

**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC)**

Wednesday, April 7, 2010  
BMC Conference Room  
5:30 P.M.

**ATTENDANCE**

**Members/Staff**

Regina Aris – Baltimore Metropolitan Council  
Michael Benelli – Anne Arundel County Disabilities Commission  
Art Cohen – b'more mobile  
Edward Cohen – Transit Riders Action Council of Metropolitan Baltimore  
Sandy Conner – Sojourner Douglass College - Workforce Transportation & Referral Center  
David DiQuinzio – Annapolis Planning Commission  
Monica Haines Benkhedda – Baltimore Metropolitan Council (BMC)  
Dwayne Hess – A New Faith Community Center  
Stephen Lauria – Citizen, Baltimore City  
Jud Malone – Central Maryland Regional Transit (CMRT)  
Kevin Racine – Citizen, Harford County  
Alan Sweatman – Friends of Harford (*by phone*)  
Sharonlee Vogel – Transportation Advocates

**Guests**

Morgan Barlow – Portfolio Associates, Inc.  
Ted Rosenberg – Citizen, Baltimore City

CAC Chair, Mr. Jud Malone called the meeting to order at 5:35 P.M.

**1. INTRODUCTIONS**

There were no new member introductions.

**2. REPORT ON RECENT AND UPCOMING BRTB MEETINGS**

Ms. Regina Aris shared highlights of the March 23<sup>rd</sup> BRTB meeting. Action items included the approval of Resolution #10-15 to amend *Transportation Outlook 2035* and the 2010-2013 Baltimore Region Transportation Improvement Program with two new capacity projects; and Resolution #10-18 to support the Preferred Alternative and Conceptual Mitigation for MD 175 from MD 295 to MD 170.

Resolution #10-17 to amend the 2010-2013 Baltimore Region Transportation Improvement Program to include funding from the Jobs Bill of 2010 – Stimulus II was withdrawn since Congress has not passed the anticipated funding. On a related note, Mr. Mike Nixon of MDOT reported that the current federal transportation bill, SAFETEA-LU, has been extended until December 31, 2010.

The BRTB also received presentations on the following informational items: Urban Heat Island Effects (University of Maryland); Climate Change Mitigation Efforts (MD State Highway Administration); update on The Partnership For Sustainable Communities (BMC); and an update on *Imagine 2060*.

Ms. Aris also highlighted a presentation that she thought the CAC would be very interested in: Ms. Mary Leary, Director of Transportation Projects for Easter Seals Project ACTION, presented on Accessible Community Transportation. The focus of the presentation revolved around the benefits of Accessible Community Transportation to not only the disabled population but their caregivers and businesses in general. She pointed out that 9.4% of Marylanders have some type of disability and the cost of lost work by caregivers in business productivity ranges from \$17.1 to \$33.6 billion. Ms. Leary noted that livable and sustainable communities are beneficial to the general population, but also benefit disabled populations. Ms. Leary asked the BRTB to work to include the school system, students, people of limited income and the housing industry in the *imagine 2060* process. She concluded by indicating that the disabled population wants to live a spontaneous life that allows them to access all eight life satisfying activities. She reported that increased access to these types of activities provides a variety of benefits, including giving people greater life satisfaction and helps people stay healthier, reducing unnecessary institutionalization, and supports intergenerational and cultural diversity and inclusion. A copy of Ms. Leary's presentation to the BRTB can be downloaded at: [www.baltometro.org/downloadables/BRTB/BRTB100323\\_EasterSeals.pdf](http://www.baltometro.org/downloadables/BRTB/BRTB100323_EasterSeals.pdf). Ms. Sandy Conner, who attended the BRTB meeting on the CAC's behalf, reported that Ms. Leary's presentation was excellent and suggested that perhaps she could be scheduled to speak to the CAC at a future meeting.

The next meeting of the BRTB is Tuesday, April 27 at 4 p.m. with elected officials. Ms. Aris noted that the BRTB is looking forward to a presentation by Mr. Ralign Wells, the new Administrator of the MD Transit Administration.

Next, Ms. Aris updated members on the April 6<sup>th</sup> Technical Committee meeting. At this meeting, the TC reviewed and discussed the following resolutions: Resolution #10-19 to approve FTA Section 5310 Grant Applications (funding for private non-profit organizations for capital equipment that provide transportation services to the elderly and individuals with disabilities); and Resolution #10-20 to approve requests for federal grant assistance from the Human Services Transportation Coordination Program (Job Access & Reverse Commute as well as New Freedom programs). The TC also approved the following: Resolution #10-21 to approve the Fiscal Year 2011 Unified Planning Work Program and Budget; and Resolution #10-22 to approve a Policy for Establishing a Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Program.

The TC members also received presentations on: A status report on I-95 Electronic Toll Lanes (ETLs) from the Maryland Transportation Authority (MdTA); an update on *imagine 2060*; and incorporation of ETL modeling within the Version 3 Travel Demand Model.

The next meeting of the Technical Committee is May 4 at 9:30 a.m.

### **3. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT SUBCOMMITTEE BRIEFING AND ACTION ITEMS**

The Public Involvement Subcommittee reported on the following work activities and action items:

- Public Involvement – Ms. Conner reported that the group met on March 24<sup>th</sup> to make final changes to the Glossary of Planning Terms. This was distributed for CAC review. Earlier comments were received via e-mail from Ms. Michele Rosenberg and other CAC members provided input at the meeting. Due to a lack of quorum and the need to make additional changes, a final version will be developed and submitted to the CAC for final approval.

Ms. Conner also reported to the group that Mr. Morgan Barlow of Portfolio Associates, Inc. joined the meeting via conference call to review and discuss the branding scheme for the Vision and Long-range Transportation Plan. In addition, Mr. Barlow talked with the group about potential outreach activities and ways the CAC could be involved. A summary of the PI subcommittee's input is detailed in the handout.

Ms. Conner then reported that the subcommittee had some recommendations to the full CAC on ways they can assist with outreach for *imagine 2060*. Specifically, the group recommends that CAC members:

- Forward a letter or e-mail to someone you know and personally invite them to attend a workshop or take the survey
- Make phone calls (10?) to people in your area to personally ask them to attend a meeting.

Due to a lack of quorum, an electronic survey was issued via e-mail to address these subcommittee action items. Nineteen responses were received. A summary of the results are as follows, with detailed responses in the attachment.

- Will you distribute information about the *imagine 2060* public workshops?  
≈ 16 Yes; 2 No; 1 Abstain. 5 Comments.
- Will you make 10 phone calls to personally invite individuals or organizations to attend an *imagine 2060* public workshop?  
≈ 9 Yes; 9 No; 1 Abstain. 5 Comments.

[ATTACHMENT: Results of CAC Action Items Survey for April 2010]

[HANDOUTS: Draft Updated Glossary of Transportation Planning Terms & Acronyms; Comments from M. Rosenberg (e-mail, 4/2/10); Public Involvement Subcommittee: Meeting Summary - March 24, 2010]

#### **4. PRESENTATION: VISION AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Mr. Barlow of Portfolio Associates, Inc. presented details about the upcoming public involvement process for *imagine 2060*. Mr. Barlow began by thanking the PI subcommittee and the full CAC for their assistance in developing the branding scheme for *imagine 2060*. He noted that the logo is in the final stages of development, based upon input from the CAC, BMC staff, BRTB, and the local Planning Directors.

Mr. Barlow noted that three primary areas of focus have been to (1) Increase the number of people who attend public meetings; (2) Design the format of workshops that clearly demonstrates how peoples voices and ideas were heard; and (3) Use this information in the development of the next regional long-range transportation plan.

In order to reach the first goal, the outreach plan calls for mailing a postcard to 10,000 people and organizations in the region; individualized letters to over 800 civic leaders; advertisements in local and regional newspapers; press releases in local newspapers and online outlets; e-mail announcements to BMC mailing lists; and follow-up phone calls. He noted that the primary emphasis of this outreach will be to leaders who are civically engaged, but likely have not been engaged on the issue of transportation or regional planning.

Mr. Barlow asked the CAC members for their input on what messages could be developed that would move someone to become engaged in the *imagine 2060* process (attend a public meeting, take a survey, etc). He also shared a copy of the postcard that will be sent to area households and organizations.

CAC members shared their thoughts in potential messages and ideas for outreach. They also expressed concern over the language in the postcards. BMC staff noted that the postcard had already been submitted to the printer; however they'd use any input received to update language used on the web site, press release, etc.

CAC members finalized the following input on the postcard and Monica Haines Benkhedda agreed to share with staff working on the postcard and other communications.

