

**A RESOLUTION REGARDING THE BALTIMORE REGION
FY 2012 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM
FOR TRANSPORTATION PLANNING (UPWP) BY THE CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC) OF THE
BALTIMORE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION BOARD (BRTB)**

WHEREAS, the BRTB, the Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Baltimore region responsible for transportation planning and policy making for the Baltimore region, has prepared the FY 2012 UPWP and requested comment on its content from the CAC; and

WHEREAS, the CAC Serves as an advisory body to the BRTB, charged with providing independent, region-oriented citizen advice to the BRTB on issues related to the development of the Baltimore Regional Transportation Plan (BRTP), Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and amendments that affect the region's conformity with federal air quality requirements, the public involvement process, regionally significant land use issues, and other regional transportation-related issues, as appropriate, promotes public awareness and participation in the regional transportation planning process and promotes equity in the regional transportation planning process; and

WHEREAS, the CAC has reviewed the FY 2012 UPWP;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the following comments pertaining to the FY 2012 UPWP are hereby submitted by the CAC to the BRTB for consideration:

1. The UPWP is well composed. The document addresses transportation planning topics of interest to the CAC while balancing legislative requirements of the MPO.
2. Unify the UPWP. The UPWP addresses activities representing divergent interests. However, it lacks a clear, unifying statement of its purpose. Descriptions within the 'Prospectus' list various entities associated with activities of the BRTB, their roles and enabling legislation. Projects and tasks describe useful and necessary individual activities performed to plan parts of a complex network of transportation. It does not describe how the activities and tasks are integrated. Other than a general reference to "a careful consideration of critical transportation issues currently facing the region, as well as the analytical capabilities necessary to address them" the document does not address how or why the various interests and tasks are coordinated or how they support a common vision or goal to unify the planning efforts. This theme is articulated in comments that follow.
3. Elaborate on the role of community participation. Portions of the document headed 'Prospectus', and 'Metropolitan Transportation Planning - Roles & Responsibilities', 'Transportation Improvement Program' and several project descriptions could better describe the composition of and roles and responsibilities of the CAC and citizen organizations.
4. Clarify the information. Spreadsheets throughout the document shall better define the numeric units contained within them.
5. Account for expenditures. For the project 'Public Participation and Community Outreach' a more detailed accounting of expenses is requested. An accounting of how these efforts dovetail with public outreach efforts within other projects and tasks such as 'Transportation Improvement Program' is requested.
6. Integrate the projects. Indicate how the various projects integrate with one another to provide a comprehensive transportation planning strategy. As currently presented, each project seems to stand alone and lacks shared benefit. One of many possible examples of opportunities to

integrate projects is by indicating how the 'Congestion Management Process' is coordinated with the 'Travel Monitoring Program', 'Intermodal Planning', 'Freight Mobility Planning' and many others to make each project more useful. The task 'Transit Coordination' may seek to accomplish such an objective but it is not articulated. Another opportunity to articulate project integration may include how the '2010 Census and American Community Survey' and 'Cooperative Forecasting Process' are linked with 'Data Development', GIS activities and other such data interdependent tasks.

7. Provide evidence that projects and tasks are not conducted at cross purposes or in variance with one another. How does 'Travel Demand Modeling' incorporate the aims of 'Transit Coordination', 'Freight Mobility Planning', 'Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning', 'Environmental Planning', etc?
8. Coordinate with other MPOs. Where possible, indicate how the BRTB coordinates its efforts with other regional MPOs. As currently presented, such coordination is described in a very limited number of projects.
9. Strive for economic efficiencies. Assure that projects do not duplicate efforts of other federal, state or local governmental agencies. One example is in the 'Cooperative Forecasting Process'. Assure that tasks are not conducted to produce information which may be available through private market purchase for costs lower than those of the BRTB costs. It seems that the ES-202 data purchased, analyzed and augmented for the 'Cooperative Forecasting Process' may be available in whole or part, through other sources. Once data is compiled by the BRTB is it possible to recoup expenditures by making such information available to others for a fee?
10. Explain why the BRTB undertakes the projects and tasks in the UPWP. The 'Introduction' begins to justify policy and legislative requirements. A few project descriptions reference legislative requirements however, such justification seems absent on several project descriptions. Within each project, indicate how BRTB activities are linked to new or ongoing governmental policies and legislation. Where possible, cite references.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, the CAC thanks the BRTB for this opportunity to participate through this opportunity to comment on the FY 2012 UPWP. The CAC thanks the BRTB staff for facilitating our participation.

Submitted by;

Stephen Lauria
Vice-Chair, BRTB Citizen Advisory Committee
Chair, Policy and Legislation Sub Committee