VMT and Sprawl: The relationship between collisions and VMT is well accepted. In fact, collision rates are calculated using VMT or intersection volumes as the denominator. However, the relationship between collisions and sprawl is less defined. This section seems to imply that a sprawl index needs to be calculated to determine whether safety is impacted. We suggest reducing the length of this section to avoid the implication, including deletion of the sprawl index table. The VMT-related guidelines effectively address sprawl, but entangling sprawl with safety means that any project in the exurbs has a safety impact.

40. Page 41: Emergency access merits its own section in the technical advisory, given that the checklist still asks “Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?” The proposed guidelines imply that sprawl is a problem but urban congestion is not, which is untrue. Lead agencies need guidance on how to deal with this.

41. Page 41, bottom, Analyzing Safety Impacts Related to Transportation: Guidance on impacts to emergency access is weakly addressed in the Technical Advisory. The only mention of emergency access is a statement that emergency access suffers more from sprawl than from congestion. Leaving that statement as the only guidance is misleading. Emergency access still
has its own checklist bullet, so it deserves a dedicated section in the Technical Advisory. Citations of case law, such as City of Hayward vs. Board of Trustees of California State University, would be far more useful in the Technical Advisory than mentioning academic research.

42. Page 42, Attribution of Safety Impacts: This section should be deleted. Its main point appears to be that safety impacts should be attributed to the projects that caused them. This seems to be obvious and does not need to be re-stated. The information provided regarding modeling errors in traffic volumes is not supported and is not helpful.

43. Page 42, Attribution of Safety Impacts: If this section is retained, we would suggest a different example besides turn pocket queue overflow as a safety problem. That situation has a relatively small risk of fatality or serious injury. Inclusion of this example implies this kind of analysis is necessary for CEQA.

44. Pages 42 to 45: Addressing Tradeoffs and Finding Win-Win Safety Improvements: This section is unnecessary and should be minimized, if not deleted. Transportation engineers and roadway designers are well aware of tradeoffs needed to balance the desires of motorists, transit users, pedestrians, cyclists, urban designers, landscape architects, the fire department, the police department, businesses, residents, school districts, and the disabled, as well as the need to conform to design standards, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and the various funding requirements for grants. As an example, meeting the demands of several of the aforementioned parties is the reason a pedestrian must wait over two minutes to walk across a street, and has to push a button to get the OK. It isn't because transportation-engineers think it's safe. Having design suggestions in the CEQA Guidelines is, to say the least, not helpful. What is missing from the safety section is guidance on a threshold of significance. The guidance could be as brief as a checklist item asking "Would the project cause a substantial degradation in the safety of the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle lanes and pedestrian paths?" The Technical Advisory safety section could then clarify that if safety doesn't degrade, there is no impact. As it reads now, the safety section is implying that unless speeds are lowered, lanes are narrowed, and sprawl is reduced, the project has a safety impact.

45. Page 43, Item (2): “Surface roadway lanes can be redesigned from traditional 12.0 foot widths to with [sic] 9.2 to 10.8 foot widths…” Could OPR provide a source for this statement? “Karim (2015)” is cited at the end of the paragraph, but no further information on this reference is provided for this article. Although there have seen studies indicating that narrower lanes (typically 10-11 feet) have minimal impacts on safety, it would be useful to have this citation for lane widths under 10 feet. California law currently allows vehicles to be 8.5 feet wide, exclusive
of mirrors. Mirrors may project out another foot on each side, so inclusive of mirrors, a truck or bus perfectly centered in its lane may be 10.5 feet wide including mirrors. Also, it should be noted that most experts believe that these narrower lane widths should be used only on streets with a speed limit of no more than 40 or 45 mph.

46. Page 44, Third Bullet: Change “Signal lengths of greater than 90 seconds” to “Inappropriately long signal cycle lengths”.

47. Page 44, First Paragraph, Second Sentence: Change “examples of mischaracterization” to “examples of possible mischaracterization” in order to be consistent with the text prior to the list of possible detriments to safety.