- Change 1st non-bold paragraph to remove conflict of 50 years vs. 20 years. Change paragraph to: Your help on the transportation vision will guide our transportation plan.
- Change 2nd non-bold paragraph... Add text after the word 'work' at the end of the paragraph to convey the message that this is long-term thinking for future generations. This is your chance to

contribute your ideas and make this region and our communities great places to live and work for you, your children, and your children's children.

- o Fix last 2 non-bold paragraphs to clarify the times for workshops: The Howard Community College workshop begins at 7 pm. All others will run from 6 to 8 pm. Registration begins 30 minutes prior. Then, remove star on Howard County listing as it wouldn't be necessary.
- o If possible, add transit options under meeting locations

*[HANDOUT: imagine 2060 values workshop postcard]*

## **5. MEMBERSHIP, POLICY, AND VISION SUBCOMMITTEE BRIEFINGS AND ACTION ITEMS**

Due to limited time and a lack of quorum, the following reports were distributed in writing and any essential action items were agreed to be sent out via e-mail:

- o Membership – The group met on March 17<sup>th</sup> to discuss a number of membership items including recommendations for new members, requests for leave of absence, follow-up on non-attending members, outreach for new members, and an update to the CAC Application. Details of these discussions are included in the handout. The next meeting of this subcommittee is Wednesday, April 21 at 5 pm at Panera Bread.

Due to a lack of quorum, an electronic survey was issued via e-mail to address the Membership subcommittee action items. Nineteen responses were received. A summary of the results are as follows, with detailed responses in the attachment.

- o The subcommittee recommends Stuart Stainman to fill an open slot that runs through Dec. 2012. View Stuart's application here: [www.baltometro.org/downloadables/CAC/StuartStainmanCACApplication.pdf](http://www.baltometro.org/downloadables/CAC/StuartStainmanCACApplication.pdf). Do you agree with the recommendation to approve Mr. Stainman's application?  
≈ 18 Yes; 0 No; 0 Abstain; 1 No Response. 3 Comments.
- o The subcommittee recommends Mary Shuey to fill an open slot that runs through Dec. 2011. View Mary's application here: [www.baltometro.org/downloadables/CAC/MaryShueyCACApplication.pdf](http://www.baltometro.org/downloadables/CAC/MaryShueyCACApplication.pdf). Do you agree with the recommendation to approve Ms. Shuey's application?  
≈ 15 Yes; 3 No; 0 Abstain; 1 No Response. 2 Comments.
- o CAC Member Diana Mitchell has not attended any meetings, nor has she responded to phone calls or e-mails. The subcommittee recommends that Ms. Mitchell be removed from service and her slot be filled. Do you agree with the recommendation to open this slot?  
≈ 17 Yes; 1 No; 0 Abstain; 1 No Response. 2 Comments.
- o If a majority of members agree that Ms. Mitchell's slot should be opened, the Membership Subcommittee recommends that her slot be filled by Mr. Albert Pietrolungo for a term ending Dec. 2012. View Albert's application here: [www.baltometro.org/downloadables/CAC/AlbertPietrolungoCACApplication.pdf](http://www.baltometro.org/downloadables/CAC/AlbertPietrolungoCACApplication.pdf). Do you agree with this recommendation to appoint Mr. Pietrolungo?  
≈ 18 Yes; 0 No; 0 Abstain; 1 No Response. 3 Comments.

*[ATTACHMENT: Results of CAC Action Items Survey for April 2010]*

*[HANDOUT: Membership Subcommittee: Meeting Summary - March 17, 2010]*

- o Policy – The group met on March 18<sup>th</sup> to discuss a Draft Policy Guide; FTA Changes to New Start Transit Project Evaluation Criteria; and TIP Evaluation. Details of these discussions are included in the handout. The next meeting of this subcommittee is Thursday, April 22nd at 12 noon at Arcos Restaurant (129 South Broadway, Baltimore).

*[HANDOUT: Policy Subcommittee: Meeting Summary - March 18, 2010; Draft CAC Policy Guide (4/6/10)]*

## **6. ACTION ITEM: APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY AND MARCH 2010 MINUTES**

Due to a lack of quorum, an electronic survey was issued via e-mail to address these action items. Nineteen responses were received. A summary of the results are as follows, with detailed responses in the attachment.

- Do you approve of the February 2010 minutes as posted at [www.baltometro.orgminutes/CAC100203min.pdf](http://www.baltometro.orgminutes/CAC100203min.pdf)?  
≈ 16 Yes; 0 No; 2 Abstain; 1 No Response. 1 Comment.
- Do you approve of the March 2010 minutes as posted at [www.baltometro.org/minutes/CAC100303min.pdf](http://www.baltometro.org/minutes/CAC100303min.pdf)?  
≈ 16 Yes; 0 No; 2 Abstain; 1 No Response. 2 Comments.

*[ATTACHMENT: Results of CAC Action Items Survey for April 2010]*

## **7. MAY AGENDA, OTHER BUSINESS, AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Members who have ideas for the May meeting agenda or ideas for future meetings (speakers, topics, etc). were asked to notify the CAC Chairs or Ms. Haines Benkhedda.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:25 P.M. The next meeting of the CAC is scheduled for Wednesday, May 5, 2010 at 5:30 P.M.

**PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT SUBCOMMITTEE**

March 24, 2010

**ATTENDEES:**

- Ed Cohen – Transit Riders Action Council of Metropolitan Baltimore
- Sandy Conner – Sojourner Douglass College - Workforce Transportation & Referral Center
- Monica Haines Benkhedda – Baltimore Metropolitan Council
- Dwayne Hess – A New Faith Community Center
- Kevin Racine – Citizen, Harford County
- Alan Sweatman – Friends of Harford

**ACTION ITEMS:****Glossary of Acronyms and Transportation Planning Terms**

Members reviewed the revised list of acronyms and planning terms and recommended that one additional term (BRAC) be added to both the Quick List and the list of definitions. The group also chose the shorter of the two draft definitions for the Long-Range Transportation Plan.

Ms. Haines Benkhedda agreed to update the document with these changes and then share with the full CAC for their review prior to the April meeting. Members will be asked to submit any comments by April 5, 2010. Once the full CAC finalizes, the document will be formatted into booklet format that can be shared at meetings or events and distributed as needed.

>> *Action to date:* Document updated; Sent to CAC via email on 3/24 with request for comments by 4/5.

**Subcommittee Meeting date, time and location**

Mr. Alan Sweatman proposed that the group consider meeting prior to the monthly CAC meeting. This would save time and gas for those members who don't live or work in the city. The subcommittee agreed to change the meeting schedule to 4 pm on the 1<sup>st</sup> Wednesday of the month at BMC offices.

>> *Action to date:* All committee members were notified via e-mail on 3/25/10 about the new meeting schedule; Room at BMC offices reserved on 3/25/10.

**DISCUSSION:****Vision**

Mr. Morgan Barlow of Portfolio Associates, Inc. joined the meeting via conference call to review and discuss the branding scheme for the Vision and Long-range Transportation Plan. In addition, Mr. Barlow talked with the group about potential outreach activities and ways the CAC could be involved. A summary is below.

*Branding Scheme*

Members reviewed 7 draft concepts for branding scheme for both the Vision and the LRTP. Members rated the 3 that they liked the most and then shared their thoughts about the top voted concepts (G and M), as well as any thoughts on the other concepts that received fewer votes.

### *Outreach Activities and CAC involvement*

Ms. Haines Benkhedda and Mr. Barlow shared some possible outreach activities for the Vision process. It was noted that the BRTB is currently looking at mid-April for an initial series of public workshops on what people value in the region, as well as an online survey (with print copies available for those who require). Members discussed this and also offered some suggestions (below):

- Concerned that meetings in mid-April is too soon – can you push back some?
- How will you contact elected officials about these meetings and this process? It is important to involve them early in the process
- Place notifications about the process and meetings on the inside of MTA transit vehicles and local buses.
- Create videos of meetings or about the process (keeping it simple, not too technical) that can be distributed at local libraries, soup kitchens to reach low-income residents.
- Post flyers at local markets
- Place ads with meeting dates, times, and how to RSVP in local papers as soon as possible.
- Involve schools and students
- Visit community recreation centers
- What is the draw for people to come to these meetings?
- Why should I care about 2035/2060? How can I when I am just trying to make it through 2010!
- PSA's
- Mailing to every home in target area?
- Live video of meetings where individuals can phone in a comment?
- Have table of activities for kids at meetings – perhaps they can color/draw some posters? Have candy or other small giveaways for kids who participate.

Members asked how they can be of best assistance in this process. Suggestions were as follows:

- Personal invitation
  - Forward a letter or e-mail to someone you know and personally invite them to attend a workshop or take the survey
  - Make phone calls (10?) to people in your area to personally ask them to attend a meeting.
- Provide advice and feedback
- Attend the public workshops (and bring a friend!)

