

**Public Meeting
January 26, 2009**

Chip Jackson: I'm Chip Jackson, associate vice president for planning and facilities at St. Mary's College. We appreciate everyone coming out tonight. The Capital Design Advisory Committee is seated right here in front. We'll introduce them in a minute. First I'd like to thank Gina Fadden and her staff at Historic St. Mary's City for hosting this meeting tonight and we're glad that we can be here at the City as well to do some of these meetings. This is a great room. So, thank you. The main agenda tonight is to talk about the footbridge and alternatives. Many of you, I recognize your faces, came to an open house that we had last week. It was very well attended. So, our agenda will include a review of the information that was provided at that meeting, at that open house. Some of the members of the Capital Design Advisory could not make the open house and I see faces here that did not make that open house as well. So there will be some new information for those who came. Bear with us, we hope to keep that presentation relatively brief. This meeting is not about what is the solution or the recommended alternative. We'll talk more about process in a few minutes. I think it's important to say that at the last public meeting, which was held in November, we heard from the community, the local community, students, and others, that people wanted to know more about what was the need that led to the proposal for a footbridge and what are the alternatives considered and we listened and heard that and both the City and the College, after that meeting, agreed that we really do need to step back and provide the community with a basic needs analysis of what the issues are that led to the proposal of a footbridge and then to seriously consider alternative proposals in addition to the footbridge. What

you'll see tonight, what you saw at the open house last week, is really an honest attempt by the College and the City to say, what are the alternatives. We believe safety is key. Safety is what we're after. No one wants to build a footbridge just to build a footbridge. So, looking for ways to improve safety, what are the alternatives? That led to the analysis. There's a report on our website that addresses these issues and led to the information that many of you saw at the open houses and we will review with all of us tonight. I mentioned there's a report. On our website, which is, oh it's on the screen, thanks. It's the College website, www.smcm.edu/cda. If you type that in, it will go to a website and on that website there is a report that is this information and then there is a survey. Many of you have already filled out a survey about the various issues related to safety along Route 5 and we will continue to receive surveys through this week. We felt we would give it an opportunity through this week. So anyone who has not provided feedback and filled out that survey we encourage you to go to the website and complete it. It doesn't take long. With that, I'd like, before we get into the presentations for the Capital Design Advisory, the CDA, to introduce themselves, so we'll just go down the table and if you could each give your name and the affiliation, the association that you're here to represent.

Melvin McClintock: My name's Melvin McClintock and I am the assistant director of human resources at St. Mary's College and I'm here representing the employees.

Ray Dodson: I'm Ray Dodson, representing the St. Mary's County Chamber of Commerce.

Gina Fadden: Gina Fadden, Historic St. Mary's City.

Bob Lewis: Bob Lewis, St. Mary's River Watershed Association.

Jim Hardin: Jim Hardin St. Mary's Parish.

Ingrid Swann: Ingrid Swann, St. Mary's County Arts Council.

Julie King: Julie King, faculty at St. Mary's College.

Pete Himmelheber: Pete Himmelheber, St. Mary's County Historical Society.

Chip Jackson: Thanks, I appreciate it. A couple notes on process. We have a sign in sheet and I see that Porzia has fortunately made sure that everyone signed. If you haven't signed in, it's just a matter of recording who has come and have counts. There will be, as shown on the agenda on the screen, after the report, there will be some preliminary feedback on the surveys that I mentioned earlier. The surveys are open until the end of the week, so it's not the conclusive results of the surveys. But, we will give some information that was suggested in those that we've received. There will be a time period for public comment and similar to the last meeting, we'll ask you to state your name. At the last meeting, we asked you to come to a microphone, some folks did not want to do that. Today we have our wireless microphone. We do have a wireless microphone. The

reason it's important, we did a transcript of the meeting in November, and it's posted on the same website, you can find the transcript there. It was very hard, the tape recording that we made, and we are taping tonight, it was very difficult to get all the questions from the audience. The recording didn't pick it all up and so we do ask that, you can either come here or we will bring a microphone to you, but we really want to capture everyone's comments for the record and then make that available for everyone. Similar to the last meeting, if you can keep comments to about three minutes we would appreciate that. The last comment is if you have cell phones, please put them on vibrate so we can proceed uninterrupted. Process, let's talk a little bit about process. We've broken down this review of considering safety improvements for Route 5 into a couple steps. The first step is, it really needs discussion of alternatives. There is the report I mentioned before, we had the open house last week, there were two, and we have this meeting tonight. The goal of this, first, is to provide information on alternatives and get feedback on things that the community, whether it be the College community, local community, City community, any community individuals we can think of, feedback on what's important to you. So, the questions dealt with, what are the safety issues that are important to you, and developing a preferred alternative. What are the things that should be considered, what are the criteria that are most important? And, tonight, we're reviewing some of that information as I mentioned. The second step will be for the College and the City to discuss the feedback that's received and to develop a preferred alternative. It may be any of the alternatives that are out there today. There was one individual at the open house who commented to me that, is this really for real or is this just an effort to talk to the community about alternatives and I said it earlier and I'll say it

again, the College and the City are very open to any of the alternatives. We want to find the best alternative that improves safety. So, we will develop what we think is a preferred alternative and then we'll have another round of public conversations about that in February with the hope that after that conversation, then our two governing boards, the Trustees for the College and the City Commissioners, for Historic St. Mary's City, will then adopt a final alternative. So, that's the second step of the process. The third step is that there are these two projects we've mentioned, Anne Arundel Hall and the Maryland Heritage Interpretive Center, are projects where we hope to begin design in March and the alternative that's chosen can influence the design of these facilities. They are adjacent to Route 5 and if there was a footbridge, if that is maintained as a preferred alternative, that would suggest something else. If there was a tunnel, that would suggest something else. If there was one of the other alternatives, traffic calming, or improving crosswalks, any of those alternative strategies will affect how architects will think about the land on that section of Route 5 for the College and the City, so we want that to be the kind of the last step – to understand the needs, the alternatives, and develop an alternative that is preferred and then we can begin design. There will also be a meeting about Anne Arundel Hall and the Interpretive Center to provide more information about those projects and we'll do that at the next public meeting so people will have a better understanding of those. So, that's process. We're into the process, and as I mentioned, we had many people stop at the open house, we had a hundred fifty some surveys already completed and we'll talk more about that now. At that, I'd like to introduce two individuals from the College's office of facilities and planning, Chris Mergner and Christophe Bornand,

who have worked hard at this report. They are really are the guys that put the information together on the report. Christophe, you're going first? Okay.