48. Page 47, Case Studies: The three case studies shown in this section are helpful. It is noted that two of the case studies recommend consideration of mitigation measures that are not considered practical given current technical, political, and economic factors. The Mission Viejo Medical Center recommends a $6 per day parking charge, which is considered to be infeasible in an area where neighboring developments offer employee parking for free. The Kern County Roadway Expansion Project recommends consideration of tolls and other strategies. Toll roadways have been implemented in only a few highly urbanized areas of California and only on freeway-type facilities. It is highly unlikely that a toll strategy could be successful in Kern County or other similar areas of the state. We believe that these two case studies illustrate some of the difficulties in implementing SB 743. While some projects may be able to be designed to avoid VMT impacts or may be able to provide off-site mitigation, there will be large numbers of projects that will be unable to mitigate their VMT impacts and will need to seek a statement of overriding considerations if they are to move forward. This comment is not intended to argue against the implementation of SB 743, but rather to help manage expectations about the ability to fully mitigate the VMT impacts of projects.

49. Page 47, Case Studies: ITE would be interested in a case study that would respond to the example described in Additional Comment 6 from our November 21, 2014 comment letter on the August 2014 draft guidelines. That example had a project that generates a large amount of greenhouse gases being insignificant while a smaller project is significant using a per capita-based threshold.

50. Page 47, Case Studies: It would be helpful to add a case study for a special event facility such as an arena, stadium or similar use.

51. Page 48, Mixed Use Project Case Study: It is unclear how the calculations were made outside of CalEEMod. This case study would be improved if further clarification could be provided.
52. Page 53, Medical Office Case Study: This case study is helpful and it is recognized that it is only intended as a sample calculation. However, VMT analysis can involve many considerations and ITE members who have reviewed this case study have raised some additional considerations that could affect the calculations regarding VMT generation and VMT mitigation.

(1) Medical office buildings are different from typical office buildings in that they have a lot of trips made by visitors/patients. This leads to different travel behavior and more accurate calculations may result from tailoring the analysis to medical office buildings.

(2) With respect to the mitigation measures, the VMT reduction associated with a transit subsidy for employees may be dependent on the quality of transit service provided. This particular site is not served by a robust transit system and may have difficulty achieving the recommended reduction. In addition, transit may be less applicable to patients/visitors than employees.

(3) The 9/80 work week and the carpool vanpool mitigation may also be less applicable to a medical office than a typical office building.

53. Page 55, Roadway Capacity Expansion Project Case Study: ITE has some comments and questions regarding this case study.

“Lane mile and VMT data are available from the Caltrans Performance Measurement System (PeMS):” We searched the PeMS website on 2/5/16 and were unable to locate either the lane miles or VMT noted for the Kern COG. It would be helpful if the guidelines could provide a link to the applicable website.

The calculation of the percentage change in lane miles (0.328%) is not, strictly speaking, correct. Nearly every economics text recommends the use of an arc elasticity that considers the average value of the independent variable (in this case, lane miles), not the starting value. Otherwise, a 2.2 lane mile increase and a 2.2 lane-miles decrease give you different answer. This problem increases as the magnitude of the change increases. A simple example may illustrate this point: going from 50 to 75 is a 50% increase, but a change from 75 to 50 is a 33.3% decrease, even though both involve a change of 25).

The correct arc calculation should be (using LM to stand for lane-miles):

\[
\text{Project added lane-miles} = \frac{\text{“Before project” LM} + \text{“After project” LM}}{2}
\]
While the difference is minimal for such the example small change in lane miles (a third of a percent), it is more important with larger changes in lane miles. We recommend that OPR use the formula use in virtually all economic texts. This would require the example to document the number of project lanes-miles before and after the proposed roadway expansion.

