
ATTAINMENT REPORT ADVISORY COMMITTEE (ARAC)

MEETING #3 SUMMARY

TSO RICHARD TRAINOR CONFERENCE ROOM

APRIL 9, 2018

2:00-4:00 PM

1. Introductions and Meeting Objectives

Pat Keller opened the meeting, welcomed attending members, and thanked all the MDOT Transportation Business Units (TBU) staff for their efforts supporting the work of the committee.

Stacy Cook noted that the goal for the meeting is to try to cover the remaining four goals, but it is possible that the final goal will need to be addressed in the May meeting.

2. Goal: Promote Fiscal Responsibility – Ensure responsible investment and management of taxpayer resources to add value and deliver quality transportation improvements through performance based decision-making and innovative funding mechanisms and partnerships.

1. Objective: Accelerate project completion through improved and efficient use of alternative project delivery methods and strategic partnerships.
 - a. Percent of roadway access permits issued within 21 days or less (after receipt of a complete application package)
 - Jim Beauchamp suggested that the objective and the suggested performance measures for objective 1 might not match since objective 1 seems to be focused on the completion of major highway projects.
 - Lorraine Moore said that the percent of roadway access permits measures development access to state roadways, not private driveways. Stacy said that this measure is aimed at measuring the time to process these permits which had historically taken a longer time.
 - It was also noted that access permits may best fit under an economic goal. Tim Davis added that access permits are a major factor for localities' experience with MDOT. Since access permitting was decentralized, the process has greatly improved.
 - Lorraine stated that five years ago this measure was at 72%, and for FY2018 Quarter 1 this measure is at 100%. Michelle Martin said that since this performance measure will likely not be needed long-term, it should likely not be retained in the AR.
 - Since this goal is fiscal responsibility, accelerated project delivery, might fit under a different goal, but the group agreed that perhaps these measures should be re-assessed to determine the appropriate measures for this goal.

- Stacy noted that Excellerator measures 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3 address contract completion within a certain time.

b. Potential New Measure:

- New Measure: Alternative Service Delivery (ASD) cost savings of customers (could also calculate Greenhouse Gas (GHG) savings due to trips not taken) – see Excellerator 10.7c
 - Stacy noted that this is an Excellerator measure reported by MDOT MVA, which has seen a notable increase in ASD in recent years. ASD includes items such as the delivery of MDOT MVA services (e.g., license renewal) online instead of a typical in-person visit to a MVA branch.

2. Objective: Provide transportation services and solutions that maximize value.

a. Number of nonstop airline markets served

- No changes were proposed to this measure.

b. User cost savings for the traveling public due to incident management

- Tim asked how the costs were calculated.
- This measure addresses the differential in the delay time. The actual delay and the delay for a typical day without incident are compared, and then the value of time for personal and freight hours saved, dollar value per hour per vehicle, is calculated. The University of Maryland's Civil Engineering Department conducts this analysis. This is focused on highway incident management.
- Jim noted that the dollar per hour conversion may be generally understood by the layman, and that if this is presented as raw hours versus a cost it may be more relatable.
- Subrat Mahapatra responded that presenting just hours of delay is possible, but that this measure incorporates more than just the traveler's time monetized (for example, extra fuel expended is also monetized).
- Stacy said MDOT could potentially use this same graph and add a second axis for hours.

c. Operating cost per revenue vehicle mile

- It was clarified that the operating cost per revenue vehicle mile is calculated for all MDOT MTA modes.
- Steve Chan noted that the benefits of using mass transit to the individual (i.e., reduction in household savings costs) and to society (i.e., less congestion, fewer emissions, fewer incidents) could potentially be shown in the AR.
- Ross indicated that gas saved is a metric MDOT MTA has, but historically measuring all of these benefits from the use of mass transit has been difficult to measure. MDOT MTA is currently examining the impacts of the temporary shutdown of Metro Subway.
- Jim asked about the units – i.e. whether it is measured per passenger mile.

