



Appendix B

Summary of Public Comments Received

- 9/11/03 Focus Group Meeting #1 Minutes
- 9/30/03 Focus Group Meeting #2 Minutes
- 10/27/03 Focus Group Meeting #3 Minutes
- 2/24/04 Focus Group Meeting #4 Minutes

APPENDIX B.

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM THE NOVEMBER 18, 2003 SECTION 100 PUBLIC WORKSHOP

ID	Name	Organization	Focus Group Member?	Date Received
1	Perry Scott Bowser		No	11/18/03
COMMENTS: Wants noise wall, request call				
2	Luci Smith		No	11/18/03
COMMENTS: Wants noise wall, request notification of Focus Group Meetings				
3	Mike Poniatowski		No	10/25/03
COMMENTS: Wants interchange at Kenwood or Hazelwood Ave.				
4	Albert Zorn	Perry Hall Imp. Assoc.	Yes	10/28/03
COMMENTS: Attended Focus Group Meetings, no response needed				
5	Steve Martin		No	11/18/03
COMMENTS: Concerned about ROW impacts to Joppa Rd. residents				
6	Phil Garrett		No	11/18/03
COMMENTS: Concerned about ROW impacts to Joppa Rd. residents				
7	Harvey & Jeanne Bair		No	11/18/03
COMMENTS: Wants a noise wall, water drainage from I-95				
8	John G. Gregory		No	11/18/03
COMMENTS: Wants noise wall. Was soil analysis done? Is funding available?				
9	Fred & Frances Myers		No	11/18/03
COMMENTS: Support managed lanes. Wants a noise wall.				
10	Lynn Burca	Kings Court Townhouse Assoc. #2	Yes	11/18/03
COMMENTS: Concerned about traffic during construction				
11	Susan Ches	Hazelwood Park East Civic Assoc.	Yes	11/18/03
COMMENTS: Concerned about truck accidents. Supports managed lanes.				
12	Carol & Scott Brown		No	11/18/03
COMMENTS: Concerned about long term air quality, related projects, and noise				
13	Carole Derus		No	11/18/03
COMMENTS: Wants noise wall.				

ID	Name	Organization	Focus Group Member?	Date Received
14	Joan Siejack		No	11/18/03
COMMENTS: Wants noise wall.				
15	Sam & Joan DeFazio		No	11/18/03
COMMENTS: Wants noise wall.				
16	Fred M. Jonjo		Yes	11/18/03
COMMENTS: Wants noise wall.				
17	Jessie Bangert		No	11/18/03
COMMENTS: Wants noise wall.				
18	Dennis Seibel		Yes	11/18/03
COMMENTS: Supports Option 2B @ I-895. Supports Option 2A @ I-695. Supports Option 2B @ MD 43. Incorrect label on display.				

MEMORANDUM

To: Attendees

From: Melissa Williams
MdTA Project Manager

Date: October 27, 2003

RE: *Focus Group Meeting*
Section 100: I-95, I-895(N) Split to North of MD 43
White Marsh Public Library, White Marsh, MD

On September 11, 2003, the Maryland Transportation Authority (Authority) conducted a Focus Group Meeting for the Section 100 project planning study. The purpose of the meeting was to introduce the Focus Group to the Authority, provide members an overview of the Section 100 project, review the project schedule and address/receive questions and comments from the public. Those in attendance included:

Attendees:

- Mr. Rich Bolton - McCormick, Taylor & Associates
- Ms. Lynn Burca - King's Court Townhouse Association
- Mr. Bruce Campbell - Nottingham Properties
- Mr. Cornelius Carmody - Gunpowder Valley Conservancy
- Mr. George Ches - Hazelwood Park East Civic Association
- Mrs. Susan Ches - Hazelwood Park East Civic Association
- Ms. Mary Deitz - Maryland State Highway Administration – Regional Planning
- Mr. Keith Duerling - Maryland Transportation Authority
- Mr. Ken Goon - Rummel, Klepper & Kahl / Maryland Transit Administration
- Mr. Emory Hines - Baltimore County Department of Public Works
- Ms. Melissa Kosenak - Maryland Transportation Authority
- Mr. Jack Moeller - Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson
- Ms. Roxane Mukai - Maryland Transportation Authority
- Ms. Andra Parker - McCormick, Taylor & Associates
- Mr. David Pinning - Baltimore County Office of Planning
- Mr. John Quinn - Baltimore County (representing Hon. Joseph Bartenfelder)
- Mr. Dennis Seibel - King's Court Condominium Association
- Mr. Tom Seymour - South Perry Hall Improvement Association
- Mr. Preston Snedegar - South Perry Hall Improvement Association
- Ms. Wanneta R. Thompson - Garden Village Community Association
- Mr. Charlie Utermohle - McCormick, Taylor & Associates
- Mr. Sam Wilkes - McCormick, Taylor & Associates
- Mr. Matt Wolniak - Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson
- Mr. Al Zorn - Perry Hall Improvement Association

Ms. Kosenak, the Authority Project Manager for Section 100, began the meeting with brief introductions. She then described the goals of the meeting and the role of the Focus Group. The Focus Group will meet with the Project Team approximately once a month between September and November and work cooperatively with them to meet the goals and objectives of the project. Focus Group members are encouraged to discuss Section 100 project information with their respective groups / organizations, to relay public comments back to the Focus Group, to ensure that proposed improvements to I-95 are sensitive to local community and business concerns. Opportunities for public involvement include the Focus Group meetings, advertised Public Meetings and the Section 100 Project Website.

BACKGROUND

Ms. Kosenak provided a brief overview of the Maryland Transportation Authority. The Authority is the State agency that owns, operates, maintains, funds and provides law enforcement for Maryland's seven toll facilities, including the Governor Harry W. Nice Memorial Bridge (US 301), the William Preston Lane, Jr. Memorial (Bay) Bridge (US 50/301), the Francis Scott Key Memorial Bridge (I-695), the Baltimore Harbor Tunnel Thruway (I-895), the Fort McHenry Tunnel (I-95), the Thomas J. Hatem Memorial Bridge (US 40) and the John F. Kennedy Memorial Highway (I-95).

I-95 MASTER PLAN

Ms. Kosenak then discussed the recently completed I-95 Master Plan. The Master Plan was a cooperative effort that looked at improvements to the John F. Kennedy Memorial Highway (JFK) to meet both existing and future transportation needs for I-95 from the I-895(N) split to the Delaware State Line. The Authority in coordination with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) reviewed the transportation needs and environmental inventory in an effort to identify independent projects. These independent projects include: Section 100 (from the I-895/I-95 to north of MD 43); Section 200 (from north of MD 43 to north of MD 22); Section 300 (from north of MD 22 to north of MD 222) and Section 400 (from north of MD 222 to the Delaware State Line). The Maryland Transportation Authority adopted the I-95 Master Plan in April of 2003. Planning for the first independent project, Section 100, began soon thereafter.

A brief overview of Section 100 was presented, including a discussion of the study boundaries and the project purpose and need. Section 100 begins at the I-895(N) split and ends north of MD 43 in the vicinity of New Forge Road. This section has the most immediate need for improvements.

MASTER PLAN TRAFFIC

Mr. Wolniak presented an overview of traffic in regard to the I-95 Master Plan and Section 100. During a weekday peak hour count sampled in April 2001, approximately 12% to 16% of passenger vehicles on the JFK had an auto occupancy of two or more occupants north of MD 43 (White Marsh Boulevard). This percentage increased to 27% during the mid-day hours. A concurrent sample taken at the JFK toll plaza indicated that 32% to 37% of the peak period weekday passenger vehicles carried two or more occupants. During a sample count on a weekend afternoon in May 2001, 66% of the vehicles on the JFK at the toll plaza had two or more occupants.

Currently, truck volumes of approximately 500 vehicles per hour remain steady throughout much of the day accounting for approximately 10% to 15% of the total weekday traffic along the JFK but only 5% of peak period, peak direction traffic in the urban, southern section. Trucks constitute approximately 5% to 6% of the total weekend traffic.

