

**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Wednesday, November 5, 2008

BMC Conference Room

5:30 P.M.

**ATTENDANCE**

**Members/Staff**

Michael Benelli – Anne Arundel County Disabilities Commission

Art Cohen – b'more mobile

Sandy Conner – Sojourner Douglass College – Workforce Transportation and Referral Center

Monica Haines – Baltimore Metropolitan Council

Frank Johnson – BRTB Liaison, Carroll County

Jack Knox – AARP Maryland, Executive Council

Linda Loubert – Morgan State University

Jud Malone – Citizen – Howard County

Jody McCullough – Baltimore Metropolitan Council

Gloria Moon – Friends of Harford

Barker Much – Citizen, Baltimore County

Foster Nichols – Valleys Planning Council

Albert Pietrolungo – Central Maryland Council of the Blind

Irene Poulson – Neighborhood Design Center

Judy Rose – Citizen, Harford County

Michele Rosenberg – Friends of Gwynns Falls/Leakin Park

Lindsay Thompson – Citizen, Baltimore City

Bill Yerman – Greater Baltimore Board of Realtors

**Guests**

Ted Rosenberg – Friends of Gwynns Falls/Leakin Park

CAC Chair, Ms. Lindsay Thompson, called the meeting to order at 5:35 P.M.

**1. INTRODUCTIONS**

There were no new members at this meeting.

**2. ACTION ITEM: APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 2008 MINUTES**

Approval of the October 2008 minutes was delayed until the December meeting because there was not a quorum.

**3. DISCUSSION: CAC MEETING LENGTH AND PARKING**

This discussion item was deferred to a future meeting.

#### **4. DISCUSSION: PROPOSED MTA SERVICE REDUCTIONS**

CAC members discussed the proposed service reductions to MARC and Commuter Bus recently announced by the Maryland Transit Administration. Copies of the service reductions and a listing of public hearing dates and locations were provided.

Overall, members expressed concern about the proposed reductions to transit service. Many felt that given the economy, this was the time to offer more transit services to people who may be struggling with high gas prices – not to reduce service. Others felt that this is a long-term financial problem that needs to be addressed by finding alternative sources of funding for transportation that are more stable and are not as susceptible to changes in the economy. One member also noted that the MD Climate Change Commission report calls for a dramatic reduction in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). To meet this goal, the state needs to increase transit service, not reduce it.

Members were encouraged to attend the public hearings to submit comments. Ms. Sandy Conner also encouraged members to do some research to obtain data regarding ridership and level of service in preparation for submitting comments. Other members encouraged interested individuals to contact other organizations in the region who are working on the proposed cuts (Transportation Advocates in Howard County; Transit Riders Action Council of Metropolitan Baltimore, etc) and/or staff in their local planning offices who may be reviewing the proposed cuts and may have useful data or analysis.

#### **5. SUBCOMMITTEE BRIEFINGS AND ACTION ITEMS**

The following subcommittee reports were given:

- **Membership** Ms. Linda Loubert reported that the subcommittee met on October 30, 2008 to discuss the possibility of submitting some nominations for the 2009 Chair and 2 Vice-Chairs. The committee reviewed the list of eligible members and submitted the following names for consideration:
  - Chair – Jud Malone (Howard County)
  - Vice-Chair – Colin Furneaux (Carroll County)
  - Vice-Chair – Raine Mullan (Baltimore City)

Ms. Loubert asked for additional nominations from the floor. None were given, but members were informed that there is an option to write-in additional candidates when they complete their ballot at the December meeting. Members approved the slate of nominations as proposed.

- **Public Involvement** Mr. Art Cohen led the members in a discussion about the possibility of the BRTB hosting at least some of their meetings at different locations throughout the region, as well as at different times.

The members discussed the proposal and agreed that it is a good idea that the BRTB should consider. They noted that if the BRTB members feel this is not feasible, they suggest that they record and televise the meetings. This could be done through partnerships with local community colleges or local public access cable TV stations (for example, Channel 25 in Baltimore City). Recordings could also be made available online for members of the public who have internet access. In addition, video webinars could provide interactive capabilities. CAC members recommend that the BRTB explore video recording of future meetings.