- Ross explained that the operating cost per revenue vehicle mile is the cost to operate based on how long the revenue service portion of a vehicle's trip is, independent of how many people are on a bus or the bus capacity.

d. MDOT MVA cost per transaction

- This measure is shown as two data points to demonstrate the impact of inflation.
- Steve asked how this measure is calculated.
- Kameel responded that all transactions (vehicle registration, registration renewal for drivers or vehicles, driver licensing fees, etc.) are included, and it is a simple calculation of total transactions by the number of dollars. MDOT MVA is evaluating transaction costs for individual transactions for the Excellerator, but this is not yet ready for inclusion in the AR. This also relates to ASD, as time reduced on transactions decreases the cost per transaction.

e. Airline cost per enplaned passenger (CPE)

- Stacy explained that enplaned is anyone who gets on the plane. Some components of airport services are excluded, such as cargo facility rentals. This cost represents what the airlines are paying BWI for passenger services divided by passenger for the airline.
- Tony noted that the MDOT MAA breaks this out by carriers, and that this measure provides perspective on how cost competitive the airport (BWI) is. When an airline is looking to locate or relocate routes, it examines airport costs to the airline as a decision-making factor.
- We discussed comparisons to other airports, and again discussed showing a national trend or issue when there is a spike or decline in a measure to show how MDOT aligns with the rest of the country. However, it is worth noting that MDOT is far more centralized than most State DOTs and direct comparisons can be difficult.
- Kameel indicated that the MDOT MVA participates in a national group for motor vehicle service comparisons, however cross-state comparisons are difficult due to the diverse nature of State. Kameel can bring back some benchmarks the agency has done against similar types of states, however, not all states collect this type of information.
- When asked if the CPE costs take inflation into account, Tony responded that it is absolute cost.

f. Potential New Measure:

- New Measure: Construction value – Percent Change from Estimated Cost to Final Contract Amount – Excellerator 2.10
 - Stacy asked the group if this measure and the representative graphic is understandable as a public measure. It is displayed as a box and whisker plot.
 - Pat and Tim asked about the cost estimates and Michelle responded that it is an engineer's estimate completed right before a project goes to bid. She noted that

this was originally shown as a scatter diagram and this is an attempt to make this measure more understandable. MDOT is unsure whether the public will easily understand this measure and if it is worth keeping.

- Jim responded that he understands everything except the outlier dots, and he thinks the concept is worthy. Without the outliers, the y axis could be compressed. He and others suggested putting a line across the graph at zero to show what is positive versus negative, perhaps using green as positive.
- Matt suggested that this is way too difficult to understand, and the actual cost is not well defined. There is a cost estimate, contract award, and final cost to build (post change-orders).
- Michelle stated that MDOT staff will give this measure some more thought, recognizing that the concept is generally good.

3. Objective: Ensure a consistent revenue stream and ample financing opportunities.

a. New Measure – Qualitative discussion of public-private partnership (P3) initiatives and other innovative solutions underway

- Stacy indicated the desire to express innovative and private funding partnerships for State projects; however, this is currently best expressed through a narrative approach. Public private partnerships, or P3 initiatives, can be a public-private partnership or a local-state partnership; the Purple Line is an example of a P3. Stacy elaborated that P3 initiatives provide a form of risk sharing (financial obligations) among partners, typically where there is a revenue stream. The MDOT project team will spell out all acronyms in the future.
- Steve suggested being clear that these are sources of revenue other than the Transportation Trust Fund.
- Tim asked if MDOT could show how local governments are spending highway user revenue funds. Michelle stated that MDOT could look into this, but it has been difficult to track in the past.
- Jim asked if MDOT could add a measure to display the amount of funds collected from the gas tax per mile driven.
- Matt suggested using a simple count of the number of projects using innovative solutions. MDOT would have to do a definition of “innovative” for universal application.

3. Goal: Facilitate Economic Opportunity and Reduce Congestion in Maryland through Strategic System Expansion - Invest in and pursue opportunities to promote system improvements that support economic development, reduce congestion, and improve the movement of people and goods.

1. Objective: Pursue capital improvements to the transportation system that will improve access to jobs and tourism and leverage economic growth opportunities.

a. International cruises using the Port of Baltimore

- Tom noted that this measure is currently reported in the AR, and Michelle added that tourism was added as a planning factor during the last federal reauthorization.
- Jim cautioned against using expansion and improvement interchangeably as is not always good. Some jurisdictions believe that adding a lane does not necessarily equate with improvement.
- Tom and Michelle discussed that system preservation and modernization improvements are generally focused under a previous goal and strategic expansion could be covered under this goal; however, there is of course overlap between the goal areas.
- Jill indicated that expansion is more of a strategy and that there are other strategies to facilitate economic opportunity and reduce congestion. Michelle agreed with this statement, however, we included “expansion” to be responsive to feedback received on the transportation priorities. Expansion should be strategic and can cover many transportation modes, not just highway.

