

## TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

November 1, 2016

9:36 to 11:33 A.M.

### MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 9:36 A.M. by Mr. Scott Graf.

#### 1. APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 4, 2016 MINUTES

Mr. Graf asked for approval of the minutes from the October meeting of the Technical Committee. Mr. Kwaku Duah moved to approve the minutes with Ms. Martha Arzu McIntosh seconding the motion. The minutes were unanimously approved.

#### 2. RECOMMENDED ACTION OF RESOLUTION #17-11

Mr. Zach Kaufman introduced Resolution #17-11 to the Technical Committee. In Resolution #17-11, Baltimore City is requesting to add the Citywide Bridge Preservation and Rehabilitation project to the 2017-2020 TIP so that the city can proceed with the rehabilitation of the Edison Highway Bridge over Amtrak. The project was publicized for public review from October 3, 2016 through November 4, 2016 with a public meeting on October 26 at the Southeast Community Development Corporation. No comments have been received thus far. The Interagency Consultation Group has determined that the project qualifies as exempt.

Mr. Greg Bauer from Baltimore City presented details on the project. The rehabilitation of the Edison Highway Bridge over Amtrak includes: rehabilitating the bearing pads, concrete piers, and abutments; concrete repairs to bridge parapets, approach sidewalk, and curb; replacing joint strip seals; installing a drainage trough system; repairing several concrete pedestals, spalls, and cracks; and cleaning and painting. The total cost has increased from \$1.9 million to \$4.2 million due primarily to increases in maintenance of traffic and concrete and crack repair costs. Work is expected to be completed in CY 2017. Mr. Tyson Byrne asked if the bridge was tall enough to accommodate double-stack rail transport. Mr. Bauer responded that while the project is not a bridge replacement, no issues regarding the height of the bridge have been raised.

Mr. Graf asked for a motion. Ms. Arzu McIntosh made a motion to move Resolution #17-11 to the BRTB as presented and Mr. Alex Rawls seconded the motion with unanimous support from the members.

***[Handout: TIP Amendment Summary and PowerPoint: Edison Highway Bridge]***

### **3. STATE OFFICE OF TOURISM PRESENTATION**

Mr. Terry Freeland introduced this topic, noting that the FAST Act added two planning factors that all MPOs must consider in their transportation plans and programs. One of these factors is “enhance travel and tourism.” To follow up on the presentation given by a representative of Visit Baltimore a few months ago, BMC invited the Maryland State Office of Tourism Development to present its perspective on the issues and challenges facing the tourism industry in the state with regard to transportation.

Ms. Heather Ersts of the Maryland State Office of Tourism Development gave a presentation on the state’s perspective. The state measures the impact of tourism on the economy in terms of sales tax revenue. The mantra is to get tourists to visit and, once they’re here, to get them to stay longer and visit other sites. Tourism statewide has increased every year since 2009. The presentation included information about tourist travel on all facilities, including state and local roads, scenic byways, and bike trails. Ms. Ersts ended her presentation with a video showing the attractions along Charles Street in Baltimore County and Baltimore City and the transportation modes a pair of tourists use to reach each destination along this corridor.

Ms. Valorie LaCour asked about the state’s top three priorities related to transportation. Ms. Ersts responded with four focus areas: 1) signage, 2) well maintained roads, 3) bike lanes, and 4) maintaining scenic views.

Other committee members asked questions related to online information for tourists, including customized trip planning tools, and smartphone apps. Mr. Michael Helta commented on the quality of the Charles Street video and that it mostly focused on driving. He asked about the possibility of partnering with the state tourism office to produce a video on transit corridors in the region (for example, the Metro subway line from Owings Mills to Johns Hopkins Hospital, with features on all destination points in between). Ms. Ersts responded that this is something MTA should follow up on with Visit Baltimore. Mr. Freeland added that he would send Mr. Helta contact information for the Visit Baltimore representative who had presented information at a previous Technical Committee meeting.