Weekday

Analyses indicate that in 2020, during weekday peak periods, the JFK south of MD 24 would be operating at or above its theoretical capacity. During the AM peak hour, the southbound JFK would operate at LOS F between I-895(N) and MD 152, and LOS E between MD 152 and MD 543. During the PM peak hour, the northbound JFK would operate at LOS F between I-895(N) and MD 543 and LOS E between MD 543 and MD 22.

Weekend

North of MD 543, 2020 weekend peak period traffic volumes along the JFK will continue to exceed 2020 weekday peak period traffic volumes. South of MD 543, weekend volumes are expected to increase significantly with peak period weekend volumes approaching 75% to 90% of peak period weekday volumes. Currently, weekend peak period traffic volumes are approximately 65% of weekday peak period traffic volumes.

By 2020, during the weekend peak period, the JFK is expected to operate at LOS F between MD 24 and MD 272 and at LOS E south of MD 24 and between MD 272 and the Delaware state line.

MASTER PLAN TRANSIT

Mr. Goon presented an overview of transit throughout the I-95 corridor. The JFK is part of an established multi-modal corridor. Amtrak, Maryland Rail Commuter (MARC) and commercial bus services carry one out of every seven passenger trips across the Susquehanna River. Additional bus transit on the JFK is provided by the Maryland Transit Administration (MTA) and the local jurisdictions. Highway improvements such as transit or shared transit preferences and enhanced park-and-ride station access may improve transit use.

MASTER PLAN FREIGHT

Freight rail service in the study area is provided by three major rail lines: Amtrak's North East Corridor (NEC), CSX Transportation's (CSXT) Philadelphia Subdivision, and Norfolk-Southern's (NS) Port Road Line. Amtrak's service is limited to high priority/low bulk and weight packages. CSXT and NS operate 60 to 70 freight trains per day within the study area. In the vicinity of the JFK, forty-six of every 100 tons of freight carried across the Susquehanna River are carried by rail.

MASTER PLAN SCHEDULE

Ms. Kosenak then presented the design year timetable for each Section of the I-95 Master Plan. Project planning for Section 100 will take 2-3 years to complete. Three Master Plan Concepts were presented as possible Alternates for Section 100. Master Plan Concept C-1: The No-Build Alternate is the scenario if no major improvements are made to the JFK, only routine maintenance and safety improvements. Master Plan Concept C-5: Managed Lanes Alternate includes the use of managed lanes in combination with general purpose and collector-distributor (CD) lanes. Master Plan Concept

C-6: General-Purpose Lanes includes general-purpose lanes as well as CD lanes. The estimated costs and schedule for each section of the I-95 Master Plan were reviewed. Section 100 improvements are needed today; the anticipated cost is \$750 million.

At this point, members of the Focus Group were provided the opportunity to ask questions and to comment concerning the Authority as well as the I-95 Master Plan.

- Q: Mr. Pinning asked if the I-95 Master Plan would coincide with the Delaware Master Plan.
- A: Ms. Kosenak explained that the Authority is coordinating with the Delaware Department of Transportation and the Wilmington Planning Council to assure the continuity of I-95 between the states.
- Q: Mr. Seymour inquired where the money for the project would be coming from.
- A: Ms. Kosenak stated that the funds for improvements to the JFK Section 100 are included in the Authority's overall capital program.
- Q: Mr. Carmody asked how frequent exits would be along the managed lanes and how the managed lane concept would improve traffic.
- A: Ms. Kosenak replied that the number of entrances and exits along the managed lanes would be controlled to facilitate traffic flow. Vehicles traveling on I-95 would not be required to use the managed lanes. If access was not available via the managed lanes, access at the existing interchanges would still be available via general-purpose lanes.
- Q: Mr. Seymour asked if the extension of MD 43 will be taken into consideration during Section 100 project planning.
- A: Mr. Wolniak stated that the traffic forecast and analysis that would be used to design concepts for Section 100 assumes that the extension of MD 43 would be completed.
- Q: Ms. Thompson inquired what the role of focus group members would be.
- A: Ms. Kosenak asked the Focus Group members to share project information with their groups/ organizations and bring back to the Focus Group any input or questions their members may have. It was noted that each member received two copies of the PowerPoint presentation – one in color and one in black and white. The black and white versions were distributed for photocopying purposes.
- Q: Mr. Carmody noted that there were no trucks pictured in the managed lanes photograph and questioned the purpose of this.
- A: Ms. Kosenak explained that various management strategies were considered for the managed lanes concepts including truck use. The lack of trucks shown in the picture was purely coincidental.
- Q: Mr. Seymour questioned why improvements currently underway in the tunnels couldn't be done during night hours to reduce the impact of the tunnel closure on traffic.

A: Mr. Duerling responded that the extended hours of work reduce the total length of time it will take to complete the repairs. The Authority has been observing the traffic situation, and has made reductions to the hours that the contractor can work. The traffic impacts of the project will continue to be monitored.

SECTION 100

At this point, the meeting question and answer period was closed and the presentation was turned over to Mr. Utermohle. He began with the Section 100 project schedule. The Authority will hold a Public Workshop on November 18th at the Perry Hall Middle School. Final project planning activities are planned for the spring of 2005 and construction is planned to begin in the fall of 2006. The limits of the study area were outlined, interchanges and existing communities noted and future development discussed.

SECTION 100 TRAFFIC

Section 100 is the most congested section of I-95 in Maryland north of Baltimore City. It currently operates at a Level of Service (LOS) F during the morning and evening rush hour. By 2025, it is expected to operate at LOS E and F during weekend peak periods. Increased congestion levels will extend the existing peak hour into a period of several hours duration and increase the level of diversion to alternate routes, such as the community oriented US 1, US 40 and MD 7. It was noted that while the accident rate is currently lower than the statewide average rate for comparable urban interstates in Maryland on Section 100, the number of accidents is increasing, especially in the vicinity of the I-895 and MD 43 interchanges, where large amounts of merging, diverging and weaving movements occur. Left hand entrances and exits were also noted as having a higher potential for accidents. If the anticipated congestion levels are not addressed, an increase in the number and severity of accidents would likely occur.

SECTION 100 TRANSIT

Mr. Goon discussed various transit options that are planned for the Section 100 study area. Improvements to Section 100 should provide transit patrons with faster and more reliable bus service. He also noted that a potential extension of the Baltimore Regional Rail System may include a future transit station with access to I-95 within the study area.

SECTION 100 LAND USE & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Utermohle presented information regarding the land use and economic development within the I-95 corridor. I-95 is a major transportation facility that influences both inter and intra-regional road transportation. It provides access to local and regional inter-modal terminals including the Port of Baltimore. The Section 100 study area is located on the urban side of Baltimore County's Urban Rural Demarcation Line (URDL) and is designated by Baltimore County within the Priority Funding Area (PFA). Major on-going development within the PFA / Study Area includes the White Marsh Town Center, the Middle River Employment Center and the Honeygo Development.

SECTION 100 ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Various environmental issues will be considered throughout the planning and design of Section 100 alternates. Natural wetlands and terrestrial habitat will be identified and their quality, function and

values will be assessed. Potential hazardous waste issues will be identified through review of Maryland Department of Environment (MDE) files and verified through field reconnaissance. Once existing conditions have been defined, avoidance measures will be investigated.

Maryland Historical Trust (MHT) and the National Register of Historic Places files will be reviewed for recorded cultural resources. The condition and sensitivity of archeological resources will be determined and a plan developed for initial field surveys. Historic properties will be investigated to determine their National Register eligibility. Where appropriate, avoidance and minimization measures will be examined. Noise sensitive sites will be documented, existing noise levels monitored and potential impacts determined. Where standards are exceeded, abatement strategies will be investigated. The impact of the project on local air quality will also be assessed.

Mr. Utermohle announced the dates, times and location of the next two Focus Group meetings and the Public Workshop. The meeting was then opened up to questions and comments from the Focus Group.

Q: Mr. Zorn asked if there was anyone present to represent the State and County involvement in the project.

A: Mr. Utermohle recognized representatives from the Authority, State Highway Administration (SHA), Maryland Transit Administration (MTA) as well as Baltimore County, and reiterated the State and County's continued interaction regarding Section 100.

Q: Mr. Zorn noted that residents within the study area have noticed in past years that as improvements are made to I-95, more motorists decide to utilize it. He asked if traffic would worsen with the improvements and if the local arteries would be affected negatively.

