

## Meeting Minutes

**Salisbury Wicomico Metropolitan Planning Organization  
Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)  
July 27th, 2005**

**City of Salisbury/Wicomico County Government Building  
125 North Division Street, Salisbury, MD  
Room 302**

### **Attendees:**

#### TAC Members:

John Redden, Chair, Wicomico County Public Works  
Ray Birch, City of Salisbury Public Works  
Tracey Gordy, Maryland Department of Planning  
Mike Nixon, Maryland Department of Transportation  
Paul Weber, City of Salisbury Transportation & Safety Advisory Committee  
Rob Hart, Shore Transit

#### Others:

Gary Pusey, SW/MPO staff, City of Salisbury/Wicomico County Planning  
Jack Lenox, City of Salisbury/Wicomico County Planning  
Jim Thompson, Maryland State Highway Administration  
Richard Kautz, Sussex Co. (Del.) Planning Dept.  
Charles Fisher, Tri-County Council for the Lower Eastern Shore of Md.

### **Discussion**

Mr. Redden opened the meeting at 1:05 p.m. and welcomed everyone.

### Minutes

Mr. Redden introduced the first item on the agenda, which were the minutes of the Committee's June 15, 2005, meeting. Mr. Thompson raised the question of the Planning Staff not being represented as a voting member of the Technical Committee. Mr. Pusey verified that the MPO Bylaws did not list the Department as being a voting member. Discussion ensued, with Mr. Nixon stating that some MPOs do have the Planning Staff as voting members of their technical committees, and that if the MPO Council wants to consider this change, then the Bylaws would need to be revised. It was agreed that this issue would be raised with the Council.

Ms. Gordy moved to approve the June 15, 2005 meeting minutes, and Mr. Nixon seconded the motion. All Committee members voted aye, with none opposed, and the motion to approve the minutes was passed.

### FY 2005-07 Transportation Improvement Plan Amendment – Recommendation to the MPO Council

Mr. Pusey stated that this item was being added to the agenda.

Mr. Nixon provided information to the Committee members explaining the proposed amendment. Mr. Thompson summarized and stated that an item called "Congestion Management" is already included in the FY 2005-07 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) that was adopted by the Council in December of 2004. This item provides traffic control, and monitoring and management on State facilities, and includes such projects as access management on U.S. Route 50, signage, lighting, marking, signals, and utility relocation, among other things. This item was funded in the amount of \$2,895,000 in the current TIP. The amendment is to increase the funding for this activity by \$150,000 in FY 2005, to a total amount of \$3,045,000 for the FY 2005-07 period. The Committee is being asked to forward a recommendation to the Council for its action.

In response to a question from Mr. Redden, Mr. Nixon and Mr. Thompson clarified that the activity as listed in the current TIP was not being changed and that the projects would remain the same; the amendment is only the funding level was being increased.

There being no further discussion, Mr. Redden asked for a motion from the Committee. Upon a motion by Ms. Gordy, seconded by Mr. Birch, and unanimously carried, the Committee forwarded a favorable recommendation to the Council to adopt the amended FY 2005-07 TIP, to reflect an increase in funding for Congestion Management activities.

#### Discussion of Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)

Mr. Redden asked Mr. Pusey to report on this item. Mr. Pusey summarized the status of the Plan, referencing the first three draft chapters that were distributed to the Committee members, along with an outline of a fourth chapter that lists and describes future transportation needs. Mr. Thompson suggested the Committee go through the handouts from the beginning and raise any concerns members may have for discussion.

Mr. Lenox summarized a meeting that was held on June 29, 2005, in Philadelphia with Federal Highway and Federal Transit representatives. Mr. Lenox, Mr. Pusey, Mr. Nixon and a representative from the MPO's consultant, The Traffic Group, also attended. The outcome of that meeting was that it was agreed that, with the time restrictions that exist in order to complete and adopt the Long-Range Transportation Plan (originally due October 1, 2005), that an acceptable alternative was to prepare and adopt an Interim Plan that was specific for the first five years, with the remaining 20 years of the Plan to be addressed by policy statements. The financial portion of the Plan would still need to address the entire 25 year period. The more detailed 25 year Long-Range Transportation Plan would then be required to be adopted by October 1, 2006, so that the Interim Plan would, in essence, be in effect for only a one year period.

There was considerable discussion about this alternative, with the consensus that the preparation and adoption of an Interim Plan would be the best course of action to take.

Discussion then ensued about the draft sections that had been distributed by Mr. Pusey. Committee members made a number of suggestions that Mr. Pusey said he would incorporate into revisions that would once again be provided to the Committee for review.

Mr. Nixon asked Mr. Hart about the status of the Transit Development Program. Mr. Hart responded that he was supposed to receive a copy of this within the next couple of weeks, and he would provide Mr. Pusey with a copy that could be incorporated into the Interim Plan, and eventually, into the LRTP.

Mr. Thompson asked about the data that The Traffic Group would be providing. He stated, and the Committee members agreed, that the primary data missing for the Interim Plan was the Level of Service (LOS) analysis. Mr. Pusey responded that this data will be provided by the consultants.

Mr. Pusey also brought to the Committee's attention an issue concerning the MPO Boundary that needed to be addressed by both this group and the Council, and that concerned the portion of Delaware that was to be included within the boundary. Mr. Kautz had provided to Mr. Pusey portions of Delmar, Delaware's draft Comprehensive Plan, and also suggested an MPO boundary based on traffic analysis zones identified by Delaware's Department of Transportation. Mr. Kautz offered that the boundary based on traffic analysis zones had the advantage of having much data available, since DelDOT collects that data, although he also stated that the boundary may be larger than what is needed. As an alternative, Mr. Pusey stated that mapping the "Area of Study" from Delmar's Comprehensive Plan matched fairly closely the MPO boundary from the Maryland portion, and was much smaller in area than that using the traffic analysis zones. In addition, the rationale used in this approach was the same as that used for the Maryland MPO boundary – the boundary would be based on the growth area as recommended and identified in each of the jurisdictions' comprehensive plans. After some discussion, it was agreed that the growth area as identified in Delmar's plan should also serve as the MPO boundary. Mr. Redden asked if the Committee would like to make a motion to this effect, since the boundary needs to be adopted by the Council. Mr. Hart motioned, and Mr. Birch seconded, that the Committee forward a recommendation to the Council that the MPO Boundary incorporate the growth area (identified as "area of study") recommended in the Delmar, Del. Comprehensive Plan. The motion passed unanimously.

Discussion continued with suggestions made concerning the draft sections of the Plan that were provided. Mr. Pusey stated that he would make the revisions and provide the updated text to the Committee for another review.

#### Next Meeting Date

The Committee discussed the next meeting date, and agreed on a date of **August 17, 2005 from 1 p.m. to 3 p.m.** at the same location.

There being no further business, upon a motion by Ms. Gordy, seconded by Mr. Nixon, the meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m.