### **4. STATE OF MARYLAND CONNECTED VEHICLE GROUP PRESENTATION**

Ms. Heather Murphy, Director of the MDOT Office of Planning & Capital Programming addressed the Technical Committee on activities of the Maryland Autonomous and Connected Vehicle Working Group. The Working Group was formed after legislative attempts to create a task force to study the issues failed. Ms. Murphy provided a definition and an outline of Autonomous Vehicles (AV) and Connected Vehicles (CAV) and the mission of the Working Group. There are various levels of "autonomy", some have been in place for years (e.g. cruise control) while today most people think of AV/CAV as what is known as "level 4 and level 5" or "fully autonomous", where full operation of the vehicles is not accomplished by a human driver. As over 90% of auto crashes are due to "human error" the clearest benefit would come from relieving a person from driving responsibilities. There are currently manufacturers of these vehicles and devices looking to use public roads in Maryland, notably Local Motors at National Harbor. Currently none are permitted to operate on public roads in Maryland because of a wide range of legal, regulatory and insurance reasons. Ms. Murphy described the array of regulatory hurdles and new federal guidelines being discussed by the Working Group. Ms. Colleen Turner, MDOT Office of Planning & Capital Programming, provided a brief overview of the federal

guidelines. The Working Group is discussing these issues and meets next on December 1, 2016 at MVA Headquarters in Glen Burnie.

## **5. PROGRESS REPORT ON UPWP PROJECTS**

- **Regional Bicycle Map – Status Report**

Mr. Kaufman provided an update on the UPWP funded regional bicycle map project. The project is intended to serve as a resource for on-street and off-street bicycle facilities throughout the region, with an eye towards looking at commuter connectivity. Each jurisdiction received \$35,000 for data collection efforts and is responsible for submitting a GIS layer composed of the approved data layers and attributes. BPAG members agreed on a proposed list of attributes and layers for the map in November 2015, with approval to proceed from the BRTB and Technical Committee at their retreat in January 2016. Recommended attributes include details on data source and ownership, road/trail name, the status of the facility (planned, programmed, under construction, or existing), and facility type (bike lane, separated bike lane, signed designated bike routes, sharrows or shared lane markings, and transportation trails/shared use paths), whether the trail is part of a multi-state network, whether the facility is on one or both sides of the road, hours of operation, and posted speed limit. Status and bicycle facility types will be depicted on the map along with prohibited roadways for bicycling, regional transit, and park-&-ride lots.

BMC held a series of project kickoff meetings in spring 2016. All jurisdictions have made progress, with data collection ongoing. BMC staff have conducted monthly email check-ins as well as two rounds of conference calls to discuss progress to date. Jurisdictions should submit a finalized GIS layer with all data and attributes by late fall or early winter. BMC staff will then combine these layers into a regional layer and create a web mapping application that will be shared with local jurisdiction staff and state agencies. To ensure a consistent product, all jurisdictions should adhere to the database schema as agreed by BPAG and approved by the BRTB and TC.

***[PowerPoint: Regional Bicycle Map Update]***

- **Trip Based Model Round 8B Simulation – Initial Results**

Presentation postponed

- **T2 Training Program – Member Discussion**

Mr. Freeland noted that participants in the combined BRTB / Technical Committee retreat last December had added training as a task in the current UPWP. At a previous meeting, some committee members had expressed an interest in receiving training in traffic analysis software—not technical training necessarily but rather training in traffic analysis software targeted toward policy decision makers and planners.

Mr. Freeland stated that he had contacted the National Highway Institute (NHI) about a course that had been in the NHI catalog titled “Planning and Managing Successful Application of Traffic Analysis Tools.” The NHI representative explained that NHI was currently revising this course and is not currently offering it.

Mr. Freeland also noted that he had contacted the Technology Transfer (T2) Center in the University of Maryland's Center for Advanced Transportation Technology (CATT) to ask about that organization's course offerings in traffic analysis software. The T2 Center does not have such a course, but it has an instructor who could develop and teach this course, focusing on the needs of committee members. This course would be a 1-day, classroom-style offering at BMC. The estimated cost to develop and teach this course is \$3,000. Committee members stated their preference that this course should cover corridor-focused software packages such as VISSIM and CORSIM, not a more micro-level analysis tool such as HCS. Another member also said that a course focusing on regional and sub-regional modeling would be beneficial.

