

## **Public Meeting**

**November 13, 2008**

### **Cole Cinema**

**Tom Botzman:** So the St. Mary's City, Historic St. Mary's City and the College would like to thank the members of the Capital Design Advisory Committee, and all of you from the community, for coming out tonight. I would like to very quickly introduce all of you to Gina Fadden, if you would just say hello. Dr. Fadden is the new executive director of St. Mary's City. She spent four years as head of the Mark Twain Boyhood Home and Museum in Hannibal, Missouri, or Missouri for some of us. But, Missouri. She also has an academic background and has taught at several universities and we are looking forward to having her teach some of the courses here and she will be the new co-chair of the Capital Design Advisory. Some of you know that Roger Hill has retired and the last we saw of him, there was a Harley heading down the road and he looked pretty happy on it. We have copies of the agenda. I hope that you have those already and if we haven't got one to you, please just let us know and we will try to get one to you. Couple notes on process. We have a sign-in sheet, and Dan, if you want to grab that while you're up there. We have a sign-in sheet that we're passing around during the meeting and we would ask you if you could let us know if you want us to include you in the minutes of the meeting as being present. There will be a period after all the presentations when we will have some community feedback. There is going to be a transcript made of the meeting so we can post it on our website, so there are some minutes for all of us to see. We are recording the meeting to facilitate the transcript. So, if you sense you are being

recorded, you are. If you'd like to speak during the feedback portion, and knowing that some of you looked at me like, speak up, if you would please come forward when you do that and use the microphone provided so we can all see and hear you. And also, if you'd please state your name, and when you do that, we're going to ask that we follow the same process pretty much as the county commissioners. If you are speaking as an individual, try to keep to about three minutes so everyone gets a chance. If you are speaking for a group, certainly you could take a few more minutes and have the members of the group raise their hands so that we can know which group and that their members are here. Also we're going to ask you to put your cell phone on vibrate now. Just as a point of information, Professor Bill Roberts - I think Bill is right in the middle of the room - he's a professor of anthropology and directs our program in The Gambia. He has a class where some students are doing research projects on the College's interaction with members of the Southern Maryland community. So, when the sign-in sheet comes around, we'd ask you to check yes or no if you'd be willing to be interviewed by a member of Bill's class. Bill we thank you for doing that and for helping us give just one more way we can try to get a little bit more communication. Chip's going to come up in a minute. We have an agenda for this meeting where we're going to look at a few of the different projects that you're all very interested in, starting with the shoreline, which seems to be the one of most interest right now. Then we're going to ask Henry Miller to help us understand some of the environmental and cultural programs that we have going on, and then the status project on the activity that we have going on over in the Historic Triangle will be the third point. We'll also then, after that, after we finish with that, we'll ask the members of the Advisory to help guide us through that process. Then we will ask for community

feedback and have an opportunity for each of us to speak, and if we can hold it to three minutes, we can probably hear everybody that wants to say something. I again want to thank you for attending tonight and ask Chip to come up and give a start with a brief – you're going to pass that around, that's very important Dan, because if you don't pass it around, they won't sign it and then we'll have fooled everybody. If you could check yes or no, if you don't want to be interviewed by the students, please let us know that and Chip will give us a brief overview and then we'll start talking about the shoreline, it will be the first topic.

**Chip Jackson:** Thank you, Tom. Before we get started, I'd like the members of the Capital Design Advisory just to raise your hand. I'll read the names real quick. I'm Chip Jackson. I'm one of the co-chairs and a staff member here at the College. Gina Fadden, as Tom mentioned, and she raised her hand earlier, is the director of Historic St. Mary's City. Mac McCormack, Sunny Schnitzer, a student, Jim Hardin, Gary Williams, Ingrid Swann, Ray Dodson, and Pete Hemelheber, how are you doing? He is standing as well as raising his hand. Before we get started, I wanted to introduce everybody. The College has put together what we call the CDA, Capital Design Advisory, webpage, and if you go to the College's webpage, which is smcm.edu, St. Mary's College of Maryland-dot-edu, and we're going to create a link. It's not there quite yet, but if you type in CDA you can come to the College's, well, it's on our website, the CDA webpage. It has a little bit about the purpose, the membership. We have on the left-hand side the facilities home page, which lists some of the projects that the College has been doing. There's planning for the future, it has meeting agendas. We had one meeting last summer, it was about the

amphitheater. We have frequently asked questions. Right now it's populated with two, one about the pedestrian footbridge, one about the shoreline, two projects which we will hear about tonight. And in two places, either here on the right side or down at the bottom, you can send an email to the CDA, and as Tom mentioned earlier, we will have a transcript of tonight, comments, and some comments that are made tonight will be recorded. And also if you prefer to send a note, you can go to our webpage and click on that link and send an email to the College and the City. With that, I'll introduce Dan Branigan. Dan Branigan is our director of design and construction at St. Mary's College and he will give the overview of the shoreline protection project and then we'll move from there.

**Dan Branigan:** (Unintelligible) I'll stand off to the side so I can see the slide and describe it to you. Good evening, again, I'm Dan Branigan. I'm in the facilities department. I'm going to give you a very brief overview of the shoreline protection project and what's involved. Let me orient you first. Here's Route 5 starting from the north and coming down into the campus past St. Johns Pond and headed south. There's Trinity Church Road, St. John's Pond, and there's our existing pier and River Center area. And this is the shoreline that we're concerned about. Planning for our stabilization started back in 2003. The Army Corps of Engineers helped us prepare a draft plan to meet our goals. The goals of our shoreline protection project are first and foremost. The erosion protection of the shoreline and in the process of getting the erosion protection, we want to, one, enhance the environment as best we can, and two, meet the recreational programming need in and around our River Center. At the behest of the Critical Areas

Commission, they looked at the draft plan and asked us to take it to something called the Joint Evaluation Committee. That's a joint group of state and federal regulators and we meet up in Annapolis. It includes the Maryland Department of the Environment, Critical Areas, State Historic Trust, Department of Natural Resources, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, the Army Corps, and the Title Permitting Agency. They reviewed these plans several times. We took their comments, brought them back, and took their comments on board and got to the final plan that we had at that time. Then about 2006 we went to the Army Corps and got permits to put in temporary sandbags. I'm sure most of you have seen those down in this area and that's strictly a temporary measure to stop any erosion that's going on. The project will be, it's phase one, phase two, it's a two step project. Phase one is down here around the River Center. And phase two is from St. John's Pond going north as shown by the orange areas and I point out this green area here as an existing, living shoreline and we're going to talk about those a little bit later. Currently the project we've solicited and are ready to go to the Board of Public Works to get approval toward a contract to a design build contractor to help us to design and build the facilities that we'll need for shore erosion protection around the River Center. An overview of the erosion problem in the current River Center area, this is a photo taken from 1989. We're losing currently a foot or more a year. We did an overlay with a Google map and it shows the shoreline approximately where that red line is showing right there and you'll note that it's right in this location and right in here the beach is pretty healthy. We're going to talk about that later too, about why we're in good shape right there. An important fact to consider in this area is recreational needs. What are those recreational needs? We have a lot of people using kayaks, we have Special Olympics

dragging catamarans through here, canoes, rowing shells, wind surfing, a lot of activity. So we think it's very important to try and maintain recreational access to this area. At the same time, erosion protection is the first piece, so let's get the erosion done and do it in a manner that gives us recreational access. This is the plan that after we met with the Joint Evaluation Committee that came out of the Army Corps study. First and foremost, we have this pier, which you'll notice there is the existing pier. It sticks out in the water about the same distance as the existing pier. It's a little shorter across the top, close to the same thing. It also would have a wave screen across here, just like this existing pier. If you're not familiar, you may not, unless you've been on a boat and come in from the water side, you wouldn't notice, but there are battens all along this side of our existing pier. Those battens aren't just at the surface, they go down almost to the bottom of the river bed. The purpose of them is to break the wave action that comes across from this direction in the wintertime, when we get those strong cold fronts from the northwest winds. Also we have a beach nourishment going on here that we are going to bring in sand here where the erosion has taken place. There's a stone groin right here at the inlet to St. John's pond. The purpose of that is to tie the beach nourishment in place. There's a pier here, a floating pier for launching rowing crews, and there's a boat ramp that goes into our boatyard area. This would also serve as sort of a groin, or the anchor point, of this beach nourishment. As I said, I want to talk a little bit about the wave screen and what went on. You'll notice behind the pier and you can see it, there it is, it shows up really good, I did not realize, you can see it right through the pier, the wave screen. Do you see it? Most beaches are in real good shape (unintelligible) back behind the pier. This is from looking towards that direction. You'll notice as soon as you get out from

behind the pier, you'll notice the erosion starts. There's no protection at that point and that's why the beach is in the shape it's in down there. This is what we call our recurrent revise plan. Then what we did on the current revise plan is, in response to things we've been hearing from people in the area that they are concerned about the size of this pier, that this pier was out here and was going to be a further visual obstruction, we've moved the pier back so it's behind the Rowing Center. We've shortened it down some. We've brought in the rowing ramp, the rowing platform, and integrated it in with the pier. We have floating platforms similar to the ones we have on our existing pier that we put dinghies on. The boat ramp is there. The beach here is a little softer and we feel strongly that we probably do not have to do any kind of bulk-heading and that we can do a soft approach, with the environmental approach for stabilizing the sand, and we're looking at reshaping this area in here and it may not be a groin. We may be looking to try and do something with a living wetland where it's a stone sill and you've got marsh grasses back behind it as a way to hold that sand in place. I want you to note the red flag. That's there for a purpose on the next couple of slides. In an effort to help you visualize what we're talking about is, today I got one of our waterfront staff to go out in a boat, and you can barely see his red flag. I was standing in-between Route 5 and Queen Anne Hall and took this picture across, and where he is standing there with the red flag is approximately the same location where this red flag is on this drawing, to give you some idea of perception. You can see, and I think it's important to note, that where this pier is coming out, the end of that pier in this area here is essentially in front of the pier now. So what you are seeing from here is a pier and what you will see in the future is a pier. Nothing's changed except it will be closer to you. This is getting a little closer so you can see this was at the bridge

there at St. John's Pond. You get a little closer in, you can see a little closer, so obviously it is closer to you. This would be the end of the pier about here and we did a little attempt at trying to sketch in what we think that in perspective would look like and that piece coming across here, right here, and then the (unintelligible) coming down goes off the drawing. That's phase one. Phase two is, as I said, north of St. Johns Pond down to (unintelligible) Pond and the shoreline is in just as bad a shape, if not worse, along here. Here are just a couple of quick pictures. This is maybe right across from where the old public safety building was. You'll notice, it'll be hard to see, but this is the telephone pole, Route 5, you have a guide wire coming down and right here you'll see where it's eroded, where the water has been cutting into the bank. That guide wire is no longer anchored to the ground. It's just broken and hanging there. Further down, this is closer to Queen Anne Hall, State Highways came out last, almost a year ago now, and did an emergency repair. This right here, you can see this stone that they filled in the hole, this hole is all the way back to that telephone pole. That telephone pole was completely exposed all the way down to the depth of the river. You'll also note here the guide wire, right here for that pole. Now you know that when that pole was put in, SMECO did not go wading out in the water to put that guide wire in. That shoreline was out here somewhere. So, as I said, this shoreline is in just as bad a shape. Living wetlands, living shorelines, we have an example as I showed you on the map earlier, there is a section, this was put in during the early 90s and so it's obviously a very robust, viable alternative to a shoreline protection since it's gone through several tropical storms and hurricanes. You'll notice there a stone ledge that runs along it and then it allows water to go behind it when the tide changes. You've got marsh grasses and it slowly (unintelligible) in a

wetland fashion up to the road. The more current trend with this one, this particular one, is a solid row of stone all the way around it. Currently the idea is that we put breaks and openings in these things at various points to allow the water to better flush in and flush out, and crabs and critters can get in there and it makes it a more viable shoreline. And that's the overview of the shoreline, Chip and everybody.

Applause.

