1) Approval of Agenda for Meeting – Chairperson Schoen
MULTIMODAL TRANSPORTATION BOARD
January 26, 2021 - 7:00 p.m.
Held via Webex event
Ellicott City MD 21043
******************************************************************************
AGENDA

Regular monthly meeting

1) Approval of Agenda for Meeting – Chairperson Schoen
2) Approval of December 8, 2020 Meeting Minutes – Chairperson Schoen

3) Public Comment – General Topics *(Participants that have signed up in advance will have 3 minutes each to address the MTB)*

4) New Business/Ongoing Business
   i. Studies of Regional Transit Authority for Baltimore Region
      (1) Summary of Enos Eno Report by Brian O’Malley, CMTA 11-12-20 Enos Report - Transit Reform for Maryland
      (2) Update on Baltimore Metropolitan Council Study on Regional Transit Governance and Funding by Don Halligan, BMC Staff 12-15-21 BRTB presentation
   ii. Legislative Proposal to abolish Transit and Pedestrian Advisory Group and incorporate duties into MTB – Bruce Gartner
   iii. 2021 State Transportation Priority letter process (due to MDOT 4/1/21) – David Cookson

5) Development Project Updates – David Cookson

6) Office of Transportation Updates
   i. RTA Leadership Changes – Bruce Gartner
   ii. Active Transportation/Complete Streets Implementation Updates – Chris Eatough
   iii. FY 2022 Budget Calendar – Bruce Gartner

7) Future Meeting Items
   i. Complete Streets Implementation Updates- Ongoing
   ii. HoCo by Design – Update on 4 Growth Scenarios being analyzed
   iii. FY 22 CIP Development
   iv. Age Friendly Community Workgroup (Draft Transportation Recommendations)
   v. Update on Statewide Transit Innovation Grant Projects (Mobile Payments and Bus Stops)

8) Adjournment

9) Next Meeting – February 23, 2020 – 7:00pm
2) Approval of December 8, 2020 Meeting Minutes – Chairperson Schoen
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, David Drasin seconded the motion. The motion to approve the minutes carried.

3. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

4. New Business/Ongoing Business
   i. Pedestrian Crossings in Howard County

   Chris Eatough provided the group with an update regarding the cross-walk request chart. Since the last meeting DPW has provided OOT with the number of public requests (75) they have received regarding Crosswalk Markings.
The next steps for OOT will be to review the requests and delete any duplicate requests. Then OOT will have DPW review the request from a feasibility standpoint because there’s going to be some locations that aren’t feasible for crosswalks because of bad sightline, high speed, or they’re just not appropriate. OOT needs do a little more weeding through the list so that OOT can have a smaller list that they can narrow down and prioritize requests.

Chris Eatough briefly went over the “Howard County Owned and Maintained Traffic Signals” inventory list that was provided by DPW. The list focused on existing signalized intersections in Howard County. There are 99 signalized intersections that the County maintains. The list provides some details of the signal set up for the 99 signalized intersections such as major and minor road phasing, marked crosswalks, etc. Chris E informed the group that most of the pedestrian crossings have no right on red because it does not have good sight line for traffic approaching from the left which is needed in order to be able to safely and successfully merge out into moving traffic. David Zinner questioned how to deal with the issue of cars that stop at the red, look to the left see no cars and make a right without noticing pedestrians. Chris E answered by telling David Z that it is an enforcement issue because it is an illegal and dangerous maneuver. David Drasin questioned whether it legally mattered whether there is a sign posted. Chris E answered by telling David D if a pedestrian isn’t present then it doesn’t, but you can’t turn on red and hit a pedestrian. If the pedestrian has not yet stepped into the crosswalk it is not a legal violation, but if the pedestrian is in the crosswalk it is illegal even if it’s a no right turn on red because the driver is disobeying the pedestrians right away. David Zinner suggested better signage at every crosswalk suggesting that drivers yield to pedestrians as a solution.

Any additional questions regarding traffic signals can be directed to DPW’s Traffic and Engineering Department to obtain the best technical responses.

<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>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ii. FY22 Capital Improvement Plan Development

Bruce Gartner went over the Capital Budget for Howard County’s OOT. Bruce Gartner informed the group that he will be accepting questions afterwards via email regarding the budget.