Several transportation publications explain this difference and the correct calculation of an elasticity. For example, see Donald R. Rothblatt and Steven B. Colman, “Impacts on Ridership of Bus Fare Changes in Small to Medium Urban Transit Systems,” San Jose State University Institute for Metropolitan Studies, September 1997, especially pages 2 thru 8. Also, Richard H. Pratt, “Traveler Response to Transportation System Changes,” available online at http://onlinepubs.trb.org/Onlinepubs/terp/terp_webdoc_12.pdf, especially “Appendix A-Elasticity Discussion and Formulae” and pages 1-13 thru pages 1-16 (first chapter of document).

54. The following additional case study provided by ITE indicates that the recommendations provided in the Revised Draft may result in some projects with small VMT increases showing a significant VMT impact while some projects with large VMT increases may show an insignificant impact. This is shown in the VMT calculations for Project A and Project B below:

PROJECT A

Urban in-fill/transit priority area project on a 10-acre site  
500 du of very high density apartments  
Daily Trips = 2,100 trip-ends per day  
VMT/person = 8 VMT/person  
Persons/du = 2 persons/du  
TOTAL DAILY VMT = 8 VMT/person x 2 persons/du x 500 du = 8,000 VMT/day

PROJECT B

Suburban/rural single family residential project on a 10-acre site  
12 du of very low density residential (one acre lots)  
Daily Trips = 114 trip-ends per day  
VMT/person = 20 VMT/person  
Persons/du = 4 persons/du  
TOTAL DAILY VMT = 20 VMT/person x 4 persons/du x 12 du = 960 VMT/day

Regional/City wide Average VMT/person = 16 VMT/person
Both projects would propose to develop 10-acre site. Project A would add 8,000 VMT per day, but may be considered to have an insignificant impact. Project B would add 960 VMT per day, but may be considered to have a significant VMT impact. It is recommended that agencies working with VMT thresholds consider this example, since working with averages can lead to misleading results, depending on how the averages are used.

This letter was prepared by the California SB 743 Task Force, a task force appointed by the Western District of the Institute of Transportation Engineers. The Western District oversees the thirteen Western states, including California. Within California, the Institute of Transportation Engineers is represented by seven sections throughout the state. The Officers representing the seven California ITE Sections have supported the task force in preparing this letter and their names and contact information are shown below. In addition to the officers listed below, ITE would like to recognize the following members who contributed to the information provided in this letter:

Walter Okitsu, KOA Corporation  
Bob Kahn, RK Engineering Group  
Steve Colman  
Jim Jeffery  
Tony Petros, LSA Associates  
Sandipan Bhattacharjee, Translutions  
Mike Calandra, San Diego Association of Governments

Future correspondence should be directed to Erik Ruehr, Chair of the California SB 743 Task Force, who can represent the California ITE Section Presidents for correspondence purposes. Contact information is shown below:

Erik Ruehr, Chair  
ITE California SB 743 Task Force  
c/o VRPA Technologies  
9520 Padgett Street, Suite 213  
San Diego, CA 92126  
(858) 566-1766  
eruehr@vrpatechnologies.com

Thank you again for the opportunity to be involved in this discussion. We look forward to working with you in the months ahead.
Respectfully yours,

Institute of Transportation Engineers
California SB 743 Task Force

Erik Ruehr
VRPA Technologies
Chair, ITE California SB 743 Task Force
(858) 566-1766
eruehr@vrpatechnologies.com

Doug Maas
Sacramento County DOT
President, ITE Northern California Section
(916) 875-5157
maasd@saccounty.net

Paul Stanis
San Francisco Municipal Transit Agency
President, ITE San Francisco Bay Area Section
(415) 701-2311
paul.stanis@sfmta.com

Justin Link
Kimley Horn
President, ITE Central Coast Section
(747) 900-8380
justin.link@kimley-horn.com

Aly Tawfik
California State University, Fresno
President, ITE Central California Section
(559) 278-8791
tawfik@csufresno.edu
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Gianfranco Laurie
City of Palm Springs
President, ITE Riverside – San Bernardino Section
(760) 323-8253
Gianfranco.laurie@palmsprings-ca.gov

