



**Red Line
Citizens'
Advisory
Council**

2011
ANNUAL REPORT



2011 ANNUAL REPORT (September 2010 – July 2011)

Table of Contents

Section 1

- CAC History and Membership..... Page 3

Section II

- Executive Summary and Meeting Attendance Records Pages 5-9

Section III

- Red Line Planning Process Update..... Pages 11-12

Section IV

- Mission of Red Line Citizens' Advisory Council..... Pages 13-14

Section V

- Analysis of the Red Line Criteria Pages 15-18

Section VI

- Review of Red Line Planning Process to Date..... Pages 19-23

Section VII

- Community Response Pages 25-31

Appendices

- Appendix A – CAC Meeting Minutes – September 2010 to July 2011
- Appendix B – Media Coverage of the Red Line – September 2010 to July 2011



Red Line Citizens' Advisory Council • 2011 Annual Report

Section I

CAC History and Membership

2011 ANNUAL REPORT (September 2010 – July 2011)



2011 RED LINE CITIZENS' ADVISORY COUNCIL

The Maryland General Assembly created the Red Line Citizens' Advisory council in 2006 (HB 1309/SB873), which requires that the members of the CAC be selected by the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, Baltimore Mayor, Baltimore County Executive and the Governor or, at the Governor's discretion, the Maryland Transit Administrator. This statute also requires the Maryland Transit Administrator to designate two co-chairs of the Advisory Council by selecting one from a list of two names provided by the President of the Senate, and one from a list of two names provided by the Speaker of the House.

Dr. Rodney Orange
Co-Chair

Executive Committee, Baltimore
City Branch of the NAACP

Ms. Angela Bethea-Spearman
Co-Chair

President, Uplands Community
Association and Chairperson,
Southwest Development Committee

Mr. Edward Cohen

Transit Riders Action
Council of Metropolitan
Baltimore

Mr. Gary Cole

Deputy Director, Baltimore City
Department of Planning

Ms. Sandra E. Conner

Director, Workforce Transportation and
Referral, Sojourner-Douglass College

Mr. Christopher Costello

Baltimore City Resident:
West Gate Community

Mr. Emery Hines

Senior Transportation Officer
Baltimore County Department of
Public Works

Mr. Jamie Kendrick

Deputy Director
Baltimore City Transportation
Department

Mr. George Moniodis

Greektown Community
Development Corporation

Mr. Warren Smith

President, West Hills Association

Mr. Charles Sydnor, III

Lawyer and Baltimore County Resident

Mr. Martin (Marty) Taylor

President, Cambridge Walk
Community Assoc. (Canton)



Red Line Citizens' Advisory Council • 2011 Annual Report

Section II

**Executive Summary
and Meeting
Attendance Records**

2011 ANNUAL REPORT (September 2010 – July 2011)

II EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The members of the Red Line Citizens Advisory Council (CAC) have reviewed the information provided at our meetings and otherwise available to date regarding the planning for the proposed “Red Line” and have prepared the following comments in line with the preamble and legislative requirements contained in the authorizing legislation: Baltimore Corridor Transit Study – Red Line - Requirements and Citizens’ Advisory Council” (2006 HB 1309/SB873).

The enabling legislation indicated above, specified that the Council should have 15 members; however, there are two unfilled vacancies or 13 active members. The appointing authority is as follows: Five members are to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and five members are to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Delegates. These 10 members must be business owners, residents, service providers, or workers in the Red Line corridor and are to be appointed in consultation with the members of the Baltimore City Delegation of the General Assembly that represent Legislative Districts 41, 44, and 46, and the members of the Baltimore County Delegation that represent Legislative District 10. Of the remaining five members, two are to be appointed by the Governor, or at the Governor’s discretion, the Maryland Transit Administrator; two are to be appointed by the Mayor of Baltimore City to represent the Departments of Planning and Transportation; and one is to be appointed by the County Executive of Baltimore County. Members do not receive compensation. MTA is to staff the council.

This report is intended to provide state and local elected officials with a community view and evaluation of the Red Line planning process. In addition, it contains responses from the public to the issues identified in the authorizing legislation, as well as suggestions for improving the planning process in the future.