A: Ms. Kosenak explained that the goal of the project is not to *eliminate* traffic on I-95, but rather to *manage* it. Managing traffic on I-95 may relieve congestion on the local routes if motorists desiring to use I-95 did not divert to the local alternate routes of US 40, MD 7 and US 1.

Q: Mr. Zorn inquired about funds available for the maintenance of the JFK.

A: Ms. Kosenak explained that toll revenues are the source of Authority funds

Q: Mrs. Ches asked if there was going to be an increase in toll rates in order to fund the Section 100 project.

A: Ms. Kosenak stated that any potential toll increase would aid in funding Authority projects statewide, with a portion being allocated to the JFK improvements. However, toll increases are not being made for the sole purpose of generating funds for Section 100.

Q: Mr. Campbell inquired what the impacts of widening I-95 would be on property owners adjacent to the right-of-way (ROW).

A: Mr. Moeller explained that some areas will require additional ROW acquisition, especially near the interchanges. Mr. Utermohle explained that the new roadway may not be centered on the existing centerline. It may shift slightly to either side to minimize impacts. Mr.

Moeller noted that other minimization efforts such as retaining walls and mitigation efforts could reduce the impact on properties adjacent to I-95.

Q: Mr. Snedegar asked if the additional flow of traffic would increase the already elevated noise levels on properties adjacent to the JFK, and if the addition of noise walls would be considered in this scenario.

A: Mr. Moeller explained that a noise study would be done as part of the study process to determine if or when noise walls might be appropriate. Mr. Snedegar pointed his house out to the group on the Environmental Inventory display map and it was noted that a noise receptor (study site) was located on or near Mr. Snedegar's property.

Q: Mr. Seymour asked what bridges along the JFK would be affected by the Section 100 improvements.

A: Mr. Moeller pointed out the bridges at Ridge Road and Cowenton Road, as well as many other older bridges within the study area that may need to be rebuilt because the location of existing of piers and abutments could be in conflict with the proposed improvements.

Q: Mr. Quinn questioned if the improvements would really be improving more than simply a few miles of roadway. He noted that regardless of the improvements, certain points along the JFK will continue to be congested, such as the tunnels. What will happen at the ends of the Section 100 corridor when motorists all converge on the unimproved portion of roadway?

A: Mr. Utermohle pointed out that one thing the managed lanes option offers is the flexibility in restrictions, such as by time or vehicle type. This option allows greater management of traffic.

Q: Mr. Seymour noted that traffic is currently congested at the I-95 tunnel. He questioned what the congestion level will be if I-95 is widened and even more lanes are feeding the tunnel.

A: Mr. Duerling explained that the Section 100 project will balance the capacity of the roadway with the capacity of the tunnel.

Q: Mr. Campbell asked if average daily traffic (ADTs) for all concepts would be updated with the newer traffic model. He also inquired if the level of service (LOS) on I-95 would be improved from LOS F to LOS D.

A: Mr. Wolniak confirmed that ADTs for all concepts would be updated. He also stated the improvements to the JFK should decrease the number of hours that traffic is operating at LOS F. As the proposed alternates are developed, the anticipated LOS will be determined.

Q: Mr. Seymour questioned what ramps would be upgraded within the study area.

A: Mr. Wolniak noted that all interchanges would be updated. It was noted that additional engineering data would be presented to the Focus Group at the next meeting.

Q: Mr. Campbell asked what types of improvement strategies were eliminated during development of the Master Plan.

A: Ms. Kosenak noted that three of the Master Plan Concepts were eliminated from further consideration:

- Concept C-2: All Lanes Tolled – This concept was eliminated from further study. Tolling of all lanes is expected to increase peak hour traffic volumes on parallel routes (primarily US 40, US1 and MD 7) by 25% to 70% causing operational failures along the entire highway network.
- Concept C-3: HOV Lanes – This concept was eliminated from further study. The existing average auto occupancy rate for vehicles on the JFK exceeds the average rate (11%) for other freeways with existing HOV lanes. Today, vehicles with two or more occupants on the JFK comprise 12% to 16% of weekday peak-period traffic (north of MD 43) and 66% of weekend mid-day traffic (Susquehanna River).
- Concept C-4: Reversible Lanes – This concept was eliminated from study. It is anticipated that the reversible facility would work well during weekday peak periods (flow 65% in the peak direction). However, serious operational and maintenance concerns would arise in the southern portion of the corridor during weekend peak periods when peak directions of flow are not established (50% north/ 50% south). Reversing traffic flow direction may take up to one hour for each four-mile section of roadway and will reduce roadway capacity during flow reversal.

Mr. Zorn noted that Concept C-5 seemed similar to the New Jersey Turnpike design. The project team agreed that the physical concept is similar to the New Jersey turnpike. It was also noted that there was a similar roadway in Chicago.

FOCUS GROUP SURVEY

Member Survey Forms were then distributed to the Focus Group. The group was encouraged to document up to three issues / concerns that they think should be addressed in project planning. Everyone was asked to present the information they received about Section 100 to their groups / organizations and to mail their completed forms back to Ms. Kosenak so that the results could be presented at the next Focus Group meeting.

NEXT MEETINGS

Focus Group Meeting #2

Date: Tuesday, September 30, 2003

Time: 6:30PM-8:30PM

Location: Perry Hall Middle School

Focus Group Meeting #3

Date: Monday, October 27, 2003

Time: 6:30PM-8:30PM

Location: Perry Hall Middle School

Public Workshop

Date: Tuesday, November 18, 2003

Section 100
Focus Group Meeting #1 Minutes
October 27, 2003
Page 9 of 9

Time: 5:30PM-8:30PM
Location: Perry Hall Middle School

If you have any questions or comments concerning the minutes, please contact the Authority Project Manager, Melissa (Kosenak) Williams, by telephone at (410) 288-8400 extension 383 or by email at mwilliams9@mdtransportationauthority.com.

MEMORANDUM

To: Attendees

From: Melissa Williams
Project Manager
Maryland Transportation Authority

Date: September 30, 2003

RE: Focus Group Meeting # 2
Section 100: I-95, I-895(N) Split to North of MD 43
Perry Hall Middle School, Perry Hall, Maryland

On September 30, 2003, the Maryland Transportation Authority (Authority) conducted the second Focus Group Meeting for the Section 100 project planning study. The purpose of the meeting was to introduce the Focus Group to possible alternates considered for the Section 100 project. Those in attendance included:

Mr. A.J. Bierman-US 40 East Business and Civic Association
Mr. John Bowers-Nottingham Properties
Mrs. Susan Ches-Hazelwood Park East Civic Association
Mr. George Ches-Hazelwood Park East Civic Association
Mr. Randy Cogar-Essex/Middle River/White Marsh Chamber of Commerce
Mr. Jim Dorsey-McCormick, Taylor & Associates
Mr. Keith Duerling-Maryland Transportation Authority
Mr. Ken Goon-Maryland Transit Administration/RKK
Mr. Emery Hines-Baltimore County Department of Public Works
Mr. Walt Kulis-Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson
Mr. Jack Moeller-Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson
Ms. Roxane Y. Mukai-Maryland Transportation Authority
Ms. Andra Parker-McCormick, Taylor & Associates
Mr. Keith Quintrell-Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson
Ms. Wanetta Thompson-Garden Village Park Community Association
Mr. Bob Sweeney-Maryland Transportation Authority
Mr. Tom Seymour-South Perry Hall Improvement Association
Mr. Charlie Utermohle-McCormick, Taylor & Associates
Mr. Sam Wilkes-McCormick, Taylor & Associates
Ms. Melissa Williams-Maryland Transportation Authority
Ms. Peggy Winchester- South Perry Hall Improvement Association
Mr. Matt Wolniak-Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson
Mr. Al Zorn-Perry Hall Improvement Association

Ms. Williams, the Authority Project Manager for Section 100, began the meeting with brief introductions. She then reviewed information discussed at the previous focus group meeting including the role of the Focus Group, the I-95 Master Plan and the Section 100 project.

