CHESAPEAKE
BAY CROSSING STUDY
TIER 1 NEPA

WELCOME TO THE 2019 OPEN HOUSES

U S DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

MDTA
Maryland
Transportation
Authority

Open Houses

CHESAPEAKE BAY CROSSING STUDY
TIER 1 NEPA

2019 Open Houses

- **Tuesday, September 24 (6-8 p.m.)**
  Kent County H.S.
- **Wednesday, September 25 (6-8 p.m.)**
  Queen Anne's County H.S.
- **Thursday, September 26 (6-8 p.m.)**
  Calvert H.S.
- **Tuesday, October 1 (6-8 p.m.)**
  Middle River Middle School
- **Wednesday, October 2 (6-8 p.m.)**
  Anne Arundel Community College
- **Thursday, October 3 (6-8 p.m.)**
  Talbot County Community Center

The Maryland Transportation Authority (MDTA) is hosting a series of Open Houses to provide updates on the Chesapeake Bay Crossing Study: Tier 1 NEPA (Bay Crossing Study). Open House attendees will learn about:

- the environmental review process for the Bay Crossing Study,
- the overall study schedule,
- public comments received to date, and
- the alternatives development, screening process and results.

All meeting materials are available at baycrossingstudy.com. Comments may be provided at the meetings, online or by email/U.S. mail.

Maryland Transportation Authority

Bay Crossing Study Overview

The Bay Crossing Study will:

- Identify potential solutions to address existing and future traffic congestion at the William Preston Lane Jr. Memorial (Bay) Bridge,
- Encompass a broad geographic area, spanning nearly 100 miles of the Chesapeake Bay, and
- Result in a Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).



Overview: Environmental Process

CHESAPEAKE BAY CROSSING STUDY
TIER 1 NEPA

- The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is federal legislation that applies to projects receiving federal funding or approval.
- NEPA requires consideration of a reasonable range of alternatives and ensures that environmental agencies and the public are informed and involved in the consideration of environmental impacts.
- The MDTA and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) are following a tiered NEPA process.

Tier 1 (current study)

- Establish Purpose and Need
- Evaluate a range of alternatives across the Bay using broad-scale engineering and environmental information
- Include public involvement and comment
- Identify the Preferred Corridor Alternative
- Prepare a Tier 1 EIS

Tier 2 (future study)

- Refine Purpose and Need
- Identify alignments within the Preferred Corridor Alternative identified in Tier 1
- Include more detailed engineering of alternatives and specific assessment of potential environmental impacts
- Include public involvement and comment
- Select a Preferred Alignment within the Preferred Corridor
- Prepare a Tier 2 EIS

Tier 1 completion does not presume Tier 2 initiation.

Tier 2 is not funded at this time.

Overview: Study Schedule

CHESAPEAKE BAY CROSSING STUDY
TIER 1 NEPA



Public Meeting Topics

November 2017: Scoping Meeting

May 2018: Purpose and Need, Existing Traffic and Environmental Conditions

September/October 2019: Presentation of Range of Alternatives and Preliminary Corridor Alternatives Retained for Analysis

Overview: Public Comments to Date

CHESAPEAKE BAY CROSSING STUDY
TIER 1 NEPA

The MDTA has received more than **1,100 comments** since the start of the study through July 31, 2019. All comments received on the Bay Crossing Study are available at baycrossingstudy.com.

Percentage of Comments by Topic Area



Overview: Purpose and Need

CHESAPEAKE BAY CROSSING STUDY TIER 1 NEPA

The **PURPOSE** of the Bay Crossing Study Tier 1 NEPA is to consider alternatives for providing additional capacity and access across the Chesapeake Bay in order to improve mobility, travel reliability and safety at the existing Governor William Preston Lane Jr. Memorial (Bay) Bridge.