Bruce Gartner briefly went over a chart that was presented at last month’s Transportation Town Hall. Out of the one chart, Bruce created three charts focusing first on FY21 projects that are funded by other prior year preparations. The first category of projects includes those that are funded and anticipated to go to the construction in the current fiscal year with completion in FY2022. The 2nd chart focused on FY22 projects that are
funded by FY2022 and prior year appropriations. FY2022 projects are more dependent upon future funding. While part of the list can be accomplished with appropriation levels consistent with what was anticipated during the last budget, other projects will require state funding for Construction that has yet to be secured. Projects scheduled for FY2023 and beyond are more dependent on outyear funding approvals for County funding and State grants. FY2023 and Outyear projects completion is dependent on outyear appropriations and/or State Grant Awards to fund 55-80 percent of project.

Larry Schoen bought to the group’s attention a recent email that he sent out regarding the Resolution for Testimony for the County Executive’s Budget hearing on Thursday. Larry recently added bullet number four and wanted feedback from the board members.

“4) Despite the pandemic, many of our essential workers depend on it and expanding the local transit service will be an important part of the County’s economic recovery and provide for our transit dependent population, and increased opportunities once a vaccine has been widely distributed– hopefully by the beginning of the next fiscal year. The Multimodal Transportation Board would like the County to refocus on implementing parts of the County’s adopted Transit Development Plan (TDP) at some point in CY 2022 even if that means that services would need to be started on a pilot basis through innovative partnerships.

Rationale: Expansion to Howard County School System Campus on MD 108 was postponed last year due to the pandemic and provides an important link between Columbia and a major County facility. Furthermore, the MDOT-MTA Regional Transit Plan has identified both the US 29 Corridor and the US 40 Corridor as high priority corridors for improved transit service. Improved peak hour connections to the new Montgomery County Flash Service between Columbia and Burtonsville is one such transit expansion that should be explored with the State and Montgomery County. Improved local connections between Ellicott City and Catonsville is also important due to the suspension of the MTA Express Route 150 and uncertain timeline for reinstatement after the pandemic.”

David Drasin motioned to approve the document as the MTB’s testimony subject to minor editorial tweaking, David Zinner seconded the motion. The motion to approve the testimony carried.

iii. 2021 State Transportation Priority Letter Process

David Cookson gave the group an update on the Priority Letter Process. OOT has started and is currently preplanning for the project at this point. David provided the group with an outline of tasks.
OOT plans on coming back to the MTB in January to present and discuss some of the draft changes that’s being proposed for the letter. As well as get the MTB’s feedback on priorities

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>Kimmel’s Enclave, Elkridge MD</td>
<td>December 14, 2020</td>
<td>Design Advisory Group</td>
<td>The proposed development is age-restricted multi-plex homes. There will be 3 multi-plex units at 5,000 square feet net floor area per building, each with 4 condominium dwellings with one-car garages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZB-1119M Redevelopment of Hickory Ridge Village Center</td>
<td>January 6, 2021</td>
<td>Zoning Board</td>
<td>Continuation of rezoning case.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Newly Submitted Development Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Name</th>
<th>Plan Number</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>OOT Comments</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dorsey Overlook</td>
<td>SDP-20-074</td>
<td>82 unit apartment building</td>
<td>Site plan for 82 unit apartment.</td>
<td>OOT commented on coordinating with DWP on signal improvements at Columbia Road/Old Annapolis Road.</td>
<td>Resubmit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson</td>
<td>SDP-21-017</td>
<td>Data Center</td>
<td>Fast track project for a data center.</td>
<td>OOT requested the project extend a sidewalk around the cul de sac to access the future park/rec. facility and also add bike parking for the admin portion of the building.</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
David Zinner requested that addresses be provided on the maps that are shown when going over Newly Submitted Development Plans. David Cookson agreed to provide a little more detail on the specific locations on single lot subdivisions.

Dave Briefly went over two plan review updates that were previously presented to the MTB.

- **Rauscher Property (MD103)**
  - OOT has asked for sidewalk and frontage improvements to connect to existing sidewalks on this road, DPZ has made the same request.
  - **Update**- The Applicant has requested that the fee be waived, OOT denied.

- **Roberts Property (US 1 near Duckett’s Lane)**
  - Provide ped connections to Belmont station, confirm viability of sidewalk/pathway connection to the north and south, bus stop pad.
  - **Update**- Resubmit, OOT is working with applicant to extend extending he shared use path to Loudon Ave.