John Kerenyi
City of Moreno Valley
Past President, ITE Riverside – San Bernardino Section
(951) 451-3199
johnk@moval.org

Giancarlo Ganddini
Kunzman Associates
President, ITE Southern California Section
(714) 973-8383
giancarlo@traffic-engineer.com

Sri Chakravarthy
Kimley-Horn and Associates
Past President, ITE Southern California Section
(213) 261-4037
sri.chakravarthy@kimley-horn.com

Ryan Zellers
Michael Baker International
President, ITE San Diego Section
(858) 810-1432
Ryan.zellers@michaelbakerintl.com

Mark Jugar
Rick Engineering Company
Past President, ITE San Diego Section
(619) 291-0707
mjugar@rickengineering.com
## Sponsorship Sign-Up:

- **HOLE SPONSOR**
  - Unlimited
  - $150 EACH
- **PRIZE SPONSOR**
  - Unlimited
  - $100 EACH
- **BEVERAGE CART SPONSOR**
  - 2 AVAILABLE
  - $150 EACH
- **FOOD SPONSOR**
  - 2 AVAILABLE
  - $200 EACH

### Registration Deadline is April 15, 2016!

Sign-Up includes Lunch & 2 Drink Tickets. Lunch without golfing is $20.

## Player Sign-Up:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLAYERS</th>
<th>COMPANY</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>EMAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Please RSVP!**

You may pay at the door or make checks payable to **ITE** and mailed, along with this completed form, to:

**LIN Consulting, Inc.**  
**Attn: Saul Kane**  
4858 Mercury Street, Suite 207  
San Diego, CA 92111

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOLF:</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPONSORSHIP TOTAL:</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUNCH ONLY:</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL:</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS, PLEASE CONTACT SAUL KANE OF LIN CONSULTING, INC.**  
**SKANE@LINCONSULTING.COM**  
**T. (858) 278-4800**  
**RSVPs NOT HONORED WILL BE BILLED**
**JUNIOR ENGINEER**  
STC TRAFFIC - CARLSBAD, CALIFORNIA

Position for an Entry-Level Civil Engineering Graduate

**REQUIREMENTS**
- B.S. or M.S. in Civil Engineering or related field from an accredited college or university
- Strong communication, leadership, and technical skills
- Strong sense of urgency and self-initiative to meet client deadlines
- Must possess or working towards obtaining the Engineer-In-Training (EIT) certification
- Basic knowledge of computer office software including: Microsoft Word, Excel, PowerPoint, and Adobe Acrobat.

**IDEAL CANDIDATE HAS PREFERRED QUALIFICATIONS**
- Working knowledge of AutoCAD and/or Microstation
- Previous internship experience with a civil engineering design firm

**TO APPLY**
Submit Resumes and Cover Letter to: employment@stctraffic.com

**DESIGN ENGINEER**  
STC TRAFFIC - CARLSBAD, CALIFORNIA

Position for a Candidate with 1-3 Years of Relevant Experience

**REQUIREMENTS**
- B.S. or M.S. in Civil Engineering or related field from an accredited college or university
- AutoCAD and/or Microstation design experience
- EIT Certification
- Basic knowledge of computer office software including: Microsoft Word, Excel, PowerPoint, and Adobe Acrobat.

**IDEAL CANDIDATE HAS PREFERRED QUALIFICATIONS**
- PE license or ability to obtain license within 1 year
- Proficient writing/public speaking skills
- Related experience in traffic signal design, signing and striping, or traffic control
- Strong sense of urgency and self-initiative to meet client deadlines
- Synchro, SIDRA, or GIS project specific experience

**TO APPLY**
Submit Resumes and Cover Letter to: employment@stctraffic.com
TRAFFIC PLANNER (PLANNER I)
MICHAEL BAKER INTERNATIONAL – CARLSBAD, CALIFORNIA

Michael Baker International’s Carlsbad office seeks a Traffic Planner (Planner I) to join our Transportation Planning team.

