

Legislative Testimony for June 21

Full Name	Home Address	City	Zip Code	Representing yourself?	What organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Optional Attachment
Steven Waddy	Po box 6210	Annapolis	21401	No	Naacp	Resolution 31-21	Support		
							1		
Patricia A. Lynch	1648 Homewood Road	Annapolis	21409	No	Broadneck Council of Communities, Inc.	Resolution 32-21	Support	The Broadneck Council was formed in 2007 with the intent of working to improve the Bay Bridge traffic problems that crush the Broadneck Peninsula on all summer weekends, now extended from Thursday through Sunday for E/B travelers. There has been an improvement to the movement of vehicles over the Bridge since all electronic tolling was completed but the volume of traffic exceeds the capacity of the Bay Bridges. The recommendation to add another-"3rd Bridge" to our Broadneck Peninsula would destroy part of the watershed in order to locate the approach roads. We would lose either Sandy Point State Park or the communities located on the South side of the Rte #50/301 corridor. There is a 100 mile land mass bordering the Chesapeake Bay where another span must be built for residents located south/north of the Bay. We must not draw more traffic to central AA County by providing 2-3 spans for the Bay Crossing on one central location that ruptures our Peninsula and drives huge traffic volumes through the Annapolis/Broadneck corridor. Please help save the Broadneck and vote in favor of Councilwoman Fiedler's Resolution #32-21. --Pat Lynch, President of the Broadneck Council.	
Bradley Duane Knopf	1018 Magothy Park Ln	Annapolis	21409	Yes		Resolution 32-21	Support	An inadequately informed decision to move ahead with compounding the congestion in the current bridge corridor will magnify the real damage to local quality of life. The poorly executed presentation of options made the current direction appear to be a foregone conclusion. Northerly avenues from Baltimore and Southerly avenues through Calvert County need to be thoroughly studied.	
Stephen D Weinstock	802 Holly Dr E	Annapolis	21409	Yes		Resolution 32-21	Support	As i understand the study parameters the go/no go evaluation of which bridge alternative location was based strictly on traffic issues. That seems a bit misguided because you have to make trip generation assumptions based on vehicle trips which, of course, are generated by population. The flaw in a strict trip generation analysis is a failure to take into account various land use alternatives. These are not simple analyses. However, a new bridge span without prior land use planning including infrastructure like water, sanitary sewer, local roads, schools, police and fire will make the Eastern Shore one big sprawling subdivision...which i think most citizens would abhor. This also will be an environmental fiasco. I think you should table the current expansion plan and do a broader more comprehensive review of the Eastern Shore and its communities future. Truly, a proper exercise would be to convene a council of governments (like COG in the DC area) including all of the eastern and western shore communities, yes this is a big task, and start working on a regional land use plan that will then flow into a transportation plan. Right now saying we need a third bridge because of beach traffic on weekends for about 14-16 weekends per year seems shortsighted at best. And really, the 3rd bridge impact on the growth of eastern, and to some extent western, shore communities need to be considered in the context of Chesapeake Bay health...more people means more storm and sanitary infrastructure, treatment plants, parks, marina's, boating, fishing, etc. This is not building a bridge in a vacuum, it will have a lot of impacts. It is irresponsible to say 'Let's build a bridge and see what happens, we will fix any problems later'. Pause the study and expand its scope of work.	
Marc Greenspan	1672 Homewood Landing Rd	Annapolis	21409	Yes		Resolution 32-21	Support	I write in support of Resolution 32-21 and in opposition to the focus on corridor #7 in the current Bay Bridge Crossing study. I moved to Annapolis in 1994 and have lived off exit 31-Whitehall Road since 2012. In those years, we have suffered from both routine backups/delays caused by traffic volume and accidents, as well as extensive backups and delays caused by events such as ice dropping on cars earlier this year and the police activity by Cox Neck Rd on May 8, 2021. These events point to the need to have an alternate corridor across the bay rather than continuing to funnel more traffic through the choke points on US 50 between I-97 and the US-50/301 split on the Eastern Shore. When these events happen, the quality of life of local residents is negatively impacted, even if we do not need to cross the Bay Bridge. It also impacts the ability to conduct business in the area, the ability to get to offices and meetings, even the ability to go out for a meal. The current proposal did not include a study of all the costs of the approach road corridors on either side of the potential crossing sites. These important roadways/highways that feed traffic to/from the bridge must be studied and evaluated in any site selection process, but this key requirement was not included in the NEPA DEIS Report. We don't even know if the proposed bridge would be a replacement bridge or an additional parallel bridge. How can we lock in the selection of this corridor without considering the additional impacts (i.e. eminent domain land confiscation) and costs of all of this required work? The Purpose and Need statement is a critical piece of the report that allows for an informed selection, but it was poorly implemented. It must include not only traffic volume but should include the overall evaluation of the favorable and harmful effects on the region, our State capitol, the value of having multiple avenues of access across the Bay, and the effect on Baltimore/Washington commuters and those living on Eastern Shore of Maryland who don't cross the bridge. Without this evaluation, the federal highway administration will not be able to tell if a proper selection has been made. Thank you for considering my request to reconsider this process and do it right before finalizing this decision.	