6. **Office of Transportation Updates**

   Transportation Town Hall Questions and Answers

   On November 18, 2020 OOT hosted its annual Transportation Town Hall for Howard County residents. Howard County responded to approximately 28 questions during and after the Transportation Town Hall. The link to the responses can be found on Howard County’s Office of Transportation website. Anyone interesting in viewing this information can click [here](#).

   Larry Schoen informed the group that Maple Lawn Blvd is one of the case study locations that is currently being used as an example to look at rewrites of the design manual for roads in Howard County to make Multimodal.

   David Zinner wanted to know if the MTB could ask the state to provide an inventory of bridges in Howard County and their plans for upgrading them. Including areas that lead up to them that are under state jurisdiction something similar to the “Howard County Owned and Maintain Traffic Signals” inventory list. Bruce Gartner suggested that it might be helpful to ask the state. Bruce encouraged David Z to put the request in writing so that OOT is making the right request.

7. **Adjournment**
   The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

8. **Next Meeting**
   The next MTB meeting is scheduled for January 26, 2021.
Bruce Gartner                       Date
Executive Secretary

Kimberly Woods                      Date
Office of Transportation
3) Public Comment – General Topics

(Participants that have signed up in advance will have 3 minutes each to address the MTB)
4) New Business/Ongoing Business

i. Studies of Regional Transit Authority for Baltimore Region
   (1) Summary of Enno Report by Brian O’Malley, CMTA
   (2) Update on Baltimore Metropolitan Council Study on Regional Transit Governance and Funding by Don Halligan, BMC Staff

ii. Legislative Proposal to abolish Transit and Pedestrian Advisory Group and incorporate duties into MTB – Bruce Gartner

iii. 2021 State Transportation Priority letter process (due to MDOT 4/1/21) – David Cookson
ENO Report on Regional Transit Governance and Funding

https://issuu.com/enotrans/docs/transit_reform_for_maryland_new_models_for_accou/1?ff
Transit Reform for Maryland

Brian O’Malley, Central Maryland Transportation Alliance

January 26, 2021

Howard County
Multimodal Transportation Board
2020 Transportation Report Card

D The Central Maryland Region’s Grade

- Streets are dangerous for pedestrians
- Transit breakdowns hurt reliability
- We need to reset our priorities
Transit Reform for MARYLAND

New Models for Accountability, Stability, and Equity

NOVEMBER 2020

https://www.enotrans.org/eno-resources/transit-reform-for-md/
Key highlights:

1. Currently, of the 50 largest transit systems in the U.S., the MTA is the only one that answers only to one person: the Governor.

2. Determining the long-term vision and goals for what a transit system should accomplish is vital to a healthy transit network.

3. The lack of local participation in planning and funding decisions has been a contributing factor in the maintenance problems and lack of significant expansion or improvement in the last two decades.

4. Three case studies for best practices: Metro Transit (Minneapolis-St. Paul region), the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (Boston region), and the Port Authority of Allegheny County (Pittsburgh region).

5. State involvement in Maryland transit is beneficial, but power is too consolidated.
Three options for governance reform, with varying degrees of deviation from the status quo:

- establishing three advisory boards;
- establishing a board of directors over the Maryland Transit Administration;
- or establishing a Baltimore Regional Transit Authority with participation from the state and local governments.
Questions I hope the BRTB study will address:

- What share of the Transportation Trust Fund expenditures should go to the Central Maryland transit system under a fair distribution?

- If a regional authority is formed, can parts of counties opt in while other parts of counties opt out? Perhaps by Priority Funding Areas.

- How should locally operated transit systems like the RTA, Harford Transit and the Charm City Circulator be governed?
About Baltimore Regional Transportation Board (BRTB)

• Metropolitan Planning Organization
  – Representing 2.8 Million Population

• Planning & Programming for the Region’s Federal Surface Transportation Funds

• 11 Subcommittees
  – Bike/Ped.
  – Safety
  – Public Advisory
  – Demographic/Employment Forecasting
  – Traffic Signals
  – Freight
  – Technical
  – Incident Mgmt.
  – Air Quality
  – Trans/Public Works
  – Disaster Debris
The Baltimore region includes the cities of Annapolis and Baltimore, as well as the counties of Anne Arundel, Baltimore, Carroll, Harford, Howard, and Queen Anne’s.
SCOPE AND SCHEDULE