The Traffic Planner will be responsible for performing traffic impact analysis. Project aspects and study will include field visits and surveys, analyzing traffic data utilizing Synchro/Traffix/HCM, preparing graphics for presentations and reports, and preparing text on study methodology and findings. The Traffic Planner will also be responsible for coordinating and analyzing traffic counts, conducting field reviews, analyzing alternative land use scenarios and associated traffic impacts, and preparing documentation.

REQUIREMENTS
- Degree in Transportation Planning, Urban and Regional Planning, or related technical fields.
- 5 - 10 years of experience conducting transportation planning studies with focus on traffic impact studies for new development projects and preparing traffic study reports.
- Strong design skills utilizing Synchro/Traffix/HCM.
- Excellent writing skills.

PREFERENCES
- Experience using Illustrator graphics software.

TO APPLY
Follow this link:
Click the Apply Now Button!
PROJECT ENGINEER-TRANSPORTATION
DOKKEN ENGINEERING – SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

Dokken Engineering is currently seeking a Transportation Engineer to support project managers through the entire design process (from proposal through PS&E and construction support) for small to large transportation projects throughout California. The ideal candidate has been responsible for at least one project that he/she personally designed and supported through construction.

PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITIES
- Execute engineering tasks for the planning, design and construction of transportation projects.
- Perform/produce detailed geometric designs, design calculations, technical reports, and PS&E for transportation facilities.
- Coordinate with internal disciplines, utility companies, subconsultants, and clients involved in projects.
- Perform quality control for projects.
- Mentor less experienced staff.
- Support marketing efforts.

REQUIREMENTS
- BS degree in engineering.
- California PE.
- 5 to 10 years of transportation project experience after graduation.
- Success in the delivery of completed (100%) PS&E packages for transportation projects.
- Understanding of multidisciplinary team coordination, compilation of design and construction documents, and local agency and Caltrans design standards and practices.
- Experience with Microsoft Office applications and transportation design software including at least one of the following Civil 3D, MicroStation, or CAiCE.
- Strong oral and written communication skills.
- Demonstrated leadership skills and proven ability to work in a team environment.
- Commitment to delivering quality work products and superior service to clients.

TO APPLY
If you feel you meet these qualifications, please submit your resume to: jobssd@dokkenengineering.com
THANK YOU TO OUR SPONSORS FOR YOUR CONTINUED SUPPORT!

www.RICKENGINEERING.com

ENGINEERING TRANSPORTATION SOLUTIONS SINCE 1955
Civil Engineering • Transportation & Traffic Engineering • Landscape Architecture
Water Resources • 3D Laser Scanning • Urban Revitalization • Surveying & Mapping
Urban Design & Planning • GIS Services • Storm Water & Environmental Services

5620 FRIARS ROAD  SAN DIEGO  CALIFORNIA 92110  T: 619.291.0707

LINSIOTT LAW & GREENSPAN
Providing Mobility Solutions for 50 YEARS 1966-2016
Pasadena  626.796.2322  Irvine  949.825.6175  San Diego  858.309.8800  Woodland Hills  818.835.8648

Kimley-Horn
Quality and personalized service you would expect from a local company, with the resources of a nationally-ranked engineering firm.

• ITS
• Traffic Signal Systems
• Roadway Design
• Transit Planning & Design
• Traffic Engineering

SAN DIEGO
401 B Street
Suite 600
San Diego, CA 92101
619-234-9411

LOS ANGELES
660 South Figueroa Street
Suite 2050
Los Angeles, CA 90017
213-261-4040

ORANGE
21820 Burbank Blvd.
Suite 230
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
714-990-8400

765 The City Drive
Suite 200
Orange, CA 92868
714-939-1030

www.kimley-horn.com

ADVANCED

SmartCycle
Video detection of bicyclists at intersections allows for extended greens for cycling safety:
• Differentiates bicycles from vehicles
• Provides extension time for bicyclists to cross the intersection safely
• Supports bicycle commuting

Learn more about SmartCycle at Iteris.com

Innovation for better mobility

Iteris
STC TRAFFIC, INC.

