# Attainment Report Advisory Committee (ARAC) on Goals, Benchmarks, and Indicators: Summary of Meeting #3

June 20, 2023: 1:00 PM – 3:00 PM, Virtual

## Attendees

- Alexander Austin – Prince George's Chamber of Commerce
- Ben Groff – MTA Citizens Advisory Committee
- Brian Wivell – Maryland State & DC AFL-CIO, Legislative & Political Director
- Charles Boyd – Director of Planning Coordination, Maryland Department of Planning
- Charlotte Davis – Executive Director, Rural Maryland Council
- Dr. Chester Harvey – National Center for Smart Growth, University of Maryland
- Deborah Price – Demographic Planner, Harford County
- Dennis Enslinger – Gaithersburg Deputy City Manager
- Gustavo Torres – Executive Director, CASA Maryland
- Jaimie McKay – Transit Services Division, Frederick County
- Lindsey Mendelson – Sierra Club Maryland
- Louis Campion – Maryland Motor Truck Association
- Ragina Ali – AAA Mid-Atlantic, Maryland & Washington DC.
- Robert Holsey Jr., International Union of Operating Engineers, Local 37
- Sheila Somashekhar – University of Maryland, Purple Line Coalition
- Dr. Ting Ma – TRB Standing Committee on Performance Management

**Unavailable for Meeting #3**
- Derrick Waters – US Treasury IRS
- Dr. Mansoureh Jeihani – Morgan State University
- Dr. Shima Hamidi – Johns Hopkins University, Environmental Health & Engineering
- Jacqueline Allsup – Vice President, Maryland State NAACP

**Other**
- Aviva Klugh, MDOT
- Christopher Parris, MDTA
- Clay Barnes, CS/ARAC Consultant
- Cole Greene, MDOT
- Corey Stottlemyer, MDOT
- Deron Lovaas, MDOT
- Doug Mowbray, MHS
- Drew Morrison, MDOT

- Jacqueline Djomo, MVA
- Jessica Shearer, Blackwater/SHA Consultant
- Kaiqi Zhang, FS/ARAC Consultant
- Kevin Clarke, MAA
- Lisa Shemer, SHA
- Megan Jansen, MDOT
- Michelle Martin, MDOT
- Nimisha Deshwal, CS/ARAC Consultant
- Parto Mazdeyasni, MPA
- Ross Turlington, MDOT
- Sophia Cortazzo, MDOT
- Sydney Joseph, HS/MTP Consultant
- Tom Harrington, CS/ARAC Consultant
- Toria Lassiter, MDOT

**Public**
- Michael Scepaniak, Strong Towns Baltimore

# Introductions / Roll Call / Meeting #2 Overview

Michelle Martin, Deputy Director of the MDOT Office of Planning and Capital Programming, let everyone know that the Chair Dr. Mansoureh Jeihani was not able to make the meeting. She encouraged MDOT staff, the MDOT Consultant team, and any members of the public to introduce themselves in the chat.

Michelle Martin then provided a summary of the first and second ARAC Committee Meetings. The first meeting included an overview of MDOT, Transportation in Maryland, the Maryland Transportation Plan, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, the Attainment Report (AR), and a more detailed interactive discussion on the Maryland Transportation Plan (MTP) Guiding Principles, Goals and Key Outcomes. The second ARAC Meeting covered the performance measures proposed for the first and second goals. Michelle Martin noted there was great feedback from the Committee, which is still being addressed by the team. However, some comments have already been incorporated into revised performance measures.

Michelle Martin also noted that the second MTP survey is still live and everyone should have received an email notification. The survey is open to the public and available on the MTP web page through July 10. It is focused on seeking key outcomes for the 2050 MTP, transportation needs using a map feature, and gaining priorities on transportation investments. She encouraged everyone to share the survey with their Maryland colleagues, family, and friends.