BACKGROUND

Ms. Williams reviewed the three Master Plan Concepts recommended for further study during the Section 100 project planning study including:

Master Plan Concept C-1: No-Build

Master Plan Concept C-5: Managed Lanes

Master Plan Concept C-6: General-Purpose Lanes

FOCUS GROUP SURVEY

At the first Focus Group meeting, members were encouraged to present Section 100 information to members of their organizations and document the three top concerns they wanted to see addressed by the Section 100 project. Members were asked to share those concerns.

Concern: Tom Seymour asked what the effects of Section 100 will be on nearby bridges, such as the Rossville Boulevard Bridge and the King Avenue Bridge. The King Avenue Bridge was recently rebuilt. Will it now be rebuilt again?

Answer: Jack Moeller responded that the Rossville Boulevard Bridge that crosses over I-95 is in need of replacement, independent of the Section 100 Project. Even if the Rossville Boulevard Bridge is replaced prior to the completion of the Section 100 project planning study, the improvements will be designed for compatibility with the proposed Section 100 alternates. Potential impacts to the King Avenue Bridge will be evaluated during the project planning process. There is a possibility exists that the King Avenue Bridge may need to be replaced.

Concern: Will additional noise walls be considered? Members in the South Perry Hall area are concerned about increased noise levels near their homes.

Answer: Mr. Moeller responded that noise monitoring and evaluation is scheduled to occur during the project-planning phase of the project. As designs for Section 100 are refined, the need for noise mitigation such as walls will be determined.

Concern: Susan Ches asked how much noise there will be during construction. Construction recently completed along Hazelwood Avenue was very loud, especially overnight, preventing residents nearby from sleeping.

Answer: Mr. Moeller replied that construction often must occur at night to reduce the effect on traffic during peak travel times, however; consideration will be given to the neighboring communities during construction.

Concern: One noise wall exists in Mrs. Ches' neighborhood, but many homes are not benefiting from it. Will locations for noise monitoring during Section 100 be selected automatically or will they need to be requested?

Answer: Mr. Moeller responded that initial noise monitoring has already taken place and sites were chosen throughout the corridor to give a representation of the noise within the study area. There is no need to request monitoring sites.

Concern: What was the reasoning for the recent toll increase at several Authority-operated facilities? Is the increase to fund the Section 100 project?

Answer: Roxane Mukai stated that recently announced toll increases will be used to support the Authority's entire capital program. While some revenue generated by the increase will be used for I-95 improvements, the increase is not solely for the purpose of funding the I-95 improvements.

Concern: What environmental impacts are projected near the Hazelwood area?

Answer: Sam Wilkes responded that while preliminary environmental impacts have been assessed, more detailed impact studies would be conducted during the next stage of project planning for Section 100.

ALTERNATES UNDER CONSIDERATION

Mr. Moeller then presented a description of each of the mainline and interchange alternates. The alternates presented include:

The No-Build Alternate

The General Purpose Lanes Alternate with interchange Options 2A and 2B for the I-895, I-695 and MD 43 interchanges, and

The Managed Roadways Alternate with interchange Options 3A and 3B at the I-895, I-695 and MD 43 interchanges.

Terminology used in the descriptions of the alternates included:

- Collector-Distributor Road (CD) – a parallel roadway outside of the mainline to reduce access points and to accommodate speed change and weaving movements
- Driver Expectancy – perceptions and responses of drivers based on previous experiences
- Level of Service (LOS)– a qualitative measure of how good or bad traffic operations are, given as a letter grade from A (best) to F (worst)
- Mainline – the core portion of roadway that accommodates the through traffic
- Managed Lane - lanes separated from the General Purpose Lanes and operating under some form of restricted use. Management strategies may include restrictions at access locations (at ramps); by time of day (peak, off-peak); by vehicle type (trucks, buses); by type of use (commercial or occupancy); by price (tolling) or by direction
- Ramp – a short section of highway connecting two separate roadways

- Single Exit Interchange – eliminates weaving on mainline, provides for high speed exit, simplifies signing and the decision process
- Traffic Barriers (median and roadside) – longitudinal restraint systems used to minimize the possibility of an errant vehicle from crossing into the path of oncoming vehicles or hitting a fixed hazard
- Weaving Section – the crossing of two or more traffic streams over a segment of highway between merge and diverge points

I-95 Mainline

Alternate 1: No-Build

The No-Build Alternate would be restricted to normal maintenance and safety improvements. There would be no increase in roadway capacity or any significant reduction in the accident rate.

Alternate 2: General Purpose Lanes

The General Purpose Lanes Alternate includes the provision of additional general purpose lanes as necessary to accommodate the projected traffic demand. In addition, a barrier-separated CD roadway would be provided from I-695 to north of MD 43. In order to reach a desirable weekday and weekend level of service (LOS) E and D, respectively, this alternate would provide the following number of lanes per direction:

- an additional fourth lane in each direction of I-95 from approximately ¼ mile south of the I-895 interchange to the point where I-95 merges with I-895,
- six lanes between the I-895 split and I-695, and
- five mainline and two CD lanes per direction between I-695 and MD 43.

North of MD 43, the roadway would transition from five general purpose and two CD lanes per direction to tie into the existing four lanes per direction.

Alternate 3: Managed Lanes

The Managed Lanes Alternate would include two managed lanes per direction on I-95 between I-895 and north of MD 43, along with additional general purpose lanes as needed to operate between LOS E and LOS F. In addition, a barrier-separated CD roadway would be provided from I-695 to north of MD 43. In order to provide the desired level of service, this concept would provide the following number of lanes per direction:

- An additional general purpose lane would be provided in each direction of I-95 from approximately ¼ mile south of the I-895 interchange to the point where I-95 merges with I-895.
- Two managed lanes and four general purpose lanes would be provided between the I-895 split and I-695. It has not yet been determined whether the managed roadway and general purpose roadway will be separated by barrier.
- A two-lane managed roadway, a three-lane general purpose roadway, and a two-lane CD roadway would be provided per direction between I-695 and MD 43. Each roadway would be barrier-separated.

North of MD 43, the roadway would transition from the seven-lane section (two-lane managed, three-lane general purpose, and two-lane CD roadways) per direction to join the existing four lanes per direction.

The managed lanes could operate under a single management strategy 24-hours per day, or on a "time-share basis" with different restrictions at different times of day. Management strategies could include restrictions at access locations (ramps) by time of day (peak/off-peak), by vehicle-type (trucks/buses), by type of use (commercial/high occupancy vehicle (HOV), or by price (variable or fixed). Managed lanes could be designed for flexibility so that management strategies can be modified over time to maximize person moving capacity, optimize vehicle carrying capacity, and achieve transportation and community goals.

Interchange Options

I-95/I-895 (N) Split Interchange

Alternate 2, Option A: This option retains the configuration of the existing interchange, but provides a fourth lane on southbound I-95 by widening the existing bridge over I-895. The fourth lane would continue to a point approximately ¼ mile south of the I-895 interchange. This option detains the appearance of I-895 as the through movement in the interchange and adds a third lane on southbound I-895 to the Moravia Road off-ramp. Northbound I-895 remains on existing alignment.

Alternate 2, Option B: This option emphasizes I-95 as the through movement in the interchange. Northbound I-895 will cross over the northbound and southbound I-95 roadways and a third lane on southbound I-895 will be extended to the Moravia Road off-ramp.

Alternate 3, Option A: This option is similar to Alternate 2, Option A. In addition, it provides managed roadway access to and from I-895 with ramps that cross over the I-95 general-purpose lanes.

Alternate 3, Option B: This option is similar to Alternate 2, Option B. In addition, it provides managed roadway access to and from I-895 with ramps connecting the I-95 and I-895 medians. These ramps cross over the I-95 southbound general-purpose lanes. The managed lane ramp to southbound I-895 forms a third lane, which ends in the vicinity of Moravia Road.

I-95/I-695 Interchange

Alternate 2, Option A: This option replaces all left-hand entrance and exit ramps with right-hand entrances and exit ramps to meet driver expectations of ramp locations on freeways. Exit ramps split to provide access to both directions of travel on the cross street and entrance ramps contain a merge. Four roadway tiers or levels are needed to provide for all mainline ramp movements.

