

Bay Crossing Study Public Comments
April 1, 2026 – April 30, 2025

Date	Medium	Comment
4/27/2026	Website	I would love to see a pedestrian/bike path included in the new bridge design/construction.
4/27/2026	Website	No pedestrian or bike lane. Enough problems without them.
4/27/2026	Website	I am writing in support of a pedestrian/bike lane for the new Chesapeake Bay Bridge. Considering the lifespan of this new bridge, it would be shortsighted of us to only take into consideration full-sized vehicles, when just in the past couple years electric bicycles have added a viable, economical, and environmentally superior form of travel. A pedestrian option shouldn't be considered simply as a "nice to have" tourist option, but should be considered also in terms of what transportation might look like in 50 years. Will everyone still be driving enormous gas guzzling SUVs and 5,000 lb+ EVs, or might shorter trips start to include much smaller scale travel on electric (or whatever the next thing is) bicycles/scooters/etc.? \$1.2B to add the pedestrian lane now is expensive, no doubt. Adding it later couple be exponentially more expensive.
4/28/2026	Website	I support adding safe bike/pedestrian pathway(s) on the new Bay Bridge projects. This will enhance/extend trail use between the two shores of the Chesapeake Bay. As a recreational bicyclist (in my seventies no less) I recognize the value of this extension to the proposed bridge projects both for local cyclists and for enhancing tourism offerings in Maryland. Please allocate the funds needed to make this a reality!
4/30/2026	Email	Ms. Lowe, I wanted to provide some commentary on the Tier 2 BCS. I have grave concerns about the validity of some of its most basic conclusions regarding alternatives analysis and scale that should be addressed. Transit Alternatives Scope Asymmetry While the transit alternatives were forced to examine the entirety of the journey from Baltimore or Washington to Ocean City, which totals 192 miles, the highway alternative was able to constrain itself to just the 22-mile corridor surrounding the bridge. My principal concern is not the length of the transit alternative but the length of the highway alternative. Multiple other items in the statewide CTP and in local CIPs, both in 2017 and today, deal with the influx of tourist traffic. The highways-only alternative should examine the entirety of the journey, just as the transit alternative does. This presents significant scope difficulties, I realize, but a symmetrical analysis is critical to the NEPA process. Cost Analogues No matter the mode, any of the transit alternatives will be intercity, crossing vast stretches of rural landscape or using highway medians. However, the cost parallels were chosen for their geographic proximity, not operational similarity, resulting in extremely high costs. Using the raw Silver Line Metrorail extension as an analogue for heavy rail, for instance, renders a project more expensive per mile than California High Speed Rail. The Purple Line is exceptionally expensive, too, and is not a valid model. The highly urban Corridor Cities Transitway was also inappropriate. Brightline West, Texrail, and the Sonoma-Marina Area Rail Transit (SMART) are all superior cost alternatives, rendering costs that are between (using 2026 dollars) \$49 million per mile and \$98 million per mile, rather than \$289 million and \$321 million per mile. Ridership The use of mixed-traffic commuter buses as a baseline for modelling ridership on an intercity, traffic-separated transit service was exceptionally inappropriate. Not only are the markets different – commuter trips vs. all trips vs. intercity trips – but the mixed-traffic nature of the services makes them impossible to utilize as demand analogues. Furthermore, because the model was static, it was immune to known mechanisms for ridership elasticity, including speed, headway, fare cost, or station location. Furthermore, by modelling the transit alternatives apart from the MSTM, the ridership model was unable to take into account the value of transit relative to the value of bridge travel. This resulted in exceptionally high personal vehicle occupancy levels. When the MSTM outputs average vehicle occupancy above 2, and goes as high as 2.9, the model is indicating total saturation of the system and the spontaneous end of SOV travel in the corridor. Had the model been able to shunt these riders to a transit alternative, it would have likely yielded more realistic vehicle occupancy and allowed the overflow to utilize transit instead. Travel Demand Summer Weekend Days The Summer Weekend Days (SWED) travel demand values were calibrated first for 2017 at approximately 118,000, then 2022 at approximately 104,000, but the SWED surge seems to have declined