Members agreed that these are good recommendations to propose to the full CAC on April 7<sup>th</sup>.

>> *Action Needed: Present recommendations to full CAC on April 7, 2010.*

### *Recommendations on locations for public meetings*

The group brainstormed a few things that should be considered when choosing locations for Vision workshops:

- Accessible parking – must have parking available, free parking is even better.
- Transit access – make sure that transit is available to the site

Members also discussed meeting times for Harford and Carroll counties, since both have limited transit access. Discussion included: Is an evening time the best for these if no transit service? Also if people in these areas are commuting far distances, will they have the energy to go to a weekday evening meeting? How can we include transit dependent if no transit access?

The group then identified some locations that might work for public workshops:

- AA county – Glen Burnie is a good place to have meetings
  - AA community college (Crane and Annapolis Road)
  - Arnold Campus of AACC
- Baltimore City
  - Coppin State location is good with Mondawmin subway, buses, near downtown.
- Baltimore County – Towson is central – neither West nor East side. Most transit options.
  - Towson State – lots of parking, but is it close to building?
  - Goucher College – not as much parking or transit?
- Harford County – Aberdeen is much better location than Bel Air.
  - High school (some zoning meetings have occurred at high schools).
- Howard County – Mall in Columbia is central transit hub
  - Howard Community College

Ms. Haines Benkhedda agreed to share this feedback with the staff that are setting up meeting dates/times and locations.

>> *Actions to date: Shared input with BMC staff on 3/25/10.*

**NEXT MEETINGS** are Wednesday, April 7, 2010 (tentative) and Wednesday, May 5, 2010 (1<sup>st</sup> Wednesday of every month) at 4:00 p.m. at the Baltimore Metropolitan Council (2700 Lighthouse Point East, Suite 310, Baltimore, MD 21224).

**DRAFT**

**QUICKLIST**

**BMC** – Baltimore Metropolitan Council

**BPAG** – Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Group

**BRAC** – Base Realignment and Closure

**BRTB** – Baltimore Regional Transportation Board

**CAC** – Citizens Advisory Committee

**CFG or “Co-op Forecasting”** – Cooperative Forecasting Group

**EPA** – Environmental Protection Agency

**ICG** – Interagency Consultation Group

**LRTP** – Long-range Transportation Plan

**MDE** – Maryland Department of the Environment

**MDOT** – Maryland Department of Transportation

**MDP** – Maryland Department of Planning

**MPO** – Metropolitan Planning Organization

**MTA** – Maryland Transit Administration

**SHA** – State Highway Administration

**TC or Tech Committee** – Technical Committee

**TIP** – Transportation Improvement Program

**UPWP** – Unified Planning Work Program

---

**DRAFT****RECOMMENDED ADDITIONS**

**Baltimore Metropolitan Council (BMC)** is the organization of the Baltimore region's elected executives, representing Baltimore City and Anne Arundel, Baltimore, Carroll, Harford and Howard counties. The goal of the organization is to improve the quality of life and economic vitality in the Baltimore region. Areas of activity include: Air and Water Quality Programs, Building Permits Data System, Computer Mapping Applications; Cooperative Purchasing; Economic and Demographic Research; Emergency Preparedness and Public Safety; Rideshare Coordination; and Transportation Planning. BMC provides technical and staff support to the BRTB.

**Baltimore Regional Transportation Board (BRTB)** is the federally recognized Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for transportation planning in the Baltimore region. As an MPO, the BRTB is directly responsible for making sure that any money spent on existing and future transportation projects and programs is based on a continuing, cooperative and comprehensive (3-C) planning process. All transportation projects and programs that receive federal funding in our region go through this planning process. Members of the BMC Board serve on the BRTB. In addition, the Mayor of Annapolis and representatives of the Maryland Departments of Transportation, the Environment and Planning also serve on the BRTB.

**BRTB Empowered Representative** – Each member of the BRTB designates an individual empowered with the rights and responsibilities of BRTB membership to act in place of the BRTB member.

**Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC)** – is the congressionally authorized process the Department of Defense has previously used to reorganize its base structure to more efficiently and effectively support our forces, increase operational readiness and facilitate new ways of doing business. The most recent iteration of base realignment was enacted as federal law in November 2005 as is known as BRAC 2005. Source: [www.brac.maryland.gov](http://www.brac.maryland.gov)

**Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Group (BPAG)** is a subcommittee of the BRTB that focuses on tasks such as (1) Developing and implementing the regional bicycle and pedestrian plan; (2) Promoting biking and walking in the region through events like Bike-to-Work Day and Safe Routes to Schools.

**Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)** is an advisory body to the BRTB made up of citizens and representatives of community organizations and industry professionals. Members are appointed by the Baltimore Regional Transportation Board to (1) Provide independent, region-oriented citizen advice on issues related to key regional transportation planning activities; (2) Promote public awareness and participation in the regional transportation planning process; and (3) Promote equity in the regional transportation planning process.

**Cooperative Forecasting Group (CFG)** is a subcommittee of the Baltimore Regional Transportation Board. The mission of the CFG is to collaboratively develop socio-economic projections (population, households, employment, and labor force) for the Baltimore region in conjunction with jurisdictions in the Washington area. The BRTB adopts these projections each year for use in travel demand modeling and testing air quality conformity.

**Interagency Consultation Group (ICG)** is a subcommittee of the Baltimore Regional Transportation Board that focuses on coordination of the transportation air quality conformity process. This group works to promote coordination among the transportation and air quality agencies for the region.

**Land Use** – The Environmental Protection Agency defines land use planning as the degree to which land reflects human activities (like agriculture, residential and industrial uses) and describes land use and management practices by people.

**Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)** is the statement of the ways the region plans to invest in the transportation system over the next twenty years.

**Mobility** – The ability to move or be moved from place to place. (Source: *FHWA Planning Glossary*)

**Sustainability** – The traditional definition of sustainability calls for policies and strategies that meet society's present needs without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. (Source: *US EPA*)

**Technical Committee (TC)** reviews and evaluates all transportation plans and programs from a technical standpoint. Composed of transportation planners and engineers appointed by local governments, the Technical Committee makes recommendations

**DRAFT**

to the Baltimore Regional Transportation Board based on technical sufficiency, accuracy and completeness of all plans and programs. This input enables the Board to have a technical viewpoint prior to making decisions.

**Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)** is a work program and budget that lists the transportation studies and tasks to be performed by Baltimore Metropolitan Council staff or one of the local jurisdiction members. The work program, which is developed annually, begins in July of a given year and ends the following June.

**Public Transportation** – Transportation by bus, rail, or other conveyance, either publicly or privately owned, which provides to the public general or special service on a regular and continuing basis. Also known as "mass transportation", "mass transit" and "transit." (*Source for transit definitions: FHWA Planning Glossary*)

**Bus** – Large motor vehicle used to carry more than 10 passengers, including school buses, intercity buses, and transit buses.

**Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)** – Bus service that is, at a minimum, faster than traditional local bus service and, at a maximum, includes dedicated lanes just for BRT operations. To reduce travel time and to provide faster service, BRT may incorporate ITS technologies that provide off vehicle payment, rapid boarding, and/or route divergences.

**Circulator Bus** – A bus serving an area confined to a specific locale, such as a downtown area or suburban neighborhood with connections to major traffic corridors.

**Commercial Bus** – Any bus used to carry passengers at rates specified in tariffs; charges may be computed per passenger (as in regular route service) or per vehicle (as in charter service).

**Commuter Rail** – Urban passenger train service for short-distance travel between a central city and adjacent suburb. Does not include rapid rail transit or light rail service.

**Demand Responsive Vehicle** – A nonfixed-route, nonfixed-schedule vehicle that operates in response to calls from passengers or their agents to the transit operator or dispatcher.

**Feeder Bus** – A bus service that picks up and delivers passengers to a rail rapid transit station or express bus stop or terminal.

**Heavy Rail** – An electric railway with the capacity to transport a heavy volume of passenger traffic and characterized by exclusive rights-of-way, multicar trains, high speed, rapid acceleration, sophisticated signaling, and high-platform loading. Also known as: Subway, Elevated (railway), or Metropolitan railway (metro).

**Light Rail** – A streetcar-type vehicle operated on city streets, semi-exclusive rights-of-way, or exclusive rights-of-way. Service may be provided by step-entry vehicles or by level boarding.

**Rapid Transit** – Rail or motorbus transit service operating completely separate from all modes of transportation on an exclusive right-of-way.

For additional transportation terms and acronyms, please visit <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/glossary>

**RECOMMENDED DELETION****TEA-21 – Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century**

Passed by Congress in May 1998, this federal transportation legislation retains and expands many of the programs created in 1991 under the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA). Reauthorizes federal surface transportation programs for six years (1998–2003) and significantly increases overall funding for transportation.

