1. **Approval of Agenda for Meeting**

   The draft agenda for the meeting was approved by members without modification.

2. **Review of unofficial minutes from September 29, 2020**

   Alice Giles motioned to approve the minutes with spelling correction, Ted Cochran seconded the motion. The motion to approve the minutes carried.

3. **Public Comment**

   Mary Kendall, Deputy Director with Howard Count Department of Planning and Zoning spoke to the members about HoCo by Design. A few months ago, Mary gave an overview of the General Plan, a guiding document that the County will use when they develop capital budgets policies, zoning, and land development regulations related to the built in the natural environments. Right now, they are currently in the public engagement period which is important because all the information collected through the engagement activities is going to be used to inform the themes in the general plan. The input received will help establish some of the priorities that will be in the general plan update itself. There is currently an active engagement activity called “On the Table”, which is an opportunity to bring people together.
virtually to talk about the County as it relates to growth, development, and land use. The goal of “On the Table” is to give the opportunity for resident stakeholders to come together discuss the County, improvements that need to be made, and steps that can be taken to improve it. The next planned engagement is called “The Community Ideas Exchange Workshop”, which will be a 24/7 virtual workshop. There will be multiple activities to solicit feedback and information that will help inform themes. There will also be a “Better Communities” online game. The online game will allow the participants to decide how they want to allocate growth and development through the county. The timeline for the community engagement activities is now through November 30th.

4. New Business/Ongoing Business
   i. Introduction to DPW Director, Tom Meunier, PE

Tom Meunier the new DPW Director introduced himself to the group. Prior to coming to Howard County, Tom worked for Fredrick County for almost 30 years. His last three years there he spent as the of the Director of DPW. In 2014 Tom started working for Howard County as the Bureau Chief for Highways. In 2018 Tom moved into the Director’s office. Most of the Tom’s experience has been in the road grades transportation area. Tom is familiar with many of the challenges and initiatives that the MTB is interested in. DPW supports the County’s shift and focus from simple roadway and/or capacity expansion projects to a more holistic approach at the Complete Streets concepts of transportation. Particularly in areas of the County were the residents and business value access to essential service amenities without relying on a car.

On July 1st the FY21 Budget was approved, and unfortunately DPW and Transportation Capital projects were hit hard. Projects for FY21 received $10.7 million for new appropriation. Some of the projects that received funding include growth construction projects.

- The only real significant construction project that received funding was for Phase 2 of the Savage Complete Streets.
- Sidewalk projects, which include the bicycle plan projects and/or sidewalk improvements.
- Funding for road resurfacing, traffic projects, including the downtown trail extension, and bridge inspections.

Some important projects and programs that didn’t receive any new appropriations.

- The roadside improvement programs which repairs, replaces, and installs roadside elements.
- Sidewalk repairs and improvements, as well as pedestrian plan.

The Operating Budget for FY21 has been decreased by 14% of the previous 2020 Operating Budget. Ultimately 14% less funding means 14% or fewer projects get completed. Due to funding constraints which is believed to probably continue for the next several years the County needs to maximize use of these funds and one way to do that is by asset management. A process in which you perform the right strategy at the right location at the right time, that begins with a network inventory and condition rating, then you work toward a comprehensive program. Another way to maximize the
funding is to look for ways to combine programs such as repaving and bicycle route program, which DPW is currently during in collaboration with OOT.

On the bright side the Complete Streets design manual update did receive funding and is currently underway. Some of the past year accomplishments include:

- Roundabout construction projects that were completed (Columbia Road at Hemlock Cone Way & Kingscup Ct and Steven Forest Rd at Farewell Rd & Night Street Hill)
- There were 2 crosswalk with pedestrian refuge island projects that were completed
- DPW refreshed 22 pedestrian crosswalk markings this year.
- Several traffic signal projects, both in capital and developer that were completed
- Many reconstruction projects were completed (i.e. Little Patuxent Way at Cedar Lane, Cedar Lane at Hickory Ridge Road, etc.)
- Part 1 of the Savage Complete Streets projects has been completed, and Phase 2 is expected to begin in a couple of weeks.

