

[REDACTED]

Every road I drive on - Route 4 from 258 to I495 and I495 to Virginia - for example - suffers from gross negligence. These roads are perpetually covered in garbage, debris, dead animals, uncut grass and weeds, clogged drainage ditches.

I have complained for years to SHA. The condition and maintenance of both state and county roads is virtually non-existent - drive to Virginia - the contrast is dramatic once you leave Maryland. Maryland roads resemble those of a 3rd world nation.

With respect to the bay bridge - we cannot afford to build another one and we do not even have the construction expertise in this country to build it any longer. A new span will do nothing more than create more traffic, fuel more development and hasten the demise of what is left on the eastern shore.

COUNTY COUNCIL OF ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY, MARYLAND

Legislative Session 2021, Legislative Day No. 13

Resolution No. 32-21

Introduced by Ms. Fiedler and Ms. Rodvien

By the County Council, June 7, 2021

1 RESOLUTION in opposition to preparing a Final Environmental Impact Statement and
2 Record of Decision for the third span of the Chesapeake Bay Bridge

3
4 WHEREAS, on August 30, 2016, Governor Larry Hogan announced the funding
5 of \$5,000,000.00 for a Chesapeake Bay Bridge Third Span Study to be sponsored
6 by the Maryland Transportation Authority (“MDTA”); and

7
8 WHEREAS, in the spring of 2018, MDTA prepared purpose and need statements,
9 without review or input from Anne Arundel County; and

10
11 WHEREAS, the purpose statement is “to consider corridors for providing
12 additional capacity and access across the Chesapeake Bay in order to improve
13 mobility, travel reliability, and safety at the existing bridge”; and

14
15 WHEREAS, the need statement identifies the following needs: “adequate capacity,
16 dependable and reliable travel time, and flexibility to support maintenance and
17 incidents”; and

18
19 WHEREAS, the purpose and need statements fail to include a study of the
20 approaching and descending corridors on the Eastern and Western shores; do not
21 include an evaluation of the impacts to residents, commuters, and commerce on the
22 Eastern and Western shores; and do not address Quality of Life impacts on the
23 region, including safety, redundancy, commerce, growth, development, tourism, or
24 creating a more direct route to key Eastern Shore destinations; and

25
26 WHEREAS, MDTA initially identified 14 potential corridors for a third span of the
27 Bay Bridge, but in August of 2019, MDTA narrowed the potential locations to
28 three: (1) from Pasadena to Centreville; (2) the existing bridge corridor from east
29 of Annapolis, near Sandy Point State Park, to Kent Island; (3) from the Mayo
30 Peninsula in Anne Arundel County to near St. Michaels in Talbot County; and

31
32 WHEREAS, MDTA recently narrowed the potential location for a new Bay Bridge
33 to one and recommends building the new Bay Bridge in the corridor of the existing
34 two spans that cross between Anne Arundel County and Kent Island, stating that
35 the other locations would fail to divert sufficient traffic away from the existing
36 bridge; and

1 WHEREAS, in February of 2021, MDTA, in cooperation with the Federal Highway
2 Administration (“FHWA”), issued a Draft Environmental Impact Statement
3 entitled “Chesapeake Bay Crossing Study: Tier 1 NEPA”; and

4
5 WHEREAS, MDTA’s Draft Environmental Impact Statement indicates that a new
6 crossing is needed to accommodate increasing traffic volumes, but an analysis
7 funded by the Queen Anne’s Conservation Association suggests the traffic
8 projections are inflated; and

9
10 WHEREAS, it is highly likely that additional traffic lanes will be quickly offset by
11 greater demand, thereby further increasing traffic and congestion in central Anne
12 Arundel County; and

13
14 ~~WHEREAS, MDTA completed the Tier 1 Final Environmental Impact Statement~~
15 ~~and Record of Decision in February of 2021, without any additional public~~
16 ~~hearings; and~~

17
18 WHEREAS, FHWA and MDTA have announced their intention to issue a
19 combined Final Environmental Impact Statement and Record of Decision
20 sometime in the winter of 2021/2022; and

21
22 WHEREAS, while public comments received in response to a Draft Environmental
23 Impact Statement must be considered in drafting a combined Final Environmental
24 Impact Statement and Record of Decision, there is not a clear process set out in
25 federal law that mandates publication or a public comment period on the Record of
26 Decision; and

27
28 WHEREAS, there is significant opposition to the construction of a new bridge in
29 the corridor of the existing bridge; and

30
31 WHEREAS, constructing another crossing in the present corridor will take a
32 significant toll on 14 public parks, including Sandy Point State Park, and will
33 severely exceed the capacity of existing roadways and related infrastructure; now,
34 therefore, be it

35
36 *Resolved by the County Council of Anne Arundel County, Maryland, That it opposes*
37 *the completion of the Tier 1 Final Environmental Impact Statement and Record of Decision*
38 *for the third span of the Chesapeake Bay Bridge without further review and without*
39 *amended purpose and need statements; and be it further*

40
41 *Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be sent to County Executive Stuart Pittman;*
42 *Governor Larry Hogan; Gregory Slater, Maryland Secretary of Transportation; James*
43 *Ports, Jr., Executive Director, MDTA; Heather Lowe, Project Manager, MDTA; State*
44 *Delegates Heather Bagnall, Sid Saab and Michael E. Malone; State Senator Edward R.*
45 *Reilly; U.S. Senators Chris Van Hollen and Benjamin Cardin; U.S. Congressman Anthony*
46 *Brown; Pete Buttigieg, U.S. Secretary of Transportation; Jeanette Mar, Environmental*
47 *Program Manager, FHWA Maryland Division; Karen Kahl, Project Manager, RK&K; and*
48 *Tim Ryan, Project Manager, Traffic Analysis, AECOM.*

AMENDMENTS ADOPTED: June 21, 2021

READ AND PASSED this 21st day of June, 2021.

By Order:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Laura Corby". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Laura Corby
Administrative Officer

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT RESOLUTION NO. 32-21 IS TRUE AND CORRECT AND DULY ADOPTED BY THE COUNTY COUNCIL OF ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Sarah F. Lacey". The signature is cursive and somewhat stylized, with a large loop at the top.

Sarah F. Lacey
Chair