

Members

Present: Larry Schoen, Chair
Ted Cochran, Vice Chair
David Drasin
Alice Giles
Marlene Hendler
Monica Simon

Staff: Bruce Gartner, Executive Secretary
Carrie Anderson-Watters, Office of Transportation
Allison Calkins, Office of Transportation
David Cookson, Office of Transportation
Chris Eatough, Office of Transportation
Brian Muldoon, Office of Transportation

Members Excused: David Zinner

Members of the Public: Terri Hansen

1. Approval of Agenda for Meeting

The draft agenda for the meeting was presented for approval and adopted.

2. Review of Minutes from October 26, 2021

The draft minutes for the October meeting were presented for approval. Ted Cochran motioned to approve the minutes and Alice Giles seconded the motion. Minutes passed unanimously.

3. Public Comment

There was no request for comment from members of the public.

4. New Business/Ongoing Business

- i. Summary of Federal Infrastructure Bill – Bruce Gartner
 - a. Counties can be direct applicants for grants (instead of going through the state) which is a hallmark of this legislation.
 - b. Maryland should receive over \$4B in Maryland for highways plus another \$1.7B for transit over the next five years.
 - c. MDOT might incorporate some of this funding into the final CTP that’s given to the General Assembly in January, but all the details could take a few months which could create the need for a supplemental budget.
 - d. There will also be grants to remove infrastructure in order to reconnect communities.
 - e. There are specific programs related to pedestrians.
 - f. We are going to look at what the type of program is for the county, level of benefits, and list our projects or a program of projects that we might be able to gain interest from neighboring jurisdictions in the Baltimore region or in the state for a possible larger grant program the state could pursue.

- g. Many of these are competitive so we'll be more focused on grant writing and monitoring in our office, including potentially adding a position to the office or more resources.
 - i. MTB question: We support you staffing up for this. Can grants be submitted by other entities?
 - 1. OoT response: there usually needs to be a public sector sponsor.
- h. We'll be looking at what we might leverage with the state or a private developer.
- i. We joined Montgomery County on a grant application to expand the Flash service into the County.

5. Development Updates- David Cookson

- a. Erickson Senior Living Plan passed 4-1 by Zoning Board. Analysis has not yet been undertaken.
- b. One new project is coming in which is the demolition of the pedestrian bridge over Little Patuxent Parkway. Brookfield properties, the bridge's owner, did an engineering assessment and it found that major investment is necessary to keep it standing. In order to make the replacement ADA compliant, they have proposed a pathway from the mall with switchbacks along Little Patuxent to the signal at Whole Foods. It will include signal upgrades and changes to that intersection which we believe will create a better situation than we currently have. This is coming through as a red line revision.
 - i. MTB comment: concerned about at grade crossings for pedestrians because vehicles are not expecting people to cross. Program should include traffic calming or a change in signalization.
 - ii. MTB comment: the plan includes too many switchbacks and they should do better than that to accommodate the coming development, possibly another pedestrian bridge that is ADA compliant that doesn't involve so many switchbacks.
 - iii. OoT comment: the switchbacks are necessary for the pathway to be ADA compliant. Brookfield is not interested in funding a solution that leaves the non-ADA compliant bridge in place short-term and there is no obligation to provide that bridge. The crossing is a fully signalized intersection so the pedestrian signal crossing will be incorporated into the existing intersection.
 - iv. MTB question: Do we have a long-term vision of what multimodal transportation will look like in this area?
 - 1. OoT response: yes, it's built into the downtown plan and we are always trying to get the plan realized while also balancing conflicting ideas. We are looking for things that make the road more approachable and slow the traffic down from a boulevard arterial to a more commercial downtown street with retail activity along the corridor.
 - v. MTB request: Could you share the plan that shows actual crossings in certain locations?
 - 1. OoT response: The Downtown Columbia Plan is the vision and the plans come through the development process. The concept is what is engineered to in the site plans. It's also reflected in *Bike Howard*.
 - vi. MTB comment: All these projects are in the same general area, but little projects are looked at separately.
 - 1. OoT response: most of the development downtown is driven by private section development and the property owners advance their own interests within the context of the downtown plan. DPZ works with them to make sure what is proposed aligns with the plan which provides guidance on these elements.
 - vii. MTB question: What is the county's role? Can you say they can't do it?

1. OoT response: The master plan guides the development. Everything must meet the rules and regulations or must be revised to move forward.
- viii. MTB comment: Could we have a future MTB meeting focus on walkability in DTC or a walk audit? We're not in favor of a piecemeal project like this and want to address the larger issue.
 1. OoT response: There is an on-going traffic study related to the big picture in downtown, but we're looking at a few months before that's ready. We could bring those findings back to you. If you want to express an opinion about this project you could send something to the main developers about your position.
- ix. MTB comment: We would like the minutes to reflect that there is almost no support for this project and a lot of interest in making walkability in this area of DTC. Also, you've implied we have limited leverage over this developer.
 1. OoT response: We can point you to the master plan and talk to DPZ to see how they view this. We understand that walkability and integration is huge and it's an ongoing challenging with a lot of players and the pacing of development. It is the mall's property and it's somewhat up to them in terms of what they're going to do.
- x. MTB request: Can we get an update at the January meeting?
 1. OoT response: We'll talk to DPZ and let you know in December.
- xi. Community comment: This ties in with what we are trying to do to make this an age-friendly community and having a fair amount of walkability. There are a lot of voices other than the just the MTB board.
- c. Maple Lawn school: Daycare center off US 1. We're trying to work out a way for them to provide sidewalk from a large residential development.

6. Office of Transportation Updates

- i. Complete Streets Design Manual Schedule – Chris Eatough
 - a. CSIT met 36 times since December 2019
 - b. Summary of Volume III Updates
 - i. Chapter 1: New Street Types
 - ii. Chapter 2: New tools for pedestrian, bicycle, and transit design; speed management tools. Focus on safety for all users.
 - iii. Chapter 3: New shared use pathway bridges and underpasses; revisions to retrofit standards
 - iv. Chapter 4: Revisions referred to coordination with subdivision regulations; updated growth rate
 - v. Chapter 5: Added bicycle studies and updated pedestrian studies
 - c. Discussing interim versus experimental approval topic.
 - d. Schedule:
 - i. December 14 – Public Works Board
 - ii. December 22 – pre-file with County Council
 - iii. January 2022 – County Council consideration
 - iv. Early 2022 – Design Manual training
 - v. 2022 – Subdivision and Land Development Regulations and related Design Manual changes (must be done within nine months after adoption by County Council)
 - e. Final draft will be posted to website next week.
 - f. Will be looking for motion of support from MTB at next month's meeting.
- ii. RTA Driver Shortage – Bruce Gartner

- a. Briefing County Executive for salary adjustments and bonuses as well as targeted service modifications through at least March 2022.

7. Future Meeting Items

- i. Complete Streets Implementation Updates-Ongoing
- ii. Update MTA Service (Express Bus, MARC)
- iii. Capital Budget/ Project Updates
- iv. Little Patuxent Parkway Pedestrian Bridge/DTC Walkability

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned with no objections at 8:32 p.m.

9. Next Meeting

The next MTB meeting is scheduled for December 16, 2021 at 7pm.



Bruce Gartner
Executive Secretary

December 16, 2021

Date