

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

April 5, 2022
9:30 to 11:02 A.M.

MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 A.M. by Mr. Joel Gallihue.

1. APPROVAL OF MARCH 2022 MINUTES

Mr. Gallihue asked for approval of the minutes from the March meeting of the Technical Committee. Mr. Dan Janousek moved to approve the minutes with Mr. Kwaku Duah seconding the motion. The minutes were unanimously approved.

2. RECOMMENDED ACTION ON RESOLUTION #22-11

Mr. Keith Kucharek introduced resolution #22-11. In Resolution #22-11 MDOT SHA requested to amend the FY 2022-2025 TIP to add the MD 91 bridge replacement project over the North Branch of the Patapsco River and Maryland Midland Railroad.

Ms. Lisa Minnick Sirota presented the details of the project. The MD 91 bridges over the North Branch of the Patapsco River and Maryland Midland Railroad are located in Carroll County, just across the Baltimore County line. Both bridges were constructed in 1965 and are currently listed in fair condition. MDOT SHA desires to replace these bridges before they deteriorate to poor condition.

The existing bridge conditions contain two 12-foot lanes with 3-foot shoulders for a total width of 30 feet. The new bridges will continue to carry two 12-foot lanes, however shoulders will be widened to 8 feet to accommodate bicycles. The total bridge width will be 40 feet.

The project is scheduled to advertise for construction on October 11, 2022. Notice to Proceed is scheduled for January 23, 2023 with project completion and Open to Traffic in the winter of 2023/2024. The total cost of the project is \$11.337 million including \$10.763 million in federal STBG funds.

There was a request for a motion regarding Resolution #22-11. Ms. Mary Lane made a motion to send Resolution #22-11 to the BRTB as presented and Mr. Brian Ulrich seconded the motion. A vote was taken on Resolution #22-11, with unanimous support from the members.

[PowerPoint: 2022-2025 TIP Amendment for MD 91 Bridge Replacement]

3. RECOMMENDED ACTION ON RESOLUTION #22-12

Mr. Todd Lang introduced the resolution to adopt the addendum to the FY 2022-2023 UPWP. Mr. Lang reviewed the amount of funding available, what the source of funding is, and where the dollars are going (BMC, local jurisdictions, or consultants). The updated budget is the primary purpose of the addendum. Mr. Lang also covered the focus areas with available funding, ranging from the regional bike network to a review of Fares, Fees, and Fines.

Mr. Lang described the 30-day comment period and stated that two comments (the Greater Washington Partnership and David Highfield) were submitted. One comment was encouraging the BRTB to pursue rail transit into Carroll County and the other encouraged the BRTB to find a way for all of the tasks to be funded (this referenced tasks that were contingent on approval of BIL funding levels).

Mr. Gallihue asked for a motion from the Committee. Mr. Duah moved to adopt the UPWP Addendum with Mr. Steve Cohoon seconding the motion. Mr. Gallihue asked the members if there was further discussion, Mr. Duah asked if the local funding could be explained in more detail. Mr. Lang described the process that has changed the local funding over the last few years. Mr. Gallihue asked for a roll call vote, the resolution was unanimously approved.

[PowerPoint: April Action Items]

4. RECOMMENDED ACTION ON RESOLUTION #22-13

Ms. Regina Aris shared that the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise goal is set in conjunction with each UPWP. The goal adopted by the BRTB is based on a methodology developed by MDOT. The BRTB piggybacks based on being located in the same or a substantially similar market. The FY 2023 DBE goal is proposed for 26.2 percent.

Mr. Gallihue asked for a motion from the Committee. Mr. Graham Young moved to adopt the DBE goal with Ms. Mary Lane seconding the motion. Mr. Gallihue asked the members if there was further discussion. One member asked to be reminded of the previous goal – it was 31.7%. Mr. Gallihue asked for a roll call vote, the resolution was unanimously approved.

[PowerPoint: April Action Items]

5. MDOT SHA COORDINATION AROUND TPM TARGET SETTING

Ms. Toria Lassiter, MDOT SHA, began the presentation by describing the purpose today was to ensure that MPO partners were aware of the Transportation Asset Management Plan (TAMP) update. This year TAMP Transportation Performance Management Program (TPM) reporting is due. MDOT SHA is looking to continue to work collaboratively to meet federal reporting requirements through information sharing. Ms. Lassiter then filled in the committee on the TAMP. From MAP-21 and FAST Act, a State shall develop a risk-based asset management plan that describes how the NHS will be managed to achieve system performance effectiveness and State DOT targets for asset condition, while managing the

risks, in a financially responsible manner, at a minimum practicable cost over the life cycle of its assets.

