The Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Baltimore Region

## **TECHNICAL COMMITTEE**

January 3, 2023 9:30 to 11:15 A.M.

# MINUTES

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

#### 1. APPROVAL OF DECEMBER 2022 MINUTES

Mr. Gallihue asked for approval of the minutes from the December meeting of the Technical Committee. Ms. Mary Lane moved to approve the minutes with Ms. Angie Daniel seconding the motion. The minutes were unanimously approved.

## 2. RECOMMENDED ACTION ON RESOLUTION #23-11

Ms. Cindy Burch shared an overview of recent crash trends and the proposed targets for the traffic safety performance measures (fatalities, fatality rate per vehicle miles traveled (VMT), serious injuries, serious injury rate per VMT, and non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries). In 2021, traffic crash-related injuries and serious injuries increased while fatalities decreased across the region and state. This was in contrast to the increase in fatalities and decrease in crashes and injuries during the pandemic in 2020.

Ms. Burch explained the target-setting methodology that is employed by the State and adapted for these regional targets. This Resolution follows the statistical approach used in the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) and Highway Safety Plan (HSP) reports submitted to FHWA and NHTSA, respectively, in 2022. That approach incorporates five-year rolling averages with a baseline of 2005-2009. Exponential trends are used to set the targets, with a two percent annual reduction used in cases of increasing trends.

Ms. Burch shared the anticipated targets for the 2019-2023 average and goal for 2030 in the Resolution under consideration and discussed BRTB efforts underway to address safety, including an enhancement to the LRTP project scoring.

Mr. Gallihue inquired about the safety effect of automated enforcement and Ms. Burch will work with MDOT to gather more information. Mr. Gallihue also mentioned public concerns about freight volumes and Ms. Burch noted a focus on commercial vehicles in the Carroll and Harford County Local Strategic Highway Safety Plans.

1500 Whetstone Way, Suite 300, Baltimore, MD, 21230 ★ Phone 410-732-0500 ★ www.baltometro.org

Voting: City of Annapolis, Anne Arundel County, Baltimore City, Baltimore County, Carroll County, Harford County, Howard County, Queen Anne's County, MD Department of Transportation and Annapolis Transit. Non-Voting: MD Department of the Environment, MD Department of Planning, and MD Transit Administration.

Mr. Gallihue asked for a motion to send the traffic safety targets to the BRTB. Ms. Daniel moved to recommend sending the resolution to the BRTB and Ms. Lane seconded the motion. The motion passed.

#### [PowerPoint: Safety Performance Targets]

#### 3. RECOMMENDED ACTION ON RESOLUTION #23-12

Mr. Shane Sarver introduced the resolution regarding acceptance of MDOT MTA Tier I Transit Asset Management Performance targets. FTA established a system in 2016 to monitor and manage public transportation assets, which requires MDOT MTA to submit a TAM plan update every four years, in addition to annual submission of asset inventory data to NTD. In addition to these requirements, MPOs must adopt new targets when it updates the MTP on a four year cycle.

Mr. Sarver shared MDOT MTA's 2022 TAM performance and 2023 TAM performance targets and summarized the methodology used by MDOT MTA to develop the targets. Targets are developed using three factors: expected asset retirements, expected asset deliveries, and expected capital and operating budget.

Mr. Sarver also shared that MDOT MTA's 2021 State of Good Repair backlog was estimated to be at \$1.8 Billion, including \$477 Million in vehicles, \$163 Million in guideway assets, \$526 Million in systems assets, \$311 Million in facilities, and \$343 Million in stations assets. Many of the needs identified in MDOT MTA's SGR backlog are funded to some extent, and MDOT MTA prioritizes safety-critical projects to ensure safe operation of the system.

Mr. Gallihue asked for a motion to send the TAM targets to the BRTB. Mr. Steve Cohoon moved to recommend approval of the resolution, and Ms. Daniel seconded the motion. The motion passed.

#### [PowerPoint: MDOT MTA Transit Asset Management Targets]

## 4. RECOMMENDED ACTION ON RESOLUTION #23-13

Mr. Don Halligan introduced the resolution regarding endorsement of a financial forecast for the upcoming LRTP, *Resilience 2050*. BMC requests a forecast of state and federal revenues for each LRTP from MDOT each plan cycle. MDOT provided a forecast extending through 2050 in August 2022. The financial forecast resolution also includes a forecast of local revenues available through 2050. The local financial forecast was developed in FY 2022 with help from a consultant, Kimley-Horn.