Members also discussed the possibility of hosting the CAC meetings at locations throughout the region. Mr. Jud Malone suggested that members reply to a “survey” via e-mail about whether or not they could attend meetings around the region.

Mr. Albert Pietrolingo supported this idea, but also questioned if the CAC was perhaps “putting the cart before the horse”. He suggested that before moving meetings to new locations, the CAC (and BRTB) first do a better job of advertising BRTB and CAC meetings. He felt this was key to determining if members of the public are actually interested in attending committee meetings.

Mr. Barker Much suggested that area reporters for local news media outlets should be invited to cover some of the BRTB meetings. He felt this could generate interest among members of the public or get information about meetings out to those who are unable to attend meetings.

Another member noted that all meetings of the BRTB should be held in a central location (perhaps in downtown Baltimore) that is accessible by bus and other forms of transit.

In summary, the CAC generally endorsed the recommendation from the PI committee stating “Four of the BRTB meetings per year should be rotated amongst the jurisdictions and these should be scheduled in the evening rather than in the morning.”

- Policy and Legislation – Mr. Foster Nichols reported on the subcommittee’s activities as part of the next agenda item.

## **6. DISCUSSION: UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM (UPWP)**

Mr. Nichols reported that the Policy and Legislation Subcommittee did not meet this past month, but that he did prepare a list of potential work tasks to include in the 2010 UPWP. Mr. Nichols clarified that he is not recommending any deletions of existing planning activities, but rather proposing additional work tasks. The recommendations are detailed in a handout distributed by Mr. Nichols.

Members asked about the draft schedule for developing the UPWP and wondered if there would be some additional time for the CAC to submit their ideas to the BRTB and BMC staff before the document is released for review. Specifically, they wondered if November 18<sup>th</sup> was the final deadline for submitting ideas. They also expressed interest in having a representative attend the January BRTB retreat to present to the BRTB their ideas and rationale for recommended work tasks, as well as to be available to answer any questions about the CAC’s proposals. Staff reported they would pass along their questions and comments to the staff member in charge of the UPWP for follow-up.

Members discussed the proposal and provided feedback to the Policy Committee. Mr. Nichols agreed to make some additional modifications based on the discussion and either pass along to staff or submit to the CAC at the December meeting.

Ms. Irene Poulson reported that the Public Involvement Subcommittee met during the month to talk about the UPWP and drafted a number of ideas and recommendations (see handout from PI subcommittee). After discussion, members endorsed this report and asked that BMC staff review and pass the input along to BRTB members for their consideration as they develop the FY 2010 UPWP.

***Handouts:*** *Baltimore Region FY2010 Unified Planning Work Program for Transportation Planning; PI Subcommittee Comments Regarding the FY 2010 UPWP, 5 November 2008*

***Action – Policy & Legislation Committee:*** *Refine recommendations for FY 2010 UPWP.*

## **7. REPORT ON RECENT AND UPCOMING BRTB MEETINGS**

Due to time limitations a report on the October BRTB meeting was not given. Minutes for this meeting, when available, will be posted online at: [www.baltometro.org/content/view/418/295](http://www.baltometro.org/content/view/418/295).

Members did, however discuss the BRTB meeting with elected officials scheduled for 5 p.m. on Tuesday, December 2, 2008. Members expressed an interest in attending the meeting as individuals, as well as having a presentation by the CAC chair. Ms. Thompson asked if there would be time set aside on the agenda for the CAC to present. Ms. Haines reported that the agenda for the annual meeting with elected officials is different than the BRTB meetings with empowered representatives. However, the CAC and other members of the public are allotted time at the beginning of the meeting to submit comments during the public comment opportunity. Ms. Thompson asked that members e-mail her with suggested topics to present to the BRTB. Ms. Conner suggested that the CAC could perhaps present on the work they've done over the past year and perhaps even ask for

Ms. Poulson asked if the December 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting is being advertised and if press releases have gone out about this. Ms. Haines reported none have been sent to date, but that she'd check with the Communications Director to determine if any are scheduled. Ms. Poulson strongly recommended that the meeting be advertised since this is the one chance this year that the public will have to speak to all of the elected officials in their capacity as the Baltimore Regional Transportation Board.