Alternate 2, Option B: This option retains portions of the existing interchange configuration, however three ramps which create six left-hand exit/entrance movements are removed. The southbound I-95 to eastbound I-695 (inner loop) and eastbound I-695 to northbound I-95 ramps are replaced with right-hand directional ramps. The westbound I-695 (outer loop) to southbound I-95 ramp is also removed and replaced with a loop ramp.

Alternate 3, Option A: This option retains the I-695 mainline alignment. All connections between the I-95 general-purpose lanes and I-695 are provided with right-hand entrance and exit ramps. I-95 managed roadway access is provided with right-hand ramps in the median of both roadways except that left-hand exit/entrance ramps link westbound I-695 to the I-95 managed roadway. This option provides for a potential connection between the managed roadway and planned, managed 9HOV) lanes in the median of I-695 to the west of I-95.

Alternate 3, Option B: This option is similar to Alternate 3, Option A. I-95 managed roadway access is provided with left-hand ramps in the median of both roadways. This option provides for a potential connection between the managed roadway and planned, managed (HOV) lanes in the median of I-695 to the west of I-95.

I-95/MD 43 Interchange

Alternate 2, Option A: This option includes a single exit and entrance point along I-95 northbound and southbound and MD 43 eastbound and westbound. Two lane ramps diverge from northbound or southbound I-95 with one lane directed to eastbound and one lane directed to westbound MD 43. Similarly, ramps from eastbound or westbound MD 43 are merged together before joining I-95. There would be no weaving movements within the interchange.

Alternate 2, Option B: This option provides a partial cloverleaf interchange. Loop ramps are provided from MD 43 westbound to I-95 southbound. All other movements are provided via direct ramps and the direct ramps connect to MD 43 at signalized intersections. There would be no weaving movements within the interchange.

Alternate 3, Option A: This option has a general-purpose ramp configuration similar to Alternate 2, Option A. In addition, the MD 43 eastbound and westbound roadways are separated and a managed roadway connection is provided between the relocated MD 43 roadways. Access to the I-95 managed roadway is provided via ramps that rise to meet the MD 43 managed roadway connection at a signalized intersection in the middle of the interchange.

Alternate 3, Option B: Under this option, the eastbound and westbound through lanes of MD 43 are separated significantly, allowing access to the managed lanes to be accomplished within the median of MD 43. From I-95 north and south, single point exists would divide to provide access to both eastbound and westbound MD 43. From MD 43 east and west, single point exits would divide to provide access to both northbound and southbound I-95.

Members were then given an opportunity to examine the graphic representations of each interchange that were available and ask questions.

Question: Al Zorn expressed a concern for the number of rear-end type accidents near the I-95/Chesaco Avenue crossing.

Answer: Matt Wolniak confirmed that nearly 50% of accidents on I-95 between I-895 and I-695 are rear-end type accidents which could be related to the existing congestion queues in the area. Ms. Mukai noted that I-95 is generally regarded as safer than comparable interstates in Maryland.

Question: J. Bierman inquired about the possible addition of a “left” (westward) movement from the exit to Lombard Street from I-95.

Answer: Mr. Moeller stated that the community to the west of this intersection was opposed to a westward ramp when the interchange was constructed years ago. With the existing development of the area, a ramp constructed in this direction would not meet current design standards and is, therefore, not feasible.

Question: Mr. Bierman also asked where the project would be in approximately 5 years.

Answer: Mr. Moeller responded that the project would be in Project Planning until late 2004. Design is expected to begin in late 2004 and construction is expected to begin in 2006.

Question: Mr. Bierman asked if taxes would be raised in order to fund the I-95 projects. He noted that the state of Maryland already has a gas tax higher than that of other states.

Answer: Keith Duerling responded that the Authority does not receive revenue generated by the gas tax. The project will be funded using revenue generated from toll collection.

TRANSIT

Ken Goon then gave a brief transit presentation. He explained that the Authority is working with the Maryland Transit Administration (MTA) during the Section 100 project planning study to coordinate planned highway improvements with planned transit services and strategies. MTA recently developed a long-term plan for meeting transit needs within the Baltimore region. The plan calls for expanding transit service and supplementing the existing Maryland Rail Commuter (MARC) service in the I-95 corridor. As transit projects are adopted into the region's plans and models, their effect will be incorporated into future project planning studies.

Mr. Seymour asked if a monorail system, similar to that in Walt Disney World, would be a more efficient use of space.

Section 100
Focus Group Meeting #2 Minutes
September 30, 2003
Page 8 of 8

Mr. Goon stated that the difference in cost between construction of a light rail and construction of a monorail type system is the main difference. The costs for the elevated structure must be taken into consideration.

The meeting was adjourned with a reminder of the next Focus Group meeting to be held on October 27, 2003 at the Perry Hall Middle School.

If you have any questions or comments concerning the minutes, please contact the Authority Project Manager, Ms. Melissa Williams, by telephone at (410) 288-8400 extension 383 or by E mail at Mwilliams9@mdtransportationauthority.com.

MEMORANDUM

To: Attendees

From: Melissa Williams
MdTA Authority Project Manager

Date: November 7, 2003

RE: *Focus Group Meeting # 3*
Section 100: I-95, I-895(N) Split to North of MD 43
Perry Hall Middle School, Perry Hall, Maryland

On October 27, 2003, the Maryland Transportation Authority (Authority) conducted the third Focus Group Meeting for the Section 100 project planning study. The purpose of the meeting was to update the Focus Group on the project and introduce them to materials that will be displayed at the November 18, 2003 Public Workshop. Those in attendance included:

Attendees:

Mr. Richard Bolton – McCormick, Taylor & Associates
Ms. Lynn Burca – Kings Court Townhouse Association #2
Mr. Bruce Campbell – Nottingham Properties
Mrs. Susan Ches - Hazelwood Park East Civic Association
Mr. Jim Dorsey - McCormick, Taylor & Associates
Mr. Keith Duerling - Maryland Transportation Authority
Mr. David Flowers - GGP & Associates, LLC
Mr. Ken Goon-Maryland Transit Administration/RKK
Mr. Walt Kulis - Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson
Mr. Jack Moeller - Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson
Ms. Roxane Y. Mukai - Maryland Transportation Authority
Ms. Andra Parker - McCormick, Taylor & Associates
Mr. Keith Quintrell - Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson
Mr. Dennis Seibel – Kings Court Condo Association
Mr. Bill Spiegel - Hazelwood Park East Civic Association
Mr. Bob Sweeney - Maryland Transportation Authority
Ms. Wanetta Thompson - Garden Village Park Community Association
Mr. Charlie Utermohle - McCormick, Taylor & Associates
Ms. Melissa Williams - Maryland Transportation Authority
Mr. Matt Wolniak - Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson

Melissa Williams, the Authority's Project Manager for Section 100, began the meeting with brief introductions. She then reviewed information discussed at Focus Group Meeting #2, including the alternates for Section 100. Jack Moeller was introduced to further explain the alternates and update members on recent design developments.

ALTERNATES

Mr. Moeller reviewed the three alternates (the No-Build, the General Purpose, and the Managed Lanes Alternates) including the interchange options at I-95/I-895(N), I-95/I-695, and I-95/MD 43.

Since Focus Group Meeting #2, the collector-distributor (CD) lanes have been removed from Section 100. The function of CD-lanes is to reduce dangerous weave conditions when they exist on the mainline. For Section 100, the engineering team was successfully able to alleviate the weave conditions on the mainline, thus negating the need for CD-lanes.

The No-Build Alternate would be restricted to normal maintenance and safety improvements. There would be no increase in roadway capacity or any significant reduction in the accident rate.

The General Purpose Lanes Alternate includes the provision of additional general-purpose lanes as necessary to accommodate the projected traffic demand. In order to reach a desirable weekday and weekend level of service (LOS) E and D, respectively, this alternate would provide the following number of lanes per direction:

- An additional fourth lane in each direction of I-95 from approximately ¼ mile south of the I-895 interchange to the point where I-95 merges with I-895,
- Six lanes between the I-895 split and I-695, and
- Six lanes per direction would be provided between I-695 and MD 43.

North of MD 43, the roadway would transition from six lanes per direction to tie back into the existing four lanes per direction.