Michelle Martin noted that this third ARAC Committee meeting's objective was to continue discussion on performance measures for the third and fourth goals.

## Questions

- Dr. Chester Harvey inquired about the target guidance aspect, and when the Committee might weigh in on targets. He was specifically interested in the discussion on a target for measures related to vehicle miles traveled (VMT)?
  - o Targets will be addressed in the upcoming discussion on the AR performance measure recommendations. All recommended targets will be provided in the next meeting after subject matter experts within MDOT have helped to formulate recommended targets.

# Presentation with Interactive Discussion: Performance Measures by Goals

Michelle Martin and the ARAC Consultant team presented slides containing performance measures for the last two goals and engaged in an interactive discussion with the Committee members. The discussion was based on the Performance Measure summary document that the ARAC received via email prior to the second Committee meeting. The team reminded the attendees that the performance measures had been slightly adjusted and would continue to be refined based on their input and public comments. They also reminded the attendees of the color coding used in the document:

- Yellow – existing measure, keep in AR
- Blue – existing measure, move to an appendix
- Green – proposed measure based on research, best practices, and modal administration input

# Goal: Serve Communities and Support the Economy

| Objectives | Guiding Principles | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Equity | Resilience | Preservation | Experience | Modernization |
| Enhance Marylanders' satisfaction with the transportation system and MDOT services. | X | X | X | X | X |
|   1.  Overall Satisfaction with MDOT – U of M survey results OR MDOT MTA Customer Satisfaction Survey Results<br>  2.  MVA Branch Office Wait Time under 15 Minutes (MFR) | | | | | |
| Apply enhanced technologies to improve communication and to relay real-time information. | | | | X | X |
|   1.  Percentage of modal administration assets that provide real-time information | | | | | |
| Prioritize the transportation needs of underserved and overburdened communities in project selection and scoping. | X | | | | |
|   1.  Investment in equity emphasis areas (determine how best to measure progress towards equity goals)<br>  2.  Access to Jobs within 45 minutes by car/60 minutes by transit for residents in equity emphasis areas | | | | | |
| Deliver a system that improves access to opportunities and quality of life by non-auto modes. | X | | | X | |
|   1.  Access to Jobs within 60 minutes by transit<br>  2.  Percent of 10 largest job centers in Maryland within 0.5 miles of a transit stop served by all-day frequent transit service<br>  3.  Percent of Sidewalks that Meet ADA Compliance (MFR)<br>  4.  ~~Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) (MFR)~~ – moved to Environmental Stewardship<br>  5.  ~~Number of MDOT SHA centerline mileage with a LTS score of 1~~ – updated to Miles of lower level of traffic stress (LTS 2 or better)<br>  6.  MDOT MTA Average Weekday Transit Ridership (MFR)<br>  7.  Transit Ridership – MDOT MTA direct-operated services (thousands) (MFR)<br>  8.  Transit Ridership – Contracted services and LOTS (thousands) (MFR)<br>  9.  Total Maryland – only WMATA annual ridership (MFR)<br>  10. Annual Revenue Vehicle Miles of MDOT MTA Service Provided (MFR)<br>  11. Commute Mode Share | | | | | |
| Increase transit-oriented development. | X | | | X | |
|   1.  Percentage of all residents and residents 30% AMI and below living within a half mile of a transit service station, stop or hub<br>  2.  Percent of higher educational centers within 0.5 miles of a transit stop served by all-day frequent transit service<br>  3.  Percent of head start centers within .5 miles of transit stop served by all-day frequent transit service | | | | | |

## Objective 1 – Enhance Marylanders' satisfaction with the transportation system and MDOT services.

Megan Jansen commented on the graphs in the presentation pointing out that wait time includes the visit time, so the data values should be visually stacked and labelled as a summation. Megan Jansen assured the ARAC that the Motor Vehicle Administration team is working on adjusting and/or reducing the 15-minute goal. Any further changes will be communicated to the MDOT/ARAC Consultant team.