SCOPE OF WORK

1. History of MDOT MTA and the LOTs System
2. Review of Current Status
3. Financial Review
4. Review of Peer Agencies/Regions
5. Review of Transit Funding Measures
6. Options for Governance and Funding

❖ Stakeholder and Community Engagement
# 3. SCOPE AND SCHEDULE

## SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>DELIVERABLE</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>History of MDOT MTA and the LOTS System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Prepare Technical Memo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>BRTB Meeting (Materials, Agenda, and Facilitation)</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Review of Current Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Prepare Technical Memo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>BRTB Meeting (Materials, Agenda, and Facilitation)</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Financial Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Prepare Technical Memo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>BRTB Meeting (Materials, Agenda, and Facilitation)</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Review of Peer Agencies/Regions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Prepare Technical Memo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>BRTB Meeting (Materials, Agenda, and Facilitation)</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Review of Transit Funding Measures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Prepare Technical Memo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>BRTB Meeting (Materials, Agenda, and Facilitation)</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Options for Governance and Funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Prepare Technical Memo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>BRTB Meeting (Materials, Agenda, and Facilitation)</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Public and Community Engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Public and Community Engagement (Main Events)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**BRTB**

Baltimore Regional Transportation Board
**SCOPE AND SCHEDULE**

**STAKEHOLDER COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT**

**Stakeholder Meetings and Interviews**
- Understand perspectives, needs and opportunities
- Collect data and information
- Includes staff, elected officials and advocates

**Panel Discussion on Governance**
- Shaped with BRTB Input
- Collaborate with TransitCenter (Getting to the Route of It)
- Timed with Peer Review

**Virtual Town Halls**
- Summary of Existing Conditions (late March)
- Share Draft Options for Governance & Funding (June)

**Meeting Materials, Draft & Final Reports**
- Published on BMC website
GOVERNANCE & FUNDING GOALS

**Regional Connections**
Better meet regional travel needs
Seamless connections between services

** Improve Coordination**
Support local planning efforts
Improved regional planning

** Improve Service**
More service hours and frequency
Better transit reliability
Better service quality

** Improve Coordination**
Support local planning efforts
Improved regional planning

** Enhance Decision Making**
More local input and support
More regional decision-making framework
Promote transparency & accountability

** Increase Investment**
Address State of Good Repair needs
Invest in major transit infrastructure
Increase funds for transit operations

** Ensure Equitable Investment**
Expand funding sources
Consider distribution of funding
Improve cost effectiveness of delivering services
HISTORY of MDOT MTA and LOTS

1908
State Roads Commission created
with Commissioner appointed by Governor

1910
State Public Service Commission created
to regulate transportation providers

1957
On-Going Issues with private Baltimore Transit Company lead the Mayor to call for local or public ownership; City Council and business community reject role for the City

1961
Metropolitan Transit Authority created
by General Assembly to regulate/oversee public transit in the City of Baltimore and Baltimore County (MTA replaces PSC).
[Board includes locally-appointed members as majority; BTC continues to operate the service]

1969
Stikes lead General Assembly to create new Metropolitan Transit Authority to take over ownership and operation of BTC services, and to construct and operate a regional rapid transit system; Anne Arundel now included

1970
MDOT formed
to be statewide transportation agency with Governor-appointed Secretary and Commission
*“New” MTA is included as a modal administration*

1985
Statewide Specialized Transportation Assistance Program
Provides state funds to Counties under MTA administration; reinforces role of administering grants to Counties

1983
MARc brand created
for commuter rail, Baltimore Metro subway opens

1978
State Railroad Administration created
in MDOT, separate from MTA

1974-75
County Governments assume responsibility for planning, managing and operating county-based services, MTA provides funding

1974
MTA re-organized into three divisions:
1. Operate Baltimore transit services
2. Plan and construct rapid rail
3. Administer grants for transit programs statewide

1987
MTA begins funding contracted commuter bus service

1992
MTA assumes functions of State Railroad Administration
MARc now part of MTA; first section of MTA Light Rail opens

2015-2017
MTA Baltimore services restructured and rebranded as BaltimoreLink
HISTORY OF MDOT MTA AND LOTS

