MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 9:36 A.M. by Ms. Lynda Eisenberg.

1. APPROVAL OF APRIL 4, 2017 MINUTES

Ms. Eisenberg asked for approval of the minutes from the April meeting of the Technical Committee. Ms. Valorie LaCour moved to approve the minutes with Mr. Alex Rawls seconding the motion. The minutes were unanimously approved.

2. RECOMMENDED ACTION OF RESOLUTION #17-21

Mr. Peter Southerland from SHA began the discussion with background on why the MPO considers and approves the functional classification of roadways. Based on FHWA guidance, the functional classification of roadways defines the role each element of the roadway network plays in serving various travel needs. Functional classification also carries with it expectations about roadway design, including the speed, capacity and relationship to existing and future land use development. Federal legislation continues to use functional classification in determining eligibility for funding under the Federal-aid program. Finally, as agencies continue to move towards a more performance-based management approach; functional classification will be an increasingly important consideration in setting expectations and measuring outcomes for preservation, mobility and safety.

After the 2010 Census, SHA began to review each roadway segment and sent recommendations to each jurisdiction to either keep the same classification or to update a segment. At this point nearly all of the review is complete and FHWA is looking for the MPO to approve, or change what the state will be sending in. One jurisdiction still has some review but if the recommendations are ok, the BRTB will be asked to approve a resolution in May – with an opportunity to amend if necessary.

Ms. Eisenberg asked for a motion for approval. Ms. LaCour motioned for approval, and Mr. Rawls seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

[Handout: Decennial Functional Classification Update, BRTB Jurisdictions]
3. APPOINTMENT OF A NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Ms. Eisenberg reported that a Nominating Committee is needed to recommend officers for FY 2018. She suggested the Nominating Committee members include the Maryland Department of Transportation, Baltimore City and Queen Anne’s County. Ms. Eisenberg asked those representatives if they would participate. All three accepted the task of working on nominations for Fiscal Year 2018. A slate will be offered next month and the vote will take place at the July meeting.

4. BRIEFING ON THE RECENT SURVEY ON ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIORS WITH RESPECT TO PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION CHOICE

Mr. Charles Baber and Mr. Robert Berger presented the results of the recently completed Public Transportation Choice Study: Attitudes and Behavior of Baltimore Area Residents with Access to Transit. At the request of BMC, WBA Research (WBA) developed a comprehensive web/telephone survey to assess the attitudes and behaviors of Baltimore area residents towards public transportation and other travel options. The study provides additional market information to locally operated transit systems (LOTS) that are currently writing their five-year Transportation Development Plans (TDP) and also supports ongoing local projects such as MTA’s urban core and Commuter Bus network redesign (BaltimoreLink).

The study area comprised the ZIP Codes that are served by local fixed-route bus service or by MTA in each jurisdiction. A total of 1,205 interviews were conducted between November 2016 and January 2017.

Based on the survey, one-third (34%) of commuters currently use or would consider using transit. The proportions are fairly consistent across jurisdictions, although the Urban Core (Baltimore City and Baltimore County) is particularly high (41%), while Carroll County is particularly low (19%). A similar proportion would consider transit for personal trips (28%).

The main reasons offered for not using transit to commute are cost (22%), length of trip (20%), and proximity to stops/stations (13%). The findings for personal travel were similar: proximity to stops/stations (22%), cost (17%), and convenience/ease (16%). Some reasons cited, such as cost, reliable/dependable service, and safety, may be issues of perception rather than reality.

Two-step clustering analysis was used to identify five market segments, each representing a share of the Baltimore area transit market. Road Worriers (19%), Urban Trippers (19%) and the Retired But Ready (32%) segment are open to considering transit, while Car Commandos (17%) and Carmudgeons (14%) are committed to driving.

The five market segments are distributed unequally across the Baltimore region: Road Worriers represent 31% and 28% of Howard County and Anne Arundel County residents, respectively. Urban Trippers are found mostly in Baltimore City (17%), Harford County (15%), and Annapolis (15%). The Retired But Ready segment represents 42%, and Car Commandos make up 29%, of Carroll County residents. Carmudgeons represent 20% of Annapolis residents.
WBA also offered recommendations for BMC and for the LOTS agencies. BMC: 1) Engage in regional educational initiatives to promote the existence and availability of transit, 2) Launch targeted marketing campaigns to promote transit as a viable option for all residents of the region, and 3) Investigate the potential of flexible or demand responsive feeder service. LOTS: 1) Continually perform outreach to promote systems; educate on how to use the system, 2) Engage in targeted marketing or outreach, and 3) Consider technological investments, especially real-time information.

[PowerPoint: Public Transit Attitudes and Behavior Survey]

7. PRESENTATION ON CRITICAL URBAN FREIGHT CORRIDORS

Ms. L’Kiesha Markley, SHA outlined steps being taken by MDOT and SHA to address MAP-21 and FAST act requirements towards identifying critical urban and rural freight corridors.