---

**DRAFT**

## Glossary of Transportation Planning Acronyms and Terms

The transportation arena has a language all its own. Navigating your way through the complex web of transportation terminology can be a challenge. So, we've put together this list of acronyms and commonly used words in transportation planning.

[A](#) [B](#) [C](#) [D](#) [E](#) [F](#) [G](#) [H](#) [I](#) [J](#) [K](#) [L](#) [M](#) [N](#) [O](#) [P](#) [Q](#) [R](#) [S](#) [T](#) [U](#) [V](#) [W](#) [X](#) [Y](#) [Z](#)

### Accessibility

The extent to which facilities are barrier free and useable by persons with disabilities, including wheelchair users. Examples of facilities are sidewalks, buses, trains, etc.

### Activity center

Locations within urban areas where there are a concentration of business, commercial and other uses that draw a large number of people from the region on a daily basis.

### ADA – Americans With Disabilities Act

Federal civil rights legislation for disabled persons passed in 1990; calls on public transit systems to make their services more fully accessible as well as to underwrite a parallel network of paratransit service.

### Alternative Fuel Vehicles

Low-polluting fuels which are used to propel a vehicle instead of high-sulfur diesel or gasoline. Examples include methanol, ethanol, propane or compressed natural gas (CNG), liquid natural gas (LNG), low-sulfur or "clean" diesel and electricity.

### Annual Element

Transportation projects, included in the TIP, that are proposed for implementation in the current year. The annual element is submitted to the U.S. Department of Transportation (U.S. DOT) as part of the required planning process.

### Automatic Vehicle Location (AVL)

A system that senses, at intervals, the location of vehicles such as buses or subways. These vehicles are equipped with special electronic equipment that communicates a signal back to a central control facility.

### BRT – Bus Rapid Transit

Bus service that is, at a minimum, faster than traditional local bus service and, at a maximum, includes dedicated lanes just for BRT operations. To reduce travel time and to provide faster service, BRT may incorporate ITS technologies that provide off vehicle payment, rapid boarding, and/or route divergences.

### BRTP– Baltimore Regional Transportation Plan

A master plan to guide the region's transportation investments for a 20-year period. Updated every three years, it is based on projections of growth in population and jobs and the ensuing travel demand. Required by federal law, it includes programs to better maintain, operate and expand transportation. [>> Learn about the most recent BRTP: \*Transportation Outlook 2035\*](#)

### Capital Funds

Moneys to cover one-time costs for construction of new projects — such as roads, bridges, bicycle/pedestrian paths, transit lines and transit facilities — to expand the capacity of the transportation system, or to cover the purchase of buses and rail cars.

### CBD – Central Business District

The downtown retail trade and commercial area of a city or an area of very high land valuation, traffic flow, and concentration

**DRAFT**

of retail business offices, theaters, hotels and services.

**Census Data**

Information used by transportation planners to make projections about future Bay Area travel patterns, housing needs and the like. Required by the U.S. Constitution, the U.S. Census is a complete listing of the population conducted every 10 years by the U.S. Census Bureau (the last one was completed in 2000).

**CMAQ – Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program**

A federal source of funding for projects and activities that reduce congestion and improve air quality, both in regions not yet attaining federal air quality standards and those engaged in efforts to preserve their attainment status.

**Conformity**

A process in which transportation plans and spending programs are reviewed to ensure they are consistent with federal clean air requirements; transportation projects collectively must not worsen air quality.

**Environmental Justice**

This term stems from a Presidential Executive Order to promote equity for disadvantaged communities and promote the inclusion of racial and ethnic populations and low-income communities in decision-making. Local and regional transportation agencies must ensure that services and benefits, as well as burdens, are fairly distributed to avoid discrimination.

**Equity Analysis**

Consistent with federal requirements for environmental justice, the BRTB conducts an equity analysis covering the 20-year regional transportation plan to determine how the benefits and burdens of the plan’s investment strategy affect minority and low-income communities.

**FHWA – Federal Highway Administration**

U.S. Department of Transportation agency responsible for administering the federal highway aid program to individual states, and helping to plan, develop and coordinate construction of federally funded highway projects. FHWA also governs the safety of hazardous cargo on the nation’s highways.

**Financial Constraint**

A federal requirement that long-range transportation plans include only projects that have a reasonable expectation of being funded, based upon anticipated revenues. In other words, long-range transportation plans cannot be pie-in-the-sky wish lists of projects. They must reflect realistic assumptions about revenues that will likely be available during the 25 years covered in the plan.

**Flexible Funding**

Unlike funding that flows only to highways or only to transit by a rigid formula, this is money that can be invested in a range of transportation projects. Examples of flexible funding categories include the Surface Transportation Program (STP) and the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) program.

**FTA – Federal Transit Administration**

U.S. Department of Transportation agency that provides financial and planning assistance to help plan, build and operate rail, bus and paratransit systems. The agency also assists in the development of local and regional traffic reduction programs.

**FY – Fiscal Year**

An annual schedule for keeping financial records and for budgeting transportation funds. Maryland’s fiscal year runs from July 1 through June 30, while the federal fiscal year runs from Oct. 1 through Sept. 30.

---

**DRAFT****GIS – Geographic Information System**

A system of computer hardware, software and data for collecting, storing, analyzing and issuing information about areas of the earth. GIS can display attributes and analyze results electronically in a map form. For example, BMC uses GIS to create maps that visually show things like congestion, minority populations in relation to transportation projects, growth patterns, etc.

**GPS – Global Positioning System**

A system that uses satellite signals to track the location or position of vehicles or vessels on earth. In the Baltimore region, BMC uses GPS in cars to track and monitor traffic congestion on area highways.

**Intermodal**

The term “mode” is used to refer to a means of transportation, such as automobile, bus, train, ship, bicycle and walking. Intermodal refers specifically to the connections between modes.

**ITS – Intelligent Transportation Systems**

A broad range of diverse technologies such as information processing, communications, control, and electronics which can help transportation systems in many ways, including congestion management.

**LOS – Level of Service**

A report card that rates traffic flow from A (excellent) through F (flunks), and compares actual or projected traffic volume with the maximum capacity of the intersection or road in question.

**MPO – Metropolitan Planning Organization**

A federally required planning body responsible for the transportation planning and project selection in its region; the governor designates an MPO in every urbanized area with a population of over 50,000. The BRTB is the Baltimore region’s designated MPO.

**Maglev**

Magnetic levitation: A rail transportation system with exclusive right-of-way which is propelled along a fixed guideway system by the use of magnets on the rails and under the rail cars. The Baltimore and Washington regions are studying the possible use of Maglev between the two metropolitan areas. See <http://www.bwmaglev.com/> for more information.

**Mixed Use**

In land-use and transportation planning, generally refers to different compatible land uses located within a single structure or in close proximity to each other. An example is buildings that host stores on the bottom level and offices or residences above it.

**Mode**

The types of transportation available for use, such as rail, bus, personal vehicle or bicycle. Also includes air and water travel.

**Nonattainment Area**

Any geographic region of the United States that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has designated as not attaining the federal air quality standards for one or more air pollutants, such as ozone and carbon monoxide.

**Ozone**

Ground-level ozone is an air pollutant that causes human health problems, and damages crops and other vegetation. It is a key ingredient of urban smog. The Baltimore region is a nonattainment area for Ozone. [Learn more and find out how to protect yourself...](#)

---

**DRAFT****Particulate Matter**

Also known as particle pollution or PM, is a complex mixture of extremely small particles and liquid droplets found in the air. By themselves, these particles and droplets are invisible to the naked eye. But together, they can appear as clouds or a fog-like haze. PM is a serious concern. Because of their small size, they can get into sensitive areas of the lung and heart, causing major health problems. [Learn more and find out how to protect yourself...](#)

**Paratransit**

Door-to-door bus, van and taxi services used to transport elderly and disabled riders. Paratransit is sometimes referred to as dial-a-ride service, since trips are made according to demand instead of along a fixed route or according to a fixed schedule.

**Pedestrian-Oriented Development**

Development that is designed with an emphasis primarily on the street sidewalk and on pedestrian access to the site and building(s), rather than emphasizing personal-vehicle access and parking. Buildings generally are placed close to the street and the main entrance is oriented to the street's sidewalk. Although parking areas may be provided, they are generally limited in size and are located at the side or rear of the buildings. This type of development also is characterized by the mix of uses within walking distance of one another, allowing people to move easily among many destinations.

**Performance Measures**

Indicators of how well the transportation system or specific transportation projects will improve transportation conditions.