The project **NEEDS** include:

- adequate capacity
- dependable and reliable travel times
- flexibility to support maintenance and incident management

As part of the study, the MDTA will also consider:

- financial viability
- environmental considerations

Alternatives Screening Process

CHESAPEAKE BAY CROSSING STUDY
TIER 1 NEPA

Apply Identified Needs and Related Considerations to:

Modal and Operational Alternatives (MOA)

TSM/TDM, Ferry, and Transit (Bus and Rail), which do not add new roadway capacity for vehicular traffic

Corridor Alternatives

Two-mile wide corridors where a new crossing of the Chesapeake Bay might be located

No-Build Alternative

The No-Build Alternative includes existing infrastructure, and any future improvements already planned and funded.

WE ARE HERE

Preliminary Alternatives Retained for Analysis

Corridor Alternatives

Corridors that best meet the Purpose and Need criteria for adequate capacity and related considerations are being carried forward for further analysis.

No-Build Alternative

Preferred Corridor Alternative

A Preferred Corridor, approximately 2 miles wide, that best meets the Purpose and Need in Tier 1 NEPA could be carried forward into Tier 2 NEPA

Tier 2 EIS

At the conclusion of Tier 1, evaluate multiple alignments within the 2-mile wide Preferred Corridor Alternative as well as a no-build alternative

TIER 1 NEPA

TIER 2 NEPA

Development of Modal and Operational Alternatives (MOA)

CHESAPEAKE BAY CROSSING STUDY
TIER 1 NEPA

Alternative		Description
Transportation System Management / Travel Demand Management (TSM/TDM)		Infrastructure and operational changes to improve operations of the existing roadway network without adding major new capacity. Improvements could include all-electronic tolling, variable tolls, and/or other TSM/TDM.
Ferry Service		A ferry service including one or more sets of ferry terminals to connect the Eastern Shore and Western Shore. May include roadway improvements to connect terminals to existing roadways.
Transit	 	Bus service, light rail, or heavy rail connecting major destinations on the Eastern Shore and Western Shore. Bus service could cross on the existing Bay Bridge or could use a new Bay crossing. A new Bay crossing would be needed to support a new rail line.

Maryland Transportation Authority

Development of Corridor Alternatives

CHESAPEAKE BAY CROSSING STUDY
TIER 1 NEPA

The Tier 1 Corridor Alternatives development process includes a broad geographic area to identify a reasonable range of corridors. The MDTA identified 14 corridor alternatives that were screened to narrow the range of alternatives.



The 14 identified corridor alternatives:

- are approximately two miles wide
- are generally perpendicular to the shorelines
- generally connect to peninsulas or long stretches of Chesapeake Bay shoreline
- avoid mouths of rivers or other large bodies of water
- generally avoid towns and developed areas where practical
- extend from a freeway or major state highway on the Western Shore to US 301, US 50, or US 13 on the Eastern Shore

Alternatives Screening Criteria & Considerations

CHESAPEAKE BAY CROSSING STUDY
TIER 1 NEPA

The alternatives were evaluated to determine if they met the Purpose and Need adequate capacity criteria. The MDTA then analyzed the alternatives that met these criteria to see if they achieved dependable and reliable travel times, and provided adequate flexibility to support bridge maintenance and incident management. Cost, financial, and environmental inventory data were also considered.

SCREENING CRITERIA

Project Needs

- Provide adequate capacity at the existing bridge
- Provide dependable and reliable travel times at the existing bridge
- Provide flexibility to support maintenance and incident management at the existing bridge

CONSIDERATIONS

Cost and Financial Considerations

- Length and complexity of Chesapeake Bay crossing
- Length and type of roadway connections to Chesapeake Bay crossing on both shores

Environmental Considerations

- Inventory of environmental resources and sensitive lands
- Potential for indirect and cumulative effects

Alternatives Screening: Modal and Operational Alternatives (MOA)

CHESAPEAKE BAY CROSSING STUDY
TIER 1 NEPA

Transportation Systems Management/ Travel Demand Management (TSM/TDM)

Operational improvements to existing roadway networks such as all-electronic tolling (AET) and variable tolling