After reporting on the TAMP requirements Ms. Lassiter talked about the update. This effort updates a base TAMP document that was certified by FHWA in 2019 and certified for implementation each year since. Updates are obligated every 4 years. The approach is to leverage most decisions already made for that document, with strategic enhancements on partner coordination processes and risk analysis.

Ms. Lassiter then outlined the TAMP development schedule. Content inputs were completed in February and March, next is gathering financial plan and 2021 spending data by April, then confirming bridge and pavement targets later in April, review Draft TAMP in April/May, a TAMP internal draft in May and a 2022 Final TAMP in October. She went on to detail the performance approach - 2- and 4-year targets align with federal TPM2 Infrastructure Condition performance reporting requirements. For Maryland, the 10-year target is Maryland's "performance objective" based on the philosophy of maintaining current condition levels. Ms. Lassiter wrapped up her presentation by outlining the State/MPO TPM target setting coordination process and the MPO TPM Reporting Requirements.

Mr. Duah asked if there was a relationship between the SHA TAMP and the MTA TAMP. Currently there is no direct linkage, however staff will look at both documents for similar information when they are available later in the year.

[PowerPoint: MDOT TAMP TPM Coordination]

6. PRESENTATION: TRAVEL DIFFERENCES BY AGE AND GENDER

Mr. Robert Berger discussed results from the 2018-2019 Maryland Travel Survey (MTS), specifically, an analysis of travel differences by age and gender. The analysis used Baltimore region, rather than jurisdictional, data.

Mr. Berger noted that between early childhood and middle age, Females make more daily trips than Males. In addition, the difference is most pronounced among 16-17 year olds (2.8 vs 2.4 trips) and 18-44 year olds (3.5 trips vs 3.2 trips). In contrast, he noted that, at all ages, Males travel more daily miles than Females.

In addition, the difference is most pronounced among 16-17 year olds (28.3 miles vs 4.8 miles), 18-44 year olds (38.0 miles vs 35.1 miles), 45-64 year olds (44.3 miles vs 37.7 miles), and Seniors, i.e., 65 years old or older (32.4 miles vs 25.8 miles).

With the exception of Seniors, Males and Females are equally likely to be licensed drivers. Among Seniors, i.e., those 65 years old or older, Males (95%) are somewhat more likely than Females (89%) to be licensed drivers.

Contrasts in trip purpose between Males and Females, pointing out that at most ages, Males make a larger share of work trips than Females, with the largest differences seen among 18-44 year olds (48.5% vs 37.1%) and year olds (44.9% vs 34.3%). At most ages, Females make a

larger share of trips for Shopping and Meals than Males, with the largest differences are seen among 45-64 year olds (41.6% vs 35.1%) and 13-15 year olds (24.2% vs 17.9%).

Females make a larger share of trips to Drop off or Pick up others than Males. The largest differences are seen among 18-44 year olds (18.4% vs 11.8%). Females also make a slightly larger share of social trips than Males. The largest differences are seen among the elderly, i.e. 65 year olds and older (10.2% vs 7.7%), 16-17 year olds (9.6% vs 8.0%) and year olds (6.4% vs 5.4%)

Trip Purpose: the largest shares of the Male and Female travel days are Work trips, but they represent a much larger share of the distance covered by Males (51.5% vs 39.3%). In contrast, the second largest shares of the Male and Female travel days are Shop/Meal trips, but they represent a much larger share of the distance covered by Females (29.4% vs 23.6%). The third largest shares of the Male and Female travel days are trips to drop off/Pick up others, but they also represent a much larger share of the distance covered by Females (11.2% vs 7.5%). The next largest shares of Male and Female travel days are HealthCare trips, but they also represent a much larger share of the distance covered by Females (6.2% vs 5.0%). He pointed out that School trips represent approximately the same share of the distance covered by Males and Females (4.5% vs 4.6%). He drew the following Conclusion: The paradox that Females make more Daily Trips, while Males travel greater Daily Distances, is explained by the longer work trips of Males.