**Ridesharing**

A form of public transportation, other than public transit, in which more than one person shares the use of the vehicle, such as a van or car, to make a trip. Also known as "carpooling," "buspooling" or "vanpooling." [Learn more about ridesharing in the Baltimore region...](#)

**SAFETEA-LU – Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users**

Signed into law on August 10, 2005, this \$286.4 billion federal transportation bill reauthorizes federal surface transportation programs for six years (2003–2009) and significantly increases overall funding for transportation. It expanded upon many of the programs created in the 1992 Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA) and the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21). This bill is expired as of September 30, 2009. Congress is expected to begin working on a replacement bill for the next six-year period during its 2009 session.

**STP – Surface Transportation Program**

One of the key funding programs in TEA-21. STP moneys are "flexible," meaning they can be spent on mass transit, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, as well as on roads and highways.

**TCM – Transportation Control Measure**

A strategy to reduce driving or smooth traffic flows in order to cut auto emissions and resulting air pollution. Examples of TCMs include carpool lanes, new or increased transit service, and ridesharing services to get people into carpools and vanpools.

**Telecommuting/Teleworking**

Refers to employees who work at an alternative site, such as at home, usually one or more days per month, thereby reducing their commutes. [Learn more...](#)

**Title VI**

Refers to Title VI of the Federal Civil Rights Act of 1964, and requires that transportation planning and programming be nondiscriminatory on the basis of race, color and national origin. Integral to Title VI is the concept of environmental justice.

---

**DRAFT****TIP – Transportation Improvement Program**

A short-term (covering three years) program of transportation projects that will be funded with all federal funds expected to flow to the region; the projects contained in the TIP are drawn from, and consistent with, the long-range transportation plan.

**TOD – Transit Oriented Development**

A type of development that links land use and transit facilities to support the transit system and help reduce sprawl, traffic congestion and air pollution. It includes housing, along with complementary public uses (jobs, retail and services), located at a strategic point along a regional transit system, such as a rail hub.

**Traffic Count**

A record of the number of vehicles, people aboard vehicles or both that pass a given checkpoint during a given time period.

**TDM – Transportation Demand Management**

Programs designed to reduce demand by automobiles on the transportation system. Examples are the promotion and use of transit, alternative work hours, ridesharing, etc. Land-use planning also plays a role in providing alternate travel options.

**Travel Demand Model**

Used by transportation planners for simulating current travel conditions and for forecasting future travel patterns and conditions. Models help planners and policy-makers analyze the effectiveness and efficiency of alternative transportation investments in terms of mobility, accessibility, and environmental and equity impacts.

**U.S. DOT – United States Department of Transportation**

The federal cabinet-level agency with responsibility for highways, public transportation, aviation and ports; it is headed by the Secretary of Transportation. The DOT includes the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration, among others.

**Value Pricing**

The concept of assessing higher prices for using certain transportation facilities during the most congested times of the day, in the same way that airlines offer off-peak discounts and hotel rooms cost more during prime tourist seasons. Also known as congestion pricing and peak-period pricing, examples of this concept include higher bridge tolls during peak periods or charging single-occupant vehicles that want to use carpool lanes.

**VMT – Vehicle Miles Traveled**

One vehicle (whether a car carrying one passenger or a bus carrying 30 people) traveling one mile constitutes a vehicle mile. This number is used in transportation models because reducing VMT can help ease traffic congestion and improve air quality.

**Walkable**

Refers to a single route, or a system of routes, between points that is relatively short, barrier-free, interesting, safe, well-lit and comfortable, inviting pedestrian travel. Walkable Communities are areas that incorporate these kinds of principles (See also pedestrian-oriented development).

**Questions?**

If you have any comments about this glossary or just can't find the word you are looking for, please contact Monica Haines Benkhedda at 410-732-0500 x1047 or [mhaines@baltometro.org](mailto:mhaines@baltometro.org).

---

**From:** michele rosenberg [michel.rosenberg@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, April 02, 2010 11:06 AM  
**To:** Monica Haines Benkhedda  
**Cc:** Alan Sweatman; Albert Henry; Art Cohen; Brenda Latney-Lee; Calvin Peete Jr.; Calvin Peete Jr.; Colin Furneaux; Daveeda White; David DiQuinzio; David Wright; Diana Mitchell; Dwayne Hess; Earl Matthews; Edward Cohen; Irene Poulsen; James Smolinski; James Smolinski; Jennifer Holz; John Murphy (AARP - MD); Joseph T. "Jody" Landers; Jud Malone; Kevin Racine; Mary Yates; Mary Yates; Michael Benelli; Raine Mullan; Rolla Chng; Sandra Conner; Saul Wilson; Sharonlee Vogel; Steve Lauria; Teresa Romiti; William L. Yerman; Regina Aris  
**Subject:** Re: [CAC] For your review: Revised Glossary of Planning Terms and Acronyms  
**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Red

What an excellent job the committee has done with this document which many people will truly appreciate.

Here are my suggestions for changes or additions - most which are truly minor.

Definitions should be in complete alphabetical order. The last definition for public transportation is out of alphabetical order.

City of Annapolis should be included in first definition which is given in same way as it is included in definition for BTRB.

I think ICE-TEA definition should remain. Sometimes people might be reading an older document where this is mentioned.

MAGLEV - Are we still doing active research on this mode of transportation? If not, include definition but leave out this part of it.

Definition for MOBILITY SERVICES. Service which is provided in Baltimore City. Include with other definitions.

Hope many of you read this document seriously and make any changes which you think are necessary now instead of waiting for the general meeting.

Michele Rosenberg

# Can You Imagine?



# 2060

## Help the Baltimore Regional Transportation Board develop a Transportation Vision for the region.

Your help on the Transportation Vision will guide our 20-year transportation plan.

This is your chance to contribute your ideas and make this region, and our communities, great places to live and work.

All workshops will start at 6 PM and finish at 8 PM. Registration begins at 5:30 PM.

\*(Howard Community College workshop in Columbia begins at 7 PM.)

For more information please call 410-732-0500.

You can also take an online survey at [www.Baltometro.org](http://www.Baltometro.org).



**You are invited to take part in any of the following workshops to share your vision of the future of transportation.**

### Monday, 4/26

Pascal Senior Center  
125 Dorsey Road  
Glen Burnie, MD

### Wednesday, 4/28

Westminster Senior Center  
125 Stoner Avenue  
Westminster, MD

### Thursday, 4/29

Planning Board Meeting Room  
105 West Chesapeake Avenue  
Towson, MD

### Monday, 5/3

Planning Board Room  
417 E. Fayette Street  
8th Floor  
Baltimore City, MD

### Tuesday, 5/4

\*Howard Community College  
Duncan Hall - Kittleman Room  
10901 Little Patuxent Parkway  
Columbia, MD

### Tuesday, 5/11

County Administrative Building  
2nd Floor, Conference Room  
220 South Main Street  
Bel Air, MD

## MEMBERSHIP SUBCOMMITTEE

March 17, 2010

### MEMBERS:

- Albert Henry - Citizen - Harford County
- Monica Haines Benkhedda – Baltimore Metropolitan Council
- Earl Matthews – Mayor’s Commission on Disabilities
- Michele Rosenberg – Citizen, Baltimore City

### GUESTS:

- Ted Rosenberg – Citizen, Baltimore City

### ACTION ITEMS:

#### Recommendations for new members

The group has the recommends the following people fill open slots on the CAC:

- Stuart Stainman (Position runs through Dec. 2012, filling Christopher Fletez-Brant’s slot)
- Mary Shuey (Position runs through Dec. 2011, filling Sean Egan’s slot)

#### Follow up on members who are non-attending

- Diana Mitchell – Because Ms. Mitchell has not attended any meetings, nor has she responded to any emails or phone calls, the group recommends that she be removed from service and her slot filled by Albert Pietrolungo (term ending December 2012).

The group recommends that these members be contacted to determine the reason for their absences and see if they have the time to attend in the future or if they represent an organization, is there an alternate:

- Rolla Chng – BMC will contact and ask for a response by 4/5/10.
- William Yerman/Jody Landers (GBBR) – BMC will contact and ask for a response by 4/5/10.
- Calvin Peete – Michele Rosenberg will follow-up to determine if Mr. Peete is moving out of state, as was reported at the last CAC meeting.

#### >> *Actions to date:*

- Ms. Chng reported that she has conflicts this semester with her children’s school activities. She anticipates that she should be able to participate in the summer months (June, July, August), as well as attend subcommittee mtgs. She did not know her children’s fall schedule at this point however.
- Ms. Regina Aris has reached out to GBBR regarding their participation; however they have not been able to connect at this time.
- Mr. Calvin Peete has indeed moved out of state; however he reported that CPHA is very interested in continuing their participation on the CAC. They are currently in the process of confirming his replacement(s). Mr. Peete agreed to follow up with CPHA to verify who his replacement(s) will be.