- Includes no major new capacity
- AET may result in slightly better operations in the eastbound direction only (where toll booths exist today)
- Variable tolling could shift traffic to nighttime hours, when maintenance activities on the bridge largely occur, negating any benefit
- May have relatively minor environmental impacts
- TSM/TDM alone would not meet the project need to provide adequate capacity at the existing bridge

Ferry Service

One or more ferry routes owned and operated by a private entity

- One ferry route conveys fewer than 1,000 vehicles/day
- Ferry terminals, roadway approach infrastructure, and ferry service operation could impact environment
- Estimated fare would not be enough to cover operational costs
- Ferry service alone would not meet the project need to provide adequate capacity at the existing bridge

Transit Service

One or more bus rapid transit (BRT) routes or a new rail system operated between the Western Shore and Eastern Shore

BRT

- Would operate on the existing bridge and roadways, so minimal construction and impacts would result
- Most or all cost would be related to bus service operations
- Removes fewer than 1,600 vehicles/day from the existing Bay Bridge on summer weekends and less on non-summer weekdays
- Would not meet the project need to provide adequate capacity at the existing bridge

Rail

- Would require construction of a new crossing and approach infrastructure with corresponding costs and impacts
- Removes fewer than 1,600 vehicles/day from the existing Bay Bridge on summer weekends and less on non-summer weekdays
- Would not meet the project need to provide adequate capacity at the existing bridge

Alternatives Screening: Modal and Operational Alternatives (MOA)

CHESAPEAKE BAY CROSSING STUDY
TIER 1 NEPA

- Results of the MOA Screening shows that alone, none of the MOAs meet project needs. Therefore, the MOAs have been eliminated from further analysis in this Tier 1 NEPA study.
- TSM/TDM, Ferry Service, and Bus Rapid Transit would be studied in combination with alignment alternatives in Tier 2 NEPA.
- Due to its high costs/impacts, Rail would not be studied in combination with alignment alternatives in Tier 2 NEPA.

Maryland Transportation Authority
MDTA

Assessment of Project Needs

Three types of traffic analyses were performed using the Maryland Statewide Travel Demand Model to determine how well each Corridor Alternative would meet the Project Needs at the existing Bay Bridge.

Provide Adequate Capacity

- Developed traffic volume forecasts for 2040 for existing bridge and each corridor
- Compared 2040 volumes at the existing Bay Bridge (assuming a new crossing) with 2017 volumes at the Bay Bridge

For those corridors that resulted in some congestion relief at the existing Bay Bridge compared to 2017, two additional screening criteria were applied:

Provide Dependable and Reliable Travel Times

- Travel times during congested conditions are highly variable
- Queue lengths and durations were used to assess travel times

Provide Flexibility to Support Maintenance and Incident Management

- During maintenance or incidents on the existing bridge or approaches, drivers may want/need to divert to another crossing, if one is available
- Travel times on diversion routes to new crossing were evaluated



Provide Adequate Capacity: Traffic Forecasts

CHESAPEAKE BAY CROSSING STUDY
TIER 1 NEPA

2040 Average Daily Traffic (ADT) Compared to 2017 ADT at Existing Bay Bridge



	No-Build		Corridor Alternative 1 I-95 to US 301 between Aberdeen (Harford County) and Cecilton (Cecil County)		Corridor Alternative 2 I-95 to US 301 between Abingdon (Harford County), Kent County, and northern Queen Anne's County	
Does this corridor cause volumes at the existing Bay Bridge in 2040 to drop below existing levels?	**Non-summer Weekday**	**Summer Weekend**	**Non-summer Weekday**	**Summer Weekend**	**Non-summer Weekday**	**Summer Weekend**
	Not Applicable	**Not Applicable**	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**