We are a full-service Traffic Engineering and Planning firm and are leaders in planning, design, implementation, and operation of high-tech Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) and Traffic Engineering and Control Applications. At the core of our firm's philosophy is providing solutions to our clients' greatest challenges. Our services are tailored to meet the needs of diverse clientele from small agencies to large regional organizations. We are dedicated to building a long-term, mutually beneficial relationship with each client.

SERVICES INCLUDE:
- TRAFFIC ENGINEERING
- TRAFFIC OPERATIONS
- ITS TECHNOLOGIES
- SYSTEM OPERATION & MAINTENANCE
- PROGRAM MANAGEMENT
- TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
- ON-CALL CONTRACT SERVICES
- SYSTEM ENGINEERING & INTEGRATION
- CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT
- GRANT WRITING

LOCATED AT:

CARLSBAD OFFICE
2794 Loker Ave West #102
Carlsbad, CA 92010
(760) 602-4290

SAN DIEGO OFFICE
2356 Moore Street #102
San Diego, CA 92110
(619) 255-6538

For more information, contact:
info@stctraffic.com

WWW.STCTRAFFIC.COM

Providing a full continuum of services to restore and enhance transportation infrastructure

Traffic Engineering • Traffic System Design/Analysis
Intelligent Transportation Systems • Transportation Planning
Transportation Engineering • Public Works
Mobility/Pedestrian/Bike Studies

Ryan Zellers, PE, TE, Project Manager – Traffic Engineering
(858) 810-1432

MBAKERINTL.COM
TRAFFIC DATA COLLECTIONS
50+ YEARS OF EXPERIENCE
GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE CLIENTS
VTMC’s - TMC’s, ADT’s, GAP STUDIES,
PARKING LOT STUDIES, ETC.

LATEST VIDEO COUNT SYSTEMS FROM
OMNIBIRD VIDEO SYSTEMS

619.677.6542
VERACITY.PRO

THE RIGHT EXPERTISE IS CLOSE AT HAND
#smartcities #sandiego

America’s Finest City has put its trust in McCain’s integrated traffic solutions for nearly 30 years.

From advanced traffic equipment to local intersection control, and one of just a few regional arterial management systems in the nation, McCain is proud to help San Diego raise the bar for innovative traffic control.

Discover what McCain can do for you.

888-262-2246 | www.mccain-inc.com
DOKKEN ENGINEERING
www.dokkenengineering.com

SERVICES WE PROVIDE:
- Highway, Roadway, & Interchange Design
- Traffic Signal, Lighting, and Electrical Design
- Bridge & Structures Design
- Local Street, Bikeway, and Walkway Design
- Transit Guideway Design
- Constructability Reviews & Plan Checking
- Hydraulics, Hydrology, & Stormwater Quality
- Environmental Resource Studies
- CEQA/NEPA Environmental Documents
- Surveying
- Construction Management
- Right-of-Way Planning & Acquisition Management

Getting Projects Built... From Concept to Construction!

LIN Consulting, Inc.

Moving Traffic Forward with Insight and Passion

Traffic Engineering | Traffic Control
Street Lighting | Traffic Studies
Construction Support

Certified DBE | SBE | MBE
SANDAG DBE Bench Firm for A&E and CM

Diamond Bar  909.396.6850
San Diego  858.278.4800
Tustin  714.258.8411

www.linconsulting.com

FEHR & PEERS
Improving Communities Since 1985

Accurate Video Counts Inc
Video Based Intersection Counts for Accurate, Reliable and Credible Data

Our latest innovations & more, FEHRANDPEERS.COM