**Chip Jackson:** Thank you, Dan. Next on the agenda is the overview of the environmental and cultural resource programs. I will give you the environmental program review and then Dr. Henry Miller will follow with the cultural resources management programs. The reason these two items are on our agenda is that many of the issues that we hear from the community are concerns about respect for both environmental resources and historical resources, cultural resources, and we would like to just give an overview of how the College and the City work in managing these issues. They are very important issues, obviously, to all of us. Environmental stewardship programs at the College have been around for a while. They began very seriously in a round of master planning that the College did in 1986. It was one of the seminal master planning efforts that the College has done in recent times and it really laid the vision for how this campus would develop and it had four defining principles. One of the principles was the kind of architectural style and vocabulary of Tidewater buildings, the buildings that you've seen us build on the campus over the past 20 years. Another one was that the campus would be primarily a walking campus, and those of you who know the campus real well will know that 20

years ago there were a lot of parking lots within the campus and people drove from building to building often. We have, over time, moved parking lots to the periphery and even moved, as many of you know, old Fisher Road that used to run through the north campus so that the campus became a walking campus. The two other key principles of this master plan were the issues that Dr. Miller and I are talking about tonight: protection of the environment and protection of this place in terms of its historical and cultural importance. Many of you know that Critical Areas was a law that was enacted in the 80s as well that added another layer of regulation to how lands are managed within 1000 feet of the Chesapeake Bay or any of its tidal tributaries. And so, that was coming into play just at the time this master plan was developed and gave us another set of issues to deal with when we think about how to protect the environment. Coming out of that master planning, I think we established some very important goals and one of the goals was that it's not our intent to meet the minimum state requirements or federal requirements in terms of environmental. It's to go beyond those and do what makes sense to best practices. This is a challenging thing. Most civil engineers who are in the engineering discipline that does storm water management issues, water quality issues, they're used to owners who ask them if they really have to do this, how can we spend less money on storm water management, infiltration ponds, or other types of devices. When we work with civil engineers, the first job a civil gets with us, they usually struggle a little bit because we turn that 180 degrees. We don't want to know what the minimum is, we want to know what we can do, and that's important, and I think we're proud to say that over the past 10 to 15 years, the projects we've done we have reduced storm water pollutant loading into the St. Mary's River and the St. John's Pond by 50%. We've actually built a

campus with almost double the size of the number of buildings on this campus and in doing so, we've actually reduced by half the amount of storm water, and this is all through engineering programs that work with the Critical Areas Commission and the Maryland Department of Environment. We also did a master plan just for storm water. We had this, as you have all seen a major development program over the past ten years, and we wanted to not just deal with storm water from a one-project-at-a-time, but we looked at all these potential projects and looked at how we could work the different projects together. At the time when we presented the master plan for storm water to the Critical Areas Commission, they wrote and called us a model for how all other entities and institutions should be planning for environmental impact. This is a map that tries to illustrate a little of what we've done in water quality. The blue areas, well orientation, Route 5 comes from the north down through the campus to Historic St. Mary's City to the South Mattapany Road that heads to the northeast. The north campus, and in blue you see areas that have been developed by the College over the past 20 years that have achieved very strong water quality management, where we've made those results I've mentioned earlier. You can see in historic campus here the Campus Center where we are, the library expansion in 1990, the most recent work down at the waterfront. Those are the areas where there was not any storm water management protection before and we've come in and put those measures in. The brown areas are areas that were developed prior to the Critical Areas legislation, prior to many of the federal and state regulations about caring for the watershed and we hope that over time we capture all those areas as well, in particular as we talk more in the future about the Anne Arundel Hall and Interpretive Center projects and the historic campus, use that as an opportunity to again improve

water quality. Then you see the vast areas of green which represents forest and agricultural land that we hope stays in those land uses. There's been a lot of attention about the River Center and the Rowing Center and the environmental issues there and we'd like to demystify some of that we know. It's confusing to people when you first look at it. At first you see these new buildings that show up near the water and people reasonably ask how could that be done and isn't this a damaging way to treat the shoreline. So we know those are sensitive issues and we began when we first started planning these projects by first asking ourselves can we develop the River Center and Rowing Center in a way that not only does no harm, but actually enhances environmental issues. We worked very closely over many, many years with the Critical Areas Commission and the Maryland Dept of Environment and other state agencies on how we can actually do that. We set ourselves a high bar, I mentioned campus wide we averaged 50% reduction of pollutant loading into the Chesapeake Bay and St. Mary's River. At the River Center we achieved a 39% reduction. That's still pretty good results we believe. We also picked up voluntarily the runoff that comes down Trinity Church Road as a part of the project itself. We picked up much of the runoff of that road so that it is now also treated with some storm water management features at the project site include an infiltration base in here with some wetland plantings. There are some sediment traps and other underground structures that collect storm water and clean it of its pollutants before they migrate off the site. Another key question that has come up many times is how we could build these projects so close to the water. Many people are familiar that within the Critical Areas laws. There is a 1000 foot, that everything within 1000 feet has certain development requirements. But then there is a real strict requirement for building within

100 feet called a buffer, for building within 100 feet of the shoreline. On this map you can see the existing shoreline and this red line here shows that 100 foot buffer and it turns because on this side is St. John's Pond, so it's 100 feet from that side as well. What is not as well known in the Critical Areas regulations is that our provisions for areas that, prior to the Critical Areas legislation in the mid-80s, that were already previously developed and heavy use within the buffer that the land owners, whether they are a state agency or a local jurisdiction or a private homeowner, have the ability to redevelop. Not newly develop, but redevelop those sections that did not provide the benefits of the buffer and it's important to understand that. The benefits of the buffer are to improve water quality so there's not runoff directly from impervious surfaces going into the river or the Chesapeake Bay, so there's a filter within that first 100 feet and that provides habitat and the criteria that the Critical Areas Commission uses, and considering what's called a buffer management area which this area has been defined is that it's an area that was previously developed and had none of those benefits that the critical areas buffer rules were intended to provide. It was not providing those benefits, so they allowed the land owner to redevelop. But in doing so, improve environmental issues and that's what we've done here. This yellow shows the area that's been defined, that specific area, as a buffer management area, doesn't extend the whole shoreline of the College, doesn't extend to other areas of the St. Mary's River on the College, but it is that particular instance and the Critical Areas Commission approved this as a buffer management area in 2002. There are 19 buffer management areas in St. Mary's County in addition to St. Mary's College, and this is just a list that came from St. Mary's County's Office of Planning, both land use management and growth management (unintelligible). These are other areas within

St. Mary's County that are identical to St. Mary's College. The College did not get away with some sneaky thing through the permitting process, which some people have assumed that we did. We followed the regulations, and in doing so, we believe enhanced the environment down at the River Center. Move on to a couple other quick things. Many of you have heard about Smart Growth. It was championed by then Governor Parris Glendening. He continues to work on this on a national level. Smart Growth is how you can develop cities, or organizations, or institutions, in a way that is more holistic about land use management. Some of the key elements of Smart Growth that we provide on a campus scale is we limit sprawl, we try to build buildings, on in-fill sites, buildings like Goodpaster Hall, Glendening Hall, that we've recently built on the north campus, takes spaces between buildings and put new buildings there, versus taking the next piece of flat land, or cutting down exiting woodlands, or taking existing green space. Another key element as I mentioned earlier about traffic is minimizing the use of vehicles on a daily basis. Couple other environmental issues that the College has been very much engaged in over the past few years. We did what was called an energy performance contract that looked at replacing inefficient light fixtures, air conditioners, boilers, other features of the campus that consumed energy, water fixtures, toilets, shower heads, and replace them with more energy efficient equipment. We completed this project two years ago. Students that were here at the time will remember that we went into all the residence halls and replaced all the shower heads and toilets and light fixtures, but we effected a 17% reduction in electrical use, a 23% reduction in heating oil, which is 73,000 gallons a year, an almost nine million gallons in water and sewer we reduced through these measures. While most of the discussion has been about environmental issues, as in

pollution issues, there's no question that in today's, with global warming and other issues, preserving and reducing the amount of resources is an absolutely critical thing. We've also been one of the front runners in Maryland with green buildings. Many of you have heard about green buildings. We were a leader within higher education. In fact, Goodpaster Hall was one of the state's pilot projects and our success with green buildings contributed to the work of that the legislature did over the past couple of years that lead to legislation last year that requiring that all new state buildings in the state of Maryland will be green buildings, unless there's an exemption. And that is all I have about environmental issues and at this point I'd like Henry to come forward and talk about cultural resource management.

**Henry Miller:** Thank you. Good evening everybody. I hope you can hear me. I was asked to talk a little bit about cultural resources because that's a term we use a whole lot and of course one of the questions is, what are cultural resources? Well, they vary. They can be artifacts, they can be artwork, and they can be an ancient monument or standing buildings or landscapes. They can be any number of these things that are due to human creation. Here in St. Mary's City, we have a distinct shortage of art work and ancient monuments, so we are going to focus on the things that are primarily of the cultural resources that we contend with. One is architecture. Of course most of the Colonial architecture is no longer standing, but there are later buildings of significance. There's also landscape, the view sheds that have historic value to us and are part of the rural heritage of early Maryland. And finally, we have archeology. Each of those has unique requirements and unique challenges in terms of trying to understand them and preserve

them. All of the work, though, really goes back in terms of protecting them to 1966 when a very important piece of legislation was passed by the U.S. Congress - the National Historic Preservation Act. It has been amended a couple of times since then, but what it did was establish something called a National Register and that National Register is the list that's maintained up in Washington of any district sights, buildings, (unintelligible) objects that are significant in America's history and they are maintained there. That is something that we all work with, all professional archaeologists, architectural historians deal with this issue and there's levels of significance. There are things that are just of a local significance that are interesting because of the unique communities around them. Other things have state significance and there is a Maryland State Register, where a lot of those sights are on. But the National Register is for things that have significance of a national scope and above that is the National Historic Landmark, which is the highest designation this nation has for its history. The only other higher one is through the United Nations, through UNESCO, it's a world heritage sight, and that's the pyramids and things like that. That's pretty much the levels of significance and we are a National Historic Landmark and that is defined as a building sight, structure, that is deemed to have exceptional value in commemorating or illustrating the history of the United States and we got this designation back in 1969. It was one of the earliest archaeological sights, Colonial sights, that received that designation. But what makes a sight significant? That's a question that we always grapple with a lot. There are actually four criteria that are laid out in the legislation. Is it something where an important event occurred? Think of Gettysburg or something. That would clearly make it an important sight. Or, is it with an important person, where Abraham Lincoln was born, for instance, or some other inventor,

something of that nature would make it of potential national significance. Also, is there something distinctive about it? A classic example of Greek revival architecture or a Chesapeake style building or work of a particular artist or a particular individual of note in our history and finally, does it yield or may it potentially yield, information that's important to either pre-history or history of our nation. And that's where primarily archeological sights fall. But St. Mary's City can be, I believe all of us would argue that it fits, A, it fits pretty well in there in terms of establishing a colony. B, it fits in with people such as Leonard Calvert, Andrew White, Margaret Brent, there's importance there. So those are the significant criteria and in that legislation there's something called Section 106 and that is something we deal with all the time. It's any project that has a federal agency involvement, directly, or indirectly, or a permit they have to review it and take account of the highlighted section, take into account the effects the undertaking of any of these National Register properties, sights, or buildings, or locations there and that's what we do consistently. What is the effect? Most of that effort in Maryland, in fact throughout the United States, is handled by a specific office in each state called the State Historic Preservation Officer, called the SHPO, is how it's referred to by everybody. In Maryland it's Rodney Little, he works at the Maryland Historical Trust and they are normally given the responsibility to begin the initial review of this 106. Although there are federal groups, the Advisory Council for Historic Preservation, that has also a critical role in that as well. Well, we know here that there are certainly things we need to take into account. Buildings and landscapes are the really big critical factor and those are pretty much, you can see them. That helps a whole lot when you can see those resources. Archaeology is a different critter because normally it takes a trained eye to know that

there is a place that somebody once lived, or died, or did something, and for that we have worked throughout the world. Basically now, there is a series of three steps that you go through to figure out about archeological resources. The first one, called phase one is where you basically go and do reconnaissance and the big question for that one is, is there anything here? Did anyone do anything in this spot? We try to collect artifacts from that. The second phase is, assume you find something, is you test it and find out is it important? Does it have any potential significance? And, finally, if it does, phase three, and you go through a project and there is no way to avoid it, it's going to be destroyed, then you have to go in what is called typically mitigation, which is full-scale excavation and recovery of the unique evidence that that sight holds. So these are the standard things. Phase one has usually been plowed and we re-plow it. We use that one around here a lot because these fields have been for 200 years, at least. We look for anything from Indian pottery on the surface to the plethora of Colonial artifacts that would say, yes, a building stood in this location at some time in the past. And that allows us to, of course, to do computer mapping and very much, very sensitive analysis. But, there are places where you can't do that. You can't plow. While we would love to plow up all the lawns of the College, they just don't like that for some reason. So, what do we do? We go in and dig a little one by one foot hole, called an STP, a shovel test pit, and there you collect the artifacts every 10 feet or 20 feet and sometimes you come down actually on foundations, which is kind of unusual. That's great to have that kind of success. But this is again, a method of reconnaissance. Is there anything there? Then you go in and do more formal test pits. These can get really deep. Sometimes they're not that deep, but in this case there's a lot of stratified archeology there and finally, if you can't avoid the