Christophe Bornand: Thank you, Chip. I'm Christophe Bornand. I'm the facilities planner and sustainability coordinator at St. Mary's College. The next few slides are going to be about what you can find in the report we have developed. It's a quick summary of the information. We start with the purpose and need. So, why are we doing the study, why are we studying alternatives to cross Route 5. It stems from the need to improve safety and safety is really paramount in everything the College and the City do. Just by observing what's happening around Route 5 when Route 5 crosses the College campus and the City area, you can observe a large number of vehicles with quite an excessive speed in this area of Route 5. Also, there's a high volume of pedestrians and bicyclists, and as many of you have seen, they don't always cross Route 5 at the crosswalk, they cross at many locations. Also, what's very obvious in the evening is inadequate lighting in this area of Route 5. So, all these show us that there is a need to improve safety and this is, as Chip mentioned, what this project is about. Now, Route 5 across the College and the City, of course a highway has many purposes, but we are in a very specific location with specific constraints and purposes. The first purpose of the highway is of course to provide a way of commuting and there's some commuter traffic along Route 5 in this area. Webster Field is not very far to the south of the College and the City, so, it's important to maintain for these people a convenient thoroughfare. Obviously we talked about safety. We want to provide a safe commute between the two sides of the roadway. The College and the City are on both sides of the roadway, so there

is going to be pedestrian and bicycle traffic. It is important to provide a safe passage. In addition to the College and the City, there is the Post Office, as you all know, Trinity Church is there. They have need for access and we need to make sure that whatever solution we decide at the end will still provide a good access to the Post Office and the Church. Then, what's also specific of Route 5 along this area is if you, some of you may know that Route 5 was built before the College expanded to the north side of the roadway and it's basically dissecting the College campus and the City in two pieces and it does not seem to really belong to either the City or the College and it does actually contribute to sense of place and maybe that's something that can be improved if we do anything on Route 5 or along Route 5. Route 5 is also serving as an emergency route and we need to recognize that and whatever we do has to comply with, of course, the State Highway Administration standards, but also remember that it has to accommodate emergency vehicles. We are in a rural area, there are a lot of farm fields around, and they from time to time, large farm equipment that travel Route 5 and we seem to accommodate that. We talked about safety before, so, a little bit of facts about traffic safety. Speed is actually the main factor contributing to safety or non-safety and the reason is it's the number one contributor of traffic accidents. Excessive speed is. A few reasons why, when you look at the stopping distance, it takes about 200 feet to stop a vehicle at 30 m.p.h. and is increased to more than 300 feet at 40 m.p.h. So the increase in speed has a dramatic impact on how long it takes for a car, or the vehicle to stop. Also, the seriousness of a crash or an accident, if a pedestrian is struck at 30 m.p.h., the survival rate is 60% and it drops dramatically to 10% at 40 m.p.h. So, this is information we obtained from the Federal Highway Administration. Now, some information about existing conditions of

Route 5. Route 5 was indeed designed for high speed of vehicles. As all of you know, there is the posted speed of 30 m.p.h. that the roadway south was designed for larger speed at a time when, again, there was no construction on the north side of Route 5, so it was not designed to cross in the developed area. This is why we have large traffic lanes, large shoulders, all the visual cues tell you to drive at a fairly high speed. As far as pedestrian count, this is our observation. We spent several days counting pedestrian traffic across Route 5 at the main crosswalk and the number of crossings at the peak hour is really significant, more than 500 pedestrians within two hours and at the peak time, around lunch time, you have 250 pedestrians crossing in less than 15 minutes. Most of you have experienced that continuous flow of pedestrians crossing Route 5 at the peak time of the day. Our observations also showed, we had, we experienced 32 when cars or vehicles fail to stop when pedestrians cross, I would call that near misses. If you spend some time next to Route 5 and look at what's happening, it's really cause for an improved safety in this area. Now we, so with this being said, we wanted to provide alternatives to crossing Route 5 and we need to define which criteria will help us select the preferred alternatives. We mentioned safety. It's an obvious one I hope, but it's not the only criteria for selecting options. Accessibility is really important. As mentioned before, we need to bring pedestrians and bicycles from one side of the roadway to the next. It has to be accessible for everyone. So, we need to avoid any barrier and make it accessible for disabled people as well. Functionality is, we believe in this important factor as well. If an option is not convenient, it's not going to be used, so, we want to make sure that whatever is being done, it will be used. Viewshed is an important criteria as well. I believe a few comments about the initial option with the footbridge were

regarding the impact on viewshed. This is indeed a beautiful area so we will be avoiding having a large impact on the view. Protection of resources, by this we mean the impact on the environment as well as the impact on archeological resources. You all know that we are on the grounds of archeological resources, so anything we might do could have an impact and so it's important to recognize that and make sure that we minimize anything that's being done and that's an important criteria for the selection. Vehicle congestion, I mentioned before that there is significant commuter traffic in this area and the heavy flow of pedestrian traffic across Route 5 is at times an impediment to fluid traffic. So, if the solution we end up implementing eases vehicle congestion that would be a big plus, or at least not impact it. Feasibility, we want to make sure that the selected option is feasible and that it is acceptable by the State Highway Administration standards and makes sense. Cost is a factor as well. We want to minimize expenses unnecessary expenses. So, I am going to end this part of the presentation by showing you this map. I think it's quite telling. Just to orient ourselves, this is Route 5, the north of Route 5 going along St. Mary's River, crossing St. John's Pond and turning and heading south. We now have other pictures, it's difficult for me to show you where we are. The Campus Center is here. The Library is next to it and this is the main existing crosswalk, across Route 5 and that's the side of the existing Anne Arundel Hall. So, this map is also to show you that there are multiple destinations on both sides of Route 5 for pedestrians and bicycles. The Library and Campus Center are two interesting ones on the north side, but remember there's also this entrance sight on the north part of campus that will have to be connected somehow to the future Visitor's Center in this area. And there is the River Center and several academic buildings on the south side of the roadway that are destinations for our students

at all times of the day. I think what's also interesting, the red arrows are, we observed, pedestrian paths of travel, and you can see that most of the pedestrian crossing happens at the existing south crosswalk. There are several other crossings that happen north of that, including people crossing outside of crosswalks. The existing north crosswalk is very little used and also a large pedestrian traffic crossing Route 5 at the bridge, or close to the bridge. So, again, pedestrian traffic does not happen only at the main crossing, but over a significant area of Route 5. This being said, I'm going to hand the microphone to Chris.

Chris Mergner: Thank you, everyone. Can everyone hear me?

Attendees: Yes.