Ms. Markley noted that the 2015 Strategic Goods Movement Plan was being updated to be FAST Act and MAP-21 compliant. The state has already established the National Highway Freight Network (NHFN) and the Primary Highway Freight System (PHFS) and is now in the process of developing the non-PHFS routes as Critical Urban Freight Corridors (CUFC) and Critical Rural Freight Corridors (CRFC).

The CUFC’s have to meet the following criteria: 1) supported by MPOs, 2) connects an intermodal facility to the PHFS or Interstate Highway, 3) located along corridor of a route on the PHFS and provides redundancy, 4) serves a major freight generator, logistics center, or manufacturing/warehouse, and 5) total mileage within the 75 mile limit. SHA is working with the seven MPO’s in the state and has divided the urban corridor mileage as shown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPO</th>
<th>Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore Regional Transportation Board</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland Area MPO</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagerstown/Eastern Panhandle MPO</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Planning Board</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salisbury/Wicomico MPO</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary’s Calvert MPO</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmington Area MPO</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SHA, working with their consultant, Cambridge Systematics, developed a tool to help MPO’s identify segments that could be designated as CUFC’s. Mr. David Willauer with CS outlined the corridor tool methodology that relies on freight density by zip code, truck volumes, connections to intermodal facilities, and congestion mapping. The tool gives a higher score to segments that are in close proximity to intermodal facilities, therefore, Baltimore City has most of the segments since that is where
intermodal facilities are located. Mr. Willauer pointed out that two sets of preliminary corridors were developed – with and without a score for intermodal facilities.

Ms. Markley highlighted the preliminary corridors in map and tabular form. The corridor list with intermodal scoring is shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Miles</th>
<th>Revised</th>
<th>Starting Point</th>
<th>Ending Point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broening Highway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Boston St.</td>
<td>Dundalk Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston St.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Fleet St.</td>
<td>I-895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South St.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>E. Baltimore St.</td>
<td>E. Lombard St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Donnell St.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Boston St.</td>
<td>I-95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Lombard St.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>N. Charles St</td>
<td>S. Patterson Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Baltimore St.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>N. Charles St</td>
<td>N. Haven St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Charles St.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>E. Baltimore St.</td>
<td>US-40 Bypass/US 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLK Jr Blvd</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>N. Howard St.</td>
<td>I-395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President St.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>E. Fayette St.</td>
<td>Aliceanna St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolling Mill Rd</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Erdman Ave</td>
<td>Eastern Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Route 1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Wilkins Ave.</td>
<td>I-695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Rd</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Hawkins Pt. Rd</td>
<td>to end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritchie Highway</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Magothy Br Rd</td>
<td>B&amp;A Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aris T. Allen Blvd</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>U.S. 50</td>
<td>Forest Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Fayette St.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>N. Charles St</td>
<td>N. Highland Ave</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43.5  25

Ms. Markley offered the committee members the opportunity to review these corridors and provide comment, suggestions and feedback. SHA would like to have these finalized by the end of June for submission to FHWA. The corridors would then be eligible for funding under the FAST Act freight funding guidelines.

The committee members asked to have a work session in the coming weeks to take a closer look at these corridors and to bring any others they would like to be considered in their jurisdictions. The meeting has been scheduled for May 31st.

[Attachment – CUFC BRTB Presentation v2.ppt]

8. OTHER BUSINESS

Scenario Planning to Support the Development of Maximize2045 – Mr. Freeland reminded the members about the options for scenario planning introduced at the May meeting, and again distributed the handout that describes these options. Some discussion followed, including the possibility of combining elements of one or more options. Mr. Brian Ulrich stated his preference for Option 4: analyze the effects of different investment scenarios. Ms. Eisenberg suggested that the topic
of scenario planning be added as a full agenda item at a future Technical Committee meeting, possibly in June. Mr. Freeland said he would send the members some additional information about the Southeastern Michigan Council of Governments’ approach to analyzing the effects of different investment scenarios.

[Handout: Options for Scenario Planning for 2019 Baltimore Regional Transportation Plan – Maximize2045]

NEPA Training – Mr. Freeland noted that SHA’s presentation of a case study of a project that followed the NEPA process, originally scheduled for the May meeting, had been postponed to the June meeting. He also reminded the members of the web-based NEPA training that would take place following the Technical Committee meeting.

Ms. Eisenberg asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ms. LaCour made a motion to adjourn at 10:16 and Mr. Ulrich seconded the motion. Ms. Eisenberg asked for members to approve the motion, which carried.

CLOSED SESSION

At 10:17 Ms. Eisenberg asked for a motion to open a Closed Session of the Technical Committee. Ms. LaCour made a motion and Mr. Rawls seconded.

Mr. Lang explained the role of the TC in reviewing RFP’s prior to release. Mr. Lang described three upcoming RFP’s and answered a few questions from the members. The Chair asked for a motion to approve the recommendation, Ms. LaCour made the motion and Mr. David Cookson seconded. All members supported the release of the proposed RFP’s.

At 11:10 Ms. Eisenberg asked for a motion to adjourn the Closed Session of the Technical Committee. Mr. Ulrich made a motion and Mr. Rawls seconded the motion – motion carried.

[PowerPoint: Clearance (from the TC) to Release RFP’s]
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