sight, you can't work around it, you go in and do full-scale excavation, collect all of the knowledge that people have left from their activity centuries ago in that location and that's a large-scale effort. That's intensive and takes a lot of time to accomplish. So those are the basic steps we do. Now there's federal, there's the National Preservation Act. Maryland also has laws, though, about its activities on state-owned lands and this is through the SHPO office, where it has to look at impacts of cultural resources in any state undertaking and we've been working with that for many, many years. I want to take you real quickly through an example that St. Mary's City managed of how we work with a sight of great national significance, but we try to meet all of the requirements of the state and federal law in working on that sight. This is St. John's as most of you know. Built in 1638 by John Luger – a sight of tremendous significance in Maryland's early history. It stood until maybe 1720 and then it was abandoned and became a field for 200 years. In 1972 we began excavations on it. The first 17<sup>th</sup> century sight to undergo modern scientific analysis and study in Maryland. Found a wonderful sight, oh my God, it was just incredible. The cellar was full of artifacts, unique architectural remains, zillions of stuff, just, buildings, trash pits, post holes, you name it. It was a tremendous learning sight for us and we basically, after a number of years of analysis and study of the samples that had been collected, we were able to come up with a sense of what this long lost building might have looked like and from the mid-1970s we started thinking about how could we turn this into an exhibit that people would really get into and enjoy and understand the importance of this place. We began that process and we put up a temporary shelter in 1974, the lovely A-frame you see there that was to stand in place until we could get around to a real exhibit. Thirty years later, it finally came down and we were able to start

trying to figure out what was there. We'd done a lot of work in the 70s, but we hadn't sampled the area very broadly so we went back with these STP's, began digging those and were able to plot where various artifacts were around the house to give us a good data set. Then we were able to take that information with all of the work that had been done previous to it, produced a data set, a summary of where things were. Then in the late 1990s, we began the process of working with architects to try to come up with an exhibit. We had some pretty good ideas of how to build an exhibit around it, but what the building was actually going to be constructed like and how we would tell that story was a really significant question. So, we took the archeology and we wanted to make it, of course the feature that is the importance of this place. But how do we make a building around it that will tell the story, and this is the plan, but at the same time, allow us to preserve and protect for the ages the remains that we uncovered in that spot and particularly leave other areas that have never been excavated, leave them alone for future generations. That was a very significant challenge and what we came up with is a plan that we had to assess what the impact would be. We couldn't do it until there was an architectural plan. We went to the Maryland Trust after we had those plans and basically they have three options. The project would have no effect on the historic resources, it would have no adverse effect – for example, you have a 1970s addition on an 1840s house, removing the 1970s addition would have no adverse effect on the old house. It would simply purify it a bit. But this case was different. Or the project would have an adverse affect in which the undertaking would harm one or more of the properties. Well, clearly constructing on that sight would potentially harm the archaeology. So what we had to do is A, work with the architects to limit the disturbance as much as possible, and

then we had to come up with a plan to take care of the information that was there, try to preserve it. We developed what is called a Memorandum of Understanding with the Trust in which we were able to devise areas that were going to be accessed zones, areas that would be left totally untouched by anyone, and I even went to the trouble, designed efforts where we could maintain unexcavated soil zones without any disturbance at all but still let vehicles drive around and things and we produced basically the zoned areas where contractors would know exactly where they could dig, where they could not dig and where they couldn't drive anything. So that was a really important step forward. The Trust agreed with us and then we had to implement it. We knew there was a lot of disturbance because you can't put foundations in without some disturbance. So we spent basically three-and-a half-years doing archaeological excavation in those exact locations to remove the things. We dug to cut down trees, found almost one and a half million artifacts during this process. Then we got to the point where, much to our sadness, the old A-frame had to come down. Okay, it had done its job well. We began dismantling it and our maintenance staff and I, we worked out of a shelter that would protect the archeological remains of that 1638 building while the construction process was underway. When that was done, we laid down a thick layer of gravel and bank run gravel that would protect the archaeology in the unexcavated areas. We put up silt lines so that there would not only be no water, I mean no sediment, but they would know to not drive over those no-go zones. Then we reviewed it with all of the people on the contract and then we reviewed it with all of the people working for the contractor and we reviewed it again with all the people working for the contractor and guess what? Can we dig a little bit more here? Why can't we take a foot over there? A constant problem. The contractors

understood it, but the sub-contractors weren't at the meeting so they didn't know. So we continually had to be there making them work in very narrow zones because no, you can't dig a foot or two here because you'll be destroying unexcavated archeology. And basically there was that black stuff that's over preservation zone where we didn't want them to dig that is still there for somebody in the future. But what it took, and this is a big lesson we have from that project, is that no matter how clear you are in specifying where things are, where the archaeology is, where you can do whatever you want, you have to be on the sight all the time because casual supervision does not work with sub-contractors coming in and Ruth Mitchell, some of you know her, she really deserves a huge round of applause because she was on the sight, babysat it and made sure that things that we wanted to preserve were left in place and not damaged. So that's one of a lot of lessons we learned from this sight. But with that we began to put the sight up, the building became a reality after all those years and of course a little over a month ago we had the grand opening of St. John's and we now have here in St. Mary's County a truly unique and world-class exhibit that is a presentation of Maryland's, some of it's earliest archeology, in a way that has never been seen before and by gosh, it's as good as Jamestown, let me tell you. So we have a great project there to work on and it really is a stunning exhibit and I invite all of you to go by to take a look and spend some time there and really see what we've been able to decipher from that long, lost sight. The next project that is underway is around Anne Arundel Hall. There are proposals for a bridge and a placement for the Anne Arundel building. This process is just beginning. The first step for us is to take all of the archeological evidence from surveys, from oral history, from various sources, pull it together and synthesize it and figure out where things are

and where there isn't anything of archeological note. That will include looking at the maps of the past. That's the oldest map of St. Mary's City from the 1780s. We'll look at aerial photographic evidence where we can trace not only what it looked like at certain times, but how it was changed over the course of the years and we will be able to take that data, combine it with the testing and the survey work that have been done, the phase one and the phase two testing that has been done in a number of locations in that vicinity compile all that into a document that will then allow us to go in to the architects. And there's other rescue archeology work and other efforts that have occurred throughout this area. Take all that massive amount of data and then produce a document that architects will be able to work with and we'll be able to work with them to try to avoid as much as possible the archeological resources that we want to protect. This will then be reviewed by Section 106, I talked about earlier, as well as the SHPO offices. They will look at likely impacts of it. We will then be obligated to develop a memorandum of understanding with them about how the project will proceed and we'll make every effort, of course, to try to avoid the archeology wherever possible, but where that is impossible would do mitigation work and that is pretty much the sequence. We're just at step one right now. But, it is a process that is consistent throughout the United States. It's a process that's really essential for us to preserve the unique heritage of St. Mary's City and it takes consistent diligence, of course, to make sure, as I said, contractors do the right thing, they don't mess up, they don't just dig a little more here because that can be so damaging to these unique things, these unique cultural resources that are really part of all of our history. So that's what we will be doing here and I will now turn it over to the next speaker, okay?

Applause

**Chip Jackson:** Thank you, Henry. This will just be brief. On our agenda is the next action, the next agenda item, the status for Anne Arundel Hall, the Interpretive Center and the pedestrian bridge. We have not begun design on these projects. We are in the process of hiring architects for all those projects. That's ongoing now. We hope to have the architects hired by the first of the year, roughly, or soon thereafter and will bring forward to the Capital Design Advisory public meetings the early conceptual drawings of what those buildings and that foot bridge will look like and how they are being coordinated exactly as Henry Miller described very similar to the St. John's project where it has this extensive amount of review and coordination between design and historical resources. And, so, that's when we will be able to actually talk more specifically about what's going to happen there. Right now we don't know specifically because the projects aren't yet in design. So that ends the presentations that we have. Next on the agenda is the feedback and comments. I will first ask members of the Capital Design Advisory if they have any questions or comments that they would like to make to have that discussion first, then we'll open the floor up to the community. Ray?

**Ray:** (Unintelligible.)

**Chip Jackson:** The question is would the shoreline project, how will we take care of environmental concern about erosion into the St. Mary's River and I think when Dan

made the presentation, most of the shoreline, that area between the St. John's Pond and Fisher's Creek will be handled through what are called living shoreline methodologies and those are the preferred methods in the state of Maryland that protect shorelines in a soft way, a non-structural way, that provide the most environmental benefit. In the area of the River Center and the Rowing Center we're again doing non-structural solutions and the issues of providing the groin on one side and the pier on the other side should protect the shore and let it stay in place and in fact, over time, may even actually replenish itself to some extent. So I think those are how the environmental issues are being managed through that project. Yes?

**Unidentified Man:** (Unintelligible.)

**Chip Jackson:** The question is about the boat ramp on the shoreline project and will it have public access. The main reason for the boat ramp right now is to help our recreational programs, get dinghies in and out of the water. It's not intended to become a county boat ramp area that is available for daily use, for people who want to launch skiffs and other types of boats. Adam Werblow?

**Adam Werblow:** I would just comment on that also. The local marinas don't really appreciate it if the College, whether it's overnight dock or the issue that goes on right now, is the College sometimes has guests come to the College that want to dock overnight. The local marinas understand that we have certain guests who come to the College, but in general they frown upon that because they look at it as it's their business.

They are in the business of providing slips for people for overnight dock. So, there will certainly be at the boat ramp plenty of occasions that the public will use the boat ramp for whatever, for regattas, events, for all types of activities and it will be open to the public at various times. But on a daily basis, we certainly don't want to wind up putting our local businesses in controversy with us.

**Chip Jackson:** Yes, Gary.

**Gary Williams:** I'm Gary Williams. The St. Mary's River with the Watershed Association and it's very nice to have this presentation (unintelligible) planning and process. I have three suggestions I'd like to make, and maybe you're already doing this, but there are areas that cause other institutions problems. First is considering the cumulative impact of your actions. That means taking into account all the past, present, and future activities into account when you consider these types of improvements. So that requires you to work with the State Highway Department, Historic St. Mary's City, your own planners and engineers that have the grand dreams about other things on campus and you consider of course the cumulative effect all that stuff in this phase, you know, and some (unintelligible) and so it's an area where a lot of people fail and I would just ask the College to start trying to do, I'm sure you do that to some extent, you try to be more proactive. The second thing, and you may be doing this, that is consider putting together, using geographic information systems, the limits to growth for the campus and for St. Mary's City. This would consist of overlays, I'm sure you already have a lot of this. There's the wetlands, buildings, parking lots, the archeological sights, so forth and so on

and you would be able to map your future expansion areas as opposed to kind of do not touch areas, you know, and anticipate changes in the critical areas act and buffers, etcetera, etcetera, so that planners or administrators or others could easily do all the overlays and (unintelligible) and this would be publicly available and people could kind of see (unintelligible). The third is something you and I talked about earlier, the idea that the College might consider doing something that might be the environmental equivalent of the energy performance contract, would be kind of an environmental assessment or environmental audit of the College's environmental footprint. So this would allow kind of a fresh set of eyes, you know, to come in and look at how the College manages its resources, you know, (unintelligible) and maybe this would give St. Mary's College projects (unintelligible) at the risk of irritating the administration, but it would be something I think that might identify scenarios where you could be doing better job at and could certainly highlight all the good things you do (unintelligible) as a watershed member and someone interested in making sure that we all work to improve the quality of the water here in the river (unintelligible) I think would be helpful for the College and the public.

**Chip Jackson:** Thank you. Thank you very much. Sunny?

**Sunny Schnitzer:** I'm wondering if there's any evidence of submerged archeology (unintelligible) and if so (unintelligible).