[PowerPoint: Maryland Travel Survey: Age and Gender]

7. UPWP UPDATES

- **Update on PPP Activity** – Ms. Monica Haines Benkhedda reported that this year the Public Participation Plan (PPP) is being updated. As part of this process staff are planning to do some advanced consultation with interested parties through an online survey. Ms. Haines Benkhedda shared a draft of the survey questions and asked members to add their suggestions this week. A final version of the survey will be created in PublicInput and shared with interested parties and key stakeholders. The results of the survey will be used to inform the update to the PPP policies and public involvement procedures.

Ms. Haines Benkhedda also reported that staff are looking for member support in helping staff recruit volunteers to serve on a newly formed group, Transportation CORE. This is an opportunity for a diverse group of 30-50 stakeholders to be engaged in the regional planning process and serve as a sounding board for regional decision-makers and planning staff. Applications are due April 15 and a link to apply is available at baltometro.org.

Ms. Haines Benkhedda noted that staff have sent an outreach toolkit with a sample e-newsletter announcement and social media posts. Staff would appreciate any help members can provide in sharing these messages widely and she thanked those of who have done so already.

[Handout: Outreach Toolkit for BRTB Transportation CORE]

- **Review of Call for Projects for Resilience 2050** - Mr. Zach Kaufman reviewed the call for projects for *Resilience 2050*. Mr. Kaufman sent an email to all submitting jurisdictions on Monday, April 4. Project submissions are due by Wednesday, June 15. Submittal of candidate projects will be followed by technical scoring of projects by BMC staff, drafting and approving the preferred alternative, and an analysis of the effects of the preferred alternative. The Technical Committee and BRTB are scheduled to vote on *Resilience 2050* in July 2023.

Mr. Kaufman then summarized the requirements for projects in the LRTP. The LRTP must include regionally significant major capital projects. These include any surface transportation investment that is greater than five million dollars (>\$5M) that will increase system capacity or is otherwise determined as regionally significant by the BRTB. LRTP projects not fully funded by FY 2027 must be included in the LRTP, as this is the final year of the TIP that will be considered in July 2023. Thus, the timeframe for *Resilience 2050* extends from FY 2028 through FY 2050. Any project that will be either complete or will have requested all funds by FY 2027 will be included as an “existing and committed” (E&C) project. E&C projects are not part of the LRTP preferred alternative and do not require project submittal forms.

Mr. Kaufman closed with a few notes and resources for TC members.

[PowerPoint: Call for Projects for Resilience 2050: Adapting to the Challenges of Tomorrow]

8. OTHER BUSINESS

- Ms. Aris addressed survey results for meeting format. A limited number of responses were received, yet there was agreement to begin some level of in-person meetings. Members agreed to participate in-person at the May 3rd meeting and decide on the schedule.
- Mr. Don Halligan mentioned the need for members to assist with interviews scheduled by Valbridge. Members asked for a 1 page summary so that they are prepared for the interviews. Mr. Halligan indicated that he could send that out shortly.

The next meeting will be held on May 5, 2022.

Mr. Gallihue asked for a motion to close the TC meeting. Ms. Lane made a motion which Mr. Cohoon seconded. The meeting adjourned at 11:02 A.M.

ATTENDANCE

Members

Brian Ulrich – Anne Arundel County Office of Transportation (OOT)

Ken Choi – Maryland Department of Planning

Patrick McMahon (for Jade Clayton) – Maryland Transit Administration (MDOT MTA)

Steve Cohoon – Queen Anne’s County Department of Public Works

David Cookson – Howard County Office of Transportation

Angelica Daniel – Baltimore County Department of Public Works & Transportation

Kwaku Duah – Annapolis Department of Transportation

Joel Gallihue – Harford County Department of Planning
Dan Janousek – Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT)
Mary Lane – Carroll County Department of Planning
Lisa Minnick Sirota – Maryland State Highway Administration (MDOT SHA)
Catherine Salarano – Maryland Department of the Environment
Graham Young – Baltimore City Department of Transportation

Staff and Guests

Regina Aris - Baltimore Metropolitan Council (BMC)
Keith Belcher -
Robert Berger - BMC
Cindy Burch - BMC
Rochelle Carpenter -
Monica Haines Benkhedda - BMC
Don Halligan – BMC
Victor Henry - BMC
Zach Kaufman - BMC
Keith Kucharek - BMC
Todd Lang – BMC
Toria Lassiter – MDOT SHA
Sheila Mahoney - BMC
Charlene Mingus - BMC
Eileen Singleton - BMC
Sam Snead – AA OOT