Red Line CAC is grateful for the support provided by the Maryland Transit Administration in the conduct of meetings and activities over the past year. The CAC also wishes to recognize the Mayor of Baltimore’s Red Line initiative and ongoing support for the success of the Red Line in the person of Danyell Diggs.

During the past year since, the Red Line Citizens’ Advisory Council (CAC) met in alternate months in locations along the proposed Red Line alignment. As recorded in the minutes of each meeting, the topics for discussion included:

September 2010 *Johns Hopkins Bayview Medical Center*
Response to Capacity Analysis by M. Taylor
Annual Report
Station Area Planning Process

November 4, 2010 *Edmondson-Westside High School*

Joint Follow-Up Response to Capacity Analysis by M. Taylor
Annual Report
Station Area Planning Process

January 13, 2011 *UMB Bio-Park Life Sciences Conference Center*

Follow-Up Response to Capacity Analysis by M. Taylor
Introduction of Community Liaisons
Status of FTA New Starts Process
Design Options for Edmondson Avenue Segment

2011 ANNUAL REPORT (September 2010 – July 2011)

II EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (Continued)

March 11, 2011 *Holy Rosary Church*

Red Line Economic Impact Study
Transit Safety and Accident Data [Postponed to July]
Station Area Planning Process
Minimum Operating Segments

May 12, 2011 *Edmondson High School*

CAC Vacancies
Update on Project Outreach Activities
Status of FTA New Starts Process
Map Documentation of Project Impacts
Design Options for Edmondson Avenue Segment
CAC Committees

July 14, 2011 *UMB BioPark Life Sciences Conference Center*

Transit Safety and Accident Data
Proposal for CAC Committees
Proposed Modifications to Locally Preferred Alternative
Project Expenditures to Date
Framework for Special Edmondson Avenue Meeting

Some of the developments of note during the past year include:

- a) MTA created the Community Liaison positions to support improved communication and cooperation with the communities along the Red Line corridor;
- b) Station Area Advisory Committees were established and have been meeting during the year;
- c) Federal Transit Administration approved the Red Line for Preliminary Engineering (PE);
- d) Several changes in alignment, elevation and station location have been suggested since the Locally Preferred Alignment (LPA) was approved.

As was the case in 2010, individuals and organizations representing the communities in East and West Baltimore have reiterated their concerns related to the placement of rail on the surface: a) Edmondson Avenue between Edmondson Village Shopping Center and Hilton Parkway; b) Boston Street in the Canton area. The primary objections relate to loss of parking space and vehicular traffic lane capacity as well as restrictions in local residents' vehicular and pedestrian access and egress from side streets due to the barriers required to maintain safe light rail operations. Concern related to whether or not there was sufficient useable space available for the Red Line at the most narrow area of Edmondson Avenue was the subject for discussion during the March and May meetings.

During the meetings between September 2010 and May 2011, each meeting agenda included 15 - 30 minutes for "Public Comment." The dialogue during this segment of the meetings allowed anyone interested in being heard the opportunity to raise issues and express concerns related to the plans for the Red Line. This was discontinued beginning with the July 2011 meeting. The reason for this change was a disruptive incident that was caused by a member of the public during the May 2011 meeting.

2011 ANNUAL REPORT (September 2010 – July 2011)

II EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (Continued)

At that meeting, a representative from the Rognel Heights neighborhood was given an opportunity to present information pertaining to an assertion that the measurements provided by MTA for the width of the right of way in a narrow area on Edmondson Avenue were inaccurate. The presentation in question did not address the issue that was approved for the agenda. It was also revealed that prior to this meeting, printed notices were distributed to residents in the Edmondson Avenue area. This notice (a copy was not provided to MTA or the CAC) contained inaccurate statements that alarmed many of the residents. Among the statements made by the Rognel Heights representative who spoke at the meeting in May was an assertion that many homes on Edmondson Avenue would be condemned using eminent domain wherein owners would be required to accept as little as \$25,000 in compensation. The representative from Rognel Heights and many of the Edmondson Avenue residents who attended the May CAC meeting behaved in a disruptive and uncooperative manner - refusal to follow the instructions of the Co-Chairs and disrespectful behavior toward members of the CAC and several of the elected officials who had asked to be heard.