Date	Medium	Comment
		<p>further, to 94,000, as of 2024 and 2025. This is likely due to a spread of demand across five days (Thursday-Monday) rather than three (Friday-Sunday), according to tourist board information and the Summer Lookbacks published by MDTA. This decline puts into doubt the forecasted demand of 135,000 vehicles per day by either 2040 (Tier 1 date) or 2045 (Tier 2 date). MSTM may need to be recalibrated to reflect the shift.</p> <p>Non-Summer Weekdays While I have not been able to identify Non-Summer Weekday (NSWD) values for 2024-2026, the annual AAWDT from MDOT counts on the bridge indicates stagnating demand at around 79,000 vehicles per day. While the average AAWDT growth since 2021 is on target for 94,000 by 2045, this is likely too high given that, in the base years for both Tier 1 and Tier 2, NSWD demand was around 68,000. The MSTM should be run again using more current data.</p> <p>Static Land-Use However, by using a static land use input developed by localities, MSTM does not allow for realistic feedback between traffic congestion and development viability or land value. This is the ultimate source of the unrealistically high vehicle occupancy modelled in the Tier 1 study and deployed as part of the transit analysis. Furthermore, it is very likely that the land use forecast is built around optimistic projections of improved roadway conditions, ensuring that the stated need for roadway capacity is being led by assumptions of additional roadway capacity. Interviews with local officials in 2022 for Baltimore Magazine imply optimistic biases in planned land uses, too.</p> <p>A travel demand model that takes into account the impacts of both transportation capacity and transport mode options would shake out some of these potential biases and provide cleaner and more realistic alternatives analyses. A new model should be developed and utilized for the demand analysis.</p> <p>Bridge Modernization and Lane Capacity The appendices of the Tier 2 DEIS indicate that a modernized bridge structure could improve vehicle throughput per lane per hour by between 6% and 11%. This assumption is not supported by research from peers such as the Golden Gate Bridge, San Francisco Bay Bridge, Tappan Zee Bridge, or other structures and so cannot be verified.</p> <p>Despite this assumed improvement in lane capacity, neither the Tier 1 nor Tier 2 analysis took it into consideration. Modernization and the attendant improvements to capacity and reliability were core parts of the Purpose & Need statement, and so should have been modelled when choosing the number of required lanes to meet travel demand.</p> <p>Blended Alternatives The alternatives analyses in Tier 1 and Tier 2 did not take into account the complementary nature of congestion pricing, transit alternatives, and a modern bridge structure. While congestion pricing was deemed insufficient due to the long duration of peak SWED congestion, improvements to per lane capacity and/or the addition of transit alternatives could have provided sufficient relief to allow congestion pricing to function as a demand management tool.</p> <p>Furthermore, the spreading of summer travel demand from 3 to 5 days and the attendant slumping of SWED demand; the relative stagnation of AAWDT; additional vehicle per lane per hour improvements; the potential for transit as an alternative if modeled properly; and potential land use shifts due to congestion or demand management, congestion pricing on a 6-6-6 alternative may be able to adequately manage current and future demand. However, by cutting the 6-6-6 alternative, congestion pricing, and transit in the Tier 1 analysis, the blended and complementary nature of these three tools was not even explored, let alone explored alongside shifting travel patterns.</p> <p>While I compliment the BCS for finding a reasonable location and limiting the footprint of a new Bay Bridge, I do not believe the 6-8-6 Alternative C has been weighed against the 6-6-6 alternative and has not been analyzed with current travel patterns in mind. I also believe the transit alternative was cut arbitrarily, with severe methodological flaws guaranteeing its failure. Finally, I believe the project suffers from artificial segmentation given the origins and destinations of summer travellers and the incorporation of summer demand surges, including reference to Chesapeake Bay Bridge flows, in projects described in the statewide CTP and local CIPs far beyond the 22-mile scope.</p> <p>These deep flaws baked into even the Tier 1 assessment that forms the baseline of the Tier 2 assessment require a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement to remedy, and the delay of the Record of Decision scheduled for November 2026 until such an SEIS can be drafted and commented upon.</p>



Bay Crossing Study Public Comments
April 1, 2026 – April 30, 2025



Date	Medium	Comment
		Thank you for your time, [Name Redacted]Principal Urban Mobility Strategist & Assumptions Auditor Edmondson Planning Strategies [Phone Number Redacted]