**Chip Jackson:** I'd like Dr. Miller to address that.

**Henry Miller:** There hasn't been a survey done on the area we're talking about here, but the erosion is such that any archeological resources are probably fairly deeply buried in the sediment. We have done the survey on the Dove side of the point and there are a few sights that are under about three-to-four foot of sediment and they kind of blow out occasionally, when we have a storm that sediment will move around and we saw (unintelligible) which may be (unintelligible) from an abandoned vessel. It's normally under three-to-four foot of fill, or sediment, and just occasionally exposed. So, most of those resources are not near the surface due to all that sediment that's going out of the bank, it's going out onto the bottom, so it's kind of protecting whatever archeology would be in that area and so I don't, most of these rip rap things, when we put extensive (unintelligible) groins and stuff, basically they are laid (unintelligible) they lay on the surface, they aren't really damaging, they really kind of keeping the sediment (unintelligible) is what we want to do. This underwater stuff, when you pull it up, you have awful, awful conservation problems because you have to treat it instantly and it's very costly. It's better to leave it wet (unintelligible) if at all possible, unless you have an underwater archeology program and we simply do not have the facilities to begin to work on some of that. It is very challenging. So I think that's all I know right now in terms of that, but there are a few vessels along the St. Mary's River, most of them are further out, though. (Unintelligible)

**Chip Jackson:** Any other members of the CDA that have questions? Yes, Ingrid?

**Ingrid Swann:** (Unintelligible)

**Chip Jackson:** The foot bridge? I think the foot bridge, I talked a little bit about it, as I mentioned it's not yet under design. We're in the process of hiring architects and engineers to design it. What we do know is that the land on both sides of Route 5 is very high. On the Anne Arundel Hall side, in fact I could, we have a slide that might help this. This is a drawing, Route 5 comes going south, Trinity Church Road comes up into the historic side of campus and St. Mary's City. This is Anne Arundel Hall, this is Margaret Brent. The Anne Arundel Hall and the Maryland Heritage Interpretive Center will be generally in this green area. Again, we don't know exactly how it's going to work. The project also includes the service drive to the Campus Center, creates a dangerous intersection here, so we're going to probably realign that service drive to make it directly opposite of that. That's not quite to your question but for the bridge, the, we know that the land here on this side, near Anne Arundel Hall, is high and it in fact is higher, as high as a foot bridge would need to be. The land at the current cross walk is low, but if you go up just a little distance towards the existing parking lot at the Campus Center, the land is high and so we know just from doing some early analysis of grading that if the Anne Arundel Hall project and the Interpretive Center on this side and you leave from that site where these buildings would be built, you can actually just go right across this foot bridge and land on this hillside and then come to the Campus Center with no steps, it would all be handicapped accessible and we think actually if it's done, designed right, people would have to try hard not to use the bridge instead of having to say, oh, I guess I have to get up on the road. So we think it has great prospects for being the preferred way to cross

Route 5. Any other members of the Capital Design Advisory have any questions? If not, we will open it to community comments as Tom mentioned at the beginning of the meeting. We are recording the meeting, so if you have comments you'd like to make, come to the microphone, state your name, and that way we can identify you correctly. We will post the transcript when it's produced on the website so everyone can have a copy of that as well. So we are now, if anyone would like to, please raise your hand and come down to the microphone. Yes ma'am.

**Unidentified Woman:** (Unintelligible)

**Chip Jackson:** Ma'am, please come to the microphone and state your name.

**Unidentified Woman:** (Unintelligible) Does the College have any plans to close 584?

**Chip Jackson:** 584, which is the old, the question is does the College have intentions to close old 584. 584 is what's now known as Trinity Church Road, which swings through and is Old State House Road. The question comes, there have been some studies and some discussions over the years about could the road become safer all around if the road was terminated and traffic could come in and then come back out. We've had numbers of conversations with the Church and with others on this process, or on the prospects of this, and that has not met with good support and so that is not under consideration right now. There are no plans to do that.

**Unidentified Woman:** Another thing, with all these diagrams, what have you, there's a cemetery on top of that hill. St. Nicholas has to bring theirs back (unintelligible). Why doesn't St. Mary's have to bring theirs back because they're the ones that (unintelligible).

**Chip Jackson:** Maybe we can talk after the meeting on that note. I don't know exactly what you mean

**Unidentified Woman:** (Unintelligible)

**Chip Jackson:** I'd be happy to talk to you more about the, we know that there are some cemeteries there and Doctor Miller did an archeological investigation way back in 1989, 1990, that indicated where those are. If you have concerns about, we have no intention to do anything to impact them.

**Unidentified Woman:** (Unintelligible) that is the cemetery that is there. The law says you cannot touch it.

**Chip Jackson:** And we have no intention of disturbing that area, so we understand that.

**Unidentified Woman:** (Unintelligible) Not just one grave.

**Chip Jackson:** I understand that. Dr. Miller's report did a pretty good job of defining where those cemeteries are and we have absolutely no intention of disturbing those

cemeteries in any way. That would not be on any consideration of any work we would do.

**Unidentified Woman:** (Unintelligible)

**Chip Jackson:** We'd be happy to put that, when we do our presentations in February that show how the design concepts for the pedestrian bridge will work, we will make sure that we integrate and show on those maps the work from Dr. Miller's reports, so, we, I think it's a great suggestion to show those on our maps, we'll do that.

**Unidentified Woman:** I have one other statement and another question. I wonder how many more in this room were in the meeting 14 years ago at the fire house besides you and I.

(Unintelligible talking in the room. Multiple people speaking at once.)

**Chip Jackson:** Thank you.

**Unidentified Woman:** I was just wondering. I remember what went on there, which is still going on. But anyhow, my next problem is, I have a concern and I would like you to clarify that these people here, where does the sewage and sewer lines currently, how does it process and where does it dispose of right now?

**Chip Jackson:** Right now, all of the sewage from St. Mary's College is collected and drained to one location, which does not show on this map, but it is near the admissions building, near Route 5. There is a pump house station, all the sewer comes to that location and then it is pumped north towards the base at the Pine Hill Sewage Treatment Facility. That's where all sewage from St. Mary's College goes, except for a small drain field that's behind admissions, where there is a typical septic system. All other sewage on campus goes to that sewage treatment facility.

**Unidentified Woman:** (Unintelligible) Fourteen years ago it was said that the overflow went in the St. John's Pond. Does it still?

**Chip Jackson:** There's no overflow that has gone into St. John's Pond or that happened. There used to be at the old Public Safety Building, that was the College's sewer treatment facility many, many moons ago. But when the state built this interceptor, this force main that comes from the College that goes up to Pine Hill, that was eliminated entirely and there has been absolutely no overflow of sewage from St. Mary's College into that pond that I'm aware of and I've been here for 23 years.

**Unidentified Woman:** Last question. Does the College still truck sewage (unintelligible) sewage treatment plant?

**Chip Jackson:** Absolutely not. I don't know where that story came from but I can tell you that there's absolutely nothing even close to that happening or has happened at last in the past 30 years. I have no idea, I know the last 23 years.

**Unidentified Woman:** I wasn't born yesterday, Chip.

**Chip Jackson:** Nor was I.

**Unidentified Woman:** (Unintelligible)

**Chip Jackson:** Yes, sir?

(Some brief audience mumbling – unintelligible)

**Man:** So, last May.

**Chip Jackson:** Can you state your name, please?

**Aaron French:** Oh, yes, my name is Aaron French. (Unintelligible).

**Chip Jackson:** Should be on this (unintelligible).

**Aaron:** (Unintelligible) I'm a sophomore here at the College. Last May, President O'Brien signed something called the President's Climate Committee, an agreement to go carbon neutral, to put this campus on the path to carbon neutrality. I'm just wondering how these multiple building projects, specifically the destruction and replacement of a building have to plan into that, when in fact retrofitting Anne Arundel could put it on that path (unintelligible).

**Chip Jackson:** The question is, could a replacement of Anne Arundel Hall be of better benefit to reducing carbon footprint than tearing the exiting building down and replacing it.

**Aaron French:** And the building projects in general.

**Chip Jackson:** And the building projects in general. The building projects, as you know, serve programmatic purposes and we've had enrollment growth over the past 20 years and so we've had to build additional classroom buildings. We know that additional buildings, of course, create a greater carbon footprint because we have to heat them and cool them, lighting and use of other equipment. So the goal is that we reduce the energy consumption of these new facilities and all of our buildings. That's one of the initiatives through green buildings. Goodpaster Hall, Glendening Hall, we had about a 30-35% reduction in consumption of electricity and oil than a typical building of those sizes would have by being extraordinarily efficient. The River Center, because of donations, the students funded a geothermal system at the River Center, which cut in half the heating

and cooling costs at the River Center, great contribution. So our goal is to minimize the impact of these efforts. We have a much larger problem campus-wide. In order to get to zero carbon emission neutrality, which is the goal we have and should have, it will require us to do more ambitious things about finding ways to off-set our usage. Students again took the lead in this to begin with purchasing renewable energy credits for our electrical use. That's a start, but we need to be considering on this campus other measures, whether it's additional (unintelligible word) energy production or wind farms, or whatever the issues may be, finding ways that we can get to that carbon neutrality. As part of the president's commitment we have to submit a plan on our goals and our action steps to do that. Our Campus Sustainability Committee is right now working on developing that plan. So I think we are all on the same page on these issues.

**Aaron French:** I disagree.

**Chip Jackson:** Okay, well, we need to continue to have this conversation. Yes, sir?

**Joe Burch:** My name is Joe Burch and I'm retired from the College. Chip, on the shoreline projects, has there been any thought as to the impact to other areas, especially in front of the (unintelligible word). I know there have been losses there from behind the sea wall. Is that going to impact that area, has that been looked at?

**Chip Jackson:** Joe, the question is, does the shoreline improvement project impact other neighbors. This is absolutely a major concern. Part of the process of having engineers do

the development of these plans and working with, as Dan mentioned this, the Joint Evaluation Committee that's got every state or federal agency that's involved in these things looking at this. As part of the analysis, not just protect my shoreline, but what will that impact be to neighboring shorelines as well. That absolutely needs to be and is part of the evaluation. We'd be happy to talk to you and the Taylor family more about how that is taken into consideration. Gladys?

**Gladys:** (Unintelligible) I have to concerns. One (unintelligible) retrofitting (unintelligible).

**Chip Jackson:** Yes.

**Gladys:** There's an excellent article on the National Historic Trust website where a lady, I can't remember her name, gave testimony about the advantages of used and existing buildings over demolishing them. It's a long presentation, but it's excellent and I think that should be considered before you demolish Anne Arundel Hall because I think there are other places where you could have (unintelligible) near the Visitor's Center. That's a perfect place to (unintelligible) and have (unintelligible) rather than destroy that very unique area, which isn't crowded right now but will be when we get that bridge, a pier and a new Interpretive Center and God knows what else. That's my one (unintelligible). The second thing is (unintelligible) came up tonight and makes me want to say this. Dr. Miller's presentation (unintelligible) he mentioned the value of underwater archeology and that it's very costly. But it could be done, maybe in future years when we have

enough money to do it. I will make that assumption. I remember reading a quote from one of your (unintelligible) that the College sent to the Maryland Historic Trust when they wanted to get a permit to monitor this digging for the River Center (unintelligible) and in that quote you mentioned the possibility of some very valuable vessels on that build sight. Would you please (unintelligible) and that it was very deep I would assume, but that on (unintelligible), was that during the monitoring you might be able to find something. Okay, I also read the report from the company that was hired by the College to do the monitoring and in it, it talked about every stage of the monitoring and one stage was at the end in January where they were putting in the geothermal and they went down deep, which I assume they had to do to get any information. But they couldn't do it and the College and the Historic St. Mary's Commission decided with them to cancel the rest of the monitoring they couldn't do it because of the equipment that was there putting in the geothermal. The hole was too small, there were other considerations, so they decided to cancel the monitoring that was going on. Now it seems to me that what should have happened and I don't think (unintelligible). What I'd like ask Dr. Miller, could they be under the River Center building, do you imagine or do you know, or under the boat house portion (unintelligible). I don't know if you know that.