MEETING ATTENDANCE – CAC MEMBERS

NAME	SEPT. 2010	NOV. 2010	JAN. 2011	MAR. 2011	MAY 2011	JULY 2011	TOTAL
Dr. Rodney Orange ¹	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	6/6
Angela Bethea-Spearman ²	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	6/6
Edward Cohen	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	6/6
Gary Cole	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	6/6
Sandra Conner	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5/6
Christopher Costello	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5/6
Emory Hines	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	6/6
Jamie Kendrick	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	4/6
George Moniodis	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	5/6
Warren Smith	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	4/6
Charles Sydnor, III	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	5/6
Martin Taylor	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	5/6
Annie Williams	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	6/6
QUORM	11/13	12/13	11/13	11/13	12/13	12/13	

¹ Co-Chair

² Co-Chair

2011 ANNUAL REPORT (September 2010 – July 2011)

II EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (Continued)

MEETING ATTENDANCE – ELECTED OFFICIALS/REPRESENTATIVES

NAME	2010		2011				TOTAL
	SEPT.	NOV.	JAN.	MAR.	MAY	JULY	
Danyell Diggs (Mayor)	Yes						
David Fraser (Delegate Mitchell)						Yes	
Kristen Harbeson (Delegate McIntosh)						Yes	
Hon. Keith Haynes		Yes					
Hon. Helen Holton					Yes	Yes	
Hon. Nathaniel Oaks					Yes		
Bridgit Smith (Sarbanes)				Yes			
Hon. Melvin Stukes		Yes					
James Torrence (Sen. Jones)							

COMMUNITY LIAISON STAFF

NAME	2010		2011				TOTAL
	SEPT.	NOV.	JAN.	MAR.	MAY	JULY	
Roxana Beyranvand				Yes	Yes	Yes	
John Enny				Yes	Yes		
Crystal House					Yes		
Lisa Kramer				Yes	Yes		
Charisse Lue				Yes	Yes		
Rachel Myrowitz				Yes	Yes	Yes	
George Shardlow				Yes	Yes	Yes	
Keisha Trent				Yes	Yes	Yes	

2011 ANNUAL REPORT (September 2010 – July 2011)

II EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (Continued)

MEETING ATTENDANCE – MTA/CONSULTANTS

NAME	2010		2011				
	SEPT.	NOV.	JAN.	MAR.	MAY	JULY	TOTAL
Chris Blake		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		4/6
Rev. Anthony Brown					Yes		1/6
Lorenzo Bryant	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	6/6
Patrick Fleming						Yes	1/6
Staycie Francisco			Yes				1/6
Tamika Gauvin		Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	4/6
Michael Goode		Yes					1/6
Mark Henry			Yes				1/6
Henry Kay	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	6/6
Tori Leonard	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	6/6
Sam Minnitte		Yes	Yes			Yes	3/6
Tom Mohler			Yes			Yes	2/6
Diane Ratcliff	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes		4/6
Dudley Whitney	Yes						1/6
Sgt. Bryan White (MTA Police)						Yes	1/6
Carl Williams			Yes		Yes	Yes	3/6

MEETING ATTENDANCE – GENERAL PUBLIC

2010		2011				TOTAL
SEPT.	NOV.	JAN.	MAR.	MAY	JULY	
25	34	32	15	150	34	290



Red Line Citizens' Advisory Council • 2011 Annual Report

Section III

Red Line Planning Process Update

2011 ANNUAL REPORT (September 2010 – July 2011)

III RED LINE PLANNING PROCESS UPDATE

A description of the development of the Red Line Project as planned by MTA

The proposed Red Line is a 14 mile, east-west transit line connecting the areas of Woodlawn, Edmondson Village, West Baltimore, downtown Baltimore, Inner Harbor East, Fells Point, Canton and the Johns Hopkins Bayview Medical Center Campus.