Chris Mergner: Great. I'd like to apologize in advance if there's any glare coming off my head tonight. Hopefully, you can see the presentation very well. I'd like to thank Christophe for a wonderful presentation and the CDA and the distinguished guests. My name is Chris Mergner and I'm the capital projects manager at St. Mary's College in the office of facilities and planning. We're going to talk about some alternatives. The alternatives you are about to see in about eight slides. They consist of alternates that were presented at the open house. Some of the information has been pared down just a little bit to give us a better feel for just the highlights, but a detailed account of all the components of the alternatives, the advantages, and considerations and costs are outlined in the report online and we'll have that website up again for you at the end. The first alternative, obviously, is to do nothing, no physical improvement. This alternative proposes to leave

the unchanged, the current operations in the pedestrian circulation parallel to and across Route 5 with no change. One obvious advantage is there's no cost. There's also no negative impact on viewshed. A few of the considerations are that does not improve pedestrian or bicycle safety. There are no negative impacts on traffic congestion and again, there's no cost associated with this. So, we first looked at this with regards to the crosswalk, the existing crosswalk. As we look forward, the next alternative as we proceeded was to look at alternative number two, which has a series of about three slides. The focus here is to improve the existing south crosswalk where about 90% or a large majority of people cross between the Campus Center and Margaret Brent. That was our first focus beyond doing nothing. So, the first suggestion was to look at better roadway lighting. Roadway lighting in this section of roadway is in some ways inconsistent. The strategy consists of installing additional light poles on Route 5 in the vicinity of the existing crosswalk. There has been some discussions of some glare and other conversations for consistency. One of the advantages of the existing crosswalk better roadway lighting is improved visibility of the pedestrians and for the motorists at night. It reduces night time crashes by as much as 20% and improves security. There's a low impact on archeological resources and may be combined with other traffic calming measures. It has a relatively cost. Some of the considerations are that it does not provide immediate pedestrian exposure to traffic. I'm sorry, it does not eliminate pedestrian exposure to traffic. It does not improve pedestrian safety during the daytime and there are some impacts on viewshed. The cost for something like this in the immediate vicinity of the crosswalk, at the south crosswalk would be about \$50,000. Along the same lines at that existing crosswalk, at the south crosswalk, would be an idea of a traffic signal. This

alternative consists of installing a traffic stoplight at the location of the existing south crosswalk. Some of the advantages would be that it improves pedestrian and bicycle safety, it reduces traffic congestion at peak hours, it has relatively low cost, it may be combined with other traffic measures, low impact on archeological resources. Some of the considerations are it does not eliminate pedestrian exposure to traffic completely. We also have to consider a negative impact on viewshed and another consideration is the number of pedestrians and bicycles will not necessarily wait for the walk signal to cross. Driver's attention to pedestrians will be reduced with a controlled device and there is the potential for an increase in rear-end collisions for motorists. This does not address safety of pedestrians and bicycles along the entire Route 5 and the cost is approximately \$100,000 for an installation of this at this location. A lot of the data that supports this comes from the State Highway Administration and J.M.T. Engineers, who are traffic engineers on this subject. Alternative number two, with regard to improving the existing, the south crosswalk, would be some crosswalk enhancements. The purpose of a crosswalk enhancement is to warn motorists and to expect pedestrians and bicycles to invite them to adjust their speed accordingly. I want to highlight that this strategy does not propose speed bumps or cobblestone pavement. The posted speed limit remains as is at 30 m.p.h. Some of the advantages are that it discourages excessive vehicle speed. It has a low impact on archeological resources, it has a low impact, or potential improvement, on viewshed, and it may be combined with other traffic measures. Some considerations of this option are limited effect on reducing excessive vehicle speed, does not eliminate pedestrian and bicycle exposure to traffic, does not address safety of pedestrian and bicycles along the entire Route 5. The approximate cost of something of this magnitude

would be about \$100,000 to \$200,000, which leads me to the next series, or concept, of alternatives. Alternative number three, improvements throughout Route 5, the campus corridor, otherwise known as traffic calming. The immediate vicinity north and south of the existing two crosswalks is about 1,200 feet, but there is more distance along Route 5 above and below that between the two 30 m.p.h. signs. The purpose of this strategy is to promote safe conditions for motorists, bicyclists and pedestrians along Route 5 by encouraging motorists to reduce their speed to the established speed limit of 30 m.p.h. Again, I'd like to emphasize that this strategy does not propose speed bumps or cobblestone pavement. The posted speed limit remains as is at 30 m.p.h. Some of the advantages of alternative three would be that it discourages excessive vehicle speed, it addresses pedestrian safety along the entire corridor, and it has a low impact on archeological resources. It improves aesthetics and a sense of arrival for visitors of Historic St. Mary's City and there's a moderate impact on the viewshed. Some of the considerations of alternative three are it does not completely eliminate pedestrian exposure to traffic, there's no significant impact on traffic congestion, and the design needs to accommodate all the uses of the roadway, such as, fire, farm equipment and emergency vehicles. These would be strong considerations. Before we get into the next series of the last two options, which are a bridge or a tunnel, I'd like to review with you a sight section and some basic data. Over here is the Campus Center, and over here are the high grounds of Anne Arundel Hall and Maryland Heritage Interpretive Center, or the State House. The red line represents the current path of travel. It comes down to the road from elevation 18 down to elevation 12 as you can see here. It's about six feet of drop. As it rises back up, it goes to elevation 32, even a little higher at the State House, which

is at about elevation 36. But in the vicinity of the project, and what we're accomplishing, these are the numbers that we are working with. So when we look at the existing path of travel, we notice here the existing pathway, the length is a total of about 860 feet. The length of path, which is less than 5% slope, is 330 feet and the length of handicap ramping that is required is 530 feet. There's a total vertical change down and back up of 26 linear feet. If you look at the bridge option, the concept here is that we go straight from the existing sight line that's already developed at the Campus Center and it goes straight across, up and over. It goes up and it pretty much plateaus at the height of elevation 32. The total elevation change here is 16 feet and it has a total length of travel of about 738 feet. It has a path of 418 feet and less rampage at 320 required for this project. The tunnel concept has some other challenges, but we're going to show you that, for example, there's a 1,300 foot travel distance required for this particular design idea. If we come down from the existing path of travel to the road, we'd have to come back about 120 feet and then back to the tunnel about 120 feet, underneath the tunnel, and then go 90, 90, 90, 90 and then go back up for a total length of 1,300 feet and a ramp, length of handicap ramping would be about 960 linear feet. There would be only a leftover path travel of 340 feet. The total vertical change for the tunnel is 48 feet down and up. There is also some existing high ground beyond to the south of the existing crosswalk. The red line represents the existing path, but this green area here represents higher elevations of earth that is existing and would be a spring point for a potential bridge. So, when we look at alternative number four, which is to construct a pedestrian footbridge in place of the crosswalk at the south location, this alternative consists of the construction of the pedestrian footbridge to span Route 5. The advantages would be, it separates pedestrians