sandra weinstein	663 mallard ct, Apt, Suite, Bldg. (optional)	arnold	21012	Yes	sandra weinstein	Resolution 32-21	Oppose	While we have debated this 3rd span of the bay bridge for as long as I have lived in Ulmstead for over 25 years the plain fact is that more people need to get to the beach. My quality of life (2 hours in traffic to get home from work)is a plain and simple fact! More time, air pollution and decreased family time because we all spend too much time in traffic. For God's sake just build the bridge, plan for a subway/train to the eastern shore area--Every other place in America that suffers from this just pulls up their panties and fixes the problems. Our roads are a mess:pot holes, buckling & little to no public transportation. Why are there not late activity buses from the high school? Why don't we have more sidewalks? Mean while our home values suffer due to over development, over crowding in our schools and streets:Fresh field lane????? Just put the bridge up, plan for a train/subway to the beach over the bridge. The real problem is our elected officials just want to kick the can down the road! The \$ for the study could have been used to build another span and plan to decrease the amount of pollution and destruction to the watershed.	
Barbara Hitchings	2135 Sandy Point Rd.	Annapolis	21409	Yes		Resolution 32-21	Support	I support resolution 32-21 I am in opposition to preparing a Final Environmental Impact Statement and a Record of Decision for the third span of the Chesapeake Bay Bridge. The study has not provided information about cost, infrastructure or impact on local communities. Until more information is provided, a wise decision cannot be made as to the location of another Bridge. As a lifelong Broadneck Peninsula resident, I have seen a steady increase in traffic using the current bridges. During the summer weekends, traffic is constantly backed up 7-10 miles on Rt. 50. The service rds. (East College Pkwy, Whitehall/Skidmore) and other rds. (St. Margaret's, College Pkwy, Church Rd, Bay Dale Dr. etc.) are bumper to bumper with drivers trying to find a shortcut. Emergency responders (fire, police, ambulance) would be hard pressed to get into or out of local communities. This is a major concern for many who live on the Broadneck Peninsula. If a 3rd span in built in the current location, it would only compound the traffic problems. This record of decision needs to be stopped. Once it is decided where the 3rd Bridge will be built, there is no going back and changing the location. If the decision is made to move the study forward, the residents of the Broadneck Peninsula will have to live with this decision in the years ahead.	
Rodney Green	1448 Log Inn Road	Annapolis	21409	Yes		Resolution 32-21	Support	There has not been a thorough enough study conducted. Whose home will be targeted for seizure? This is information we should have some idea about NOW not after the gov has pushed through his agenda. My family home is over 80 years old are we expected to allow a govt to steal our land after our ancestors scraped, scrimped & sacrificed maintaining it? We are prepared to fight to keep it & not allow it to be stolen from under us. We ask that you support Councilwoman Fiedler's resolution. We need more information. Thank you	
Kim Blake	757 Matchpoint Driv	Arnold	21012	No	Me & my family	Resolution 32-21	Support	These are just some of our concerns in supporting Res 32-21. We ask for your support in this resolution. How many homes will be targeted for seizure? 1. A study of all the costs of the approach road corridors on either side of the potential crossing sites was not conducted. These important roadways/highways that feed traffic to/from the bridge must be studied and evaluated in any site selection process, but this key requirement was not included in this NEPA DEIS Report. 2. The Purpose and Need statement is poorly implemented. This is a critical piece of the report that allows for an informed selection. It must include not only traffic volume but requires the overall evaluation of the favorable and harmful effects on the region, our State capitol, the value of having multiple avenues of access across the Bay, and the effect on Baltimore/Washington commuters and those living on Eastern Shore of Maryland who don't cross the bridge. Without this evaluation, the federal highway administration will not be able to tell if a proper selection has been made. Additional Concerns: - Anne Arundel County, the Broadneck Peninsula, and Queen Anne County would be the most affected communities in the 13 County NEPA study area that focuses solely on the selection of Corridor #7. It did not include any of the concerns or input by those entities when selecting Corridor #7. - The NEPA study did not provide any information concerning the shore-side construction and quality of life impacts of selecting this corridor versus any other corridor. - It did not indicate whether the proposed bridge would be a replacement bridge or a parallel and additional bridge. It is unrealistic to build a third span in Corridor 7, because it would be pointless to maintain two old bridges. - The NEPA study did not indicate any of the Corridor #7 costs and timelines or impacts of huge infrastructure requirements to rebuild Kent Island roadways, Anne Arundel County roadways, Queen Anne County bridges, and Severn River bridges to accommodate a new Chesapeake Bay Bridge span and related traffic. - This is a \$5 billion+ proposed structure projected to last for 100 or more years with regional and multi-state transportation impacts. The Purpose and Need criteria presented in developing the objectives of the long-term impact of selecting the existing corridor, and excluding all other corridors, have not been sufficiently developed to execute a FEIS/Record of Decision. - A myriad of unknowns have not been considered or revealed. The decision