## Objective 2 – Apply enhanced technologies to improve communication and to relay real-time information.

The discussion centered on clarifying available data on real-time information for the traveling public. Michelle Martin pointed out that a survey previously used is no longer available and lacked data on aviation or freight. Dr. Ting Ma inquired about the target audience for the real-time information, to which Michelle Martin explained that it considers the traveling public across all modes. Dr. Ting Ma and Cole Greene followed up by inquiring about the definition of "asset" in terms of the percentage of modal administration assets providing real-time information is questioned. Michelle Martin acknowledged clarified that the focus is on real-time information

for customers and the traveling public, excluding facility assets, and focused on transportation services. Dennis Enslinger proposed that in order to demonstrate leadership, it would be beneficial to emphasize the availability of information in public/mobile apps.

## Objective 3 – Prioritize the transportation needs of underserved and overburdened communities in project selection and scoping.

The discussion focused on equity emphasis areas, measuring accessibility gains, and job accessibility. The definition of equity emphasis areas was discussed, with considerations for options such as Washington, DC regional definition and the definition in the Maryland Climate Solutions Now Act (CSNA). The complexity of defining equity and the need for deliberate research and time was also highlighted. The importance of differentiating between "accessibility" and physical/built environment accessibility was also emphasized. There was a discussion about considering economic inflation and land use limitations. The conversation noted the need for consistency in defining and measuring equity across the state, with an acknowledgement of the impact that defining equity characteristics can have on addressing inequities.

In the discussion, the participants talked about several important aspects related to equity emphasis areas and accessibility in transportation planning. Sheila Somashekhar inquired whether equity emphasis areas are already defined by the state. Dennis Enslinger pointed out that measuring prioritization requires a comparison to something other than just the investment itself. Jamie McKay emphasized the distinction between "accessibility" and the physical/built environment accessibility for residents of equity emphasis areas. Dr. Chester Harvey suggested considering the Washington DC regional definition and other measures, with ongoing discussions about the best approach. Lindsey Mendelson recommended incorporating the "overburdened and underserved" definition from the CSNA, particularly regarding pollution exposure. Douglas Mowbray acknowledged the complexity of defining equity emphasis areas and proposed mode-specific equity models rather than a statewide definition. The conversation also touched upon the need to differentiate between "access to jobs" and "number of jobs accessible" and how to account for economic inflation. Michelle Martin emphasized providing transportation options while working within existing development patterns. Chuck Boyd suggested considering the environmental justice (EJ) Screen tool for evaluating equity consistently across the State. Cole Greene suggested considering the number of jobs or a normalized matrix. Dr. Chester Harvey reiterated the significance of equity emphasis areas and their impact on addressing various inequities. Overall, the participants agreed that equity is a top priority, but it required intentional research and deliberation to ensure inclusivity and fairness in transportation planning.

## Objective 4 – Deliver a system that improves access to opportunities and quality of life by non-auto modes.

The discussion focused on the distribution and presentation of numbers related to routes, mode share, and job accessibility within a certain timeframe. Jaimie McKay raised the question of whether to distribute the numbers by routes or consolidate them into a single sum. Michelle Martin agreed with considering distribution by routes. Cole Greene suggested collecting data from the local operating system and coordinating with Jaimie McKay for the ideal output. Dennis Enslinger emphasized the importance of considering non-auto mode shares. Tom Harrington clarified that bikes are still included in the mode share analysis.  A participant asked for clarification on the unit of measurement for "Jobs within 60 minutes by transit." Tom Harrington briefly explained the methodology used, and noted challenges with using a statewide accessibility measure for trend comparisons across years. Dr. Ting Ma expressed concern about the under-representation of bike mode share and suggested using a  more multi-modal analysis. Chuck Boyd highlighted the significance of pedestrian accessibility when assessing job opportunities.