Maryland Transportation Authority
MDTA

Provide Adequate Capacity: Traffic Forecasts

CHESAPEAKE BAY CROSSING STUDY
TIER 1 NEPA

2040 Average Daily Traffic (ADT) Compared to 2017 ADT at Existing Bay Bridge



	Corridor Alternative 3 I-95 to US 301 between White Marsh (Baltimore County), Chestertown (Kent County), and central Queen Anne's County		**Corridor Alternative 4** I-695 to US 301 between Essex (Baltimore County), Kent County and Centreville (Queen Anne's County)		**Corridor Alternative 5** I-695 to US 301 between Edgemere (Baltimore County), Rock Hall (Kent County), and Centreville (Queen Anne's County)	
Does this corridor cause volumes at the existing Bay Bridge in 2040 to drop below existing levels?	**Non-summer Weekday**	**Summer Weekend**	**Non-summer Weekday**	**Summer Weekend**	**Non-summer Weekday**	**Summer Weekend**
	NO	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**	**YES**

Provide Adequate Capacity: Traffic Forecasts

CHESAPEAKE BAY CROSSING STUDY
TIER 1 NEPA

2040 Average Daily Traffic (ADT) Compared to 2017 ADT at Existing Bay Bridge



	Corridor Alternative 6 MD 100 to US 301 between Pasadena (Anne Arundel County), Rock Hall (Kent County), and Centreville (Queen Anne's County)		Corridor Alternative 7 US 50/301 to US 50 between Crofton (Anne Arundel County) and Queenstown (Queen Anne's County) ***Existing Corridor***		Corridor Alternative 8 US 50/301 between Crofton (Anne Arundel County) and Easton (Talbot County)	
Does this corridor cause volumes at the existing Bay Bridge in 2040 to drop below existing levels?	**Non-summer Weekday**	**Summer Weekend**	**Non-summer Weekday**	**Summer Weekend**	**Non-summer Weekday**	**Summer Weekend**
	NO	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**	**YES**

Maryland Transportation Authority

Provide Adequate Capacity: Traffic Forecasts

CHESAPEAKE BAY CROSSING STUDY
TIER 1 NEPA

2040 Average Daily Traffic (ADT) Compared to 2017 ADT at Existing Bay Bridge



	Corridor Alternative 9 MD 4 to US 50 between Deale (Anne Arundel County) and Easton (Talbot County)		Corridor Alternative 10 MD 4 to US 50 between Chesapeake Beach (Calvert County) and Trappe (Talbot County)		Corridor Alternative 11 MD 2/4 to US 50 between Prince Frederick (Calvert County) and Cambridge (Dorchester County)	
Does this corridor cause volumes at the existing Bay Bridge in 2040 to drop below existing levels?	**Non-summer Weekday**	**Summer Weekend**	**Non-summer Weekday**	**Summer Weekend**	**Non-summer Weekday**	**Summer Weekend**
	NO	**YES**	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**

Maryland Transportation Authority

Provide Adequate Capacity: Traffic Forecasts

CHESAPEAKE BAY CROSSING STUDY
TIER 1 NEPA

2040 Average Daily Traffic (ADT) Compared to 2017 ADT at Existing Bay Bridge



	Corridor Alternative 12 MD 2/4 to US 50 between Saint Leonard (Calvert County) and Cambridge (Dorchester County)		Corridor Alternative 13 MD 2/4 to US 50 between Lusby (Calvert County) and Cambridge (Dorchester County)		Corridor Alternative 14 MD 235 to US 13 between Lexington Park (St. Mary's County) and Princess Anne (Wicomico County)	
Does this corridor cause volumes at the existing Bay Bridge in 2040 to drop below existing levels?	**Non-summer Weekday**	**Summer Weekend**	**Non-summer Weekday**	**Summer Weekend**	**Non-summer Weekday**	**Summer Weekend**
	NO	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**

Maryland Transportation Authority

Provide Adequate Capacity: Traffic Forecasts

CHESAPEAKE BAY CROSSING STUDY TIER 1 NEPA

2040 Summer Weekend Average Daily Traffic



2040 Non-Summer Weekday Average Daily Traffic



In summary:

- Ideally, the future volumes would be LOWER than the existing (2017) volumes at the existing Bay Bridge. Corridor 7 provides the most congestion relief.
- On Summer Weekends, Corridors 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 are the only corridors that reduce volumes on the Bay Bridge to below existing (2017) levels.
- On Non-Summer Weekdays, Corridors 7 and 8 are the only corridors that reduce volumes on the Bay Bridge to below existing (2017) levels.
- Corridors 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 were carried forward for additional screening to determine if they met the remaining project needs.