In support of Governor Martin O'Malley's "Smart, Green & Growing" initiative, the Red Line should provide enhanced mobility and connecting service to Baltimore's existing transit systems - MARC commuter service, metro, light rail and local and commuter bus routes.

Baltimore Red Line



Red Line Schedule

Milestone	Projected Timeframe
Begin Preliminary Engineering	June 2011
Begin Final Design	2013-2015
Federal Funding Commitment	2015
Construction	2015-2021
Operation	2021

2011 ANNUAL REPORT (September 2010 – July 2011)

RED LINE KEY FACTS

Mode	Light Rail	
Overall Length	14.5 miles	
	Surface	9.8 miles
	Tunnel	3.9 miles (Cooks Lane & Downtown)
	Aerial	0.8 miles (over I-695 and ramps; Woodlawn Drive; and between Highlandtown/Greektown & Bayview Campus Station)
Stations	19	
	Surface	15
	Underground	4
Capital Cost	\$1.8 Billion (2010 dollars)	
Average Daily Ridership in 2030	57,000	
FTA Cost-Effectiveness Rating	\$22.77	
Vehicles	38 LRT vehicles	
Maintenance Facility	At Calverton Road bounded by Franklinton Road, Franklin Street, and Amtrak	
One-Way Travel Time	Woodlawn to Bayview – 44 min.	
Frequency of Service (Peak/Off Peak)	7 minutes / 10 minutes	



Red Line Citizens' Advisory Council • 2011 Annual Report

Section IV

**Mission of
Red Line Citizens'
Advisory Council**

2011 ANNUAL REPORT (September 2010 – July 2011)

IV MISSION OF RED LINE CITIZENS ADVISORY COUNCIL (CAC)

An explanation of what the CAC was commissioned to do and how those requirements are being fulfilled.

The Redline Citizens Advisory Council was established by an Act of the Maryland State Legislature and has been meeting since September 2007. The mission of the Council as codified in HB 1309 is to advise the MTA on certain major policy matters surrounding the Baltimore Corridor Transit Study- Red Line including:

1. Compensation for property owners whose property is damaged during the construction of any Red Line project, redevelopment of commercial areas surrounding the Red Line transit corridor in Baltimore City and Baltimore County, and providing hiring preferences to residents of legislative districts in which the Red Line transit project will be constructed or to residents of legislative districts adjacent to those in which the Red Line transit project will be constructed.
2. Consideration of a full range of construction alternatives, including an underground rail option.
3. Ensuring that the Red Line project:
 - a) Benefits the communities through which it will travel;
 - b) uses an inclusive planning process, including consultation with community residents, businesses, and institutions in the corridor;
 - c) is planned to maximize the likelihood that federal funding will be obtained for the project;
 - d) includes, during its planning phase, the distribution of factual information that allows the community to compare the costs, benefits, and impacts of all construction alternatives;
 - e) favors alignments that produce the least negative community impacts practicable; and
 - f) places a priority on maintaining the Study schedule

In addition, the CAC has assumed the responsibility to enhance communication of information to communities regarding the planning, engineering, and construction process.

The CAC holds six meetings during the year (September, November, January, March, May and July). Meeting locations are rotated between Downtown, East and West Baltimore; including Baltimore County in an effort to make meetings more accessible to the residents along the Red Line corridor.

In order to provide more structure for its meetings, the CAC has established a subcommittee to develop bylaws. The bylaws, which provide an outline of the framework and rules under which the CAC operates, were approved by CAC (see Appendix 3). By Law, the CAC is composed of fifteen members representing business owners, residents, service providers, and workers in the Red Line transit corridor. These members were appointed by the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, the Governor, the Mayor of the City of Baltimore, and the County Executive of Baltimore County. Upon its establishment, MTA designated two co-chairs in the persons of Dr. Rodney Orange and Ms. Joyce Smith. Upon the resignation of Ms. Smith, and in accordance with the House Bill and the CAC bylaws, MTA designated a new co-chair in the person of Ms. Angela Bethea-Spearman.