b. BWI total annual passengers

- No changes were proposed to this measure.

c. Potential measures

i. New Measure: Annual Hours of Delay for Trucks, or Truck Reliability Index (example from Missouri DOT Tracker)

- Tom stated that this measure specifically pulls out truck delay and reliability in relation to overall economic activity and may best fit on the goods movement objective. The group generally agreed.
- Jim asked if is there a more simple congestion index; for example, one that compares major city congestion. Tom noted that we report peak period delay and reliability, for all highway users, in a separate goal area.
- Subrat added there is some analysis of congestion impacting auto commutes that is released annually, but it looks at the metropolitan area level and not the state level. With the federal reauthorization, there is an urbanized area measure on delay that could also be used.
- Michelle suggested that the ARAC consider these potential new measures to determine if they recommend their inclusion in the AR.
- Steve added that delay is easy for the public to understand, and that showing decreases in delay is good.

ii. New Measure: Change in Market Access due to Improvements in the Transportation Network – Excellerator 10.5

iii. New Measure: Change in Productivity due to Improvements in the Transportation Network – Excellerator 10.6

- Tom noted that these proposed new measures cover both productivity and access to market. The group agreed that generally people can understand these measures, both of which an increase is good.
 - Jim asked how can one isolate productivity due to transportation improvements and control for other variables?
 - Tom responded that Excellerator measures 10.5 and 10.6 are new but proposed to be reported in the Excellerator and may be ready for inclusion in the AR at a later date.
 - Steve recommended color coding throughout the report in the form of green = good, red = bad, for ease of reading.
2. Objective: Improve the movement of goods within and through Maryland by investing in intermodal connections and improvements to reduce freight bottlenecks.
- a. Freight originating and terminating in Maryland
- Jill asked if this is a new measure and if it is a single year measure.
 - Stacy said it has been in the introduction in the past, and it is reasonable to present the annual data (including previous years) going forward.
- b. Port of Baltimore foreign cargo and MDOT MPA general cargo tonnage
- No changes were suggested for this measure.
3. Objective: Strategically invest in expansion and operational improvements to reduce congestion along the multimodal transportation system.
- a. Annual revenue vehicle miles of service provided
- No changes were suggested for this measure.
- b. New Measure: Annual cost of congestion (\$ Billions) on the MDOT highway network – from the MDOT SHA Highway Mobility Report
- Tom noted that this measure includes auto delay, air emissions cost, and truck delay.
 - Jim asked if these measures can be used for decision analysis. For example, last year there was talk about expanding an underground rail tunnel through Baltimore. Can one use a performance measure here to understand the impact of such a proposal?
 - Stacy responded that a statewide perspective is shown in the AR, but that MDOT has some more localized data. The AR has a greater potential to capture a policy direction than to focus on a particular project.
 - Nick asked if there is a way to show how much worse the system performance would be without transit, alternative work scheduling, etc.
 - Stacy responded that she isn't sure this data analysis available, but that the team will check on it.

4. Goal: Provide Better Transportation Choices and Connections – Improve transportation connections to support alternative transportation options for the movement of people and goods.

- Stacy explained the difference between mobility and accessibility as a part of the introduction of this goal. A person can have great mobility of 70 mph on an empty highway; but if you had to drive 70 miles to a grocery store, it would not be considered accessible. Your actual ability to access services within a given timeframe, i.e. their proximity (accessibility), is distinct from the ability to get to a destination (mobility).
1. Objective: Enhance, through statewide, regional and local coordination, transportation networks to improve mobility and accessibility.
 - a. Transit Ridership
 - No changes were suggested for this measure. It is currently shown as average weekday riders for all MDOT MTA modes and the locally operated transit services (LOTS) across the state.
 - b. New Measure: Access to Transit (Percent of population within 1 mile of fixed-route transit or multimodal center)
 - Ross explained that this measure will analyze the population within 1 mile of a bus stop. There is additional analysis documenting the population within 1 block, 3 blocks, 6 blocks, and a half-mile being prepared for internal use.
 - Steve asked if 1 mile is the correct catchment area for all MDOT MTA transit modes. There are individuals from Southeastern Pennsylvania who drive and park at MARC stations. Each mode's catchment area differs greatly.
 - Pat asked if this analysis will buffer "as the crow flies" or analyze actual walking access via a network analysis.
 - Ross replied that the analysis would geofence [a virtual geographic boundary] the areas, and that they would look into the catchment area by mode further.
 - Matt also noted that this analysis is just looking at access, and not the destinations available to the population served. There is some national research into this topic, particularly in looking at access to jobs.
 - Ross replied that MDOT MTA has origin-destination (O-D) survey data that could be used to examine destinations for riders, but the sample size is relatively small.
 - c. Number of directional miles improved for bicycle access
 - No changes were suggested for this measure.
 - d. Percentage of State-owned roadway centerline miles with a bicycle level of comfort (BLOC) grade "D" or better – may transition to a new measure based on a Level of Traffic Stress (LTS)/Accessibility Measure over next two years. (ongoing study)