Provide Dependable and Reliable Travel Times

CHESAPEAKE BAY CROSSING STUDY TIER 1 NEPA

What will backups at the existing Bay Bridge be in 2040 as compared to 2017?

Corridors 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 were evaluated for reliable travel times because they would reduce volumes on the existing Bay Bridge to below 2017 levels.

	Typical Summer Weekend: Number of Hours where Backup is 4 Miles or Greater	Typical Non-Summer Weekday: Number of Hours where Backup is 1 Mile or Greater
Existing Bay Bridge (2017)	**0**	**0**
5	**0**	**3**
6	**0**	**1**
7	**0**	**0**
8	**0**	**1**
9	**1**	**6**
Existing Bay Bridge (2040) - No-Build Alt.	**9**	**9**

- The chart above compares the number of hours that backups and congestion would occur at the existing Bay Bridge in 2040 under Corridor Alternatives 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and the No-Build Alternative.
  - Corridor 7 results in the least amount of backups at the existing Bay Bridge for both summer weekends and non-summer weekdays.
  - Corridors 6 and 8 result in backups over 1 mile on non-summer weekdays for 1 hour at the existing Bay Bridge.
  - Corridors 5 and 9 result in longer backups at the existing Bay Bridge than Corridors 6, 7 and 8.

Provide Dependable and Reliable Travel Times

CHESAPEAKE BAY CROSSING STUDY
TIER 1 NEPA

What will the Levels of Service (LOS) at the existing Bay Bridge be in 2040 as compared to 2017?

Corridors 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 were evaluated for Levels of Service because they would reduce volumes on the existing Bay Bridge to below 2017 levels.

	Typical Summer Weekend: Hours with LOS E or F		Typical Non-Summer Weekday: Hours with LOS E or F	
	Eastbound	Westbound	Eastbound	Westbound
Existing Bay Bridge (2017)	10	9	3	0
5	10	8	3	2
6	9	5	3	1
7	0	0	0	0
8	8	2	3	1
9	10	8	3	2
Existing Bay Bridge (2040) – No-Build Alt.	12	10	5	2

- The chart above compares the number of hours that LOS would be E or F at the existing Bay Bridge in 2040 under Corridor Alternatives 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and the No-Build Alternative.
  - Corridor 7 results in no LOS E or F at the existing Bay Bridge for both summer weekends and non-summer weekdays.
  - Corridors 6 and 8 result in some LOS E or F on both summer weekends and non-summer weekdays at the existing Bay Bridge.
  - Corridors 5 and 9 result in the most hours of LOS E or F at the existing Bay Bridge.

Level of Service (LOS) is used to describe traffic flow on a scale of "A" to "F". ("A" is the best and "F" is the worst. Generally, "D" is the lowest acceptable LOS.)



Provide Flexibility to Support Maintenance and Incident Management at Existing Bridge

CHESAPEAKE BAY CROSSING STUDY
TIER 1 NEPA

- Corridors 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 were evaluated as part of the travel time analysis because they would reduce volumes on the Bay Bridge to below existing (2017) levels.
- During maintenance or incidents, travelers may want/need to divert to another crossing if one is available.
- Diversion travel times from the existing Bay Bridge to Corridors 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 were developed.
  - Corridor 7: traffic can divert more than 25 minutes faster than the other corridors
  - Corridors 6 and 8 have similar results: approximately 26 additional minutes
  - Corridors 5 and 9 have similar results: approximately 40-43 additional minutes



INCIDENT DIVERSION SUMMARY

Origin: US 50/US 301 interchange on the Western Shore
Destination: US 50/US 301 interchange on the Eastern Shore

Corridor #	Total Mileage (mi.)	Total Travel Time (min.)	Additional Travel Time from existing Bay Bridge (min.)
5	73	79	43
6	56	62	26
7	33	36	0
8	57	62	26
9	70	76	40

Maryland Transportation Authority
MDTA

Cost and Financial Considerations

CHESAPEAKE BAY CROSSING STUDY TIER 1 NEPA

The cost of a new Chesapeake Bay crossing is based on engineering factors such as the length of crossing needed for each alternative (on-land and water). The chart below shows the total length of each on-land and water crossing, allowing comparison of the potential cost magnitude among alternatives.