Faced with the task of advising the MTA on certain policy matters regarding the Red Line Project, the CAC established an Evaluation Criteria Subcommittee to develop a set of measurement tools for each of the missions set forth by the legislature. The criteria that were developed are expected to evaluate benefits to communities and to minimize negative impacts on those communities, as well as to make sure that the Red Line planning process maximizes the likelihood that federal funding will be obtained for the project.

2011 ANNUAL REPORT (September 2010 – July 2011)

IV MISSION OF RED LINE CITIZENS ADVISORY COUNCIL (Continued)

Based on the SAFETEA-LU requirements for funding New Starts projects criteria, measurable outcomes will be used to review mobility improvements, environmental benefits, operating efficiencies, cost effectiveness, transit - supportive land use policies and future patterns, economic development effects and local financial commitment. In developing these criteria, the CAC subcommittee has researched DEIS processes in other parts of the country. These examples were used to develop its own criteria which may or may not overlap with the DEIS evaluation criteria. Examples of such criteria are: equity analysis, public participation and information sharing.

The Evaluation Criteria tables were approved in unanimity by the CAC, and they were made available to the public through the MTA's website. Since most of the criteria and measurement units follow the DEIS structure, the CAC has relied on MTA to provide data for input into the CAC Evaluation criteria tables. The CAC has learned that not all the data required in the Evaluation Criteria tables are available during the DEIS phase of the Red Line Project. Some of the data will become available during the subsequent phases of the project such as in the Selection of Locally Preferred Alternative, Final Design, Preliminary Engineering, etc. Also, information on properties and businesses damaged during construction will not be available until construction of the Red Line starts. It is important to note that the CAC doesn't have the technical expertise to analyze the sets of data MTA has provided. Therefore, it relies on individual judgment of Counsel members, as well as interpretation and explanation required from the MTA's technical team. The criteria tables and measurement units, and input of available data are presented in Section V.

Over the course of the last year, the CAC has received presentations on alternative design options, presentations from citizen and advocacy groups, presentations by individual CAC members, and presentations in response to community concerns.

Methodology

CAC efforts on behalf of the citizens and the legislature are separate and independent from the Maryland Transit Administration's Redline planning effort. The MTA has maintained its own separately established multi-year schedule to design, document, and construct the Red Line.

The CAC has provided comment areas related to each of the policy matters identified by the legislature. It is the objective of the CAC report to document matters of concern to individuals, communities, and council members so that members of the legislature learn firsthand about issues and concerns of local citizens regarding the Red Line Project.



Red Line Citizens' Advisory Council • 2011 Annual Report

Section V

Analysis of the Red Line Criteria

2011 ANNUAL REPORT (September 2010 – July 2011)

V ANALYSIS OF THE RED LINE CRITERIA

5.1.0 Mission No. 1 - Ensure that the Red Line Project provides compensation for property owners whose property is damaged during the construction of any Red Line project, redevelopment of commercial areas surrounding the Red Line transit corridor in Baltimore City and Baltimore County, and providing hiring preferences to residents of legislative districts in which the Red Line transit project will be constructed or to residents of legislative districts adjacent to those in which the Red Line transit project will be constructed.

Project Compensation Criteria			Employment Opportunities Criteria	
Residential displacements	Business & Institutional displacements	Property damaged during construction	Number of construction workers who reside within the Red Line legislative districts (city, county data)	Number of other jobs created by Red Line Project (city, county data)
0	9	*	**	***

* Data will not be available until construction is ongoing.

** 2000 Census data reports that 5% of the population residing within the Red Line Corridor Study area is employed in the construction industry.

*** Data is not available. A significant number of temporary jobs would be created for several years during construction. The Red Line could also result in the creation of permanent jobs to operate and maintain the system. Aside from the creation of permanent jobs, the Red Line should provide economic benefits by improving transit access and mobility for the work force and consumers within the study area.

5.1.1 Project Compensation - includes: property acquisition, business displacement and property damaged during construction.