#### Additional open slot to be filled

- Brian Holmes – Mr. Holmes was injured at the end of 2009 and is unable to continue on the CAC at this time. The Membership subcommittee does not, however, have a recommendation at this time for filling this vacancy due to limited number of active applications on file.

**Requested leave of absence**

- AARP Maryland (Jen Holz/John Murphy) – Since there are not enough applications to fill current vacancies, the subcommittee recommends that Ms. Holz be contacted to see if a replacement can be found by Mid-April. The group will then review/discuss any progress at their April subcommittee meeting.

>> *Action to date:* Ms. Holz reports that she has identified a possible candidate and has sent her information to verify her interest and availability to attend CAC meetings. She will confirm by 4/20.

**Policy and procedure for leave of absences**

The group discussed a policy and procedure for leave of absences and recommends the following:

- Allow for 3 months leave; Consider longer term if there are extenuating circumstances.
- Encourage members from organizations to identify a volunteer who can attend in their absence. Members who do not represent an organization will not be allowed to have an alternate attend in their place.
- Requests must be submitted in writing (form to be developed)
- Requests shall be reviewed by Membership, with recommendations brought to the full CAC/BRTB.

>> *Action needed:* Ms. Haines Benkhedda will draft form for subcommittee review in April.

**Applications on file**

Ms. Haines Benkhedda agreed to contact the following individuals who submitted applications some months ago to determine if they are still interested and available: Matthew Joseph Riesner; Joshua Thaniel, and Estelle Kent-Harris.

>> *Action to date:* Ms. Haines Benkhedda contacted via e-mail on 4/6/10.

**DISCUSSION:****Outreach for new members**

The group brainstormed ideas for outreach for new members. Typically outreach is done in the summer via press release, e-newsletters, postings online (BMC site, Facebook/Twitter, Craigslist, Volunteer Centers, etc), and when time permits, sent to area newspapers for posting.

This year, the group recommends sending out an invitation letter and application to a targeted group of individuals (to be determined, based on current CAC demographics and opportunities for increasing a balanced cross-section of representatives). In addition, the group would like to have announcements (free) placed in local newspapers and through community organization newsletters/web sites.

**Update to CAC Application**

Recommend that a sentence be added to the CAC application stating that because the CAC provides independent citizen advice to the BRTB, it is requested that employees of BRTB member jurisdictions refrain from applying.

>> *Action to date:* BMC drafted the following statement to include on application: “The CAC provides independent, region-oriented citizen advice to the BRTB. As such, the BRTB requests that employees of BRTB member agencies refrain from applying.”

**NEXT MEETING:** Wednesday, April 21 at 5 pm at Panera Bread.

**POLICY AND LEGISLATION SUBCOMMITTEE**

March 18, 2010

**ATTENDEES:**

- Ed Cohen – Transit Riders Action Council of Metropolitan Baltimore
- David DiQuinzio – Annapolis Planning Commission
- Monica Haines Benkhedda – Baltimore Metropolitan Council
- Steve Lauria – Citizen - Baltimore City
- Jud Malone – Central Maryland Regional Transit
- David Wright – Citizen - Baltimore City

**DISCUSSION:****Draft Policy Guide**

The group discussed the draft Policy Guide document prepared by Steve Lauria and David DiQuinzio. The group agreed that the document is generally moving in the right direction and that once its various blanks are filled in and content refined, it will prove useful. The group set a target of March 31 for comments and suggestions so that the document can be ready for presentation at the full CAC meeting on April 7.

**FTA Changes to New Start Transit Project Evaluation Criteria**

The group then discussed a related topic – the major changes to “New Start” transit project evaluation criteria announced by US DOT in January 2010. These changes reduce the weight assigned to cost effectiveness, as measured by average trip time reduction, in the formula used to arrive at the overall scoring of a given project application. At the same time, the new formula increases the weight assigned to other factors long deemed important to transit advocates such as land use coordination, contribution to modal choice, preservation/expansion of mobility options to non-drivers and mixed-use development.

The group then used the Red Line as an example to explore how these changes would apply to real-life projects. In developing the Red Line, emphasis on the narrowly-defined cost-effectiveness criteria then in use at the time led the MTA to take a series of design decisions, including routing, station sites, vehicle designs, track configuration, surface/overhead/underground running, etc., that would likely have been different under these new criteria. For example, street running through Fells Point and Canton on Aliceanna and Boston Streets apparently met the cost-effectiveness requirement, but it causes the line to miss areas with higher proportions of transit-dependent residents and connect them with major employment centers. See the attachment for additional info regarding the FTA New Start funding criteria changes.

**TIP Evaluation**

Following up on an item from last month, the group reiterated its desire to not only see BMC’s project scoring sheet template, but the completed sheets for each project as well.

**NEXT MEETING:** Thursday, April 22<sup>nd</sup> at 12 noon at Arcos Restaurant (129 South Broadway, Baltimore)



U.S. Department  
Of Transportation  
**Federal Transit  
Administration**

Headquarters

**January 13, 2010**

1200 New Jersey Avenue S.E.  
Washington DC 20590

Today, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) announced a change to the process for recommending New Starts and Small Starts projects for discretionary Federal funding assistance and described additional steps FTA would be taking to further improve the process for rating and evaluating such projects.

Please see:

- Press Release [http://www.fta.dot.gov/news/news\\_events\\_11036.html](http://www.fta.dot.gov/news/news_events_11036.html)

Below are questions and answers about this change in process. If you have further questions, please contact Susan Borinsky or Beth Day in the FTA Office of Planning and Environment at 202-366-4033.

## **QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

**Q: How will FTA now determine which projects to recommend in the annual President's budget for Full Funding Grant Agreements (FFGAs) and Project Construction Grant Agreements (PCGAs)?**

A: The Administration will no longer target its funding recommendations only to projects that receive a Medium or better cost-effectiveness rating. Instead, FTA will rely on the statutory framework contained in Sections 5309(d) and (e) of Title 49, United States Code, as amended. Thus, in order to be eligible for a funding recommendation, a project must receive an overall rating of at least Medium and be expected to be ready for an FFGA or PCGA in the fiscal year for which the President's Budget is being developed. To receive an overall project rating of Medium or better, a project's justification and the local financial commitment ratings both must be Medium or better. Cost-effectiveness will continue to be evaluated as one of the six statutory project justification criteria.

**Q: Will FTA be changing how cost-effectiveness is calculated?**

A: In the near term, the New and Small Starts evaluation and rating process, including the calculation of cost-effectiveness, will remain as it is. However, FTA will soon put out a rulemaking for public comment that will propose ideas for better measuring and quantifying the benefits provided by transit projects including environmental, economic development, congestion relief, and other social benefits.

FTA will propose a revised cost-effectiveness calculation that more fully takes into account this wider range of benefits. FTA encourages active participation by the transit industry on this rulemaking and looks forward to hearing input from our grantees and stakeholders.

**Q: When will these changes take effect?**

A: The rescission of the budget decision principle requiring at least a Medium rating on cost-effectiveness for a funding recommendation takes effect immediately. Changes to the New and Small Starts evaluation and rating process will take effect upon completion of the rulemaking process.

**Q: How will the rescission of the requirement for at least a Medium cost-effectiveness rating for a funding recommendation affect projects already in the New/Small Starts pipeline?**

A: Most of the projects currently in the New Starts pipeline have a cost-effectiveness rating of Medium or better. The few that do not could be affected favorably by this change, as long as an overall project rating of at least Medium is maintained. The change also benefits those projects close to the threshold between a Medium and Medium-low cost-effectiveness rating since projects in this situation in the past sometimes have had to select sub-optimal design options to remain at a Medium rating for cost-effectiveness.

**Q: How does this affect FTA's New and Small Starts approval process for entry into preliminary engineering, final design, or project development?**

A: Previously, FTA did not prohibit new projects from entering into New Starts preliminary engineering or Small Starts project development if they had a cost-effectiveness rating less than Medium as long as the overall project rating was at least Medium. However, FTA did previously prohibit New Starts projects from moving into final design if they had a cost-effectiveness rating of less than Medium. With this new change, all projects will be allowed to advance through the various phases of project development as long as they receive a Medium or better overall rating and have met the other readiness requirements associated with advancement into that stage.

**Q: How does this change affect National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) approvals of New and Small Starts projects?**

A: Existing FTA New and Small Starts policy guidance related to NEPA approvals does not address the previous cost effectiveness policy specifically. Instead, it

states that the environmental decision document for a New or Small Starts project with an overall project rating of less than Medium must include a statement as to how the New or Small Starts process may affect the ability of the project to advance to implementation. This does not change.