## Objective 5 – Increase transit-oriented development.

The discussion began with Cole Greene asking about the proposed measures that are focused on higher education and Head Start centers (within ½ mile of transit) rather than healthcare and senior living. Michelle Martin explained that it was a recommendation to prioritize higher education but ensured that the team will consider other types of destinations. Cole Greene suggested that the measure should consider other community centers such as hospitals instead of solely focusing on higher education. Sheila Somashekhar agreed with Cole Greene's comment, expressing the need to broaden the definition of points of interest and consider access to a wider range of facilities. Dr. Ting Ma agreed with Cole Greene's suggestion as well. Dennis Enslinger added that daycare centers and kindergarten centers should also be taken into consideration, as there is a growing demand for their services. Dr. Ting Ma raised a question about the distance criteria used, asking why they are using 0.5 mile instead of the commonly recommended 0.25 mile, which is considered a reasonable walking distance for planning purposes. Michelle Martin explained that they typically use 0.5 mile for Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) evaluation.

# Goal: Promote Environmental Stewardship

| Objectives | Guiding Principles | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Equity | Resilience | Preservation | Experience | Modernization |
| Protect and enhance the natural environment through avoidance, minimization, and mitigation of adverse impacts related to transportation infrastructure. | | X | X | | X |
| 1. Water Quality Treatment to Protect and Restore the Chesapeake Bay – updated to Percent of MDOT's 5-year MS4 Permits attained | | | | | |
| Employ resource protection and conservation practices in project development, construction, operations, and maintenance of transportation assets. | | X | X | | X |
| 1. Diversion rate and cost of disposing construction, demolition, and maintenance materials in landfills and incinerators | | | | | |
| 2. Annual Dredged Material Capacity Remaining for Harbor and Poplar Island Material (cubic yards) (millions) (MFR) | | | | | |
| Minimize fossil fuel consumption, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, improve air quality, and support the growth of alternative fuels. | X | | X | | X |
| 1. Utility Electricity Use & Renewable Energy Generation – updated to Percent of Transportation Energy Used from Renewable Energy Sources | | | | | |
| 2. Transportation-Related Air Pollution Reduction (TPM) | | | | | |
| 3. VMT/VMT per capita (MFR) | | | | | |
| 4. Percent of Electric Vehicles (EVs) registered from Total Registered Vehicles (MFR) | | | | | |
| 5. Percentage of MDOT fleet comprised of EVs (data not readily available) | | | | | |
| 6. GHG emissions from LDV VMT (light duty) vehicles and MHDV VMT (medium heavy duty) vehicles **OR GHG emissions (lbs. $CO_2$ EE – emissions equivalent) per personal miles traveled** | | | | | |
| 7. Level 2 and DC Fast Charger charging ports per 1000 residents | | | | | |
| 8. Total number of EV AFCs/number that are certification-ready | | | | | |
| 9. Number of employee partners in Statewide TDM programs | | | | | |
| 10. Number of stations along EV Alternate Fuel Corridors (AFCs) that comply with federal minimum requirements/targets | | | | | |
| 11. Number of Vehicles Tested at VEIP (MFR) | | | | | |
| 12. VEIP Testing Compliance Rate of Vehicles Registered in Non - Attainment Counties | | | | | |

## Objective 1 – Protect and enhance the natural environment through avoidance, minimization, and mitigation of adverse impacts related to transportation infrastructure.

No Committee members had questions or comments for the measures in this objective.

## Objective 2 – Employ resource protection and conservation practices in project development, construction, operations, and maintenance of transportation assets.

Dennis Enslinger raised a concern over tree removal in station development and recommended that using Best Management Practices (BMP) might help to include tree removal into the accounting.

## Objective 3 - Minimize fossil fuel consumption, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, improve air quality, and support the growth of alternative fuels.

The discussion covered various topics related to alternative fuels and transportation goals. Lindsey Mendelson asked for clarification on the definition of alternative fuels, particularly in regard to hydrogen. Sophia Cortazzo agreed to double-check and provide an answer to this.