Implications for Transit Funding and Governance

- Long history of State involvement in transit development and funding in the Baltimore Region
  - State’s role created stability and created an early vision for rapid transit services
- Maryland has been less active in suburban systems
  - Provide technical support and funding but allow more local control
- The MTA expanded its jurisdiction twice:
  - Management of federal transit funding for statewide transit programs
  - Modal expansion from a Baltimore-oriented transit operator to the provider of light, heavy and commuter rail (MARC) and commuter bus services for the greater region
For More Information

https://baltometro.org/transportation/planning-areas/multi-modal-planning/transit-human-service-transportation-coordination

Don Halligan | Senior Transportation Planner
410-732-0500 x1002 | dhalligan@baltometro.org | www.baltometro.org
Summary of Legislative Proposal to Eliminate TPAG and amend provisions related to the Howard County Multimodal Transportation Board (MTB)

The Transit and Pedestrian Advisory Group (TPAG) was brought into existence in 2017 by County legislation to advise and inform the Office on transportation matters; provide additional subject matter expertise to the Office; and provide feedback and technical assistance on the implementation of master plans and other initiatives and policy issues.

The purpose of the draft legislation is to streamline the stakeholder input process to the Office of Transportation and update the language pertaining to the MTB to reflect recent trends in transportation policy since the adoptions of the Complete Streets Policy adopted by County Council in late 2019.

These changes concern Sec.6.408, Sec. 21.502, and Sec. 21.503 of the Howard County Code regarding Traffic Control and Transportation and the Department of County Administration, Office of Transportation and will eliminate the Transit and Pedestrian Advisory Group and incorporate duties into the general powers, and duties of the Multimodal Transportation Board and its membership.
The proposed changes to the County Code include:

- Elimination of all references to the Transit and Pedestrian Advisory Group.
- Providing language concerning our transportation network that is consistent with the County’s Complete Streets policy emphasizing safety, connectivity, equity, and sustainability.
- Specific reference to active transportation, which includes bicycling, walking, and e-scooters, to reflect the increased importance these modes have in our County and country and which promote healthy citizens and healthy communities.
- Inclusion of micromobility as a mode, which includes e-scooters, to be consistent with Council Bill 3-2020, Electric Scooter Sharing Permits.
- Requesting a more active role of the MTB members, specifically to support and educate themselves on transportation issues related to Howard County and vulnerable populations.
- Addressing the fact that our transportation network serves visitors, as well as residents and businesses.
- Redressing language focused explicitly on transit from previous Code amendments and clarifying the MTB’s focus on helping to provide a network that includes multiple transportation options.

Financially, there are no budgetary obligations required to enact these changes; on the contrary, the elimination of a redundant advisory group will eliminate unnecessary demands on staff, improve efficiency, and assist staff to better support existing and future County transportation policies, projects, and initiatives.
HOWARD COUNTY
MULTIMODAL
TRANSPORTATION BOARD

Priority Letter Presentation

January 26, 2021
What Role Does The Priority Letter Play

• Priority letters represent each County’s internal ranking of transportation priorities

• Priority letters involve requests for a wide variety of projects, such as transit improvements, highway reconstruction, highway capacity projects

• Multi-modal submissions enable local governments to have a greater impact on all State transportation investment decisions
How They Relate
Priority Letter and Scoring

• **Priority Letter Process**
  • Utilized by MDOT to consider system preservation, safety and all highway/transit capacity or enhancement projects under $5 million, TOD designations, local transit or aviation projects, etc.
  • Priority Letters shall still include Major Transportation project priorities but they will not be evaluated and considered for funding if they do not have a Chapter 30 Application submitted by March 1st.
  • Does Not Require an Application or Any Project Data

• **Chapter 30 Scoring**
  • Only applies to Major Transportation Projects over $5 Million
  • Requires Separate Application Process for Funding Consideration
  • Requires Project, Cost & Local Impact Information
January

- Project Planning
- MTB
- DPZ/DPW Meeting
- Public Outreach Notice

February

- Public Meeting 2/17/2021
- Meet with council members
- Work session with MTB
- Meet with delegates
- Draft Priority Letter
- Ch. 30 Scoring Input
- Compile Comments
- Review Results
- Develop Draft Letter

March

- Send Draft Letter to County Council and State Delegates for Feedback
- Review Results
- Chap 30. Finalized
- Finalize Draft Letter

April

- Finalize Letter
- Submit Letter to Maryland Department of Transportation
What goals do projects need to meet
What goals do projects need to meet

• Support Goals of State Transportation Plan
  • Safety & Security
  • System Preservation
  • Quality of Service
  • Environmental Stewardship
  • Community Vitality
  • Economic Prosperity
What Projects Require Scoring

Only Major Transportation Projects required to go through Chapter 30 Scoring Model

- Highway Capacity Projects Over $5M
- Transit Capacity Projects Over $5M

Projects That Do Not Go Through the Chapter 30 Scoring Model are

- System Preservation Projects
- Safety Projects
- Non-Highway/Transit Capacity Projects
- All Capacity Projects Under $5M
MTB Priorities?