and bicyclists from vehicular traffic, it improves convenience of circulation directly between the Campus Center and historic campus and it eases traffic flow. Here's a picture of a very simple installation at Boys Latin in Baltimore, at Lake Avenue. Some of the considerations would be that it increases vehicle speed and risk in the rest of the corridor. Some people actually might see this bridge as a solution and may travel faster, exposing the north crosswalk to perhaps other considerations, it has an impact on viewshed, it has a consideration of potential maintenance of graffiti or banners. Another consideration is potential moderate impact on archeological resources. This alternative could be used in conjunction with other alternatives, traffic calming measures, as an adjunct. The total cost for this particular project is about \$1.5 million. The last alternative, alternative number 5, is to construct a pedestrian tunnel in place of the south crosswalk. This alternative consists of the construction of a pedestrian-bicycle underpass below Route 5 in the vicinity of the existing crosswalk near Margaret Brent. The advantages are it separates pedestrians and bicycles from vehicular traffic and it eases traffic flow. This is an example of an underpass in Phoenix, Arizona, called the Phoenix Pedestrian Underpass in Phoenix, Arizona. Some of the considerations for this option would be it increases vehicle speed and risk in the rest of the corridor. It reduces convenience of circulation between the Campus Center and historic campus. There's a potential large impact on archeological resources with the amount of excavation required and the tunnels are often perceived as unsafe. There's also the consideration of maintenance of graffiti and a project of this magnitude would probably cost \$1.2 million or more. That concludes the alternative section. There were other alternatives that we

received under the surveys, we'll share that information with you and talk with Dan. I'm going to turn this back over to Chip for a little segue and thank you very, very much.

Chip Jackson: I'm just going to turn this over to Dan real quick. There's not much else to say. Thank you, Chris, for giving the information on the alternatives, and Christophe on the various issues. Take it away, Dan.

Dan Branigan: Thank you, sir. I'm Dan Branigan, director of design and construction at the College and, gosh, I see a lot of faces that I met at the open houses and I want to thank you for coming. It was my first chance to meet some of you. Here it is, this is what you've been waiting for – the results of the survey. I do want to thank you for filling out the surveys because without them, we wouldn't have the responses. Just so you know, we had 150 people sign in. I'm not sure that everybody signed in, but that's about what we had sign in at the two open houses we had. We received 188 survey responses and the surveys are really pretty evenly, from students, community members, and faculty and staff from the College and Historic St. Mary's City, so they are not all from one group or another. I do want to again plug the report and the survey are still online until the end of the week, so if you know anybody who has not turned in a survey and would like to, please point them to our website and they can do the survey and it will be included. So, as of 12:00 noon today, this is when we tabulated the results, these are the results we had on the first eight questions, if you remember the survey, if you took it, was in two parts and it had eight questions and 10 questions. The first eight questions dealt with what were people's concerns about safety and how did you rank them. If you put down, if you

ranked it a number one, that meant it was not important all the way up to five, which was extremely important. What I've done here is, we took all the results and we did an arithmetic mean, or an average, of all the responses that were received, so what you are looking at is the mean answer to each question and I will put them up not in necessarily the order that you saw them on the survey, but they are in descending order of what people thought were most important down to least important. As you can see, most people, not most people, everybody responding as a whole, thought that vehicles traveling faster than 30 m.p.h. was the number one concern followed by inadequate street lighting, pedestrians outside of crosswalks, inadequate lighting on shoulders, and no signals at crosswalks. Then the last three, interesting just to point out, that's where they fall below three, which was important, so you might say that those last three, signage, pedestrians on shoulders and bicycles on shoulders were to the whole population of respondents a little less than important, not a whole lot less than important, but just a little bit less than important. Interestingly, on no questions did we get everybody coming back and saying it was not an important issue. So, overall, everybody who responded felt that we had some important safety issues. Now, here I took those same questions just so you could see and I broke them apart by the different responding groups. We broke down the responding groups, remember at the end you could circle whether you were a community member, or a faculty or staff member, or student. So, these are the top three concerns in blue. The students, inadequate lighting on the shoulders, inadequate street lighting, and vehicles traveling faster than 30 m.p.h. For the community, pedestrians outside of crosswalks, inadequate street lighting, vehicles faster than 30 m.p.h. For faculty and staff, vehicles faster than 30 m.p.h., pedestrians outside of crosswalks and inadequate

street lighting. You'll note that community and faculty and staff picked the same top three. Maybe in a little slightly different order, but the same top three. Students picked almost the same top three. The only thing that was different there was the inadequate lighting on shoulders, since students are typically mostly pedestrians, that would be a concern to them. The next section, the last 10 questions, dealt with, as responded, how would you if you were developing criteria for designing a solution for these safety problems, what was important criteria. Again, in descending value of what you thought was important, improving pedestrian safety was number one, preserving the environment was number two and preserving archeology was number three. Then costs came up at four, followed by bicycles, viewshed, vehicle safety, improving accessibility, minimizing vehicle, vehicular congestion and enhancing the sense of arrival filled out the bottom. Again those were the only two that fell below the 3.0 line, but again, just barely below the 3.0 line. As groups of respondents, students felt archeology was number one, which Henry should be cheering. Environment was number two and safety was number three. The community, safety was number one, environment was number two and archeology was number three, all very close. With the faculty and staff, safety, environment and archeology. Guess what? Everybody picked the same top three. Again, maybe not necessarily in the same order, but as a whole group, it's, people are a lot closer together thinking than you might otherwise have thought. Lastly, and this is the hardest part, the survey comments, as you remember on the last part of the survey form, there's a box on the back of the paper for comments, on the online one, there's a block for the comments, and we were really pleased. Seventy-seven percent of people who took the survey gave us comments, which was great. So many people to say yes, I'll do your survey and turn it

in. People really took the time to fill out the survey and let us know what they thought and if I was going to give you a talk about all the comments, we'd be here for two more hours. We haven't really had a chance, we just started looking at these things on Friday, so we haven't really had a chance to digest them and take in everything everybody said. But, I will give you the highlights that kept coming up time and time and time again in many of the surveys, you might say the most popular comments. The first one was pedestrian safety and just about everybody agreed that yes, there is a pedestrian safety problem for many different reasons. But, the commonality was that there's a pedestrian safety problem. Lighting was a real common theme. Everybody, no matter if you were a student, faculty, staff, community member, everybody said the lighting was not very good, do something to fix the lighting. Traffic problem measures, again, pretty much across the board, many people, a lot of people thought it was not a bad idea, we hadn't thought about it, but you should consider that. The bridge, now the bridge was interesting. We got a lot of comments about the bridge and I will tell you, there were some that were saying don't dare build that bridge, it's a terrible idea. We had others saying why hadn't you built it already. The comments were quite diverse on the bridge comments, which tells me that it's controversial, I guess you could say. But that's what we had on the bridge. But, last, it was nice to see that we got a lot of comments just talking about the process that we're using, the people were thanking us and telling us it was a good idea, a good process, we like the involvement. So, that's it in a nutshell. I'm sorry I can't give you more detail. Like I said, we just started analyzing this the other day. But, as we proceed through this process we will do more and more. Now, Chip.

