

**Bay Crossing Study Public Comments**  
**May 18, 2021 – May 31, 2021**

DATE	MEDIUM	COMMENT
5/18/2021	Web	<p>There seems to be a significant error in the studies conducted, as they appear to solely use the metric of vehicles crossing the bay bridge as their only criteria. The infrastructure of Rt 50 does not support additional traffic volume at the existing bridge location.</p> <p>Questions I would like answers to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Who were the representatives from Talbot County QAC involved in the decision making process?</li> </ol> <p>These counties are disproportionately impacted by the existing traffic volume to and from the current bridge location. Residents of Talbot and QAC who work in Western Shore counties are negatively impacted on at least 4/7 days a week, and non-work related travel is impossible eastbound on Thursday/Friday and Saturday and impossible westbound on Saturday, Sunday and Monday. Residents cannot travel, even on local roads during peak travel days, which seems totally neglected in the studies.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. How were the ADT numbers derived?</li> </ol> <p>The only figure that makes any sense and has any logic is the number assigned to Crossing 7, as its simple math to divide existing traffic volumes by the capacity of Option 7. To suggest that a bridge at corridor 11 would result in a net increase in bridge traffic at existing location isn't supported by any of the data in the report. It appears to be based on an incorrect modeling assumption derived from erroneous or ill-founded assumptions that fails to take into account adjusted travel patterns with the advent of a viable alternative. It also fails to take into account the negative aspects of existing travel when passing through Cambridge, Trappe, Easton, and all the traffic signal choke points between Easton and the Outlets.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Please provide more detail as to how options 10-14 were excluded?</li> </ol> <p>It appears that the lack of suitability of 8, 9, 10, 13 and 14 have been used to totally disregard 11 and 12 and again there is no basis for the ADT figures. The study also considers the impact of accessibility to employment centers as a negative, I doubt the people of DoCo would agree.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Can you confirm that there were no instructional bias included in the assignment of the studies that steered the studies to release findings that favor crossing 7? AN Objective review of the report indicated that this may have been the case, as all the data is skewed to support/endorse what appears to be a pre-determined outcome. It certainly appears that the report was created to confirm a decision that has already been made, rather than objectively and accurately assess the viable alternatives.</li> </ol>
5/18/2021	Web	<p>To Whom it May Concern:</p> <p>I hope my words reach you despite my lateness in submitting. I thought this had already been sent prior to the May 10 deadline.</p> <p>Before expressing my strong opposition to a 3rd Bay Bridge Span along Corridor 7 in the Bay Crossing Study, Tier 1, NEPA, let me begin by telling you that I spent extensive time reading through the 244 page Feb., 2021 DEIS. I have listened to the public comments made on April 14, 15, 21 &amp; 22 and have read as much as I possibly can to make an educated and thoroughly thought out conclusion.</p> <p>The conclusion (or presumption) that a third Bay Bridge through the existing Bay Bridge Corridor 7 is determined to be the best alternative as documented in the DEIS is deeply flawed.</p> <p>As a 30 year resident of Queen Anne's County my family and I believe there are valid and unanswered questions and significant concerns about the underlying traffic analysis, as documented in Queen Anne's Conservation Association sponsored study completed by AKRF, Inc. in December 2020 and further examined and documented in the QACA's 4/22/21 comments submitted via email.</p>

## Bay Crossing Study Public Comments May 18, 2021 – May 31, 2021

DATE	MEDIUM	COMMENT
		<p>Further the assumptions about travel habits post Covid, and the impact of intelligent vehicles all exist, are not addressed by the DEIS, is significantly weak and needs to be seriously studied and run to ground.</p> <p>There is an overarching issue that is at the heart of why the "Preferred Corridor Alternative" would be a catastrophic and irreparable disaster.</p> <p>The Rt 50/301 route is the wrong location for a "destination highway" from the western shore to the beach destinations. Such a highway should be a limited access high speed road that does not bisect urbanized, densely populated communities of Annapolis, Kent Island, Grasonville, Queenstown and Easton. Furthermore, it should not impose the irreparable environmental insult and damage that would occur in these largely environmentally sensitive areas.</p> <p>A clear eyed assessment should plainly see that the present Rt.50/301 route has become mainly a local highway that has been forced to accept a burgeoning seasonal traffic load that increasingly threatens the local livability of the communities that located along it. The full cost of the damage that an expansion of the existing corridor in economic, environmental and quality of life terms has been grossly underestimated in the State's studies to date.</p> <p>A separate, limited access, high speed crossing and corridor needs to be established with routing that carefully considers community and environmental impact. It should be accompanied by a high speed transit facility.</p> <p>Please do not move forward and build a 3rd span in Corridor 7 along the existing Rt. 50/301 route.</p> <p>In the Executive Summary of the April 2021 DEIS the first sentence begins with "The Chesapeake Bay is one of Maryland's most iconic and significant environmental resources." If the decision is made to construct a 3rd Bay Bridge along Corridor 7 you can restate that sentence in the future to read: The Chesapeake Bay use to be one of Maryland's most iconic and significant environmental resources.</p> <p>The responsibility for improving safe highway travel across the Chesapeake Bay is one that I take seriously so I will do my share to be a smart driver along the Rt. 50/301 corridor in the following manner:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I will not travel unnecessarily on the Rt. 301/50 highway.</li> <li>2. All highway travel will be organized in such a way to minimize use of the highway.</li> <li>3. I will travel at safe speed and do no damage to the highway.</li> <li>4. I will never purchase/drive an oversized truck so as to take more of the highway than I need for safe travel.</li> <li>5. I will be respectful of other drivers.</li> <li>6. I will never do donuts on any Bay Bridge.</li> <li>6. I will use technology and tools to drive off peak hours.</li> <li>7. I will not dispose of trash on the highway.</li> </ol> <p>Together we can make a difference. I will do my part. Will you?</p> <p>Respectfully submitted, [Name Redacted] [Address Redacted]</p>
5/18/2021	Web	Going through Pasadena Maryland should NOT be an option. It is already a nightmare with the traffic we have and adding bridge traffic will make it undeniably deplorable. It will force Pasadeniens to vacate the are for good.
5/19/2021	Web	There is no way the Lake Shore community and mountain itself could sustain the influx of traffic associated with another Bridge to the Eastern Shore. We do not have the infrastructure needed. Despite how dangerous the road in on a normal basis the county has been unable to find a way to widen or improve the road or deal with the various above ground wires and associated poles. There is no public water which may be necessary in the event of vehicle fires etc. all of these obstacles aside I DO

## Bay Crossing Study Public Comments May 18, 2021 – May 31, 2021

DATE	MEDIUM	COMMENT
		NOT WANT to share my small community with the hundreds of travelers who will inundate the area. Thank you for your consideration, this project would devastate our area.
5/27/2021	Email	<p>Studies on where to put another bay bridge crossing have been going on for years with hundreds of thousands of dollars wasted. Summer beach traffic occurs Thursday through Sunday every weekend in the summer. Residents of Kent Island, Chester, Queenstown and Easton are held captive by the traffic backups. If there is a medical emergency in any of the Kent Island or Chester communities along Rt 50, responders have difficulty getting through as accidents and gridlock are common occurrences.</p> <p>The reason another bridge by the existing bridges is favored by Governor Hogan may be economics, but to the residents in the affected areas it is insane. To add more traffic coming from the North across the bay to an already overcrowded congested Route 50/301 is crazy and unacceptable.</p> <p>To build another bridge South or North of the existing bridges to handle beach traffic makes more sense.</p>