Mr. Todd Lang summarized by saying that staff would develop a proposal for a training course focusing on corridor-level analysis and would contact the T2 Center about developing and teaching such a course. For a course on regional modeling tools, Mr. Lang explained that the modeling group staff members could look into developing and presenting something along those lines to committee members

- **Metropolitan Building Activity - 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report**

Mr. Blake Fisher presented a summary of the region's building permit activity. He provided an overview of the region's residential, non-residential, and mixed-use permits for the second quarter with comparisons to national trends and regional numbers from the year prior. He also highlighted green (energy conservation) permits issued in the first half of the year.

Through a series of tables and charts Mr. Fisher illustrated trends and comparisons between jurisdictions in the region and highlighted areas of growth and contraction. The percent of new multi-family units added in the Baltimore region was well above the national average during the second quarter of 2016. Single-family units increased 7.4 percent from the 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter of 2015 and 9.2 percent year-to-date.

A total of 1,144 residential units were permitted in mixed-use developments in the second quarter of 2016, a figure that is 89.8% greater than the year prior. Mr. Fisher also noted that the region's second quarter mixed-unit development activity was focused in Howard County and Baltimore City. The estimated construction costs for the permitted mixed-use buildings stood at \$221.9 million in the second quarter of 2016.

The estimated construction costs for new non-residential permitted projects increased by 58.5 percent over the second quarter of 2015. The increase is largely attributable to the high figures reported from Anne Arundel County and Howard County. Non-residential alterations, additions and repairs (AAR) were 56 percent higher than the second quarter from the year prior and up 31 percent year-to-date. Baltimore City had two AAR permitted projects that appear in the top-five for the region.

Maryland has increased its solar capacity by 109% year-to-date 2016 from the year prior. With a strong first half of the year Maryland is now just outside the top-five in the nation surpassing states such as New Jersey and Arizona for green permits issued. Non-residential projects tend to be larger in scale, as measured by electricity output. Mr. Fisher explained that the decline in the cost of solar technology has fueled the recent growth in deployments. Lastly, regional examples were provided

of the types of projects being permitted, and Mr. Fisher highlighted the solar additions which enabled a “Net Zero” Wilde Lake Middle School.

***[PowerPoint: Baltimore Region Building Permit - Half Year Activity Update 2016]***

## **6. OTHER BUSINESS**

### **ATTENDANCE**

#### ***Members***

Martha Arzu McIntosh – Anne Arundel County Department of Planning & Zoning  
Alex Brun– Maryland Department of the Environment  
Tyson Byrne - Maryland Department of Transportation  
Ken Choi – Maryland Department of Planning  
Steve Cohoon – Queen Anne’s County Department of Public Works  
Kwaku Duah – City of Annapolis Department of Transportation  
Scott Graf – Carroll County Department of Planning & Zoning  
Michael Helta – Maryland Transit Administration (MTA)  
Emery Hines – Baltimore County Department of Public Works  
Valorie LaCour - Baltimore City Department of Transportation  
David Cookson – Howard County Department of Planning & Zoning  
Tara Penders – State Highway Administration (SHA)  
Alex Rawls – Harford County Department of Planning & Zoning

#### ***Staff and Guests***

Bala Akundi – Baltimore Metropolitan Council (BMC)  
Laurie Brown - MTA  
Charles Baber - BMC  
Greg Bauer – City DOT  
Robert Berger – BMC  
Yolanda Camp - MTA  
Heather Ersts - MD State Office of Tourism Development  
Blake Fisher - BMC  
Terry Freeland – BMC  
Don Halligan – BMC  
Todd Lang - BMC  
Mara Kaminowitz - BMC  
Zach Kaufman – BMC  
Shawn Kimberly – BMC  
Heather Murphy - MDOT  
Rebecca Smith – BMC  
Sara Tomlinson – BMC  
Colleen Turner - MDOT