After the meeting, Sophia indicated that the definition of Alternative Fuel Corridors (AFCs) comes from the U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). FHWA designates a national network of plug-in electric vehicle (EV) charging and hydrogen, propane, and natural gas fueling infrastructure along national highway system corridors. Lindsey asked specifically about the production method of hydrogen that may be included. She wanted to ensure that natural gas reforming is excluded from hydrogen as an alternative fuel. We do not have any performance measures that use calculations specifically including hydrogen at this time.

Lindsey Mendelson emphasized the importance of using VMT per capita and recommended a 20% reduction goal. She also suggested considering the scale of pollution in equity emphasis communities. Michelle Martin agreed to verify the data source for granularity. Dennis Enslinger expressed concerns about the number of objectives and suggested narrowing them down. Michelle Martin acknowledged the comments to reduce the objectives to less than six. Dennis Enslinger asked whether the inventory of EVs are at the state-owned or statewide level and Michelle Martin clarified that the goal is statewide and focused on mapping. Sophia Cortazzo confirmed the availability of data on publicly available stations. Cole Greene raised Maryland Transit Administration (MTA)-related questions, including the percentage of zero emission buses (ZEB) in the bus fleet and the source of electricity for electric rail systems, highlighting the importance of clean sources. Michelle Martin said that the ZEB count is covered, and efforts will be made to make that clearer in the report. Louis Campion advised considering the percentage of chargers available to registered vehicles, especially for freight. The conversation delved further into topics such as measurement goals, narrowing objectives, clarifying scope, electricity sources, and charger availability. Dr. Chester Harvey shared that the University of Maryland (UMD) has a study underway on mapping equitable access to charging stations throughout the State which might be useful.

# Next Steps

Michelle Martin proposed a Google Form for any feedback after having more time to think through these measure and provide if have any further questions by no later than June 23, 2023. Michelle Martin announced that in the fourth ARAC meeting, the recommendations will be finalized and then included in the main body of the draft report. Clay Barnes said the recommendations and targets package will be sent to everyone on July 5th, prior to the fourth ARAC meeting. Further comments on the AR are welcome through Friday, June 23: https://forms.office.com/r/BewH8DX3c5.

Next meeting:
- Tuesday, July 11th – Meeting #4 – review recommendations and draft report, review of AR requirements, data, and targets, and discuss any suggested improvements to the AR document and to the AR dashboard.

# Attainment Report Requirements

Michelle Martin recapped the requirements of the AR:

- Discuss transportation and population trends
- Discuss transportation modes, demand management and unmet needs (State of Good Repair backlog)
- Discuss Performance Measures in providing travel choices and reducing congestion
- Review of performance indicators and key outcomes
- Review of transportation investments (related to the State Report on Transportation)
- Discuss the impact of transportation on the environment/climate action plan goals; environmental justice; communities; and economic development

She then discussed the potential approaches of generating the report, including the design and length of the report, and visualization. She asked for any input from the Committee members. Dr. Ting Ma inquired about the click count on the dashboard. Dennis Enslinger proposed to separate the report and the data as a separate appendix.

As a general comment, the population trends of the State was mentioned. Aging population and remote working were brought up as potential future considerations.

# Public Comments

Michael Scepaniak said that community activists do not want just another marketing brochure. He said detailed information was needed. While a high-level summary is useful, it is crucial to understand the methodology behind the recommendations and measures. Therefore, a comprehensive and detailed report would be greatly appreciated.

# Meeting Conclusion

Michelle Martin concluded the meeting and informed the panel that the recommendations package will be released before the next meeting. Any further comments on the ARAC are welcome through June 23rd for incorporation into the final draft report.

The meeting summary will be posted online and emailed to the Committee. The panel will next convene for the final time on Tuesday, July 11th. Any further questions can be sent to Michelle Martin.