Comment: *Sufficient information is not available to respond at this time.*

5.1.2.0 Employment opportunities Related to the Red Line – includes potential construction job creation and other job possibilities

Comment: *If or when the federal funding for the Red Line is approved, a great deal of work will be needed to facilitate the creation of job opportunities related to the construction of the Red Line. The primary objective should be to provide job opportunities to the residents in the Red Line corridor. At some point, this effort would require the coordination of multiple state and local government organizations to identify the skills needed for the jobs to be created. The availability of persons with those skills in the area and the development of needed training to prepare potential job applicants where the necessary skills are not available.*

2011 ANNUAL REPORT (September 2010 – July 2011)

V ANALYSIS OF THE RED LINE CRITERIA (Continued)

5.2.0 Mission No. 2 - Ensure that the Red Line project takes into consideration of a full range of construction alternatives, including an underground rail option, as well as mode and alignments.

No.	Criteria	Source/Project Phases					
		DEIS	New Starts/LPA	PE	Final Design	ROW Acquisition	Constr
1	Review DEIS alternatives			N. A	N. A	N. A	N. A
2	Review TRAC alternative + Fells Point alternative			N. A	N. A	N. A	N. A
3	Minimum Operable Segments			N. A	N. A	N. A	N. A

5.3a.0 Mission No. 3a - Ensure that the Red Line project benefits the communities through which it will travel.

Mobility Improvements Criteria									
Transit User benefits	Number of transit dependents using the project	Transit dependent user benefit per passenger mile	Share of user benefits received by transit dependent users	Red Line Travel time (end-to-end) minutes	Number of Transit-Dependent Households Served by Enhanced Transit	Pedestrian and disabled access	Differences in transfer access	Connectivity between transit system elements	Appeal to drivers of choice (Daily new trips vs. No Build)
17,900	21,900	3.7	30%	44	14,148	*	**	N. A	16,037

* This calculation was not performed; data is not available.

** Data is not available.

*** This information is not available at a corridor-level. Volume II of the DEIS identifies at a Geographic Area level, by yes or no, whether the existing pedestrian movements are affected.

Table 5.3a (continued)

Environmental Benefits Criteria			Land use/community development, economic development & access to jobs Criteria				Equity Analysis Criteria	
Daily Auto VMT Change No Build	Noise	Vibration	Development potential within walking distance of station area (# of city/county planned development TOD Locations)	Jobs near station	Employees within walking distance to station area	Future employees within ¼ -mile of station area (BMC, Community Profile)	Extent to which the transit investments improve transit service to various population segments, particularly those that tend to be transit dependent (EJ analysis)	Incidence of any significant environmental effects, particularly in neighborhoods adjacent to proposed project (EJ Impact)
-39,000	*	**	5	***	NA	NA	NA	NA

* Information is not available at a corridor-level. The DEIS presents noise impacts by Geographic Area.

** Information is not available at a corridor-level. The DEIS presents vibration impacts by Geographic Area.

*** Information is not available at a corridor-level. The Stations Technical Report includes the number of jobs per acre within the ¼ mile walk zone of the station.

2011 ANNUAL REPORT (September 2010 – July 2011)

V ANALYSIS OF THE RED LINE CRITERIA (Continued)

5.3b.0 Mission No. 3b - Ensure that the Red Line project uses an inclusive planning process, including consultation with community residents, businesses, and institutions in the corridor.

No.	Criteria	Source
1	<i>Consultation</i> <input type="checkbox"/> MTA should consult the public on major decision with regard to the study	MTA will provide documentation
2	<i>Representativeness</i> <input type="checkbox"/> The public participants should comprise a broadly representative sample of the population of the affected communities <input type="checkbox"/> Community planning participation	MTA will provide documentation
3	<i>Transparency</i> <input type="checkbox"/> The planning process should be transparent so that the public can see what is going on and how decisions are being made	MTA will provide documentation
4	<i>Participation</i> <input type="checkbox"/> The number of stakeholders (individuals, groups, organizations) involved <input type="checkbox"/> Participation by local academic institutions and professional service providers in design and development	MTA will provide documentation

5.3c.0 Mission No. 3c - Ensure that the Red Line project is planned to maximize the likelihood that federal funding will be obtained for the project.