Mr. Halligan summarized the methodology used by MDOT to generate the state and federal revenue forecasts. Total statewide revenues are projections of state and federal funds using historical average annual growth rates. MDOT then determines anticipated Operating and System Preservation expenditures through 2050 by applying inflation rates to the previous

year. Statewide expansion funds are derived by subtracting operating and system preservation values from total forecasted revenues.

MDOT calculates the share of expansion funds available to the Baltimore region by applying historical shares dedicated to the region to statewide surface expansion funds. From 1981 to 2021, the Baltimore region received approximately 36.1% of total statewide surface expansion funds. Baltimore region shares for operating and system preservation were calculated by applying the same share (36.1%) to statewide operating and system preservation forecasts. The financial forecast of state and federal revenues available to the Baltimore region for *Resilience 2050* includes approximately \$37 billion, \$21 billion, and \$12 billion for operations, system preservation, and expansion, respectively. Projects submitted for inclusion in *Resilience 2050* compete for the \$12 billion in expansion funds anticipated to be available through 2050.

Mr. Halligan also highlighted a change in MDOT's categorization of projects that affects the financial forecast. Prior LRTP project submittals were "major capital" projects, which could include large-scale projects that don't expand roadway or transit capacity. This major capital category is now exclusively expansion. This means that projects that had previously been categorized as major capital that don't include additional capacity are now categorized as system preservation. This results in an increase in system preservation funds in the financial forecast. In addition, some non-capacity projects submitted for the LRTP will be considered part of the system preservation portion of funding for the region. In addition, the urbanized area of Queen Anne's County is not mentioned in MDOT's financial forecast methodology. This area includes all of Kent Island and the area up to Grasonville at the US 50/301 split. MDOT confirmed that the financial forecast accounts for State highway facilities in this area.

Mr. Zach Kaufman summarized the local financial forecast. While MDOT provides state and federal funding forecasts for the LRTP, federal regulations require a financial plan to identify "all necessary financial resources from public and private sources that are reasonably expected to be available," which includes forecasting of local sources of revenue. In 2022, the BRTB worked with a consultant and local jurisdiction staff to develop a local funding projection tool for use in *Resilience 2050*. This local funding tool can also be adapted to generate local funding forecasts for future LRTPs.

The local financial forecast was based on baseline funding information for FY 2022. Baseline funding information was gathered through the review of relevant local funding documentation for each jurisdiction, and interviews held with relevant representatives of each jurisdiction. Local funds come from a variety of sources including Highway User Revenues, general funds, bonds and other sources such as usage fees.

Funding sources were allocated to either operating or capital based on the review of local documents and staff interviews. Capital was further divided into system preservation and expansion categories to mimic the state and federal financial forecast. Baseline funds for operating and capital were projected forward by source (HUR, general funds, bonds, etc.) using growth rates estimated from interviews with budget staff and reasonable economic principles.

Technical Committee January 3, 2023 Page 4 of 8

For the 2028 to 2050 time period, \$16.5 billion, \$6.4 billion, and \$982 million in local funds are forecast for operating, system preservation, and expansion, respectively. Programming of local funds will remain a local decision. *Resilience 2050* will include a region-wide summary of the local financial forecast to present a more complete picture of transportation revenues available in the Baltimore region as required by the metropolitan planning rule.

A member of the public asked why MDOT makes the assumption that expansion funds will increase incrementally over the planning horizon. Expansion funds in the past have jumped around and have not displayed a continuous increase. They also noted that it would be helpful to split out the forecast for MDOT MTA and MDOT SHA. Mr. Halligan responded that even though there are differences in total revenues over the years, the general trend has been an increase in revenues. The forecast projects a steady increase in funds, estimated through a historical annual average from 1981-2021. In addition, the financial forecast is updated every 4 years to account for new trends. Mr. Halligan also responded the MDOT has not historically provided a breakdown of the forecast for MDOT MTA and MDOT SHA. The breakdown in the LRTP is determined by the projects approved by the BRTB.

Mr. Gallihue asked for a motion to approve to send the financial forecast to the BRTB. Ms. Lane moved to recommend approval of the resolution, and Ms. Daniel seconded the motion. The motion passed.

#### [PowerPoint: Financial Forecast for Resilience 2050]

# 5. PRESENTATION: CONNECTED AND AUTOMATED VEHICLE (CAV) INTEGRATION FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Mr. John Hicks presented an update for the ongoing project *Connected and Automated Vehicle (CAV) Integration*. Mr. Hicks is the assistant project manager with the Kittelson consultant team. He provided an overview of the project and presented highlights from the recently completed literature review. Customized recommendations for the region will be developed and submitted in March.

This project is building upon the CAV toolkit that MDOT SHA developed for local jurisdictions. The project Steering Committee met one time so far and provided input for the recommendations.