- Stacy explained that the first part (BLOC) is the existing measure, and the second part (LTS) is an alternative under consideration.
- Virginia noted that BLOC has been tracked for over a decade, and its purpose is to measure the comfort level for a bicyclist riding on a given State Road segment. BLOC is not a good measure for overall network connectivity, and therefore MDOT TBU staff believe it may be possible to develop an improved measure going forward. Two efforts are currently underway, which are expected to inform the development of a new measure; an 'Accessibility Study', and an update of the Maryland Bicycle/Pedestrian Master Plan. The MDOT staff recommendation is to report BLOC in the AR for another year, and then migrate to a new measure based on LTS going forward.
- Peter added that BLOC has a lot of different types of information that goes into generating a score, but it is unclear to the customer what, for example, "D" means for the user experience. LTS is Levels 1-4 and correlates well with what the cyclists view as what level of infrastructure gets people onto the road – i.e., Strong and Fearless riders (LTS 4), Enthused and Confident riders (LTS 3), Interested but Concerned mainstream adult riders (LTS 2), and No Way, No How (children LTS 1). MDOT will receive the results of the Accessibility Study, which will assess all roads based on this type of scoring. The Accessibility Study and LTS data will be available in another month or two for all roads in the State (including locally owned roads). The Study is being prepared by the University of Minnesota for Maryland and 10 other State DOTs. This data will be updated annually and can be used to inform the bicycle system expansion. The LTS analysis will be relatable to viewer of the AR report.
- Tim asked how the LTS analysis takes intersections into account. Because BLOC does not include intersections, this is a limitation of the BLOC measure. Peter responded that LTS does consider intersections in its scoring.

2. Objective: Increase and enhance multimodal connections to improve movement of people and goods within and between activity centers.

a. Potential New Measures:

i. New Measure: Connections from transit to Airport

- Stacy asked if this measure can be tracked, and if it is something that could experience year-to-year change.
- Tony responded that transit connections to the airport are more important for employees than passengers. Bus access to the airport is mainly used by employees, the employee/passenger split on Light Rail is 50/50, while MARC is mainly used for passenger access. Having more weekend service on MARC would be a big win for the airport, and MDOT MAA would like to see strategies for enhanced shuttle service in the Baltimore to BWI Airport.
- Ross stated that MDOT MTA does not have any strategies to bring greater shuttle or bus access to the airport, and that light rail is fairly constrained.
- Tim asked if this measure is focused only on BWI, and could it include other smaller airports in the state.

- Michelle responded that yes, this is a BWI-focused measure and it may be more of a Maryland Transportation Plan (MTP) strategy to address employee access to BWI, rather than a measure for the AR.
 - Tony stated that MDOT should clarify that this currently is a BWI-specific measure and does not include other state-owned airports.
- ii. New Measure: Bicycle access to transit, including bikeshare memberships and usage
- Ross elaborated that this measure reflects how MDOT MTA users interact with bikes and accommodations for transit riders who are also using a bike for a portion of their trip. Bicycle access to transit is the percentage of MDOT MTA vehicles that are equipped with bike racks and the percentage of the MARC fleet (train sets) that have a bike car.
 - Jim asked if there is a way to track the utilization of accommodations for bikes on transit. Ross responded that he thinks there is a button pushed on the bus to deploy the bike rack, but he is not sure where that data may be kept. It may be in the software used for scheduling and operations.
 - Steve suggested transitioning this measure into the number of bike racks/lockers per stations, etc. to show the availability of the infrastructure across the system. This type of measure may better encourage capital investment.
- iii. New Measure: Bike to bus connections
- This measures transit stations with bikeshare facilities at them. No changes were suggested for this measure.
3. Objective: Inform and educate customers on transportation options and benefits.
- a. Mode Share
- No changes were suggested for this measure. It was previously a part of the introduction.
- b. Travel Demand Management; Transportation Emission Reduction Measures (TERMs) – Daily Reduction in Vehicle Trips - table (Add park and ride data)
- Pat asked about how the park and ride data is derived.
 - Stacy responded that it is the number of spaces available, utilization, and estimated Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) reduction based on a set of assumptions. It includes MDOT MTA-owned and -leased, and MDOT SHA-owned lots. This section of the AR will include a narrative description of the activities associated with all of the data analysis, and the park and ride data would be incorporated into the table with the other TERMS (page 30 in the handout).
 - Nick noted that the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOG) does a lot of data collection, and it is willing to collaborate on future data collection and share the data it currently has. A lot of the data on page 30 in the handout is State of the Commute survey data, collected by MWCOG. MWCOG is moving away from using the term “TERMs” and now just using “TDM measures.” Nick suggested