ii. Pedestrian Crossings in Howard County

Chris Eatough presented the group with a “Summary of Crosswalk Marking Requests” list. There are various sources on the list School Walk Zone Expansion Project, Complete Streets/Road Diet Studies, Walk Howard, and Public Request to OOT, to name a few which sums to 104 request. A lot of the requests come from planning studies as well as the Pedestrian Master Plan. OOT will coordinate with DPW to see if they have any crosswalk marking request to add to this list. Once the finalized list is compiled OOT will look at all the request individually and ask DPW to evaluate them from a technical standpoint if it’s a viable location for a crosswalk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Walk Zone Expansion Project</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Streets/Road Diet Studies</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathway or Bike Lane Design Studies</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WalkHoward (Priority Score of 10-17)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WalkHoward (Priority Score of 7-9.9)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WalkHoward (Priority Score of 4-6.9)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Request to OOT</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Request to DPW</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>104</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kris Jagarapu went over the prioritization process regarding the request. A lot of the signal reconstruction projects are used as an opportunity to add new crosswalk locations as part of the rebuild of the traffic signal. Little Patuxent Parkway at Cedar Lane was a location where there was a great need for crosswalks, which have since been installed. Once DPW receives the request list from OOT the key for DPW will be to focus on the
request that maximize the dollars available. Some of them could be county projects, while others could be developer projects when they come in. Kris mentioned that School Walk Zones are something that DPW wants to focus on. On a few projects DPW has prioritized working with School Transportation to make sure that they get implemented. At a lot of the crosswalk locations DPW tries to install signs as well as pedestrian refuge islands (where applicable). In addition, DPW wants to focus on maintaining the crosswalks that are already installed in the County (refreshing pavement markings on a timely basis). Within the last 3 years DPW has added and refreshed close to 400 crosswalks. The typical marking crosswalk life span is 5 to 10 years depending factors such as traffic volume, and heavy precipitation.

Larry Schoen questioned the cost of painting a crosswalk. While Kris J couldn’t provide an official amount, he believes the cost to be about $2,500. Larry also asked Kris J for an updated regarding the 99 signalized intersection list and whether it includes any information about the pedestrian facilities at the intersections. Kris J informed Larry that the information on was still being finalized and he should receive the requested information before the next MTB meeting.

iii. MTA Statewide Transit Plan

Jaime McKay from MTA discussed the Maryland Statewide Transit Plan with the group. The plan is going to create a vision for the next 50 years with more discrete projects and objectives for the 1st 25 years, and more visionary and broad objectives for the 2nd half of the plan’s timeframe. The purpose of the plan is to establish a vision for transit in Maryland, including the customer experience. As well as addressing the relationships between transit and other state and local goals such as economic opportunity, community development, and environmental protection. While the state-wide plan will be a high-level plan it will not repeat or recreate the content of existing local plans across the state. The plan is going to create and provide a framework for coordinated transit performance that puts the transit customer experience at the center. MTA has reviewed local and regional plans from across Maryland as well as statewide transit plans from other states to begin to develop the baseline. The MTA currently has the following draft vision and goals that they have presented to the regional roundtable participants, which they will continue to revise after the conclusion of roundtable discussions and the survey.

Draft Vision

Maryland's public transit system will connect people, places and opportunities, supporting Maryland's economy with efficient, equitable, sustainable and innovative transit. Transit riders across the state will experience convenient and coordinated travel and a dignified customer experience.

Draft Goals

- Ensure a safe, secure, and resilient transit system
- Provide inclusive, equitable, and accessible transit choices
- Deliver a reliable and quality customer experience
- Facilitate economic opportunity locally and regionally
- Leverage innovative transit infrastructure and technology
- Expand and integrate transit options and partnership
The state transit plan goals were developed in alignment with the goals of the 2040 Maryland Transportation Plan.

Jaime went on to discuss key challenges and opportunities that were heard during their five regional roundtables.

- Connections between rural and urban transit systems
- Improving reliability, frequency, and extended hours
- Promoting walkability and transit-oriented development
- Improving options and alternatives in rural areas
- Serving aging and vulnerable populations
- Addressing state of good repair needs
- Facilitating comfortable, safe, and efficient transfers

Key Future Trends heard at Roundtables
- Connected and automated vehicles
- Electric/Alternative Fuel/High Efficiency Vehicles
- Rapid bus and rail transit to TOD
- Increased walkability and cycling
- Lining up transit schedules between providers
- Integrated, cashless/contactless fares
- On demand transit options (Uber, Lyft)

The plan is mood agnostic, so it does not define or explicitly identify which mode will best serve an area but instead established the types of service that could be in demand. Since the MTA is in the very baseline development of this plan roundtables and discussions with the public will help allow the plan to reflect what the user’s needs are and build off existing community and jurisdictional plans. MTB members who have questions or would like to request additional briefing of the MTA statewide transit plan are encouraged to send inquiries to MTASP@mdot.maryland.gov.

Larry Schoen questioned what can be done to improve the connections (timing and coordination of schedules) among the transportation systems. Jaime informed Larry that it is a solvable problem and is something that the MTA can do and coordinate. MTA has data and time tables that shows where vehicles will be and when. MTA has the ability now more than ever to community it efficiently and effectively between systems to know how to align the different schedules. So, over the next 50 years this is something that can be achieved.