Mr. Hicks provided an overview of connected and automated functions as well as examples of these technologies in use in Maryland. He noted that it is important for local jurisdictions to plan for CAVs so local policies can incentivize impacts or guide development to meet local goals. There will be positive and negative impacts of CAVs on safety, mobility, accessibility, congestion, environment, land use, equity, labor and workforce, and data and privacy; the impacts are not yet known.

It will be important for CAV deployments to be equitable and accessible to all travelers. Public policies could support these goals, particularly in areas of regulating land use, zoning and permitting, design, and managing infrastructure and curbside.

Technical Committee January 3, 2023 Page 5 of 8

Mr. Hicks said that the recommendations will focus on items over which local jurisdictions have some control. Some of the top lessons from the literature review include:

- build collaborative partnerships
- monitor state of the practice
- understand roles and responsibilities of federal, state, and local agencies
- centralize data collection and distribution
- prepare the infrastructure
- be agile, avoid technology-specific policies and regulations
- plan for an evolving workforce
- use policies to incentivize real-world impacts that meet local goals

There were several questions/suggestions after the presentation:

- Suggestion to consider cybersecurity in the recommendations
- Suggestion to include rural as well as urban considerations in the recommendations

- Question about Technical Committee members reviewing the draft recommendations and about who is on the Steering Committee.

Ms. Eileen Singleton, BMC project manager, said that she would send the list of Steering Committee members to the Technical Committee members. And all Technical Committee members are welcome to review the draft recommendations when they are developed; she will share the draft with them.

Mr. Hicks noted that Carroll County is installing fiber optic cables throughout the county which will facilitate deployment of some of the CAV technologies.

#### [PowerPoint: Connected and Automated Vehicle Integration]

#### 6. PRESENTATION: MARYLAND TRAVEL SURVEY TOPIC – DRIVING AFTER USING TRANSIT

Mr. Robert Berger discussed results from the 2018-2019 Maryland Travel Survey (MTS), specifically, an analysis of driving after transit. The analysis used Baltimore region, rather than jurisdictional, data.

Mr. Berger noted that he analyzed the mode choice of Baltimore region transit commuters, both bus and rail, for travel after they returned home from work, in particular how many headed back out again by personal vehicle, either as a driver or a passenger.

The number of persons who commute home from work via transit is fairly small, representing 6.3 percent (6.3%) of all commuters, those who travel by automobile, including drivers and passengers, represent just over 93 percent (93.1%) of all commuters, and that Uber/Lyft/Rideshare riders make up the smallest share of commuters, at just 0.6 percent (0.6%).

He also noted that the share of weekday transit commuters who head back out after returning home is comparatively small: 1) 17.3 percent (17.3%) head back out by personal vehicle, 2) 12.4 percent (12.4%) head out by some other mode (rail, bus, walk, or Uber/Lyft/rideshare), and 3) the largest share, 70.3 percent (70.3%), stay at home.

Also analyzed was trip purpose for trips by personal vehicle after transit commute trips. The largest share of travel by personal vehicle is for shopping trips at 44.4 percent (44.4%), the second largest share of travel by personal vehicle is for social/recreation trips at 25.8 percent (25.8%), the third largest share of travel by personal vehicle is for trips to have a meal at 19.4 percent (19.4%), the fourth largest share of travel by personal vehicle is for trips to drop off/pick up a passenger at 8.1 percent (8.1%), and the smallest share of travel by personal vehicle is for trips to work at 2.4 percent (2.4%).

#### [PowerPoint: Maryland Travel Survey Results: Driving After Transit]

## 7. UPWP UPDATES

• **Resilience 2050 Activity** – Mr. Kaufman shared the draft preferred alternative for *Resilience 2050* with Technical Committee members. A total of 98 projects were submitted for inclusion in *Resilience 2050*. Of these, 62 were roadway projects and 36 were transit projects. Mr. Kaufman summarized the various elements required to generate the draft preferred alternative, including project scores, year of expenditure (YOE) costs, and a financial forecast of revenues available for the projects. Projects are included in either the first half (2028-2039) or the second half (2040-2050) of the draft preferred alternative. Both halves must be fiscally constrained, meaning that the YOE costs cannot exceed revenues anticipated to be available.

The financial forecast includes \$12.062 billion in expansion funds from 2028 to 2050. The YOE costs of projects submitted for inclusion is larger at \$14.13 billion. This is after moving non-capacity projects to system preservation due to the change in MDOT's methodology for the financial forecast. This means that not every project submitted for inclusion could be included in the draft preferred alternative.