showing the VMT reductions under this goal and the associated greenhouse gas reductions under the environmental goal.

c. Travel Demand Management; Transportation Emission Reduction Measures (TERMs) – Estimated annual regional VMT reductions through TERMS

d. Potential New Measures:

- i. New Measure: Awareness and use of commuter assistance resources
- ii. New Measure: Formal or informal telework arrangements by employer type; availability of flexible work schedules
- iii. New Measure: Percent of employers working with TDM programs that provide a transit benefit and/or number of employees using these benefits
 - Nick noted that MWCOG has this data for the Washington, D.C. region, but it will be tougher to get for the entire State of Maryland. He is willing to assist MDOT with this.
 - Michelle responded that she would love to talk about how MDOT and MWCOG could collaborate on collecting this type of data; however, MDOT staff are not really sure how much of this data can be collected in the next five years and included in the AR. In the near term, this section may initially be a more qualitative discussion, addressing the number of businesses participating with Maryland Commuter Choice, vanpools running, etc.
 - Jim asked if this would include Dillion's (private commuter bus) users and inter-jurisdictional routes (e.g., Eastern Shore to DC). He also asked if there a way to identify where employers are paying for transit rather than the employee.
 - Michelle responded that MDOT used to receive hard copy forms with some of this information, but currently that information is not available. MDOT aims to start building this data set once again.
 - Pat noted that MARC and Commuter Bus service providers may have information on employer-provided transit benefits.
 - Nick stated that MWCOG has a database with 12,000 employers in which the number of employers providing transit benefits (fully paying, and the pre-tax benefit) is tracked. WMATA's SmartBenefits program may also be able to provide data.
 - Across Maryland, the Comptroller's office may be able to provide data on the number of businesses providing a pre-tax benefit.

5. Goal: Ensure Environmental Protection and Sensitivity – Deliver sustainable transportation infrastructure improvements that protect and reduce impacts to Maryland's natural, historic, and cultural resources.

- Tom introduced this goal. It can be discussed again at the next ARAC meeting given the limited time available at this meeting. ARAC members are asked to review this

goal and bring comments on it to the next meeting. Tom then did a quick review of the measures included in this goal area (listed below).

- Under the 3rd objective, Tim offered a general comment on how the PM 2.5 data change in methodology to calculate emissions needs to be explained in the AR. The AR chart shows a dramatic reduction for 2014 – is this correct? Did the methodology change?
 - Michelle responded that there is a discussion of the methodology change for calculating PM 2.5 emissions and how it impacted the performance data in the AR.

1. Objective: Protect and enhance the natural, historic and cultural environment through avoidance, minimization and mitigation of adverse impacts related to transportation infrastructure, including support for broader efforts to improve the health of the Chesapeake Bay.
 - a. Acres of wetlands or wildlife habitat created, restored or improved (since 2000 or only 10 years) – MDOT MPA, MDOT SHA, etc.
 - b. New Measure: Water Quality Treatment to Protect and Restore the Chesapeake Bay – Excellerator measure PM 9.1. This measure tracks MDOT compliance with achieving impervious surface restoration as required by the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit.
2. Objective: Employ resource protection and conservation practices in project development, construction, operations, and maintenance of transportation assets.
 - a. New measure: Recycled/Reused Materials from Maintenance Activities and Construction/ Demolition Projects - Excellerator 9.4
 - b. New Measure: Total EVs Registered in Maryland [Recommend a density map of registrations and includes FHWA Alternative Fuel Corridors, and publicly available charging infrastructure (item d., below)]
 - c. New Measure: Total Publicly Available EV Charging Infrastructure
3. Objective: Implement initiatives to reduce fossil fuel consumption, mitigate greenhouse gases, and improve air quality.
 - a. Transportation-related emissions by region
 - b. Transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions
 - c. Compliance rate and number of vehicles tested for Vehicle Emissions Inspection Program (VEIP) versus customer wait time
 - d. New Measure: Energy – Electricity Consumption and Renewable Energy Generation – Excellerator 9.3c (Conventional Energy Use)