Shahriar Etemadi questioned whether the MTA had a monitoring system for optimization of bus stops (location, ridership). Jaime answered by telling Shahriar that while the MTA at the present doesn’t have a live monitoring system, they have several different sources of data.

David Zinner questioned whether there is a role for the transit plan in talking to legislators or to businesses about continuing telework, or changing hours, to avoid
having to build more roads. (How to plan better so that we may not necessarily need more road). Jaime answered by telling David yes, MTA is working with commuter choice and the business community. MTA have representatives from the business community in their implementation team. The implementation team advises them on how to get stuff done.

Shahriar Etemadi voiced that Transit success for the most part is in the hands of local jurisdiction. Shahriar mentioned that the group currently has the opportunity be involved with the general plan update. MTB has the chance to influence and suggest ways that can bring about better transit service to Howard Country.

iv. Revised Resolution on MTA Service Reductions/Suspensions Effective November 2\textsuperscript{nd}

Bruce Gartner briefly went over the Revised Resolution for the Transit Service Reductions. OOT drafted a resolution on the MTA’s focus on reductions to the core bus service in the Baltimore Region. The MTA Service Reductions/Suspensions negatively impacted the Baltimore region in terms of all the local connections, vulnerable population, essential workers, etc. As a result of the input through the region and elected officials, the MTA revised the plan and made so that it would more evenly spread the reduction throughout the state. The revisions resulted in reductions of approximately 60\% on MARC and Commuter Bus service, but ridership on the services has only been in the 10-13\% during the pandemic. The 150 Express Bus which services Howard County is one of the nine express buses in the region. MTB approved the resolution last meeting but a few day later MTA made some changes regarding their service reduction plans. Since MTA made changes to their service plans the previously approved resolution required to be modified/replaced. The new resolution still highlights the 150 express route which is being suspended indefinitely. The County would like to see the 150-route come back as oppose to it being suspended indefinitely. MTA has 9 express bus routes and Howard County deserves to be separated from Baltimore City and County. Mainly due to the fact that the 150 is the only operated service that serves HoCo. Bruce noted that one positive revision the MTA made was that the 320-express route, was the only commuter bus that was able to retain its full schedule, as opposed to being cut back. Ted Cochran motioned to approve the resolution, Monica Simon seconded the motion.

5. Development Updates- Dave Cookson
## Upcoming Public Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Meeting Type</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZB-1118M Erickson at Limestone Valley</td>
<td>October 28</td>
<td>Zoning Board</td>
<td>Continuation of rezoning case for continuing care retirement community and to permit the expansion/relocation and architectural enhancement of the existing Freestate Gasoline Service Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPD-19-068 Taco Bell of Baltimore, Inc.</td>
<td>October 29</td>
<td>Planning Board</td>
<td>The request is for the demolition and redevelopment of the Taco Bell pad site. The proposal is to construct a 2,753 square foot, fast food restaurant and associated site improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-10 Paddock Pointe-Phase II</td>
<td>November 4</td>
<td>Design Advisory Panel</td>
<td>Site Development Plan for Paddock Point, the old Laurel Park Development. TOD development at the Laurel Park MARC station. <a href="https://www.howardcountymd.gov/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=heq2xLqhB4%3d&amp;portalid=0">https://www.howardcountymd.gov/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=heq2xLqhB4%3d&amp;portalid=0</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-11 Route 40 Acute Care</td>
<td>November 4</td>
<td>Design Advisory Panel</td>
<td>Acute care facility on RT. 40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZB-1119M Hickory Ridge Village Center</td>
<td>November 18</td>
<td>Zoning Board</td>
<td>Continuation of rezoning case</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dave Briefly went over two plan review updates that were previously presented to the MTB.

- **Lakeview Retail (Broken Land Pkwy near Cradle Rock Drive)**
  - The County received some pushback from the applicant and since then have met with them. Currently the tentative solution is for the applicant to provide share used pathway along their frontage and then provide sidewalk. The sidewalk would connect the shared us pathway to Cradle Rock Drive. The goal is to keep the sidewalk in the public right away, since they couldn’t secure the rights to use the adjacent property owners right away or property. While it’s not the perfect solution it will provide access from the development to Cradle Rock Drive.

- **Dorsey’s Ridge Phase 1 (Cooks Lane at Old Columbia Road)**
  - This development will provide a shared use path that would offer a connection to Veteran’s Elementary School. The County plans on meeting with the applicant tomorrow to discuss the offsite improvements and the implementation of them.

### 6. Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 8:47 p.m.

### 7. Next Meeting
The next MTB meeting is scheduled for December 8, 2020.
Bruce Gartner  Date
Executive Secretary

/2020

Kimberly Woods  Date
Office of Transportation