## **8. DECEMBER AGENDA, OTHER BUSINESS, AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Members briefly discussed potential topics for the December meeting. No announcements were made.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:40 P.M. The next meeting of the CAC is scheduled for Wednesday, December 3, 2008 at 5:30 P.M.

## PI SUBCOMMITTEE COMMENTS REGARDING THE UPWP 2009

5 November 2008

<http://www.baltometro.org/UPWP/UPWP2009.pdf>

### Public Participation and Community Outreach

pp 42 – 44

p. 42: “. . . staff will conduct an annual review of the 2007 Public Participation Plan, as well as an evaluation of current public participation activities.”

The anticipated timeframe in the Activity chart (p. 43) is winter 2008-9. As noted in the PI report of 1 October 2008, PI would like the following items included in item # 4: *Annual review of Public Involvement Plan*:

- Outcome: all items in BRTB response matrix noted that BRTB “will”
- Outcome: all items in matrix that note that BRTB “*may consider at a future time*” (is the time now?)
- Outcome: BMC staff working with BRTB to strengthen process of reviewing and responding to public comments (CAC minutes Jan 3/07)
- Use of newspapers and “primary print” since January 2006: what items have been sent to which ones, and did these actually appear?
- Evaluation on number of people reached by current outreach efforts, and how much this needs to be increased considering the total population of all jurisdictions within the Region
- Efforts to address over-reliance on the website
- Efforts to provide information to special communities (diversity)

PI looks forward to an outline of items that will be reviewed and evaluated, and that this will be completed in advance of revising the PPP.

### p. 43 -44: PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES

This section should include additional explanation for each item, for example:

“1. *Engage individuals and groups in the transportation planning process.*”

#### **Engage how, engage how many?**

PI suggests:

- Four of the BRTB meetings per year should be rotated amongst the jurisdictions and these should be scheduled in the evening rather than in the morning.
- All BRTB meetings should be videotaped for television broadcast.
- Regarding “*Opportunity to make comments and ask questions*” (item # 5 in chart p. 43), PI recommends:
  - (a) consider having information and comment forms on buses and trains
  - (b) Review of time frames for public comment (currently 15-days?)

*“2. Provide opportunities for the public to learn about regional transportation planning.”*

**What opportunities are planned?**

PI suggests:

- Each BRTB official should form a special transportation group within their jurisdiction that includes citizens. These meetings should be scheduled in the evening and well-publicized.
- Identify specific issues that the public wants to learn about and when and where workshops can be held. It is important for BRTB officials to attend these—a rare opportunity for citizens to discuss regional transportation issues directly with their elected representatives. CAC might consider adding special education items to their agenda also and act as meeting host, and will need support in publicizing such opportunities.
- Review the methods of providing public notice—opportunities should be prominent in the news, not relegated to the back of the classified pages. Confirm that newspapers are being used adequately to inform the public of regular BRTB meetings and agendas
- Regarding TIP (item # 2 of chart on p. 43), consider a public workshop regarding TIP before developing the first draft.

In addition, UPWP should define exactly *how* success or accomplishment will be measured.

**Transportation Equity Planning**

*pp 72 - 73*

PI suggests: The future UPWP needs to include a great deal more about transportation equity, particularly as regards serving those persons who are transit-dependent

## FY 2010 UPWP --- SCHEDULE

• Oct 6, 2008	Discuss projects with Technical Committee
• Nov 18	Submit project proposals to BMC staff
• Dec 16	Present overview to BRTB
• Jan 6, 2009	Present 1st Draft to Technical Committee
• Jan 9	Review by BRTB Budget Subcommittee
• Jan 23	Release to public and Federal agencies for review and comment
• Feb 22	Deadline for public comments
• Feb 26	Present public comments to BRTB
• March	Modify as appropriate and prepare Final Draft
• Mar 3	Present TC Resolution for approval of UPWP
• Mar 24	Resolution for BRTB approval and Submit UPWP to Federal Agencies