**Henry Miller:** Everything from...

**Chip Jackson:** Henry, could you repeat the question?

**Henry Miller:** The question is what are the archeological resources basically in the area around St. John's Pond.

**Gladys:** At the sight where they put the River Center.

**Henry Miller:** The River Center, there's actually a project done by Avery who did the underwater survey for us (unintelligible). But he found original shoreline, or the sand bar, where the entrance to St. John's Pond was. The River Center is basically on that sand bar. Away from that, where the land drops off, that was the original edge of St. John's Pond and we put out by the road, out by Trinity Church Road. We dug down five feet and then we (unintelligible) down another nine feet, (unintelligible) so there's at least nine foot of sediment that has filled in that area. So, anything that would be (unintelligible) would be very deeply buried under all that fill because that area was intentionally filled in 1926, 1927, (unintelligible). So, those resources that are there, if they are there, they are very deeply in the muck and our hope was that if they hit something that looked like a solid piece of wood or something, we might be able to see just a twig or a log and we might be able to save something. The method that they had to drill down to 800 feet or 1000 feet, 300 feet, the method they used required water and you simply couldn't see it, it was freezing up, so I said this was a waste of this guy's time and there was no way you could pull up valuable data out of it. So that was the reason we did that, it wasn't for a lack of trying. It was just the conditions and the way they had to do all that didn't let us collect it. Now there is other evidence that was collected and (unintelligible). But we're talking about deeply buried resources and that was, the hope is

that if there was a little boat or something there, that is over here versus over there, but without a major trenches dug I don't think we could be able to see that, because it's so confusing.

**Gladys:** My other question is, had there not been those buildings put there, to preserve that area until such time when you could have done a full-fledged archeological dig, which might cost more money than you have right now, then we might have been able to put in the equipment if the monitor's report had indicated it, and I'm not criticizing the fact that they stopped the monitoring. What I'm criticizing is the fact that they decided to put those buildings there before anything could ever be done. So now there, under two big buildings that are eyesores to start with, and they are down deep and they will stay there forever. But you mentioned the shells, 1600 and some odd year shells that you thought might be down there.

**Henry Miller:** Nobody knows, there's possibility there and they would be deeply buried. Most of that area though is fill. If you come under 584 they actually found an old top surface there about five feet thick. So, it's very deep and if I was going to look for old craft? I would go on the other side of St. John's Pond where the landing for St. John's house was, because that muck over there probably has cargo storage, all kinds of things. So that's, there's other opportunities for sure. I understand what you mean. The other place is near where the bell tower is. That was where John Hixson, in the 1720s, was and there's probably stuff there too. So all of St. John's Pond is one is just one great vigilant underwater archeological sight.

**Gladys:** That was my concern, that we didn't wait. I think we did this backwards.

**Chip Jackson:** Follow up. You were involved early in the planning and discussions of the River Center and the Rowing Center. Did that project, was it approached irresponsibly in terms of all of the things that you talked about in your presentation?

**Henry Miller:** The River Center was, the archeological monitoring aspects were what we discussed with the Maryland Trust and they agreed to the strategy because it wasn't going to intrude below the Calvert Hall debris layer. That was the strategy for most of the area there. (unintelligible) sampled that and we got more than enough brick rubble from Calvert Hall, there's no reason for more. And it's still there. Remember, the main building is on that sand bar, so the craft wouldn't be up on the sand, it would be preserved, remember they're going to be in the muck.

**Gladys:** What about the boat house?

**Henry Miller:** That's on fill. The fill's from the old cafeteria, that's filled that swamp in, in 1964.

**Gladys:** But it is possible things could be underneath?

**Henry Miller:** There potentially could be, I can't say where things are around that pond and we tried magnetically. We also tried ground surface radar out there and it was very noisy, it was hard to interpret.

**Gladys:** Thank you.

**Chip Jackson:** Yes, sir.

**Donald Beck:** I have three questions. When we had the meeting on the River Center and the boat house about a year-and-a-half ago, we were told that it was about \$6.7 million. I'm Donald Beck of St. Mary's City, a concerned tax payer. At that time we were told that all of the funds for those two facilities were going to be donated. Since then I've heard that's not the case. I would like to know how much tax payer's money went into those buildings.

**Chip Jackson:** Tom, would you like to answer that question?

**Tom Botzman:** The building, the River Center, is a privately funded project. It is one that the College started, we took out a bond anticipation note, or a BAN, a bond if you will, with a twist to it. So, it is financed that way. We are repaying it and this year already the St. Mary's College of Maryland Foundation has transferred to the College \$2 million toward payment for the building. We still continue to fundraise. It is a privately fundraised facility, the River Center, it is not a state capital project.

**Donald Beck:** But are there tax payer dollars involved? In every type of bonds, something, somewhere along the way, somebody has to pay for it.

**Tom Botzman:** Right and the payments are coming from donors who are giving money to the St. Mary's College of Maryland Foundation and that money then comes to repay the bonds.

**Donald Beck:** But was it built outright with donations as we were originally told?

**Tom Botzman:** Was the building built with donations? No, we're still collecting donations to pay for that bond. So if the question is, did we have \$6.7 million in hand before we started the building, the answer is no, or we wouldn't have taken out a bond.

**Donald Beck:** The second question I had, Chip, did anybody in this planning, the pedestrian bridge is primarily for students or safety, did anybody in the planning look at a tunnel-like bridge. We can dig under Boston, we can dig under the English Channel, wouldn't it have been much more cost effective to dig a tunnel under Route 5 rather than another proposed eyesore?

**Chip Jackson:** Yeah, that's another great question. We have considered a tunnel as part of the earlier planning a number of years ago. We called cost estimators and looked at the geography and again when you think about the land, particularly on the current Anne

Arundel Hall side is high, and that is where everyone is coming from, Calvert Hall, Kent Hall, Anne Arundel Hall, they're all on that high land. To get a handicapped accessible pathway down to a tunnel level would require 300 – 400 feet of ramping switch backs down to get to that level and the cost to build a tunnel was estimated to be much more than what were suggesting here, about a \$1.5 million for an overpass. So those were considered.

**Donald Beck:** The third question I have is, in the state of Maryland, in St. Mary's County, in the federal government, everybody has budgets, everybody has (unintelligible word), and that has access to the taxpayer, that is public information. When is St. Mary's College going to open up their books so we can find out exactly where the dollars are going out for these things?

**Tom Botzman:** If you'd like a copy of our audit, which is opening our books, it's on the website. I will also provide one and if there is additional detail that you'd like, I'd be glad to sit down and talk to you and hear specifically what the questions are that you'd like to have answered. We are a public institution and I must tell you the answers to those questions if you ask me.

**Donald Beck:** Well, I can tell you this, that I know from experience that an audit is not necessarily the entire books. They pick up specific items in the audit and that is not a total financial. I can go up to St. Mary's County and find out exactly what this county spent

and what it was used for, it's public information. I don't believe you have the same access to St. Mary's College.

**Tom Botzman:** I believe I should. So if you'll ask me the questions very specifically, we can sit down, you can ask them and I will do my best answer them. I am required to do that by law.

**Unidentified Woman:** (Unintelligible) Do we have to go through the (unintelligible) to get them?

**Tom Botzman:** You can ask me the questions.

**Unidentified Woman:** (Unintelligible) Because up until now, everything we've asked for, we've had to get through the (unintelligible).

**Tom Botzman:** If you want to sit down and talk about how the project is budgeted, I can sit down and talk to you about how the project is budgeted. If you'd like us to do all the documents, if you request all that, I can. But I'd be glad to sit down how we worked the College's budget on the River Center, how we operate, that is public information and I'd be glad to provide it.

**Unidentified Man:** What public documents can you show us?

**Tom Botzman:** Our spending patterns at the College as a whole. In our audit there's a part that called a Management Discussion and Analysis and I'd be glad to give you a copy of that. It shows how the College spends and what we spend our operating funds on. We do that annually. There's an independent auditor that does that. The Board sees it, the Board approves it and part of what I need to do is send that up then to the state of Maryland and they can certify it. We also have a legislative audit that comes every three years. We're finishing our approval of this year's audit December 6<sup>th</sup>. The Board will see it and then we'll have an approved audit.

**Donald Beck:** All I can say is that local Senator Roy Dyson says that he can't get any information on your spending.

**Tom Botzman:** I would be pleased to provide the Senator with an audit and if he'd like to sit down and talk to me about our spending I'd be pleased to answer any of his questions.

**Chip Jackson:** Yes, sir.

**Unidentified Man:** Chip, (unintelligible), it's not obvious to me how this bridge, tearing down a building and building a new one ties in with the long-range vision the College might have for managing growth here at St. Mary's College. It just looks like to me we are moving the campus towards very environmentally sensitive areas. It doesn't make sense to me.

**Chip Jackson:** The question is, how does this planning, or maybe, protecting your question, lack of planning make sense in terms of environmental issues. I mentioned earlier that we did a master plan for the whole campus. We have a master plan just on environmental issues and water quality management. The College has just gone through a major development program and will begin another round of master planning about the future, looking at the next 10 – 15 years. It looks at enrollment growth and looks at all other kinds of issues. So I think that that's there. I'd be happy to talk to you more detailed about more specific issues that you have, though, with that planning.

**Unidentified Man:** Well, it's obvious, at least obvious to me, that we're going to cross the road, that's a historical area, at least to the Indian tribes and everybody else, why is the campus going that way? What makes it necessary to have a bridge? If you weren't going that way, I assume you might not need the bridge.

**Chip Jackson:** I'll give a brief answer, but in February, on the agenda, is exactly the Anne Arundel Hall replacement, the Interpretive Center, and the bridge and I think we will give an overview that will explain the rationale on all that. You might recognize that the vast majority of campus construction has been on the north campus over the recent years. We've doubled the size of that campus in 15, 20 years. The quick answer is that academic programs that will go in Anne Arundel Hall will be those academic programs that are specifically related to the history and the legacy of this place. It's anthropology, Bill Roberts is here, the anthropology department, some historians and other faculty will

be in the facility. That will be half the facility. The other half will be Dr. Miller and his colleagues and the curation of those millions of artifacts, that they now have stored in boxes in the basement of one of their little houses, is to put a modern, appropriate curation and research facility for archeology for Historic St. Mary's City, that it does not have today. And so there's some logic in having an academic and research facility for the College and City that is near where those issues are. But that's the brief answer. The long answer we'll get into much more detail in February.

**Unidentified Man:** Is there a strategic plan?

**Chip Jackson:** Yes, yes there is.

**Unidentified Man:** (Unintelligible)

**Chip Jackson:** There is a copy of the Maryland Heritage Project, which is a kind of a sub-set of the strategic plan, just on the development of Anne Arundel Hall and the Interpretive Center and things like that. That's on the website that I showed earlier. If there's additional information, please give me a call, I'd be happy to meet with you and go over those details. We have a lot of that information out there already.

**Unidentified Man:** My second question, by the way, I really appreciate your points on developing this kind of planning and coordinating basis (unintelligible) archeological finds on the bottom of the river where all this activity was, you gotta drop something

overboard. How is that being assessed before you start going out there and drilling all these pilings?

**Henry Miller:** Basically the only way you could effectively assess it is to dig it and there's no money or time, I don't want to dig it, I don't like that mud. Underwater...

(Unintelligible – people talking over each other)

**Unidentified Man:** What do you say, screw it, we're just going to drill it?

**Henry Miller:** Well, there's a lot of it left there. The drill holes only go down so many feet. The rest is still intact, whatever's under there. We don't know what's under there, and again, the only way you can tell is by digging and underwater is just way outside of our abilities to comprehend the cost right now for that.

**Unidentified Man:** So we pay attention to archeology when we can afford it, otherwise, forget it.

**Henry Miller:** Well, we can go anywhere. There are sights all over Maryland that are being destroyed right now by private...

**Unidentified Man:** But I'm only interested in this sight.

**Henry Miller:** But, we don't know for sure where the underwater archeology is. It's a whole different class of the survey work. Terrestrial archeology is pretty well defined and we understand that very much. It requires an underwater expert to really do the river system here and we don't have the support for that.

(Unintelligible – multiple people talking at the same time.)

**Unidentified Man:** Some of the greatest archeological finds have been those that were found underwater.

(Unintelligible – multiple people talking at the same time.)

**Dr. Miller:** I have lots of time working in it and it's wonderful stuff...

**Unidentified Man:** (Unintelligible) You should take another look at it before you start drilling holes out there.

**Chip Jackson:** Yes, sir.

**Brendan Larrabee:** Student: Yes, my name is Brendan Larrabee and I'm a freshman here at St. Mary's College and I'm wondering if the College has performed any (unintelligible) analysis on the use of the crosswalk when the bridge would be in place

(unintelligible) and pedestrian traffic to see exactly how necessary this bridge is?