- e. New Measure: Energy – Electricity Consumption and Renewable Energy Generation – Excellerator 9.3d (Renewable Energy Generated)

4. Wrap Up and Next Steps

Michelle closed the meeting by noting that we now have 72 measures for potential inclusion in the AR. This process started with 50 measures with the aim to reduce the total number of measures. The fact that we currently have expanded the number of measures is not necessarily an issue; some of the new measures are existing Excellerator measures, and MDOT is incorporating more measures formerly in introductory materials as actual measures. At this stage of the process, MDOT and the ARAC members are asked to critically examine all of the measures at a higher level and ask ourselves again if we really need each individual measure to ensure progress towards meeting the objectives, and whether the measures selected are truly measuring the objective. As each ARAC member reviews the meeting notes, please consider which measures may be redundant, what may be missing, what is needed to properly measure the objective, and what is not needed to have as a performance measure.

The May ARAC meeting will focus on reviewing our work to date and gathering input on the format of the AR document. We may or may not hold a June ARAC meeting, depending on the outcome of the May meeting. At the May meeting, the group will decide whether or not we need to meet in June.

Please note that our next ARAC meeting will be held on **Monday**, May 7th at 2 pm at MDOT.

ARAC Members in Attendance

<u>Representation</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Chair / Maryland Department of Planning	Pat Keller	Assistant Secretary for Planning Services	Maryland Department of Planning
Disabled Citizens Community	Janice Jackson	Commissioner	Maryland Commission on Disabilities
Auto Users Group	Ragina Cooper Averella	Public & Gov't Affairs Manager	AAA
Transit Users Group	Steve Chan	US Department of Veterans Affairs	Chair, MARC Riders Advisory Council
National Expert: Transportation Demand Management	Nicholas William Ramfos	Director, Transportation Operations Programs	Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments
National Expert: Transportation Performance Management	Matthew H. Hardy, Ph.D.	Program Director for Planning and Policy	American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO)
Maryland Association of Counties	Alex Rawls	Long-Range Planner	Harford County Planning & Zoning
Maryland Municipal League	Jim Beauchamp	Town Council Vice President	Town of Centreville
	Tim Davis	Transportation Planner	City of Frederick

ARAC Members Unable to Attend

<u>Representation</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Maryland Association of Counties	Keith Hall, AICP	Chief, Long Range and Transportation Planning	Salisbury/Wicomico Co.
Environmental Advocacy Organization	Joel Dunn	President/CEO	The Chesapeake Conservancy
Rural Interests	Geoff Turner	President/CEO	Choptank Transport
National Expert: Pedestrian/Bike Transportation	Jennifer L. Toole, AICP, ASLA	President	Toole Design Group
Goods Movement Industry	Louis Campion	President/CEO	MMTA

<u>Representation</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Maryland Business Community	Christine Ross	President/CEO	MD Chamber of Commerce

Other Attendees

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Michelle Martin	MDOT The Secretary's Office (TSO)
Gladys Hurwitz	MDOT TSO
Virginia Burke	MDOT TSO
Subrat Mahapatra	MDOT State Highway Administration (SHA)
Lorraine Moore	MDOT SHA
Peter Sotherland	MDOT SHA
David K. Greene	MDOT Maryland Transportation Authority (MDTA)
Tony Storck	MDOT Maryland Aviation Administration (MAA)
Jill Lemke	MDOT Maryland Port Administration (MPA)
Kameel Hall	MDOT Motor Vehicle Administration (MVA)
Ross Turlington	MDOT Maryland Transit Administration (MTA)
Tom Harrington	Cambridge Systematics (CS)
Stacy Cook	Cambridge Systematics (CS)
Shana Johnson	Foursquare ITP