The Managed Lanes Alternate would include two managed lanes per direction on I-95 between I-895 and north of MD 43, and additional general-purpose lanes as needed to operate between LOS E and LOS F. In order to provide the desired level of service, this concept would provide the following number of lanes per direction:

- An additional general-purpose lane would be provided in each direction of I-95 from approximately ¼ mile south of the I-895 interchange to the point where I-95 merges with I-895.
- Two managed lanes and four general-purpose lanes would be provided between the I-895 split and I-695.
- A two-lane managed roadway, and a four-lane general-purpose roadway would be provided per direction between I-695 and MD 43.

North of MD 43, the roadway would transition from the six-lane section (two-lane managed, four-lane general purpose) per direction to join the existing four lanes per direction.

Members were then given an opportunity to examine the graphic representations of each interchange that were available.

SECTION 100 TRANSIT

Mr. Goon discussed various transit projects that are planned by the Maryland Transit Administration for the Section 100 study area. Improvements to Section 100 should provide transit patrons with faster and more reliable bus service. He also noted that a potential extension of the Baltimore Regional Rail System may include a future transit station with access to I-95 within the study area.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Charlie Utermohle reviewed the related environmental impacts with the Focus Group. Various environmental issues are being considered throughout the planning and design of the Section 100 alternates. Wetlands and terrestrial habitat will be identified and their quality, function and values will be assessed. Potential hazardous waste issues will be identified through review of Maryland Department of Environment (MDE) files and verified through field reconnaissance. Once existing conditions have been defined, avoidance measures will be investigated.

NOVEMBER 18th PUBLIC WORKSHOP

Members received copies of the brochure and (draft) displays that will be available to the public at the November 18th Public Workshop. Mr. Utermohle and Ms. Williams reviewed the materials with the group and explained the role the Focus Group members will play in the workshop. Members were encouraged to attend the workshop as well as to participate in informing the attending public about the Section 100 project. Those Focus Group members attending were encouraged to participate in the workshop for at least two hours.

QUESTIONS

Questions from the Focus Group included:

Question: Mr. Bill Spiegel asked if the information presented at the Public Workshop would be set up in a logical progression.

Answer: Ms. Williams noted that displays at the workshop would be set up in a logical progression and a map of the layout of the room would be available.

Question: Mr. David Flowers asked if other agencies comments were being considered during the project planning phase of Section 100.

Answers: Ms. Williams stated that Section 100 updates have been given to agencies at regularly scheduled Inter-Agency Review meetings. The Authority has an "open-door" policy allowing for comments from agency representatives at any time.

Question: Ms. Wanetta Thompson inquired how the public would be notified of the Public Workshop.

Answer: Ms. Williams pointed out that notices of the workshop had been placed in several regional newspapers and brochures had been mailed to citizens within the study area and on the mailing list.

Question: Ms. Thompson requested a further explanation of how the workshop would be set up.

Answer: Ms. Williams noted that as citizens enter the room, a map will be available to them showing what information is displayed and where. Members of the project team will be stationed at each display to respond to any questions. Additional members of the project team will be available to “roam” the room answering questions and facilitating citizens’ progression through the displays.

Question: Mr. Spiegel asked if each person who had a comment at the Public Workshop would receive a response.

Answer: Ms. Williams stated that as long as contact information was given, each individual noting a comment would receive a response.

Question: Bruce Campbell asked if a matrix showing a summary of the anticipated level of service for each alternate and interchange was available.

Answer: Matt Wolniak noted that such a matrix is difficult to produce at the current time because of the various management strategies that could be used on the Managed Lanes Alternate. Because these management strategies would affect the LOS of each roadway, the interchanges are difficult to summarize in this manner.

Roxane Mukai stated that additional information was being developed; however, there was not enough information available to provide a complete matrix at the current time.

The Focus Group was encouraged to review the distributed minutes from Focus Group Meeting #1 and provide any revisions.

If you have any questions or comments concerning the minutes, please contact the Authority’s Project Manager, Melissa Williams, by telephone at (410) 288-8400 extension 383 or by Email at Mwilliams9@mdtransportationauthority.com.

MEMORANDUM

To: Attendees

From: Melissa Williams
Authority Project Manager

Date: February 24, 2004

RE: *Focus Group Meeting # 4*
Section 100: I-95, I-895 (N) Split to North of MD 43
Perry Hall Middle School, Perry Hall, Maryland

On February 24, 2004, the Maryland Transportation Authority (Authority) conducted the fourth Focus Group Meeting for the Section 100 project planning study. The purpose of the meeting was to update the Focus Group on the progress of the project since the November 18, 2003 Public Meeting. Those in attendance included:

Attendees:

Mr. Bala Akundi - Baltimore Metropolitan Council
Mr. A.J. Bierman - Route 40 East Business Association
Mr. Bruce Campbell - Nottingham Properties
Mr. George Ches - Hazelwood Park East Civic Association
Mrs. Susan Ches - Hazelwood Park East Civic Association
Mr. Jim Dorsey - McCormick, Taylor & Associates
Ms. Anne Elrays - Maryland State Highway Administration
Mr. J. Craig Forrest - Baltimore County Department of Public Works
Mr. Vernon Freeman - Maryland State Highway Administration
Mr. Ken Goon - Maryland Transit Administration/RKK
Mr. Emery Hines - Baltimore County Department of Public Works
Mr. Walt Kulis - Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson
Ms. Michelle Martin - Maryland Department of Transportation
Mr. Jack Moeller - Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson
Ms. Roxane Y. Mukai - Maryland Transportation Authority
Mr. Joel Oppenheimer - citizen
Ms. Andra Parker - McCormick, Taylor & Associates
Mr. Keith Quintrell - Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson
Mr. Dennis Seibel - Kings Court Condo Association
Mr. Bob Sweeney - Maryland Transportation Authority
Mr. Charlie Utermohle - McCormick, Taylor & Associates
Ms. Melissa Williams - Maryland Transportation Authority
Mr. Matt Wolniak - Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson

OPENING REMARKS

Melissa Williams, the Authority's Project Manager for Section 100, began the meeting with brief introductions. She then reviewed information discussed at previous Focus Group meetings, including how the alternates for Section 100 have evolved since first introduced to the Focus Group. Ms. Williams gave a brief summary of comments received at the November 18, 2003 Public Workshop. Comments included requests for noise wall studies, support/concerns for specific alternates, drainage issues, funding questions, and traffic concerns during construction.

Ms. Williams reviewed the Alternates Retained for Detailed Study (ARDS), the No-Build, General Purpose and Managed Lanes Alternates, and why these alternates are preferred. These alternates are being carried forward because, based on existing information, it appears that each has the potential to meet project objectives with acceptable environmental impacts and costs. However, based on more detailed engineering and environmental studies, these preliminary evaluations may be revised. Determinations of reasonableness, practicability, and prudence will be made (if needed) once more detailed information has been developed.

SECTION 100 TRAFFIC

Matt Wolniak discussed traffic issues that are currently being addressed by the project team.

I-95 currently is designed for two different roadway speeds, 60 mph south of the I-95/I-895 split, and 70 mph north of the split. The curve of the northbound I-95 roadway over the I-895 roadway is designed for 60 mph. A review of accident data at this curve shows the accident rate would not be considered either a primary or secondary candidate safety improvement location. Therefore, the 60 mph curve does not appear to cause an accident problem.

The average travel time on I-95 from I-895 to north of MD 43 has been studied to ensure Section 100 improvements will maintain or improve average travel times throughout the study area.

Mr. Wolniak explained what Level of Service F would mean in 2025 if no improvements were made. Under these conditions it is estimated that approximately 8,000-10,000 vehicles per day would divert to the alternate routes of US 40, MD 7 or US 1, creating congestion on these arterial routes that abut residential and commercial areas.

ALTERNATES

Jack Moeller explained the Alternates and gave an update on current design developments.

Mr. Moeller reviewed the three current alternates (the No-Build, the General Purpose, and the Managed Lanes Alternates) including the selected interchange options at I-95/I-895 (N), I-95/I-695, and I-95/MD 43.

1. Alternate 1: No-Build - The No-Build Alternate would include normal maintenance and minor safety improvements. There would be no increase in roadway capacity or any significant reduction in the accident rate.