Corridors requiring longer, more complex crossings and approach infrastructure would be more expensive to construct.

Maryland Transportation Authority

Environmental Considerations

CHESAPEAKE BAY CROSSING STUDY
TIER 1 NEPA

The **environmental inventory** quantifies the presence of natural, cultural and socioeconomic resources within the two-mile wide corridors. The environmental inventory does not reflect **environmental impacts** from the project. Actual environmental impacts would be a subset of the full inventory; the potential impacts would be evaluated in a Tier 2 NEPA study. The environmental inventory includes the following resources:

- ✓ Military Land
- ✓ Parks and Wildlife Refuges
- ✓ Residential Land Use
- ✓ Priority Funding Areas
- ✓ Low Income and Minority Census Tracts
- ✓ Prime Farmland
- ✓ Cultural Resources (historical sites, objects, structures, etc.)
- ✓ Wetlands
- ✓ Perennial Streams
- ✓ Floodplains
- ✓ Open Water
- ✓ Submerged Aquatic Vegetation
- ✓ Natural Oyster Bars
- ✓ Forested Land
- ✓ Chesapeake Bay Critical Areas
- ✓ Sensitive Species Project Review Areas
- ✓ Coastal Barrier Resources Act (CBRA) Protected Lands



Environmental Inventory

CHESAPEAKE BAY CROSSING STUDY
TIER 1 NEPA



Resources by Corridor

NOTE:
The environmental inventory does not reflect impacts from a new crossing. The numbers shown reflect an inventory of the resources present with each 2-mile wide corridor.

CHESAPEAKE BAY CROSSING STUDY
TIER 1 NEPA

Maryland Transportation Authority

Environmental Inventory

CHESAPEAKE
BAY CROSSING STUDY
TIER 1 NEPA



Resources by Corridor

NOTE:

The environmental inventory does not reflect impacts from a new crossing. The numbers shown reflect an inventory of the resources present with each 2-mile wide corridor.

Maryland Transportation Authority

CHESAPEAKE
BAY CROSSING STUDY
TIER 1 NEPA

Maryland Transportation Authority

Environmental Inventory



CHESAPEAKE
BAY CROSSING STUDY
TIER 1 NEPA

Maryland Transportation Authority
MDTA

Environmental Inventory

CHESAPEAKE BAY CROSSING STUDY
TIER 1 NEPA



Resources by Corridor

NOTE:
The environmental inventory does not reflect impacts from a new crossing. The numbers shown reflect an inventory of the resources present with each 2-mile wide corridor.

Maryland Transportation Authority
MDTA

Environmental Considerations

CHESAPEAKE BAY CROSSING STUDY
TIER 1 NEPA

- The MDTA considered the potential for **indirect effects** from each corridor alternative. The screening considered:
  - **Undeveloped Land.** Providing new access to rural lands could lead to pressure for new development.
  - **Priority Funding Areas**. Designated areas where growth would be consistent with local plans.
  - **Proximity to Employment Centers.** Corridors that provide new access within a typical commute time (approximately 30 to 45 minutes) of a major employment center could drive demand for residential development.
  - **Consistency with County Master Plans.**
- Corridors 3, 4 and 5 would have the greatest potential to induce indirect effects from new development on the Eastern Shore due to their proximity to the Baltimore Metropolitan area, and prevalence of undeveloped farmland on the Eastern Shore.
- More detailed analysis of potential indirect and cumulative effects will be presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS.