Chip Jackson: Thanks, Dan. Again, very interesting results so far, as Dan mentioned. The survey is still open for people who haven't filled it, responded to the survey. We will, once the survey closes this Friday, we will endeavor next week to get the final results posted on the website. There's some more detail we can provide beyond the review here. We want everyone to have a chance to, not only fill out the survey, but to see the data that was provided in response to that. One of the comments that I found very interesting during the open house is the number of people who suggested that one of the things we haven't covered in the open house or in the report is how can we improve student's behavior in terms of how they cross the road. That's an important suggestion. It's a very difficult suggestion, but one that we heard and we're going to think and talk more about. It's an ongoing issue. You can't do it once because as we know, the students come and go. That's what we want them to do, but how we can have a dialog with the campus community, about, there is a crosswalk, we can't just assume that it's the sidewalk to our back door and just cross it without thinking. So, we appreciate that comment as well. In terms of process from here, we have this feedback, there was one other question in the open house about State Highway's involvement in this process and I guess I would summarize it in that State Highways has been very much consultative with us on this project for many years. The idea that began as a footbridge and their view is, since there is federal funding, as you know, for the footbridge, they're not required to provide funding for the project. A footbridge would go over their property, but not touch physically their right of way. So, they would consult with us, they certainly are supportive if that is what the decision would be. But, they don't have a formal role in saying the footbridge can't or can happen. They would have to give a permit for it, but

that's a technical engineering issue about how you would do it. If there's alternatives, such as the lighting along Route 5, or sidewalks or improving crosswalks, traffic calming, anything that, some suggestions of a stoplight, with things that happen within the roadway, State Highways certainly has to be a major player. Again, since we began, after the November public meeting we had to begin talking about other alternatives, we've certainly been in contact with State Highways a number of times. They've provided a lot of input into the report, but a project that actually would change anything within the right of way, the roadway, or anything else in the roadway, they certainly become a partner in the project and would have a much more higher involvement. So, that was a question that was asked during the open house. Christophe mentioned, not Christophe, Chris mentioned the, in terms of the traffic calming idea, or other changes to the roadway, such as improving the crosswalk, that that's not the proposal from the early 90s. Many of you were there at the Ridge Fire House. I was certainly there and very sensitive to that proposal and it was a faulty proposal, I admit that. It went too far, it went too hard and it didn't consult the community in the process. If there are these options that, of improving things in the right away, if the preferred alternative is traffic calming or other changes in the roadway, we will be very clear that we would not propose anything as extensive as that 1993 proposal. There would be no speed bumps, there would be no cobblestone, we would not eliminate the shoulders. That would not be on the table. But there may be issues that State Highways has suggested, that adjust the roadway to make it feel like you're safer driving at a slower speed like 30 m.p.h. instead of the 50 m.p.h. or the 60 m.p.h. that it's designed for. I'm not suggesting that people drive 60 m.p.h. all the time. At that point on the agenda, we'd like to first have questions and comments from

members of the Capital Design Advisory and after that we will open the floor because we want, again, to get your feedback.

Melvin McClintock: Can everybody hear me?

Attendees: Yes.

Melvin McClintock: Good. I'm wondering why not seriously consider all of the options that are there. This is a wide-open process and, more importantly, don't look at them singularly, you can combine any alternative that you see. You may think that part of one and part of another is a solution that you believe to be best, so, don't think singularly, think of the whole concept and what you believe to be the best project.

Pete Himmelheber: I'm Pete from the St. Mary's County Historical Society. My concern was, the problem is, you have a meeting of people and a meeting of cars, so to eliminate that situation, you have to get rid of one or the other. That's kind of hard to do with cars, it would be a monumental detour. But I ask the staff at the College here if they would consider eliminating crossing the road by the students. In other words, have all of the classes on one side of the road, if you have the administrative section on the south side of the road. This of course, if you can eliminate 80% of the traffic, you eliminate 80% of your problem, it's that simple. But, I was told there's historical aspects to consider and so forth and so on. I hear you, but, I mean, it is a solution and I'd like to just put that forward. Thank you.

Chip Jackson: Thank you. Well, having had full opportunity...

Unidentified Man: I'd like to comment a little bit about the timeline you have as far as the federal funding goes.

Chip Jackson: Yes, again, could you please stand up and state your name and we'll get a microphone?

Unidentified Man: My name is (unintelligible) and I'd like to know what the timeline is as far as the federal funding and the drop date.

Chip Jackson: The drop date or the beginning date?

Unidentified Man: When do the monies expire for the federal bridge?

Chip Jackson: We'll find out. Did you sign in?

Unidentified Man: I certainly did.

Chip Jackson: If you give us your phone number, we'll find out and let you know what year it is. I don't actually know, right here, what year it is. I know it's not this year or the next year, but I'm not sure.

Unidentified Man: So that's not driving the decision at this point?

Chip Jackson: No, it's not. As I said earlier, the main issue driving the timing is that there are, there is funding as well for designing the two buildings, Anne Arundel Hall and new Interpretive Center which is a replacement for the City's museum and the barn next door, and there is, the money does not run out, as the federal money can run out. But those projects, the legislature has actually said to get moving on this, on the designs of these projects. Any other? Yes?

Sherry Stanley: I'm Sherry Stanley and my husband and I live three driveways north of the College and we also have the 30 m.p.h. sign right above our driveway so I can testify that people are not going 30 m.p.h., they are going faster. One of my questions is, in the traffic coming, if it could be extended because there's a College field right across from us and if the traffic coming could come further and to me, also, it's a wonderful way of entering St. Mary's City.

Chip Jackson: Okay, thank you. Yes?

Mr. Stanley: I'm the other half of Sherry Stanley and I've probably got a few comments more, but, one thing is just talking about Sherry's piece. The bridge, from the field, there on the north, I walk that area and to me, that is actually a more serious concern for safety because there is no place to walk. The other comment, as we've seen with security over

the years, you can justify all kinds of monies and so forth on the basis of needing more security, and I'm still not convinced, I don't have any strong views one way or the other on what we do, but I'm still not convinced of the safety and what it takes to totally eliminate risk. Also in that regard, then, on just to keep things more straight on alternatives four and five, the tunnel number five, and the bridge number four. Even though students and others did not make walking along the shoulders, or the bicycles along shoulders, as much of a safety issue, I really do think that four and five, under its considerations, needs to put that 1,200 or 1,500 feet exposure to bicycles and pedestrians, like they've put it under the other three alternatives, just to keep it, because, that exposure is not eliminated and frankly, I mean, my own view is that with, if you do not have a bridge or a tunnel up there, I think we're just going to see increased traffic, which means also, then, increased risk of anybody walking along Route 5. Thank you.

Chip Jackson: Thank you. Yes?

Marc Apter: I'm Marc Apter and I wanted to know has there been an analysis of (unintelligible.)

Chip Jackson: The question is, has there been an analysis. Some of you may have noticed that last week there were little sensors in the road. State Highways put those in to count cards, just to update their data on cars and vehicle speeds. That analysis, they haven't completed yet. We will report that analysis when it's available, either later this week or next week. Yes, sir?