to lock in Corridor #7 for subsequent Tier 2 preliminary design work is premature without knowing and evaluating the extensive shore-side impacts: • Will this be a parallel structure to the existing structure and maintain the existing structures? • How many additional Bay crossing and support or safety lanes are required on this new bridge? • How many additional lanes will be required on Route 50 west and east of the new structure to provide for the additional bridge lanes? • Will the Severn River Bridge and the Kent Narrows Bridge require additional lanes when a new Chesapeake Bay bridge is in place? • What happens to all of the parallel service roads, such as East College Parkway, Whitehall Road, and all of Route 18 on Kent Island? • What will be the impact on feeder arterials, such as College Parkway, Route 2 North and Route 2 south, Route 8, and many other roads? • What is an order of magnitude estimate of the Eminent Domain land-takes to accommodate a new bridge? - No consideration is given to an alternative corridor placement for safety, evacuation, military action, or an alternative choice in the event the existing structure is damaged or blocked for any reason. - No consideration of providing greater state-wide economic benefits and advantages in another corridor location were considered. Furthermore, the existing corridor is not the most direct path to the Eastern Shore's Ocean City environs and attractions. Thank you	

Full Name	Home Address	City	Zip Code	Representing yourself?	What organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Optional Attachment
Rosalyn Fountain	1633 Colbert Road	Annapolis	21409	No	I represent myself & family members who are neighbors	Resolution 32-21	Support	Just some of our concerns in supporting Res 32-21. We ask for your support in this resolution. 1. A study of all the costs of the approach road corridors on either side of the potential crossing sites was not conducted. These important roadways/highways that feed traffic to/from the bridge must be studied and evaluated in any site selection process, but this key requirement was not included in this NEPA DEIS Report. 2. The Purpose and Need statement is poorly implemented. This is a critical piece of the report that allows for an informed selection. It must include not only traffic volume but requires the overall evaluation of the favorable and harmful effects on the region, our State capitol, the value of having multiple avenues of access across the Bay, and the effect on Baltimore/Washington commuters and those living on Eastern Shore of Maryland who don't cross the bridge. Without this evaluation, the federal highway administration will not be able to tell if a proper selection has been made. Additional Concerns: - Anne Arundel County, the Broadneck Peninsula, and Queen Anne County would be the most affected communities in the 13 County NEPA study area that focuses solely on the selection of Corridor #7. It did not include any of the concerns or input by those entities when selecting Corridor #7. - The NEPA study did not provide any information concerning the shore-side construction and quality of life impacts of selecting this corridor versus any other corridor. - It did not indicate whether the proposed bridge would be a replacement bridge or a parallel and additional bridge. It is unrealistic to build a third span in Corridor 7, because it would be pointless to maintain two old bridges. - The NEPA study did not indicate any of the Corridor #7 costs and timelines or impacts of huge infrastructure requirements to rebuild Kent Island roadways, Anne Arundel County roadways, Queen Anne County bridges, and Severn River bridges to accommodate a new Chesapeake Bay Bridge span and related traffic. - This is a \$5 billion+ proposed structure projected to last for 100 or more years with regional and multi-state transportation impacts. The Purpose and Need criteria presented in developing the objectives of the long-term impact of selecting the existing corridor, and excluding all other corridors, have not been sufficiently developed to execute a FEIS/Record of Decision. - A myriad of unknowns have not been considered or revealed. The decision to lock in Corridor #7 for subsequent Tier 2 preliminary design work is premature without knowing and evaluating the extensive shore-side impacts: • Will this be a parallel structure to the existing structure and maintain the existing structures? • How many additional Bay crossing and support or safety lanes are required on this new bridge? • How many additional lanes will be required on Route 50 west and east of the new structure to provide for the additional bridge lanes? • Will the Severn River Bridge and the Kent Narrows Bridge require additional lanes when a new Chesapeake Bay bridge is in place? • What happens to all of the parallel service roads, such as East College Parkway, Whitehall Road, and all of Route 18 on Kent Island? • What will be the impact on feeder arterials, such as College Parkway, Route 2 North and Route 2 south, Route 8, and many other roads? • What is an order of magnitude estimate of the Eminent Domain land-takes to accommodate a new bridge? - No consideration is given to an alternative corridor placement for safety, evacuation, military action, or an alternative choice in the event the existing structure is damaged or blocked for any reason. - No consideration of providing greater state-wide economic benefits and advantages in another corridor location were considered. Furthermore, the existing corridor is not the most direct path to the Eastern Shore's Ocean City environs and attractions.	
							9		
Steven Waddy	Po box 6210	Annapolis	21401	No	Naacp	Resolution 33-21	Support	This is a long overdue and well needed resolution. It should be followed up with a series of bills that put into law the recommendations from Interim Chief Lowry.	
							1		