**Q: Will this alter FTA’s process for reviewing ridership estimations, calculation of transportation system user benefits, or comparison of the proposed project with a baseline alternative?**

A: In the near term, the evaluation and rating process will remain as is, including FTA’s review of ridership estimations, calculation of user benefits, and comparison with a baseline alternative. Changes in one or more of these areas may occur as a result of regulatory changes.

**Q: Does this change affect the projects considered eligible for funding under the Urban Circulator notice of funding availability?**

A: This change does not affect the Urban Circulator program in any way. Because they will receive less than \$25 million in Section 5309 Major Capital Investment funds, Urban Circulator projects will be exempt from the evaluation criteria and rating process pursuant to Section 5309(e)(1)(B). As stated in the notice of funding availability, Urban Circulator projects will be evaluated solely on the livability criteria listed in the Federal Register notice. The Federal Register notice does not mention cost-effectiveness as a criterion.

###

## CAC Policy Guide

### Baltimore Regional Transportation Board Citizens Advisory Committee Policy and Legislation Sub Committee

#### Guiding Principles

The purpose of this document is to:

1. establish a written record of principles, benchmarks and criteria to be used as reference against which transportation planning decisions may be evaluated,
2. provide support for these benchmarks and criteria by linking them to credentialed research,
3. incorporate Federal, State and regional established values and policies pertaining to transportation planning decisions,
4. facilitate consensus and confirmation by committee and community on planning initiatives and the planning process.
5. incorporate statements pertaining to transportation impacts on the conservation of natural (air, water, forest, soil, etc.) and human resources, land use, historic assets, capital assets, economics, and public participation in planning

These objectives are consistent with the UPWP as follows:

*“...development of the goals will provide the future targets for the region as identified in the vision process, list outcomes for the region, and be a cooperative effort with the public stakeholders and jurisdictions. This activity will also compare proposed plan goals with state conservation plans, the Maryland Strategic Highway Safety Plan, land use plans, climate change plans, and other relevant plans. Following efforts started as a result of current metropolitan planning regulations, this task will also compare proposed goals with natural and historic resource inventories, integrate safety into all aspects of goal development and will consider a range of special groups, including consideration of environmental justice communities, aging population, labor force, goods movement, and pedestrian and bicycle communities”<sup>1</sup>*

This table lists benchmarks and criteria along with references, supporting research, goals and actions.

Principle	Source/Reference	Support	Goals/Actions
Publicly funded transportation projects shall have transparent funding with the ‘true’, complete and comprehensive costs identified. Total cost shall be considered including construction, operations, opportunity	Consistent with recent USDOT Federal Transit Administration project funding criteria update and USDOT TIGER grant program criteria	Victoria Transport Policy Institute <i>Transportation Cost and Benefit Analysis: Techniques, Estimates and Implications</i> January 2009	Advocate for adoption of this principle as a key element of the regional visioning process

<sup>1</sup> ‘BALTIMORE REGION FY 2010 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM FOR TRANSPORTATION PLANNING’ BALTIMORE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION, BALTIMORE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION BOARD RESOLUTION #09-20, LONG-RANGE & VISION PLANNING Tasks (pp 17)

BRTB CAC L&P Subcommittee Guiding Principles - continued

Principle	Source/Reference	Support	Goals/Actions
<p>Public participation and input into the planning process shall be facilitated. The transportation planning process shall be clear and cogent for the public. Each planning product and its milestones shall be clearly defined.</p>	<p>UPWP FY 2010 PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES</p>	<p>Fundamental requirement of USDOT Surface Transportation governance since ISTEA legislation of 1991</p>	
<p>Transportation investment choices shall favor the creation of a comprehensive, integrated multi-modal system, that incorporates safety of all users (e.g. do not compromise pedestrian safety for vehicular efficiency or safety) into all levels and modes of transportation</p>		<p>Surface Transportation Policy Partnership <i>Dangerous by Design: Solving the Epidemic of Preventable Pedestrian Deaths (and Making Great Neighborhoods)</i> November 2009</p>	
<p>Planning decisions pertaining to a particular transportation mode shall not be considered in isolation rather, each shall be considered in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rail (subway, light rail, MARC, AMTRAK) for passengers and freight</li> <li>• Shipping for passengers and freight</li> <li>• Road freight</li> <li>• Commercial air, private air</li> <li>• Pedestrian, bicycle/scooter, private vehicle, taxi, bus, ferry/water taxi</li> <li>• Emergency and security public works and services, e.g. snow plow operations, tree trimming / street sweeping / roadside mowing, and roadway maintenance</li> <li>• “Complete Street design”</li> </ul>		<p>Victoria Transport Policy Institute <i>Multi-Modal Transport Planning</i> <i>Measuring Transportation: Traffic, Mobility and Accessibility</i> <i>Evaluating Accessibility for Transportation Planning</i></p> <p>US DOT, FHWA <i>Integration of Emergency and Weather Elements into Transportation Management Centers</i></p>	

BRTB CAC L&P Subcommittee Guiding Principles - continued

Principle	Source/Reference	Support	Goals/Actions
<p>Transportation planning, funding and project delivery shall facilitate broad public input on planning and local decision-making processes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interagency Consultation Group</li> <li>• Travel Analysis Advisory Group</li> <li>• Citizens Advisory Committee</li> <li>• Bicycle &amp; Pedestrian Advisory Group</li> <li>• Freight Movement Task Force</li> <li>• Cooperative Forecasting Group,</li> <li>• Others as appropriate</li> </ul>	<p>UPWP FY 2010 MDOT Maryland Freight Profile, Maryland Statewide Freight Plan</p>	<p>American Planning Association <i>Complete Streets: Best Policy and Implementation Practices</i> February 2010</p>	
<p>Transportation planning shall be integrated with the region's efforts to address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• economic challenges,</li> <li>• land development and</li> <li>• environment and quality of life issues</li> </ul>	<p>BRTB Transportation Outlook 2035 Baltimore Region FY 2010 Unified Planning Work Program For Transportation Planning' Baltimore Metropolitan Planning Organization, BRTB Resolution #09-20</p>	<p>RAND Corporation <i>Conference Proceedings: Integrating U.S. Climate, Energy &amp; Transportation Policies</i> June 2008 <i>Beyond the Gas Tax: Alternatives for a Greener World</i> February 2007 Victoria Transport Policy Institute <i>Smart Transportation Economic Stimulation: Infrastructure Investments That Support Strategic Planning Objectives Provide True Economic Development</i> April 2009</p>	

BRTB CAC L&P Subcommittee Guiding Principles - continued

Principle	Source/Reference	Support	Goals/Actions
<p>The process for developing both metropolitan and rural TIPs shall adhere to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All TIPs shall be financially constrained to the available and projected funds known at the time of adoption</li> <li>• All TIPs shall include a financial plan</li> <li>• Projects in metropolitan TIPs shall be derived from an approved metropolitan transportation plan</li> <li>• Projects in rural TIPs must be consistent with the Statewide Transportation Plan</li> <li>• Development of all TIPs shall follow approved public involvement processes</li> <li>• Projects selected in nonattainment areas must conform with the Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA) and the state implementation plan.</li> </ul>		<p>Reconnecting America  <i>Connecting Destinations Is Key To Transit Success</i>                      May 2009  <i>Growing Mixed-Income TOD</i>                      April 2009</p>	
<p>Transportation planning, funding and project delivery shall enhance personal mobility for all population groups</p>		<p>Surface Transportation Policy Partnership  <i>Aging Americans: Stranded Without Options</i>                      April 2004</p>	
<p>Transportation planning, funding and project delivery shall proceed in a manner that reinforces the effectiveness of the Metropolitan Planning Organization</p>		<p>SAFETEA-LU  <i>MPO Certification Program</i></p>	