Don Beck: Yes, my name is Don Beck and I've observed this traffic for a while. I've lived, I'm (John Stanley's?) next door neighbor, one door down. I've been coming to the post office for 20 years and I had a couple daughters at St. Mary's so it's been about 30 years that I've been coming down here. I'm pretty familiar with the traffic pattern and I'll say right up front that my own thing is the dollars and cents and the thing that makes most of all the alternatives to me is a light. A light you can adjust. People will say, oh, the NESEA traffic will get backed up. Let me tell you, those commuters at NESEA get smart real fast. There are other alternatives to get back to Route 5. They can go to 235 and double back to Park Hall. They'll figure out a way around it and it'll cut your traffic down if the wait gets too long. There you've got a system you can change, what have you. If you want to go another alternative a little less than that, probably a little safer, you know, in schools for years, we've had school crossing guards out there who stop the traffic and let things go. I wonder why some of you didn't add, in this day and age of tough times in the economy, we don't we do that. But regardless of which option you choose, John stole some of my thunder on the four options, none of these options will solve the problem with the lower crossing. And I can call you they zip across. People come around from the dorms, around the pond and right across. And, you built the River Center and the Boat House there and all I can say is that in the summer, the traffic is going to be tremendous going back and forth across there. It's going to be (unintelligible word.) The other thing which nobody's addressed, and I think it's the greatest chance of having a valid fatality at St. Mary's College, is Mattapan Road. I see people walking, biking and hiking on especially that first quarter mile as you come off of Route 5. It's a

deathtrap waiting to happen and the best thing the school could do would be to say, don't ever come out of the back thing and take a right if you're on a bike or if you're going to walk. The other one, as John mentioned, is the bridge over there. And in the summer, you've got people crabbing and what have you and it's confined. You've got all your athletic teams going to the north field. It is a really dangerous place. That's something that I think really needs to be addressed. One of the ideas that I had, if you really want to slow down traffic, put one of the radar things that clocks your speed as you go by. Watch people come to the Potomac River Bridge when all of a sudden they see that 25 m.p.h. ahead and all of a sudden, bingo, they slow down. I don't see why, I don't know what they cost, but if we had one on each end, I guarantee you the traffic coming through St. Mary's College will slow down. It's a human reaction, what we do. The other thing, which may sound far-fetched, I noticed in some of your advantages and disadvantages, you have graffiti. Well, let me tell you, as someone whose lived her 20 years, come the weekend, there's a lot of partying down on Church Point and I can tell you there's some people very soused up. If you build a bridge, you'd better consider that somewhere along the way, somebody's going to drop a bucket of paint, a rock, or the other thing that could happen is that they may decide to go over themselves. So if you build a bridge, my advice is, be sure you build it safe because, let me tell you, in this day and age, college students, we were all that age at one time and we all did some wild and dumb things. But, I think you're really rushing to try and get resolution. If you're rushing, my advice is to take the least, cost effective, and I really believe the light will help you a lot and you also can change that. You can change signs and lighting, we all know that. The bikers, that's something. I can be coming through there at 20 m.p.h. and all of a sudden,

shhhheeeewww, here comes this bicycle out of nowhere. So, I think you really need to step back and take a look at this and I think the pace is going too fast. But, like I say, none of these alternatives really, really affect where I think you are most likely to have a fatality. I think people, with a light, I also don't know about your stopping distance. I don't know about you, but I have a Ford F-150 truck and I guarantee you that at 30 m.p.h. I can stop that truck in less than 200 feet. But, in general, I think you really need to look at some other areas and as John pointed out, that bridge and the little narrow point in Route 5 is an accident waiting for a place to happen. I would rather see you use money to build a pedestrian bridge on the other side where people could go to the fields and not have to worry about getting out on Route 5. Thank you.

Chip Jackson: Thank you, Don. I just have a quick comment on one of those points. They are all great points. On Mattapany Road, we have worked with the county for a number of years and they have, or I think they have put in, their five-year capital improvement program though the Department of Public Works some money to start looking at how to improve safety on Mattapany. The College and the City could not agree more that that lower section of Mattapany is very dangerous and its not one of those cases of waiting for an accident to happen. There have been serious accidents and we have lost students there. Thank you for bringing that up. Yes, sir?

Paul Evans: I'm Paul Evans. I have a couple of observations and comments. First off, I'm a little disappointed in the CDA website. I went there about eight o'clock this morning to find out when the next CDA meeting was and there was nothing about this

meeting on the website. So whoever is in charge of that, it would certainly help us, the community, to know that something is actually happening. It's one of the reasons I showed up late today. Secondly, I'm a little disappointed in the rest of the CDA membership. I haven't heard a comment other than the St. Mary's Historic Commission, Historical Society. There have to be other comments from the other members of the CDA and it's a little disappointing to me not to hear anything other than from the College and Historic St. Mary's City. After the last CDA meeting that talked about this issue, I happened to go for a run through the College. I live about a mile north of the College and it wasn't lunch time and I saw one of the public safety officers parked at the crosswalk. His lights were flashing and he was standing part-way in the crosswalk, similar to what Mr. Beck was talking about, the perfect opportunity for a crossing guard and I was wondering how often that has happened. You know, we all know what happens with rubbernecking when there is a police car on the other side of the interstate, everybody slows down. The perfect way to slow people down is to get that car out there with its lights flashing, another way to save some money. And my last comment and question, again, has to do with the public safety officers. Do they have any power of enforcement for traffic code? Can they run radar? Can they give traffic tickets for people speeding? I think a major, a better way to fix this problem, may be increased enforcement. So, if the public safety officers can do that, perhaps that will slow people down. It's easy to condition drivers, as some of us have mentioned earlier. You start throwing tickets at us, we'll slow down. That's all I have.

Chip Jackson: Thank you.

Rae Thompson: My name is Rae Thompson and I've lived here in St. Mary's City for 45 years and I have yet to see a vehicle not, to not stop when a pedestrian is crossing at the crosswalk and I think it's been remarkable with the 30 m.p.h. speed limit has been observed. Maybe I'm not there at the right time, but I've spent a lot of time at the post office and going north and south. I have yet to see anyone not stop for a pedestrian and my input, I wanted to compliment the, for the open house. That thing was very well handled and nicely done. I feel that it's very simple from my standpoint. All you do is put some additional lighting down there. Another two of your light posts and, if need be, put in the light for the students going across the walkway. Let them push the button and traffic will stop. I'd bet my bottom dollar on that. But as far as the rest of these ambitious and costly things as a tunnel. The tunnel is absolutely ludicrous and I think we're not addressing the bicycles right here, because there are bicycles, but I think they have to adhere to the same restrictions as your pedestrians do. They have to stop and push the button also. But I think rather than get all these grandiose thing going and the community is now is saying okay, we're going to take the burden when the bicycles are out. Now I don't see too many bicycles in the winter, but I think that needs to be addressed, that the bicyclists do not have the first preference. Thank you.

Chip Jackson: Yes, sir?

