

MAXIMIZE 2045

July 9, 2019





2-Year Process

- What Are Our Guiding Principles?
 Feb. 2017: goals/strategies Resolution #17-18
- What Might the Future Bring?
 - June 2018: Round 8A forecasts Resolution #18-19
 - Chapters on future trends, emerging technologies
- How Should We Decide on Investments?
 June 2018: evaluation criteria Resolution #18-20
- How Much Funding Can We Expect?

- Sept. 2018: financial forecast - Resolution #19-7







2-Year Process

- How Will We Measure Progress?
 - June 2017 Oct. 2018: Series of resolutions on federally mandated performance measures
- Project submittals
- Scoring / draw fiscal constraint line
- Preferred Alternative
- Analyses: conformity, travel demand, EJ
- Public Involvement process





Public Comments

• Comments submitted by individuals and groups

- 2 about replacement for Red Line
- 2 supporting Metro extension to Carroll County (same person)
- 1 supporting Manchester Bypass in Carroll County
- 1 about need for more Howard County connections to DC Metro, Dulles corridor, and Fort Meade
- 1 about need for specific traffic signal in Elkridge
- 1 about bike infrastructure needs in Elkridge
- 1 about demolishing 1.5 miles of I-895 (I-95 to I-195)
- 1 about U.S. 40 improvements in Harford County





MIZEZ

Public Comments

- Comments submitted by individuals and groups
 - 2 opposing I-95 ETLs; advocating for more transit options
 - 1 about removing I-695 hard shoulder running and I-95 ETL projects from plan; supporting U.S. 50 BRT project
 - 1 from former resident with questions about specific proposed projects and methodology; advocating for more transit options
 - 1 about "cleaning up" transportation
 - 1 from resident suggesting specific bus service improvements
 - 1 from SCMagLev group (BWRR) supporting TIP/plan projects
 - 1 from community association in Howard County supporting proposed projects; advocating for Complete Streets and more transit options





XIMIZE

Changes: Draft to Final

- Carroll County, MD 31, Church Street to Coe Drive
 - Revert to originally submitted project limits
 - Increase in estimated YOE cost: \$14 to \$16 million
 - Fiscal constraint is maintained
- The Loop
 - Remove from Chapter 2 "Mega-Regional" Projects
- Minor corrections
 - Typos and inconsistencies





IMIZE

Show me the money . . .

- Financial plan Anticipated revenues (22 yrs)
 - \$36.749 billion system operations
 56.4%
 - \$16.270 billion system preservation 25.0%
 - \$12.162 billion major capital projects 18.7%
- Decreasing \$ and % for major capital projects

 2015 plan (21 yrs) \$15.590 billion
 27.0%
 2011 plan (20 yrs) \$11.819 billion
 26.1%







What are we doing better?

Future trends

- Environmental issues, highway safety, population growth, needs of aging population, freight movement, "mega-regional" projects
- New technologies and ride-sharing models
- Greater emphasis on performance measures
 - Cooperative process for target setting MDOT/BRTB
- Stronger analysis of potential effects of future projects on EJ populations
 - Accessibility and mobility





Commitment / Flexibility

- "Setting a goal is not the main thing. It is deciding how you will go about achieving it and staying with that plan." — Tom Landry
 - Today: Recommend adoption of final plan Resolution #20-3
 - Next month: FHWA / FTA review U.S. EPA acceptance of air quality conformity determination
 - Next year: Follow the plan: from guiding principles to specific projects.
 - However, . . . "Nothing is written. . . "





Air Quality Conformity

- Ensures the Plan and TIP do not worsen air quality in the region, or delay the attainment of national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS).
- Requires transportation emissions to not exceed motor vehicle emission "budgets" in the state air quality implementation plan (SIP).
- Ties together transportation planning and air quality planning.







MAXIMIZE 20



Air Quality Conformity



Reference: MDE Clean Air Progress Report 2019

BMC



Air Quality Conformity

- Regional Emissions Analysis: Models transportation emissions of nitrogen oxides (NOx) and volatile organic compounds (VOC's) expected from onroad mobile vehicles, ie. cars, trucks, buses, motorcycles, in addition to idling trucks.
- Models emissions in particular "horizon" years assuming existing road and transit network, in addition to TIP and Plan projects.
- All modeled horizon years (2020, 2030, 2040, 2045) show emissions will be below SIP "budgets."





MAXIMIZE7



Process for Determining Conformity

Major Steps/Decisions by ICG:

- Methodology Letter (Which pollutants, emissions model, model run years)
- Determine conformity exempt/non-exempt/regionally significant status (project-by-project)
- BMC and MDE run EPA-developed emissions model.
- Approve regional emissions analysis results for public review
- Draft document and results out for public review.
- ICG/TC recommend approval of conformity document





For more information

Regina Aris | Assistant Director for Transportation 410-732-9572 | raris@baltometro.org | www.baltometro.org



@BALTOMETROCOUNCIL