Mr. Kaufman distributed a spreadsheet for the draft preferred alternative. All but six projects were able to be included in the draft preferred alternative, though several projects had to be shifted to the 2040-2050 timeframe due to financial constraints in the 2028-2039 time period. BMC staff are also recommending \$250 million off the top for small program set-asides. These small program set-asides have been included in previous LRTPs and are intended to support initiatives such as emissions reductions and regional bicycle and pedestrian priority projects. BMC staff recommend including the regional bicycle and pedestrian priority projects identified by BPAG in 2022 as a part of the small program set-aside. Technical committee members were asked to discuss the draft preferred alternative with their BRTB representative prior to the January BRTB meeting and to contact BMC with any questions or concerns.

## [PowerPoint and Handout: Draft Preferred Alternative for Resilience 2050]

• **Continued discussion of upcoming UPWP focus areas** – Mr. Halligan explained he was filling in for Director Todd Lang who was out, and that he desired to discuss with the Technical Committee an early draft of potential FY 2024 UPWP focus area topics.

He reminded the members of the UPWP schedule. The FY 2024 UPWP will run from July 1, 2023 to June 30, 2024 and mentioned that the development began with a review of topics

at the AMPO conference and with discussions at subcommittees, with individual members and BMC staff. He told the Technical Committee that they will be presented a draft FY 2024 UPWP at the February 7th meeting where they will hopefully vote to release for a 30 day public review. At the April 4th TC meeting will review the comments and present a final UPWP for your recommendation to the Board. The BRTB will approve the FY 2024 UPWP at the April 21st Elected Officials meeting. Staff will then submit it to our federal partners while we are developing local contracts.

Mr. Halligan mentioned that there were twelve (12) draft focus areas, nine (9) of these new topics and three (3) continuing tasks. He went over each of the focus area tasks in a quick review. Mr. Halligan stated that staff have developed very rough estimates of consultant funding required for each project and that staff will continue refining these throughout the month of January.

A new focus area task, based upon prior discussions at the Technical Committee, was also presented for consideration. Staff are proposing revising the local planning support portion of the UPWP. In the past, BMC has reimbursed local staff for their work in relation to BRTB Focus Areas, previously known as "core" tasks. Mr. Halligan mentioned that after reviewing options from other national UPWPs, staff was now proposing that each jurisdiction identify local transportation planning projects that local members expect to work on in FY 2024 (July 1, 2023 – June 30, 2024). These tasks must support regional planning practices (or relate to the BRTB work program). They can only be planning projects, no design beyond 30%, no construction, no operating funds and they must result in a product for the auditors. These can be staff or consultant funding. Staff asked members to consider finding a project you were planning or hoping to do and work with staff to scope out its support through the UPWP. Ms. Regina Aris mentioned that the slide regarding this area will be circulated to members for consideration. Halligan said he and Mr. Lang will be contacting every jurisdiction to discuss the new Local Planning Support proposal and to get your feedback on the early draft UPWP focus areas. Then we will present a final proposal at next month's Technical Committee.

#### [PowerPoint and Handout: Review of Potential FY 2024 Focus Areas]

#### 8. OTHER BUSINESS

The next meeting will be held on February 7, 2023 in a virtual format.

Mr. Gallihue asked for a motion to close the Tech Committee meeting. Ms. Lane made a motion which Mr. Cohoon seconded. The meeting adjourned at 11:15 A.M.

## ATTENDANCE

#### Members

Ken Choi – Maryland Department of Planning Steve Cohoon – Queen Anne's County Department of Public Works Technical Committee January 3, 2023 Page 8 of 8

Angelica Daniel – Baltimore County Department of Public Works & Transportation Joel Gallihue – Harford County Department of Planning Dan Janousek – Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) Mary Lane – Carroll County Department of Planning Patrick McMahon – Maryland Transit Administration (MDOT MTA) Lisa Minnick – Maryland State Highway Administration (MDOT SHA) Catherine Salarano – Maryland Department of the Environment Patrick Smith (for David Cookson) – Howard County Office of Transportation Brian Ulrich – Anne Arundel County Office of Transportation (00T) Graham Young – Baltimore City Department of Transportation

#### Staff and Guests

Bala Akundi - Baltimore Metropolitan Council (BMC) **Regina Aris - BMC Charles Baber - BMC Robert Berger - BMC Cindy Burch - BMC** Rebecca Deibel - BMC Don Halligan – BMC Victor Henry - BMC John Hicks - Kittelson Zach Kaufman - BMC Keith Kucharek - BMC Sheila Mahoney - BMC **Charlene Mingus - BMC** Abby Morgan – Kittelson Shane Sarver - BMC Michael Scepaniak – Strong Towns Baltimore **Eileen Singleton - BMC**