Danny Ruthenberg-Marshall: My name is Danny Ruthenberg-Marshall. I'm a student at St. Mary's. One of the things I keep hearing is people saying that they think a stoplight

would be a really good idea. I think something (unintelligible) would be a good idea, but I'm thinking a stop sign would be a much better idea. We all know that pedestrians and bicyclists are not going to stop and press the button. Yes, we would like them to, but that's not the reality of the situation. I know as a pedestrian myself and as a sometimes bicyclist, I have not stopped before when I should have. I'm at fault there, I know. But there are 2,000 of us and even if we are all at fault just once or twice, we're not going to stop. So, it's important to keep the realities of the situation in mind when we're doing this and having a stop sign would be very effective to that end, as everyone, all the drivers, would have to stop. Most of them have to anyway because there are often times pedestrians there. So, it wouldn't harm vehicle congestion very much. It would keep things fairly similar in terms of that aspect. It would always slow people down because they know they have to stop. They don't have to sit there and they're driving along slowing down, I know I've driven around there and I'm looking back and forth and I can't tell, it's nine, ten, twelve o'clock at night, I'm a Safe Ride driver, so I'm always out there at night and it's very hard to see, I know that, so lighting would also be helpful, but there's that sense of uncertainty when we are driving that we don't know if there's going to be a bicyclist whipping out. If we have to stop, it takes away that unknown factor. We can stop, we can look, and we can continue. This also keeps traffic speed down for the north crosswalk because people have already had to come to a stop, every drive and once they stopped, they can't immediately start going 40 or 50 m.p.h. again and the north crosswalk isn't that far away. So, it'll keep the safety there. I know you said at 30 m.p.h. the rate of survival is 40, 60%, or whatever it was and then it goes down to 10%. That would help with that. Some of the other things I wrote down about why it would be better

than the traffic light. It has less impact on the viewshed and it's much cheaper than a traffic light even. Think about how much a stop sign costs, a thousand, two thousand dollars for both of them on each way? And that's being very fancy stop signs. So, sorry, so that would definitely be a very cheap solution. If it turns out, for some reason, that this doesn't work, not a lot has been invested in it so we can go back and change it if it doesn't work. The only way any of these solutions can actually be analyzed and proven is to have it implemented and to implement a \$1.5 million footbridge only to find out it doesn't work would be a huge waste of money and resources and it would have such a significant impact on the environment and archeological aspect of things compared to a stop sign that it just doesn't seem to make sense. That's about it. Thank you.

Chip Jackson: Thank you. Yes, ma'am. I'm sorry, I didn't see your hand.

Minnie Russell: I always like to be last. First of all, I want to thank you for having these meetings. I think it's absolutely a big turnaround from 14 years ago. I had to bring it up, Mr. Jackson, I'm very sorry, but that was a promise 14 years ago and it took a little while, but we finally made it. Another thing I want to remind people, that we're basically talking about adults. We're not talking about juveniles, we're not talking about babies, we're not talking about just walking, we're talking about adults and how many accidents has anybody reported in this particular area on 5, I'm not talking about Mattapan, I'm talking about 5. Can you cite any accidents in the recent years? I can't? By the way folks, my name is Minnie Russell and I have lived here my entire life. In fact, I was the youngest person at the 300th anniversary of St. Mary's City. I happen to, that happened to

be the 17th of June. I was born on the 26th of April. That's how old I was. I'm 74. Just like you to know that. So, I can't remember any accidents than a construction accident right at the end, right where that Rowing Center is. There was a construction accident there while they were building the road. That I do remember.

Chip Jackson: There haven't been any accidents reported to State Highways. We do know of miscellaneous minor infractions. A couple years ago, a student had a student had their backpack taken off of their back by a side mirror of a car and this fall we had a student who jumped out of the way of a car that didn't stop. She was in the crosswalk. She broke her ankle and there's a report on that, but it didn't end up as a traffic accident to State Highways, but it was still an accident.

Minnie Russell: We're thankful that nobody's lost their life.

Chip Jackson: Yes.

Minnie Russell: With that, I have to tell you, I was sitting there in the southbound lane one day, not too many years ago, just sitting there waiting for the students and whoever to cross across the walk and this student came legging it, big, tall, not big, he was tall and thin in fact, nice looking guy, college student, and guess what he did? He walked straight into my car! And I'm just sitting there and he leaned over the hood and rolled around like he just hit a deer, you know how you do, and he kept on walking up the hill. I just have to throw that in. Okay. To this...

Attendees: Laughter.

Chip Jackson: That's precious, it's great.

Minnie Russell: Pardon?

Chip Jackson: I said, that's precious, that's great.

Minnie Russell: Well, I don't know whether it broke his leg or arm or anything else, but I wasn't moving, that's for sure, if he wants to file suit, go ahead. On this questionnaire, when you speak to pedestrians walking in the road, on the road shoulders and bicycles traveling, you can't stop that. That's a Maryland law. They can travel along the shoulder of the road as much as they want to, you don't have much control of that and as far as improving bicycle safety, the first thing you need to do is stop the Russian roulette coming down the hill. I almost got one, one day for that. I don't call that an adult action when they do that. Improving the barrier-free accessibility if at all possible, yes, I'd like you to do that. Now, from here, I know my three minutes might be up, but from here on out, I'd like to read what I spent a few hours this afternoon writing and thinking about. What this area of Rural Route 5 does not need is a footbridge or a tunnel. Neither...

Attendees: Laughter and unintelligible comments.

Minnie Russell: Thank you. Neither will improve safety. When a bridge or tunnel, or a road or a path, or a street, take you past where you want to go, you're going to look for a shorter route and that's what both of these do – take you past the post office. The only other route, in this case, is to walk, or drive a vehicle, or ride a bike, or a horse. Yes, there have been horses crossing there, across Route 5. Solutions. I want you to get paper and pencil out because I have some new solutions. Move all classrooms to one side of Route 5 to eliminate the majority of student traffic across Route 5. Build a new classroom building, if necessary on the side of Route 5 where most of the classes are now. This was something that was brought up 14 years ago and they are still building buildings on, I think you refer to this as the north side, but I'm not that familiar with it. And they are still talking about building buildings on the south side. It was then promised that they would try to direct as many classes on the north side. Now, second, now this I'm not that familiar with, but I understand that it does exist. Put a mechanical mechanism, I don't know what it's called. Maybe some of the folks here do know. At the beginning and end of the 30 m.p.h. zone, so when a speeding vehicle goes past this mechanism, the light at the post office crossover will automatically turn red. You will have to install a stoplight at the post office area. Now I understand that this is in other places, you might want to check it out. I think it's a great idea. With these speeds, only a speeding car will reflect and come up red. So he can't go anywhere. Let's see, post office area. Also you can install speed cameras and mail the speeding motorists a ticket he wouldn't appreciate too many of them. This traffic light in the post office area could have the push button system the students could push so they wouldn't have to wait as long for the light to change. They can have a dual thing here, the one that picks up the speeding motorist and also one