BRTB CAC L&P Subcommittee Guiding Principles - continued

Principle	Source/Reference	Support	Goals/Actions
<p>Transportation planning, funding and project delivery shall promote orderly growth in accordance with the 3-C Planning Process which requires addressing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Homeland security,</li> <li>• Broad-based public participation efforts,</li> <li>• Long-range planning update frequency,</li> <li>• Air quality conformity timelines and</li> <li>• Inter-agency consultation and coordination.</li> </ul>		<p>Victoria Transport Policy Institute  <i>Comprehensive Transport Planning Framework: Best Practices For Evaluating All Options And Impacts</i>                      October 2008</p> <p>Transportation Research Board  <i>Visioning Versus Modeling: Analyzing Land Use-Transportation Futures of Urban Regions</i>                      March 2007</p>	
<p>Transportation planning, funding and project delivery shall promote participation of minority business enterprises in the planning process</p>		<p>Transportation Research Board  <i>Minority &amp; Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Requirements in Public Contracting</i>                      September 2009</p>	
<p>Transportation planning, funding and project delivery must comply with federal laws, regulations and policies regional transportation plans must not disproportionately affect low-income or minority communities in an adverse way</p>	<p>Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments   <a href="http://www.mwcog.org/transportation/tpb/">http://www.mwcog.org/transportation/tpb/</a></p>	<p>Surface Transportation Policy Partnership  <i>Driven to Spend: Pumping Dollars out of Our Households and Communities</i>                      September 2006</p>	
<p>Transportation planning shall include exploring opportunities to employ technology as a means of adding capacity, cost effectiveness, safety, utility and efficiency to the region's transportation network</p>		<p>SAFETEA-LU  <i>Transportation Technology Innovation and Demonstration (TTID) Program</i></p>	

## Constant Contact Survey Results

**Survey Name:** CAC Action Items (April 2010)

**Response Status:** Partial & Completed

**Filter:** None

Apr 30, 2010 11:09:08 AM

### 1. Will you distribute information about the imagine 2060 public workshops?

	Number of Response(s)	Response Ratio
Yes, I will distribute information	16	84.2%
No, I am unable to distribute information	2	10.5%
No Responses	1	5.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>100%</b>
5 Comment(s)		

### 2. Will you make 10 phone calls to personally invite individuals or organizations to attend an imagine 2060 public workshop?

	Number of Response(s)	Response Ratio
Yes, I will make 10 phone calls	9	47.3%
No, I am unable to make 10 phone calls	9	47.3%
No Responses	1	5.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>100%</b>
5 Comment(s)		

### 3. The subcommittee recommends Stuart Stainman to fill an open slot that runs through Dec. 2012.

View Stuart's application here:

[www.baltometro.org/downloadables/CAC/StuartStainmanCACapplication.pdf](http://www.baltometro.org/downloadables/CAC/StuartStainmanCACapplication.pdf). Do you agree with the recommendation to approve Mr. Stainman's application?

	Number of Response(s)	Response Ratio
Yes, I agree	18	94.7%
No, I do not agree	0	0.0%
I abstain	0	0.0%
No Responses	1	5.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>100%</b>
3 Comment(s)		

4. The subcommittee recommends Mary Shuey to fill an open slot that runs through Dec. 2011. View Mary's application here: [www.baltometro.org/downloadables/CAC/MaryShueyCACApplication.pdf](http://www.baltometro.org/downloadables/CAC/MaryShueyCACApplication.pdf). Do you agree with the recommendation to approve Ms. Shuey's application?

	Number of Response(s)	Response Ratio
Yes, I agree	15	78.9%
No, I do not agree	3	15.7%
I abstain	0	0.0%
No Responses	1	5.2%
<b>Total</b>	19	100%
2 Comment(s)		

5. CAC Member Diana Mitchell has not attended any meetings, nor has she responded to phone calls or e-mails. The subcommittee recommends that Ms. Mitchell be removed from service and her slot be filled. Do you agree with the recommendation to open this slot?

	Number of Response(s)	Response Ratio
Yes, I agree	17	89.4%
No, I disagree	1	5.2%
I abstain	0	0.0%
No Responses	1	5.2%
<b>Total</b>	19	100%
2 Comment(s)		

6. If a majority of members agree that Ms. Mitchell slot should be opened, the Membership Subcommittee recommends that her slot be filled by Mr. Albert Pietrolungo for a term ending Dec. 2012. View Albert's application here: [www.baltometro.org/downloadables/CAC/AlbertPietrolungoCACApplication.pdf](http://www.baltometro.org/downloadables/CAC/AlbertPietrolungoCACApplication.pdf). Do you agree with this recommendation to appoint Mr. Pietrolungo?

	Number of Response(s)	Response Ratio
Yes, I agree	18	94.7%
No, I disagree	0	0.0%
I abstain	0	0.0%
No Responses	1	5.2%
<b>Total</b>	19	100%
3 Comment(s)		

**7. Do you approve of the February 2010 minutes as posted at [www.baltometro.org/minutes/CAC100203min.pdf](http://www.baltometro.org/minutes/CAC100203min.pdf)?**

	<b>Number of Response(s)</b>	<b>Response Ratio</b>
Yes, I approve	16	84.2%
No, I do not approve	0	0.0%
I abstain	2	10.5%
No Responses	1	5.2%
<b>Total</b>	19	100%
1 Comment(s)		

**8. Do you approve of the March 2010 minutes as posted at <http://www.baltometro.org/minutes/CAC100303min.pdf>?**

	<b>Number of Response(s)</b>	<b>Response Ratio</b>
Yes, I approve	16	84.2%
No, I do not approve	0	0.0%
I abstain	2	10.5%
No Responses	1	5.2%
<b>Total</b>	19	100%
2 Comment(s)		

## Constant Contact Survey Results

**Survey Name:** CAC Action Items (April 2010)

**Response Status:** Partial & Completed

**Filter:** None

Apr 30, 2010 11:09:08 AM

### 1. Will you distribute information about the imagine 2060 public workshops? - Comments

#### Answer

Do you have them pre-printed? I can pick them up from you and leave them at businesses in Fells Point. Also distribute them through my family's Taekwondo Studio in Hamilton and their school (Baltimore Montessori Public Charter School)

H

I am out of the country until the end of May.

I am doing this by trying to stand up to Gerry Neily, Al Barry, and others on the Envision Baltimore website who have trouble understanding and accepting this visioning process.

Yes! Already have done so -to all sources in Howard County!

### 2. Will you make 10 phone calls to personally invite individuals or organizations to attend an imagine 2060 public workshop? - Comments

#### Answer

Do you have a list I can call?

I am out of the country until the end of May.

Yes, I'm willing to make calls-- assuming names and numbers of suggested individuals/organizations are provided. Yes?

Too busy with other things

Done so!

### 3. The subcommittee recommends Stuart Stainman to fill an open slot that runs through Dec. 2012. View Stuart's application here:

[www.baltometro.org/downloadables/CAC/StuartStainmanCACapplication.pdf](http://www.baltometro.org/downloadables/CAC/StuartStainmanCACapplication.pdf) Do you agree with the recommendation to approve Mr. Stainman's application? - Comments

#### Answer

Yay! Public Transit!

Stuart would be a strong addition to our CAC.

Like to have more members outside of Baltimore City/County

### 4. The subcommittee recommends Mary Shuey to fill an open slot that runs through Dec. 2011. View Mary's application here: [www.baltometro.org/downloadables/CAC/MaryShueyCACapplication.pdf](http://www.baltometro.org/downloadables/CAC/MaryShueyCACapplication.pdf) Do you agree with the recommendation to approve Ms. Shuey's application? - Comments

#### Answer

She seems to be considered about everything!

I have nothing against Ms. Sheuy (who I do not know). But, given the fragile state of public transit in our region, and the historical primacy of the road interests, we do not need any more representatives from the highway folks on our Board.

**5. CAC Member Diana Mitchell has not attended any meetings, nor has she responded to phone calls or e-mails. The subcommittee recommends that Ms. Mitchell be removed from service and her slot be filled. Do you agree with the recommendation to open this slot? - Comments**

**Answer**

I'm glad I picked up my phone call!

I think she should be given a chance to explain her absences with the warning that unless she tries to do this, she will be dropped from the CAC. Also, it would be helpful now to give us another look at her application.

**6. If a majority of members agree that Ms. Mitchell slot should be opened, the Membership Subcommittee recommends that her slot be filled by Mr. Albert Pietrolungo for a term ending Dec. 2012. View Albert's application here: [www.baltometro.org/downloadables/CAC/AlbertPietrolungoCACapplication.pdf](http://www.baltometro.org/downloadables/CAC/AlbertPietrolungoCACapplication.pdf). Do you agree with this recommendation to appoint Mr. Pietrolungo? - Comments**

**Answer**

Wow! A whole new set of challenges with transport for the blind.

Yes I think that is wonderful!!!!!!

Albert has always been an important participant in the CAC deliberations. I would add him back anyway instead of Ms. Shuey, regardless of what happens with Diana Mitchell.

**7. Do you approve of the February 2010 minutes as posted at [www.baltometro.org/minutes/CAC100203min.pdf](http://www.baltometro.org/minutes/CAC100203min.pdf)? - Comments**

**Answer**

That's crazy! It's almost May. Why so late??

**8. Do you approve of the March 2010 minutes as posted at <http://www.baltometro.org/minutes/CAC100303min.pdf>? - Comments**

**Answer**

cool.

I was absent, so have no basis for approval or disapproval.