

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|---|
| 10/12/2017 | Email | I read that there is a proposed idea of a second bridge crossing to the eastern shore in southern Maryland. I'm curious if a ferry crossing would be a possibility seems like that would be any attraction as well as an alternative to the existing bay bridge. Just a suggestion |
| 10/30/2017 | Website | Seriously? Another 3 years to study this again? Why not stop wasting our tax money on continuous "studies" of where to put a bridge! Put the money TOWARDS another crossing instead of yet another study! Only with wasting our tax money would things progress this slow. |
| 10/30/2017 | Website | I think a new crossing should connect Calvert County to the Cambridge area. This would remove a lot of traffic from D. C. and Virginia on the existing bridges. I don't think a crossing of the northern bay would help much because the majority of the population lives south of it and it would make the trip longer. |
| 10/30/2017 | Website | My two cents would be to build a new 3-lane bridge just south of the "old" bay bridge. The existing access roads/toll facilities are already in place. Then the "old" bridge can be used for one way travel at peak times or on holidays. Then possibly widen route 50 from Queenstown south to route 404. You could also look into a light rail system from Washington D.C. or Annapolis to Queenstown. Another possibility would be to build a new 4 or 6 lane bridge from Long Beach across the bay to Taylor's Island. Major infrastructural improvements would have to be made on both sides of the bay to handle traffic, noise, etc. There may be extensive impact/damage to wildlife areas near Taylor's Island. |
| 10/30/2017 | Website | This is an important study. I believe that the area that is in the approaches of a new bay crossing would see an economic boost that would help vitalize the area for future growth. This kind of project would greatly expand Maryland's economic muscle in an area that has plenty of room to profit from such a project. One such area that I would recommend would be Route 413 from 13 down to Crisfield then across to Smith Island and on to the Western shore. Both sides of the Bay would benefit from the project and I think the state as a whole would see tremendous business growth (Tax revenue) as a result. It would make the Eastern shore competitive with other areas of the state for business growth. |
| 10/30/2017 | Email | Bay Crossing (New Bridge area for consideration) at Saint Leonardo MD to Taylor Island, MD. |
| 10/30/2017 | Email | A bridge should be put up between Harford county and Kent county. Those further north should not have to drive south to Glen Burnie to get over to the eastern shore. |
| 10/30/2017 | Email | As an Eastern Shore resident for the past 20 years, I have followed with interest the discussions about the need for increased capacity for vehicles crossing the Bay. I'm a visual person, and if I was also an artist, I would provide a visual attachment to highlight my position, but I'm going to have to settle for words in a message. I understand there are essentially three competing approaches that could achieve this increased capacity. For brevity, I will refer to them as Northern (New Crossing, Balto. Cnty to Kent Cnty): Central (Expand Capacity of existing AA Cnty to QA Cnty) and Southern (Calvert Cnty to Dorchester Cnty). The long range betterment of life in Maryland seems best |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments

October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|--------|--|
| | | <p>served by a Southern approach.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The major eastern shore destination that contributes to the current strain on capacity is Ocean City and the Delaware Beaches. With the exception of traffic originating from Cecil County and north (PA and DE), most all western shore traffic will use the existing Rt. 50/Bay Bridge route to and from the MD/DE Beaches. That can only increase. The Southern Approach provides an alternative route that will actually also shorten the trip for traffic originating anywhere from a line about 10 miles north of Rt 4 and the entire Washington Beltway. Not sure what % of the current Bay Bridge Beach Bound traffic originates from this MD/DC/VA region, but the key here is a shorter trip, reduced miles, reduced emissions, reduced fuel consumption etc. On the Western Shore, the Rt. 4 corridor is ideal for upgrades to accommodate increased capacity. The Eastern Shore side (Taylor's Island) is more challenging because of the natural state of the land and the importance of keeping Blackwater intact and undisturbed, but there are plenty of examples of highways through or around natural preserves that have extremely low impact. Actually Rt. 13 on the eastern shore side of the bridge tunnel provides a good example of such a highway. Alligator Alley in FL seems to be another example. The opportunity for some economic development along the Rt. 4 corridor and in Dorchester County (away from the protected lands) seems a plus rather than any attempt to increase the traffic for the already taxed capacity along existing Rt. 50 & 404 in QA, Talbot, Caroline and Dorchester Counties. <p>I look forward to the coming web presentation [Name removed] Easton, MD [Information removed]</p> |
| 10/30/2017 | Email | <p>Thank you for the invitation to attend the November 15th presentation on an alternative Bay crossing.</p> <p>I am a resident in Owings. I am also a native Marylander. I regret I am unable to participate so I am sending a suggestion.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> There is also a need for a new bridge from St. Mary's County into Calvert County at Solomons. Over the last few years, the traffic has significantly increased over that bridge. My recommendation for a new Bay crossing from the Western Shore to the Eastern Shore is in the vicinity of Solomons: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The distance between the Eastern and Western Shores in the Solomons vicinity appears to be minimal than elsewhere in the Bay. Less environmental impact and offers a southern entry to the Eastern Shore for more "southern residents/travelers." |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|--|
| | | b. The new bridge at Solomons could possibly be integrated into a new planned bridge from St. Mary's County to Solomons. This could also prove to be very beneficial. "Kill two birds with one stone" possibly? All the best with your planning! |
| 10/30/2017 | Email | I highly suggest putting a crossing in Calvert county to keep southern Maryland from having to go so far north to just back track again south! |
| 10/31/2017 | Website | Greetings. I believe another crossing from the Western Shore to the Eastern Shore is needed but I oppose an bridge when there are other bridges that need to be replaced. I support a ferry from St. Mary's or Calvert County to the Eastern Shore. I believe this is better for the commuter, local economies and the environment. Ferry service can be implim ented in just a few years while a bridge would take decades to finance and build. Plus a ferry would add a level of appeal that a bridge can't touch. Thank you. |
| 10/31/2017 | Website | All for the new bridge design in Calvert County at the narrowest point between west and east shore. Two things to consider: 1. Consider designs that lessen stress for people who suffer from a fear of heights. The existing bay bridge are not well designed in this regard making it difficult for those with this anxiety. Obviously you will not find a design that will satisfy everyone, but, considering consulting with experts this area would be so foresighte and allow more people to less stressful access to the other side of the great state of MD. Suggestions include: additional space between cars and edge, secure sides to avoid the open spaces feeling like you are high up in the air. 2. In the future, link it up with a road that connects through St Mary's and a bridge to Virginia. Thanks for your time and consideration into this matter. |
| 10/31/2017 | Website | Put the new span across from Lusby (rt 4) to Taylors Island and run the access just north of the refuge and connect to Rt 16 and on to Rt 50. |
| 10/31/2017 | Website | I think an additional crossing is a good idea. I would like to know of the progress. |
| 10/31/2017 | Website | We have long needed another bridge crossing for the Chesapeake Bay to relieve the pressure and overwhelming traffic which occurs every evening to cross the existing Chesapeake Bay Bridge. Even a ferry would help but another bridge crossing makes more sense, whether it is near Havre de Grace or ends up in Somerset County, MD. |
| 10/31/2017 | Website | After years living on Kent island understand that no new bridge should be thought to go up there. infastucture can not handle it. Only logical place is a bridge or bridge tunnel to cross lower bay that would relieve pressure on volume at current bridge. Too many studies over the years. Its not rocket science. get the engineers together and make a plan that distributes traffic up and down the bay. already can go over the top of bay and at current choke hold bridges. Now time for one someplace between cheasapeake bay tunnel and current bridges. Former Senator Pipkin had the correct idea. Seems the \$\$\$ people in st michael's area do not want impact but what is fair about inudation of current path to beach for all of those people. |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|---|
| | | Moved to Delaware to get away from MD. & taxes. was life long resident. but was tired of democratic strong hold and tax and spend philosophy that has driven many to leave the state. Nice to visit now. Need to shrink government not create more inefficient bureaucracy. |
| 10/31/2017 | Website | Please consider extending Rt 43 in White Marsh across the bay towards Centerville in Kent County, Giving the Northeast corridor of the Baltimore beltway and I-95 easy access to the Eastern Shore. The current Bay Bridge is getting more dangerous considering the amount of time the lanes are open for 2-way traffic. Expanding in a new location would lift the burden off of Glen Burnie, Annapolis and Kent Narrows traffic. |
| 10/31/2017 | Website | We need a tunnel to reduce traffic on the bridge |
| 10/31/2017 | Website | I recommend building the new bridge much lower across the Bay. Yes, I realize it'll have to be longer and will cost a lot more. Justification: - Building another bridge where the current bridges are may improve the flow going over, but it won't relieve the traffic waiting to go over. - Building a new pass lower, will split the customer base between NW and SW, thus vastly decreasing the traffic build up. - A new bridge lower down will promote a lot of commercial and housing growth on both sides of that new bridge. Which will also increase tax revenue. - Provides an Emergency COOP Thank you. |
| 10/31/2017 | Website | I would like to see the new span to be from Crisfield, Maryland to St. Mary's County. |
| 10/31/2017 | Website | "Crossing" needs to address supporting roads. Why are people crossing? To go to beaches between Lewis and Ocean City or west from total eastern shore to DC and Baltimore areas for employment. The north is covered by Rt 95 and Rt 40. Far south is covered by the Tunnel. The real volume is in and around Rt 50 and Bay Bridges. Another crossing from southern MD (i.e Calvert-Rts 2 and 4) and connecting Rt 16 to Rt 50 would add lanes and reduce load at the other locations (principally the Bay Bridges) and would take advantage of the existing Rt 50. Rt 50 (and 16) could be expanded easily since the bulk of the road is thru existing farm land all the way to the beaches. |
| 10/31/2017 | Website | The funds for another bay crossing would be a luxury however the funds could be better spent to do something to relieve the gridlock on the Baltimore beltway which is a disaster every day 24/7 and effects many more citizens than the bay bridge crossings. If only the funds were spent on some type of rapid rail system in the median instead of the continual widening of the road we wouldn't have the mess we all "enjoy" today. Doesn't anyone in government have the ability to see past a few years into the future!. I have had the "pleasure" of driving the beltway every day to work for |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments

October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|--|
| | | 35+ yrs and I have watched it being widened every day throughout my entire time in practice. Now what- it cant be widened any more and the road is a disaster!!!! Congratulations on a job well done |
| 10/31/2017 | Website | No reason to have bay crossing to/from Calvert County. |
| 10/31/2017 | Email | <p>Gentlemen:</p> <p>It seems foolish to spend time and money on what can only be one conclusion. The next crossing can only be at Taylors Island. My reasoning only states the obvious; Taylors Island is the next closest Eastern Shore land mass to the western shore.</p> <p>It is possible to build several bridge crossings at the current site but how can any additional road structure be put into place without exorbitant cost and relocation of hundreds, perhaps thousands, of businesses?</p> <p>MD RT 16 is the feeder route to Taylors Island. It bisects the town of Church Creek and is lined with primarily residential housing. However, almost unlimited acreage exists to the south and east of that route which is primarily farm land and can be acquired without any major relocation costs.</p> <p>The bridge located in this area would bring a boom to three of Maryland's lower income counties, Dorchester, Wicomico and Somerset. There is ample open space in the middle-to-lower Eastern Shore for expansion of many industries which can only be to Maryland's economic well being. With just a little effort to showcase the myriad of possibilities on the lower shore, it is not inconceivable that an east coast 'silicon valley' environment could be encouraged. There is much acreage available at reasonable prices. The weather is generally mild but variable enough to attract golfers, hunters, fishermen, ironman competitors, bikers, swimmers and lovers of the outdoors in general. Maryland roads are generally among the best maintained in the nation. Maryland medical care (Johns Hopkins, U. of M. Hospital/School of Medicine, MedStar) compares favorably to the world. I urge immediate action on what can only be the reasonable conclusion.</p> <p>[Name and contact information removed]</p> |
| 10/31/2017 | Email | I live in Leonardtown, St Marys County MD and travel to the Delaware Shore every weekend. Please consider a crossing somewhere closer to SO MD. We are directly across from the Eastern shore but must travel hours out of our way to go north and then cross the bridge. |
| 10/31/2017 | Email | <p>I have no doubt that we need to accommodate more people crossing the bay. I think one of the biggest challenges is how the traffic is routed.</p> <p>Currently, we have a 3 lane highway that is expanded into 11 lanes at the toll then you merge them back into 2/3 lanes. This alone creates unnecessary traffic.</p> <p>1- The toll lanes need to be wider for people who have EZPASS (2 toll lanes made into 1 lane for EZPASS)</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments

October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|--|
| | | <p>2- When 2 lanes are heading east Two lanes open for EZPASS(to right) and 2 lanes on the far left for cash</p> <p>3-When 3 lanes are heading EAST Three lanes open for EZPASS(to right) and 2 lanes on the far left for cash</p> <p>This will eliminate the congestion on the toll and will encourage the cash customers to use EZPASS</p> |
| 10/31/2017 | Email | <p>We drive across the Chesapeake Bay Bridge regularly and are very much in favor of adding another crossing. In our opinion, the next crossing should be somewhere in the area of southern Calvert County (Calvert Beach area) to Dorchester County in the Taylors Island area. A bridge/tunnel similar to the existing Bay Bridge Tunnel would be ideal. Thank you for asking for input.</p> |
| 10/31/2017 | Email | <p>As an Eastern Shore resident, I'd like to share my thoughts. Two toll crossing points both north AND points south would help alleviate traffic on western shore 97 and 50 on Kent Island. It would also cut the brunt of new growth down 50% if both points north and south had an alternate route. I am also for reinstating a ferry or two for recreational drivers. Provide an acceptable dock access for private companies in Edgewater and near Baltimore to rock hall. Thank you for including community input in your meeting [Name removed] Queenstown</p> |
| 10/31/2017 | Email | <p>Dear Sirs , Good morning from the upper reaches of the Choptank River . Suggestion : a tunnel and south of the present bridge. Easton , Md. is chaotic enough on summer weekends Thank you [Name, address and phone removed]</p> |
| 10/31/2017 | Email | <p>To whom it may concern: 1 - Who from the MDTA is leading this study? 2. Is it cheaper to maintain a tunnel or bridge? 3. Is it cheaper to build a tunnel or bridge?</p> |
| 11/1/2017 | Website | <p>Bay Bridge Crossing StudyIt is high time to consider alternatives outside of the present crossings. The traffic will only be increasing in the current area which decreases the quality of life for those impacted by the ever increasing 5-10mile back-ups. With the newest Bay Bridge, the construction is never ending & impacts us daily. The costs must be astronomical & yet repairs continue. The routine switching to 2 sided traffic is a nightmare & always frightening to travel. It is time to find an alternative placement for a new bridge. The residents impacted by the current bridge have their quality of life affected enough already. Another bridge or span is unconscionable. The politicians want to jostle and manipulate where the bridge won't go. Their personal agenda is NOT important. It is the wishes of those most adversely affected who should be considered. Thank you. I'm sure the state has all the numbers of how many cross over the bridge, the number of accidents, the costs of on-going, never ceasing construction. They should have a total of the numerous back-ups not just during summer weekends, summer holidays, accidents, hazard spills but on the routine</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|-----------|---------|--|
| | | days when you leave out and find there's a back up on many regular work days.ENOUGH!!!!!!!!!!!! Find an alternative placement for the new bridge! |
| 11/1/2017 | Website | <p>My idea for a new crossing is to simply replace the 2-lane eastbound span, which is the world's longest functionally obsolete facility, IMO, with a new span that includes 3 12-foot lanes and a right shoulder of at least 10 feet and a left shoulder of at least 4 feet (interstate standards).</p> <p>Prior to doing the replacement, simply raise the bridge toll from \$4 cash and \$2.50 E-Z pass to the original \$6 cash and \$4.50 E-Z pass, which is 25% off. The extra money can be used to replace the toll plaza with an all-electronic system. Then the rates can be \$4.50 E-Z Pass and \$6 for toll-by-plate.</p> <p>After the tolling system is replaced and paid for, the increased tolls can then be used to back the bonds needed to replace the bridge. The all-electronic system and 3-lane bridge will hopefully end the traffic backups that occur both before and after the current toll plaza, and the speed limit can then be increased back to 50 mph, if not higher.</p> |
| 11/1/2017 | Website | <p>If you build it, They will Sprawl. Where ever it goes will be destroyed by urban sprawl and ruination. Quality of life will diminish and the environment will suffer and eventually the traffic that results will lead to the exact same congestion levels once again. There is a zero sum gain and huge cost. This will destroy the rural quality of life left on the shore . Taxes will increase to pay for services and roads that accompany the growth, traffic will increase locally, quality of life will suffer. Long term costs to local residents will be huge. Agriculture will be negatively impacted. The only people who benefit are developers and land speculators.</p> |
| 11/1/2017 | Website | The bridge crossing should be from route 43 across the bay to the chestertown area |
| 11/1/2017 | Website | Please consider high speed rail service to the eastern shore. Existing high speed rail runs from Washington DC to Wilmington DE. There are existing rail corridors from Wilmington to Berlin MD that could be upgraded to high speed rail at far lower cost and environmental impact than a new Bay crossing. |
| 11/1/2017 | Website | <p>1st question I have , why 5 million dollars to do a study, it has been on the drawing board for sometime. They have proposed several areas already, pick one and then proceed. Spend the money for a detail construction cost, put it out for bid to build a new crossing At the best possible crossing , either north or south of the current location. Spend the money for a detail construction cost, put it out for bid to build a new crossing At the best possible crossing , either north or south of the current location. Spend the money for a detail construction cost, put it out for bid to build a new crossing At the best possible crossing, either north or south of the current location. They have proposed several areas already, pick one and then proceed. "No charge for my input . [Name removed] Born, lived and worked in Maryland 73 years, now retired , and still pay taxes, don't waste any more money on studies, you have what it will take to go forward,just do it.</p> |
| 11/1/2017 | Email | Current Maryland Code allows Counties, who may be selected as possible sites for the new Bay Bridge span, to reject the State's selection of their County for the eastern and western side of the proposed new span. Legislation proposed |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|-----------|--------|---|
| | | <p>by Senator John Astle and Senator Stephen Hershey, filed in a prior Legislative session, that would have eliminated the ability of a County Executive and/or County Commissioner to reject their County for the new proposed Bay Bridge site, was passed overwhelmingly in the State Senate but scuttled in the House of Delegates.</p> <p>Is the MdTA working on the introduction of new legislation during the 2018 session to remove a County's ability to reject their geography as the location of the new proposed Bay Bridge span? If a rejecting County is selected for the new span, how will MdTA gain approval--as now required--to construct a new Bay Bridge span if the County votes against it? Are we in jeopardy of wasting the \$5M contribution to DOT/MdTA by Governor Hogan to advance the study of site selection and funding sources since the Counties still retain the right of refusal if they have been selected as the optimal site for the new span?</p> <p>[Name removed], President Broadneck Council of Communities, Inc.</p> |
| 11/1/2017 | Email | <p>I would like to know how many more studies are going to be conducted before a decision is made that we need another bridge. I tried unsuccessfully for 30 minutes to access the online meeting on November 15, 2017, but each attempt failed. I am very interested in this effort as another bridge is badly needed.</p> <p>The ideal place would be toward the Southern end of Maryland on the western side of the bay. A bridge there would eliminate traffic jams through Annapolis, Easton and Cambridge. Not only would it benefit those communities, it would save gas for those traveling from the Southern counties to the beaches and other destinations across the bay.</p> <p>There have been numerous other studies done as to where to put another Bay Bridge but no one wants it in their neighborhood. The money already spent on studies would have gone a long way toward building a bridge.</p> <p>Please don't let this be another study that goes nowhere and millions of tax dollars wasted.</p> <p>Thousands of dollars have already been spent on studies over the last 20 years and nothing has come of it. Why don't you take those prior studies and come up with one that works, and save the tax payers money for another study that will never go anywhere.</p> |
| 11/1/2017 | Email | <p>I have a couple questions being that the email that was sent out does not contain any useful information. From the email "The purpose of the Study is to identify the location of a new crossing and to explore potential financial options."</p> <p>What is the goal that is being sought for the new location? Are we attempting to reduce congestion on the current bridge? Is the issue due to EAST bound traffic in the morning? Is the issue due to WEST bound traffic in the morning?</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|-----------|---------|--|
| | | <p>Is the issue due to EAST bound traffic in the evening? Is the issue due to WEST bound traffic in the evening?</p> <p>Has a study been done to see where the commuters are mainly traveling FROM in regards to the Eastern Shore? Has a study been done to see where the commuters are mainly traveling TO in regards to the Eastern Shore? Has a study been done to see where the commuters are mainly traveling FROM in regards to the West side of the bridge? Has a study been done to see where the commuters are mainly traveling TO in regards to the West side of the bridge? Is this to make getting to DC easier? Is this to make getting to Baltimore easier? Is this to make getting to Eastern Shore easier?</p> <p>Are there known areas that are OFF LIMITS to development of the bridge that we should be aware of, such as game lands, state lands, military areas preserves?</p> <p>Is the roadway intended to attach directly into a main highway directly or dump into a normal roadway with traffic lights?</p> <p>These are the initial thoughts that come to me in just a couple minutes of thinking of the topic.</p> <p>Appreciate some feedback on these questions as soon as possible.</p> <p>Thank you. Respectfully, [Name removed]</p> |
| 11/1/2017 | Email | <p>I would like to know how many more studies are going to be conducted before a decision is made that we need another bridge.</p> <p>Thousands of dollars have already been spent on studies over the last 20 years and nothing has come of it. Why don't you take those prior studies and come up with one that works, and save the tax payers money for another study that will never go anywhere.</p> |
| 11/2/2017 | Website | <p>So your page says there will be an online discussion. Will it be on the page I just left? Why is there no online registration for something as simple as a webinar. Will you outline that this is just a study related to the National Environmental Policy Act? What role does the state play in is process? Who is leading the metting? Where can we follow-up. This is a such a lack-luster announcement that is completly shutting out the majority of people that this may affect - or likely our kids since you won't even get through this Phase I until 2020. Seems like political bluster.</p> <p>I look forward to your response and increased notice and avaiability.</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments

October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|-----------|---------|---|
| 11/3/2017 | Website | <p>Where can I find the proposed locations of the bridge? Someone said you're considering Prince Frederick but I can't find it anywhere on this website.</p> <p>And is this really sufficient notice to citizens about your half-hour meeting scheduled in less than 2 weeks?!?</p> |
| 11/3/2017 | Website | <p>Interstate Highway I-99</p> <p>The third Chesapeake Bay Bridge crossing (CBB3) should begin in Calvert County near Calvert Light Station and span due east across the bay to Taylors Island in Dorchester County.</p> <p>Relieve traffic on RT-50 and the existing Wm Preston Lane Bridge.</p> <p>Shorten the travel time to the Atlantic beaches from the Washington suburbs.</p> <p>Relocate I-95, I-495 and I-695 beltway traffic between Richmond and Wilmington to the Eastern Shore. (Snowbirds and Trucks)</p> <p>The western access road from the DC area to the new bridge would be MD RT-4 through Prince George's and Calvert Counties. RT-4 has been improved and dualized over the recent past.</p> <p>Access from Virginia I-95 traffic would connect at Ruther Glen, VA and use VA RT-207 to US-301, and then proceed to Dahlgren and cross the Potomac River over the new bridge to be completed in 2023. Both VA RT-207 and US RT-301 are dual lane roads. From there it would proceed to CBB3 via MD RT-4.</p> <p>The eastern access road would connect to MD RT-16. Interstate I-99 traffic will then use US RT-50 to Wye Mills, Maryland. From there I-99 heads to US-301 and on to the Delaware Memorial Bridge at Wilmington. Currently US-301 is an underutilized highway.</p> <p>DC area resort traffic would proceed east from Cambridge on US RT-50.</p> <p>See Map: https://www.google.com/maps/d/embed?mid=1x25I3rRZHjenAvi1Mq-iOgHuVew</p> |
| 11/3/2017 | Website | <p>I am interested in knowing the feasibility of better connecting the northern Baltimore area with the eastern shore. I see the connected of either Rt. 152 or a spur of Rt. 43 across the bay through Pools Island and into Kent County as a good traffic relief from the Bay Bridge. It is a relatively narrow span of about the same length as the current bay bridge. It could act as a more direct transportation corridor between Dover, DE and Batlimore.</p> |
| 11/3/2017 | Website | <p>I can not support the concept of adding an additional bay crossing in southern Maryland. None of its counties have the infrastructure in place to support the increased traffic and incidents they'd involve. A lack of roads to get around potential incidents in calvert county has potential to become a larger concern to residents then they already deal with.</p> |
| 11/4/2017 | Website | <p>I feel Tolchester would be the optimal local. It would also solve employment/travel issues for Chestertown. I love our quiet town but it's dying and this would bring more people and business here , I believe . My only issue is how to we do this and keep the environment safe in that area?</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|-----------|--------|---|
| 11/4/2017 | Email | <p>Dear Madam or Sir:</p> <p>There are several factors that should be considered as well as simply extrapolating the traffic crossing the Bay. I hope you will take the time to identify all the relevant issues and take them into consideration. For example, two projects will likely result in a quantum increase in traffic across the Bay, not just incremental growth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State of Delaware is expanding US 301 and its intersection with I 95. This will enhance an important alternative corridor for north-south traffic through Maryland, and increase the traffic on US 301 across the Bay. Likewise the project to replace the Nice—Potomac River bridge with a modern multi-lane bridge will provide an alternative corridor for north-south traffic and enable Marylanders traveling to Richmond and points south to avoid the I 95 traffic around Washington and through Northern Virginia. This project will also likely increase US 301 traffic across the Bay. <p>These factors should lead us to consider the through traffic across Maryland, and the role a new Bay crossing could play in relieving the congestion on the I 95 corridor.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment.</p> <p>[Name, address, email and phone number removed]</p> |
| 11/6/2017 | Email | <p>US Rt 50 has as much traffic as it can handle.</p> <p>The next Bay Crossing ??? Well I suggest North at the narrow part of the Bay above middle river and into Kent Co north of Chestertown. That links to rt 213 and eventually rt 13 and accommodates transit from NJ, NY headed for Baltimore and may reduce traffic on I 95 the most accident prone highway.</p> <p>And reduces Baltimore area transit going east away from Rt 50. Could be the main truck route for Balt and points NW and NE.</p> <p>Any route South of present location would require a tunnel bridge and disrupt habitat important to maritime species. North is already industrialized.</p> <p>So North and new highway connectors.</p> <p>[Name and information removed]</p> |
| 11/6/2017 | Email | <p>I have been a long-time boater and property owner here on the upper Eastern shore. Boaters, vacationers, residents and recreational users of the unspoiled sections of the Eastern Shore spend their time and their dollars here because it is UNSPOILED!</p> <p>As of 11/13/2017 I became a full-time proud, legal resident of Maryland. I am here because of the rural nature of the Eastern Shore.</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|-----------|---------|--|
| | | I implore you to protect the Eastern Shore by dropping the idea of building another bridge. I am against building a bridge. |
| 11/7/2017 | Website | Build a 3rd span at present site. To reduce auto congestion all the way to coast, use shuttle across bridge and rail to shore. Can't stand the drive, don't go anymore. |
| 11/8/2017 | Website | Please send information about how one can access the meeting online, such as a url for web-viewing and phone line to dial in on for audio. Thank you. |
| 11/8/2017 | Website | Another bay crossing is long overdue and I applaud Gov. Hogan for taking this on. I think a southern route would most beneficial. Combining the bay crossing with the 301 corridor would give a viable option to 95 and offer potential increased development to Dorchester county (though they are probably against it). |
| 11/9/2017 | Website | I hope the next bridge across the Chesapeake is not at Sandy Point. Rt 50 in Anne arundel or Queen Anne and rt 404 and rt 2 are jammed to capacity and the next crossing needs to be in another area totally. Large vehicles rvs, trucks almost need a special wider lane. I was hit just entering onto the east span in June 2017 without much wind, I think due to a new driver and just distraction of merging and seeing the views of the bay on a Friday rush hour. I drive this bridge every workday to ft meade and my husband to Washington beltway (he's in sales to construction sites) and this commute is often too long and too slow, and too unpredictable to make getting to work on time impossible to predict. My grandson and daughter live in cape st Claire and visiting is hard and getting to shopping or soccer games, etc are not made any easier by not knowing how long a commute will take. Thanks for studying and we hope a plan can come together soon. |
| 11/9/2017 | Website | <p>Unfortunately I have a previous commitment on that date. I do have the following comments:</p> <p>what are the demographics of those using the current Bay Bridges? what are the origins and destinations of those travelers? what are the future demographics and growth patterns of Queen Anne County (QAC) and surrounding areas? Regardless of which site crossing or bypassing (in the case of a northern Bay route) is chosen one only needs to look at Kent Island (KI) on the western border of QAC to imagine the impact of a bridge crossing and associated infrastructure. This in spite of the current mantra by QAC to maintain its rural characteristics at the expense of development on KI and along the 50/301 corridor.</p> <p>Few Eastern Shore (ES) citizens will want that type of development and infrastructure in their backyards. Sure, developers, some service businesses, and commuters (including future homeowners) may find it attractive. The county or counties may benefit greatly through tax revenues and service industries through increased sales, etc. But at what cost?</p> <p>The rural nature of the ES will be impacted. The very thing that attracts visitors and residents to the ES will be impacted. Critical areas of the Bay will be affected: wildlife, health of the Bay, aesthetics, etc.</p> <p>Therefore, I feel the bias is towards an additional crossing at KI because there will be resistance by most residents</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|---|
| | | <p>(elsewhere) to the building of a crossing where they live (and this may apply to the Western Shore (WS) residents as well).</p> <p>That leaves us with the KI crossing since plans have already been implemented to improve the 301 corridor from 95 in Wilmington, DE to KI. It seems as though the decision to funnel more traffic through QAC has already begun although I don't recall any public referendums or discussions taking place.</p> <p>In my opinion KI and the ES have seen enough overdevelopment and other things such as public transportation should be considered to decrease the amount of traffic on our roads and the impact it has on the environment!</p> <p>In closing, the reason that that we chose to live on the ES was to enjoy the rural nature of QAC. We moved to our current location to avoid what we view as traffic, strip malls, a slew of small businesses, and fast food restaurants encroaching upon the very core of what the ES stands for in QAC. For those wishing to go from point A to point B (home to beach - if that is determined to be the largest demographic) they will not care what happens between those two points - because they don't live there and they just want have a place to eat, a place to gas up their vehicle, and a quick way to their destination! Some people will profit greatly while the rest of us will suffer the consequences! We live here and we care!</p> <p>Respectively yours, [Name removed] Centreville, Maryland</p> |
| 11/9/2017 | Website | I do hope that if a crossing is undertaken, a bike/pedestrian lane will be included. It would be ashamed not to. |
| 11/9/2017 | Website | <p>Go to Charleston South Carolina. They had the same thing that we have now. First one bridge (route 17), then two bridges. Now they have one 8 lane bridge that took the place of the two (2). Find out how a poor state could do that \$8,000,000,00. They only had to add some to the roads that were already there, but it seems to be working. Get their engineers to tell how they did it and where the money came from.</p> <p>Good luck, I'll never see it. I'm 84.</p> |
| 11/10/2017 | Email | <p>Please consider a bay crossing from Calvert County to the Taylor Island area. It would provide perfect access to the Blackwater refuge, and the rest of the eastern shore area. It might be worth considering a ferry system in this area also. It seems to work well for Seattle.</p> <p>Thank you, [Name removed] HVAC Sales Manager</p> <p>[Phone number and email removed]</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|--|
| 11/11/2017 | Website | I strongly urge consideration of bridge alternatives such as commuter and beach buses (electric) or lightrail, staggered work hours, sliding scale tolls based on traffic hours, ferries, HOV lanes. Farming is MDs largest business. Additional roads, cars, air pollution, water pollution risks our farming resources. Additional roads only attract additional cars. Sustainable living would require fewer cars and roads. In addition, the vulnerability of the Eastern Shore to flooding and erosion should be considered. Flooding around Annapolis particularly could affect the existing and any new bridge. Sinking land and rising ocean levels around Dorchester county should be considered as well. I believe we do not need another bridge. Sincerely, [Name removed] |
| 11/13/2017 | Website | Do you have any read ahead materials? How can these materials be obtained? |
| 11/14/2017 | Website | Need to build one, do not let N. I.M.B.Y. get in the way do what is best for the majority. |
| 11/14/2017 | Website | <p>Notice of this meeting was received only today, November 2, 2017 at 4:19 pm. The on-line/in person meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, November 15th. This seems an exceptionally short time between public notification and the scheduled meeting. Recognizing that there are two weekends and a national holiday - Veteran's Day - during this two-week span this means that you have provided only 8-businessdays notice of the meeting.</p> <p>While this may comply with the letter of the Maryland Open Meetings law, which does allow for "short notice," it clearly skirts the intent of the open meetings provisions to provide the fullest possible transparency for government actions. Any proposal to build a third • Bay Bridge, will have enormous import for the voters and taxpayers of Maryland and even greater impact on the counties - on both sides of the Bay (ironically - and I am sure - unintentionally, your preliminary materials mention only the need for consent among the Eastern Shore counties) - meaning the full and transparent discussion of proposed options is imperative.</p> <p>Finally, let me note that the locations of your public meetings clearly imply three possible corridors for the second Bay Bridge project: a northern route from northern Baltimore county across to Queen Anne's County; a mid-Bay route from Anne Arundel County across to Dorchester County; and multiple possible routes through Calvert County across to either Dorchester County in the North or Kent County in the South. Obviously, there are many permutations of these routes in each of the apparent corridors, but MDTA needs to make clear more of its thinking and planning - even at this early stage - than it has done to date.</p> <p>Moreover, these meetings pick up the thread of the preliminary work done on the possibility of a Bay Bridge that was done under Governor Ehrlich's administration. Those studies explored very similar routes for a third Chesapeake Bay Bridge but reached no conclusion. The current project should build on, not duplicate, the work previously done. With that in mind the materials developed in this earlier study should be immediately and conveniently made available to the public.</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|--|
| | | <p>This is not an auspicious beginning to the planning process, especially when a third Bay Bridge will inevitably constitute one of the largest and most expensive infrastructure projects in the United States when the full-scale planning and construction begin.</p> <p>Respectfully . . . [Name removed], Prince Frederick, Calvert County, Maryland</p> |
| 11/14/2017 | Email | <p>I am against buidling a new Bay Bridge.</p> <p>Very truly yours, [Name and address removed]</p> |
| 11/15/2017 | Website | <p>The last thing we need is another Bay Bridge next to the existing two. Route 50 could not be made wide enough to handle it. How about thinking outside the box and spending some real money? Maybe two new bridges - one just north and east of Baltimore, coming off the east side of the beltway, and a second crossing over towards Cambridge to handle DC and northern VA traffic. And while you're at it, what about a "chunnel" style crossing? High speed rail under the Bay from DC and Baltimore, with limited stops - maybe one or two on the western shore and one or two on the eastern shore. It's time to invest in mass transit. With enough trains running frequently enough it could take a load off the highways. And then there's the old-fashioned ferry. Today's high speed hovercraft ferries can handle a good number of cars in short order. Maybe a mix of solutions is what's needed instead of another band aid.</p> |
| 11/15/2017 | Website | <p>The current bridge crossing did not keep up with the spike in the population growth of the Washington D.C. and Baltimore suburbs. Need to double the number of bridge crossing lanes at it's current location. Along the way, The Annapolis exits at Route 50, The Severn River bridge area, and the Route 97 exit towards Baltimore need to be completely redesigned to include sky ramps leading to and from these currently highly congested areas of Route 50. The current MTA should be dissolved and become part of MDOT. The current road systems associated with the Chesapeake Bay Bridge, Nice Bridge, the Baltimore tunnel and the newest road system in Montgomery County should be maintained by MDOT. That way all Marylanders would be paying for their upkeep through their taxes. The State of Florida has bridges over waterways everywhere. Only a few have tolls. Road systems and bridges without tolls would help in preventing traffic back-ups. The cost to maintain all road systems throughout Maryland should be shared by all citizens of Maryland equally.</p> |
| 11/15/2017 | Website | <p>First let me start out by saying with what you doing on the severn river bridge which is going to be huge mistake . Have you seen the backups going west bound in the AM People are scared to drive those narrow lanes . Going east bound the problem has always been the last minute drivers trying to get into the right lane to drive on route two . I would probably say that you are going to see a major increase in traffic accidents making matters worse . The Bay bridge needs to be built down south, this area is so conjested that on most weekends especially during the summer months we are prisoners in our community because of traffic . We even have people cutting through our community to get over the bridge that has to stop , along with people using ST. Margrets as alternate route . Give us locals special decals for</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|--------------|---|
| | | our cars and start handing out tickets . The population is not going to shrink and by the time you even come to a decision and then the completion of another bridge it will be literally nuts |
| 11/15/2017 | Website | Please add a second Chesapeake Bay crossing and put in southern MD. While you are at it, complete the Eastern Shore bypass for traffic going to/from New York to destinations south of Washington, DC. |
| 11/15/2017 | Website | Don't forget not only daily and weekend traffic factors, but also disaster evacuation needs (hurricanes, nuclear power plant, etc.), economic growth potentials, Dept of Defense impacts (improved alternate access to Norfolk area from PAX for possible growth or solidifying position in future BRAC or interference with air traffic), routing more traffic away from existing bottleneck areas, making OC closer for SoMD vice VA Beach, etc. Many factors seemed to be missed from previous studies which may offer sources of supplemental Federal funding from FEMA, NRC, DoD, and others depending on location selections. |
| 11/15/2017 | Website | My concern is that "scientists have forecasted the sea levels in the Chesapeake Bay area to rise 2 feet by 2050" . Will there even be an eastern shore, or beach destination at that point? |
| 11/15/2017 | Website | I'm trying to find on-line information regarding the 11/15/17 @ 7PM meeting regarding the 2nd Bay Bridge. |
| 11/15/2017 | Website | I think another Bay crossing should be put in Southern Maryland and should be a Tunnel. This would not disturb the view of the Bay and would not be effected by adverse weather. |
| 11/15/2017 | Email | As someone who uses the current Bay Bridge every day I have been concerned with the growing traffic and capacity issues. It is my thoughts that a southern crossing would be most effective. Giving southern Maryland and northern Virginia a more direct route to Salisbury and the routes north toward New England. [Name and address removed] |
| 11/15/2017 | Comment Card | Cross the bay near cove point to Taylors Island and directly to OC. The Annapolis area can not support more traffic. Save Annapolis. Could there be a connection to 95 south of Washington to relieve the traffic below DC? |
| 11/15/2017 | Comment Card | Please build bridge to north or south of Route 50 on Thursdays through Sunday I get stuck for hours trying to get from my home in Winchester on the Severn to Davidsonville, MD. Dreadful and will only get worse! |
| 11/15/2017 | Comment Card | So. MD could not handle the traffic that this bridge would create. We can't handle the traffic we have now. Specifically zones 5 and 6. We need a new bridge going from Calvert county (Solomon's) over to St. Mary's!! In zones 5 and 6 a new bridge would be disastrous |
| 11/15/2017 | Comment Card | What will be done to mitigate the impact on affected communities ie noise, aesthetics, etc |
| 11/15/2017 | Comment Card | How will residents be compensated if they are close enough to hear noise, deal with heavy traffic, lose value of their property |
| 11/16/2017 | Website | How come I can't get access to the 7 PM meeting on line!! |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|--|
| 11/16/2017 | Website | Initial meeting was unavailable. Your computers are too slow or too weak. Correct that problem or your study will be besmirched. It will stink to high heaven. We are very disappointed. |
| 11/16/2017 | Website | I think rt4 to rt 16 looks like a logical choice... Not a third span to Kent Island.Its way too crowded in the summertime now. |
| 11/16/2017 | Website | This may have been covered during the presentation, but it appears that the servers got overloaded and I was unable to watch. Anyway, I have a question. Why is the studying to take almost 3 years to complete? That seems excessively long, and costly to me. |
| 11/16/2017 | Website | The website was unavailable during the presentation. How can we see what was presented? |
| 11/16/2017 | Website | I have been coming to Rock Hall since 1990, bought a house here and married a local woman 5 years ago. I retired and have been living here full time 4 years ago. I oppose the building of any bridge from the western shore to Kent County as it will destroy the pristine rural beauty of the county. |
| 11/16/2017 | Website | All of Maryland growth and tax dollars are around Baltimore and the Washington metropolitan area. The outer parts of the state have been ignored or treated like a step child. A bridge connecting southern Maryland to the Eastern Shore would be an economic boost, spread growth and offer more escape routes in case of an emergency. Additionally, the Nice bridge has been an example of the treatment of Southern Marylanders travel needs. It is finally being financed. If someone was thinking ahead about 301 traffic and congestion, combining the Nice bridge project to an additional Chesapeake crossing in Southern Maryland, that would be such a blessing to many. |
| 11/16/2017 | Website | Having grown up on the Eastern Shore (in Salisbury) and having lived in Baltimore for 45 years with frequent visits to the Eastern Shore, I can attest to the need for another bridge across the bay. I think if one were to be placed closer to the third section (just south of the current bridge), it would facilitate the Washington and Virginia crowd trying to get to the Eastern Shore and the beaches. So many people go to Rehoboth Beach and the Delaware beaches that a bridge not far from Route 404 would be helpful. |
| 11/16/2017 | Website | Your web meeting did not work. If you are going to offer this type of communication, you need to make sure it will work for all who wish to join. |
| 11/16/2017 | Website | Currently traffic approaching the existing bay bridge and switching lanes at the last moment in order to get into our get out of a ezpass lane only. Prior to reaching the part of the highway where you need to pick a lane, giant white lettering marking the pavement should be made to guide people to the ezpass lane only. |
| 11/16/2017 | Website | Please build the bridge from St Mary's County across to Dorchester County. The people of Cambridge Maryland need the economic development. |
| 11/16/2017 | Website | Since this is early in the study and we can blue-sky how the final product should look, i have the following recommenations; |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|---|
| | | <p>1) Incorporate flexibility to anticipate high - tech improvements in transportation, including variable message signing and speed posting, self driving cars, buses and trucks, and a connected highway for the bridge and approaches that can be accessed online</p> <p>2) incorporate a safe lane for pedestrians and bikes. Make this facility available to the East Coast Greenway Project.</p> <p>3) determine if this bridge can be a catalyst to high speed rail. The link to building a system to connect Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis with the Eastern Shore and Ocean City.</p> <p>4) incorporate new safety measures such as reflective or lit lane markings, embedded heaters to keep roadways from freezing, and sufficient space for shoulder lanes.</p> <p>Thanks again for allowing the public to be a part of this exciting endeavor.</p> <p>[Name removed]</p> |
| 11/16/2017 | Website | <p>I grew up on the lower Shore (Princess Anne) and have visited continuously and frequently since; though I have lived in Baltimore for the past 46 years, I still consider myself a Shoreman in spirit.</p> <p>I have thought long about the potential for another bay crossing since the building of the second parallel span in 1973. It seems to me, that, apart from a ferry service, which would be a questionable proposition economically, the only reasonable alternative is to construct a third span in the location of the other two. My reasons for this conclusion are as follows:</p> <p>Although I am not an engineer, It would appear to me that the only two places where another span would make sense from a purely physical standpoint would be the current location of the two existing bridges, or a potential crossing from Calvert County to Taylors Island. Any crossing North of the existing bridges would make no sense from a traffic standpoint, as it would be little used, if at all, by residents of the D.C. metropolitan area, and it would lengthen the travel time to the beaches for those using it. Otherwise, it seems to me that the distances over the bay at other crossing points are simply too great from either an economic or an engineering standpoint for another span to be feasible.</p> <p>In my opinion, a crossing from Calvert to Dorchester Counties would be an environmental disaster. The Dorchester marshes are a natural treasure, with a beauty and historic significance that is probably unparalleled on the East Coast. They are also environmentally fragile, and it does not require much imagination to visualize the harm done by a superhighway from Taylors Island past Church Creek and linking with the existing Route 50 East of Cambridge. The concept of running such a road through the Neck District is even more appalling.</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|--|
| | | A third bridge, of at least four lanes, beside the existing bridges probably has its own potential problems, but I'm sure they pale by comparison to the problems that would be created by a bridge between Calvert and Dorchester, Thanks for considering my opinion(s) on this matter. [Name removed] |
| 11/16/2017 | Website | Really?!? Get your internet/web set up properly. Too many bugs, couldn't participate in the first round. |
| 11/16/2017 | Website | We do NOT need a third bridge! Build mass transit. Repair the infrastructure. There is no mass transit from Cumberland to Baltimore to Annapolis. This is crazy in the 21st century. |
| 11/16/2017 | Website | This is the dumbest thing I have ever heard. Let's pile more cars on the shore with their single lane highways, that makes no sense at all. It's bad enough being here in the summer and try to get to work or anywhere else for that matter, with no way to get around with all the bumper to bumper cars. I have lived here all of my 60 plus years, but am so ready to leave this backwards eastern shore. Someone needs to get smart. And 4 years to do this study, wow I love seeing my tax dollars work. |
| 11/16/2017 | Website | How about putting another bridge in-between the 2 existing bridges right now? |
| 11/16/2017 | Website | I feel that a light rail line should be considered to link Baltimore, Annapolis, Easton, Cambridge, Salisbury and Ocean City. |
| 11/16/2017 | Website | Please keep me informed. Thank you. |
| 11/16/2017 | Website | Thanks for the opportunity to comment. I commute to Silver Spring at least three days a week from Worton. We definitely need an alternative crossing to help with peak traffic challenges. I would like to see a train commuter line on the new crossing connecting both shores and linking to the Wilmington DE station. This would ease congestion as well, but may be difficult to accomplish. I think the new crossing should be further south of the Bay Bridge as the majority of congestion problems arise during summer towards the weekend because of DC and Virginia beach traffic to southeast Delaware and Maryland (Rehoboth and Ocean City beaches). Thanks. |
| 11/16/2017 | Website | Expand the bridge as it is now maybe 3 lanes going both ways and maybe expand Highway 50 or build side roads for the expanded 3 lane bridge and gradually connecting onto 50.or 404 Thank You for your time [Name removed] |
| 11/16/2017 | Website | I strongly believe and would build the 3rd Bay Crossing North or South of Route 100...why....I strongly believe it would disrupt the mounting traffic as everyone goes to 97 South to 50 East to cross the Bay. People in the northern sector of the state would cross the Bay, and could continue East to Ocean City, & Rehobeth on a newly designed route after they cross the Bay. |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments

October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|--|
| 11/16/2017 | Website | <p>MDTA should replace both existing Bay Bridges with a bridge-tunnel complex south of the current bridges, similar to the three bridge-tunnels in Virginia. Facility can include fishing pier, restaurant, and gift shop, possibly similar to MDTA toll plazas on I-95. The new complex would consist of a set of dual 4 lane bridges west of the shipping channel, 4 tunnels (8 lanes total that are located under where the shipping channel is) that are bored using a TBM-similar to the Port of Miami Tunnel and the upcoming CBBT Thimble Shoals Parallel Tunnel project in VA, and another set of dual 4 lane bridges on the east side of the shipping channel. My guess cost (based on extrapolating the proposed CBBT project) is \$3 billion for the tunnels, and \$5 billion total for the project.</p> <p>This will allow the Port of Baltimore to expand to Sparrows Point with Tradepoint Atlantic and allow bigger and higher container ships such as the Maersk E and Triple E class ships to call into Sparrows Point. By replacing the Bay Bridge with this Bay Bridge-Tunnel, Baltimore (Sparrows Point) would potentially be one of the only ports on the East Coast of the US capable of handling the biggest container ships in the world. The current bay bridges are obsolete and will probably be due for replacement once the study is completed and funding is available. This is an historic opportunity to not only replace the bridge with a bridge-tunnel complex but in doing so allows for bigger container ships to go to the Port of Baltimore at Sparrows Point and transform Maryland's economy.</p> |
| 11/16/2017 | Website | This is a project that is overdue. It should include both traffic and mass transit opportunities to cross from Baltimore and Washington to the eastern shore. It should also maintain the recreational opportunities for those of us who occasionally get to swim and run across the span for fun. I am someone who lives in Baltimore but owns both vacation and rental property on the eastern shore and cross regularly for both personal and business reasons. |
| 11/16/2017 | Website | Is there a possibility to put a second level to provide an upper and lower deck on one of the bridges? Perhaps that would be a less expensive alternative to constructing an entirely new bridge. |
| 11/16/2017 | Website | I would love to see a way across the bay from the Taylor's Island/ Fishing Creek area to the Lusby area. Not only is it between the Tunnel and Bay Bridge but it also is a shorter distance to cross the bay which could save money. |
| 11/16/2017 | Website | Put in a Tunnel like the one between England and France. The English Channel. |
| 11/16/2017 | Website | Please consider doing a crossing from Somerset County to the Patuxent River area. It would give access to jobs in Patuxent River area for people living on the Eastern Shore. It would also give people who live south of DC and in Virginia easier access to the eastern shore. It would help promote tourism in Somerset County. Depending on how it is built, it could also connect Smith Island to the mainland. Thank you. |
| 11/16/2017 | Website | For a daily commuter to Baltimore from Cambridge, it is a struggle daily in the afternoons trying to get home due to the traffic. I understand that it is my choice to live where I live, but the volume of traffic to the Western/Eastern Shore is incredible. Summer months on Fridays are insane. Another bridge needs to be built in the lower part of the Eastern Shore to connect Rt.4 with Rt 16 Washington DC, to Cambridge. People who travel to Ocean City in the summer should be charged tolls going into Ocean City, and Delaware Beaches, my personal opinion would be to charge them \$20 |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|---|
| | | during peak times of travel and \$5 for off peak times. This would alleviate Friday afternoon rush hour NIGHTMARES, and could possibly generate money for the State. |
| 11/16/2017 | Website | <p>Currently, there are only 3 main options off the peninsula: North through Delaware, West through 50, and South through Virginia. For those of us that live in the middle part of the peninsula, it takes a long time to have to go around to get to Baltimore or DC. And in the event of an emergency or natural disaster, evacuation routes become congested. We all know what summertime traffic looks like as well.</p> <p>As someone who also has to commute for work multiple times a month from the Eastern Shore across the bay, I would love to see another option to get across.</p> <p>As someone who lives in Crisfield, a once-bustling waterfront town that is still suffering from the effects of Hurricane Sandy, I recommend another Bay crossing from our town over to St Mary's. Preferably by Ferry like the Cape May-Lewes one. This would save all of those folks travelling from having to go down through Virginia and the tunnel, or up and around to 50. It would bring more business to towns in those counties as well.</p> <p>I'd recommend anything from Salisbury South, as long as building across the wide part of the bay isn't an issue. But I think Crisfield would benefit most from having another point of access.</p> |
| 11/16/2017 | Website | This meeting seems to not provide any input on the locations of the proposed bridge, which I thought was the purpose of the meeting. |
| 11/16/2017 | Website | A ferry from Crisfield to St Mary's is needed. We need something south of Salisbury. I believe ferries are needed at multiple locations up and down the bay. |
| 11/16/2017 | Website | No matter where you place the new bridge, please include a passenger train trestle bridge along with it. A train to Ocean City or Berlin will greatly reduce traffic across the bridge. I can't understand why this hasn't already been done. A train connect to the Northeast corridor will greatly improve tourism & reduce traffic simultaneously. Thank you for taking the time to read my opinion. |
| 11/16/2017 | Website | As I was just made aware of this study, these suggestions are not well researched, which is where this study group comes into play. The lower level of Sub Area 1 would divert majority of the traffic from the northern Baltimore area away from the Bay Bridge, significantly reducing traffic across that span. This option may be immediately rejected due to the fact we are talking about the Aberdeen Proving Ground. On the Eastern Shore, we are now suggesting a point somewhere between Betterton and Newtown, the impact of which would be substantial, not to mention the countless miles of road on the Eastern Shore that would now need to be built to accommodate the greatly increased volume. On the southern end of the Chesapeake Bay, a crossing point between Long Beach and Cove Point seems logical, though it may not reduce traffic on the Bay Bridge as greatly. Thank you for your time. |
| 11/16/2017 | email | I would like to request a list of names of the members of the Bay Crossing Study project team. |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|--|
| | | Thank you[Name removed] |
| 11/16/2017 | Website | <p>Part of the purpose stated in the PowerPoint presentation states you are to identify an additional crossing.</p> <p>It is my hope that you will consider expanding the existing corridor and bridge crossing . It would seem that would be the least costly, have the least environmental impact and provide adequate flow of traffic to the ocean well into the next 25-50 years.\</p> <p>Additionally, a rapid transit system parallel to the road bed could also provide alternate transportation, reduce accidents and reduce car traffic at the ocean destinations.</p> |
| 11/16/2017 | Website | <p>Why build a bridge linking Baltimore to the eastern shore when the road infrastructure already exists to support traffic from 97 to rt 50? Maryland's eastern shore is a jewel of the state, not a pass through to OC and should be protected for its natural and unique habitat. I can only imagine the city traffic on 4 lane highways cutting through chestertown and ruining the historical and remote atmosphere that many love.</p> <p>What makes sense is to build a new bridge at the current location with the idea that it will replace what currently exists - an aging eastbound bridge. If a new bridge is built somewhere else, the issue with two aging bridges still persists which will require action regardless.</p> <p>As studies have shown, traffic has remained flat for the last 10 years. We cross the bridge every Friday evening or Saturday morning, and with the easy pass - it's almost always smooth sailing. All the talk about 2-4 hour backups simply does not exist. If you cross during so-called peak hours with a smart pass, you will see congestion is relatively minor.</p> <p>Build a bridge - but don't ruin the beautiful eastern shore in order to fill hotels in OC. That would be the most short sighted thing one could do.</p> |
| 11/16/2017 | Website | <p>Thank You for the opportunity to be aware and participate in the process.</p> <p>Another Bay crossing is very much needed, probably south of the current bridge to help funnel DC and Northern Virginia traffic to the eastern shore beaches. Just an initial thought.</p> |
| 11/16/2017 | Website | <p>I am against building a bridge.</p> <p>I have been a long-time boater and property owner here on the upper Eastern Shore. Boaters, vacationers, residents and recreational users of the unspoiled sections of the Eastern Shore spend their time and their dollars here because it is UNSPOILED!</p> <p>As of 11/13/2017 I became a full-time proud, legal resident of Maryland. I am here because of the rural nature of the Eastern Shore.</p> <p>I implore you to protect the Eastern Shore by dropping the idea of building another bridge.</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|---|
| | | Thank you[Name removed] |
| 11/16/2017 | Website | <p>i am not sure what area of study my comment falls under. It is important that whatever study is done, it takes into consideration the impact on the communities affected by the bridge.</p> <p>Kent Island infrastructure is maxed out. Widening Route 18 would only invite more travelers to jump off Rt50 and clog us up worse than they do now. If a system could be worked out where only local travelers could access Rt 18 or where travelers would have to stop and shop, leaving their money behind, it might work. A middle lane dedicated to emergency service vehicles is needed now.</p> <p>Many counties will vote to add on to the existing bridge so that they don't have the infrastructure problems KI has. The system should be weighted so that the effected county has enough say.</p> |
| 11/16/2017 | Website | I would love to see another bridge happen. It would be nice if it was south of the current bridge, but understandable if the Baltimore traffic would need a northern one. |
| 11/16/2017 | Website | I would strongly prefer that additional bridges across the Chesapeake Bay not be constructed. I work as a Civil Engineer, specifically related to stormwater remediation, and every day I see the deleterious impacts of development on the environment. Adding an additional major roadway (plus the collector roads and associated infrastructure) will be a further stress on the condition of Chesapeake Bay. Rather than treat "too much traffic" as a problem to be solved by increasing the supply of roadways, seek alternatives to suppress demand, such as promoting "live-near-your-work" programs, telecommuting, or other means of reducing commuter traffic on our roadways. Anthropogenic contribution to climate change is a scientific consensus; it is imperative that government agencies (especially in sensitive regions such as ours) not incentivize additional driving or unsustainable growth that will increase emissions of CO ₂ , NO _x , heavy metals, and other air, water, and soil pollutants. I find it very difficult to believe that any amount of "mitigation" credit for such a major infrastructure project at any of the considered sites would properly account for the additional degradation to the environment. I will continue to oppose efforts to construct this bridge in Maryland--any projected economic impacts are dwarfed by an urgent need for environmental stewardship. |
| 11/16/2017 | Website | Please build the next bay bridge South of the existing bridge. We have a large population, particularly around Salisbury, that is very isolated from the west side of the Chesapeake Bay because we have to drive so far to the North to get to the Bay Bridge in order to cross. The lower shore can become an economic powerhouse with a more direct route to Washington D.C. and visitors traveling to Ocean City would have a shorter route, leading to more frequent visits. |
| 11/16/2017 | Website | Stop spending money on study and invest it in overhauling the current bridge after you build a new 6 lane bridge beside the one you have now. Put a toll on going both ways and you will see it pay for itself eventually. I have family that lives on the eastern shore and it's a pain to sit in traffic just to visit. |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|--|
| 11/16/2017 | Website | There should be expensive free driver to drive people over the bridge . We shouldn't have to pay for our fears .. of a new bridge goes in place it shouldn't be so high we should have to stare down at the suspensions it's scary and make it wider with 4 rows |
| 11/16/2017 | Website | I do not believe that channeling thousands(?) of cars through rural Kent County will do anything except cause more costly problems. The roads, bridges, all of the infrastructure was not made for this volume of traffic. Take it to a more populated area where there are traffic control and super highways already in place. You would be opening a can of worms. |
| 11/16/2017 | Website | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What study has been done to determine if an additional bridge is needed 2. I have traveled for 2 years across the bridge from eastern shore to Annapolis. Only had 1 major hold up due to accident on bridge 98% of the regular delay is at the Severn River bridge NOT the bay bridge 3. Any back up at weekend are due to holiday traffic all going south If a bridge is required it should be well south of existing bridge 4. The whole reason we live on the eastern shore is for the peace and tranquility a bridge and major roads would completely destroy this If we wanted that we would live in New Jersey or the Western shore! 5. Any bridge particularly if north of existing bridge would effectively homogenize the eastern and western shore which is very detrimental to the environment and our way of life, there must be some variety in environment to suit all the population 6. How many of the major stakeholders and decision makers live on the eastern shore? 7. How much is driven by business interests rather than a true need or requirement? |
| 11/16/2017 | Website | Please plan on building a state of the art people transportation system rather than building a bridge for automobiles that won't be the main way folks will travel in 2030. Automakers realize the end of privately owned cars is coming at a rapid pace. We should plan on high speed transport to shore points for vacationers with easy ways for them to get there and to get around while they are there without automobiles. Hyperloops, tunnels, maglevs. Those kinds of forward thinking things need to be considered. Improve what roads and bridges that exist, keep them well maintained, but do not build more of the same just to see them fall into ruin from lack of maintenance or lack of interest due to large changes in what the needs of the public will be 20 to 40 years from now.. |
| 11/16/2017 | Email | <p>After seeing your request for Bay crossing ideas on WBOC, I would like to submit a suggestion</p> <p>From Alternate Route 50 in Vienna due west to Church Creek area (Blackwater Refuge) create an artificial island in the Chesapeake and connect a bridge west to Route 2 or 4 toward Washington, DC. A suggested name would be the Harriet Tubman Memorial Bypass. If you have any questions, you may contact me at [Email and address removed] Thank you.</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|---|
| 11/17/2017 | Website | The route 50 corridor at Annapolis cannot handle further traffic. Best to divide eastbound traffic with a span at a different location. |
| 11/17/2017 | Website | Can you imagine the culture SHOCK that would result with dumping urban Baltimore and all its problems into rural Kent County in a matter of a few miles and minutes? A crime against humanity is what it would be. |
| 11/17/2017 | Website | We need a crossing of the Chesapeake Bay so very much here on the eastern shore. I grew up in southern Maryland and when I go home to visit my family and friends I must go so far north to reach the bridge only to come back south once across. I would be able to go much more if it were more convenient. A ferry is a fantastic idea! I am beyond excited at the thought |
| 11/17/2017 | Website | <p>I absolutely agree with a new Bay crossing. I am a former resident of North Carolina and they have a functional and varied transportation system over their many waterways including bridges and ferries. Many of these crossings are free.</p> <p>Being a resident of St. Mary's County, we are limited in transportation (as well as a lot of other services). We have few roads in and out of the county, no rail lines and inadequate, outdated bridges. While I am sure not all residents of St. Mary's County feel the same, I would welcome either a bridge or ferry crossing to the Eastern Shore. Of course this would ease traffic on the Bay Bridge, but it would also bring more people to Maryland's beaches and Eastern Shore. A crossing near our county would also open up St. Mary's County to other parts of the state and make our county a little more accessible.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> |
| 11/17/2017 | Website | Not sure why we have to have cash lanes now when other toll rds there are electronic toll readers which would reduce some of the crazy congestion At the bridge getting to the bridge is more of a problem at the Severn river and rt 2? Then actually crossing the bridge if we could cut back all the lanes and just drive across it would save 5 million dollars to try things like this first. |
| 11/17/2017 | Website | I vote for building a new span ASAP. Population is rising at a rate high enough that by the time it gets built we will be discussing the need for yet another (fourth) one. |
| 11/17/2017 | Website | Kent County would not benefit from a Bay Bridge crossing. It would only bring with it many undesirable problems that we do not have the resources to manage, ie: emergency services, which are already stretched with volunteers providing most of the first response, infrastructure for the demand that a northern crossing would create and a multitude of other community concerns. It would be most cost effective to build an additional span where the current crossing is located or if you truly want to aide in relieving congestion the crossing would be best suited with either of the more southern routes either in southern Maryland or maybe in Dorchester county. |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|--|
| 11/17/2017 | Website | The Buckman Bridge over the St Johns River in Jacksonville FL had the same problem as we are dealing with here with the Bay bridge. The new and improved Buckman Bridge would be a good example of a solution to the Bay Bridge traffic issue. |
| 11/17/2017 | Website | Cove Point in Calvert County - less congestion on Rt 50, boost for So MD economy, plenty of open, flat land to widen existing roads as necessary, closer to Ocean City MD on the Delmarva peninsula. |
| 11/18/2017 | Website | After speaking to an engineer, I was informed that Crisfield was one of the longest points to build another bridge. Somerset county is one of the poorest counties in Maryland, and Crisfield was once a thriving town, considered the crab capital of the country. Not only would this revitalize these areas, but 113 would be easily accessed directing traffic away from route 50, and freeing up back ups especially on weekends. Thank you for your consideration. |
| 11/18/2017 | Website | A southern route through Calvert County and connect to Cambridge is the most sensible route. The roads through Annapolis cannot handle any more traffic for a 3rd bridge there. Going north of the existing will require more bridges on Kent Island. That would help the Balt. to KI traffic. But, so would the southern route. The big difference would be summer traffic (for the southern route). People around Annapolis & Kent Island have a horrible time getting around. Most people from DC & Va. would take that route. I suspect a great deal in Maryland would also. |
| 11/18/2017 | Website | <p>I would like to comment on what I see as the two main elements to the focus of the study - best meeting future traffic demand and relieving congestion within the study's Sub Area 3. Having driven the Bay Bridge almost daily for the past 17 years, most traffic failures (long backups) seem to occur during peak vacation travel days. Relocating vacation traffic to a crossing in one of the other Sub Areas seems logical. Having experienced the levels of traffic from Routes 97/50 to 50/404, there doesn't appear to be a way to provide for increased flow by adding a bridge within Area 3. To determine which alternate crossing location would be the most beneficial, the study should include an analysis of the origin and destinations of the travelers and their optimum routes. By my observations, at the current bridge, there appears to be a slight edge to assumed vacation travelers from the west and south of Annapolis (D.C. and VA license plates), when compared to travelers from the north (PA plates).</p> <p>In the meantime, to better promote flow through over the current bridge, I would suggest requiring all or most travelers to use EZPass, reducing the number of toll lanes at any one time to no more than two EZpass lanes per available eastbound travel lane (to reduce the fanning out and subsequent funneling of traffic), widen toll lanes and boost the speed through the toll lanes (think Route 1 in Delaware). Perhaps continue to have one cash lane for those who were unable to obtain an EZPass.</p> <p>Thank you[Name removed]</p> |
| 11/18/2017 | Website | I am really glad this is happening. Thanks to everyone who has had the vision and implementation to make this first phase occur. |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|---|
| | | Will you be considering the implications of the massive changes we will experience in the next 5-10 years in terms of self driving cars and changes to roads and transportation needs because of this? [Name removed] |
| 11/19/2017 | Website | Calvert County is serviced by one divided highway with two lanes in each direction. With the population growth that has already happened and more in the planning, the average commute from Annapolis takes anywhere from 60 to 90 minutes in the evenings. It is worse on Fridays when the people from north of the county make their drives to their vacation spots in Solomons. We are trying to live here. Adding bridge traffic to Route 2/4 traffic would make the commute impossible. We would not even be able to get out of our communities on Friday evenings (southbound Route 4) or Sunday evenings (northbound Route 4). Would it not make more sense to divert traffic to north of Baltimore for a second Bay Bridge there and then bring them down to Ocean City over the various routes available on the Eastern Shore? After all, this is being done simply to benefit Ocean City. Let the Eastern Shore pick up more of the responsibility for getting people there. Sending people past the current Bay Bridge down the two lanes of Route 2/4 to another bridge in Calvert County is only going to create a complete gridlock in Southern Maryland. This does not even take into account the width of the bay at the Southern end as compared to the northern end. Road construction is less expensive than bridge construction so a northern Bay Bridge would be less costly. |
| 11/19/2017 | Website | <p>I have lived on Kent Island since 1993. I moved there from Annapolis and travel regularly to the western shore for work, shopping, doctor's appointments, and to visit family and friends. I feel the state needs to make improvements at the current crossing to alleviate congestion in the Kent Island - Annapolis corridor now and also plan to build a northern crossing and a southern crossing for the future as soon as possible. This would help spread the traffic burden to other areas and not just dump more traffic at the current crossing. Kent Island can't handle anymore traffic and with the Middletown, DE bypass coming the situation will become worse here very soon.</p> <p>My suggestion for improvements that could be done at the current bay bridge would be</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) To build another span in between the existing 2 spans that could flow either way depending on the need so you don't have to do contra-flow. 2) Create an elevated, express highway on Kent Island above the existing Rt. 50 for through traffic and the existing Rt. 50 can be for local traffic. <p>If the state decides to only make improvements at the existing crossing to increase capacity then I suggest they plan to buy people out of their homes so they can move elsewhere because they will ruin our way of life.</p> <p>I, also, think the way the state is handling "improvements" at the Severn River Bridge will only make the traffic there worse because the narrowing lanes will cause traffic to slow down & back up more than it already does now.</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|---|
| 11/19/2017 | Website | <p>Diametrically opposed to the bridge.</p> <p>The reason for my residence is to stay far from city</p> |
| 11/20/2017 | Website | <p>I have been traveling to Maryland's beautiful Eastern Shore on most weekends in the spring, summer, and fall for over 30 years. I subscribe to the email alerts and call the bay bridge traffic number regularly. The areas that I always hear about backing up are route 97 on the western shore, and route 50 at various points such as near the intersection of 50 and 213 and the intersection of 50 and 404.</p> <p>It seems as though another Chesapeake Bay bridge crossing would help alleviate traffic if it were located farther south. We already have one near Baltimore. Maybe it might make sense to have one south of Washington D.C. We need to find a way to have a more direct route to the ocean beaches. The current traffic back up on route 50 through the small towns could be avoided.</p> <p>It would also be beneficial to try to place the new bridge in a location that is already business oriented trying not to disturb historical, agricultural, and wildlife areas. New and existing business could thrive.</p> |
| 11/20/2017 | Website | <p>The corridor from the western shore to Ocean City is already established. With the dualization of MD Rte. 404 complete, an alternative route is now available to funnel the traffic to points along the shore. Furthermore, with the new bypass being built in Middletown, Delaware, one can expect more traffic, especially truck, on MD. Rte. 301 past the split with US 50. The future expansion should consider a third span south of the existing eastbound span. The infrastructure is in place on the western shore. There is an existing concept for widening US 50 from Grasonville to Wye Mills. Let's coordinate our efforts to managing traffic through Kent Island to the proposed widening and allow the new MD 404 to handle some of the southern/eastern traffic. One other thing to consider: the east bound span is now 65 years old. A new span situated south to handle east bound traffic will allow MDTA to manage the volume on the old span, thereby reducing weighted wear & tear.</p> |
| 11/20/2017 | Website | <p>Leave Dorchester County out of this - a span there would be ruinous to the great marshes!</p> |
| 11/20/2017 | Website | <p>My compliments on your process, using digital methods to convey information and to collect comments. My compliments also for starting this lengthy project to plan the future. The current bridges are often overwhelmed, and by the time improvements occur the situation could be at a crisis level.</p> <p>I propose that some consideration be directed toward a rail line crossing and creating a mass transit option for commuters and beach travelers. I fully recognize the limitations of this option in solving all the challenges. However, we must think of transit differently than just the motor vehicle in the future or we shall be destined to suffer traffic jams forever.</p> <p>I will remain engaged and offer suggestions along the way.</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|---|
| 11/20/2017 | Website | Build a new bridge from Cambridge to below Washington. Washington and lower shore residents can use it and Baltimore and upper shore residents can use the old bridge. |
| 11/20/2017 | Website | Very excited about this project! Thank you for making the presentation accessible and so clear. Area 2!! |
| 11/20/2017 | Website | I really think a new bridge would be wonderful. Something north of the current bridge would be ideal. I like zones 1 or 2 on the map provided. |
| 11/20/2017 | Email | Years ago, the State said that they would put the new Bay Bridge up at the end of RT 702. That is why they built the road. Thanks [Name and zip code removed] |
| 11/22/2017 | Website | 1. Include Rail or light rail to provide options beyond cars and busses on all routes. 2. Cross North of Baltimore Harbor entrance to avoid conflict with large ships and mitigate the need for high bridge. Make rail viable since rail has grade/slope limitations. 3. Southern Crossing should be designed to draw traffic from Washington area to new crossing and still serve Ocean city. 4. Former Bethlehem Steel property would make a good location to cross. |
| 11/22/2017 | Website | As someone who grew up in Kent County, I have always heard about the wonderful Tolchester Ferry and the economic benefits of having a bay crossing in Kent. The county would certainly benefit economically from having the new crossing be in corridor 2. I hope you will consider Tolchester as a great spot for the new crossing! |
| 11/23/2017 | Website | I would like to offer a suggestion to alleviate some of the traffic going across the bay by mentioning Washington States ferry system. By looking at this system one will see that it is extensive, successful and a great option for for Maryland. A possible route would be from Chesapeake Beach to a new port on the Choptank River. A 2 ferry system capable of handling 200 cars per trip would be a small help but may plant the seeds for a more extensive system throughout the Bay Area and other destinations is MD. [Name removed] |
| 11/24/2017 | Website | I believe that the most severe traffic overloads on the Bay Bridge are related to summer beach resort traffic. Much of this extra traffic probably originates from the Washington DC and Virginia areas. Traffic studies should assess this situation. If this is the case, a new crossing should located be somewhat south of the current crossing, to funnel that traffic out of Annapolis. By putting the crossing south of Annapolis, the traffic to beach resorts, especially Ocean City, MD, can be sent directly east and southeast. This potentially avoids building up roads and overpasses through Easton and the surrounding areas. A causeway may be required to span the width of water, however this may be the most environmentally sound pathway. A northern crossing would be far less effective. Many Baltimore-area people driving to the northern Eastern Shore already take the Route 40/Route 213/Route 313 roads, which work very well most of the time. Another disadvantage |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments

October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|--|
| | | <p>of a northern crossing is that many north/south roads on the Eastern Shore would need to be built up to handle much greater traffic. This means bypasses, overpasses, and limited access to ensure safety. Rail lines are an additional concern. The upper Eastern Shore is largely agricultural, and railroads move most of the corn, soybeans, and other crops outside of the immediate area. Routing of rail lines should be studied.</p> <p>My primary concerns are with Kent County and Queen Annes County, both of which are largely agricultural. These areas, including Chestertown and Centreville, are both historic and unspoiled. Any routing of heavy traffic through either area would destroy the quality of life enjoyed by current residents. My wife and I considered many areas to live, and chose Kent County because it was unspoiled, quiet, and un-congested. If this situation changes, as it has on Kent Island, we would probably leave the area for good.</p> <p>I look forward to the results of thorough traffic studies. Thank you for your concerns.</p> |
| 11/25/2017 | Email | <p>Kent County residents have historically opposed a Chesapeake Bay bridge crossing into Kent County. Kent County residents have made many sacrifices and long term plans over the years to protect and maintain the rural atmosphere, complete with access to nature and viable farmland.</p> <p>We do not feel a bridge into Kent County will solve Baltimore's traffic problems and will only benefit the Western Shore.</p> <p>We tire of the recurring "threat" that rears its head, and fear that one day a loophole will be found that will invalidate our defense of our earned heritage.</p> <p>Thank you, [Name removed]</p> |
| 11/26/2017 | Website | do not want any more crossings. leave the Eastern Shore just as it is. |
| 11/26/2017 | Website | Please please please reconsider any serious consideration of a 3rd bridge across the Chesapeake Bay. Putting more cars on the road is NEVER a long term sustainable option for moving people. The negative impact this will have on the environment is shameful. Maryland needs to be progressive and forward thinking and that means breaking the mindset of being so heavily focused on cars, roads and land use that is all about parking. What about a train to the Eastern Shore? And one that is bike friendly? What about more water transportation? Please anything but another bridge. Other than politically, I cannot see how this will help or advance the current state of Maryland. Thanks for your consideration. |
| 11/27/2017 | Website | The route should come off the beltway east of route 157, travel along old bay shore railroad line, cross bay north of Brewerton channel where bridge height would be minimal, travel along Langford road and cross Chester river and connect with 301. This would accomodate traffic north and east of Baltimore. |
| 11/28/2017 | Website | It's unfortunate that the state is willing to invest unknown amounts of money into another crossing of the Bay without first implementing new technologies and/or techniques to alleviate the traffic backups on the current bridge. Removing the tolls booths and collecting the tolls electronically seems to be working with the Intercounty Connector roadway, so |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|--|
| | | why not utilize it on the Bay Bridge? In addition using variable toll rates based on traffic conditions would be an incentive for drivers to use the bridge during less congested periods, or even take a different route. Building another bridge will just create the opportunity for more sprawl to pour over the Bay from the western Shore. Kent County does not want to become a suburb of Baltimore and we residents are absolutely opposed to a bridge crossing terminating in our county to destroy the historic, cultural and agricultural gem called Kent County. |
| 11/28/2017 | Website | <p>If you build it, they will come.</p> <p>As evidenced by "The Power Broker," Robert Caro's monumental study of New York City's master builder, Robert Moses, the more roads and bridges that are built, the more traffic they will attract and generate.</p> <p>A third bay bridge--no matter where it is built--will certainly attract more traffic much as the second bay bridge already has.</p> <p>The answer is not another edifice that will only increase traffic and congestion and over-development, but a transportation system with more public transit choices.</p> <p>However, if a third span is to be, it should be located with the other two spans, and keep whatever traffic is engendered in the corridor that's already congested and over-developed.</p> |
| 11/28/2017 | Website | In order to minimize disruption to residents & businesses, enlarging the present eastbound bridge from 2 lanes to 4 should be a consideration. I oppose bringing a bridge into Kent Co. where we have worked hard to preserve farmland & maintain our rural character. |
| 11/28/2017 | Website | I think critical to evaluate will be where the majority of the traffic originates from and its travel path to the current crossings and then the proposed new crossing. This will be important to consider because depending on where the bridge is placed, new traffic choke points may emerge. One example would be if the bridge were placed in southern Calvert county, and most of the traffic originates outside of Calvert county. This may create new traffic choke points at the two bridges that connect southern Calvert county with the rest of the state. As a result the new bridge may be capacity limited by other approaches or bridges that are miles from the actual crossing. If such a site is chosen, appropriate plans and funding should be included to address any new traffic choke points that are developed. |
| 11/28/2017 | Website | <p>This whole concept is a complete waste of time and taxpayer money. There are already three ways of reaching Delmarva from the Western Shore:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Exit 95 and head south via the Northern route. 2) Come across the Chesapeake Bay Bridge - Tunnel via the Southern route. 3) Or come across Chesapeake Bay Bridge that splits the other two routes. |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments

October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|---|
| | | So some people have to sit in traffic for a couple of days a year, so what. If your beloved option #3 above is backed up then leave earlier/later or take another route. If Maryland "has to" do something about this "problem", then the most obvious and cost effective solution would be to add to the existing spans of the Chesapeake Bay Bridge and fix the bottle neck that is the toll plaza. The technology exists people, so that the state can still collect their toll money and not impede the flow of traffic. MDTA, set up a meeting with FDOT (Florida Department of Transportation), they'll walk you through how to do it. |
| 11/28/2017 | Website | <p>A significant basis for the study should be origin and destination of traffic flows. What fraction of the Bay bridge traffic is Eastern-Western shore commuter based ? What fraction of the traffic is transient to and from longer range geographical regions connecting to other major roadways? How much of the Bay Bridge traffic is to and from Delaware-Maryland Atlantic beaches? What is the expected growth in these (and other) traffic flows? Are major roadways to and from the Bay Bridge at or near capacity as well?</p> <p>Cost effective solutions to the bridge congestion should be a major consideration in the study. Building new major roadways to a new bridge crossing the Bay at another location may be attractive to real estate and commercial developers, but it brings enormous consequence to environmental, ecologic, economic and social impact to affected areas not to mention destruction of natural habitat and beauty of green space.</p> <p>Alternatives to expansion of existing bridge capacity in the current location should be strongly considered before other locations in my view.</p> |
| 11/28/2017 | Website | Why would Maryland taxpayers want to build anything that would get Maryland citizens quicker to Delaware's tax free shopping... and that's exactly what any northern bridge would do.sseems like the ideal location is one where citizens of Northern Virginia and DC have better and quicker access to the lower Eastern Shore. |
| 11/29/2017 | Website | <p>Many years ago, Calvert County was mentioned as a potential location for an additional bridge to the Eastern Shore; then Rt. 4 was widened to a four lane road all the way to Solomon's Island. At that time, there was FAR less traffic on Rt. 4- NOT THE CASE ANYMORE!!</p> <p>The traffic has increased tenfold (or more) since my family moved to Calvert County in 1980. Additional traffic lights have been cropping up in many places in the county. There are only 3 ways out of Calvert County (Rt. 4, Rt. 2 and 231) and they are ALL congested all the time now. I couldn't believe it this summer when I went out in the middle of the day in the middle of the week how BUSY it was on the roads. It was the worst I've ever seen it in the 38 years I've lived in this county. This county also has a HEAVY volume of commuters going into D.C. everyday as well. People come over from as far away as Virginia to commute to D.C. via Rt. 4.</p> <p>IF a bridge went in at the end of Calvert Co, kiss the ability to drive ANYWHERE GOODBYE. It would be an absolute nightmare for any resident. Calvert Co is such a narrow county, it would be a nightmare if Rt. 4 were expanded; many residents would lose their house to an expansion; and the reality is, the roads are about as saturated as possible already. There would be many added cars on Rt. 4 because of "beach traffic" from other counties. Calvert Co. residents'</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|---|
| | | quality of life would be dismal in hopes of driving around to do our daily activities. Anyone who says otherwise obviously will be receiving a monetary gain from saying that it would work in this county. |
| 11/29/2017 | Website | <p>Exactly why do we need another bay crossing location? What is the issue we are trying to solve for? Yes...the current Bay Bridge gets very busy, and arguably over-crowded on many weekends during the summer. Why does that happen? It's simple...people want to get to the beaches in Delaware and Maryland.</p> <p>At other times, the Bay Bridge is under capacity or workable. It would seem to make sense to just build an additional bridge or spans at the current site...where the current highways are there on both sides of the bay.</p> <p>Is this all just an excuse to spread out the urban and suburban sprawl from the west side of the bay to the eastern shore? Or is this just a way to relieve traffic going north on I95? Do we want Kent County to turn into another Middletown Delaware, where growth and sprawl are out of control? Again I ask...what are we trying to solve for or achieve...and are we clear as to what the actual goal is. It would be ashamed to destroy the bucolic, farm-based environment in Kent County just to get people to the beaches a little faster.</p> |
| 11/29/2017 | Website | <p>For disclosure, I want to mention that I have a large property in Corridor 2 that could result in a significant financial gain to me if a new bridge were built in this area.</p> <p>It is my hope that the Tier 1 study would allow for a smaller segmentation within each corridor. Without exception there are significant historical, cultural, environmental, and population centers in every corridor that should be protected from the direct development of a bridge and the future growth associated with the improved access. Still, there are appropriate places that the bridge could cross that would benefit locals as well as millions who might use the route.</p> <p>I hope you consider the obvious overlap of the corridors that results from the huge traffic that is heading to the beaches of Delaware and southern Maryland as well as the growth of truck traffic heading northward on 301 to avoid increased tolls. Although the 301 traffic is acceptable by my opinion, the beach traffic struggles every weekend to go to and from the beaches due to the limited roads. It is beyond the responsibility of the MDTA to create open routes to the beach but it does need to be a key part of the thought process.</p> <p>People being people and a need for fairness requires consideration of any potential bridge crossing. Still, Corridors 1 and 2 offer so little value. Both are heavily rural and would require significant investment in connecting roads. The environmental impact alone would be a nightmare. A bridge there would not take people where they want to go. I also want to point out how limited the human resources are in those two areas. There are virtually no business or human resources to support the building, maintenance, or services associated with a huge project such as this. I know that when the original bridge was proposed a route stepping across Pooles Island to Tolchester was considered. At the time, people vacationed in Tolchester and went to the amusement park and it was easier to step across from land to land.</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|---|
| | | <p>Those days are long gone, technology and engineering are far improved, and people want to go south when they reach the Eastern Shore.</p> <p>Thank you for providing a clear website and multiple ways to reach those of us potentially affected. The process is complicated and you explained it very well. I look forward to following the evolution of this important and needed project.</p> |
| 11/29/2017 | Website | <p>While the commute across the bay bridge may be a hike I would much rather make that commute then have all the traffic going through our small quite rural towns. Anyone living here knew when they moved here that they would have to travel a distance to get to the Western Shore. We like the quite and peace!:)</p> |
| 11/29/2017 | Website | <p>This issue of placement of a Bay Bridge has been studied twice before, and each time the conclusion was inevitably reached that crossing to small and rural Kent County on the upper end of the Eastern Shore was not feasible for a myriad of reasons. When I was a child, my father, [Name removed] of Washington College, served on the commission regarding the location of the second span of the Bay Bridge. As I testified in support of a bill introduced by Del. Mary Roe Walkup several years ago to "take Kent County off the list," these reasons still hold: there is no infrastructure on the Kent County side to support the resulting traffic, so that the economic, construction cost of such a location would be sky-high. The heaviest travel days across the Bridge are due largely to beach traffic headed for the Lower Shore, and a lot of it comes from the D.C. area, so this farther northern route would not help ease that traffic. To place a span here would cause a great sacrifice in what is already scarce pristine rural and scenic land in our State, with no concomitant benefit. At the bill hearing, the opponent acknowledged the verity of all these points; his only argument was that the federal regulations and the Corps of Engineers would require the location to be studied once again, regardless whether to do so made sense.</p> |
| 11/29/2017 | Email | <p>To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>I write this letter to voice my opposition to a new Bay Bridge through Kent County, not only is it in the wrong location but it will certainly destroy the life and fabric of Marylands smallest county. The proper location for a new span, if it is actually needed, would be further down the Bay, so that it might exit near Salisbury. By locating it in this area it would allow citizens in the Northern Virginia and Washington, D.C. area a shorter commute, therefore less gas consumption and air pollution and would also relieve some of the traffic on the current Bay Bridges. In addition should the coast need to be evacuated folks would have a more direct route, instead of having to drive two hours north to reach the bridge and causing a bottle neck. In addition, though there have been improvements to RT. 404, you will still have a bottle neck at the Maryland/Delaware line, since our neighboring state has not improved the RT. 404 road system.</p> <p>We do not think the wishes of the maritime industry should come before our county's needs. Please remove our county from your list and let us live in quite peace.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted [Name removed].</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|--|
| 11/30/2017 | Website | I would be interested in either a 3rd span at the Bay Bridge or a shorter span in Chestertown that connects to Baltimore. I currently use the Bay Bridge daily for my commute to Baltimore from Church Hill. |
| 11/30/2017 | Website | <p>There could be some changes made to the current Bay Bridge which I believe would ease traffic problems significantly. The main improvement would be to convert from traditional toll booths to a toll by plate system that is automated so traffic never has to stop. This would also avoid having the lanes on 50 spread to 10 booth lanes and then back into 2 bridge lanes. The merge causes much of the traffic. There could be some testing days where the toll booths in the 5 left lanes are removed making way for 4 high speed (50-55mph) thru the toll area. The fee could be removed during testing and If traffic eases with the testing then the toll by plate system investment could be made with knowledge that it would be a great solution.</p> <p>Until the above is implemented the current setup of traffic cones when the north span is open for east bound traffic should be changed immediately. The traffic using the southern span headed east bound when both spans are open for eastbound traffic are forced to merge into one lane and then just after the merge to one lane you can move to the left lane, there is no reason for the merge to one lane when both lanes are open on the southern span.</p> |
| 11/30/2017 | Website | I work in Greenbelt so the current bridge location works for me but my husband works in East Baltimore. It would be nice to have direct access from Kent County to Baltimore County. |
| 12/1/2017 | Website | <p>There are many ways from land use to transportation management and dynamic pricing to manage peak demand on the existing bay crossings that would not require added capacity to mitigate congestion. Furthermore, it is almost certain that autonomous vehicles will have a wide penetration by the time an added crossing would be in place. Almost all experts AV prognosticate that the AV will add anywhere between 50 to a 100% of capacity on existing available pavement areas, in part through efficient platooning and speed with no or much less friction from human behavior in part through narrower travel lanes for guided vehicles.</p> <p>On the other hand, the impact of added vehicles flooding to the Eastern Shore is significant on the culture and ecosystem of the peninsula which most Marylanders cherish. This has already become evident from past efforts to make "reach the beach" easier. Only a few would consider the transformation of the landscapes along US 50 and MD 404 which now in parts resemble Ritchie Highway or York Road a positive. Homogenizing the rural landscapes through sprawl is the true "war on rural Maryland", not the alleged restrictions stemming from carefully planning Maryland which strive to maintain the historic landscapes and cultures in an environmentally and economically sustainable way.</p> <p>As a Maryland resident, a friend of the Eastern Shore, as a planner and transportation expert I am opposed to any additional vehicular bridge crossings and strongly suggest to solve existing very "spiky" capacity problems (capacity issues exist only at relatively short peak times, probably less than 5% of total time) through transportation management, mode choice, dynamic pricing and preparation for AVs. Those no-build scenarios must be fully analyzed and included in the alternatives for the EIS.</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|-----------|---------|---|
| 12/1/2017 | Website | <p>The meeting did not meet the requirements of NEPA, the objectives stated in the NOI "to engage and educate stakeholders" or the "public" collaboration articulated by Heather Lowe in the 15 Nov 2017 video presentation, the project manager of explaining "scoping" or "purpose and need" in sufficient detail for the public or "interested agencies" to intelligently comment on these essential issues by December 15, 2017. The fact that there was no discussion, nor any questions allowed at least at the Broadneck High School venue shut out any "collaboration" with the public. The scoping meeting lasted all of 15 minutes, and 13 minutes were consumed by the MDTA video. While the video checked off a number of NEPA requirements it does not supplant the need for a Q and A review of these key, but complex EIS issues. The public should be given an opportunity to "engage" in an understanding of a Tier 1 EIS, the what and why of NEPA, key milestones in the EIS process, and the role of "participating" agencies, especially those with sign-off requirements before asking for public comments to meet the requirements of NEPA and those presented in the NOI.</p> |
| 12/2/2017 | Website | <p>As a former lifelong resident of Anne Arundel County, I have first hand experience of the effect of a large highway and bridge on the local lifestyle. On one hand it is a very convenient facility for travel, but the changes I experienced are what led me to finally leave Anne Arundel County.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overpopulation made worse by the constant over-development of farmlands 2. Noise pollution from huge traffic volumes 3. Having to plan routine activities around huge traffic volume, staying home to avoid huge traffic volumes. 4. Destruction of animal and plant habitat-decline of the Bay water quality due to overpopulation caused by real estate developers constant overbuilding on farmlands (see item 1.). 5. Anne Arundel was at least somewhat rural in the 1960's and 1970's, now it is an urban jungle and will be getting much worse. <p>If Calvert County is selected, all these things will happen to that county, which is a really beautiful county at this point. I pray it is not destroyed in the future. Also, Dorchester County is still very much the 'old' Eastern Shore, those of us remember these times, and hope another generation can grow up crabbing and fishing in the summers on the Shore.</p> <p>Kent County, same comments would apply as Dorchester County.</p> <p>My advise, humbly written here, is to create 2 modern systems of high speed ferry services. One from Hart-Miller Island Area to Tolchester (Baltimore travelers)with dedicated road to Rt 301 with no ramp access to this road until Rt. 301.</p> <p>Second parallel system from North Beach Area to Cambridge City Area (waterfront) on the Choptank, which would help Cambridge revive from it's sorry state currently. Cambridge should be thriving with it's location. Same advantages with North Beach as it's in a good area (for Washington travelers).</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|-----------|---------|---|
| | | <p>This will give a total of 3 crossings to the Eastern Shore, but without the environmental impact of a giant permanent structure that cost huge sums in maintenance forever.</p> <p>The ferry terminals could be modeled after the Cape May - Lewes Ferry System at a larger scale with faster ferries and enough of them to keep traffic moving. The terminal can also offer facilities that can generate revenue, food courts etc...</p> <p>Also, this system can easily expand and contract for seasonal traffic flows. It also keeps the public in contact with the natural area and not just speeding by locked up in their cars.</p> <p>Even though I don't live there at this time I still visit and it will always be Home, so that's why I comment.</p> <p>Hope this will give y'all some ideas, best wishes.</p> |
| 12/2/2017 | Website | <p>I do believe that it is time to plan for and initiate construction for an additional crossing over the Chesapeake Bay. I also believe, though, that additional public transit options over the existing and future crossings must also be a part of the process -- to reduce congestion and to give a wider range of people access to the crossing. I favor a new crossing south of the existing crossing for two main reasons. First, it would direct traffic towards one of the largest destinations on the Eastern Shore, the beaches. Second, it would not create a new growth corridor in historic Kent County, Maryland's oldest county and one rich in colonial- and revolutionary-era history. I am very concerned about the impact of a new major highway through or around Chestertown and then across and through Queen Anne's county. I do not support this approach. Thank you for considering my views.</p> |
| 12/5/2017 | Website | <p>Please build another bridge somewhere besides Kent Island. People need other options so that all traffic is not going through the same spot on Sunday evenings in the summer.</p> |
| 12/5/2017 | Website | <p>Strengthen access to US17. Replace Potomac River Bridge in Southern Maryland.</p> |
| 12/5/2017 | Website | <p>I am opposed to siting a future Bay Bridge through Kent County. This is a rural county with 57% of land rated as USDA prime for agriculture (a higher percentage than Lancaster County, PA which is often considered an important breadbasket to preserve). Just because it appears to some that there is in Kent County, it is a vibrant and important agricultural grain center for our state, working symbiotically with the chicken industry. The impact of a bridge from Baltimore will only serve to expand Baltimore's suburban area and this important farmland will be lost, not to mention the historic cultural landscape that has prevailed since colonial times. Our Scenic ByWay (Rt. 213) would also be impacted.</p> <p>This county's residents work hard to limit impervious surfaces that impact the quality of the Bay which is so important to both our aquaculture industries and our agricultural industries. Siting a bridge through this open land will only serve to negatively impact the Bay, as well as our indigenous industries.</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|-----------|---------|--|
| | | <p>The need for another bridge has yet to be demonstrated. As ones who make occasional crossings our back-ups are found not on the Bay Bridge but on the Severn River Bridge, Ritchie Highway, and other local roads. No apparent efforts have been attempted to speed bridge traffic. For example, in San Francisco, toll lanes were eliminated and only an electronic pass gets one across the Golden Gate to speed traffic on a bridge used for heavy daily commutes, not just seasonal.</p> <p>Agricultural, cultural, historic, and environmental reasons aside, the one thing that another span directly from Baltimore will provide is an expressway for our state's major population area's residents to enjoy tax free shopping in Delaware. I doubt that this advantage would help the State treasury.</p> <p>I see no advantage to Kent County or its residents.</p> |
| 12/5/2017 | Website | Please have a crossing somewhere other than Kent Island. The roads in Queen Anne county cannot accommodate the current traffic load. Adding an additional span to the current bridges will not help alleviate traffic issues. |
| 12/5/2017 | Website | <p>Will transit be a part of the consideration? If the scope is narrow ("how can we get more cars across the bay"), it will reach a narrow conclusion.</p> <p>I would offer to consider rail transport as an option. A link for freight rail traffic to bypass DC and Baltimore could be very beneficial. A method of hooking mass transit from Baltimore-DC into a US50 routing could be very beneficiary. Trains could leave western shore cities, and travel thru to Ocean City.</p> |
| 12/5/2017 | Website | Please build the new bridge from Point Lookout to Crisfield. Rt 50 gets too often backed up from Annapolis to Ocean City. Also lower Shore counties would benefit. Thanks |
| 12/5/2017 | Website | Yes to a new bridge |
| 12/5/2017 | Website | <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed study.</p> <p>The Maryland Transportation Authority (MDTA) is fundamentally the wrong state agency to direct this study.</p> <p>MDTA, while a fine agency, does not have the experience with the successful design and execution of such a complex Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Moreover, MDTA will probably not be the agency that will design and construct any new bridge and all of its related infrastructure.</p> <p>The fact that this proposed undertaking, if implemented, would have such an absolutely profound impact on the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries, as well as every single Marylander over the next century, necessitates that this project be directly overseen by the highest level of state government, the Maryland Department of Transportation and the Secretary of Transportation.</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|-----------|---------|---|
| | | <p>Absent such elevation of administrative oversight and review, the state must confirm with the federal Department of Transportation that MDTA is indeed the appropriate agency to oversee this study, and that it has the necessary knowledge, skills, and experience to successfully compete such a complex environmental analysis.</p> <p>I would appreciate a response to this comment.</p> <p>[Name and address removed]</p> |
| 12/5/2017 | Website | The 3rd span should be built further south mainly because of Ocean City traffic in summer. Perhaps in Crisfield or Dorchester county |
| 12/5/2017 | Website | Bridge. Keep the title of the bridge-tunnel to the south and keep this one just bridges. That way we can tell them apart. There is already confusion on them to begin with. |
| 12/5/2017 | Letter | <p>Dear Folks,</p> <p>A bridge-tunnel at North Point could make use of existing access roads and any crossing north of there would feed underutilized sections of 301 North on the Eastern side. Also, the land on the Eastern Shore side in that area is solid, not prone to flooding, and less developed.</p> <p>Routes in that northern area would give Baltimoreans easy access to the Eastern Shore and also feed the Port of Baltimore -think what population pressure will be like by 2050.</p> <p>[Name removed]</p> |
| 12/5/17 | Letter | <p>[Name removed] [Address removed]</p> <p>December 5, 2017 Ms. Melissa Williams, Director Division of Planning & Program Development Maryland Transportation Authority 2310 Broening Highway Baltimore, MD 21224</p> <p>Subject: Chesapeake Bay Crossing Study, Tier 1 EIS / NEPA</p> <p>Dear Ms. Williams:</p> <p>I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Chesapeake Bay Crossing Study recently initiated by the Maryland Transportation Authority (MDTA) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). While serving as Delegate to Maryland's 36th Legislative District (1995-2010), I represented Kent Countians' strong opposition to the inclusion of a</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------|--------|--|
| | | <p>northern Bay crossing in the State’s transportation planning. Ten years later, the reasons are still valid for opposing construction of a Chesapeake Bay bridge to the shores of Kent County – now shown as an alternative in “Sub-Area 2” and partially in “Sub-Area 1” on the Bay Crossing Study map presented November 15, 2017 by the MDTA.</p> <p>The 2010 U.S. Census reported Baltimore City’s population as 620,961 and Baltimore County’s as 805,029. A Bay crossing within Sub-Area 2 would directly link these massive metropolitan regions to the open spaces of Kent, the smallest and least populated county (20,107) in Maryland. Adverse consequences would inevitably include unmanageable urban sprawl and non-mitigatable destruction of ecologically sensitive environments at the Eastern terminus.</p> <p>Preserving Kent County’s rural legacy and historic towns; perpetuating its agricultural fields and carbon-sequestering forests; protecting its wildlife habitats and Chesapeake Bay tributaries – these positive actions are far more essential to the continued well-being of all Maryland citizens than providing another traffic corridor for summer vacationers.</p> <p>Building a Bay bridge to Maryland’s Upper Eastern Shore is not a responsible, reasonable, nor sustainable method of facilitating seasonal access by motorists from the Western Shore to ocean resort destinations on the Lower Eastern Shore. I therefore respectfully request that the MDTA and FHWA designate any Bay crossing sites terminating in Kent County as “No Build” alternatives.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>[Name Removed] [Phone and email removed]</p> <p>cc: Jeanette Mar, Environmental Program Manager Federal Highway Administration, Maryland Division 10 S. Howard Street, Suite 2450 Baltimore, MD 21201 Jeanette.Mar@dot.gov Congressman Andy Harris, M.D. (MD-01) U.S. House of Representatives 1533 Longworth HOB Washington, DC 20515 Andy.Harris@mail.house.gov Delegate Jay A. Jacobs (District 36) Maryland House of Delegates 321 House Office Building 6 Bladen Street Annapolis, MD 21401 Jay.Jacobs@house.state.md.us William W. Pickrum, President Ronald H. Fithian, Member William A. Short, Member Board of Kent County</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|-----------|---------|---|
| | | Commissioners 100 High Street Chestertown, MD 21620 KentCounty@kentgov.org Reference: link to Federal Highway Administration (Lead Federal Agency) 10/11/17 Federal Register notice link to Maryland Transportation Authority (Local Project Sponsor) Bay Crossing Study website |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | I have lived on the Rt 50 eastern shore corridor most of my life (30+ years) in QA and now Talbot County. There needs to be another bridge built somewhere other than the current location. KI cannot sustain anymore traffic coming through there. Weekend parking lots on 50 and backroads from the bridge down to Easton needs to be fixed with an alternate route. Dorchester is probably the best spot to alleviate upper shore congestion but please do not even consider another span in the same location. That would be a bigger nightmare than it already is. Please finally take this need seriously and act upon it. Build another bridge!!! |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | Focus on study areas 5 and 6. The other areas are already so close to the existing bridge or going north of bay. The existing span between Kent Island and Kiptopeake without any crossings is rather large so it would be nice to provide more options and not make the Queenstown/404 merger any worse. |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | A spot south of the existing bridge should be considered. Such as just south of Chesapeake Beach across to Cambridge. This would help revitalize the once booming town of Cambridge while giving traffic coming from DC Metro area a more direct crossing. This could also help to draw people in who would otherwise travel to Virginia Beach and spend thier money there rather than MD. This could then also free up traffic coming from the Baltimore region to more easily cross at the existing crossing. If you were to make the new crossing north of the existing bridges it would make it easier for people to get to the Delaware beaches and not spend thier money in MD essentially having MD tax payers foot the bill to increase revenue for Delaware. By having it further south and more convenient to MD beaches that revenue can stay in MD. |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | Good evening Please notify me of all upcoming public meetings regarding the study. Thanks [Name removed] |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | No additional crossings necessary . Please use existing. It's only painful on certain days in the summer. Find a mass transit solution? |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | When you build the new bridge, please make it user friendly for those who fear heights. I go to the beach each year and have to pay someone to drive my car across it. Scariest bridge in the world |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|-----------|---------|---|
| 12/6/2017 | Website | <p>I believe that if a new bridge were to be built across the Bay, there should be a strong consideration into putting the bridge in southern Maryland (either Calvert or St. Mary's) and there should be a component of the bridge that makes an option available to build a MARC train line into southern Maryland and extending over the Bay to Salisbury and Ocean City.</p> <p>On the first point, the area around Anne Arundel and Prince George's counties is already a heavily congested corridor, and becomes even more congested on summer holidays and weekends. Placing the new bridge in southern Maryland can keep southern Marylanders and some DC travelers from traveling across the heavily used bridge in Anne Arundel and divert some of the traffic into a less crowded direction. Also, it would make traveling to the Lower Eastern Shore a more convenient and faster process for those who live in southern Maryland.</p> <p>On the second point, I believe it is a great opportunity for travel and tourism in southern Maryland and the Eastern Shore by adding a rail component to a future Southern Maryland Chesapeake Bay Bridge. Currently, southern Maryland and the Lower Eastern Shore are cut off from the MARC rail system, which provides rail service from West Virginia, to Baltimore, to Washington DC. This isolates southern Maryland and Eastern Shore residents, especially those without vehicles, from connecting to high paying jobs in Washington and Baltimore. It also makes weekend tourism trips to Ocean City and the rest of the Eastern Shore into a very unlikely option for residents of Washington DC. DC residents can be tempted to visit the beach in Ocean City, but are unlikely because of the traffic faced, the long drive, or because a large number of DC residents are choosing to live a car-free lifestyle. A MARC train option opens up new opportunities for tourism on the Eastern Shore for DC residents.</p> <p>I hope MdTA will consider my comments and look at the potential possibilities that can be realized with a future Bay Bridge.</p> |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | Are alternatives to building a bridge being considered? A ferry and rail service from a point on the bay down to let tourist locations may be a better alternative to increasing the number of vehicles that are impacting the shore's infrastructure. |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | I believe the 3rd crossing should begin near Rocky Point Park in Baltimore County. MD 702 was extended many years ago with that goal in mind. |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | I think a good idea would to put a new bridge at the closest point towards the end of rt 2 in southern Maryland. Connecting it with black water, which would lead to Cambridge area. |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | Wherever it's built does it have to be so high. That bridge gives me nightmares. |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | I think a new bridge crossing the Chesapeake Bay should be built from Cove Point in Calvert County to Dorchester County. |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | I have reviewed the on line presentation and make the following recommendations: |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|-----------|---------|--|
| | | <p>1) Use the existing Bay Bridge corridor and add a new three lane bridge to allow traffic flow similar to the I-95 corridor south of DC . This implies 3 lane flow East/West + additional 2 lanes in each direction as needed during peak traffic hours. Traffic studies should be easy using the I-95 corridor comparisons</p> <p>2) Once the new 3 lane span is completed, this assumes upgrade of 2 lane span and/or replacement if necessary. The good news is very little impact to existing traffic during the construction process</p> <p>3) Evaluate a similar process for the Severn River Bridge to accommodate the same implied traffic flow</p> <p>Advantages:</p> <p>1) Comparatively MUCH LOWER infrastructure costs that any likely alternatives</p> <p>2) Much ower environmental impact for a Bay that does not need new infrastructure development. New roads and interchanges have severe environmental damage implications</p> <p>3) No real impact on marine traffic with one passage vs two</p> <p>4) Lower community economic impact for existing corridor businesses/towns</p> <p>As a Talbot County resident, I would happily see traffic elsewhere, but as a taxpayer and environmentally concerned citizen, this seems like our best alternative.</p> <p>Thank you for your continued efforts</p> |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | <p>I favor a limited access tolled highway from Route 5 at T.B. Md. across the Patuxent River through Calvert County under Battle Creek and Route 2-4 to the northern edge of Calvert Cliffs Park, into a tunnel under the Bay to Taylor Island and on bridges to reach Route 50 toward Ocean City.</p> <p>That Crossing would draw Virginia, D.C., much Washington suburb traffic from Annapolis crossing to this new crossing. I STRESS LIMITED ACCESS TOLLED HIGHWAY from T.B. to the Rte 2-4 connection for entry of any local traffic.</p> |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | <p>The bridge needs to go south maybe coming into Somerset County. That county could certainly use the influx of jobs and tourism. We certainly do not need more traffic in the northern part of the bay.</p> |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | <p>I recommend that the third crossing not be placed adjacent to the two existing crossings. There is already a bottleneck there if there is an accident on Rt. 50 on either side of the Bay. I suggest a crossing from East of Baltimore to the Tolchester Beach area. This will siphon off a large amount of traffic from the Baltimore area and provide expedited access to the Upper Shore. With a relatively short length and the ability to have a somewhat lower crossing, this will reduce the cost considerably.</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|-----------|---------|--|
| | | I strongly recommend full public funding for this. I've seen the very high tolls that can result from 'public-private partnerships' and we don't need that on the Shore. Slightly increasing the existing tolls now will help build funding for the new bridge. |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | I appreciate that your process is open and hope that this process will result in looking away from building another span parallel to the existing spans using the Route 50 corridor. As a lifetime resident of Anne Arundel County residing in both Annapolis and Arnold I have lived through the expansion of the the roads during the "Reach the Beach" drive which continue today with more Severn River Bridge changes. All made to accommodate the ever-growing traffic. The additional 1973 span and the concomitant roadway improvements caused an influx of people to move to the Kent Island and even further east on the Eastern shore to live. Jobs, however, remain on the Western shore, mostly in Washington and Baltimore, and so the improvements have added to more traffic through daily commuting across the spans. At this point the main Anne Arundel County roads, 97, Route 2 (Ritchie Highway) and Route 50 are maxed out. The back roads, College Parkway and the Route 50 service roads and community streets in West Annapolis, Route 450/Naval Academy Bridge are impacted. No community adjacent to these roadways is spared. The same is true for Kent Island and Queen Annes County. These areas do not deserve to be so heavily and negatively changed by this crossing and should not be considered for a 3rd span. I am sure you will hear this cry many times over the next three (3) years. Previous administrations have been locked into maintaining the status quo by insisting that the best solution is a parallel span. I hope that the process that you have established determines a better outcome and moves congestion away from communities that are currently impacted. Thank you. |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | If a new bridge is to be built the location of the existing bridges is where it should be built. The 2005 Chesapeake Bay crossing study identified all of the pros and cons of all of the possible locations for a new bridge and the existing location of the bridges appeared to be the most cost effective location which makes sense because no other new roads or bridges would be needed. My question is another 5 million dollar study needed? Three bridges at the existing location would be two too many, why not build one big multi lane double deck bridge and take down the two existing bridges? The cost of building a third/new adjacent bridge is one thing but the cost of maintaining three bridges and all of the service roads would be astronomical and cost prohibitive. |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | We need a new bridge. Its constant gridlock Friday afternoon till Sunday night. I travel it both ways 6 days a week. |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | By far the easiest, quickest and cheapest option will be to add a span at the site of the existing bridge. Preferably to the south of the two-lane bridge. The infrastructure is in place, and you have a 6-lane highway to and from on either side. To duplicate that elsewhere is probably not feasible. The new span is needed soon--drive the bridge hundreds of times a year like I do. Also, this is the 21st century. Get rid of the toll plaza and go all electronic. Please. |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments

October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|-----------|---------|--|
| 12/6/2017 | Website | <p>I think it makes sense to locate the next bridge/tunnel in a different transportation corridor than US50/301. The traffic through Annapolis and Kent Island (on AND off the highway) on summer weekends is miserable, and adding a third span using that same road won't really help matters much.</p> <p>It seems logical to look to relieve the entire US50/301 corridor of traffic, not just pour more cars into an already overcrowded 30-40 mile stretch of road between I97/US50, through Kent Island, and well onto the eastern shore.</p> |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | Yes, we need another crossing of the Bay! Unfortunate it has to take so long to even get a project started. Where does all the toll money go with millions crossing it every single day? |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | <p>I believe that a Ferry to the Eastern Shore would be an excellent idea. This might also placate "fear" of Bay Bridge crossings to do it this way, and would be far less expensive an undertaking.</p> <p>Regards</p> <p>[Name removed]</p> |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | Consider adding an upper or lower deck to the existing bridge spans to reduce environmental impact of building a new span. There are examples of existing bridge decks being raised to allow ship traffic to clear. |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | Why not increase capacity of the current spans and roads leading to the bridge? Possibly add another span(s) that could take traffic when the original spans are being worked on? Or, maybe something like the George Washington Bridge, with upper and lower spans, between NJ and NYC? In comparison, adding another crossing at a new location would have economic and environmental impacts on relatively rural areas. |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | Take a close look at the cause of traffic congestion and I believe you'll find that the toll plaza is usually responsible for the back-up. Granted, we'll need the added vehicle capacity eventually, but replacing the toll plaza with scanners and license plate readers ought to be considered for buying us some additional time in the short run. |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | If there is a third span, it should be as close to the present location as possible. Kent Island has been ruined by the bridge, and while it is a necessary evil, there is no sense ruining another town. I also think it would be easier to widen 50 and connect the bridge in, rather than start from scratch |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | It appears much of the traffic comes from Baltimore and Washington. Crossing the Bay closer to Baltimore would divert a great deal of traffic. Of course, the connector roads particularly Route 50 east of the bridge and running the entire way to Ocean City needs to be upgraded to better handle the beach traffic during warmer months. |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | Encourage drivers to use the bridge at off peak hours by eliminating the toll altogether and make peak hours more expensive. The bridge is hardly used at night. This would reduce peak traffic considerably. |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | A more central Maryland crossing point connecting the Eastern Shore directly to Baltimore is desperately needed to provided increased economic/employment/recreation opportunities to Eastern Shore and Baltimore area residents as |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments

October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|-----------|---------|---|
| | | well as helping to keep Eastern Shore consumer spending within the state of Maryland vs surrounding states which are currently a shorter drive than the Baltimore area. |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | I have always thought that a bridge from the end of 202, across Hart Miller island over to Tollchester would be a good idea. That way the two large population centers in this area are taken care of. Annapolis and DC would use the Bay Bridge, Baltimore would use the Hart Miller bridge. There would be less cost since the bay is narrower there than further south, part of the length is land via the land fill, and the entrance road from the Baltimore Beltway is already 4 lanes wide for much of its length. |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | <p>As a daily commuter over the William Preston Lane Memorial Bridge, I can tell you it is clearly time to build a new bridge. In fact, it's time to build three bridges. The level of traffic congestion during warm weather, let alone the height of the summer season demand it.</p> <p>Firstly, the crossing from Sandy Point to Kent Island needs a permanent three to four lane bridge to accommodate both tourists and residents of the Eastern Shore. This bridge should have restricted truck access on a daily basis from 4 PM to 7 PM that restricts large 18 wheelers from transiting the bridge during these hours.</p> <p>Secondly, a bridge crossing from Rocky Point in Baltimore County to Kent County should be constructed to give trucks, beach goers and residents a shorter trip when crossing to and from the Eastern Shore to the Baltimore area and regions North and West of the city .</p> <p>Thirdly, a southern crossing should be constructed from near Solomon's Island to Taylor's Island in Dorchester County to allow people in the DC/Northern VA area a second crossing point with access to the Eastern Shore.</p> <p>I understand that this is a monumental undertaking, and that the costs are considerable , but something needs to be done to alleviate the bottleneck at Sandy Point.</p> |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | I don't want any new bay crossing. Because it would harm the environment. Both during the construction and in use and increase the number of vehicles in transport. |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | <p>Please consider putting another bridge in a different area of the state, either north or south of the existing bridge. The Annapolis area simply cannot sustain any increase in traffic.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | Thank you soliciting comments from the public. I doubt I can offer anything new but having sailed every mile of the Chesapeake Bay over the last 49 years I appreciate the opportunity comment. Looking at a map it is obvious there are only 3 crossing possibilities: The area just north of the Bush River where the bay starts to narrow, the Annapolis area and the relatively narrow gap from Cove Point to Blackwater. |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments

October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|-----------|---------|--|
| | | <p>1) Bush River north: Most of the current Bay Bridge traffic comes from 2 metro areas, DC and Baltimore. A north crossing would draw much of the Baltimore traffic relieving somewhat the Annapolis area/Bay Bridge. Of course there are major approach roads that would have to be built.</p> <p>2) Annapolis: A third span near the current two would only make traffic in the Annapolis area worse, as well as on the eastern shore side. This is probably the LEAST favorable alternative.</p> <p>3) Cove Point to Blackwater. The MAY be the best alternative, drawing much of the DC and other traffic from the west and south away from the current spans. Biggest obstacle is approach roads in lightly populated areas on the western shore and more environmental considerations and a lengthy road on the Blackwater side.</p> <p>Bridge, tunnel or bridge-tunnel? no opinion, but the Chesapeake Bay Bridge-Tunnel with its history may offer some good insights.</p> <p>Again, thanks for your request for opinions.</p> <p>[Name removed]</p> <p>Tysons, Va.</p> |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | I live in sub area 3, where we probably face the most congestion impact due to the current crossing situation. In my experience, congestion is worst through the Annapolis and Broadneck Peninsula corridors, and the study should address relief for these two areas specifically. This probably requires a new crossing to exist north of Annapolis off of 97, or south off 2 or 301. I would hope the study group will evaluate contemporary options such as some of the new private tunnel drilling organizations like the Boring company, which could potentially create a long tunnel off 97, deep under existing populated areas without much impact. |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | CROSSING SHOULD BE FROM LENARD TOWN WEST SHORE AREA TO CAMBRIDGE EAST SHORE AREA. THIS WOULD TAKE ALOT OF NORTHERN VIRGINIA TRAFFIC NORMALLY GOING ACROSS CURRENT SPANS. |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | <p>Il use the Bay Bridge every weekend between May 1st and December 31st.</p> <p>I keep my 45 foot power boat in Annapolis plus three (3) of my sons and four (4) of my grand children live in or around Annapolis.</p> <p>There appears to be room for a third bridge right next to the current two (2) bridges.</p> <p>A second three (3) span bridge would then allow the bridge commission to have five (5) spans available for east or west bound traffic, instead of the current three (3) and two (2) span system that they use now.</p> <p>There appears to be sufficient highway space to accommodate a third bridge at this location.</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments

October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|-----------|---------|--|
| | | <p>This would be the least disruptive way to increase the existing traffic flow on these over crowded bridges.</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>[Name removed]</p> |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | <p>Finding another location for a Bridge crossing would be wonderful! The congestion on Kent Island and Annapolis produces not only major delays in the summer but also during traffic accidents or weather conditions. This results in safety and security hazards for residents living in the congested zones on a frequent basis. I believe establishing another safe crossing, perhaps south of the current Bay Bridge, would be a viable, long-term solution.</p> |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | <p>As a resident of Kent Island I fully support this investigation. Traffic on Rt 50 between May and Sept changes the dynamic of the island for those who live here and not for the positive. It is my assumption that the bulk of that traffic is headed to the Md or Del beaches as the bridge funnels travels from the Washington and Baltimore areas . I have no preference as to location but draining traffic from one of this areas seems like a priority. Being familiar with the Eastern Shore where ever a new bridge or tunnel is (if) built road infrastructure will be an issue on both shores. I also sail the Bay and a tunnel surely has more non visual appeal. Have we given up on Ferries? NYC seems to make good use of them.</p> |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | <p>We do not need another bridge on the Chesapeake Bay..</p> |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | <p>I have sailed the Bay for decades and pondered this problem many times. The first idea is the add a second level if the existing bridge structures are sufficient to hold additional loads.</p> <p>The second idea is to drop the cost to cross after 8PM. There would be some lost toll revenue but this would spread the traffic load somewhat. Also, make it free from midnight to 4AM. I believe many folks would shift their bridge travel time if they think they are getting a bargain. I have crossed the bridge after midnight and there was no traffic. Offer a free crossing if they cross the midnight shift for a week. All a small program revision on the Easy Pass system. This idea is very inexpensive.</p> <p>I guess another span is inevitable and there has been lots of design money already spent to prove a span from Hart-Miller to Tolchester is possible.</p> <p>Thanks for the opportunity to comment.</p> <p>[Name removed]</p> |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | <p>We have needed a new bridge for a long time. Goldstein saw it when he was comptroller. It needs to span the bay from Cove Point to the eastern shore. About 30 miles of new road would hook it into Route 50 at Salisbury. It would draw all of the Washington (and points west) traffic. There are excellent roads , Rtes 2/4 which would easily carry traffic from Washington south through Calvert County. We DO NOT NEED another crossing north of Baltimore.</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|-----------|---------|--|
| | | [Name removed] |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | Traffic origination and destination study. How can MTA gather information from commuters without being too invasive. Many electronic means: from cameras (gathering license plate information) to EZ-Passes. Scope: possibly the 100 mile distance is too great. With the traffic study origination and destination information - the scope maybe limited to one fourth that. Do you want to bypass the Annapolis, Crownsville and Severna Park corridors - probably. Go from Taylor's Island (eastern shore) to St. Leonard knowing the economic impact to these areas could be great; and of course the surrounding infrastructure would have to be as sound as highways 50/301. Really depends where on the eastern shore the traffic originates / terminates and if built, would it provide a reasonable primary route for people with the Bay Bridge being a distance second. |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | I believe another Bay Bridge is necessary to receive congestion on the bay Bridge, reduce hazards in the Annapolis Area and increase the economy in the state. I believe it should go across the northern Bay area near Baltimore and Rock Hall. |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | I think a second set of bridges is a great idea. I think you could fast track some of the project by doing a proof of concept at the location you are thinking of by putting in temporary ferry services. A ferry terminal is fairly low cost to build. If it doesn't work out, it can be converted into a small marina so the entire cost of parking, breakwall, dock, etc. would not be lost. I also think that a southern location would be good. For example going from Calvert Beach / Long Beach (Rt 4) to Slaughter Creek (Rt 16) would link Southern MD to the lower Eastern Shore (Salisbury / Cambridge). Good luck with the project! |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | Build the new Bay Bridge |
| 12/6/2017 | Website | Place the bridge in zone 2. Take advantage of connecting I95 with underutilized US301. Ideal location is Pooles island to use to make practical span length. Shift north Baltimore traffic off current bridge with new span. |
| 12/7/2017 | Website | While I think the study will be important in identifying the most viable route for a 3rd bridge, I don't see an in depth analysis of the current traffic demographics including destination and origination. An analysis of toll payments would be a starting point. Has there been any attempt to analyze toll structure to influence timing and use patterns? From a revenue standpoint, should the toll structure discourage truck traffic (each truck = 3 cars)? Is there any studies of current bridge capacity relative to actual use patterns. Is the current study based on the projections from the 2006 task Force work? |
| 12/7/2017 | Website | Build a third bridge between the two existing bridges. Use and upgrade the existing roads and infrastructure. No need to further destroy the eastern shore by adding new roads and facilities. |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|-----------|---------|--|
| 12/7/2017 | Website | <p>Any crossing north of middle river should automatically be eliminated as it would go through Aberdeen proving grounds. The only viable crossing in the upper bay would be at Sparrows Point to some where in the vicinity of Tolchester Beach. Another viable location would be chesapeake beach to somewhere around the little choptank river.</p> <p>Any other more southerly crossing would do little to ease congestion at the current bay bridge. A new crossing will ease congestion for very little time as new development will over come the added capacity in very short order. If a new bridge is built it should probably be built north of the existing bridge from Sparrows Point to some where between Tolchester and Swan Point.</p> |
| 12/7/2017 | Website | DO Not create any other crossing |
| 12/7/2017 | Website | <p>I live about 1.5 miles west of the existing bridge, and have been here on the Broadneck Peninsular since 1973. As I see it, the problem here started with the reach the beach effort of the late Gov. Shaffer. The movement of people to the Eastern Shore just added to the building problem to where it is today. It had been my belief that the weekend problems were created by traffic from DC and Virginia adding to the weekend build up. However, what I have been seeing does not support that. What I see on Sunday afternoons is a very large volume of traffic coming east across the bridge on Rte 50 and turn off at Rte 97 and head north. That seems to leave a much, much smaller volume on Rte 50 east of Rte 97. That tells me that putting a new bridge north of the existing bridge will have the greatest benefit, soonest.</p> |
| 12/7/2017 | Website | <p>Build a tunnel parallel to the current location, A tunnel is inherently less expensive. The width of the Bay will work. The two tunnels now in the Baltimore harbor approach and the two tunnels in the Chesapeake Bay Bridge Tunnel across the mouth of the Chesapeake are proof of the technology. The current corridor of Rt 50 is where all the traffic has been funneled from years of road and highway improvements. Rt 50 approaches have been increased to 3 lanes in each direction with only 5 lanes available over the twin bridges...duh? Another location makes no sense as new major roads would be needed to redirect major traffic flows.</p> <p>The "new" bridge built in 1971 was incredibly short sighted with just three lanes.</p> <p>This is not rocket science. Really. In the life of the 1971 "new" Bay Bridge the Baltimore 95 tunnel was built. The new 495 Potomac River bridge was built. And the Chesapeake Bay Bridge Tunnel was built.</p> <p>All the while hundreds of thousands of mid Atlantic travelers have been forced to endure major backups every weekend and many weekdays every summer at the Bay Bridge (and several traffic fatalities).</p> |
| 12/7/2017 | Website | <p>I believe a crossing somewhere between White Marsh and Joppa MD would present an ideal solution. The area is already served by major transportation corridors including Rt. 1, I-95 and Rt. 40 as well as feeder routes such as Rt 43, Mountain Road, Rt 22, Rt 7 and several others roads. In the event of back-ups there are options for being re-routed using these roads. Currently many travelers to OC are using routes taking them through Delaware, where tolls are likely a significant source of revenue. A bridge in this area would shave as much as hour of travel, keep toll revenues in MD and likely increase visitors to OC because it makes shorter excursions more feasible if travel time is reduced.</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|-----------|---------|--|
| | | Additionally this area does not see large ship traffic, making building costs lower than a span that has to rise (and be supported) to significant heights such as the current bridge. |
| 12/7/2017 | Website | Crisfield area on eastern shore to southern Maryland. From my house it takes 2 hours to get off the eastern shore whether I go north across the Bay Bridge or south through the Bay Bridge Tunnel. From the Crisfield area I could be in Southern Maryland in less than an hour. This would also help with southern Maryland and northern Virginia travelers trying to get to Maryland beaches during the summer months. |
| 12/7/2017 | Website | Although my permanent address is in Queen Anne's County, I currently live in California, MD. My opinion on adding an additional bridge would be between Calvert and Dorchester counties. I believe that would deviate a lot of the traffic that has been funneled through the current Bay bridge. This will also cut down on travel time to beach destinations and pull people in from DC south to get to the lower Eastern Shore. Personally, it would cut off 40 minutes of my drive to my parents in QAC. Thank you for your time. |
| 12/7/2017 | Website | <p>It's great to see this work being undertaken, thanks for that. As a frequent user of the Bay Bridge (Annapolis) it would seem that any widening of the bridge would require so much expansion of the roadways leading up to it, i.e. the Severn River Bridge, etc. Depending on traffic coming from points north and northwest, a bridge further north, hooking up with 301 might make a less expensive, less invasive option. Probably somewhat stop gap however.</p> <p>Looking at the very long range picture, would be feasible to look at light rail, monorail and/or some kind of high speed auto train? As you read more and more about driverless cars, hover vehicles, frequent-short-term-cheaper rentals, it would seem prudent to look at something other than just more lanes and concrete.</p> <p>I know we love our cars but it does seem that 50 years from now that love affair might be flipped over to something very different,</p> <p>Again, thanks for the foresight.</p> <p>[Name removed]</p> |
| 12/7/2017 | Website | If another bridge is deemed necessary, the logical choice would be towards southern MD to serve the greater population density of the DC area. The population density for car traffic is far greater south of the current Annapolis spans than it is to the north. A southern location would also serve to lessen the congestion on the current spans. |
| 12/7/2017 | Website | Why can they not consider a third crossing in the Crisfield area? It's a pain to drive up through the loops then back down to required location and also a pain to drive south into Virginia then back up again - wouldn't mid-way be more beneficial? |
| 12/7/2017 | Website | Thank goodness the state is finally giving serious consideration to another Bay crossing. Financially, environmentally, politically, and from a community perspective...the only logical place to put a 3rd bridge(tunnel) is right next to or between the existing two bridges. The span is among the shortest available, the highway infrastructure is already in |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments

October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|-----------|---------|--|
| | | place, the convergence of DC and Baltimore traffic heading across the Bay only occurs at this point, and the communities currently suffering the most are AA and QA Counties. No one wants more traffic, but the only actual traffic issue is the toll facility and accidents backing up traffic on Rt. 50, which then clogs up local roads. |
| 12/7/2017 | Website | <p>Clearly the third crossing needs to be next to the existing two. All roads lead to it. This increase in capacity was needed 20 years ago. Time is of the essence to the Eastern Shore and even exploring other locations would mean the need for new roads and infrastructure to support it and that means at least another decade gone by before the needed relief is in place.</p> <p>More important than the timeline is the future operations of the Chesapeake Bay Bridge crossing. As it is, when ever maintenance is needed a lane or the entire bridge is shut down and the problem of capacity is made even worse. A THIRD CROSSING WOULD ALLOW FOR ONE OF THE THREE BRIDGES TO BE CLOSED FOR MAINTENANCE AND STILL ALLOW FOR SIGNIFICANT CAPACITY OF TRAFFIC. It would also mean no shifting of lanes for two-way suicide crossings.</p> <p>It would also result in better and cheaper maintenance. No more contracts requiring work at night and in the winter. Allowing maintenance work in better weather and in daylight would mean faster completion and at a much lower cost. The quality would increase and lessen the life cycle costs. Plus, the work would be done in a safer environment for the workers and users.</p> <p>I have served Ocean City since 1982 as City Engineer, City Manager and now as City Councilman and I have experienced first hand the significance to our resort of the highway infrastructure of our Route 50 lifeline. The improvements made to the entire length of Route 50 from Kent Island to Ocean City have made the trip so much better. Now the route 404 widening is nearing its completion. Its time to fix the last bottleneck, the actual crossing. It's not going to get better even if the third crossing is completed else where. The convenient and cheap crossing has resulted in Kent Island the Eastern Shore becoming a bedroom community for Annapolis and the metro area. That will continue and the perceived tourism traffic detoured to a remote crossing will not make the existing crossing any better in the future.</p> <p>Own it. Wrap up the study and get to work on solving the problem. Time is of the essence.</p> |
| 12/7/2017 | Website | <p>Please fix the design on the bridge approaches first.</p> <p>We have three lanes going into 12 booths then into 2 bridge lanes. Who thought that would work?</p> <p>Require everyone to have EZ pass and take out the toll booths.</p> <p>Or put ez pass tolls, not booths, on the West bound side only.</p> <p>Can lanes be added to the existing bridge? Other cities have had success doing that.</p> <p>Why did we build a two lane bridge? I hope it was not a financial decision.</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|-----------|---------|--|
| 12/7/2017 | Website | <p>I am opposed to building another bay bridge span or tunnel. The answer to the traffic congestion problem is not to build another bridge span or tunnel, which will incur significant debt. It doesn't make sense to make crossing the Bay easier and encouraging more vehicle traffic on the eastern shore. Route 50 on the eastern shore is already congested during summer weekends and makes traveling between the Bay Bridge and Rehoboth Beach and Ocean City virtually impossible. It is even difficult to cross over Route 50 given the time delays used for crossroad traffic lights. Adding another bridge span or tunnel would make travel on the eastern shore even more difficult.</p> <p>I would encourage transportation planners to consider other options to include forms of public transportation, tolls which favor multi occupant vehicles, or tolls which economically encourage off-peak hours travel. Adding more cars to already overcrowded highways is not a viable solution.</p> |
| 12/7/2017 | Website | <p>Needed? Sure, it will only get worse as it has over the years (the obvious).</p> <p>Location is the big question but I suggest region #2 in the presentation for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Would draw traffic from the Baltimore and Pennsylvania region allowing existing bridge to service the Washington, Virginia and lower Maryland traffic. 2. Less impact I suspect on the environment since the lower regions involve crossing marsh areas. 3. Access to main beach thoroughfares in Delaware could take some pressure off Rt.50. <p>These are just some thoughts I'm sure you've already identified but I wanted to respond because I have been stuck in major traffic on many occasions.</p> |
| 12/7/2017 | Website | The vast majority of people living on the Eastern Shore would prefer a second bridge NOT Be built in the first place. |
| 12/7/2017 | Website | There's no doubt an additional crossing point is needed, but it should be at appoint that precludes a terror attack from knocking out all crossings. In other words, not at the current crossing. |
| 12/7/2017 | Website | <p>I will be moving to the DelMarVa area within two years and have relatives in Baltimore. Any new bay crossing route needs to be constructed in such a way that all approach roads are elevated beyond the worst case scenario for sea level rise and storm surge for the next 150 years. The existing approach roadways to the existing bridge are too low in elevation at this time, making the new crossing crutial in extreme conditions.</p> <p>My personal preferred route for a new crossing would extend I-70 through Baltimore to the east side, then branch off of the Baltimore Beltway near the Key Bridge to go across the bay. This would releave the Baltimore portion of the traffic from the existing bay bridge, as well as potentially make interstate highway funds available by extending I-70 to either Wilmington, Rehobeth /Lewes or Ocean City.</p> |
| 12/7/2017 | Website | A new bridge will only move the "Bottle Neck" down the road to where the roads must meet up towards the Atlantic resorts. Any new bridge will need new roads that will somewhere meet to cause congestion and if south of Choptank |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|-----------|---------|---|
| | | River involve huge amounts of critical areas. Probably not popular but a monorail bridge with monorail running across the shore to Ocean City will take less acreage affected and to buy, can possibly be farmed under, will be quick and all non residential traffic banned in Ocean City. Many cities in Europe have banned city traffic, free public transport is often provided and beach gear etc. can be rented, and feeder bus routes to the other coastal towns. This at least would take the majority of extra traffic off the beach and with stops say in Salisbury, Wye Mills and close to the current Bay Bridge would provide quick alternatives to commuter traffic. Not having your personal vehicle in the resorts may be a burden, but less than sitting in traffic for 3 or 4 hours each way. |
| 12/7/2017 | Website | It makes absolutely no sense at all to have the crossing come into Kent County. The whole point is to alleviate summer traffic that is heading to the beach destinations so the bridge should be much further down into Worcester County. |
| 12/7/2017 | Website | I am A Kent Island resident and as such know first hand the vastly overcrowded condition that exists on the route 50 corridor from early spring til late fall every year. This condition is first and foremost unsafe to all travelers to and from the Eastern Shore but also to the residents of Kent Island. We feel as though we dare not leave our homes for up to four days a week so as to avoid the traffic and congestion. It is not only a route 50 problem but includes the side roads through our community. This in turn makes the local restaurants and other businesses too crowded for us to use. PUT THE NEW SPAN SOMEWHERE ELSE!! |
| 12/7/2017 | Website | <p>My home address is in Texas but I was born and raised in Maryland. I believe that the new bridge should be a bridge/tunnel configuration that is specifically built for vehicles weighing 50,000 pounds or less. This new structure should be built between Highway 4 in Calvert County, Southern Maryland and Highway 16 in Dorchester County on the Eastern Shore of Maryland.</p> <p>A connector highway needs to be built across Taylor's Island WLR to connect with Highway 16. It should be two separate bridge/tunnel configurations; a westbound bridge/tunnel and an eastbound bridge/tunnel. Each tunnel should have three lanes which would allow for one lane each way to be used for emergency access if needed. Toll or EZ Pass access would be at the discretion of the MDTA.</p> <p>I would not recommend building any type of bridge or tunnel configuration north of the Bay Bridge because that area is already congested with traffic utilizing the interstate highways and the high volume Maryland state highways.</p> <p>Building in this location would give the Washington, D.C. area a second crossing option instead of having Baltimore and Washington traffic filtering into one bridge as it is currently doing. Building a bridge/tunnel in this area would increase the commercial potential of both Calvert County and Dorchester County as well as neighboring counties in both surrounding areas and Sussex County in the State of Delaware.</p> <p>That's all I have for now. Reply to my email if you have comments because I am presently in Afghanistan.</p> <p>Thanks for your time and attention.</p> |
| 12/7/2017 | Website | NO BRIDGE! This is ridiculous. |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|-----------|---------|--|
| 12/7/2017 | Website | I think the place that makes the most sense due to its size of span, and access to major highways would be to span from Crisfield to rt. 360 in or around Reedville. |
| 12/7/2017 | Website | Anywhere but Tolchester! |
| 12/7/2017 | Website | - Cross the Bay at Calvert cliffs and send DC and VA traffic to Rt 50, will require better roads from DC beltway. Or - Cross the Bay at say Aberdeen north of Baltimore and send the traffic to Del Route 1 to Rt 13 and 113. Or - Do both. NB. I did |
| 12/7/2017 | Website | This project will undoubtedly create new development pressures in areas that are beautifully bucolic today. Local land use planning will be significantly impacted if a new corridor is chosen in an area where land use plans did not anticipate such a project. The rural character of the Eastern Shore is itself a draw for tourism and economic growth, and sprawling development caused by unchecked growth from an unplanned highway could dramatically change the way of life. The loss of productive agricultural land or natural ecosystems could impact our state's well-being. Please consider land use change and development impacts as part of your analysis. If this project must occur, please consider multi-modal connectivity in your project purpose and need. It is important to accommodate transit, walkers, and bicyclists in projects such as these to keep the induced land development more compact and less sprawling, provide more options for mobility, and to promote more environmentally-sensitive transportation methods. A separated walkway and bike trail could in itself be a major attraction that generates toll revenue and tourism in the designated corridor where no other such amenity exists. A designated transitway could promote equitable economic growth to underserved communities on both sides of the Bay. |
| 12/7/2017 | Website | A third span should be put crossing over from the St. Leonard area to the Taylors Island area. This would allow anyone from the lower part of the western shore, lower DC area or Virginia area to easily access the route to Ocean City and not have to drive the 5-6 hours to get there. This would eliminate the extra congestion through the Easton area as well. |
| 12/7/2017 | Website | If you build a bridge into Kent County I will move to Wyoming. |
| 12/8/2017 | Website | I believe a crossing area with a more direct route from the DC metro area to the Salisbury/Ocean City area would be of great significance. This would decrease travel times, have a boost in the local economies, and increase career opportunities for both sides. |
| 12/8/2017 | Website | As I look over your web site and presentation and especially those photos of the traffic congestion at the bay bridge, I'm reminding of the almost 17 years of driving over that bridge every day to Annapolis to work and then back home to the |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|-----------|---------|--|
| | | <p>Eastern Shore of all the frustration I had through those years in traffic. Being born and raised on the shore, I personally cherish the Eastern Shore's "Land of Pleasant Living" status and can understand why those on the western shore want to come over here. However to build another automobile bridge anywhere along the shore just does not make sense if we are to consider the environment. It just seems more logical to have high speed rail going across somewhere closer to Ocean City and the beaches, which would be less pollution to the air, safer than the highways for those who want to get to the beaches which in most cases that's where everyone is going would arrive there a lot faster and not worry about all the problems encountered to get there! If transportation is needed at the beach, I'm sure various means of transportation rental facilities would pop up over night. I truly believe rail would be the way to go to move people faster, safer and cleaner for the environment, not to mention a lot less maintenance than roads would present! Please consider this option and to save our beautiful way of life here on the shore! Thanks.</p> |
| 12/8/2017 | Website | <p>This Bridge location and transport system would bring much needed socio-economic changes to the Eastern Shore. The mobility of people and freight and levels of accessibility are at the core of this relationship. Economic opportunities are likely to arise where transportation infrastructures are able to answer mobility needs and insure access to markets and resources. From the industrial revolution in the 19th century to globalization and economic integration processes of the late 20th and early 21st centuries, regions of the world have been affected differently by economic development. International, regional and local transportation systems alike have become fundamental components of economic activities. A growing share of the wealth is thus linked to trade and distribution. However, even if transportation has positive impacts on socio-economic systems, there are also negative consequences such as congestion, accidents and mobility gaps.</p> <p>Transportation is also a commercial activity that derives benefit from operational attributes such as costs, capacity, efficiency, reliability and speed. Transportation systems are evolving within a complex set of relationships between transport supply, reflecting the operational capacity of the network, and transport demand, the mobility requirements of an economy.</p> <p>The areas between 3 & 4 on the map would be the best location; they seem to be poised to receive and manage the traffic and development patterns right now. Lots of interest is focused on the Mid Shore Region and new economic engines like this would bring private funding to the shore - instead of taxes, public money and other local funds. This new activity would ensure the future of the entire region, connections to other States and markets that are not accessible due to lack of transportation and the Bridge would be key to positive change.</p> <p>Example older towns would get a boost in private activity, upgrades in Utilities would occur without much help from government; while all sorts of improve healthcare, social, education and economic patterns would appear that were not there before. These connections to Annapolis, Baltimore and D.C. would impact Delaware, Virginia, Pennsylvania and New Jersey as well. So, more economy would lead to better lives on the Eastern Shore - all from a bridge!</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|-----------|---------|---|
| 12/8/2017 | Website | <p>In regard to a third Bay crossing my suggestion would be to examine the feasibility of beginning at I-695 and following the existing Rt 702 down Back River Neck to Rocky Point to cross over Hawk Cove and the mouth of Back River to the southern end of the Hart-Miller Island Dike then across the bay to a point near or south of Tolchester Maryland. Wouldn't this location relieve a lot of the traffic that begins in and around Baltimore that uses the Bay Bridge now? However, this location may make sense for the western shore logistics but I don't know of the impact it would have on the Eastern shore environment, residents and infrastructure there.</p> <p>Thanks for the opportunity to comment.</p> <p>[Name removed]</p> |
| 12/8/2017 | Website | <p>Anything is better than what is there. I don't. have a preference for tunnel, new bridge or something in between, but something should be done.</p> |
| 12/8/2017 | Website | <p>While I would love to not worry about bridge traffic on weekends, during rush hour, on holidays, or pretty much anytime that isn't the middle of the night, I would be more worried about the environmental impact that building a new bridge or tunnel would necessitate. The Bay has been damaged enough and I would want to see efforts towards recovery (or at least preventing further damage) before I would want to ease my commute.</p> |
| 12/8/2017 | Website | <p>We don't need another bridge across the Bay. We desperately need another bridge across the Potomac at 301. Double the Harry Nice bridge like you already doubled the Woodrow Wilson Bridge and Bay Bridge. I would like to think Virginia would be willing to help.</p> |
| 12/8/2017 | Website | <p>As a resident of the Eastern Shore, I feel another bay crossing would be appropriate due to the ever increasing traffic to the shore. I would think a crossing between the Cambridge area and Calvert area would make the most sense. I would be behind such a crossing as long as every precaution is taken to minimize environmental impacts to the utmost.</p> <p>Having relocated here from Florida, we often consider how daunting an effort it would be were we ever required to evacuate the shore. As things stand today, it could not be done in anything close to a timely manner. I fear, were it a catastrophic event, there would be much injury and loss of life.</p> |
| 12/8/2017 | Website | <p>If the consensus is to build another crossing and open the Eastern Shore to even more development, then do the proper job and build a six lane bridge or tunnel.</p> <p>I believe a tunnel will be more expensive to construct, but cost less to maintain.</p> |
| 12/9/2017 | Website | <p>It should be built down towards southern Md around crisfield so the travelers don't have drive up and back down the eastern shore. They could save a lot of time. And spend more money at the Ocean. 50/301 is so congested another bridge would not help alleviate it but add to it</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|-----------|---------|---|
| 12/9/2017 | Website | <p>Ocean City at its highest point is about 8 feet above sea level. Will there be a need for another Bay Bridge Crossing in the future just for vacationers?</p> <p>Eliminate the current bridge toll booths by going to Electronic Toll Lanes which will allow traffic to move freely!</p> <p>Add a Queenstown/Easton/Cambridge By-Pass, a 6 lane expressway from the Route 50/301 split to Vienna, MD.</p> <p>How will full time residents in Delmarva get off if there is a catastrophic event with and additional approximate 300,000+ temporary vacationers?</p> <p>Comparing the distances with the Bay Bridge at Kent Island to one built to Kent County, i.e., Tolchester, it makes no sense to build a new Tolchester/Baltimore Bridge considering the close proximity.</p> <p>Building a bridge to Tolchester from Baltimore would increase the flow of Baltimore's crime to many small, serene towns putting additional burdens on local and count law enforcement, volunteer fire and rescue departments, and the population itself.</p> |
| 12/9/2017 | Website | <p>Glad you are seeking public comment at many points in the project. There are no easy answers, and it will be very difficult to balance the costs and benefits to various areas that will be affected.</p> <p>Good idea to establish the 6 or so areas running north-south the entire length of the Bay. Each offers a different set of challenges and potential benefits.</p> <p>Along with thinking about motorized vehicle transportation, please consider other ways people travel - especially public transportation, bicycle transportation, and foot traffic. In the early 1900s, people could travel from Baltimore to Ocean City via train and steamship in about the same amount of time it would take today. Today, a similar trip is almost impossible without a private car. Please include options for park and ride facilities on either side of a crossing, with connections to public transportation.</p> <p>Protecting rural natural areas must receive high priority because they cannot be replaced. Economic development will occur wherever the landing on the eastern shore occurs. It cannot help but have negative impacts on natural areas nearby. Please rank maintaining protected land - especially large plots like Blackwater NWR - very HIGH.</p> |
| 12/9/2017 | Website | <p>Since an additional crossing at or near the original Bay Bridge would only add to congestion and development deleterious to the Kent Island Area(and also become insufficient in the future), I believe it would be best to locate another span(s) SOUTH of the current bridge(s) but at a point where the crossing would not be excessively long from from point to point.</p> <p>Of course the ideal would be to alleviate car over-usage by adding rail service, this probably would not be feasible, even though rail service would be far more efficient and far less polluting.</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments

October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|---|
| 12/10/2017 | Website | I drive truck for a living. I travel all over the eastern shore as well as western shore and Pennsylvania. I support another bridge and would recommend the location be in the Crisfield area. Crossing one of the narrowest parts of the bay which would span approximately 20 or so miles. This would involve a few tunnels similar to the tunnel in Virginia. When you cross that area you would not be far from Rt 113 which is also being upgraded and would be an alternative route for southerners to cross and not be far from Ocean City MD and Rehoboth DE I feel this would be a great area. If you were to select Easton area I feel that would be too close to Annapolis and cause the same congestion problem as Rt 404. A second recommendation would be the Cambridge area. Which is farther from the Annapolis area and gives the traveler a choice after crossing the narrowest part of the bay (which is more narrower than Crisfield) of Rt 50 W to 404 or Rt 50 E to Ocean City or Rehoboth DE. It is long overdue that this is being pursued. Another route outside of the existing locations is definitely the best way to go. Adding another bridge in the Annapolis area without creating additional highways as well would create more congestion, resulting in bottle necking which would be frustrating to not only the travelers but the residents. I am open to discussing further. |
| 12/10/2017 | Website | Study bridge connection Calvert/Solomon's to Rt 16 into Cambridge Need to spread out the bridges |
| 12/10/2017 | Website | The building of an additional bridge in any area besides the location of the current Bay Bridge is a terrible idea. Such construction would result in further degradation of the Bay's ecosystem. In addition, entire communities would be disrupted. A much more sensible approach would be in exploring alternate forms of travel such as high speed ferries and flight. |
| 12/10/2017 | Website | I live on Kent Island, about 10+ years now. Put the new bridge between the two current bridges, we already have the traffic problems, keep it here and leave the rest of the shore alone. |
| 12/10/2017 | Website | time to seriously consider a major (many lanes) land route (maybe 1 and 113) to Ocean City instead of another bridge. Bridges can be readily destroyed by acts of nature or man and replacement would take a long time, more so than repairing damage on a land route. If the main purpose of a new route is to further crowd Ocean City then someone had better start building a bunch of high rise parking garages so visitors can spend less time driving around burning gas looking for a place to park their vehicle. In other words if 2, 3, or four water hoses feed a 5 gallon bucket, a 5 gallon bucket can only hold 5 gallons. Finally, look at the massive corrosion taking place on the existing bridges which I feel will cause a shut down and it is not like there is an unlimited amount time to do the "thinking" |
| 12/10/2017 | Website | I'd be interested to know if there is data, or if it can be collected, about where people are coming from and going to? For example, what percentage of users of the bridge are from Maryland, DC, Virginia, and Pennsylvania? Of the DC, VA, and Southern MD group, what percentage are going to the Delaware beaches vs. Maryland Eastern Shore or MD beaches? If we have a Southern crossing and most are trying to get to Delaware, the crossing will create more |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|---|
| | | <p>problems until a massive highway is built to get them where they are going. A northern crossing could help the north of Baltimore and PA group, especially if it could connect to 301.</p> <p>I'm also concerned about environmental impacts. The eastern shore has many open spaces which are the attraction for people to come here. If you have big highways running through or next to these spaces, the enjoyment by people and wildlife is destroyed. So, site selection is critical.</p> <p>Thanks for engaging the public in this process.</p> |
| 12/10/2017 | Website | Calvert county |
| 12/10/2017 | Website | a bridge from the solomons area to south of black waters would let shore traffic past populated area with least problems |
| 12/11/2017 | Letter | <p>Dear Project Manager Lowe:</p> <p>A thank you to the MDTA for affording the public the opportunity to provide Comment relative to the Chesapeake Bay Crossing Tier 1 NEPA Study via the MDTA's Bay Crossing Study Web site, e-mail and snail mail.</p> <p>Like many residents of Kent County, MD, my wife and I are 'moved here' inhabitants, and not 'born here' natives, having moved to Tolchester from southeastern PA 24 years ago; Tolchester, once the site of the Tolchester Beach Resort and Amusement Park, is now comprised of approximately 233 residences. Some of which, like ours, being built on Park grounds. Within the past few years we have become part of the ever increasing retirement population of Kent County; many retired business executives and their families moving to Kent County from Pennsylvania, New Jersey and New York, even as far away as Michigan.</p> <p>Becoming embedded in the landscape, I have served my community as President of the Kent County Chamber of Commerce, Tolchester Community Association, and Galena Business Council; as a member of the Upper Shore Work Force Investment Board; Director of Kent County Economic Development; and Legislative Aide to the Honorable Delegate Mary Roe Walkup.</p> <p>My Comments are broken down into six sub-areas as follows:</p> <p>1) Kent County's position on a Bay Bridge.</p> <p>Kent County adamantly and in the strongest terms possible does not want a Bay Bridge built to our lands. This is affirmed by language in the Kent County Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>Point of fact, this has been made known to MDTA Officials and Staff a number of times, in a number of ways, both verbally and in writing by Kent County Commissioners.</p> <p>At the BBRAG meeting dated April 26, 2017, in an answer to my question, the Bay Bridge Master Plan Study [the name of the study at that time] Acting Director stated emphatically that Comprehensive Plans would definitely be part of the study and process. Kent Countians expect the MDTA to abide by our proclamation and standpoint.</p> <p>Additionally, the idea of expanding the search area from Havre De Grace to the MD/VA border has been perceived as not serious - - albeit the extending of an olive branch. It is seen as consuming some of the limited financial resources</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------|--------|---|
| | | <p>the MDTA has for this study; everyone recognizes if another Bridge were to be built it would most certainly not be built in the outermost northern or southern zones/sub-areas.</p> <p>2) Statute 4-407 At the BBRA meeting dated October 5, 2016, it was announced by the Bay Bridge Master Plan Study Acting Director that one of the first goals of the Tier 1 NEPA Study was to reach an agreement from the Eastern Shore Counties to satisfy the requirement of Statute 4-407. That was quite logical and made total sense. As once concurrence was established, and the location for another potential Bay Bridge was narrowed down if, in fact, there is a decision to build another Bridge, the MDTA could then with its limited financial resources efficiently and effectively study that area to pinpoint the best possible location. Since then there has not been any initiative I am aware of to satisfy the Statute 4-407 requirement, and my questions regarding Statute 4-407 have been shrugged off as something to be ignored or not to be dealt with.</p> <p>Page 2 of 3</p> <p>3) What is the future of Delaware and Maryland beaches? Millions of people and sizeable geographic areas are still recovering from the impacts of the 2017 drastically active hurricane season. The Union of Concerned Scientists has reported that the Federal Government's most comprehensive climate report forecasts growing risks of flooding because of rising sea levels and intensifying hurricanes. While some may consider the storms of 2017 the exception rather than the rule, future storms destructive power will become more common place. In a September, 2014 article in The Dispatch, an Ocean City periodical, it was reported that an independent study released on climate change and subsequent sea level rise in Maryland paints a threatening picture for the likelihood of severe coastal flooding in low-lying areas in the foreseeable future. While specifically mentioning Worcester County, one can deduce that both Delaware AND Maryland would be inclusive in the low-lying areas. Climate Central released their report entitled "Maryland and the Surging Sea" with projections for sea level rise and coastal flood risk. According to Climate Central, a moderate sea level rise would put properties within 5 feet of the high-tide-line at significant risk within the next 20 years. Maryland, and obviously Delaware, coastal areas will be at risk. According to the analysis presented, nearly 50% of Worcester County, and approx. a third of Ocean City, and its beaches, lie below the 5 foot mean-high-tide-line. Flooding in the future is a certainty. To codify and validate this flooding danger, two pieces of legislation were passed by the Maryland General Assembly during the O'Malley administration to directly address this subject. The Coast Smart Council Bill makes certain that the State follows standards to make prudent and fiscally-wise decisions when building or upgrading State agency buildings located in susceptible coastal areas. It gives direction that all new construction and those State buildings to be</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments

October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------|--------|--|
| | | <p>renovated are built so as to circumvent and minimize future flood damage. Is another Bay Bridge required if there are no DE and MD beaches to go to in the future?</p> <p>4) What happens in the event of a forecasted Delmarva Catastrophic Life Threatening Weather Event?</p> <p>MDTA recognizes and takes seriously the responsibility it carries for the safety and security of the general public. Every discussion and any decision on the location of an additional Bay Bridge, if there is a decision to build one, would include significant consideration for a forecasted Delmarva Catastrophic Life Threatening Weather Event that requires the mass evacuation of the Delmarva. As we have witnessed this year in parts of the Atlantic, there have been life threatening, devastating weather events, with the forecast that weather events will get worse, as mentioned in #3 above.</p> <p>Any mass evacuation plan would include not only Maryland and Delaware vacationers, but full-time-resident, critical-mass, population centers throughout and across the Delmarva. Just how would EVERYONE get off the Delmarva with a sense-of-urgency, in a timely-fashion, so as not to jeopardize life and limb?</p> <p>There are, by data available, approx. 325,000 vacationers just in Ocean City alone during prime summer time break. Add the population of West Ocean City, Ocean Pines, Berlin, another approx. 25,000. Then, add to those numbers the Delaware vacationers of Fenwick, South Bethany, Bethany, Dewey, Rehoboth, Henlopen, Lewes [no numbers available for these locations], plus the full time residents of Sussex County and lower Kent County, DE totaling another approx. 300,000 people. Add in the approx. 328,000 folks from Worcester, Wicomico, Somerset, Caroline, Dorchester, Talbot, Queen Anne's Counties, MD; it is very easy to foresee well over one million people trying to evacuate the Delmarva at the same time, all heading in the same general direction - - to the North West.</p> <p>It will be somewhat easier for the people that come from NJ, PA and northern MD areas to evacuate the Delmarva to the safety of their homes. They will leave exactly as they came; going north across the half dozen bridges spread along the expanse of the C&D.</p> <p>However, people that live in the Maryland Western Shore, Southern Maryland, Washington, DC, and Northern Virginia areas will not have it easy at all. They will be funneled into a traffic choking nightmare heading North West to the current Bay Bridge. If the decision were to build another Bay Bridge North of the existing Bay Bridge, well, that would provide no relief or benefit at all. We all can envision Total-Gridlock. Recall the gridlocked highways of Florida this past summer, as seen in the newscasts!</p> <p>The sizeable landmass expanse from the Bay Bridge at Kent Island all the way down to the Bay-Bridge-Tunnel at Cape Charles, VA is estimated at about 130 miles as the crow flies; however, it is about 190 highway miles.</p> <p>Compare that to the significantly smaller landmass expanse between the current Bay Bridge at Kent Island to a potential new bridge, if the decision is to build one, at and for example only, Rock Hall or Tolchester; as the crow flies that is no more than an estimated 15 miles.</p> <p>A new Bay Bridge north of the existing Bay Bridge makes no sense at all in the event of a required mass evacuation.</p> <p>A new Bay Bridge south of the existing Bay Bridge makes all the sense in the world in the event of a Catastrophic Life</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------|--------|---|
| | | <p>Endangering and Jeopardizing Mass Evacuation Event of the Delmarva, and satisfies another objective; reducing traffic over the current Bay Bridge, as half comes from PG Cnty/So. MD, Wash DC and No VA. It is not a matter of will-it-happen, but when-it-will-happen. The MDTA certainly would not want to put people's lives at risk. Page 3 of 3</p> <p>5) What will Transportation look like in 20 years? Certainly the question begs to be asked as part of the discussion, study and decision making process. High Speed Rail/Mag Lev - There would be nothing like getting to and from DE & MD beach destination points in an hour or so, while the beaches are still here. I sent a letter to Transportation Secretary Rahn, dated May 23, 2017, regarding this subject and presume everyone that is part of the study has a copy. If not, please, I ask they are provided one. The discussion should be about moving people expediently, as well as improving traffic flow. Autonomous Vehicle Transportation - Research and development for this mode of travel is at an exponential rate. It is a matter of when, not if, autonomous vehicle travel will be common place. BMW, Daimler, Fiat-Chrysler, Ford, GM, Honda, Hyundai, Renault-Nissan, Tesla, Toyota, Volvo all predict some type of self-driving vehicle production by 2021. The mind's eye can very easily envision all vehicles moving seamlessly, at the same rate of speed; no slowing down to "rubberneck" while driving over the Severn River or the Bay Bridge, looking north and south, at pleasure boats and anchored cargo ships. Is another Bay Bridge required with the advent of full autonomous module transportation? The below link is to an article in Automotive News, a widely read and respected publication dedicated to the auto, light truck and truck industry. The subject matter of which is the demise of the car as we know it. http://www.autonews.com/article/20171105/INDUSTRY_REDESIGNED/171109944/bob-lutz-kiss-the-good-times-goodbye?CSAuthResp=1%3A173667331194024%3A423309%3A1%3A24%3Aapproved%3AA58032A505939C715E3C5814261882A6</p> <p>6) Defining and Eliminating Hindrances to Create the Least Intrusive and Most Cost Effective Plan for Free Flowing Traffic. Initiatives are required that eliminate hindrances for free flowing traffic regardless of future coastal flooding that raises the question as to whether a new Bay Bridge will be needed, or whether there is a movement to High Speed Rail/Mag Lev/Autonomous Module Transportation Modes. The below provides viewpoints for improved traffic flow that we all recognize as solutions: A) It has been proven that eliminating tolls significantly improves flow. The current east bound peak traffic toll pattern of the four left-side EZ-Pass lanes funneling and choking down into one lane on the west bound Bay Bridge span, and the seven right-side EZ-Pass/Cash lanes funneling and choking down into the two lanes of the east bound Bay Bridge span is at best a worse-case-scenario, a huge hindrance to good traffic flow during peak travel. Going to full ETL's</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|---|
| | | <p>[Electronic Toll Lanes], which other States are effectively using, would significantly improve traffic flow.</p> <p>B] Add a third east bound Bay Crossing span to provide three full lanes in both directions. This will also result in eliminating the need to cease east bound traffic on the west bound span during inclement, high wind, weather events, which, as we know, chokes down easterly flow to just the two east bound span lanes.</p> <p>C] In addition to the above, construct, with Public-Private Partnership Financing, as is happening with the I-270, I-495 and MD295 expansion plans, a Queenstown/Easton/Cambridge By-Pass; a six lane limited access expressway starting at the Rte 301/50 split, merging back into Rte 50 at a point TBD by MDTA at a minimized traffic flow area. This eliminates the accordion-effect traffic choke points of the Queenstown Outlets and Rte 50/Rte 213 intersection traffic lights, the Rte 404 intersection, and the traffic hindrances of the populated towns of Easton and Cambridge.</p> <p>These may well be the least intrusive and most cost effective solution.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of the above.</p> |
| 12/11/2017 | Website | <p>Whatever the decision is regarding location, I believe we need a short term measure to help alleviate traffic while studies and planning and funding all take their natural, decades long course. And I think that interim solution is getting rid of the toll plaza and converting the bridge to EZ-Pass only.</p> <p>If there was no expansion and contraction of lanes to get on the eastbound span, much of the regular traffic would disappear. The third lane could disappear into the last Sandy Point exit. And, this would be fairly inexpensive to implement. High speed EZ-Pass readers, traffic slows to 40-50 but the merging disappears.</p> <p>Seems inexpensive to implement, might even be able to pilot it before committing.</p> |
| 12/11/2017 | Website | <p>I would only like to see a mass transit system considered for a new Bay Crossing. It would be best and easily located on an elevated track within the right of way of the existing Rt 50 corridor. In my experience , having lived along Rt 70S in the 1970's, that later became Rt. 270, multiple lanes wide, as were many other highways through Maryland, vehicle access allows development which then results in additional traffic on the roadways previously widened. A vicious cycle... Mass transit with limited access will remove a significant number of vehicles such that those with business on the Shore proper can move more freely.</p> |
| 12/11/2017 | Website | <p>Stay the Hell Away from Cambridge, we don't want it, and we don't need it. Build it with the other ones. Leave us alone. You destroyed Kent Island now don't destroy us. We can make your life Hell. Believe me we can. And we won't stop until we do.</p> |
| 12/11/2017 | Website | <p>Growing up on the shore we traveled the bridge a lot and even dealt with the back ups as were going to cambridge or easton. There does need something to help with that.</p> <p>I think putting one towards the south would be best as you can have people who are coming from 401 (if i remember correctly, i dont pay attention anymore to signs driving down) getting on the bridge easier. And all that traffic, hell it comes to 50 anyway so its not like you have to add much there and it surpasses Queenstown. The only way to fix</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|--|
| | | cambridge and easton is to either make 50 3 lanes or you have to make the bridge longer, which i dont think would be best. But if cambridge and easton didnt have so many lights it wouldnt be a issue either. |
| 12/11/2017 | Website | <p>The present crossing location is the optimal place for upgrades. It meets major highways at both ends and infrastructure improvements are already in place.</p> <p>Not only should the two lane crossing be replaced, dedicated lanes for trucks and mass transit should be incorporated.</p> |
| 12/11/2017 | Website | <p>I fully concur with the very cogent points made in the article by Michael Collins arguing the merits of a Northern Bridge crossing. Additionally, I would point out that there is significant underlying support for the project among people who have relocated here and recognize the growth potential merits. I Have lived in Kent Co. for 15 years and relocated from Chester Co. PA and the majority of my neighbors are from Delaware, Chester and Lancaster Counties in PA.</p> <p>Many of us would have moved here sooner, but distance to BWI made it difficult to work at home and travel, as many people do these days. A quicker route to the Airport is a huge factor for Kent County, but maybe not as much so for the other potential crossing sites. They may not see as much taxable population growth from a Bridge project.</p> <p>The population here is stagnant and the ability to attract new residents would help MD.State tax revenue and help fund the Bridge.</p> <p>Kent CO. is beautiful farmland, but many of us believe that 70% farmland instead of 85% would be plenty if it helps ensure the long term viability of the area. Schools and Businesses here are closing. Population in the County has increase by 1000 people in the last 100 years. For a County so close to major Metro areas, this is unsustainable.</p> |
| 12/11/2017 | Website | <p>I would prefer to have the current bridge ROW extended instead of creating an additional bridge corridor since the area has already been developed in these areas and will not disturb natural landscapes farther south on the eastern shore. I am a recent 'migrant' to the eastern shore. I would STRONGLY advocate for a biking facility (lane or path) on any new bridge. I know several commuters would bike daily across the bridge and alleviate further auto traffic.</p> |
| 12/11/2017 | Website | <p>I appreciate the broad scope of the study starting point and the opportunity now and throughout the process for public comment</p> <p>As a Kent Island resident living near US 50, my primary hope is that there will ultimately be another major crossing NOT on Kent Island to SHARE some of the traffic burden we now experience in our small community which negatively impacts our quality of life - particularly when heavy traffic prompts through traffic to exit the freeway to block our limited local roads; but also the noise pollution from the traffic that, depending on the wind direction, can negatively affect our enjoyment of our homes/yards.</p> <p>In light of our experiences here, I would hope any future crossing would learn from that to develop solutions that have a lesser negative impact on nearby local communities on either side of the crossing -- including traffic noise mitigation, and perhaps creation of "through traffic only" lanes/spans/tunnels that don't permit exits onto local roads.</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|--|
| 12/11/2017 | Website | <p>I am writing regarding the proposed Bay Crossing Study, specifically in regards to a potential new bay bridge connecting Baltimore and Kent County. I do not support this idea in any way. Kent County is unique in that it is relatively unspoiled and supports a rich agricultural industry. Its soils and climate are among the best in the nation when it comes to agricultural production. The landscape has changed little for many generations, allowing us to see the world in which our fathers lived and worked. To destroy this so that cars can bypass I-95 or to reach the beach faster makes no sense. Once an area is developed, you cannot recover what has been lost.</p> <p>I believe that a better solution is to add additional lanes and upgrade the facilities at the current Bay Bridge site. We should look at including additional public transportation, for example a train line, and measures to smooth traffic flow (such as additional EZ Pass lanes).</p> <p>Thank you.</p> |
| 12/11/2017 | Website | <p>I am President of the Homewood Community Association, and a member of the Broadneck Council of Communities. We are directly effected on a daily basis by the present Bay Crossing congestion.</p> <p>We strongly feel that the scoping has to consider a crossing site other than at the present location. We are already restricted from accessing our home by Eastern Shore bound traffic and will not be able to live with more traffic. Besides much of this traffic is coming from Washington D. C., Montgomery County and Virginia and needs a better route to the Eastern Shore.</p> <p>A site connecting with Route 4 would divert the Washington, Montgomery & Virginia traffic.</p> |
| 12/11/2017 | Website | Adamantly OPPOSED to a bridge through Kent County |
| 12/11/2017 | Website | <p>I live in upper QA County and work on Kent Island. I believe that if the new bridge is to connect at Kent Island then some major updating needs to take place to the 50/301 highways. The 50/301 stretch east of the bridge and even past the split needs to be adjusted and reworked allowing more traffic to flow more smoothly. Local traffic including emergency traffic MUST be able to get around easily at ALL times. Locals and workers in the area must be allowed to leave their homes/offices and not run out of gas trying to get to the gas station due to all the traffic that summer and the bay bridge brings. I do think its a good idea to expand in areas where traffic and growth already exists, conserving areas that are rural. But I also see that Kent Island is possible at its maximum sustainable yield already. Possibly putting the new span south in area 5, connecting Cambridge to the western shore would be best, but I am considered about the environmental effects to Calvert Cliffs and possibly disturbing the migration of Striped Bass and other vitally important species into the Bay.</p> <p>I am curious about what percentage of people come from the north and from the south to use the Bay Bridge. If more people are coming from the South, it would make more sense to build the new span in a southern sub area like area 5. I believe this should really be an important factor in deciding the area to focus on when it comes to the new span.</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|---|
| | | I also believe that MD DNR should be brought in concerning the new span, they can provide information on the environmental effects it will have on migrating Striped Bass populations, as well as oysters, crabs, and dolphins. Plus the conservation of Calvert Cliffs and fossils is important to MD. |
| 12/11/2017 | Website | I encourage you to please prioritize your span options to weight those that have the smallest impact to the environment. I live on Kent Island and would certainly support a third span above or below (if that's even possible) at the current crossing to maintain the natural habitat and rural character of the rest of the Eastern Shore. |
| 12/11/2017 | Website | Not in Kent County!!!! The roads are not equipped to handle an increased level of traffic, and it would do nothing to alleviate traffic to the beaches. |
| 12/11/2017 | Website | I think Region 6 would be highly beneficial to create a new span. There are so many positive economical impacts for the area. Increased tax revenue for a poor county, increased population, increased property values, with increased revenue brings more jobs, more law enforcement, and an overall boost for the better in the area. Creates a new, crucial artery between Wallops Island, Virginia and Washington, DC. |
| 12/11/2017 | Website | <p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>The Chesapeake Bay Bridge (CBB) has been a headache during the summer months for most of the residents of the Eastern Shore counties. If we want to go anywhere on a Thursday, Friday, Saturday or Sunday we must plan to factor in, extensively more travel time to arrive at our destinations within an appropriate time. Not to mention if an accident occurs on the CBB east and west bound lanes are congested for hours due to the physical accident and then on-lookers from the other bridge.</p> <p>My proposal is to include the needs of the residents of the Eastern Shore counties concerning any additions or modifications to the CBB.</p> <p>To treat resident tax payers and toll payers of the Eastern Shore counties fairly might you consider including a "local traffic" lane on the bridge. This would be for residents with a permanent address in one of the Eastern Shore counties. The designation could use the "EZPass" system or a digitally reactive sticker where local traffic would be funneled into a local lane. This traffic would not be tourist traffic or anyone vacationing in one of the Eastern Shore counties. This would also not exempt local traffic from paying the same toll. This would not include any residents that did not op-in to the local-lane system.</p> <p>Overall I believe that this would boot Eastern Shore resident commerce in cities such as Annapolis, Baltimore, Washington D.C. etc.. Otherwise, it is too much of a hassle to traverse the CBB during the days of the week previously mentioned.</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|--|
| | | <p>Many Eastern Shore residents prefer activities other than vacationing in Ocean City. Or have resources that are only available in previously mentioned cities on the West side of the CBB. Furthermore, just because it is summer time, our day to day plans should not come to a grinding halt.</p> <p>I appreciate the opportunity to speak about this on-going and frustrating problem.</p> <p>[Name removed]</p> |
| 12/11/2017 | Website | Kent County and Talbot County cannot handle additional traffic, look at where the traffic begins, Northern Va and DC, and try to reroute those areas. Most beach bound visitors from North of Baltimore use Rt 1 and avoid the Bay Bridge. |
| 12/11/2017 | Website | <p>Surely adding high-speed rail to the existing bridges would be just a fraction of the cost of a new bridge. Take the rail all the way to Easton, Salisbury, Ocean City.... all the major eastern shore locations vehicles are driven to today. It would be much more environmentally friendly than vehicle traffic too. Bet the commuters would be its best customers.</p> <p>Like the vast majority of Kent County residents, we love it here in this rural environment.... just as it is. Don't screw with it!! We sure don't want it to become anything like Baltimore County!</p> |
| 12/11/2017 | Website | No more bridges. Last century's solution. Develop public access solutions. Buses. Trains. Definitely protect the very few truly rural counties left in Maryland. Don't make Kent County a suburb. Once it's gone, it's gone. |
| 12/12/2017 | Website | Born the year the Bay Bridge opened, studies have been proposed not long after, envisioning Cambridge as a terminus. Grandfather owned extensive land in Church Creek, a bridge interchange tying in 50 and 16 would forever spoil the area. |
| 12/12/2017 | Website | <p>Good evening,</p> <p>I want to way in on this discussion. I am very hopeful and excited about this. I really want to see a bridge in Cambridge. I own a small business and I hope I am not selfish but doing that would help me out a bunch. It would bring new faces to the Eastern Shore regularly. It would bring more strip malls, residences, and apartment complexes. To be honest with you my business thrives off of them, SO BRING IT ON!</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>[Name removed]</p> |
| 12/12/2017 | Website | The scoping for the Bay Bridge study has to consider a crossing site other than the present location. Residents of eastern Anne Arundel County, the Broadneck and areas north on Route 2, are already restricted from accessing our home by Eastern Shore bound traffic many days during the summer and sometimes during other parts of the year; and will not be able to live with more traffic. It is likely the approach roads to the current bridge will not be able to handle the increased traffic, even if the bridge itself is expanded. There are many other bottlenecks in the area that will be |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|--|
| | | overwhelmed, diving up the expense of unsnarling the whole area to make an expanded bridge in the current location. Much of this traffic is coming from Washington D. C., Montgomery County, Northern Maryland and Virginia and needs a better route to the Eastern Shore. |
| 12/12/2017 | Website | Please look into a second crossing south of Anne Arundel County. The amount of traffic is already beyond what any one county should have to bear in order to accommodate everyone from Maryland, D.C and Northern Virginia It is time to share the burden with another jurisdiction. |
| 12/12/2017 | Website | I live in Arnold, it sometimes takes me an hour or more to get home from my job in Annapolis. I often dont go anywhere on Fridays in the Spring, summer, and fall because i know that traffic will be awful and I won't be able to get home. I have also noticed that side roads such as college parkway get very backed up because people jump off of route 50 to avoid traffic. |
| 12/12/2017 | Website | The scoping for the Bay Bridge study has to consider a crossing site other than the present location. Residents of eastern Anne Arundel County, the Broadneck and areas north on Route 2, are already restricted from accessing our home by Eastern Shore bound traffic many days during the summer and sometimes during other parts of the year; and will not be able to live with more traffic. It is likely the approach roads to the current bridge will not be able to handle the increased traffic, even if the bridge itself is expanded. There are many other bottlenecks in the area that will be overwhelmed, diving up the expense of unsnarling the whole area to make an expanded bridge in the current location. Much of this traffic is coming from Washington D. C., Montgomery County, Northern Maryland and Virginia and needs a better route to the Eastern Shore. The Study needs to include alternative routes to ensure that the livability of this area. |
| 12/12/2017 | Website | The scoping for the Bay Bridge study has to consider a crossing site other than the present location. Residents of eastern Anne Arundel County, the Broadneck and areas north on Route 2, are already restricted from accessing our home by Eastern Shore bound traffic many days during the summer and sometimes during other parts of the year; and will not be able to live with more traffic. It is likely the approach roads to the current bridge will not be able to handle the increased traffic, even if the bridge itself is expanded. There are many other bottlenecks in the area that will be overwhelmed, diving up the expense of unsnarling the whole area to make an expanded bridge in the current location. Much of this traffic is coming from Washington D. C., Montgomery County, Northern Maryland and Virginia and needs a better route to the Eastern Shore. The Study needs to include alternative routs to ensure that the livability and usefulness of a solution is maximized. |
| 12/12/2017 | Website | A new Bay Bridge span should be in a county to the south of Queen Anne's County. The existing traffic problems are mainly due to people going to Ocean City or other towns on the ocean. A southern span would take some of the traffic burden off of the residents of the upper shore. This overload of traffic also negatively impacts Anne Arundel County. This traffic damages life in areas that the drivers are passing through in order to reach locations far to the south. The |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|---|
| | | only logical solution to the current bottleneck is to have the drivers end up on the Shore in a location that is closer to their desired destination. |
| 12/12/2017 | Website | Something needs to be done reduce the traffic backups. I live a few miles from the bridge and it's getting increasingly harder to get around because of the bridge traffic most of the weekends |
| 12/12/2017 | Website | Its quite obvious we need another bridge or tunnel to connect the shores. Ideally not in the same location as the current bridges which would decrease the current congestion at tolls and crossing. |
| 12/12/2017 | Website | The new bay bridge span should be built in the original crossing of the current bridge. I beleave that's what the majority of pepole on Delmarva would want.a bridge in Kent county would change the way of life dramatically and the infer structure there could not support that amount of change and a bridge into Dorchester county would threaten a way of life and an environment that the residents of Dorchester county including my self would like to preserve for generations to come not to mentione the infer structure in Dorchester county could not support that kind of growth at the rate of speed |
| 12/12/2017 | Website | With the original two spans along the same latitude as Washington DC and Annapolis, I would suggest that the new third span be positioned to the north adjacent to the Baltimore beltway. Specifically, use an extension of Rt. 43 and/or Carroll Island Road, cross over the Gunpowder River, hop to Rickett Point and Pooles Island, and into Kent County towards Chestertown. Call it the Hogan Gunpowder Bridge! |
| 12/12/2017 | Website | This makes a lot of sense. I am a resident of Kent County and personally think that a good middle point between developing the Eastern Shore into the horrible homogeneity that characterizes most of suburban America and leaving it lost in time is to add a new span to the already existing Bay Bridge. People do need to be able to cross safely and with reliable travel times and the Eastern Shore could greatly benefit from that, but it would also be nice if there were strong considerations of what it is that makes the Eastern Shore special, namely its rural character. I hope this is helpful and thank you for your consideration. |
| 12/12/2017 | Website | The state has already ruined Kent Island. Build the 3rd bridge there and don't ruin any other part of the Eastern Shore. |
| 12/12/2017 | Website | I grew up on the shore and return whenever I can. The Bridge situation is deplorable but if another span is to be built it should be north of the current spans which might help to divert Baltimore traffic and give some relief. If they are Ocean City bound they can take 301 down to catch 50 outside of Queenstown or travel across to the main Delaware Interstate which will also take them down Ocean City way. Dorchester will be ruined with all the added traffic and businesses unless they place restrictions and caps on building. Due to the economy that is not likely.Spend an afternoon at Blackwater and you know we will not want to lose its beauty. |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|--|
| | | I had to hoped to return to the Shore when I retired from teaching but it is not economically feasible to due to unprentended growth without checks and balances? |
| 12/12/2017 | Website | Do not burden the environment and cause congestion on the Eastern Shore, please say No to a new Chesapeake Bay crossing. Thank you. |
| 12/12/2017 | Website | <p>Hello, I would first like to say thank you for giving us an opportunity to present our opinions. I have lived on the Eastern shore my entire life and I like so many others have to deal with the excessive traffic flows through Easton and other Towns along the rt 50 corridor. I'm glad that the governor is finally looking at a solution Because this is a need more than a want.</p> <p>In my opinion there are only two justifiable solutions, the first would include a third large span through Queen Anne county. The two original spans will need to be replaced eventually so this isn't a waste by any stretch. This would require a widening of route 50 from Queenstown to Cambridge. It would also require overpasses at every major intersection on route 50 between those areas. Both of these actions have been sitting on the SHA's desk for nearly 15 years so it's not a big surprise. Another piece to this plan would be the possibility of creating an entirely new highway that will be limited access which would start in Queenstown and make its way to Vienna or points south to get to the Salisbury bypass.</p> <p>The second option would be to create a third Span from Calvert County to Dorchester County through the town of Taylors Island. There is already a decent highway (Route 16) running from Taylors Island to The south end of Cambridge. Route 16 could be straightened in some points to avoid towns like church Creek and shorten the overall distance. This plan would take a significant amount of Virginia, DC, and western Maryland traffic south of the large congestion points on the shore and may be a better long-term solution.</p> <p>I know that my opinion probably won't make much difference in the grand scheme of this project but I just thought that I would offer ideas that I have been thinking about for years as a Eastern shore resident who is fed up with the beach traffic.</p> <p>[Name removed]</p> |
| 12/12/2017 | Website | PLEASE DON'T POTENTIALLY INCREASE TRAFFIC NEAR THE CURRENT BAY BRIDGE! THERE IS ALREADY TOO MUCH CONGESTION AROUND 50 NEAR THE BAY BRIDGE, MAKING IT INCONVENIENT TO EVEN TRAVEL LOCALLY ON WEEKENDS IN THE SUMMER. PLEASE CHOOSE A LESS POPULATED AREA FOR THE NEW BAY BRIDGE!! IT IS GRIDLOCK ON MOST WEEKENDS AROUND THE FEEDER ARTERIES TO THE BRIDGE - COLLEGE PARKWAY, ST. MARGARET'S ROAD, AND ESPECIALLY 50 EAST AND WEST NEAR THE BRIDGE. THANK YOU IN ADVANCE FOR LISTENING TO MY CONCERNS. |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|--|
| 12/12/2017 | Website | <p>There is not enough information at this time to make an educated comment. Quality of our life is the outcome needed and the details determine our quality. Ruining our area or breaking up the region (ie.Kent Island) for a highway system to benefit tourism in O.C. is not an option.</p> <p>1) The location and path of the bridge and supporting roads would be #1, 2) Would the bridge and supporting highways have limited access or bypass our area completely. 3) Would our existing taxes be affected immediately or in the future based on the highway/bridge? 4) Would rezoning be necessary to handle an influx of new residents or would K.C. be allowed to zone as voters demand?</p> |
| 12/12/2017 | Website | <p>I agree that it is time to build a new bridge across the bay. However I don't agree with the current way that the plan is being handled. I feel that the study will take away from the main issue that we have happening everyday and that is the capacity of the current bridge crossing. The two bridges are not capable of handling the current capacity of traffic that utilizes it at this time. Especially the East bound two lane bridge. Everyday MTA has to open up the contraflow lane to handle the existing evening traffic and at other times to handle the beach traffic. If another bridge crossing were to be built I feel that there would still be a traffic issue at the current bridge crossing. With the current traffic issues and the age of the bridges, I feel that the MTA should stop the NEPA study for an additional crossing at this time and instead do a study to replace the current two bridges with either one 8-10 lane new bridge or two separate side by side 4-5 lane bridges. A NEPA study for that to get accomplished should not be as involved and replacement could start years sooner. Once construction has started on the replacement bridge/bridges, then a NEPA study could be started for an additional bay crossing to see if it would even be needed.</p> <p>To replace the existing two bridges or to build one at another crossing will be a huge cost and undertaking but the infrastructure/roadways on both sides of the existing crossing are already there which would be a huge savings over looking into a second location. Even if another location is identified to be a good location for an additional crossing, the existing two bridges will have to be replaced by the time the second crossing gets approved and built.</p> <p>In closing I think that it would be best to replace the existing two bridges with a higher capacity one and then do a study to see if another crossing can be justified and where that crossing should be. The infrastructure cost to build roads to a second bay crossing will be extremely expensive as there are no routes that lead close to the bay on either side that have dual lanes and no other crossings will be met with open arms. Instead it will be met with a bunch of lawsuits. Take care of the existing problem at the existing crossing which will draw much less criticism and lawsuits and can be accomplished a lot sooner. Thanks</p> <p>[Name removed]</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|--------|--|
| 12/12/2017 | Email | <p>COMMENTS BY KENT CONSERVATION AND PRESERVATION ALLIANCE TO MARYLAND TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY IN RESPONSE TO BAY CROSSING PROJECT SCOPING</p> <p>The MDTA presented a project scoping presentation on November 15th that brought up many questions and concern for the Board of Directors of Kent Conservation and Preservation Alliance. This comment letter is our offering of major points and questions in response to the call for comments by the public. We appreciate the opportunity to respond to your presentation of November 15th and will stay engaged in this process as it move onto the next phases.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WE BELIEVE THAT AT THE LEAST A 60-DAY SCOPING PERIOD SHOULD BE SET, NOT THE MINIMUM 30 DAYS. The Public Scoping Meeting was held on November 15th inviting comments to be submitted by a December 15th deadline. This is insufficient time to allow for meaningful public input. • THE PUBLIC SHOULD NOT HAVE TO FILE UNDER THE PUBLIC INFORMATION ACT (PIA) IN ORDER TO RECEIVE DOCUMENTS THAT SHOULD BE ON THE RECORD. A request to access agenda and minutes from a meeting held on October 25, 2017 referenced in the Federal Highway Administration 10/11/2017 filing on the Federal Registry was denied. We received notification that in order for us to obtain records, we would need to submit a request under the PIA. We duly filed our on-line PIA request on November 30th with the Maryland Department of Transportation. To date we have received no documents nor have we had acknowledgement that the request was received. Since we believe these documents should be freely available on the MDTA website, this does not bode well for an “open and transparent” process. • OUTLINE THE SPECIFICS OF TRANSPORTATION STATUTE 4-407 OBLIQUELY REFERENCED IN THE NOVEMBER 15TH ONLINE PRESENTATION. The residents of the Eastern Shore should be given a detailed interpretation of how the language would be exercised, the practical implications, and why this express consent is not already under consideration before the study begins. • WHAT WILL BE THE TOTAL CO2 FOOTPRINT FOR ALL OF THE BUILDOUT FOR THE SPAN, NEW ROADS AND IMPROVEMENTS TO EXISTING ROADS? Any crossing will require major upgrades to existing roads that lead to and from the crossing as well as new construction. The span itself, no matter where placed, will require concrete and steel. Roadways will require ground disturbance, removal of topsoil, vegetation, trees, concrete and asphalt creating acres of impervious surfaces. During all of this construction there will be fuel spent to run the equipment and haul the dirt, supplies, and personnel to the construction zones. There will be major traffic tie-ups in the areas of construction with cars idling in place waiting to move. Finally, as with any new highways increases in traffic will occur over and above projections, as building highways attracts car use that might not otherwise be initiated. With all of this we would like to know how the cradle to grave CO2 footprint for an undertaking of this size is being calculated. These measurements should include, but not limited to, impacts from loss of forests’ and farmland as well as the manufacturing and transportation of material that are needed in the whole project. • THIS HIGHWAY IS NOT COMPATIBLE WITH THIS PROTECTED RURAL HISTORIC LANDSCAPE OR KENT COUNTY |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments

October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------|--------|---|
| | | <p>COMPREHENSIVE PLAN. Kent County has repeatedly stated that a bridge crossing through our county would not be compatible with our rural historic landscape. Page 51 of our Kent County Comprehensive Plan states clearly that the County is opposed to building a bridge into Kent County. The development pressures that it would bring to our county are enormous. We can see that Kent Island and the Narrows as well as some of Talbot and the rest of Queen Anne's County have developed for commuters to the Western Shore. There is a direct link to the increased development in Middletown, DE and the DELDOT bypass to Rt. 301. This is not the kind of development we should be encouraging. Turning Kent County into suburban "anywhere USA" is antithetical to the character that defines the best of Kent County.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DIVIDING FARMS WITH A HIGHWAY WILL MAKE FARMING MORE DIFFICULT IF NOT IMPOSSIBLE. Highways passing through farmland cannot just skirt the edges of the farms. Land taken through eminent domain will traverse through many farms in a way that will make the remaining land impractical to farm, further eroding our agricultural economy and rural agrarian culture. • LOSS OF PRESERVED FARMSLANDS. In building access roads, there would be no way to avoid the preserved lands that Kent County and the State have invested so much time and money on. With the loss of preserved land development pressure would increase on all agricultural land in the County. An access highway will also negatively impact the Priority Preservation Areas of the County. • WHERE ARE YOU MOVING CARS TO? The average weekday traffic by 2025, as estimated by the task force study of 2005, would be 85,000. Opening a new span in Kent County, as we have seen on Kent Island, triggers land to be developed into sprawl. Therefore traffic above the 85,000 is likely. However, the 85,000 is not much above the current capacity for the existing spans, noted as 82,500. With creative use of tolls, increases in ride share, mass transit, and flex time, that is a manageable amount of traffic. Therefore it appears that the sole purpose of another bridge is to encourage more growth on the Eastern Shore, while leaving the jobs on the Western Shore and to move cars to the beaches of Maryland and Delaware. With more lanes crossing the bay, and the infrastructure that accommodates this, entrepreneurs in beach communities, both in Delaware and Maryland, will seek to increase capacity, there by creating an inevitable feedback loop of more traffic and more congestion. Weekend reduction of back-ups should not be the major criteria under consideration. • SHOULD THE DESTRUCTION OF MORE LAND IN NEW CORRIDORS BE CONSIDERED WHEN THE CURRENT BAY BRIDGE HAS ALREADY DONE A REALLY GOOD JOB OF THAT AT THE CURRENT LOCATION? Zone 3, the existing bridge, already has infrastructure in place and has already destroyed large swaths of farmland, wetlands, neighborhoods, sensitive resources, and historic resources. A span at a new location would extend that damage to intact landscapes. Bottlenecks at 50 and 404 will still need addressing unless the span is built south of the current Bay Bridge. • PROJECTED GROWTH IS GREATEST FOR CECIL, WICOMICO, AND WORCESTER UNLESS THE TRAJECTORY IS CHANGED BY MAKING KENT COUNTY A SUBURB OF BALTIMORE CITY AND COUNTY. Household growth trends 1970-2030, as provided in the task force summary, show pretty convincingly that growth is in the northern and southern counties. |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|--------|--|
| | | <p>Kent County has consistently stated that it would like to see slow controlled growth that does not harm the rural nature of our county. However that trajectory and growth would be changed significantly if a bridge were put into Kent County.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MARYLAND SHOULD INVEST IN THE LOCAL ECONOMIES OF THE EASTERN SHORE INSTEAD OF BUILDING A BRIDGE TO FEED OCEAN CITY, AND THE BEACHES OF DELAWARE WHILE ENCOURAGING COMMUTERS TO THE WESTERN SHORE. Maryland should be maximizing high-wage economic growth on the entire Eastern Shore and discourage commuting to the Western Shore. Kent County now has 1G Internet, is a magnet for retirement and second homes, has recently added an enterprise zone, and major revitalization of the Chester River waterfront is underway. If the state is interested in increasing the economic indicators of the Eastern Shore, it should invest in our businesses, communities and schools. The plan to build out infrastructure that encourages commuting attracts fast-food restaurants, gas stations and convenience stores, where workers typically make unsustainable wages. Commuter communities are incompatible with our comprehensive plan and our rural cultural and historic heritage. The small land mass and population of Kent County will be drowned with this massive infrastructure project. • A BRIDGE TO KENT COUNTY SACRIFICES THE RESIDENTS OF THIS SMALL COUNTY FOR THE ECONOMIC BENEFIT OF OTHERS. The fact that the Bay Bridge is critical to the economic vitality of the Lower Eastern Shore because of tourism means that the life of residents not living on the lower shore will have their enjoyment, pursuit of happiness, and protection of open space and farmland curtailed in order to feed the economic engine of Ocean City. • DIRECT ACCESS WITHIN EASY COMMUTE TO DELAWARE TAX FREE SHOPPING. Adding another access to the Eastern Shore with a short commute to Delaware would make a convenient trip for Maryland residents to avail themselves of the tax-free shopping in Delaware. That state already has a negative impact on Eastern Shore community businesses. Many vacationers traveling to the beach by way of the existing Bay Bridge do not end up in Maryland, but instead head to the Delaware beaches bringing no benefit to Maryland businesses. <p>Board of Directors, Kent Conservation and Preservation Alliance</p> <p>[Names Removed]</p> <p>861 Washington Ave #256 Chestertown, MD 21620 Kent Conservation and Preservation Alliance contact@kentalliance.org 861 Washington Ave #256 Chestertown, MD 21620</p> |
| 12/12/2017 | Letter | LETTER NUMBER 1 |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------|--------|---|
| | | <p>The search to determine a new bridge location across Chesapeake Bay is an interesting and exciting challenge. I thank the Maryland Transportation Authority for allowing people to comment on this program.</p> <p>I live in Chestertown in Kent County. I am retired and spent most of my adult life working as a computer scientist manager for the Bell Telephone Laboratories. My PhD degree and my interest are in Operations Research, which is the study of how to do complicated tasks efficiently and correctly. I am not an elected official so I cannot speak for Kent County but I have been involved in transport problems here for the past 10 years.</p> <p>I am sending you two letters. This first letter tells how I think you should solve the transportation problem. Since I know you will not take that advice, my second letter discusses bridge alternatives and so is the kind of letter you might expect.</p> <p>We need to recognize that we are talking about a solution for 10 or more years in the future. It must be designed for then not now.</p> <p>In this first letter, I claim that Maryland's transportation problem solution is not more road lanes but fewer cars. I give three reasons why I think this is not a ridiculous statement.</p> <p>Reason one: Adding more traffic lanes does not always work. A generation ago New York found that more traffic lanes between Manhattan and, across the river, to Brooklyn, Queens, suburban Long Island, and even Connecticut, did not improve traffic flow because more drivers decided to drive and the problem was no better. And then they needed more parking in Manhattan and more feeder roads. Their solution was to convince people to travel by a different method.</p> <p>Reason two: The present state of the automobile industry is summarized nicely in an extended report in the New York Times of November 11, 2017. They predict that the social upheaval due to today's evolution in the auto industry is equivalent to the social upheaval when autos first appeared on the scene about 100 years ago. They point out that the situation today is that every family feels they need to own one or more cars. There is a huge industry producing and maintaining all these cars. But many cars are driven one hour per day and sit still for 23 hours per day. During that time it is sitting at home taking up garage space or at work where a parking garage charges a fee, often a large fee. Moreover, when the car is driven, it almost always has one person in the car.</p> <p>Instead they predict that cars will change from a capital investment to a utility. The average family does not have their own airplane or electric power system. With Uber, or son of Uber, you will be able to summon a car within minutes and go anywhere. Therefore they predict people will own about 40% as many cars as today.</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments

October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------|--------|---|
| | | <p>Reason three:</p> <p>A transit system is a much more efficient system for moving people and goods. Every large urban area eventually gets a transit system. I could imagine a north-south transit line running up and down the eastern shore and connecting with another transit line running east across the bridge. I will bet that one of the bridges is already designed for addition of a rail line. Engineers tend to do that. By the way, a transit system could be electrically powered and so would not generate smoke or carbon dioxide. Therefore it could be in the tunnel not on a bridge</p> <p>These lines would cross at a transit hub near the east end of the existing bridge. There is already a vehicle hub there that includes routes 50, 301, 213 and 404. It would interchange passengers between the north-south Eastern Shore line and the east-west lines to Annapolis and Baltimore. There would also be a large park & ride lot there.</p> <p>Some people will always drive their car, especially people who only travel on occasions or who are carrying some sort of tools or supplies. But, for the frequent driver, the system can be set up so that traveling by transit is more pleasant and less expensive than driving a car.</p> <p>If you want to appreciate public transit, take the CTA train between downtown Chicago and O'Hare airport. As you go along at 50 mph in the center island of the Kennedy Expressway you can wave to the stopped car drivers beside you.</p> <p>If you want to see the benefits of driving to collection lots and then taking transit, travel between Northern New Jersey and Manhattan. Transit buses from all over Northern New Jersey and from Park & Ride lots have a separate Lane through the Lincoln Tunnel and at the New York end they are never on the city streets. Instead they rise from below ground to the second story where they go directly into the Port Authority Westside bus terminal building. There they discharge passengers at elevators that take people down to the street level or below to the subway system. Then they continue around the oval to the outgoing position, where they pick up passengers and return to New Jersey.</p> <p>As a more unusual example of a segmented transit system divided into parts, the Ex-World Trade Center in New York had express elevators that took you one third or two thirds of the way to the top of the building where they left you off at a sky lobby. You walked across the floor to local elevators that took you up or down to any floor within that third of the building.</p> <p>Each third of the building was its own commercial neighborhood with restaurants drugstores bank branches etc. There was even a college branch campus in the building. Under the building were major subway stations. This is a vertical transit system, just as Watertown Place in Chicago is a vertical shopping mall. You could go to and from work and never be outside at ground level and never need an automobile.</p> <p>The Salt Lake City transit system is interesting. Downtown, it is a streetcar running slowly in the center of the street with frequent stops. Outside of downtown it</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------|--------|--|
| | | <p>moves off the street to its own right away and becomes a train and goes 60 mph into the suburbs with stops that are a mile or more apart.</p> <p>Eastern Shore natives have a love affair with their automobiles. This is obvious to outsiders and was even mentioned in James Michener's book, Chesapeake. But the MdTA should realize that their goal is to move people and goods, not necessarily lay concrete.</p> <p>[Name, address, phone number, and email removed]</p> <p>LETTER NUMBER 2</p> <p>The search to determine a new bridge location across Chesapeake Bay is an interesting and exciting challenge. I thank the Maryland Transportation Authority for allowing people to comment on this program.</p> <p>I live in Chestertown in Kent County. I am retired and spent most of my adult life working as a computer scientist manager for the Bell Telephone Laboratories. My PhD degree and my interest are in Operations Research, which is the study of how to do complicated tasks efficiently and correctly. I am not an elected official so I cannot speak for Kent County but I have been involved in traffic problems here for the past 10 years.</p> <p>I am sending you two letters. This second letter discusses bridge alternatives and I believe it is responsive to your request for comments.</p> <p>Kent County has decided that they are opposed to a bridge in Kent County, and they have so stated to the state. The concluding section of the Kent County 10 year Comprehensive Plan lists the few most important challenges and it says in part "Continue to vehemently oppose a Northern Bay Bridge that lands in Kent County or alternative location that significantly adversely impacts the County. But this letter is intended to discuss the relative merits of various plans.</p> <p>We need to recognize that we are talking about a solution for 10 or more years in the future. It must be designed for then not now. We also need to recognize that no highway system can be designed for the absolute peak traffic. As you request, I will assign my comments to sub-areas as per your instructions.</p> <p>I cannot imagine any situation where a bridge in sub-area 1 could be cost-effective because it would be so easy to drive around the top of the bay and because Aberdeen Proving Ground is so unsuitable. Even if they would agree, you wouldn't want artillery shells firing over the traffic lanes. I cannot imagine any bridge in sub-area 6 could be cost-effective because of the width of the bay there and the lower traffic demand and the bridge's exposure to ocean weather.</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments

October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------|--------|---|
| | | <p>There seem to be three alternative simplistic options:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Add more lanes to the present twin bridges in sub-area 3 at Annapolis. Queen Anne's and Ann Arundel counties are very much against expanding the existing bridge(s) because of the increased traffic on Kent Island and the Eastern Shore. Even if these problems were solved, the Eastern shore cannot handle any more southbound traffic than it already does because the traffic jam would just move to Easton and Cambridge. However the existing bridge does have an express highway northeast, Route 301. That road has only one bad constriction, at Middletown, DE and it is being improved at this time. Any other bridge would need a comparable road and comparable adjustments on the western shore. 2. A new bridge could be constructed 25 to 50 miles south of Annapolis, in sub- area 4/5, which would split up the traffic but not generate much revenue because cars would just switch to the other bridge. So this is undesirable because there is little additional revenue. 3. A bridge could be constructed 25 to 50 miles north of Annapolis in sub-area 2, for example to Tolchester. This would generate new cross-Bay traffic from Baltimore to the Eastern shore and so would pay for itself. But it will not prevent the congestion at Annapolis very much. So it doesn't solve the problem. <p>Therefore, option one is less expensive and quicker to accomplish but it does not really solve the problem. Option two does decrease the traffic overload at Annapolis but does not increase revenue and therefore is not profitable. Option three does increase traffic and revenue but does not really solve the problem.</p> <p>Furthermore the solution can probably not wait for the 10 to 20 years that options two or three would require.</p> <p>So we need some more thought and more creative options.</p> <p>In considering options it is necessary to investigate traffic across the bridge that goes north or south. Practically no traffic goes east from the bridge. Southbound traffic is mainly going to the ocean shore resort towns in Maryland, Delaware, and Virginia, and traffic to the north is mainly going through the Eastern shore to the Northeast corridor, Philadelphia, New York, and so forth, mostly on Route 301, which is now having its last traffic restriction, in Middletown, DE, removed .</p> <p>The following are my comments about option three, a new bridge that runs from Baltimore to Tolchester, Maryland:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * It opens the Eastern shore to Baltimore and probably generates much more bridge use and therefore more revenue * It has good existing connections at the western end * It is about 8 miles long. (present bridge is 5 miles) |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------|--------|--|
| | | <p>* It requires another bridge across the Chester River for southbound traffic</p> <p>* It requires entirely new supporting road structure on the Eastern shore because Kent County has no expressways and not even US highways. These new roads will need to be 50 miles or more long.</p> <p>* It really is not shorter for northbound traffic, than driving up Route 95 or 40 on the western shore to the top of the bay but is probably less congested.</p> <p>* Southbound traffic will be longer and add to the congestion at Easton and Cambridge probably requiring a new highway there</p> <p>* Overall it is opposed by Kent County</p> <p>I think that the option of a new bridge south of Annapolis, together with other improvements, is a better solution than the other two options. Of course it is impossible to really evaluate options because the state has not released any cost or traffic data to be used for comparison. Therefore I propose a solution in three parts. This addresses sub-areas 3, 4 and 5.</p> <p>Part A</p> <p>The traffic problem cannot wait the 10 to 20 years for an entire new bridge project so some improvements at Annapolis in sub-area 3, will be required. The Annapolis bridges are not the bottleneck. Traffic backs up because of the mixture of bridge traffic and city traffic on Route 50 in Annapolis and because of the toll booths on the bridge.</p> <p>The bridge has as many lanes as route 50 so that should not restrict traffic flow. Traffic in and around Annapolis is slow because city traffic is mixing with bridge traffic. There needs to be a way to separate them and that might require some more bridges over route 50 in Annapolis and some improved city roads.</p> <p>The tollbooth delay and the widening of the approach road for tollbooths could be eliminated if all tolls were electronic. That is done in Toronto where it seems to be successful. If these steps were taken, traffic could flow at highway speeds and the Annapolis bridges could carry the traffic until a new bridge is built.</p> <p>Part B</p> <p>The following are my comments about a crossing that runs across the only narrow place in the lower bay in sub-areas 4 & 5. It leaves the Washington beltway via Routes 2 and 4, near Andrews AFB, to the western shore of the bay, and then to a new bridge across to below Cambridge, and on a short new road to route 50 on the Eastern shore. Many roads, from all directions, intersect with this I-95 beltway.</p> <p>This bridge would be roughly 7 miles long (the present bridge is just over 5 miles long). I think of the San Mateo Bridge crossing San Francisco Bay, which is also about 7 miles long. For most of its path it is just a highway on pilings above the water, then it has a short real bridge above the bay shipping traffic lanes.</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|--|
| | | <p>Characteristics are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * It will decrease traffic at the Annapolis Bridge by moving some south traffic to this bridge. * It will also decrease traffic on Kent Island and Easton and Cambridge * It opens a new route from the Washington and adjacent Maryland areas to the Eastern shore thus increasing traffic across the bay and revenues from that traffic * It creates a much needed emergency evacuation route from the Eastern Shore * It has an existing road structure at both ends except for a short length from the bridge to route 50 * Of course new road construction will be required at both ends but that consists of widening existing roads, which is much easier than creating new roads * It is a 7 mile bridge but at the narrowest location. * It is no help for people who want to cross over and go north * Overall it has enough benefit to Talbot and Dorchester Counties that they should endorse this plan. <p>Part C</p> <p>Some additional effort should be performed to further enhance this option:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * The use of this bridge for additional emergency evacuation is very important and should be stressed. * It opens the southern part of part of the counties for development so there should be effort to encourage this * It opens the possibility of improving route 50 or maybe even making it a toll road * It allows a bridge to be combined with flood control gates which will probably be required in 10 to 20 years. This is the same solution used in London on the Thames River. This could allow environmental hazard funds to help pay for the bridge. <p style="text-align: right;">In conclusion, it seems to me that a new bridge south of the existing bridge to the Cambridge area and improvements to Annapolis and elsewhere is by far the best solution. I look forward to later phases, where more input information is available to enable a sensible choice.</p> <p>[Name removed]</p> |
| 12/13/2017 | Website | Changes can be made to current span to use EZ pass only and Kent County land use policy do not support a crossing and our comprehensive plan expressly opposes it... |
| 12/13/2017 | Website | I just want to go on record that I am against a new bridge from the western shore of Maryland to the eastern shore at all but specifically not in Kent County. I like our rural counties and hate to see more land used for highways and service stations when we already have the bay bridge. Make it more efficient or expand it or whatever but why build a new one someplace else? |
| 12/13/2017 | Website | The issues outlined in the Preservation report are real and it makes no fiscal sense to build a third bridge if full costing economics are used which consider the change in land use along the bridge and adjoining road routes, There will also be a definitive change in quality of life as now exists with some distinct winners but many losers. Get your Royal Farms |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|--|
| | | <p>franchise concessions now! Can't cross that highway Friday thru Sunday - bummer. Build more intersection over-passes, feeder lanes and by passes - not in the original budget - oops.</p> <p>Why facilitate traffic to Delaware beaches and tax free shopping? Wealth transfer to our neighbor is a gift to them! Kent County residents do not want to become Kent Island. I know first hand as a resident of Kent island 45 years ago how the change has radically affected this region. Kent Island may have been inevitable once the initial link was put in place but Kent CO is completely discretionary. I know the impact of reducing parcel sizes / developing farms - the rural nature of the upper shore will change forever. We have no votes that really count in the halls of Annapolis but a Maryland "pave it into a parking lot" land use strategy once set in motion is irreversible.</p> <p>[Name removed]</p> <p>25 year homeowner in Kent, 2007 Md Wildlife Conservationist of the Year in conjunction with statewide efforts conducted (and continuing) since 2004 for the Maryland Wood Duck Initiative and MBA in finance.</p> |
| 12/13/2017 | Website | <p>The bridge should be much further South so it will take the folks from DC and Va. Keep traffic off of I97/301 and Route 50 East.</p> <p>Fridays are horrible around Annapolis every Friday, not just in the summer.</p> <p>Do not go through the undeveloped and critical areas of the Eastern Shore. Keep the development areas in a limited area.</p> |
| 12/13/2017 | Website | <p>I think they should just leave it alone just keep the two Bridges the beauty of the Eastern Shore is being taken here on the Eastern Shore they want to take up our farmland for roads, for solar panels, for buildings, highways with congestion pretty soon they won't even want to come here because it's so overcrowded with everything. If people want to get to Ocean City they just need to sit in the traffic to get there.</p> |
| 12/13/2017 | Website | <p>I think the new bridge should cross at cambridge md, make the route from just east of washington dc and Balt. down to cambridge area.maybe a tunnel or a combination of bridge and tunner.The crossing in this ares is narrow.lets face it the summer beach traffic is the big problem and many people now live on the eastern shore and use the bay bridge. Thanks for your time [Name removed]</p> |
| 12/13/2017 | Website | <p>MDTA:</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Bay Crossing study.</p> <p>Should the need for a new crossing be demonstrated, the hands-down best choice for a location is to add a third span to the current bridge from Sandy Point to Kent Island. This option is far more logical and has fewer downsides than any of the other prospective sites. The necessary supporting infrastructure already exists, there are fewer environmental</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|---|
| | | <p>and land-use compatibility issues, and a third span would funnel traffic to both Maryland and Delaware beach destinations more effectively than other options.</p> <p>The most commonly mentioned alternatives are impractical and objectionable. To take just two:</p> <p>A new bridge from Baltimore to Kent County should be ruled out completely. Slicing a freeway through Kent County would be incompatible with the county's land use vision and impractical in terms of connectivity. The Kent County end of the bridge would have to be at Tolchester Beach, which is too far north to serve beach traffic, or at Rock Hall, which is so far south that additional bridges over the Chester River would be needed. In addition, there are no longer any reasonable connection points on the western shore. North Point and Hart-Miller Island are state parks. The Back River Neck is mostly county-protected forest conservation land. The area just north of Gibson Island is already developed for residential use. So where is the bridge going to go? The only answer is to forget this entire idea.</p> <p>The option of connecting Calvert County to Dorchester County at Taylor's Island would not work well either. There are serious environmental objections -- for one thing, the Blackwater National Wildlife Refuge is steadily expanding northward through land purchases, right into the path of a potential bridge. In addition, this location would require expensive supporting infrastructure improvements, including major upgrades to Maryland Highway 4 and a new connecting road on the Eastern Shore. And this location would do nothing to serve beach traffic to Delaware.</p> <p>Finally, I would urge MDTA not to presuppose that current traffic projections will actually be borne out. The state should take a wait-and-see approach before committing massive amounts of tax money to this project. There may be less costly measures that could be tried, such as some form of transportation demand management. Time and experimentation may open up new possibilities and save taxpayers unnecessary expense.</p> <p>[Name removed] Silver Spring</p> |
| 12/13/2017 | Website | <p>thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Bay Crossing Study.</p> <p>If the objective of this study is to come up with a plan to provide a new crossing over the Chesapeake Bay then several factors should be considered.</p> <p>Obviously, the reason for crossing the bay in the first place for the vast majority of people is to reach the Atlantic beaches and then to return home. Granted there are folks who cross the bay for business, family or other recreation reasons. But the vast majority of traffic for nine months of the year and particularly during the summer months on the typical Thursday, Friday, Saturday, Sunday and Monday is headed for the Atlantic.</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|--|
| | | <p>Placing a new bridge in Sub Areas 1, 2 or 3 means that traffic will continue to funnel through the U.S. Route 50 bottlenecks of Easton and Cambridge. There is no way to avoid this unless bypasses are constructed around both of these cities as well as several other small towns along the way. Granted some folks take Route 404, but the 404/50 intersection is another bottleneck. Building bypasses or highway interchanges to avoid traffic signals as they now exist will be frightfully expensive.</p> <p>It makes no sense to build the bridge in Sub Areas 1, 2 or 3.</p> <p>Sub Area 4 would make more sense, but the bottleneck of Cambridge would still exist. Only way to avoid a continued mess is to build a bypass around Cambridge.</p> <p>Sub Area 5 makes the most sense. But the bridge approach through Dorchester County involves sensitive areas around Blackwater NWR. Connecting the bridge to U.S. 50 east of Cambridge would involve construction in sensitive land. In addition the feeder roads for the D.C. area on the west side of the bay would have to be vastly improved.</p> <p>Constructing a new bridge in an area where traffic would still have to be funneled through the Route 50/404 interchange and also Easton and Cambridge would not be viable.</p> <p>Thank you</p> |
| 12/13/2017 | Website | <p>A new bridge is sorely needed for Kent County.</p> <p>Reverses the trend of a declining population.</p> <p>Reverses the trend of a declining median household income.</p> <p>Reverses the trend of reduced or eliminated medical services.</p> <p>Reverses the trend of consolidated or closed public schools.</p> <p>Reverses the trend of reduced or eliminated police and fire protection.</p> <p>Provides access to the Eastern Shore for Baltimore County.</p> <p>Provides opportunities for new development, housing and industry.</p> <p>Provides opportunities for new roads and businesses.</p> |
| 12/13/2017 | Website | <p>Hello,</p> <p>I am a concerned citizen of Kent County, and I hereby express my great opposition to building a new Bay bridge anywhere in Kent County. Kent County is a rural, agricultural county, with a tight-knit and wonderful community, incredible resources from both agriculture and wild lands, and overall a simpler and less stressful way of life. A Bay</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|--|
| | | <p>bridge in Kent County would destroy all of this by triggering a destructive wave of transformation from the Western Shore. First off, traffic in the county would become a nightmare as a result of the bridge, as amply evidenced by the roads in Stevensville and Kent Island. Tourists from Baltimore would likely pass right by Kent County and head to Delaware, resulting in no contribution to the county's wealth or commerce. Finally, the real estate development and urban sprawl resulting from the influx of people on the bridge would devastate this rural, agrarian county, wasting precious land and resources for the sake of handling all of these people coming from the bridge. I lived in Brevard County in Florida for many years before moving to Kent County, and I watched as cattle land was transformed into shopping centers, a stand of mature forest was fragmented for a gas station a block away from another gas station, and almost every vacant piece of land was paved over and built on. I beseech you, the MDTA, to not sentence Kent County and its residents to the same fate.</p> <p>[Name removed]</p> |
| 12/13/2017 | Website | <p>I am delighted that Maryland, under Gov. Hogan, is finally taking a definitive step toward addressing an alternative crossing of our wonderful Chesapeake Bay. Originally from Baltimore, I have lived in Harford and Cecil Counties, and, since 2016, have lived in Kent County. I also own a home in Ocean City. Therefore, I am very familiar with traffic problems associated with travel between our Western and Eastern Shores.</p> <p>I have a Bachelor's degree from Towson University, and for many years managed the NEPA program for the Army's Chemical Demilitarization Agency at Aberdeen Proving Ground as we destroyed the nation's stockpile of aging chemical weapons.</p> <p>The six sites being proposed for the Bay Crossing Study contain diverse populations and cultural resources and I am anxious to participate in the NEPA process from a citizen's point-of-view. Will be looking forward to the Public Workshops planned for the Spring of 2018.</p> |
| 12/13/2017 | Website | <p>I cannot think of more of a nightmare than building a Bay Bridge from the western shore to Kent County Maryland. It would bring urban problems to this rural county. The two areas are opposite in characteristics! We live on a farm and wish to keep our country life. The main reason for a bridge would be to access the beaches...is that worth destroying a way of life? I would say NO !!!! Build the Bay Bridge near the present one and widen the roads from that point down to the beaches. Keep the problems where they already are!</p> |
| 12/13/2017 | Website | <p>Would like to revise my comment, after some thinking on the shipping channel's deviation above crossing Leeds me to think there should be a tunnel instead of a bridge. The possibility of mechanical failure etc.</p> |
| 12/13/2017 | Website | <p>This area is completely unsuited to so much traffic. This project will only cost the state and county additional millions of dollars trying to provide the necessary infrastructure needed to accommodate the housing and businesses that are sure to follow. It is short sighted and destructive to our beautiful rural community. And we will fight it forever.</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|--|
| 12/13/2017 | Website | <p>I think the existing bridges should be used. There is room between the bridges for new lanes and the current structures could be used as partial support which could reduce the cost of the foundations. The roads are already in place and traffic is narrowed to fewer lanes coming onto the bridges. Widening the bridges would allow better flow. A whole new crossing would also be inconvenient to drive to for most users since it would be "out of the way" to get to it. Using the current footprint would have a fraction of environmental impact as opposed to all new roads and bridges. No new right of way to be bought, either, there by saving even more money.</p> <p>Thank you. [Name removed], Md. SHA (retired with 42 years service)</p> |
| 12/13/2017 | Website | <p>I think sub group 1 or 2 will be best suited for the new bridge. I-95 is close, there is easy access to the Delaware beaches or Maryland beaches. From Edgewood to Pooles Island to Georgetown Maryland is a short route over water. The Edgewood area and Kent County would benefit tremendously economically. This bridge would handle the Baltimore, Pennsylvania and New Jersey traffic, leaving the rest of Maryland, DC, and Virginia using the remaining bridges. There seem to be quite a few Delaware vehicles commuting to Maryland as well.</p> |
| 12/13/2017 | Email | <p>To whom it may concern: We are very much against any consideration of Kent County as a possible site for a new bay bridge crossing. Kent County is currently a beautiful, scenic, rural, jewel of a county. A major highway to the ocean through Kent County would be a disaster, destroying much of its current beauty. The state of Maryland should take advantage of the opportunity to maintain the unique quality of this area. If it were to be lost, it could never be restored.</p> |
| 12/13/2017 | Email | <p>It will be interesting to see how our comments are "summarized"</p> |
| 12/14/2017 | Website | <p>Area #5 is my pick as this route connects to the crowd who uses route 50 passing Salisbury to Ocean City. Thank you.</p> |
| 12/14/2017 | Website | <p>Ladies and Gentlemen:</p> <p>I approve of the bridge crossing because, due to unnecessary regulation I have been unable to do anything with my property although I have paid tax on it for 37 years. The increased traffic would aid in opening up the area for more development hence making my property more desirable and easier to liquidate.</p> <p>Please consider me pro Development and Pro Bridge Crossing.</p> <p>[Name removed]</p> |
| 12/14/2017 | Website | <p>Kent County MD is a quiet, agricultural-based community - an increasingly unique landscape that we have worked hard to protect from over-development. A new bay bridge here would obliterate this landscape in the long term. The influx of traffic would ruin the ambiance and safety of our county. A much better idea is to add a new bridge(s) to the already existing bridges at Kent Island where infrastructure already exists to accommodate such a bridge(s).</p> <p>Please consider the following alternative suggestions to improve the flow of traffic across the bay:</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|---|
| | | <p>- Elimination of the current bridge toll booths by going to full ETL's [Electronic Toll Lanes] allow traffic to move freely. It has been proven that eliminating the tolls would effectively improve traffic flow.</p> <p>- A Queenstown/Easton/Cambridge By-Pass, a 6 lane [3 each way] limited access expressway from the Rte 50/301 split to Vienna, MD, with an exit at Rte 404. By-Passing the Queenstown Outlets light, the lights at Rte 50 and Rte 213, Rte 404 intersections, Easton and Cambridge eliminates the traffic-accordion-affect of those lights, intersections and towns. This might very well be the least expensive and less intrusive alternative.</p> |
| 12/14/2017 | Website | I think any new bay crossing should be attached to or near the existing Bay Bridge, where this is infrastructure already in place. Also, making the Bay Bridge a "cashless" bridge would help ease congestion. |
| 12/14/2017 | Website | Just my two cents worth. I travel quite a bit to the southern Maryland area from Worcester County, and always have thought that a bridge or ferry service between Cambridge/Blackwater Wildlife area to the St. Leonards area in Calvert Co. would be so much of a faster commute. It also would relieve some of the traffic congestion on Rt 2 and the Annapolis area, as well as the current Bay Bridge during summer time. It would allow quicker, and faster access to the beaches of Ocean City and Assateague Island from the southern MD areas and Virginia. |
| 12/14/2017 | Website | I would like to propose a bridge crossing the Chesapeake Bay at Calvert County Maryland to Dorchester County Maryland |
| 12/14/2017 | Website | <p>The idea of putting a bridge from the western shore into Kent county is TERRIBLE. Kent is the only truly rural and farming county on the upper shore. Giving the western shore's urban population direct access to this almost pristine place would, within a few years ruin its rural character. One has only to look to Talbot and Queen Anne's counties to see what would occur if you put Ken co. within easy commuting distance of the urbanized western shore. Would it not make more sense to build a third bridge in the area of the existing two bridges. This would take advantage of the existing road infrastructure, and might only eventually require the enlargement of existing routes. As a 10 year resident of Kent county before having to move to Queen Annes, I am strongly and adamantly against the routing of a new bridge from the urban western shore into Kent county. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. WE VOTE!</p> <p>[Name removed]</p> |
| 12/14/2017 | Website | <p>I have lived in Kent County all my life as well as my parents and grandparents before me. We choose to live here in Kent County, we don't want to live anywhere else. If we wanted to live in Baltimore, we would move to Baltimore.</p> <p>If the bridge should come across it will impact Kent county tremendously, we would definitely become a suburb of Baltimore. The money that would be spent to upgrade everything from roads to by passes around towns and most importantly the change from our small RURAL county to something unrecognizable and incomprehensible to my self and my family. Growing up as farmers and their families are a way of life which is dying and along with that the change</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|--|
| | | <p>to the land. I know we aren't a big county, by we matter and without farmers who grow our foods and practice conservation and are good stewards of the land where will we be.</p> <p>Please, do not build the bridge from Baltimore to Kent County.</p> <p>Thank you for listening.</p> |
| 12/14/2017 | Website | <p>As a long time resident of Kent County, MD, I hope that the study will not fund a crossing to Kent County feasible. I am concerned about the environmental impacts to our county, and Eastern Neck Wildlife Refuge, in particular. "</p> <p>Eastern Neck National Wildlife Refuge is a 2,285 acre island providing habitat for thousands of wintering waterfowl including the tundra swan. Swans feed off of grasses in the river and narrows as do the 1,000s of waterfowl. Eastern Neck refuge supports a wide variety of habitats including brackish marsh, natural ponds, upland forest, and grasslands. The refuge holds the designation of Important Bird Areas by the Audubon Society. Over 240 bird species visit the refuge along with small mammals and many other wildlife species.</p> <p>This county has remained relatively untouched by suburban sprawl, maintaining much of its wonderful character.</p> <p>Finally, I do not believe that this county would provide the best and most direct route to areas on the Coast, Southeast of our county, such as Ocean City.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration</p> <p>[Name removed]</p> |
| 12/14/2017 | Website | <p>I am opposed to a bridge crossing the Chesapeake Bay with a terminus in Kent County. The soul of Kent County would forever be changed for the worse.</p> |
| 12/14/2017 | Website | <p>Sustainability and food production are most important to the Eastern Shore. Sustainability means no degradation to our environment, the Bay, the air, the land, the water, the wildlife, the humans living here and across the state. Another bridge will further pollute our environment.</p> <p>We need to focus on 25-50 years in the future. No cars! No gas and oil pumping! No fracking! No pollution! There must be ways that the state can take leadership in finding alternatives to cars and fossil fuels. The time to start is now! Reject all of the bridge locations and find other solutions.</p> <p>[Name removed]</p> |
| 12/14/2017 | Website | <p>As a native senior citizen, I implore you to not consider Kent County for a third bay crossing. I have seen how the bridge negatively affected Kent Island with too much traffic and development. We citizens of Kent County do not want the same thing to happen to our way of life. Please keep Kent County rural for all to enjoy!</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|---|
| 12/14/2017 | Website | Please build a bridge right through the heart of Kent County. This county is dying, and the local hierarchy does not want to allow change or modernization in any way. A new bridge would force it to change. The local school system is abysmal. The local hospital is downsizing. There are few jobs and even fewer employable citizens with marketable skills. There is no community support for families with young children. |
| 12/14/2017 | Website | I feel strongly that any new bridge crossings in an effort to divert beach traffic should absolutely be placed on the lower shore, closer to the beaches. There is no need or reason to build a new bridge in Kent or QA counties, so Cole to the existing crossing. |
| 12/14/2017 | Website | <p>TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:</p> <p>Although I am currently living in California. I grew up in Salisbury, attended the University of Maryland AND am planning to return to retire on the Eastern Shore. I also received a Master of City & Regional Planning from Catholic University's School of Engineering and Architecture, in D.C.</p> <p>If there were a new Chesapeake Bay bridge, I MIGHT NOT CONSIDER RETURNING TO THE SHORE!!</p> <p>COMMENTS:</p> <p>General: accept that there is traffic congestion; DO NOT ACCEPT NEEDING A NEW BRIDGE for the convenience of commuters (who want a rural life style) NOR for the convenience of weekend travelers.</p> <p>This new bridge WILL decimate the environment and the rural lifestyle of the Shore.</p> <p>ACKNOWLEDGE: the use of Easy Pass, and other MDTA workarounds for the congestion.</p> <p>Suggest: MORE INCENTIVES TO TRAVEL OFF PEAK. HIGHER FEES FOR SINGLE PASSENGERS IN POV's. CHEAPER BRIDGE TOLLS FOR OFF-PEAK TRAVEL. LOWER TOLLS IF BRIDGE LESS BUSY.</p> <p>DO THESE FIRST! BEFORE CONSIDERING A NEW BRIDGE!</p> <p>CONCERNS: ENVIRONMENT, ENGINEERING ISSUES, NOISE, INCREASED TRAFFIC, DESTRUCTION OF RURAL ENVIRONMENT/LIFESTYLE ON SHORE (build it and MORE will come). Traffic concerns will include REQUIRED improvements to Rte. 50 toward Ocean City/or whichever route is chosen.</p> <p>PREFERRED SUB AREA: if you must....</p> <p>BUILD IN THE ALREADY IMPACTED AREA: NEXT TO EXISTING BRIDGES. (Area #3, I believe;) toward Kent Island and Queenstown.</p> <p>OTHER POTENTIAL AREAS: IF STATE MUST BUILD go NORTH of existing bridges: NEAR BALTIMORE in AREAS #1 AND 2.</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|--|
| | | <p>DO NOT BUILD IN AREAS #4,5,6: NOT EASTON, NOT OXFORD, NOT ST. MICHAEL'S. NOT CAMBRIDGE AND BLACKWATER REFUGE. #6--ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE NEAR PRINCESS ANNE/DEAL ISLAND...and also looks like an Engineering Nightmare.</p> <p>ALSO, I question that tourists only want to go to Ocean City (OC in the vernacular of a Shore resident). In the many years I drove over the bridge...MANY turn toward the DELAWARE beaches...right after crossing the Bridge.</p> <p>Hurriedly, to get my comments to you by tomorrow!</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to share my concerns</p> <p>[Name and email removed]</p> <p>DECEMBER 14, 2017</p> |
| 12/14/2017 | Website | <p>The only people in Kent County who might want a bridge into our county are people who plan to profit from the sale of their land, and most of the landowners don't want it either. Nobody wants to become the next Kent Island, strip malls from bridge to 301. Chestertown would become a bedroom community for Baltimore. And the fact that we have the smallest population in MD means that we'll be the easiest to roll over as the state pushes this through. Sale of land to businesses along the corridor to 301 will be irresistible, and no one thinks that that will change things for the better. This project is the vampire that keeps coming back to life. It's time to drive a stake through its heart.</p> |
| 12/14/2017 | Website | <p>I'm very much against a Bay Bridge in Kent County. It would ruin this county. It would change us forever and we could never go back. Instead of a place to visit, we would become a place to drive through. My vote is NO for a Bay Bridge in Kent County.</p> |
| 12/14/2017 | Website | <p>The only additional bridge crossing that makes sense is a southerly one. If you build a bridge from Baltimore to the vicinity of Kent County, you will ruin the aesthetics of the area. The land and the community look and function now largely as they have for the last nearly 400 years. If you build a bridge next to the existing two, you will still have bottlenecks on both sides as there is no space to expand 50/301. The best choice is to build a bridge from Southern Maryland to the Lower Eastern Shore. A framework of infrastructure already exists: drivers can use the DC beltway (I-495) down Maryland Route 4 or 5 to the bridge, then pick up Maryland 413 to US 13 in Somerset County en route to the beach via US 113 or US 50. Both of those areas are economically depressed and could use the development. Furthermore, in studying existing bridge patterns, it is clear this plan would divert much of the beach traffic that backs up the current spans at present. DC beachgoers would use the southern bridge and Baltimore beachgoers would use the current one. I realize that the bay is wider and deeper the farther south one goes, but in considering many other successful albeit difficult bridge projects around the country I have seen firsthand, this one can be done and is well worth the effort. Any other plan creates many more problems than it solves.</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|--|
| 12/14/2017 | Website | <p>I am a Kent County resident and I strongly oppose a crossing to Kent County. I appreciate the rural nature of our county, and believe that a new span from Baltimore to Kent County would destroy the fabric of a county made unique by its unspoiled landscape and small towns. I also believe Baltimore is already well-served by the current bridge spans, while a span providing a closer crossing to DC residents makes far more sense.</p> <p>Failing an atomic bomb dropped in Kent County, I am hard-pressed to think of an outcome I could consider more disastrous than the addition of a Bay Bridge span and the ruination it would bring to our beautiful home.</p> |
| 12/14/2017 | Website | <p>As a Kent County resident, I strongly oppose the construction of a new bridge into Kent County. It would destroy precious farm land and increase traffic in a county with little capacity to manage that type of volume. Moreover, it threatens our way of life as a rural community-- prized by both locals and tourists for its relatively unspoiled landscape. It will also do little to lessen the traffic problems of the Bay Bridge, most of which are due to seasonal travelers going to the Delaware beaches. Building a bridge further north simply doesn't make sense.</p> |
| 12/14/2017 | Website | <p>Thank you for paying attention to public comment! I am very concerned about the serious, possibly devastating effects a northern corridor would have on the Eastern Shore. Anyone who lives on the Delmarva Peninsula knows how the increased population in Queen Anne's County created havoc in infrastructure--water and sewage inadequacies leading to failures in new developments, both residential and commercial. Middletown in Delaware, which has grown as a result of the increased traffic between Maryland and Delaware along the MD 301/DE 896 corridor, is an ugly scar, and a terrifying reminder of what increased traffic can produce.</p> <p>Maryland state funding tends to flow to the wealthier counties whose education systems reflect that wealth. The Eastern Shore does not need any more projects which are established to make the travel and shopping needs of Baltimore and Annapolis while destroying the beauty, environmental health, and farming culture of the Eastern Shore.</p> <p>One of the reasons I choose to live in Betterton is the health of the land. Although my property is small, I take my own farming/gardening very seriously. The environmental impact of increased traffic, road building, emissions, commercial construction which follows new roads (including gas stations, residential developments, strip malls,) etc., will destroy this area.</p> <p>Moreover, one of the greatest beauties of the area is its role as a winter resting place for wild birds. The symbiosis of the time when the farmers harvest their crops and the arrival of the geese which feed on the newly-exposed insects and fertilize the land with their droppings is beyond exquisite!</p> <p>I will certainly have more to say on the subject as the study continues, but please listen to the residents on the Eastern Shore. We may be fewer in number, but we love Maryland and love the richness of the area in which we live. Maryland will be significantly poorer for the loss of this precious natural resources.</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|--|
| 12/14/2017 | Website | Keep it where it is. Maryland pretends to care about environment. Another crossing site will cause environmental damage to the shore and destroy more of the Shores rural area, needlessly spending tax money to build new congestion all for the purpose of getting to the parking lot known as Ocean City. |
| 12/14/2017 | Website | There is usually only a problem with beach traffic during the day. Just make the toll free during the slow hours at night and promote it. There is only so much parking down here at the beaches and plenty of other 4 lane bridges on the route to slow traffic anyway, so do not waste our money! |
| 12/14/2017 | Website | The proposed bridge should not come to Kent County. It will fatally harm our rural way of life; our roads and towns will be clogged with traffic; and municipal areas such as Baltimore will lose business to tax-free Delaware. |
| 12/14/2017 | Website | Any bridge crossing that come into Kent County would overwhelm and greatly change the nature of this rural community which would be sacrificed for supposed improvements. What has made this country special for centuries would be destroyed in the supposed progress. Thanks |
| 12/14/2017 | Website | I am a concerned citizen of Kent County, MD. I'm concerned that the livelihood, the natural and agricultural beauty and heritage that IS Kent County is being put at dramatic risk with the proposed 3rd span of the Bay Bridge to Kent County. Why do people come to Kent County? As a resident for over 10 years I know for a fact that people recreate in this nook of the Eastern Shore for it's rural splendor. We're only 1.5 hrs from 3 major cities and yet to arrive in the county you feel as if you're much further away in distance and even time. You can watch an undisturbed sunset anywhere in the county with a view of farm fields, marshes, bodies of water and hear nothing except the lap of the waves, migratory birds overhead or the breeze blowing through the corn or other seasonal crop. Thousands of people come here for a vacation or even a day trip FOR THAT. FOR SILENCE AND THE NATURAL WORLD. They leave the traffic and lights and multi-lane highways to see what we 'simpler folks' have. And I'm not even into what we as citizens cherish about our home county. We CHOOSE to live in a rural, Wal-mart-less, drive a half hour for a movie theatre, everybody knows everyone, a traffic jam is a tractor in front of you kinda place. We've fought hard not to have mega stores invade our county, we like fields instead of shopping malls. We like to be a destination, not a pass through. We've seen and continue to see what's been done to places like... Kent Island and that part of Queen Anne's County, Elkton in Cecil County, places to stop and grab a sandwich at the Chic-fil-A or fill up the gas tank. We take pride in that people come out of their way up Route 213, stopping along at the farmer's markets or historic towns to come to our many parades, festivals and local shops. We're an environmentally aware agricultural historical community, listen to us, and keep that damn bridge away from our county. |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments

October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|--|
| 12/14/2017 | Website | <p>Firstly, I am a resident of the Eastern Shore. Secondly, there is too much money being spent over and over again on studies with the same basic outcome.</p> <p>I am totally against another bridge for any type of personal vehicles. I think it plausible that a bridge for a new Metro Station connecting an area somewhere in Anne Arundel County and the northern part of the Eastern Shore should be considered for commuters. The environment should be the first consideration in any plan.</p> <p>Most of the past plans to connect Rock Hall or Crisfield to the Western Shore are not plausible due to the amount of distance they are away from RT 50. Dorchester County is not plausible because of its marshy land and future instability.</p> <p>I don't believe continuing to build bridges is the answer. We have to start considering other ways of transporting people across the Bay for recreational purposes, too. Besides a commuter train, engineers must be creative in their ideas for the future because the same problems will continue to haunt the State of Maryland if we keep doing what we've always done. It will take a lot of money for infrastructure upfront, but in the long run it will be better for the environment and the people. The State will have to use a huge PR program to train people to rethink the way they travel. Schaefer's "Reach the Beach" campaign worked - too well. The State needs to compare other similar situations occurring in other states and bring it to the table for discussion. I am confident that there is a solution without tearing apart land and homes - and more traffic - to accomplish it.</p> |
| 12/14/2017 | Website | <p>I am adamantly opposed to any proposal for constructing another bridge crossing of the Chesapeake Bay north of the existing Bay Bridges with a terminus in Kent County.</p> |
| 12/14/2017 | Website | <p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>Please do not site the bridge on the upper bay. There is already the Tidings Bridge and the Bay Bridges. Please site the new spans where population centers are more concentrated (on both sides of the bay), namely the lower areas of the bay that the study considered.</p> <p>I could talk about the environmental impact on the county where my family has called home for generations and where I plan to live the balance of my life, that a bridge from the western shore to Kent County would have, but I'm sure you will have many comments like that.</p> <p>It is my hope that you consider the simple fact that this county epitomizes the rural life of the eastern shore of Maryland. Kent County, in a 2017 population study is shown to have the lowest population of any county in the state. The county's rural character should be preserved as an example of an historic, pastoral community. Simply a few hours away from bustling cities and population centers, visitors can enjoy a slower pace. Building a bridge from the western shore to any point in Kent County, will destroy that character and radically alter a traditional gem in Maryland's beautiful cultural and geographic diversity.</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|---|
| | | Please consider the impact on our homes, farms, and community and remove a span from the western shore to Kent County from consideration. Thank you [Name removed] |
| 12/14/2017 | Website | I strongly oppose any bridge connection that includes the geographic area of Kent County. This is definitely not an area that is amenable to the traffic and commercial development that would ensue from such construction. Come and look at it. You will see. |
| 12/14/2017 | Website | i don't think there in need for a third span, just do away with all tolls! The traffic moves fine through Annapolis until you hit the tolls, just do away with the toll booths and let traffic continue moving across the bridge. Would not that save money, in the long run instead of spending billions on a new span! Thanks |
| 12/14/2017 | Website | <p>The idea of a new crossing is a good idea. Southern Maryland would be an ideal location. In the northern part of the state, you have the crossings available from Maryland into Delaware which are not too far of a drive from the present day bridge. The only other option currently is the tunnel which is a multi-hour drive one way. A bridge in-between the tunnel and present day bridge seems the most viable option.</p> <p>In working on existing traffic problems with the current bridge, some suggestions are offered to help alleviate traffic woes. These can be alternatives while we await a new bridge, which we all know will be a 10-20 year project until completion, if that.</p> <p>We will start first with the traffic lights en-route to the bridge from the east (heading westbound). We are speaking of the traffic lights at Route 50 and Route 404, the traffic lights at Route 50 and Chesapeake College, and the traffic lights at Route 50 and the Queenstown Outlets. These traffic lights are one of the largest contributing factors that cause immense backups and slow-ups, which ultimately slow and snarl traffic leading to the bridge. Traffic needs to flow uninterrupted and smoother which can result by ridding these traffic lights (construct overpasses instead; more efficient, no intersection accidents, and less costly than a bridge).</p> <p>The second suggestion deals with the toll booths. Traffic backs up heading eastbound are, in large part, because of the toll booths. Getting rid of the toll booths is ideal. The bridge, built almost 70 years ago, has paid for itself and the delay of the toll booths is the largest contributing factor to current backups heading eastbound, although it is likely the state will not favor the option of ridding the toll booths for the benefit of alleviating traffic woes.</p> |
| 12/14/2017 | Website | Can't you put something further south that the present bridge? Look at the area around St Michael's to Deal???? I sure do hate going north to go south. It would be a relief for everyone to already be south when they are going that way anyway. |
| 12/14/2017 | Email | As a resident of Kent County, I'm expressing my opinion about the new bridge proposals. It makes more sense to aim south, putting the motorists closer to the beaches. Better yet, include a train to move the traffic. Thanks, [Name removed] |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|--------|---|
| | | Chestertown MD |
| 12/14/2017 | Email | <p>Attached attached; if problem opening please call me at [Phone number removed]. Thank you for considering my input, The Study should recognize both the intra-state and inter-state bay crossing functions in its Scope for fiscal/financial and Origination and Destination (O&D) analysis purposes:</p> <p>Allocation of traffic growth between each new and existing crossing site should be site unique.</p> <p>Intra-state (no local commuters) and beach tolls are the potential, new, major toll sources</p> <p>Might offer/create congestion avoidance route for east coast I-95 traffic.</p> <p>The “financial viability” for incremental crossing capacity and associated State highway access within local communities is dependent on the postulated traffic loads/share and incremental toll revenues. Local road congestion is reaching critical levels today!</p> <p>MdTA’s current \$3B debt ceiling will be used up with US 301 Nice Bridge</p> <p>Governor’s proposed I-95/495 and I-270 capacity upgrade is P3 funded</p> <p>SHA “Gas tax” funding declining with increasing CAFÉ requirements and electric cars; SHA CIP (“tax payer” funding) allocated to at least 2040.</p> <p>Site specific O&D based “financial viability” analysis may be able to summarily eliminate several of the 6 proposed sectors: 1, 2 and 6 (& maybe 5) thereby reducing study effort.</p> <p>If the Bay Crossing Study “financial viability” analysis supports a second crossing site, any incremental traffic growth shared with the current Chesapeake Bay Bridge, must (logically) also be addressed programmatically by the Study for “financial viability” and financing.</p> <p>MDOT State-wide funding priorities are based on several “measures of need” that can disadvantage seasonally weighted facilities. Special priority consideration should be sought for this strategic, systemic “single point of failure”, risk reduction.</p> <p>Study based financing legislative authority should not be enacted incrementally to help manage fiscal risk.</p> <p>An “illustrative” schedule for completion of the Crossing Study Tier 2 NEPA work (with its associated final Record of Decision) and an envisioned construction schedule is needed NOW for the public (and County Delegations) to clearly understand (and fund) the overall study plan and schedule.</p> <p>Two subordinate local Sub Area 3 concerns:</p> <p>Informal discussions indicate a design consideration is the use of elevated road ways in highly developed areas. This option should be thoroughly vetted with effected County governments and clearly presented for public comment – expect opposition.</p> <p>Existing summer congestion on access roads, service roads, local arterial roads, supporting bridges and local commercial activity merit full consideration between the US 50/301 split in QA County and the I-97/I-595 interchange in AA County to include the Severn River and Kent Narrow Bridges. Congestion in these central, core areas effect their entire County traffic flows!</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|--------|--|
| 12/14/2017 | Email | <p>ARTMA, the Annapolis Regional Transportation Management Association, has reviewed the presentation and material associated with The Bay Crossing Study. Our review has created major concerns about the process and methodologies that will be employed in this NEPA assessment:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ARTMA's primary concern is the lack of inclusion at the very outset of the most impacted of all "stake holders" Anne Arundel County, Queen Anne's County, and the City of Annapolis! The citizens of these three governmental entities live and "breathe" the congestion and air quality manifested along the existing Chesapeake Bay Bridge corridor. Their voices if unheard at the very outset, discredit the scope and purpose of the study. These governments of the Annapolis Region should be major players not just several of many "stake holders." 2. Transparency of the process is essential and appears to be lacking. Who are the consultants working with the MdTA? Why is the citizen feed-back being compressed and pushed rapidly? Critical action items such as a request for comments in proximity to the Thanksgiving holiday and again just before Christmas make it difficult for a robust response for many quarters. This lack of transparency is concerning especially for such a major far-reaching NEPA Study. 3. ARTMA believes that a critical component of this effort is the absolute need for a complete and detailed Origin and Destination Study. A truncated License Plate Survey will not provide sufficient data. Many trips along this corridor have neither origin nor destination within the Annapolis Region. During Summer months recreational trips substantially increase the non-Annapolis Region traffic volumes. Congestion levels are substantial and long lasting now! 4. The "Down-Select" process anticipates the selection of a single alternative for further analysis in Tier-Two from ten or more alternatives put forth in Tier-One. This begs several questions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. How can any down-select process go from 10 or more to one alternative with no interim candidates possessing worthy elements in need further analysis? b. What level of detail will be employed to Down-Select? c. Why not anticipate a multi-tiered Down-Select? 5. Will there be consideration of "Lost Opportunity" for growth along each alternative corridor? As an example: A hypothetical crossing South of the existing crossing will result in substantial economic growth along that new corridor. This "value added, or opportunity lost" should be part of the analytical Down-Select process. 6. Will the value of two crossings be part of the evaluation compared to an alternative that retains only the existing single crossing? Two crossing alternatives with two distinct transportation corridors will facilitate bridge maintenance, corridor accident mitigation, congestion management, and National Security providing redundancy in case of terror incidents? |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|---|
| | | <p>This NEPA effort is aimed at solutions for the existing and predictable congestion, air quality, and economic vitality of the entire study area. The Annapolis Region, more than any other region, will have to live with the consequences of solutions implemented through this process for many generations to come!</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>[Name Removed] Executive Director Annapolis Regional Transportation Management Association P.O. Box 3315 Annapolis, MD 21403 [Phone number removed]</p> |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | <p>When the second Bay Bridge was built in 1971-72 there were three proposed routes, next to the original bridge, Baltimore County to Kent County, and Calvert County to Dorchester County. If there has to be a third bridge, the Calvert-Dorchester route makes the most sense because it could draw some traffic from the existing bridge, especially users from the Washington area. A third bridge next to the existing ones is an absurd suggestion because Route 50 is maxed out at three lanes and if anything, there would be bigger backups than there are today if that road was feeding into three bridges.</p> <p>A bridge to Kent County has several negatives attached to it. 1) It would have a profound impact on the rural nature of the county. Those of us who live in the area don't want to see happen here what happened on Kent Island after the bridges were built. 2) It would be a longer route for those going to the ocean resorts and 3) it would require building enormous highway infrastructure. Except for one small corner, Kent County has no dual-lane highways.</p> <p>Finally, the cost of another bridge, no matter where it might be built, would be astronomical and who would pay for it? Quite frankly, I doubt any of us will ever see a third Bay crossing because there are so many hoops that would have to be jumped through. Please do not bring a third bridge to Kent County!</p> |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | I believe any improvements to the existing bridge or development of a new one should include plans to accommodate two-way heavy rail, with an eye towards providing MARC rail service to Southern Maryland, Annapolis, and the Eastern Shore. |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | Build a new span just south of the original Bay Bridge span. The infrastructure is pretty much already there for a new bridge. Use the original span as an overflow span, or for use in case of an accident on one of the other spans. Eliminate the toll booths and go to a license plate reader for tolls so traffic doesn't have to slow down. Make the new bridge four lanes wide as well to keep traffic moving. A new bridge in any other area would ruin what makes the Eastern Shore special. |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | I have lived in Kent County for over 30 years, and watched many changes come to this side of the Bay Bridge. Much of the change has been south of Kent County, with the express purpose of facilitating access to the Delaware and |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments

October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|--|
| | | <p>Maryland beaches. This generates income for counties of the lower shore, which has lost sources of income as the Bay yields less to watermen, and the types of crops have changed as chicken farming increased. Population growth on the western side of the Bay has resulted in a higher volume of traffic, especially in the warmer months. The two spans currently do not meet the requirements of these traffic overloads, and traffic accidents can paralyze both sides of the Bay.</p> <p>How does Kent County fit into this scenario? In my opinion it does not play any role in solving the problem. The comprehensive plan has put forth a vision that preserves the agricultural and historic culture of the county, with carefully planned and monitored growth related to agricultural, clean and green business and tourism. Becoming a thoroughway for western shore beachgoers hardly support this vision. Becoming a bedroom community for Baltimore does not support the vision either. These are both possibilities if Kent County was a part of the third Bay Bridge plan. As a taxpaying citizen of Maryland and Kent County I am opposed to continuing to include Kent County in any planning for a third Bay Bridge span.</p> |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | <p>We live near Kent Narrows, just off Route 50 where we can observe the traffic build up on the highway during spring summer and fall. On most weekends from April through late September, we are a captive audience due to the inevitable traffic backups and we must plan our every move accordingly. One traffic accident ties up traffic for hours if not entire days and we become prisoners in our own homes, finding it impossible to get to a nearby store or pharmacy. It's obvious that this area is already overloaded with more than our share of traffic. Adding another bridge to the mix would be insanity! A more direct route from the Western Shore to the Maryland/Delaware beaches would be further South, crossing the bay to the Cambridge area. In contrast to the Kent Island/Kent Narrows area, Cambridge and surrounds appear to need an influx of activity to boost the economy. It would also seem to make more sense to reduce travel time from the Washington, DC area to the beaches using a more direct route while also dividing the Washington/Baltimore traffic congestion between the present day bridges and one further down the bay. A more Southern bridge would also alleviate some of the heavy traffic currently jamming the roads through Parole and Annapolis and reduce backups around the Severn River Bridge.</p> |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | <p>I fought the idea of a third bridge across the Chesapeake Bay many years ago. This included hearings in Annapolis at the state house and here in Chestertown at public hearings with MDOT. Learning once more that my Kent county is being considered just scares the hell out of my family and myself. My children all of voting age do not want this bridge, my wife does not want this bridge, my closest friends do not want this bridge, the business people I know who have kept their businesses in Kent county do not want this bridge. To think that all of the troubles of Baltimore could be just a fifteen minute ride away from rural county Kent is appalling.</p> <p>If there is a need to place a third span then do so on Kent Island where the damage is already done.</p> <p>NO NEW BRIDGE ACROSS THE BAY IN KENT COUNTY!!!</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|--|
| 12/15/2017 | Website | Kent County should be eliminated as a potential new bay bridge crossing. My wife and I recently moved here from Cecil County to get away from the more populous area to better raise our son. Kent County is very rural and should stay that way! Constructing a new bridge with have a significantly negative impact on this County. With the potential of added traffic/congestion and increase in crime by providing criminals from Baltimore easy access to our County. I commute to Baltimore for work on a weekly basis and I am opposed to Kent County being a consideration for an additional bay crossing. Lastly, AA County and QA County have existing infrastructure to better handle additional crossings. Please save the ruralness of MD's eastern shore by removing Kent County as a possible option. |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | Consideration of any bay crossing solution other than an additional span at the current bridge location is a waste of time and money. Identification of any other preferred corridor by MDTA will result in decades of legal and political action, and will probably result in a legislative curbing of MDTA's activities. |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | Please Please Please don't ever build another bridge across the bay. Totally unnecessary and a waste of taxpayer dollars. How about subsidizing a high speed ferry like they have in the Seattle Washington area. The Chesapeake Bay is a fragile ecosystem that needs to heal. It doesn't need another giant construction project. [Name removed]. |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | <p>I am extremely opposed to a new bridge across the upper Chesapeake, which would absolutely destroy the rural, historic character of that section of the Eastern Shore.</p> <p>Kent County is a unique historic landscape, one of the last great reserved 18th-century environments in America. It would be irresponsible, shortsighted, and stupid to turn it into a suburb of Baltimore.</p> <p>Any new span should be built as an addition to the William Preston Lane bridge.</p> <p>Adam Goodheart Director Center for the Study of the American Experience Washington College</p> |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | I have been a resident of Kent County for most of my life and over 20 years as an adult. I have also watched the destructive nature that Route 59 has had on Kent Island and specifically Easton with its massive congestion. My parents have left Talbot County and moved to South Carolina because they felt that the town was divided in half most weekend making it difficult to enjoy a quality of life. Mr Govenor, make Maryland the state that values quality of life. Get people off the road and expand access to the eastern shore with clean public high speed rail. Be a leader in accessible public transportation and democratize the transportation model. Give our delicate ecology and natural environment a break from thousands of vehicles and chose a southern location and public transportation. Don't build a span through small and feisty Kent County. Thank you. PS - you are doing a great job! |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | I am strongly opposed to a bay bridge crossing into Kent County. It will not benefit Kent County residents in any way, shape or form, and we will be left with an expensive highway infrastructure to maintain as well as the resulting destruction of our farmlands and wetlands. We can't support our own schools, let alone a highway system designed |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|---|
| | | only to bring people from Baltimore area to the beach. Kent County has nothing to offer high volume pass-through. We don't want to build more ROFOs, Wawas, and strip malls that the local population can't and don't want to support in travel off-season. People who want tax-free shopping will simply drive until they reach Dover, stop and spend their money there before hopping onto Rt 1 to reach the beach. How this helps Maryland, I don't know. It makes more sense to run an ultra-speed rail span parallel to the existing double span bridge; or build a new span south of Kent Island with direct access into Dorchester County. TAKE KENT COUNTY OFF YOUR LIST. |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | Would like to see a southern crossing around Crisfield to Patuxent River area. Create a tunnel. An emergency exit can be made to Smith Island but make it so that normal travelers can not exit there only emergency. It would improve safety for residents but normal tourist access to the island would remain via boat. This would open access to lower shore tourism, give an alternate route to OC tourists, and open up jobs in Putuxent River to lower eastern shore residents. |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | Common sense would dictate "not that will happen"that the next crossing should be south of the Choptank River. Our group has a pool going on were the bridge will cross, all one has to do is keep an eye on the land transfers that lead to RT 50 to see were the bridge will be. |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | Please DO NOT put a Bay Bridge crossing into Kent County. Kent County is one of Maryland's treasures, and it's beauty would be destroyed by making it a cut through for people to go from the Western Shore to the beaches. We live here because we love the quiet of a small town, the unspoiled Historic area of Chestertown, and the beauty of the open farmland and rural countryside. We do not want the charm of our county obliterated. |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | Researchers I keep hearing the problem of traffic is the flow to Ocean City. Why should Kent County have to pay {suffer For this. Maryland has the infrastructure already in place with the two exsisting bay Bridges. Put in a third span and widen the roads if necessary. You already own the land and would be the least intrusive approach. We don't want the land grab , pollution, crime and the impact that would ruin our counties agriculture, wildlife, lifestyles. There is no going back once you start, keep Kent County Rural. |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the Chesapeake Bay Crossing Tier 1 NEPA Study. I am responding from the viewpoint of a Kent County resident; I would like these points to be given consideration. 1. What is the capacity of MD-DE beaches for the next 50 years? The publicized intent of the bridge crossing is to alleviate traffic congestion for vacationers making their way to beaches. In the long term, what is the capacity of the beaches? - What is the data indicating the point of origin of beach goers? What is their starting point? What is the target for majority of beach advertising markets? |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|---|
| | | <p>-what is the projected impact of environmental factors on projected growth capacity for MD/DE beaches? Include erosion, projected loss of available land due to storms/rising water. what is the capacity for services, including trash removal? How do the governments/citizens of beach areas contribute to the bay bridge crossing? (Considering that travelers can be charged tolls to help alleviate the cost, what is the cost to those who stand to benefit from increased beach businesses)</p> <p>2. Long term impact of a bridge crossing into Kent County</p> <p>Kent County has previously taken a stand to support slow growth and protection of farm lands and rural landscape as evidenced by both county policies and actions to manage power sources (windmill placements and solar) and big-box stores (the defeat of placing WalMart store in Kent County). How will the studies conducted by NEPA take into consideration the long term impact - as a bay bridge would impact for generations of our children and grandchildren) versus the shorter term goal of alleviating traffic for 3-5 months for vacationers reaching beaches?</p> <p>3. Please make information more accessible to private citizens. Although the On-line scoping meeting held November 15 was eventually available, it was not accessible via internet at the scheduled time of the meeting. It is important to citizens to hear the input from all interested parties from other communities and to be able to access the data/studies/information presented to the study.</p> |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | Kent County does not have the infrastructure to accommodate increased traffic. Routes 20 and 298 are 2 lane highways bordered by farmland. In addition, we have a small overworked sheriffs department attempting to handle all our citizen needs. Also, how will the shipping lane be affected if you put the bridge near Tolchester? |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | In regard to the possibility of a new Bay Bridge landing in Kent County I would like to voice my strong dissent and opposition. I have seen the destruction caused by development and the construction of a new bridge will have a great and permanent negative impact on area I grew up in and love. Based on that I encourage you to choose an alternate option. Options may be limited but I implore you to please remove Kent County from the list. |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | I don't currently live in Kent County but I grew up there and my mom remains a resident. In many ways the fields and bay are still my home. While a bridge between Baltimore and Kent County would bring an influx of visitors and with them a likely increase in land worth and business, it would also turn the historic, rural area into a suburb. If you want a bridge into Kent County, you need to first prove it will not change the nature of the county itself. Thank you. |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | I moved to the rural area of Chestertown, Md. on the Eastern Shore to escape the crime, violence & murders. I am opposed to disrupting the rural, farming, and quality of life offered in Kent & Upper Queen Anne County by building a Bridge from Baltimore! |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | As the owner of The Inn at Mitchell House, located in Tolchester Maryland, I am vehemently opposed to a bay bridge crossing into Kent County. Our 18th century manor home is on the National Star Spangled Banner Trail and listed on the Maryland Registry of Historic Home Sites. This piece of Maryland history would be adversely and irrevocably impacted |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|--|
| | | by such a project. Not only would the rural character of our county be forever lost, but once farm land is gone it's gone. No farms, no food. Please respect our way of life and our history and do not consider Kent County as a viable option. I firmly believe privately owned ferries should be seriously considered rather than a multi million dollar or billion dollar bridge project that would only bring destruction to where ever it is built. |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | Good Morning, I would like to ask the Study Group to continue to include Sub Area 6 in the study. Even though this would be a much longer bay crossing, the other considerations may outweigh the additional costs. Thank you [Name removed]. |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | I am opposed to building a bridge spanning the Chesapeake bay north of the existing two spans. Having a eastern shore terminal would negatively impact our rural community. I have seen the bulging development that has resulted in Queen Anne county and do not want to see that happen in Kent county. This is a rural farming and fishing community and do not wish to see it turned into a fast food, fast shopping mecca . Our way of life needs to be preserved for future generations. |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | I think the idea of building another bridge crossing for the Chesapeake Bay is very important. And if the new crossing would be built from Taylor's Island near Cambridge, crossing into southern Maryland, I think the impact would be extremely beneficial and significant-----saving time, money and energy for the thousands of people who live and vacation on the lower Eastern shore. Not only would a location like that just about split the difference of the distance between the existing crossings, but the relatively narrower section of the Bay from Taylor's island to southern Maryland, would also save time and costs in the actual construction of the spans. And providing then more convenient access to major highways, viz. Rt. 301 would also ease the transportation and delivery of goods and supplies to the lower Eastern shore. In my opinion, a new crossing for the Chesapeake Bay is long overdue, and with the current robust growth and development along the Eastern, can't happen fast enough. Good luck---let's make it work! [Name removed] |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | I am a business owner located in Linkwood on the Eastern Shore of Maryland. My company provides industrial electric motor repairs for all types of customers including manufacturing facilities, wastewater treatment plants, and institutions like hospitals and universities. Our territory includes the entire states of Maryland and Delaware. One of our biggest obstacles in daily business is planning around the traffic congestion at the Bay Bridge crossing. We are in a sense |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|---|
| | | "held hostage" by the current bridge situation. It is a not only a traffic bottleneck, but also an economic one too. I think it is a clear victory for the State of Maryland to immediately start plans to double the amount of lanes at the current crossing on Kent Island. No doubt another crossing on the bay might be nice, but let's address the current problem first. A new span in the existing location would be a huge win. The current situation almost seems criminal due to the extent of which it restricts free trade. In closing, I support a new crossing from Southern Maryland too, but I think the entire state is geared around the flow of people in the existing location. I don't think anyone will complain about shorter commutes and more access to what each side of the bay has to offer. I say, let's make Marylanders happy. |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | I feel that our money would be better spent repairing and replacing existing bridges and overpasses, rather than building new structures. |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | To Whom it may concern, I have been a Kent County resident for nearly 40 years and would rather not see a bridge built at all in this county. We have worked so hard to keep our rural heritage and a bridge would be devastating to this farmland. It should be built along side of the existing bridges or south of that. Does a new span need to be built at all? How about a high speed rail along Route 50. Again, I am adamantly opposed to a third Bay Bridge entering Kent County from Baltimore. [Name removed] |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | A new bay bridge through beautiful Kent County would be a disaster, demolishing one of the prettiest and most rural counties in Maryland. Please don't let it happen. |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | I am opposed to a Bay bridge in Kent County MD. It is a county full of farms and wildlife. This project could change the area. This county can also easily access the western shore without a bridge that would not benefit the area. Thank you. [Name removed] |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | I am opposed to the bay crossing in Kent County, Maryland. This is a rural area which we strive to preserve. No Farms - No Food. We have one of the best farmer's market known far and wide which is filled with our local farmers. A bridge here would have negative impact on the farmers. |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | I do not think a bridge from Baltimore to Kent County is appropriate. It would destroy the character and natural beauty of the county and ruin lives. |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | If another span is built in the same location, you will have not relieved the traffic pressure caused by this bottle neck. May I suggest a bridge tunnel 25 miles south of the present bridge? |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|--|
| 12/15/2017 | Website | <p>Please do not site the bridge on the upper bay. There is already the Tidings Bridge and the Bay Bridges. Please site the new spans where population centers are more concentrated (on both sides of the bay), namely the lower areas of the bay that the study considered.</p> <p>Please do not site the bridge on the upper bay. There is already the Tidings Bridge and the Bay Bridges. Please site the new spans where population centers are more concentrated (on both sides of the bay), namely the lower areas of the bay that the study considered.</p> <p>I trust that you will consider the simple fact that this county epitomizes the rural life of the eastern shore of Maryland. Kent County, in a 2017 population study is shown to have the lowest population of any county in the state. The county's rural character should be preserved as an example of an historic, pastoral community. Simply a few hours away from bustling cities and population centers, visitors can enjoy a slower pace. Building a bridge from the western shore to any point in Kent County, will destroy that character and radically alter a traditional gem in Maryland's beautiful cultural and geographic diversity.</p> |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | <p>The rural farming and low traffic volume of Kent County are two things that drew me to move here. The traffic that would pass through here to get somewhere else would require farms land to be given up to roadways and the road and air pollution of far too many cars and trucks. We could benefit by shorter access to western shore activities but that would not be worth the cost of the extra traffic and damaged landscape that will come from the building of a bridge span anywhere in Kent County.</p> <p>Please let us continue to be the slower Eastern Shore community we are now.</p> |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | <p>Please, please, PLEASE, do not consider Kent County for a third Bay Bridge terminus!! It would absolutely destroy this county and what it stands for: one of the last pristine vestiges of Rural America. Leave us as we are and site the bridge where it is actually desired by a community, and where it won't destroy its culture. Think of us as a museum, that once destroyed, is gone forever. Why should we pay the price for overdevelopment on the Western Shore? Or future development on the Eastern Shore?</p> <p>Please think of our heritage, Maryland's heritage, and let us keep our county as it is, development free, without all the problems that development would bring.</p> <p>Thank You</p> <p>[Names removed]</p> |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | <p>The infrastructure already exists in Queen Anne's County and Anne Arundel county. It would make absolutely no sense to build a bridge to Kent County.</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|--|
| 12/15/2017 | Website | I recognize the need for an additional bridge crossing the Chesapeake Bay. However, as a Kent County resident I do not support the bridge coming to Kent County. We are a rural county full of farms, and a bridge will destroy the rural aspect of our county, an aspect that is important to us. |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | <p>I am a long time resident of the State of Maryland, currently living and working in the state of CO. I grew up in Rockville, MD and lived in Edgewater, MD and Monrovia, MD until work took us away from the great State of Maryland that we love. We purchased our future retirement home in Kent County, MD in 2004, specially for it's rural character. We have been on the commuting, fast track career rat race long enough as to why we will be retiring in 2018 and moving full time into our home in Galena, MD.</p> <p>I strongly oppose a Bay Bridge crossing into Kent County, MD. It is a unique and lovely community, where neighbors still watch out for each other and care deeply about the culture and character of their history. I don't want a change in the beautiful landscape, I don't want the additional traffic, I don't want the housing developments where all the houses look the same. If I wanted that I would move back to Rockville, MD, in retirement where all the dairy farm land is gone, the beltway is a parking lot</p> <p>Stay away from Kent County!</p> <p>[Name removed]</p> <p>and yes, I am still a Redskins Fan(also strongly oppose any efforts to change the team name)</p> |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | <p>I think the Bay Crossing Study should look very seriously at public transportation. If the bridge is for two trains, east bound and west bound, and it links to rails to Rehoboth and Ocean City, you could easily move a ton of people and let the shore communities provide local transportation once they are at the beach. Young people who travel light and people who have weekend condos or homes would jump on board. Families who go to the beach for a week once a year, will want to drive with all their boogie boards and bikes, etc. But retirees travel light and would use a train. Also, it would actually make it possible to go to the beach for a day! Just think of how much more relaxing it would be to start reading your new beach book on the train on the way to the beach?!</p> <p>You see, if you build another auto bridge, you are just getting people across the bay faster. The traffic from the new bridge will just become congested on the other side! If you building another bridge, you'll need to build more lanes.</p> <p>Finally, I believe building a new bridge to Kent County would be a disaster. It's just diverting the traffic to clog up Kent County roads before reaching 50, 404 or route 1 which are already clogged roads.</p> <p>As part of your study, I hope you are looking at cities like NYC that have the same problem and how they are handling it. There are dedicated bus lanes in the tunnels going into NYC. Buses and dedicated bus lanes would also be a possibility.</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|--|
| | | <p>You have \$5M for this study, take some of that and lease 20 buses and try it next year! Let's see how many people would jump on board.</p> <p>Please, think outside the box!!!</p> |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | A bridge to connect Kent County is a great way to get people rushing through our beautiful county on their way to the DE beaches. For Kent County itself? Can't imagine it as a big enough destination spot to keep some of those dollars that will be rushing through.... |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | As a resident of Kent County, I am writing to ask you not to include Kent County as an option for a bridge location. We are a rural, historic county and would prefer to stay that way. Driving through Middletown, DE, I see that the bypass has led to mass construction of cookie cutter homes and chain businesses. That is not what the residents of Kent County want. We fought off Walmart years ago, and we won. We will fight this as well, if needed. The lower shore would be a more logical place for a new bay bridge. Thank you. |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | <p>NOT, NEVER through Taylor's Is. and Dorchester County. That would be the ruination of a lovely part of the Eastern Shore and the Chesapeake. It would be a cultural, ecological, and aesthetic abomination.</p> <p>People move here to get away from all that traffic and general crap.</p> <p>PLEASE stay with the route you have. Add another span, if absolutely necessary. Which I question.</p> <p>[Name removed] Maryland Talbot Co. independent voter</p> |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | <p>Since replacing one of the existing bridges is also in the forecast, why not put the money into making it a super bridge that can carry all the predicted traffic, light rail, and buses? All the approach infrastructure is in place already. Needed would be more lanes on the new bridge and at the Eastern end, and removal of the tollgate and installation of a pay by mail/EZPass camera system as are in place in New Hampshire and California. Current traffic problems are created and exacerbated by providing so many extra toll lanes at the west end of the bridge and then squeezing all traffic back into two lanes on the bridge. For new bridges being built adjacent to old bridges check out the Oakland/Bay Bridge and the Tappan Zee.</p> <p>Please also bear in mind that travel in fifteen years will be different in ways only being hinted at today. You are proposing a bridge to solve today's traffic problems, which will make it obsolete the day it opens. Please, take the sensible approach. Spare all the Eastern Shore communities the disruption, dislocation and destruction that building a second Bay crossing would bring.</p> |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | <p>Hello,</p> <p>I believe a bay crossing could better serve if it was located south of the current bay bridge. I am in the transportation business and that would be a huge benefit to us and many other. This way the lower shore could be better served. It's such a long ways between the tunnel crossing and the bay bridge.</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|--------|---|
| | | <p>Plus a s a life long member of Kent county one of our major incomes is tourism the other is agriculture they would both be in jeopardy. If there were a crossing here it would take away the charm and peaceful rural landscape we've worked so hard to preserve.</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to read my comment!</p> |
| 12/15/2017 | email | <p>Dear Mr. Reigrut and members of the project team:</p> <p>Please find attached comments from the Chesapeake Bay Foundation on scoping for the Tier I EIS for a new Chesapeake Bay crossing. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. We would welcome the opportunity to meet with the project team. Please do not hesitate to contact me directly to schedule a meeting or discuss these comments in further detail.</p> <p>December 15, 2017</p> <p>Mr. Kevin Reigrut, Executive Director Maryland Transportation Authority 2310 Broening Highway Baltimore, MD 21224</p> <p>SUBMITTED AT WWW.BAYCROSSINGSTUDY.COM AND VIA EMAIL TO info@baycrossingstudy.com RE: MDTA Chesapeake Bay Crossing Study Tier I Environmental Impact Statement</p> <p>Dear Mr. Reigrut:</p> <p>The Chesapeake Bay Foundation appreciates this opportunity to comment on a potential purpose, need and scope for the Maryland Transportation Authority's Tier One Environmental Impact Statement (ISIS) for the Chesapeake Bay Crossing Study prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Per your invitation at the November 15, 2017 webinar, we respectfully request to meet with the project team to discuss our comments and other aspects of the study in further detail.</p> <p>Established 50 years ago, CBF is the largest non-profit organization dedicated solely to the restoration of the Chesapeake Bay. We maintain offices in three states and the District of Columbia and represent approximately 94,000 members in Maryland. Our education department operates 15 field programs for students and teachers across the watershed. Several of these facilities are located within the study's sub-area boundaries. In addition, our land and oyster restoration programs have created and enhanced oyster reefs in the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries and established riparian buffers, wetlands, and forest stands in the Maryland portion of the watershed. We encourage</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------|--------|--|
| | | <p>MDTA to protect these resources and ensure that the study fully accounts for the state's commitments to clean water as described in the Chesapeake Bay TMDL and Watershed Implementation Plans.</p> <p>CBF respectfully submits the following comments and recommendations on a potential purpose, need and scope for the Tier I EIS. In summary, we believe that the purpose and need should reflect the goals and objectives of state and regional plans. The study should not reject alternatives to a new crossing out of hand. The analysis of direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of proposed alternatives must account for the full extent of improvements to access corridors, changes in land use, and impacts on state goals for climate change and the health of the Chesapeake Bay.</p> <p>Specifically, we note that the stated need for a new crossing requires additional justification using updated projections for population growth and travel behavior. It also requires more solid grounding in applicable state, regional and local transportation and land use plans. The scope of the study should include alternative actions that emphasize growth and land use policy changes, enhanced transit, and additional transportation demand management options in lieu of and in combination with build• alternatives. The scope must be sufficiently broad to account for improvements and impacts along potential access corridors for a new crossing. Finally, the review of direct, indirect and cumulative effects should examine the impact of proposed alternatives on Maryland's progress towards commitments established to address climate change and water quality under the Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Act and the Chesapeake Bay TMDL.</p> <p>I. MDTA should revise outdated population and traffic projections and conduct a constrained analysis of demand that accounts for reasonably attainable changes to travel patterns across the region.</p> <p>Comments by the project team during the November 15, 2017 on-line scoping meeting indicated that the Tier I EIS will consider and, presumably, build upon the 2004 Transportation Needs Assessment and the 2006 Task Force Report. CBF agrees that these past efforts provide important context for the current study in terms of stakeholder views and the various considerations and impacts associated with a new crossing. However, we believe that the population and traffic projections included in these prior studies do not provide a valid basis to restrict the purpose and need of the Tier I EIS to the construction of a new vehicular crossing.</p> <p>The 2004 and 2006 studies were completed during a time of nearly unprecedented growth, and many of the population and traffic projections included in these studies have since been revised downward. For example, the 2004 Needs Assessment cites a growth rate of almost 20% in Queen Anne's County, 11% in Upper Eastern Shore counties and 8% in counties on the lower Eastern Shore from 2000 to 2010. Recent estimates from the Maryland State Data Center indicate that the growth rate on the Upper Eastern Shore has fallen to 1% since 2010. The growth rate on the Lower Eastern Shore is approximately 2% over the same time period. Six of the nine Eastern Shore counties have experienced decreases in population since 2010.</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------|--------|--|
| | | <p>The dramatic reduction in growth on the Eastern Shore calls into question the applicability of traffic projections from these early studies. The 2004 Needs Assessment projected traffic counts of approximately 135,000 vehicles per day at the Bay Bridge by the year 2025, which would exceed capacity of the Bay Bridge and approach roadways by 60%. In 2015, MDTA revised projected traffic at the Bridge down to 92,800 vehicles per day by 2040 less than half the original projected increase over nearly twice the time. The actual average daily traffic at the eastbound toll plaza was 73,100 in 2016, which is less than the number of vehicles that crossed the Bridge in 2007.</p> <p>The traffic projections in the 2015 Life Cycle Cost Analysis are based on more recent trends; however, these projections alone are insufficient to justify limiting the scope to a new crossing. First, the unconstrained model employed in the analysis is likely to overstate future conditions because it does not fully account for adaptive behaviors by travelers or transit providers. To our knowledge, the six-hour, 12-mile daily queues produced by the analysis would be unprecedented and are not supported by experience on more heavily traveled routes and toll facilities across the state. If congestion increases, more drivers are likely to alter their departure or arrival time. Commuters may opt to share rides, take transit or add telework days. In addition, the 2015 analysis did not include an origin-destination study, which is needed to determine whether (and if so, where) a new crossing would effectively increase accessibility in the region. Furthermore, it is unclear at this point to what extent the significant delays experienced along the westbound approach to the Bridge are related to conditions at the Bridge. Traffic studies conducted as part of the Tier I EIS should examine these dynamics and not prematurely foreclose the possibility that alternatives to a new crossing would be sufficient to address capacity concerns. Without this information, it is premature to restrict the purpose and need of the study to a new crossing.</p> <p>II. MDTA should identify a purpose that is consistent with state, regional and local plans, including an emphasis on system preservation, environmental stewardship and coordination with land use planning.</p> <p>Maryland's transportation system includes more than 32,000 miles of roads and 5,000 bridges serving urban and rural communities across the state. As you know, MDOT balances and prioritizes investments in this transportation network with a set of planning and funding tools including the Maryland Transportation Plan (MTP), short- and long-range plans from Maryland's six Metropolitan Planning Organizations, and transportation planning elements in local comprehensive plans. In particular, the MTP is used to identify the State's most critical transportation needs serves as MDOT's guiding policy document incorporates related State goals for sustainable growth, the economy, and the environment and how and where to direct Maryland's transportation investments. The plan is informed by an extensive stakeholder process and other important planning tools including the State Development Plan and the Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Act Plan.</p> <p>Federal transportation statutes state that the objectives of a proposed transportation project may include achieving a transportation objective identified in an applicable statewide or metropolitan transportation plan, and supporting land</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------|--------|---|
| | | <p>use, economic development, or growth objectives established in applicable Federal, State, local or tribal plans. • CBF could not identify a new crossing in any adopted state or regional transportation plan. The adopted MTP heavily emphasizes system preservation, environmental stewardship, and better coordination of transportation investments and land use planning, both as guiding principles and as specific strategies to manage congested infrastructure.</p> <p>Given that a new crossing is a novel project in terms of state and regional planning, it is imperative that the purpose, need, and alternatives presented in the Tier I EIS reflect adopted state goals and objectives. As of now, the purpose of the Tier I EIS appears limited to adequate capacity, dependable and reliable travel times, and flexibility to accommodate future maintenance and rehabilitation. Failure to expand the purpose and scope could create conflicts between the selected alternative and other state projects and needs, long-range land use planning, and established goals for environmental protection.</p> <p>Accordingly, we strongly recommend that MDTA expand the purpose of the Tier I EIS to include these core state planning objectives in a manner consistent with applicable federal statutes. This may lead MDTA to target a level of service at Bay crossing facilities that partially accommodates anticipated travel demand, which the Life Cycle Cost Analysis identified as a reasonable and available course of action. In any case, incorporating state and regional planning objectives will provide MDTA with the flexibility needed to balance perceived capacity needs with established goals for environmental protection and growth management.</p> <p>III. MDTA should include alternatives that combine enhanced land use management with transit and transportation demand management strategies alone and in combination with expansion or replacement of an existing span.</p> <p>The on-line scoping meeting materials state that the purpose of the Tier I EIS is to identify the corridor of a new crossing. A reasonable interpretation of this purpose is that the decision to build a new vehicular crossing has been made and that the study will be limited to identifying a specific location. CBF believes this conclusion is premature and should be evaluated within the study among a wide range of alternatives, not used to define the study's parameters. Additional alternatives should include, at a minimum, enhanced land use management, increased transit options, and rehabilitation or expansion of existing spans.</p> <p>The 2006 Task Force report highlights the importance and potential efficacy of enhanced land use management to reduce demand for capacity at the Bridge while satisfying other community and regional goals. Specifically, the report states that:</p> <p>The Task Force, particularly those representing Eastern Shore counties, expressed concern that new capacity would negatively affect communities and other resources within all four zones. They recommended that state and local jurisdictions focus on creating viable jobs, businesses, and industry on the Eastern Shore for its citizens so more roads are not needed.</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------|--------|--|
| | | <p>Many Task Force members commented on the potential to slow growth and reduce the demand for capacity across the Bay. Some suggested that because growth follows the addition of highways and public utilities, limiting that type of infrastructure would also limit growth and the demand for a new crossing.</p> <p>Clearly, a wide cross-section of stakeholders believed that enhanced land use management could reduce demand for cross-Bay travel such that an additional crossing might not be needed. Land use management strategies could also influence the effectiveness of build• options, including the relative suitability of a replacement span compared to a new crossing elsewhere on the Bay.</p> <p>Increased options for transit may have similar reductive effects on traffic congestion. The Maryland Transportation Authority's Analysis of Transit Only Concepts to Address Traffic Capacity across the Chesapeake Bay (2007) found that expanding transit could have positive effects on congestion at the Bridge. While the study did not recommend a transit only solution, the study states that because transit is projected to attract ridership and provide some congestion relief at the existing Bay Bridge, it is clear that transit could be an important component of any future studies on additional capacity across the Chesapeake Bay. It is possible that better matches between proposed transit service locations and the results of the origin-destination analysis would increase the projected effectiveness of transit. Preferential toll pricing for ride-sharing and other transportation demand management programs should also be explored to reduce cross-Bay travel demand.</p> <p>These strategies are likely needed under any alternative that MDTA ultimately selects. The 2006 Task Force report found that even with the construction of a southern crossing between Calvert and Dorchester counties, major capacity issues would remain on the existing bridge. US 50 outside Annapolis would remain severely congested. Construction of a northern crossing between Baltimore and Kent counties would not relieve congestion on US 50, either. Given these findings, it is difficult to envision a successful alternative that does not include enhanced land use, transit and transportation demand management.</p> <p>The cumulative effect of enhanced land use management, increased transit options, and additional strategies to reduce or flatten peak travel demand may be sufficient to justify a no-build alternative. These strategies may reduce the size and scope of the investment needed and the impacts associated with an expansion or replacement of the existing spans. These strategies appear to be essential to address congestion at the existing spans even if MDTA were to build a new crossing elsewhere on the Bay. MDTA has a responsibility under NEPA regulations to analyze reasonable alternatives not within the jurisdiction of the lead agency. CBF recommends that these alternatives include, at a minimum, enhanced land use management, increased transit, and transportation demand management strategies in lieu of a new crossing and in combination with alternatives that would expand or replace existing spans.</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments

October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------|--------|--|
| | | <p>IV. MDTA should ensure that the study's scope fully accounts for impacts associated with improvements to access corridors serving a new or expanded span.</p> <p>Federal NEPA regulations require that MDTA evaluate all connected, cumulative and similar actions associated with proposed alternatives. Among other criteria, actions are considered connected when they cannot or will not proceed unless other actions are taken previously or simultaneously, or when they are interdependent parts of a larger action and depend on the larger action for their justification. The 2015 Life Cycle Cost Analysis clearly identifies the efficacy of expanded capacity across the Bay as dependent upon improvements to access corridors, stating that:</p> <p>If improvements were only made to the Bay Bridge, they would not address the potential capacity limitations of US 50/301 on both sides of the bridge and would; therefore, not provide the regional transportation improvements needed to accommodate future traffic demand.</p> <p>In these cases, the scope and impact of improvements required to access corridors are likely to be substantial and could extend beyond the approximate sub-area boundaries identified for analysis during the on-line scoping meeting. The 2006 Task Force report states that for a southern crossing between Calvert and Dorchester counties:</p> <p>MD 4 would need to be upgraded with one to two additional lanes in each direction with greater controls of access from I-495 to Prince Frederick (32 miles). An access controlled freeway could be needed around Prince Frederick. In Dorchester County, an upgrade to MD 16 or construction of a new roadway may be necessary. This upgrade or new construction would impact small communities and roughly 20 miles of sensitive environmental areas (along and near MD 16). Because 85 percent of Dorchester County is covered by wetlands, the length of roadway bridges could be greater than the Bay crossing itself.</p> <p>The Tier I EIS must identify the full geographic extent and material scope of improvements necessary for access corridors to adequately support additional capacity across the Bay. The EIS must also include an analysis of the impacts associated with these improvements. We strongly encourage MDTA to employ a conservative approach in demarcating the study areas for each alternative to ensure that the full extent of necessary corridor improvements and their associated direct, indirect and cumulative impacts are adequately considered.</p> <p>V. MDTA should account for the direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of each proposed alternative on Maryland's commitments for air and water quality.</p> <p>Federal regulations specifically anticipate that a Tier I EIS should focus on broad issues such as general location, mode choice, and areawide air quality and land use implications of the major alternatives. These implications can include growth inducing effects and other effects related to induced changes in the pattern of land use, population density or growth rate, and related effects on air and water and other natural systems, including ecosystems. CBF concurs with the findings of the 2006 Task Force report that a new crossing is highly likely to focus substantial demand for growth</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments

October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------|--------|---|
| | | <p>and infrastructure in areas that otherwise would not experience such levels of development pressure. These indirect and cumulative impacts, along with the direct impacts associated with construction, land conversion and increased vehicle miles traveled could have deleterious effects on local and regional air and water quality. These activities may also impact subsurface habitat and system function for oysters, fish, and benthic communities.</p> <p>As you may know, the Chesapeake Bay and many of its tributary rivers and streams are listed as impaired waterways under Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act. As result of those impairments, the Chesapeake Bay states including Maryland asked the US Environmental Protection Agency to develop a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) for nitrogen, phosphorous and sediment in the Chesapeake Bay and the tributaries to the Bay. The Chesapeake Bay TMDL establishes specific pollution loading limits for all major source sectors, including agriculture, wastewater, stormwater, septic systems, atmospheric deposition, and forest. These limits represent the maximum amount of pollution that the Chesapeake Bay can assimilate while meeting water quality standards. Specific target loads for each sector have been assigned for the Bay watershed, the State of Maryland, major basins within the state, and county jurisdictions. All of these allocations require reductions from current loads. The state, in coordination with its local jurisdictions and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, has developed a Watershed Implementation Plan to provide reasonable assurance that these reductions will be achieved.</p> <p>Construction of a new crossing and associated improvements along access corridors could result in significant short term increases in pollution loads including nutrients, sediment and toxic contaminants. In fact, the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Model recognizes construction activity among the highest loading non-agricultural sources of nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment on a per-acre basis. Systemic, long term increases in pollution loads could result from the conversion, filling or degradation of porous, bio-active resource lands such as forests, wetlands, pastures, hay fields and mixed open areas along the route. Growth and development induced by the project is likely to increase pollution loads through additional wastewater flows, increased stormwater volumes, and new sources of air deposition from associated vehicle trips and energy consumption.</p> <p>Under the TMDL framework, new or expanding loads to an impaired water body must be accounted for and fully offset so there is no increase in pollution. It is highly likely that expanded travel capacity across the Bay will result in new pollution loads from construction activity, land conversion and future growth. These activities may also impede Maryland's ability to achieve goals that support habitat, fisheries and resource lands in the Chesapeake Bay Agreement. The Tier I EIS should examine the relative contribution to changes in pollution loads caused by each alternative's direct, indirect and cumulative impacts and identify any conflicts with the Bay Agreement, the Chesapeake Bay TMDL, local TMDLs, and any limits to assimilative capacity under Maryland's anti-degradation framework. MDTA should identify the feasibility and expense of offsetting these loads in accordance with federal law.</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------|--------|--|
| | | <p>CBF also recommends that MDTA evaluate the impacts of each proposed alternative on Maryland's progress toward statutory greenhouse gas reduction goals. The 2016 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Act of mandates development of a plan to achieve 40% reduction in emissions by 2030. This plan is under development now; strategies in the current plan (written to achieve earlier reduction goals) include support for transportation investments that reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT•) and increase the availability of transit. The Tier I EIS should evaluate the relative effectiveness of each proposed alternative in achieving these goals and identify any alternatives that would increase VMT or limit the provision of transit.</p> <p>In closing, CBF recognizes that traffic congestion at the Bay Bridge can result in delays during peak travel periods that many Marylanders consider unacceptable. We are also cognizant that a new crossing could have profound impacts on the health of the Chesapeake Bay and the communities that call it home. CBF seeks to be a constructive participant to help MDTA arrive at a solution that advances the state's goals for transportation, growth management and environmental protection. In that regard, we would appreciate the opportunity to meet with the project team and discuss the purpose, need and scope of this project in further detail.</p> <p>Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on the Tier I EIS. Please do not hesitate to contact our office at [Phone number removed] or by email at [Email Removed] to discuss these comments or schedule a meeting.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>[Name Removed], AICP Maryland Land Use Planner and Assistant Director Chesapeake Bay Foundation</p> <p>1 MDTA (2004). Transportation Needs Report, William Preston Lane Jr. Memorial (Bay) Bridge. Vol I, p. 3-1. 2 MDP (2017). Table 1A, Total Resident Population for Maryland's Jurisdictions, April 1, 2010 Thru July 1, 2016. Accessed online December 12, 2017. 3 MDTA (2004). p. ES-2. 4 Md Transportation Authority (2015). US 50/301 William Preston Lane Memorial (Bay) Bridge Life Cycle Cost Analysis. p. 12. 5 http://www.marylandroads.com/Traffic_Volume_Maps/Traffic_Volume_Maps.pdf. Accessed online December 13, 2017. 6 MD Dept of Transportation (2014/2016). 2035 Maryland Transportation Plan: Moving Maryland Forward. p. 3. 7 23 U.S.C. § 139(f)(3). 8 MDOT (2014/2016). pp. 9, 16, 18. 9 MDTA (2017). Chesapeake Bay Crossing Study Tier 1 NEPA, On-line Scoping Meeting November 15, 2017. Slide 27. 10 MDTA (2015) p. 23. 11 MDTA (2017) Slide 14. 12 MD Transportation Authority (2006) Task Force on Traffic Capacity Across the Chesapeake Bay. p. 29. 13 Ibid., p. 30. 14 Md Transportation Authority (2007). Analysis of Transit Only Concepts To Address Traffic Capacity Across the Chesapeake Bay. p. 3. 15 MDTA (2006). p. 12. 16 Ibid. p. 12 17 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14(c). 18 40 C.F.R. §1508.25(a).</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|--|
| | | <p>19 40 C.F.R. § 1508.25(a). 20 MDTA (2015). p. 1. 21 MDTA (2006). p. 12. 22 23 C.F.R. § 771.111(g). 23 40 C.F.R. § 1508.8(b). 24 United States Environmental Protection Agency (2010). Chesapeake Bay Total Maximum Daily Load for Nitrogen, Phosphorus and Sediment.25 Chesapeake Bay Program (2017). Phase 6 Watershed Model – Section 2 – Average Loads - Draft Phase 6. 26 40 CFR § 122.4(i) 27 Md. ENVIRONMENT Code Ann. § 2-1205(c). 28 MD Department of the Environment (2015). Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction PlanUpdate.</p> |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | I think that Kent County doesn't have the infrastructure to endure a bridge crossing. As well as the impact it could have on the Agri-tourism that this community thrives on. I feel a more suitable location would be where the existing bridges are or further south to help split the state. The distance between the bay bridges and the bridge tunnel is daunting for any one who wants to travel to the Salisbury area from Southern MD or such. |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | Please do not bring a third Bay Bridge to Kent County. This is my Home and my family has a long history of farming. While we no longer farm it is still very important to me. Once farm land is gone it is gone for good. Kent County would change forever and I do not want to see that happen to my community. I do not want to see the way of life change in our County. Thank you. |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | <p>Delaware and Maryland beach destinations are located south of both Washington DC and Baltimore.</p> <p>The existing Chesapeake Bay Bridge provides a direct route from Baltimore to these prime destinations. A second bay bridge located north of Baltimore would not provide a practical or efficient solution for reducing traffic on the existing bridge. It seems very unlikely that Baltimore residents would drive well north of the city to access a new bridge when the existing bridge offers a much shorter route.</p> <p>Travelers from the Washington DC area must now angle north to reach the Bay Bridge before turning back south to their final destination. The better solution for reducing congestion on the existing Bay Bridge would be to add lanes to the current structure or place a proposed second bridge south of the current bridge, offering a more direct route for residents of Washington DC and points south to the Delaware and Maryland beaches.</p> <p>The best location for a new bridge or tunnel is south of Chesapeake Beach, merging with Route 50 on the Eastern Shore near Cambridge, which is situated along the most direct route to the Atlantic vacation destinations.</p> |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | Considering the summer traffic, another crossing south of the current bridge would be best into Somerset County. Visitors to our resort area could utilize Rt. 13 & Rt. 113 which is currently under construction creating more lanes. This would also alleviate some of the regular back ups that occur on Rt. 50 as well. Ferry service would also be a great alternative in various areas of our bay.....one on the southern end and possibly a northern crossing if needed. Ferry service would benefit many residents and would save a lot of drive time for everyone south of the existing bridge. |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|---|
| 12/15/2017 | Website | <p>Adding a second bay bridge north of the Chesapeake Bay Bridge would not reduce congestion on the existing bridge. This seems obvious, since the most popular vacation destinations for visitors from metropolitan Washington and Baltimore are the Maryland and Delaware beaches located south of both cities.</p> <p>The existing Chesapeake Bay Bridge provides a very direct route from Baltimore to these prime destinations. A second bay bridge located north of Baltimore would not provide a practical or efficient solution for reducing traffic on the existing bridge. It seems very unlikely that Baltimore residents would drive well north of the city to access a new bridge when the existing bridge offers a much shorter route.</p> <p>Meanwhile, travelers from the Washington DC area must now angle north to reach the Bay Bridge before turning back south to their final destination. The better solution for reducing congestion on the existing Bay Bridge would be to add lanes to the current structure or place the proposed second bridge and/or tunnel south of the current bridge, offering a more direct route for residents of Washington DC and points south to the Delaware and Maryland beaches.</p> <p>Maps off the region show that the most practical location for a new bridge or tunnel would be south of Chesapeake Beach, merging with Route 50 on the Eastern Shore near Cambridge, which is situated along the most direct route to the Atlantic vacation destinations.</p> |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | <p>I oppose any proposal to build an additional bridge span through Kent county. Common sense would indicate a route further south would ease congestion for middle eastern shore communities while achieving greater access for heavily populated Washington DC metro area. Northern MD residences already have easern shore access by way of Chesapeake city.</p> |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | <p>I live in Kent County MD, and one of the reasons I moved here 13 years ago is because of the wonderfully preserved rural atmosphere. The rich soil and the cycle of the crops all year round are a sight to see. I have been driving over the Chesapeake Bay Bridge since the early 70's and recall what Kent Island looked like at the time - in fact the bridge at Kent Narrows was just a 2 lane draw bridge. Now the whole 7-8 miles of Kent Island looks like the same shopping mall you can see anywhere in the US.</p> <p>Please let Kent County be Kent County</p> |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | <p>I adamantly oppose any proposal for constructing a bridge crossing north of the existing Bay Bridge with a terminus in Kent County. It would be detrimental to the County's rural landscape and natural resource-based economy. There is no infrastructure to support such a bridge crossing in Kent County and makes no sense when the infrastructure already exists at the current bridge crossing.</p> |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | <p>I am AGAINST a new bay bridge connected to Kent County Maryland. Connecting Kent County to Baltimore will not improved the conditions in Kent County. The cost of infrastructure required to bring a major highway through Kent county would be excessive. Not only the bridge across the bay, but also multiple crossings of local tributaries and crossings of local roads leading to residences along their multiple shores. The ecology of these tributaries would be</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------------|---------|--|
| | | impacted by the pollution of multiple cars, trash and road runoff. This pollution would be destroy the delicate balance of these critical tributaries. These roads would bring people rushing to the beaches and low tax rate of Delaware, leaving nothing of the economic growth potential to Kent County and only connect us to the crime and drugs rampant in Baltimore. The proposed growth would destroy the very essence of why we live on the shore. If we wanted to be in Baltimore we could move there. Therefore there are NO reasons to pursue a Bay Bridge connection to Kent County. |
| 12/15/2017 | Website | Please help us preserve the farmland that remains, especially in beautiful Kent County. Once the farmland goes, it won't return. If a north bridge is chosen Kent County would soon become another Glen Burnie (one is enough). The flyway used by migrating wildfowl needs to be preserved for the future also. Please save our farmland. |
| 12/15/2017 | Email | I would hope the state would first consider increasing public transportation, including using buses and ferries, as a way to alleviate bridge congestion, before building a new bridge! Please help preserve the rural nature of Eastern Shore counties. [Name removed] Kent County |
| 12/15/2017 | Email | Gentlemen: My partner and I oppose any further consideration of running a bridge from Baltimore to Kent County. My work in community planning, both here and in Prince George's prior to our move to Chestertown, has seldom encountered a county that so thoroughly has determined the goals and polices needed to preserve its lifestyle and cultural landscape as has Kent County over recent decades. Their goals are successfully being achieved. However, a bay crossing into the County would demolish all of those carefully and broadly adopted plans. We both appreciate the video and work of Melissa Bogton in pulling together a platform for this comment. The addresses and contact info included below is for your verification purpose only. Please do not add us to a mailing list. [Names removed] |
| 12/15/2017 | Email | Attached are the comments from the Broadneck Council of Communities, Inc (Anne Arundel County) as requested by MDTA for the Initial Scoping Element of the Bay Crossing Study. If you have any questions please contact [Name Removed], President, at [Email address and phone number removed] or [Name removed], at [Email address and phone number removed]. Thank you for the opportunity to submit these comments. |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------|--------|---|
| | | <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>[Name removed], BCC President</p> <p>[Name removed], BCC Director-Transportation BROADNECK COUNCIL OF COMMUNITIES INC. (BCC) ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY SCOPING COMMENTS ON NEPA BAY AREA CROSSING STUDY, DECEMBER 15, 2017</p> <p>BACKGROUND</p> <p>A Notice of Intent (NOI) was published in the Federal Register on October 11, 2017 advising the public and affected local, state and federal agencies that an Environmental Impact Study will be prepared to assess the environmental impacts of addressing congestion at the Chesapeake Bay Bridge which could result in added capacity at the existing bridge or at a new location across the Chesapeake Bay. The NOI indicates this is a Tier 1 Environmental Impact Study (EIS), (with a Tier 2 document to follow if a “build” option is approved in Tier 1). It will be prepared in accordance with the regulations in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the most recent Federal Surface Transportation Act (FAST ACT). The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA- U.S. DOT) will be the lead federal agency and the Maryland Transportation Authority (MDTA) will be the Local Project Sponsor. It will involve the public, “cooperating and participating agencies” some having a signatory jurisdiction and “agencies with an interest in the Crossing Study.” The NOI indicated that “FHWA and MDTA will undertake a scoping process for the Chesapeake Bay Crossing Study that will allow the public and interested agencies to comment on the scope of the Tier 1 EIS. This public outreach effort will educate and engage stakeholders and solicit stakeholders input. FHWA and MDTA will invite all interested individuals, organizations, and public agencies to comment on the scope.....”</p> <p>In response to the above we are submitting the following comments.</p> <p>COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS</p> <p>The Study’s first public presentation was held Nov 15, 2017 in an on-line webinar format with simultaneous presentations at 6 sites, including Broadneck High School, in the 11 county study area. The presentation was billed as the “Scoping Session,” including a request for comments by December 15, 2017 on the Scoping element and the NEPA required “Purpose and Need” element. The Nov 15 public outreach session at Broadneck HS was attended by at most a handful of the “public.” Because of insufficient local notice more staff was present than public—although staff was not allowed to answer questions. For any questions that were asked we were told to “put them on a comment card and send them to MDTA.” The MDTA video presentation, “On-Line Scoping Meeting,” lasted a little over 13 minutes. The meeting started at 7:00PM and lasted about 15 minutes. There was no discussion, no Q and A, nor any “collaboration” of any kind with the public, although both the video and the NOI both referenced this need.</p> <p>We do not believe that the Scoping Session on November 15 meets either the spirit or the text described in the NOI to</p> |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments

October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------|--------|--|
| | | <p>“...to engage stakeholders...” Further to compound this is the request to submit comments by December 15, 2017. The video presentation was held a week before Thanksgiving and comments are requested 8 days before Christmas. This is a very busy time for both Christians and Jews to prepare for and celebrate these family holidays. We hope this was an oversight and not an artificial deadline to limit public involvement. Obviously more time is required to “educate and engage” the public and interested agencies to solicit meaningful scoping comments.</p> <p>To satisfy the “collaborative” public effort for this first phase; i.e., Scoping, and Purpose and Need, MDTA needs to address, in a Q and A open discussion format the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is NEPA? Why is the NEPA process so complex, costly and require so much time? 2. Why use the Tiering approach (Tier 1 and Tier 2) and how does it differ from the conventional NEPA study approach? Are there significant financial and legal differences between the Tiering and conventional approach? 3. Regarding the request for comments on “scoping” how do you define it? Is it scoping for detailed elements of the study such as traffic volume, access roads expansion, critical origin-destination studies, fish and wildlife habitat/ protection, Bay navigation requirements)... OR... broader implications to include modal alternatives (high speed or conventional trains, ferries, maglev), tunneling, double decking, development impacts/natural and historic resource impacts/commercial impacts and the like? 4. Are there nearly a dozen Federal and State agencies already involved as “participating agencies” (as one of the graphics in the video would imply)? What is their role? Will the impacted counties (planning, engineering, traffic, and public works, legal) departments be involved in the study? What about community and home owner associations in proximity to the existing Bay Bridge and alternative locations under consideration? Will there be a role for a Citizens Advisory Committee or something comparable? 5. Who is funding this study? Are there sufficient funds to analyze 10 to 15 corridor alternatives, as proposed, and properly compare alternatives (traffic, environmental, cost, land use, economic impacts, etc.)? Are there sufficient funds to complete the Tier 1 study thru the Draft and Final EIS and Record of Decision (ROD)? If not is Federal funding a possibility? 6. What and when are the required “public” review sessions in this Tier 1 effort? How does the public engage and submit its “go” or “no go” comments regarding the various alternatives? How are these comments, and by whom, incorporated into the decision making process? 7. As the project is much more than a bridge crossing, that is it involves approach roads, parallel service roads, maintenance/administrative facilities, water, sewer, lighting, related development and infrastructure requirements, -- will this kind of evaluation detail be presented in the Tier 1 effort? If not, how can a single alternative be selected? |

Bay Crossing Study Public Scoping Comments October 11, 2017 – December 15, 2017

| DATE | MEDIUM | COMMENT (Personally Identifying Information Removed) |
|------|--------|---|
| | | <p>8. How definitive will the cost of each of the alternatives be estimated? Will it include the cost of the related approach roads, ramps, intersections, service roads, etc.?</p> <p>9. Are both Eastern and Western Shore Counties going to be consulted for concurrence and agreement for the selection of span location options for a new bridge?</p> <p>10. Will a comprehensive range of funding alternatives be explored in this Tier 1 analysis? Will it include tolling, special benefit assessments, public-private ventures, federal, state and local funding alternatives?</p> <p>11. Are there “go,” “no-go” decision points built into the decision making process in the Tier 1 Analysis? If so, what and when are they?</p> <p>12. Assuming a Tier 1 is successfully completed, can right-of-way purchases be initiated, or does that require the completion of Tier 2?</p> <p>13. What if a build option is not approved after completion of the Tier 1 Study? What is the next step or other options to enable movement to the Tier 2 Study?</p> <p>We thank you for this opportunity for members of the BCC Executive Board to submit, for the record, our response for comments and questions by this December 15, 2017 deadline. We would like to work with you to gain more understanding of this planning process and will invite an MDTA management representative to attend one of our monthly board or quarterly general meetings to respond to these questions and comments. This, we believe, would be consistent with the “collaborative process” described in the NOI and the Scoping video.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted for the BCC Executive Board, [Name removed], President-BCC [Name removed], BCC Director – Transportation</p> <p>Note: The Broadneck Council of Communities, Inc. (BCC) encompasses the Broadneck Peninsula, which includes the western terminus of the existing Bay Bridge and those homeowner associations (HOA) contained therein. Of the 40,000 people who live in this Peninsula, our HOA members represent over 10,000 voters.</p> |

CHESAPEAKE BAY CROSSING STUDY TIER 1 NEPA



Maryland
Transportation
Authority

Comment Form

Date 11-15-17

Name: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED]

City: [REDACTED]

State: [REDACTED]

Zip: [REDACTED]

Telephone:

Email:

So, MD. could not handle the traffic that this bridge would create. We can't handle the traffic we have now. Specifically Zones 5+6

We need a new bridge going from Culvert Ct. (Sohomine) over to St. Marys!!!

In zones 5+6 ~~and~~ a new bridge would be disastrous.

Add onto the existing Bay Bridge if you really think this is needed. Where the roads going to the bridge can adequately ^{+trans} handle all the traffic

Please submit your comments by mail to:

Bay Crossing Study
Maryland Transportation Authority
Division of Planning & Program Development
2310 Broening Highway
Baltimore, MD 21224

You can also submit your comments electronically on the project's website at www.baycrossingstudy.com or by email at info@baycrossingstudy.com

☐

Check here to be added to the study mailing list



EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
NOV 28 2017

COUNTY COUNCIL OF TALBOT COUNTY

COURT HOUSE
11 N. WASHINGTON STREET
EASTON, MARYLAND 21601-3178
PHONE: 410-770-8001
FAX: 410-770-8007
TTY: 410-822-8735
www.talbotcountymd.gov

JENNIFER L. WILLIAMS, President
COREY W. PACK, Vice President

DIRCK K. BARTLETT
CHUCK F. CALLAHAN
LAURA E. PRICE

November 27, 2017

Kevin Reigrut, Executive Director
Maryland Transportation Authority
2310 Broening Highway
Suite 150
Baltimore, MD 21224

Re: Chesapeake Bay Crossing Study – Talbot County

Dear Director Reigrut:

Please consider this letter as the Talbot County Council's formal request that Talbot County be removed from consideration as a corridor for any proposed future capacity expansion across the Chesapeake Bay.

While the County Council recognizes that current and future traffic volumes may warrant the need for an additional crossing, Talbot County's road infrastructure is severely insufficient to handle the anticipated increases in traffic.

Sincerely,
COUNTY COUNCIL OF TALBOT COUNTY

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jennifer L. Williams", is written over the printed name and title.

Jennifer L. Williams
President

cc: Pete K. Rahn, Secretary, Maryland Dept. of Transportation
Senator Adelaide Eckardt
Delegate John Mautz, IV
Delegate Christopher Adams



**CALVERT COUNTY
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS**

Courthouse, 175 Main Street
Prince Frederick, Maryland 20678
410-535-1600 • 301-855-1243
www.co.cal.md.us

Board of Commissioners
Mike Hart
Tom Hejl
Pat Nutter
Evan K. Slaughenhaupt Jr.
Steven R. Weems

November 28, 2017

Ms. Michele K. Gross
Manager, Government Relations
Maryland Transportation Authority
Division of Project Planning & Program Development
2310 Broening Highway
Baltimore, MD 21224

Dear Ms. Gross:


We are writing to express our concerns over the potential Chesapeake Bay Bridge crossing located in Calvert County. Having a Chesapeake Bay Bridge located here would draw a tremendous amount of pass-through traffic to our small county, adding more stress to our already extremely busy and sometimes treacherous main artery, MD Route 4.

As you may know, Calvert County has worked hard to retain our rural character. Adding a Bay Bridge crossing, we believe, would have a detrimental impact on our ability to keep any sense of rural character intact. While we understand our location is potentially prime to your project, we feel it is imperative that you understand the absolute negative impact it would have on the lives of the 90,000 residents of Calvert County. Calvert County earned the title "Charm of the Chesapeake," because of the quality of life here; we do not want to see that quality of life tarnished in any way. A bridge such as this would, in our opinion, destroy the standard of living as we know it today.

We wish you well with your project. We just wanted you to understand how deeply concerned we are about having a Bay Bridge crossing in Calvert County. Please let us know if you have any questions or if you would like to discuss further.

Sincerely,


BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
CALVERT COUNTY, MARYLAND



Tom Hejl, President



Evan K. Slaughenhaupt Jr., Vice President



Mike Hart



Pat Nutter



Steven R. Weems