• Considerations
  • Funding Cuts
  • 6 year time horizon in the CTP
  • Legacy Projects
  • Travel Patterns
  • HoCo By Design

• Opportunities?
  • Smaller scale projects?
    • Bike Focus?
    • Ped Focus?
    • Smaller scale projects?
Questions?
5) Development Project Updates – David Cookson
The Development Project Report for the Howard County Multimodal Transportation Board for plans going through the county review process.

The report is composed of:

1. Upcoming development related public meetings for projects with transportation impacts.
2. A selection of plans submitted since the last MTB on 12/8/2020 to about one week before the date of the Development Project Report (01/26/2021) This selection is based on staff assessment of plans that might be of interest to the MTB based on transportation impact, size and location.
3. Updates on already previously submitted development projects.
# 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-1119M Hickory Ridge Village Center</td>
<td>January 27</td>
<td>Zoning Board</td>
<td>Redevelopment of Hickory Ridge Village Center to amend the Preliminary Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA 776-D Karin Neufeld, et al (JN)</td>
<td>February 4</td>
<td>Hearing Examiner</td>
<td>Appeal of a DPZ letter approving WP-20-0016 for Clarksville Crossing Page 2 for lots 7-12 to share an access easement instead of providing public road frontage and removal of specimen trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZB 1118M Erickson at Limestone Valley</td>
<td>February 10</td>
<td>Zoning Board</td>
<td>To rezone 62.11 acres from B-2 &amp; RC-DEO to CEF-M for development of a continuing care retirement community and to permit the expansion/relocation and architectural enhancement of the existing Freestate Gasoline Service Station (MD 108, 12170 Clarksville Pike &amp; p/o 5450 Sheppard Lane)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA 20-002C Rock Realty, Inc. c/o H&amp;H Rock Companies</td>
<td>February 18</td>
<td>Board of Appeals</td>
<td>Conditional Use for 58 age-restricted adult housing units consisting of semi-detached dwelling units. (12170 Lime Kiln Road, Fulton, MD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascade Ridge</td>
<td>February 4</td>
<td>Planning Board</td>
<td>Planning board approval for ~9 acre parcel 16 single family lots on Landing Road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Newly Submitted Development Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Name</th>
<th>Plan Number</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>OOT Comments</th>
<th>Bike/Ped</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wellington Farms Phase 1 Section 1</td>
<td>F-21-025</td>
<td>45 units, mix of detached and attached</td>
<td>This is the road plan for a section of phase 1 of the 395 single family attached and detached development.</td>
<td>No comment as of now, under review</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Address/Link: Project

[Map Image]

[Plan Image]
## Plan Name: Bethany Glen ARAH

**Address/Link:** Project

**Plan Number:** SP-21-002

**Units:** 154 units

**Description:** Applicant is proposing 154 units of age restricted housing on two parcels on Bethany Lane south of 170 and on MD 99 north of 170.