2. Alternate 2: General Purpose Lanes

a. Mainline - This concept would include the provision of additional general-purpose lanes to accommodate the projected traffic demand. In order to reach an acceptable weekday and weekend level of service E and D, respectively, this concept would consist of:

- Four-lanes in each direction of I-95 from approximately ¼ mile south of the I-895 interchange to the point where I-95 merges with I-895,
- Six-lanes in each direction between the I-895 (N) Split and MD 43,
- and north of MD 43, the roadway would transition from five-lanes in each direction to four-lanes in each direction.

b. I-95 / I-895 (N) Interchange - General Purpose Lanes / Option 2B - This option reconfigures the existing interchange by relocating the southbound roadway of I-95 and the northbound roadway of I-895 to make I-95 the through movement in the interchange. Southbound I-95 is relocated immediately adjacent to the existing northbound roadway of I-95, whereas northbound I-895 is relocated to cross over the proposed northbound and southbound roadways of I-95.

Approaching from the south, I-95 northbound would be widened by one lane approximately ¼ mile south of the interchange. The resulting four-lanes would merge with the two-lanes of northbound I-895 to form six-lanes on I-95 northbound. The two northbound lanes of I-895 would diverge from southbound I-895, cross over both the northbound and southbound roadways of I-95, and merge with I-95 from the right.

Approaching from the north, I-95 southbound splits into three-lanes for southbound I-895 and four-lanes for southbound I-95. The fourth lane on southbound I-95 continues to approximately ¼ mile south of the interchange. The third lane of southbound I-895 ends with the off-ramp to Moravia Road.

c. I-95 / I-695 Interchange - General Purpose Lanes / Option 2A - This interchange option is a fully directional interchange which removes the braided mainline roadways on both I-95 and I-695 and replaces them with mainline roadway alignments that remain side-by-side. This improves the interchange geometry and improves driver expectancy by replacing all left-hand entrances and exits with more conventional right-hand entrances and exits.

I-95 northbound, south of the interchange consists of six general-purpose lanes. Four-lanes carry through the interchange northbound, while three-lanes exit to become the two-lane ramp to westbound I-695 and the one-lane ramp to eastbound I-695.

I-95 northbound, north of the interchange, consists of six general-purpose lanes. Four-lanes carry through the interchange to merge with the two-lane ramp from eastbound I-695 and the single-lane ramp from westbound I-695.

I-95 southbound, north of the interchange, consists of six general-purpose lanes. Four general-purpose lanes carry through the interchange while three-lanes exit to become the two-lane ramp to westbound I-695 and the one-lane ramp to eastbound I-695.

I-95 southbound, south of the interchange, consists of four general-purpose lanes and a three-lane entrance formed from the two-lane ramp from eastbound I-695 and the single-lane ramp from westbound I-695. This three-lane ramp merges with the four southbound general-purpose lanes. The outside entrance lane drops, leaving six general-purpose lanes south of the interchange.

Approaching from the east, the four westbound lanes of I-695 divide. Two-lanes carry through the interchange on I-695 and two-lanes exit, forming a one-lane ramp to I-95 northbound and a one-lane ramp to I-95 southbound.

West of the interchange, a two-lane ramp from southbound I-95 and a two-lane ramp from northbound I-95 join the I-695 westbound roadway, forming a 6-lane section westbound on I-695. This six-lane section tapers to meet the existing three-lane section in the vicinity of the US 1 interchange.

Approaching from the west, the existing three-lanes of I-695 transition to four-lanes. Two-lanes then proceed through the interchange while three-lanes exit, forming the two-lane ramp to I-95 northbound and the two-lane ramp to I-95 southbound.

East of the interchange, a one-lane ramp from southbound I-95 and a one-lane ramp from northbound I-95 are merged to a two-lane section before joining with the eastbound I-695 roadway. The resulting four-lane section tapers to meet the existing three-lanes of eastbound I-695.

d. I-95 / MD 43 Interchange - General Purpose Lanes / Option 2B - This interchange concept is a partial cloverleaf configuration, with two half-signals on MD 43 at the spur ramps. All weaving within the interchange is eliminated.

I-95 through the interchange consists of five general-purpose lanes. Two through lanes are generally provided on MD 43, with additional lanes added or dropped at interchange ramps.

Approaching from the south, the single-point exit leads to a single-lane ramp to eastbound MD 43 and a single lane loop ramp to westbound MD 43.

The southbound approach to the interchange is a similar configuration. A single-lane ramp exits to westbound MD 43 and a single lane loop ramp exits to eastbound MD 43.

Approaching from the west a single lane exit ramp connects MD 43 to southbound I-95 and a signalized left turn lane with the median of MD 43 feeds a two-lane ramp onto northbound I-95.

Similarly, approaching from the east a signalized left turn lane within the median of MD 43 feeds a two-lane ramp onto southbound I-95 and a single land exit ramp connects MD 43 to northbound I-95.

3. Alternate 3: Managed Lanes

a. Mainline - This concept includes two managed lanes per direction between I-895 and north of MD 43 plus additional general-purpose lanes as needed to operate between LOS E and LOS F. In order to provide the desired level of service, this concept would require the following number of lanes per direction:

- Four general-purpose lanes in each direction of I-95 from approximately ¼ mile south of the I-895 interchange to the point where I-95 merges with I-895,
- Two managed lanes and four general-purpose lanes in each direction between the I-895 split and MD 43,
- and north of MD 43, the roadway would transition from the six-lane section (two-lane managed and four-lane general-purpose in each direction) into the existing four-lanes in each direction.

The managed lanes could operate under a single management strategy 24-hours per day, or on a “time-share basis” with different restrictions at different times of day. Management strategies could include restrictions at access locations (ramps), by time of day (peak/off-peak), by vehicle-type (trucks/buses), by type of use (commercial / high occupancy vehicle (HOV)), or by price (variable or fixed). Managed lanes would be designed for flexibility so that management strategies can be modified over time to maximize person moving capacity, optimize vehicle carrying capacity and achieve transportation and community goals.

b. I-95 / I-895 Interchange - Managed Lanes / Option 3B - This option adjusts the configuration of the existing interchange by relocating the southbound roadway of I-95 and the northbound roadway of I-895 to make I-95 the through movement in the interchange. Southbound I-95 would be relocated adjacent to the existing northbound roadway of I-95, whereas the northbound general purpose lanes of I-895 would be relocated to a grade-separated crossing over both the proposed northbound and southbound roadways of I-95. Traffic moving from the southbound managed roadway to southbound I-895 must merge

with southbound I-895 general-purpose traffic and weave across southbound I-895 traffic to exit via Moravia Road.

Approaching from the south, I-95 would be widened beginning approximately ¼ mile south of the interchange to form the managed lane. The three northbound general purpose lanes of I-95 would merge with the two general purpose lanes of northbound I-895 before transitioning from a five-lane to a four-lane general purpose roadway approximately ¼ mile north of the merge point. A separate one-lane ramp exiting from the left side of northbound I-895 would be grade-separated over the southbound lanes of I-95 and merge with the I-95 managed lanes within the median of I-95.

Approaching from the south, the two-lanes of I-895 northbound would diverge from southbound I-895, cross over the northbound and southbound roadways of I-95 and merge with I-95 from the right, north of the interchange.

Approaching from the north, the four general-purpose lanes roadway of I-95 split into a two-lane southbound general-purpose roadway for I-895 and a three-lane general-purpose roadway for I-95. The two-lane managed roadway in the median of I-95 would split to a single-lane off-ramp to southbound I-895 that crosses over southbound I-95 and a single-lane managed lane that remains in the median of the southbound I-95 general-purpose roadway. The fourth lane of southbound I-95 (most likely the outside general purpose lane) would be carried through the interchange and dropped at a point approximately ¼ mile south of the interchange.

