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2-Year Process

• What Are Our Guiding Principles?

• 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?
2-Year Process

• How Will We Measure Progress?

• 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
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
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
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.
Air Quality Conformity

Reference: MDE Clean Air Progress Report 2019
Air Quality Conformity

• Regional Emissions Analysis: Models transportation emissions of nitrogen oxides (NOx) and volatile organic compounds (VOC’s) expected from onroad mobile vehicles, i.e. 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.”
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