**OOT Comments:** OOT has requested the sidewalk segment extend to the firehouse and to Postwick Road, sidewalk on internal roads as well bike lanes on MD 99.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bike/Ped</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Resubmit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Next Steps:**
- Resubmit.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month entered for MTB</th>
<th>Plan Name</th>
<th>Plan Number</th>
<th>Roads/Streets</th>
<th>Number of Units/Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Bike/Ped</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Plan Status / Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jun-19</td>
<td>Bethany Glen</td>
<td>SP-19-005</td>
<td>MD 99, Bethany Lane, &amp; Longview Dr.</td>
<td>112 SFA and SFD units</td>
<td>This development is for 112 units with frontages on MD 99, Bethany Lane, and Longview Drive. The developer is providing some road improvements along the existing public road and the roads internal to the subdivision.</td>
<td>OOT instructed the developer to provide bike improvements, sidewalk extensions and to extend a proposed road to eliminate a Use in Common Driveway.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes - OOT instructed applicant to provide bike improvements, sidewalk extensions and to extend a proposed road to eliminate a Use in Common Driveway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-20</td>
<td>Lakeview Retail</td>
<td>SDP-20-042</td>
<td>Broken Land Parkway near Cradle Rock Drive</td>
<td>~8500 sq. ft</td>
<td>This project is for a 8500 sq. ft one story two bay commercial building with a fast turn over restaurant and coffee shop. The project will have a drive through.</td>
<td>OOT is requesting the applicant provide sidewalk/pathway along the frontage to Cradlerock Rock drive and connect to an existing bus stop.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes - OOT is requesting resubmission. Met with applicant, tentative solution is to provide sidewalk, sidewalk on adjacent property to Cradle Rock. Project went to HC planning board, denied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-20</td>
<td>Dorsey’s Ridge Phase 1</td>
<td>SDP-20-039/SDP-21-005</td>
<td>Cooks Lane at Old Columbia Road</td>
<td>57 units</td>
<td>Dorsey’s Ridge is a 57 residential unit project, with an expected build out of 55 townhouses and 2 apartments. Phase 1 is for four townhouses. The whole project will provide sidewalks along Cooks Lane to Old Columbia Road, on Old Columbia Road to connect to the existing sidewalk network as well as a shared use pathway along the utility corridor to connect to Veterans Elementary School.</td>
<td>OOT has asked applicants to provide phasing information on the pathway and sidewalk elements on Old Columbia Road.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes - OOT will be requesting resubmission. Meeting with applicant during week of 10-06-20 to discuss offsite improvements. Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Case Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Zoning Case</td>
<td>Existing Transit</td>
<td>Update</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-20</td>
<td>Bethany Glen</td>
<td>BA-17-018C</td>
<td>MD 99, Bethany Lane, &amp; Longview Dr. 154 SFA and SFD units</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>This is a conditional use zoning request, OOT is coordinating comments with DRP. Will be asking for full frontage improvements along MD 99, as well as addressing potential pedestrian and potential speeding on one road.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-20</td>
<td>Talbott Springs ES</td>
<td>SDP-20-051</td>
<td>Whitacre Road School</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>This site plan is for the new Talbott Springs Elementary School. The project is not proposing any changes to access points or frontage improvements. OIT has requested bike parking and has provided guidance to the applicant on the type.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-20</td>
<td>Rauscher Property</td>
<td>SDP-20-056</td>
<td>MD 103 1 unit</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Resubmit</td>
<td>This is a plan for 1 unit SFD on MD 103. OOT has asked for sidewalk and frontage improvements to connect to existing sidewalks on this road, DPZ has made the same request.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-20</td>
<td>Keim Property</td>
<td>SDP-20-048</td>
<td>MD 99 at Toby Lane 4 Units</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>This is the site plan for 4 single family houses. The applicant will be providing a fee in lieu to the sidewalk project on MD99 at Raleigh Tavern.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August-20</td>
<td>Columbia EZ Storage</td>
<td>Storage complex SDP-20-077</td>
<td>Berger Road/Snowden River Parkway Self-Storage</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>This project will tear down an existing one story building and replace with a 4 story self-storage unit. Frontage improvements on Berger, connection to Snowden River PA/Intersection.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October-20</td>
<td>Oakland Ridge Industrial Park</td>
<td>SDP-21-003</td>
<td>Commercial Building</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Close to existing transit stop</td>
<td>Resubmit</td>
<td>The applicant is proposing to demolish an existing commercial building and replace. The applicant has been asked to provide ADA access from the sidewalk to the building.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October-20</td>
<td>Chapelgate Woods</td>
<td>F-21-011</td>
<td>Marriottsville Road, Resort Road 134 attached units</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Resubmit</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td>ODT has commented on the width of the loop pathway and bike parking. Internal trail system, ped access across Marriottsville Road.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October-20</td>
<td>Roberts Property</td>
<td>SP-21-001</td>
<td>US 1 near Duckett’s Lane 359 multi family and attached single family houses, 7,300 sq ft commercial.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Resubmit</td>
<td>The applicant is proposing to build a mix of townhouses and apartments on the former site of an automobile junkyard. This project was based on rezoning case no. ZB-1116M. The applicant is proposing new signals at Duckett’s Lane and Troy Hill, along with a sidewalk/shared use path a long US 1 to the south and north. Provide ped connections to Belmont station, confirm viability of sidewalk/pathway connection to the north and south, bus stop pad.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>SDP Number</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>OOT Requested</td>
<td>Actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December-20</td>
<td>Emerson SDP-21-017</td>
<td>I95/Gorman Road/Stephan Road- Near I95</td>
<td>Data center. The applicant is proposing to build a data center to serve US government operations in the region.</td>
<td>OOT requested the project extend a sidewalk around the cul de sac to access the future park/rec. facility and also add bike parking for the admin portion of the building.</td>
<td>Yes No Approved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December-20</td>
<td>Dorsey Overlook SDP-20-074</td>
<td>MD 108 at Columbia Road</td>
<td>Site plan for 82 unit apartment. OOT commented on coordinating with DWP on signal improvements at Columbia Road/Old Annapolis Road.</td>
<td>Ped access from 108/Columbia road intersection Transit on Old Annapolis road.</td>
<td>Resubmit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6) Office of Transportation Updates