(Unintelligible)

**Chip Jackson:** The question is, yes, the question is there any data collected on the number of crossings of Route 5, both vehicles and pedestrians. There is some data we collected a couple years ago when we did some initial planning. We need to update that data as we move forward. It's a great question and needs to make sure it's thoroughly analyzed. Ray?

**Ray Dodson:** Chip, Ray Dodson. As far as with the crosswalk, can you give us a sense of, from a safety standpoint, I know we are talking about artifacts, and we're talking about everything else, but from a pure safety standpoint, is there any numbers or any studies in terms of any injuries that have occurred there, things like that, can you give us a foundation of why we're looking to do this?

**Chip Jackson:** We haven't done any thorough analysis of the many years. We do have anecdotal. Just last month, there was a student whose ankle was damaged and was in a wheelchair for a while because she had to jump out of the way of a car that didn't slow down for her. So that's an example, but, I don't think anyone should question that crosswalk is dangerous.

**Ray Dodson:** We've gone through this, I think we understand that we're trying to preserve the area and everything, but we're talking about the safety here of human beings

as well. That needs to come into that somehow, some kind of study that can show the people that are concerned that we're trying to save lives here, we're not trying to infringe upon what's been left here by God over the years and by history, but by the same token we need to protect peoples lives.

**Chip Jackson:** Yes, ma'am?

**Bonnie Clark:** I'm Bonnie Clark and I just want to say, Chip, I might suggest that for future meetings we frame the plans you're talking about at the time in terms of the whole strategic plan to those of us who haven't seen it, we have some sense where your heading (unintelligible).

**Chip Jackson:** Terrific comment. We'll do that at the next meeting. Yes, ma'am.

**Joanna Gibson:** Hello, my name is Joanna Gibson and I am a senior at St. Mary's and I am a full-time (unintelligible) environmental (unintelligible) bulletin. I just wanted to say that on the subject of the bridge, it certainly does not have unanimous student support. There's a lot of turmoil in the student body about whether we want it, whether it's necessary. Personally, I don't think it is. I mean, the crosswalk is safe in the daytime and at night it could use some lights. But I don't think we need a bridge at all. I think that it would be an eyesore. I think the College is building much more than it needs to, much more than it really required (unintelligible). I think growth for the sake of growth is unwise and I also think having this bridge come out in the parking lot would just

encourage people to drive to the Campus Center parking lot, which already has a loop of issues and we want this to be a pedestrian branded campus. I know the lot with the bridge would be more accessible, but no one wants to bike through a parking lot. And on the subject of building and growth, I just want to reiterate that President O'Brien did sign the President's Climate Commitment and we are building a lot. And even (unintelligible) sustainable and green buildings, every building increases our carbon footprint. Every building uses energy and energy costs have been rising and, I'm sure you're aware of this even more than I am, and even though the buildings may be funded by donors or by the state, those energy bills are coming from my tuition and being carbon neutral is important for the climate and it's also important because it makes this school accessible to students who wouldn't be able to afford such high tuition. When we keep raising our tuition to keep paying for our energy, which isn't sustainable, we're going to be chasing away students who want to be (unintelligible).

**Chip Jackson:** I think you raise excellent questions. The, I think it's a natural moment right now in the College's, where we are, we have had a lot of development. I think all that development is driven by critical needs. We don't seek money to do projects that we don't think are serving the programmatic need. We've done a lot of development and we're now poised at this moment where we have a few of these projects on the horizon, whether they be these projects, the foot bridge or Anne Arundel Hall, other projects that you know the College is talking about, the potential auditorium, that we begin another round of what we call this master planning. We do them about every 10 years. The last one, I mentioned one earlier we did in 1986. We did one in 1999. It's the time period

both in that cycle and in this position we're in now where we just kind of exhaled after doing a lot of work to get back into an intensive planning mode that has the input of the entire campus community and local community as well. I think those questions you're asking are the exact right questions that we need to be asking this institution right now as part of that master plan process to put it into a coordinated and comprehensive plan.

**Unidentified Man:** Chip, if anybody thinks the footbridge is going to solve the safety problem, they're crazy. As somebody who goes to the St. Mary's Post Office daily I can tell you there's a lot of traffic that cuts not in the cross walks (unintelligible) and the River Center and the Boat House has done nothing but accelerate that problem with the pedestrian traffic. So, if anybody thinks the footbridge is the ultimate answer for traffic safety, you're crazy. As you build these facilities, the natural thing is for people coming around the pond and go right across Route 5 there in the original crosswalk.

**Chip Jackson:** I understand and the point is well made that a crosswalk across Route 5 will not solve all pedestrian issues on Route 5. There are many other locations. We understand those issues and that has to be weighed into the evaluation of how this would all be approached. Your point is very well made. I'm trying to get to people that haven't talked. This man in the back and then, Bryan, you're next.

**Student Russell:** (First name unintelligible) Russell, I'm a sophomore here at the College. I was wondering, why do we need to replace Anne Arundel Hall? Is there

something apparently wrong with the building, as in something structurally (unintelligible).

**Chip Jackson:** That's a great question. We'll talk about it in detail at the February meeting. The snapshot of that, we initially approached the thought of combining College anthropology research issues with Historic St. Mary's City's archeological program and there's a lot of existing, but more potential for collaboration in that area. The PhD's, the staff at Historic St. Mary's City, teach as adjunct faculty. Some of our students do St. Mary's Projects with the City, and archeology issues. So there's already some integration of programs, but we believe there will be significantly more. Anne Arundel Hall, we initially approached this as a renovation and re-use of the existing building and through analysis of its exact structure, the floors weren't built to hold the loadings of all the artifacts that would need to be stored there. There are a lot of code deficiencies in the building. The actual exterior walls of the building were made out of bricks and actual cinderblocks and cinderblocks were a product of the 50s that are very porous, so there's no moisture barrier to the outside wall. In order to preserve all of the artifacts, we actually would have had to build a second layer of wall skin, either inside the building or outside the building, to provide environmental control. So, we did a very thorough analysis and we'll actually put that analysis on our website. It's probably 80 or 100 pages long looking at all of these issues, about could we do an adaptive re-use. That was the first choice. This analysis showed that that would not work well. Great question and we'll get into much more detail when we talk about the Anne Arundel Hall project in February. I think Bryan was next.

**Bryan Siebert:** My name is Bryan Siebert and I live in Scotland. One of the things that I want the Advisory Committee to do is, and I strongly advise you to do this, what you've been hearing here tonight about this bridge is, it's not a question of if, it's a question of when and how. In my view, it's your job to call in Muldoon, call in O'Brien, and say, why do we need this bridge because if you're going to represent the public in this group that's been put together, you've got to get down to the fundamentals. Already more than a million dollars have been thrown at this project. Do you know where it came from? You don't know where it came from. Did they consult you before they lobbied to get the money? They did not, to my knowledge. I say no. I can't even figure out where that million dollars came from. Sure, I have my suspicion, it was an earmark, but it may not have been. But who's been lobbying for this before the public has even had a chance to weigh in? So it seems to me, before you, if you don't do this, if you don't get O'Brien and Muldoon before you and make them justify what they're doing, you're really gonna be relegated with the role of what color to paint that bridge because their gonna do what they wanna do. They've started down the path, they've formulated this Committee and this Committee is not going to have a role unless you get more powerful and assert yourselves with regards to advancement of this College that is pushing these things. That also applies to Anne Arundel and Margaret Brent. So, if you're going to have a meaningful role in which the citizens can have confidence, you've got to do more than listen to what the College is telling you. You've got to act independently of them and act as managers. There's money involved and there's public opinion involved. You've got to consider those things, because as citizens, who are we going to turn to if it's not the

Advisory Committee for advice, not what the College is telling you, but what you guys think. That's a generic term. So, follow the money, find out where this \$1.4 million that was reported in the paper came from and who lobbied to get it and did they ask the public for advice before they went out to get that money? See, this is the same thing we had with the River Center. I know the College's view is that they broadly broadcast what was happening with the River Center, but most of us don't believe that the word got out properly. I'm being as (unintelligible) as I can. In that case, they clearly put the cart before the horse and I don't want the same thing to happen on other things that are going on, on the campus. I'm still very disappointed in the archaeology as it applies to that sight. I don't have a Ph.D. in archeology, but I was over there right after the contractor, whose job it was, was to monitor that sight when they put down the holes for the cooling system, whatever it's called, the geothermal, and the post holes. That document, if you read it, says that they just pretty much gave up at the end because you can't do an archeological survey of a slurry and that approval was with consultation with the good doctor over here, and I have the greatest admiration for him. This is one of the guys, I think, who cares about what historical direction that this campus is taking. Then, on a personal note, this is what it was like in January. I go there in August the good doctor is saying you've got to watch these contractors like crazy. Well, that's true, they were tearing down a hill that was not (unintelligible) and that was not fill, I know that personally, that was dirt, that wasn't fill. They were running these backhoes back and forth and making big, deep trenches. Nobody was looking to see whether or not there was archeological significance. They were smoothing out for this fancy pavement for the parking area. Nobody was there looking to see whether or not there was anything of

archeological significance. I'm saying it because I was there and these guys weren't just double-time, it was more like quadruple-time, like they had to get it done as fast as they possibly could. Disappointing. Many of us think that this is the original landing sight for Lord Calvert's expedition from England for the Ark and the Dove. Even the president of this College told the Governor in my presence, and the presence of other people here that were present, we're not sure where they landed. Well, if you're not sure, you sure as heck don't want to destroy the sight until you find out whether or not you are sure. So for those of us who regard this place as sacred, if you look at the website, it says this is the only place in the United States that was relatively undisturbed from the 17<sup>th</sup> century. That is much more remarkable than almost anything you can think of in terms of its historical significance and we want to preserve it. We are on the side of preservation, not on the side of development that seems to run askew every so often. So, I've talked too long, I've got a lot of things to say, but I'm going to stop, but I'm not happy with what I'm hearing the (unintelligible) today and I appreciate you doing it, and you're making a step forward, but this was hell, it wasn't (unintelligible), it was hell. Yes I got to say some things and so did some other people, but I don't get the spirit of "we want your input and we will modify how we think" because we didn't. No, I didn't hear it. What I heard was mostly justification of what's going on, that's it.

**Chip Jackson:** Behind Gladys, you had a question as well. I was trying to get to people who hadn't spoken yet. Do you still have a question?

**Unidentified Woman:** My question, is the new pier going to have a wheelchair ramp attached to it?

**Chip Jackson:** I think that's part of the design process. I don't have the answer to that right now. I don't know.

**Unidentified Woman:** (Unintelligible) That's a law. You've got to have a wheelchair ramp.

**Chip Jackson:** Well, we need to look into that. I mean, we haven't designed...

**Unidentified Woman:** (Unintelligible) you ought to replace it with a wheelchair ramp attached.

**Chip Jackson:** We haven't designed the bridge yet. We'll make sure the bridge meets all state requirements. We will specifically ask that question and we'll get back to you about that.

**Unidentified Woman:** The other thing is, that according to the state, it must be accessible to the voting public because it has state funds into it.

**Chip Jackson:** Okay, we'll look into that as well.

**Unidentified Woman:** There's a state pier right by my house and I fight with it all the time, believe me. And another thing, there's a map that you had there, you had a boat ramp going down to it and I think you had boat storage this way and the boat ramp this way. Are you not going to have a little problem? You're removing some boats from the storage and you've got a ramp that's gonna back into it. (Unintelligible conversation) I mean, I might be looking at it wrong. The one that had a ramp on the side of the pier. Yeah, that one.

**Chip Jackson:** The idea is that this would be the boat ramp, coming out of the boat yard, where you can back in.

**Unidentified Woman:** (Unintelligible) that ramp.

**Chip Jackson:** This is a traditional, concrete ramp to launch boats off a trailer. That's what this would be. This is the pier that is next to it. Often times, boat ramps are next to piers. I think that makes sense.

**Unidentified Woman:** (Unintelligible) that new rowing platform.

**Chip Jackson:** This rowing platform is where the long crew shells would be launched. A walk down the pier, down onto this section here through a gangway and then be put into the water and move out. We don't think we have enough activity, that there are boats

being launched with such frequency that we'd have congestion here that would be a safety issue. We don't think that will be a problem.