A short weaving distance may be created from the southbound managed lane of I-895 to the Moravia Road interchange, as well as from Moravia Road to the northbound managed lane of I-895. This weaving distance would be further examined.

c. I-95 / I-695 Interchange - Managed Lanes/ Option 3A Modified - This option improves the geometry and driver expectancy on I-95 and I-695 by untwisting the braided mainline of both roadways and replacing many of the existing left-hand entrances and exits with more conventional right-hand entrances and exits. The exit ramps typically split to separate ramps in opposite directions of travel for the destination route. Some left-hand exit and entrance ramps are retained for the managed lane ramps within the median of I-695, but all ramp movements for the general purpose roadways merge to and from the outside of I-95 and I-695. Most of the merges and diverges occur off of the mainline roadways for I-695 and I-95 (on the ramps themselves), limiting the number of lane drops that must occur on the mainline. A six-level interchange is required for this option, consisting of 2 mainline levels, 2 general-purpose ramp levels, and 2 managed ramp levels. This option would tie into the possible future HOV lanes along I-695 to the west of I-95.

Three general-purpose lanes are generally provided on I-95 through the interchange, with the fourth (outermost) lane in each direction of I-95 dropping to off-ramps to I-695. A minimum of two managed through lanes are provided in each direction of travel for I-95 throughout the interchange. Two through lanes are generally provided on the mainline of I-695, with additional lanes added or dropped at interchange ramps.

Approaching from the south on northbound I-95, the four-lane general-purpose roadway of northbound I-95 splits into a three-lane northbound general purpose roadway for I-95 and a three-lane, right-hand exit that ultimately splits to eastbound and westbound I-695. North of the I-695 interchange, a two-lane entrance ramp from I-695 merges together with the three-through lanes of I-95 through a series of acceleration lanes and lane drops to form a four-lane general-purpose roadway.

Approaching from the south on northbound I-95, the two-lane managed roadway runs parallel and adjacent to the median edge of the northbound general-purpose roadway of I-95. South of the interchange, traffic in the northbound managed roadway would have the option of continuing through the interchange on the two-lane managed roadway or exiting to either direction of I-695 through a common right-hand, single-lane exit. North of the interchange, traffic will enter the managed roadway through a common right-hand, two-lane entrance that merges back into a two-lane managed roadway via a series of lane drops.

Approaching from the north on the southbound general-purpose roadway of I-95, traffic would have the option of remaining on the 3-lane general-purpose roadway through the interchange or exiting to I-695 via a two-lane exit. South of the interchange, traffic from both directions of I-695 would enter from the right at a single point with a three-lane entrance ramp and merge via a series of lane drops into a four-lane general-purpose roadway.

Approaching from the north on the southbound managed roadway of I-95, the two-lane managed roadway runs adjacent to the median edge of the southbound general-purpose roadway of I-95. North of the interchange, traffic would have the option of remaining on the 2-lane managed roadway through the interchange or exiting to either direction of I-695 through a common right-hand, single lane exit. South of the interchange, traffic will enter the managed roadway through a common right-hand, two-lane entrance that merges back into a two-lane managed roadway via a series of acceleration lanes and lane drops.

Approaching the interchange from the west, traffic on eastbound I-695 would have the option of continuing through the interchange on the 2-lane eastbound general purpose roadway, entering either the northbound or southbound managed lane of I-95 from a common left-hand, single-lane exit in the median or entering the northbound or southbound general purpose lanes of I-95 through a common right-hand, three-lane exit on the outside of the eastbound roadway. East of the interchange, two lanes of general purpose traffic from I-95 will merge from the right and one lane of managed traffic will merge from the median with the 2 lanes of I-695 traffic, eventually dropping to 4 eastbound lanes.

Approaching the interchange from the east, traffic on westbound I-695 would have the option of remaining on the 2-lane westbound general-purpose roadway or entering the managed or general-purpose lanes of I-95 from a common right-hand, two-lane ramp. Traffic on this common ramp would ultimately split between a two-lane ramp to the northbound managed/general purpose roadways of I-95 and a single-lane southbound ramp to the southbound managed/general purpose roadways of I-95. West of the interchange, traffic from both the northbound and southbound directions of the I-95 managed roadway would drop into a dedicated interior lane for westbound I-695. Traffic from both the northbound and southbound directions of the I-95 general-purpose roadway would merge from right side of westbound I-695 through a series of acceleration lanes and lane drops.

The weaving distance between the entrance from southbound I-95 onto eastbound I-695 and the exit to MD 7 will be examined. Weaving distances between the managed lane median ramps and the US 1 interchange (0.7 miles) will be also be evaluated.

d. I-95 / MD 43 Interchange - Managed Lanes Alternate / Option 3A - The features of this option include single exit points for each approach with direct connections provided for all interchange movements. All weaving within the interchange is eliminated under this concept. Single-lane ramps provide for all movements to and from the managed lanes, with the lanes connecting directly to MD 43 at a signalized intersection on the structure over I-95.

I-95 through the interchange consists of two managed lanes and four general-purpose lanes. Two through lanes are generally provided on MD 43, with additional lanes added or dropped as necessary at interchange ramps.

Approaching from the south, there is a two-lane single-point exit ramp from I-95 northbound to MD 43 that splits into a single-lane ramp to eastbound MD 43 and a single-lane loop ramp to westbound MD 43. The single-point two-lane on-ramp from westbound MD 43 splits into a single-lane ramp to southbound I-95 and a single-lane ramp to northbound I-95.

Approaching from the north, there is a two-lane single-point exit ramp that splits from I-95 southbound to MD 43 into a single-lane ramp to westbound MD 43 and single-lane loop ramp to westbound MD 43 and a single-lane loop ramp to eastbound MD 43. The single-point two-lane on-ramp from eastbound MD 43 splits into a single-lane ramp to southbound I-95 and a single-lane ramp to northbound I-95.

Option 3A has three less displacements, reduced impacts to the rubble landfill, no impacts to the overhead power lines and lower construction cost than Option 3B. Option 3A is recommended for detailed study.

COMPUTER-GENERATED IMAGING

Jim Dorsey and Keith Quintrell demonstrated examples of computer-generated 3D images that may be used to graphically display the selected alternates at the Summer 2004 Public Hearing.

Three different computer-generated 3D images were displayed. One displayed the alternates using a program that simulated the interchange based on factual information and animated vehicles traveling along the roadway to show viewers a realistic scenario. A second option displayed an image of the roadway, as it exists currently and superimposed various phases of the construction process sequentially. This included displaying vehicles traveling on the roadway and traffic patterns that would be used during the construction phases of the project. A third representation showed the existing roadway and the completed construction from an aerial view. The image rotated to give viewers a perspective as if traveling each direction of the interchange.

The Focus Group was asked to give their opinion of the usefulness of the computer-generated graphics. If beneficial, the Authority would develop similar displays for each of the selected interchange options. Members said that the images were helpful in better understanding the proposed alternates.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Charlie Utermohle reviewed the environmental impacts of the project.

Early in the study, an environmental inventory was performed to identify existing socio-economic, cultural and natural environmental resources within the study area. The environmental team has worked with the design team to ensure the alternates chosen will have the least environmental impacts possible. A detailed evaluation of the environmental impacts associated with each remaining alternate has been completed.

Environmental documentation is being prepared according to National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) regulations. Once finalized, these documents will be available for public viewing at the Summer 2004 Public Hearing, at various public libraries throughout the study area and at the Authority offices.

UPCOMING FOCUS GROUP MEETINGS

Future Focus Group meetings have been scheduled for April 27 and June 8, 2004. Both meetings will be held at the Perry Hall Middle School from 6:30PM until 8:30PM.

PUBLIC HEARING

The Public Hearing for the Section 100 project will be held on June 29, 2004 at the Perry Hall Middle School from 5:30PM until 8:30PM. The Hearing will be advertised in various newspapers throughout the study area. An informational brochure about the Hearing will be mailed to individuals owning property within the study area and to those who have requested to be on the project mailing list. At the Hearing, information regarding

the project including the purpose and need, environmental resources, alternates, and anticipated impacts will be presented. Members of the project team will be available to answer any questions the attending public may have. A formal presentation of the material will take place followed by a period of public testimony. All oral and written comments will be legally recorded and a transcript will be prepared. The project team will respond to each comment or question in writing.

Ms. Williams closed the meeting with the opportunity for members to view and discuss the alternates displays and computer-generated imaging.

If you have any questions or comments concerning the minutes, please contact the Authority's Project Manager, Melissa Williams, by telephone at (410) 288-8400 extension 383 or by Email at Mwilliams9@mdtransportationauthority.com.