to cross over on at the traffic light. Campus security could be authorized to give tickets and have them do more auto traffic and pedestrian controlling. I only see him, usually up in front of Broome Howard House, where it was, sitting back there watching the cars go by. I mean, I don't know what he get's paid for. I have no idea what his job description calls for, but to me, it looks like to me he could, on rush hours, or the class releases, go down to the crosswalk and at least stop the traffic. I do that for my grandson getting off the bus from Ridge Elementary School. The y go past the bus and they almost, the little kid next door was only about 50 feet away, almost got him one day, I mean nearly got him one day. I walk out in the middle of the road and stand there. If you want to hit somebody, hit me, don't hit my grandson, hit me. The adding of more lights would be a help at night and on dark days. We have a lot of dark cloudy days. It certainly would help along that route. Add speed bumps if Maryland law allows on a Maryland highway, I'm not sure with that, like the ones on the campus. That will slow up speeders or damage something, that's for sure. I didn't know those kind existed until I went to the meeting last Wednesday. I wasn't sure what I was looking at when I saw it, but I did stop. I don't know what would have happened if I hadn't stopped. The rest of the available funds could be used to education the students and others against drugs, speeding, and drunk driving, and any other bad habit and save some for college scholarships. When kids want to go to school, we need to do everything we can to help them. I certainly thank you for your time and I appreciate you listening to me and I didn't see you move your pencil one time.

Chip Jackson: I did, I wrote down a few of them, but we're recording it so we'll have them on transcript.

Minnie Russell: Can you put it on Channel 12? That's what they...

Attendees: Laughter an unintelligible comment.

Minnie Russell: Thank you.

Chip Jackson: Thank you, Minnie. Yes, sir? At the risk of upsetting many that you're now going last, Bryan.

Bryan Siebert: I put my comments in writing like Minnie did to facilitate it. In light of the fact there has never been an injury to a student or other pedestrian crossing the road, why does safety demand a bridge. In addition, while safety is the universal good in everyone's lexicon, in fact, a bridge will not stop students and cyclists from crossing where they please as they do now. The safety risk will not be measurably enhanced with a bridge since there appears to be little or no risk now, judging by the incidents of serious injuries, which is presently zero. So, if there is a pressing need to spend money and do something, it seems one of the least expensive and least intrusive of the alternatives would be appropriate. Where did the money come from for this project? We understand the U. S. Congress put in money for the bridge, but no Hoyer, no Cardin ever came to St. Mary's County and asked whether we, the citizens, wanted to fund a bridge. In addition,

Hoyer, a Board of Trustees member, would not tell me how many earmarks he has given to the College or who asked him for them. As a tax paying citizen, I do not want my tax dollars being parceled out by politicians to suit their interests without giving the public the chance to say whether they want their money spent in that manner. Further, the first good step, the good first step, public meeting last week at Glendening, had no information about the sources of funding already put into the project or how the money was being used. Also I saw the detailed explanations of the archeological, I saw no detailed explanations of the archeological and historical implications of building the bridge or bringing down Anne Arundel and Margaret Brent and rebuilding on those sights. Just because a Hoyer, or Cardin, or both, may have funded the A & E for the bridge without obtaining public comment, it does not mean that that is the alternative that should be chosen. In light of the fact that Chairman Muldoon has announced that the search is on for a new president for the College, and the fact that the public has been very concerned with the contentiousness of the College senior, conscientiousness, not contentiousness, of the College senior management and the Board of Trustees with regard to their responsibilities to protect historical areas and with regard to how the citizens of the county have been treated by same, it is suggested that final decisions on any building project be delayed until the new president can personally put his or her (unintelligible word) on the College's next building steps. This would include, for example, the bridge, the coming demolition of Anne Arundel and Margaret Brent. If the Trustees permit the College to proceed now, one wonders why there was a change in management at all because, in fact, it would be the same senior management at the College and the same

Board of Trustees that existed before the change announcement, announcement, making the decision in those areas before new management could even be installed.

Chip Jackson: Thank you. Right here.

Brendan Larrabee: My name is Brendan Larrabee. I'm a student at St. Mary's College. It seems that one of the major things that isn't being addressed by any of these plans at the moment is the entire Route 5 corridor from the crosswalk all the way down to the north crosswalk. As some people have proposed, you could eliminate all of the classrooms over on that side, however, that still doesn't mitigate the traffic flow that you'll have going to the waterfront, especially now that we have the new River Center and the Rowing Center. What I would propose in that case would be to construct bollards along the entire strip of Route 5 and bollards are basically pillars and while this wouldn't actually narrow the roadway, because you would have them at that, at the edge of the shoulder, in the road, so there would be a lane, bollard, and then the shoulder. It would narrow the perceived roadway so cars would actually drive slower through that section. Additionally, this would continue to allow for free flow of traffic across Route 5 at all points so people can cross to the River Center and post office and all of those other destinations over there. And, additionally, the issue of bikes speeding across the crosswalk, and I am personally guilty of this. I usually slow down so that I can look both ways. I am from the city so I'm fairly well versed in driving in traffic, but, if you put those bollards at the entrance of the crosswalk, so you make it only maybe one-and-a-half people wide. If you're on a bike, you have to slow down so you avoid those and you

don't hit them. So, that will slow bicyclists down and allow them to safely go across. Now there are trucks and other vehicles that come into St. Mary's College for deliveries and other things, also public safety. You can make bollards that go down below the ground with either something like a garage door opener or something else, a radio transmitter. I know they have this all over Europe for historic districts in town. Additionally, putting lights in would be, putting street lights in would be highly effective at night when the greatest risk to students crossing is. On the bollards you can have reflectors so you, so people see them, they see the people and it generally increases visibility. I think that's about it. Thank you very much.

Chip Jackson: Thank you, Brendan. Okay, well thank you all very much for coming out. We thank you for your feedback, both tonight and through the surveys again if you haven't read the report or filled out a survey, please do so. Those who, like Minnie and Bryan or anyone else, if you want to submit your written comments as an email to the College, there's the CDA webpage, it also has the ability to send an email, so you can do that as well. We look forward to our next phase where we will finish collecting this feedback. As I mentioned earlier, the College and City will discuss from this what we would propose as the preferred alternative and we will give ample opportunity for another round of public feedback when that when we get to that phase. We predict that to be in February. So again, thank you very much. Pray for snow. Yes ma'am.

Unidentified Woman: Will that announcement be on the CDA website?

Chip Jackson: It will be. Also, I apologize that we didn't get it there tonight on the CDA page. It was on, the College home page announced the meeting tonight, but we need to do better than that. We need to get it...

Donald Beck: I think it's better in The Enterprise. The announcement of the meeting in Glendening Hall was outstanding, but the announcement of the meeting here tonight (unintelligible).

Chip Jackson: Okay. Thanks, Don.