**Unidentified Woman:** It won't be a problem?

**Chip Jackson:** No, I really don't think so. Yes, sir?

**Unidentified Man:** (Unintelligible) and I was looking at this picture. This is phase one, and I agree with the comment that it does look like there is the potential for traffic congestion. But, if you go back to the original, just for a second, this one shows the pier and the boat ramp right there in front. It looks like a good design, but then I look at the pier and what is that really doing for the Rowing Center or the River Center and why couldn't we take the pier and put it on the other side of the existing pier?

**Chip Jackson:** On this side?

**Unidentified Man:** Yes, sir.

**Chip Jackson:** We've actually looked at that and the pier is primarily being used as a shoreline protection project. The whole idea, just like this existing pier, as Dan mentioned, all the battens, all the wood boards that go deep into the water that are along this pier. It was built as a shoreline protection project, I can't remember the exact date, maybe 30 years ago, and it has been very effective at not only protecting the shore, but

allowing the accumulation of some of the beach area here. So the whole idea in this location was how can we create a shoreline that provides great accessibility for kayaks and windsurfers and all those type of things that without creating marsh (unintelligible word) living shoreline concept and the solution was staring us right in the face. We had one that was working and if we do the same thing, in this either initial plan or in this plan, most of the shoreline, the shoreline engineers, there's been two studies done that they agree most of the damage is done by the long fetch of the northwesterly breezes that come and hit the shoreline and eat soil up, that if we build another pier here, it will essentially break the wave energy that's coming along during those heavy wind events and protect the pier and just like the existing pier, will allow us to restore and maintain this beach. In combination with the groin here, and actually the pier on this side as well, will all help kind of kind of create a still basin behind it. So, that's the concept that the engineers have suggested. Programmatically in terms of the sailing program, I know Adam has talked, he spoke earlier, much prefer additional pier facilities on this side. It's closer, you only have one pier to go down if you're carrying all this stuff to boats. It's deeper water which gives you much more flexibility for things. In one way that would provide a great benefit for the sailing program, but for protecting the shoreline, it does nothing. That's why this is the solution we think has that balance of protecting the shoreline first and foremost and then providing some additional programmatic capacity.

**Unidentified Man:** Has anybody looked at the (unintelligible)?

**Chip Jackson:** Yes, we have looked at an option which would be a breakwater that would do the same purpose as the pier, and so those are two different options to look at. If we do this one, then we provide the additional programmatic benefits as well, so I think that's the issue. Ken, you had your hand up?

**Ken:** (Unintelligible) But, I'd like to address one issue. Our economy is in the tank, the worst it's been in my generation and at all levels of government, federal, state, and local will have to look at tightening the budgets (unintelligible). I don't see much in this entire program that falls into that category. It seems to me that you should use your civic conscious, if you will, to look at whether we need to do any of this stuff and to start putting resources strictly into educational programs, not these recreational (unintelligible).

**Chip Jackson:** Yes, sir.

**Cory Smith:** My name is Cory Smith, St. Inigoes, class of 1989. I understand that the footbridge hasn't exactly been designed yet, but given the elevations that you were talking about at Anne Arundel and this side, do we have any idea what the vehicle clearance will be under that bridge?

**Chip Jackson:** Yes, the requirements, state and federal, is 17 feet, 9 inches, clearance, not just the middle, but the entire road underneath. 17 feet, 9 inches is the minimum.

**Cory Smith:** And then we have 17 feet, I mean there's enough there to do that?

**Chip Jackson:** Yes.

**Cory Smith:** Okay, couple quick comments. If the footbridge project is completed as (unintelligible) will the north crosswalks be removed?

**Chip Jackson:** North crosswalks, you mean...

**Corey Smith:** The one near the Rowing Center that goes across.

**Chip Jackson:** The one near the Rowing Center by the Freedom of Consciousness monument probably would not be removed. It is our intention that we would remove the one by Margaret Brent Hall, the one that's adjacent to where the bridge would be.

**Cory Smith:** Okay, that doesn't really seem to keep the students on a safe area. But, anyway, that's neither here nor there. The young lady made a good point about the safety of the current crosswalk in the interim until this footbridge is constructed, is there any way to get some better lighting in the area?

**Chip Jackson:** It's a great suggestion.

**Cory Smith:** When I was here, I mean we had the big ugly overhead light on the end of the State House Road. It was removed for aesthetic reasons and these post lamps are horrible, especially on a night like tonight. Then also, the bushes that were planted there to dress everything up, really hide the students coming out of buildings. And one other quick suggestion in that line, maybe some very close spaced (unintelligible word) at the end of that because students have the tendency to ride their bicycles down the hill, gaining a lot of speed and blast out into that crosswalk. I went here, I understand it, I did it too, but at the same time, I don't want to hit anybody.

**Chip Jackson:** Those are great comments and I would say when we meet in February we'll have a response on how we can do those short-term safety improvements. Thank you for bringing that up. Yes, Gladys.

**Gladys:** Chip, I sat in this room, the same room when Maggie had the first meeting where she was criticized by Dyson for not having any public input, and as I have listened today, we've had some excellent comments from this group. In particular, the young lady who happens to be a senior at this College, I think she should be president of the College instead. But, anyway, I understand (unintelligible word) she had an excellent idea. Other people have brought up ideas that say why have it at all and you keep bringing it up that we're going to talk about it in February. In February, you'll already have done all of the designs. We're all talking about deciding whether or not we should do it at all. Last year when Maggie stood up and gave all these wonderful comments, people gave very good suggestions and at the end of that program I stood up and asked her, I said, in light of all

these excellent comments, do you still hold fast to the concept that was in the paper, when you said that you didn't care what Dyson said, or what a newly elected representative, or the public says, those two buildings are still going up. She said that.

**President O'Brien:** I did not say that.

**Gladys:** You did say that. I wish I had it (unintelligible) you did say that.

(Unintelligible. Multiple speakers)

**President O'Brien:** I would not say something like that.

**Gladys:** Did I not ask you, are you still not, are you still determined to keep that thing, and what did you say when you answered the question? You remember what you said, what did you say in answer to my question?

**Dr. O'Brien:** That's why we spent six months reviewing this before we decided what to do...

**Gladys:** The answer was, I'll give you that answer at the next meeting. She never gave an answer to that question.

(Unintelligible. Multiple speakers)

**Gladys:** If you do the design and you talk about it and the CDA and honorable people will say, okay, that sounds like a good idea and we have a replica of the Four C's Advisory Committee. The only two options they had was moving the road and everybody knew that the Board of Trustees would have been insane to say we'll move the road, so...

**Chip Jackson:** Let me talk about process...

**President O'Brien:** I also responded, Gladys, with all due respect, we did after that first meeting. Clearly, as you just said, the Four C's, we did an elaborate process, a very detailed process, and came to a conclusion and then the Board made its ultimate decision. I don't make these decisions and I said that in that meeting, by myself, nor does the College make them by ourselves. We make them in consultation, first of all with Historic St. Mary's City, our partner, and we also make consultation with the board of the state of Maryland and that was the process we went through and I believe a number of you were with us in December after that discussion, which began in August, so that was a long study discussion and I think it was respectful and responsive of the community. I also want to thank you all for coming. I also want to thank Chip and his staff for the amount of time they have put in to ensure that there is communication. Now, I understand that not everybody wants to participate in the same way with the Design Advisory Committee. If there is another way to do this, again, we will be favorable to another mechanism should one be proposed. But I just want to correct that, that there was a great deal of concern and effort given in response to the concerns expressed last year as there is tonight.

**Gladys:** I would like a chance to rebut Dr. O'Brien's comments. She had adequate time to rebut mine. This is not a personal vendetta; I think we both have mutual respect for each other. However, I still maintain that we're doing it the wrong way. What we should be talking about, whether or not we're gonna have this, not waiting until (unintelligible) have the Committee discuss whether they like the designs or not.

**Chip Jackson:** Let me respond to that question. It's actually a terrific question. I don't think we've adequately described process enough. There's two pieces to this. One is response to a comment that there's no real input here, that there's no effectual input here. I think our Trustees and the administration at the College and at Historic St. Mary's City are absolutely interested in the public's comments. We will provide the Trustees, as President O'Brien mentioned, they make the decisions. We will provide them with all the comments that come. There will be no filtering of this discussion tonight. They will have the benefit of community input. I think that's a terrific thing. I think the creation of this process that we did last year, and you were at a number of the meetings that we held earlier about how we would create this, one in the State House, is that we want to be able to have a process where the community can have input. I think we acknowledged then, and we still acknowledge, that there could be a better process than what happened in the past. In fact we had a process in the 90s, we've talked about that, public interest waned, lots of interest waned and it kind of went away. The River Center gave us the, what happened there, said we need to do a better job at providing community input. I believe, listening to Trustees and President O'Brien that there's a sincere interest and

understanding what the communities comments are and we're hearing them tonight, whether its about the bridge, the shoreline or about any of these other projects. So I think and I hope, that there still is very sincere desire to hear these comments. The second piece has to do with the bridge and why would we go moving forward now. It is very difficult, for a lot of the questions about the bridge are will it be used or not, should a tunnel be there, what it will do to the viewshed, what effects it might have on historic or cultural resources and in a vacuum, which is what we have now, none of us can answer that question right now. We don't have a proposal that gives you the ability to assess what the impact would be to the viewshed, what would the impact be to safety and all these other issues. That's why we believed it made sense to start the design process. The design process, when it starts, we will award contracts. Then we'll get started. The design process takes years to go forward with. Nothing is being started with construction. I think our schedule for the footbridge is about two years and the buildings, Anne Arundel Hall and the Interpretive Center, are about four years away. They haven't been built yet. We haven't hired construction contracts to build the buildings, so what we hope is the right process is to have the analysis done that says what will these buildings be on the landscape, this pedestrian bridge on the landscape and give everybody, the public and ourselves included, a chance to assess what those affects may be. That doesn't mean because we start a design process that if at some point there was a decision made, well, maybe we shouldn't build it, that it can't happen. It's not a (unintelligible) that these things go forward, we have the opportunity to shape how they're done and assess what their actual impacts will be. So I think, try, and that's our goal, is by allowing the design to get started we actually give you and everyone else an opportunity to see truly what

these things might do. So, that's the rationale. It's not to try to barge forward and ignore process and ignore comments. It's so we can assess these issues in a more thorough way. Yes.

**Unidentified Man:** I'd just like to make two points. First I'd like to extrapolate on the gentleman's point on the crosswalk further down Route 5. I've done a little bit of traffic planning analysis on my own and when you eliminate another crosswalk where you have two crosswalks, the cars that come down that road are going to be less aware of students crossing the road and they are going to be less likely to stop. So when you have all those, you know, an increased traffic going to the River Center and to the Rowing Center and you're going to have, the cars just assume that everyone's going across the bridge and I don't have to worry about it, I don't have to slow down, then you are going to have an increased safety risk, even though you're decreasing the risk of students crossing where the bridge is. The second point I'd like to make is that you have that existing pier that's protecting the beach there and it's keeping it from eroding. When you shift that pier over, what's going to continue keeping the beach to the left of the pier and keep that from erosion from continuing to worsen. That parking lot is, right now the shoreline is almost eroded completely up to where the parking lot is.

**Chip Jackson:** Yes. I'm not a coastal engineer. We've hired two different firms, two different studies over a number of years. What they say is, similar to this pier, that there won't be a loss here, but that the affects of the boat ramp and this pier similar to the affect to a groin. You can see this many places along shorelines, whether they are on the St.

Mary's River or other places. You tend to build up some amount of sand or beach next to those areas. So that's the whole goal here, is that we will protect, and the shoreline entirely through this section through a combination of all these issues. I don't think, no one has suggested, that it would be the expense of some other location right there.

**Unidentified Man:** (Unintelligible)

**Chip Jackson:** This section here?

**Unidentified Man:** Yes.

**Chip Jackson:** We're not removing the existing pier, so, maybe that was a misunderstanding. The existing pier remains so it will continue to benefit from the wave reduction that goes through those battens. Is there a question here? Gary, did you have your hand up as well?

**Wayne Clements:** I'm Wayne Clements. I'm a transfer student. I'm also a commuter. The commuters don't want the bridge. They would prefer to see extra lighting or public safety come down and direct traffic in peak seasons of crossing and they prefer that the state not spend the money on that. The second point, for the energy savings in the buildings, have you considered tank-less hot water heaters.