Preliminary Corridor Alternatives Retained for Analysis (CARA)

CHESAPEAKE BAY CROSSING STUDY
TIER 1 NEPA



In accordance with NEPA, **Corridors 6, 7 and 8** will be carried forward as the preliminary CARA because they are the only corridors to sufficiently meet the Purpose and Need. The **No-Build Alternative** will also be carried forward.

- **Corridor 6**: MD 100 to US 301 between Pasadena (Anne Arundel County), Rock Hall (Kent County) and Centreville (Queen Anne's County)
- **Corridor 7/Existing Corridor**: US 50/301 to US 50 between Crofton (Anne Arundel County) and Queenstown (Queen Anne's County)
- **Corridor 8:** US 50/301 between Crofton (Anne Arundel County) and Easton (Talbot County)

Preliminary Corridor Alternatives Retained for Analysis (CARA)

CHESAPEAKE BAY CROSSING STUDY
TIER 1 NEPA



Corridor 6: MD 100 to US 301 between Pasadena (Anne Arundel County), Rock Hall (Kent County) and Centreville (Queen Anne's County)

- Reduces the duration of unacceptable Level of Service at the existing Bay Bridge on summer weekends but not on non-summer weekdays
- Relieves congestion at the existing Bay Bridge on summer weekends but not on non-summer weekdays
- Reduces backups at the existing Bay Bridge on summer weekends and non-summer weekdays
- Provides a more desirable diversion route than Corridor 5 and Corridor 9, but not as efficient as Corridor 7
- Less compatible with existing land-use patterns, resulting in greater potential for indirect effects

Preliminary Corridor Alternatives Retained for Analysis (CARA)

CHESAPEAKE BAY CROSSING STUDY
TIER 1 NEPA



Corridor 7/Existing Corridor: US 50/301 to US 50 between Crofton (Anne Arundel County) and Queenstown (Queen Anne's County)

- Best reduces the duration of unacceptable Level of Service on summer weekends and non-summer weekdays
- Best relieves congestion at the existing Bay Bridge compared to all other corridors on both non-summer weekdays and summer weekends
- Reduces backups at existing Bay Bridge on summer weekends and non-summer weekdays
- Provides best diversion route
- More compatible with existing land-use patterns, resulting in fewer indirect effects

Preliminary Corridor Alternatives Retained for Analysis (CARA)

CHESAPEAKE BAY CROSSING STUDY
TIER 1 NEPA



Corridor 8: US 50/301 between Crofton (Anne Arundel County) and Easton (Talbot County)

- Reduces the duration of unacceptable Level of Service at the existing Bay Bridge on summer weekends but not on non-summer weekdays
- Relieves congestion at the existing Bay Bridge on both non-summer weekdays and summer weekends
- Reduces backups at the existing Bay Bridge on summer weekends and non-summer weekdays
- Provides a more desirable diversion route than Corridor 5 and Corridor 9, but not as efficient as Corridor 7
- Less compatible with existing land-use patterns, resulting in greater potential for indirect effects

We Want To Hear From You!

CHESAPEAKE BAY CROSSING STUDY TIER 1 NEPA

- Fill out a comment card at this meeting
- Visit the website at baycrossingstudy.com
- Email your comments to info@baycrossingstudy.com
- Attend the Public Hearings in 2020
- Comments are vital to the success of the study and will be taken into consideration throughout the study.
- Public comments will be posted on the project website. The MDTA will attempt to remove personal information such as names, addresses, phone numbers and email addresses.



CHESAPEAKE BAY CROSSING STUDY TIER 1 NEPA

2019 Open House

Comment Form

Please provide your comments on the range of alternatives presented.

Please provide comments on the Preliminary Corridor Alternatives Retained for Analysis (CARA) (Corridors 6, 7 and 8 shown on the map to the right).

Which three factors are most important to you in selecting the preferred Corridor Alternative?

☐ Reducing congestion ☐ Engineering / Construction ☐ Safety

☐ Environmental impacts ☐ Community / Development impacts ☐ Cost

☐ Other (explain)

Over



Maryland Transportation Authority