i. RTA Leadership Changes – Bruce Gartner

ii. Active Transportation/Complete Streets Implementation Updates – Chris Eatough

iii. FY 2022 Budget Calendar – Bruce Gartner
Brief Updates – Bike Projects

**Route 32 Bike Alternative**
- SHA must provide a parallel biking option to Route 32 from Route 108 to Burntwood Road
- Ten Oaks Road is the selected option
- Howard County met with MDOT staff on 1/21/21 to provide guidance on priority and design

**Hickory Ridge Bike Corridor Study**
Grace Drive to Downtown Columbia (red is pathway, blue is bike lanes)

**2021 Active Transportation Open House (virtual)**
- Webpage coming soon on Office of Transportation website
- Week long, Feb 19-26
- Will include “office hours”

**Complete Streets Design Manual**
- Being developed chapter by chapter by Complete Streets Implementation Team
- Draft expected for public review in June 2021
- Due to Council in October 2021
# Howard County Design Manual Updates

Tentative schedule as of November 25, 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>New chapter #</th>
<th>Old chapter #</th>
<th>Email draft to core team</th>
<th>Discuss at core team meeting</th>
<th>Email revised draft to CSIT</th>
<th>Discuss at CSIT meeting</th>
<th>CSIT comments due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>October 21, 2020</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>November 4, 2020</td>
<td>November 13, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge and Structure Design</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>March 10, 2021</td>
<td>March 17, 2021</td>
<td>March 26, 2021</td>
<td>April 7, 2021</td>
<td>April 16, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Design</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Part of 5</td>
<td>March 10, 2021</td>
<td>March 17, 2021</td>
<td>March 26, 2021</td>
<td>April 7, 2021</td>
<td>April 16, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Public Facilities Test</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* To be discussed over two rounds of meetings. Will also include updates to the cross sections in Design Manual Volume IV.
HOWARD COUNTY BUDGET CALENDAR – FY 2022

January – February – Spending Affordability Committee Meetings (Typically Thursdays at 7:00am)

February 2021 - Planning Board Considers Capital Budget and Recommendations for County Executive

March 2021 - County Executive’s Second Residents Budget Hearing

April 1, 2021 - Capital Budget Submitted to Council

April 19, 2021 - County Executive Budget Presentation (6:30pm)

April 20, 2021 - Preliminary Date for Public Hearing on Capital Budget (4pm)

April 22, 2021 - Operating Budget Due to Council

April 21 – May 21 - Operating and Capital Budget Work Sessions typically take place MWF beginning at 9am

May 5, 2021 - Preliminary Date for Public Hearing on Operating Budget (6:30pm)

May 19, 2021 – Budget Amendment Pre file Deadline

May 26, 2021 – Target Date for Budget Adoption by County Council
7) Future Meeting Items

i. Complete Streets Implementation Updates- Ongoing
ii. HoCo by Design – Update on 4 Growth Scenarios being analyzed
iii. FY 22 CIP Development
iv. Age Friendly Community Workgroup (Draft Transportation Recommendations)
v. Update on Statewide Transit Innovation Grant Projects (Mobile Payments and Bus Stops)

8) Adjournment

9) Next Meeting – February 23, 2020 – 7:00pm