**Chip Jackson:** We did consider a number of different hot water heating solutions in the residence halls, including solar hot water. In that energy performance contract I mentioned, and when we do those types of projects, we usually do an analysis of payback. How much will you save, how many years will it take to pay back the cost of putting in that saving, and so, changing out lights, you can usually, the savings pay for the cost of the new light fixture within six months to two years. Some things are very long and the items that may have been 20 or 30 years or more of payback were not done as a first priority. The things that could be done in a shorter payback, because you get more return of your investment quicker. We are actually now beginning to look at a second round of energy performance contract on campus and all those issues we will look extensively, all campus-wide, whether solar heated water for residence halls or other issues, then we can do a second round of this. How can we improve the efficiency of things that consume energy and use the savings from those to help pay for the actual improvement. So it's a great suggestion and if it's not on our list, it will be on our list of things to evaluate in this next round.

Wayne Clemens: (Unintelligible)

**Chip Jackson:** I think we'll go with Gary, then we'll come back here.

**Gary:** I would like to respond to your comment about painting, choosing the colors of the bridge. I think it's a fair comment to make. Approaching these kinds of problems from an environmental management perspective, the thing that drives the decision

making is what's the purpose, what need are you meeting here. The need for the bridge seems to be safety, student safety, and I think what we're missing, and the Committee's missing, is the alternatives analysis that might be driven by that need, safety. So I'm sitting here and I'm hearing lighting, that would be an alternative, enhancing the present crossing, changing the road structure, slowing traffic down would be another, and I'm just wondering, well two things, one is, what alternatives analysis took place that got it narrowed down to the bridge and the second is just a general comment. I know the College is in a difficult situation, being far enough along to have something to present the public and the group, on the other hand not presenting it solely as the process of closing off other alternatives. And, so, I'd just be interested in, wondering actually from the public, what would you think of traffic calming, that is changing the road structure so that traffic was physically required to slow down as it came into the College.

**Unidentified Man:** (Unintelligible) actually it's only one of two north-south arteries and it was approached, I believe Ms. Russell, alluded to a meeting that took place about 14, 15 years ago, where I believe, if my memory serves, there was a plan that the College wanted to put in cobblestone streets through that area and the fire departments, rescue squads and everyone else. Another part of that was to try and narrow the lanes, and it makes a nightmare for them to try and do anything. What it really does, in my opinion, it just makes it worse, because now you've got a rough road that people are being bounced on in their cars and everybody's already 15 minutes late to get to Webster Field as it is. The back gate's gonna close and they're hitting the gas. I spent 15 years down there and believe me, (unintelligible).

**Chip Jackson:** Gary, your comment about needs analysis and alternatives, we'll make sure that's a primary part of our presentation next time. Yes, sir.

**Unidentified Man:** I have a question for President O'Brien. (Unintelligible) In the last year, St. Mary's College, to the best of my knowledge, spent \$960,000 buying property (unintelligible). The question I have is what is the rationalization for buying the Somerville property (unintelligible). But the second question, is St. Mary's College willing to open up all the land that they own in St. Mary's County, because that's land that comes off of taxpayer's shoulders, we don't collect any taxes and I would like to know why the College is buying all this land. I can see (unintelligible) directly adjacent, but the Somerville property is like a mile away and it has an ugly trailer on it, I don't know. I think, as a tax payer, we should be notified, or at least I would like to see (unintelligible) what is the land owned in St. Mary's County and what it is used for because we tax payers are (unintelligible).

**President O'Brien:** I would say on the tax payer's side, the College, both as an employer and a contributor to the local economy, does a great deal. In terms of a strategy, the College has a little over 300 acres now, about 320 acres. The City has, Historic St. Mary's City, has about 850 acres. One of the great things that has been enabled by our partnership, which is now 11 years old, since 1997, is the sharing of land. It has helped us enormously as the state has asked us, as the state's honors college, to take on more students, 18 year-olds who wish to go a premier liberal arts college, and we're one of a

kind, as well as one school in Florida. To be able to accommodate those students, we have tried to cooperate, but that has meant some growth. We also had some real significant deficiencies. For example, in the sciences. We had no laboratories for science faculty or students and it particularly became critical when as part of the honors college, we developed the honors curriculum, asking all students to do a thesis, that's what we call a St. Mary's Project. So, that is a large reason for the attempt to accommodate the appropriate facilities for students. And, as I recall, Chip, back in 1995 when we began this section of the master plan, we had what the state called deficiencies in classroom space of about 35%, laboratory space was almost 50%, and then we still have the assembly space. Anybody that's gone to a lecture in St. Mary's Hall recently understands this. We often, because of fire restrictions, have to limit the attendance. It's upsetting to us when we have national level speakers who are of such interest, like Tony Kornheiser, to our local population. We pride ourselves in being a cultural hub. So, though, the issue that you asked about land is pretty simple. About five years ago, as a part of our work with St. Mary's City, we began to worry quite a bit about the arrival sequence starting at Park Hall and the fact that this, as this area, is under intense pressure for development, that we were going to be exposed (unintelligible) the Jamestown and Yorktown areas so well preserved, as the arrival sequence was well preserved. The Trustees had said from Park Hall south, if there's the opportunity for the College, with the state of Maryland, to be able to purchase properties, specifically for the purpose of preservation and use - for example, if there is a house that the College can also use for visiting guests, that they would be willing to entertain that. So as properties have become available, and I think, Chip, there were two on the back end. One is now called the Artist House, which was

purchased and given to the College. There's a small piece of property also on that back end...

**Chip Jackson:** This is up on Mattapan Road.

**Dr. O'Brien:** On Mattapan, across the road on Mattapan. There is the property that is the Wise property, which is adjacent to the 300 acres of the campus. There is also a large segment we're working through with the state, to preserve with state support, the viewshed as you come down through that pine grove. That, again, with the College's initiatives, a very significant segment where the intention was, and I think it's all been approved by planning and zoning, to put, I believe it is seven lots, right up against where there is no lot right now, there will be lots. So that has been the intention of the Board, whose plan goes back about five years.

**Chip Jackson:** I would simply add to that, the question about the property on Route 5 where there is a bulldozer. When we acquired that property, the previous land owner left a lot of debris on the property. There was a trailer that you saw and that was removed. There were parts of another trailer and stuff, to use just a general term, and so we wanted to get rid of those environmental hazards off the site. That's all that happened there. We probably should have said something, somehow, to let people know about that. The last stuff that we've asked to be picked up has been picked up and we have no plans. We want that land to be preserved. We hope that it grows trees and is part of what President O'Brien says, that is preserving the arrival sequence. That's what's going on right there.

There's no development at all right there. It's just cleaning up the environmental hazards there and letting it restore to woodlands.

**Unidentified Man:** It seems very that strange that the tight economy and the state million dollar shortfall that they're spending a million dollars on a property.

**Chip Jackson:** It's a great comment. I think timing has a lot to do with this. Some of you may remember, it wasn't too long ago, the housing prices were jumping drastically. Homeowners, landowners, were rushing to get properties developed for the market. That's changed. These things don't happen overnight so when Trustees asked this several years ago, as President O'Brien said, a number of years ago to start looking at these things. Some of these issues had been in development or being worked on for a number of years and so I think in today's light, some of those issues have taken on a different shape, but if you look at the long term, these haven't been things that just popped up yesterday.

**Unidentified Man:** But one of those land purchases, one of those land sales, happened to be sold by one of the members of the Board of Trustees and I think The Enterprise had a little bit to say about that because it doesn't look very good.

**Chip Jackson:** I understand that. We recognize that. We let the Maryland Ethics Commission advise how to do that and the States Attorney General's office negotiated 100% of that transaction so there was no connection between the College on that. But I don't think we want....

**President O'Brien:** Can I also say, Don, that because these things take so much time and because the state actually has funds to purchase open spaced land, we made use of that opportunity. That actually started 25 years ago, but it took so long for this, long before the Trustee was a Trustee of the College. It takes so long to get these things worked out and for the funds to be there from the state of Maryland that this one actually preceded that person's appointment to the Board.

**Unidentified Man:** It just seems strange, President O'Brien, because I know the (unintelligible) preservation (unintelligible) had their funds cut when they were trying to get some farm lands (unintelligible). It just seems to be very (unintelligible).

**Dr. O'Brien:** We just made use of the public funds like everybody else and we're not, I don't think we're greedy. In fact, the only two times I can think of that we made use of those funds (unintelligible).

**Unidentified Man:** Maybe I can get a little more on the process these projects go through to determine funding and where the money comes from because I think we're getting so far into the woods, with the economy and whatever. There's got to be some legislative oversight of this process that I don't understand. You know what I mean? Somebody here at the College does not end up writing a check

**Chip Jackson:** No.

**Unidentified Man:** (Unintelligible) What is the procedure for this, one of these projects?

**Chip Jackson:** Well, there's funding that comes from different sources, so there's very different funding. Funds that come from the state get appropriated for that particular project or they get appropriated as part of a package of funding that can be applied to lots of different things. But all of, what any state funded project goes through, we don't have just access that we just say please, can we have X dollars and someone just sends us the money. It varies by the source of the funds. There's different types of state funds. A capital project, like a new building, like we've just built a couple and proposed Anne Arundel Hall and the Interpretive Center, we begin planning for those projects on average about 8 – 10 years before construction starts and working to develop program statements. Gary mentioned the question about driven by needs. We do needs analysis for these projects. Those are reviewed by a number of state agencies. If they don't agree with the need, that it's a compelling need, then you never even get off the starting block. It goes through then various legislative review processes and eventually out of the chute that project comes up and the legislature appropriates funds for the project. They do that in phases. Design first, then construction, last if there is equipment, they fund that last. It's 10:00. We'll take two more questions. Yes, sir.

**Unidentified Man:** (name unintelligible) St. Mary's City, a lot of people know me. I want to add something to this gentleman's question (unintelligible) we've heard so much about that footbridge. I worked for the state of Maryland transportation for

(unintelligible) and you know this section in one of the, at times, not all the time, but at times, is the most critically loaded road in this area. I give you that as a fact that you can consider when you build the bridge, or a tunnel, or if you leave it alone. That's what you're dealing with and I assume the state would (unintelligible) with building a bridge or a tunnel or whatever you want to do for that reason, but that's a very critical area. The way they rate highways, like 235 would be rated as a critical (unintelligible) but this area at no surprise to me is very critical and at times, the most critical in this county for transportation and down at Ridge, years ago we had the discussion about putting a center isle in this section and narrowing it to slow the traffic down. The fire department went wild about it because, A, it would give us (unintelligible), and B, we couldn't get the big trucks through. Those are the kinds of other considerations that state planners look at.

(Unintelligible talking among crowd.)

**Chip Jackson:** Last question. Yes, sir.

**Unidentified Man:** I was just wondering about the actual funding for the bridge. I'm wondering if it's stipulated anywhere that there's a low bid contract? I don't know if anybody knows that. I ask this because, I don't know if you've spent much time in Goodpaster Hall, and I don't know if that was a low bid contract either, but even for such a recently built building, the quality of the workmanship there is very low and you have doors that are literally falling out of their frames and you can't lock the building up at night. So I'm wondering if we are accepting low bid contracts here, and you're building a

structure over a roadway, is that going to be a long term problem, especially when we have a country where our bridges are falling apart and deteriorating and collapsing. I mean, look 20 or 30 years down the road.

**Chip Jackson:** That's a great question. We could have a whole meeting just on the ways that public entities, whether they are federal, state or local, do procurement of construction services. It is something that folks like Dan and I have spent careers pulling our own hair out over and how can you best develop a procurement process that gets you the best quality but at the best prices. There are a numbers of federal, if there's federal funds, or state regulations, we work with those rules as best we can so we manage that and Goodpaster Hall, or any building that we build, generally they're pretty well built buildings. But they all have problems that just frustrate the hell out of a lot of us and the doors in Goodpaster is an example of that and we continue to work on issues. There is no perfect solution to the question you're asking, but people in our profession struggle with this all the time, and with that, I'd be happy to talk to you about this at length, maybe have lunch or something to talk about that.

**Dr. Botzman:** We want to thank everyone for coming out and spending an evening talking with us and we certainly are going to try to listen and understand more and we're going to be back together for another Capital Design Advisory meeting in February. Thank you, have a good evening.