No.	Criteria	LPA	PE	Final Design	ROW Acquisition	Constr
1	<i>Operating Efficiencies</i>					
	Operating & maintenance Costs	-1.438 M *				
	Capital costs	\$2.2 B **				
2	<i>Cost Effectiveness</i>					
	Incremental cost per hour of transportation system user benefit	\$22.77 **				
3	<i>Local Financial Commitment</i>					
	Share of non-Section 5309 New Starts funding	NA				
	Stability and reliability of the proposed project's capital finance plan	NA				
4	<i>Transit supportive land use policies and future pattern</i>					
	Existing land use	N. A				
	Transit supportive plans and policies	N. A				
	Performance and impacts of policies	N. A				

2011 ANNUAL REPORT (September 2010 – July 2011)

V ANALYSIS OF THE RED LINE CRITERIA (Continued)

5.3d.0 Mission No. 3d - Ensure that the Red Line includes, during its planning phase, the distribution of factual information that allows the community to compare the costs, benefits, and impacts of all construction alternatives.

No.	Criteria	Source
1	<i>Information Sharing</i> <input type="checkbox"/> MTA provide timely information on the planning phases of the project, as well as information on job training and opportunities as it pertains to the Red Line project	MTA required to provide documentation*

* The requested information has not always been provided in the time requested.

5.3e.0 Mission No. 3e - Ensure that the Red Line project favors alignments that produce the least negative community impacts practicable.

No.	Criteria	New Starts/LPA	PE	Final Design	ROW Acquisition	Constr
1	<i>Equity Analysis</i>					
	Extent to which the transit investments improve transit service to various population segments, particularly those that tend to be transit dependent	N. A				
	Incidence of any significant environmental effects, particularly in neighborhoods immediately adjacent to proposed project	N. A				
2	<i>Evaluate Negative Impacts</i>					
	Neighborhood noise	N. A				
	Loss of travel lanes	N. A				
	Neighborhood parking congestion (net gain or loss)	N. A				
	Visual impacts (non- quantitative)	N. A				
	Project construction delays	N. A				
	Community choice (document support or opposition to the project)	N. A				

5.3f.0 Mission No. 3f - Ensure that the Red Line project places a priority on maintaining the Study schedule.

DEIS Submission to FTA and other agencies	April 11, 2008
DEIS revised based on FTA & agency comments	July 3, 2008
FTA signature on DEIS	July 25, 2008
Begin DEIS print and distribution logistics	August 15, 2008
DEIS completed and available to the public	2008
90 day comment period	2008
Public Hearings	2008
Selection of Locally Preferred Alternative	2009
Next Steps - Enter the New Starts Process and Initiate Preliminary Engineering / Final EIS	2011
Final Design	2013 - 2015
Right of Way Acquisition & Begin Construction	2016



Red Line Citizens' Advisory Council • 2011 Annual Report

Section VI

**Review of Red Line
Planning Process
to Date**

VI REVIEW OF RED LINE PLANNING PROCESS TO DATE

Describe the New Start Opportunity Process

The proposed Red Line is a 14.5 mile, east-west transit corridor connecting the areas of Woodlawn, Edmondson Village, West Baltimore, downtown Baltimore, Inner Harbor East, Fells Point, Canton and the Johns Hopkins Bayview Medical Center Campus. In addition, the Red Line would provide enhanced mobility and connecting service to Baltimore's existing transit systems - Metro Subway, Central Light Rail and MARC lines - while also serving major employers such as the Social Security Administration, the University of Maryland downtown campus and medical centers, and the downtown Central Business District, schools, churches, parks and tourist attractions. The western portion of the Red Line study area consists of suburban type residential, shopping and office park land uses. The study area continues through downtown and Fells Point/Patterson Park areas and includes Baltimore row-house communities, planned revitalization areas in West Baltimore and the redeveloping residential and commercial areas in Inner Harbor East. Alternative modes considered included Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Light Rail Transit (LRT) and Enhanced Bus Service on surface, and in some locations, with tunnel options. A No-Build option was also included in this study.

Red Line Corridor Transit Project - Purpose and Need Statement

Context

The purpose of the Red Line Corridor Transit Project is to help improve transit efficiency, transit mobility, access and connectivity in Baltimore City and Baltimore County. This project is a step in the ongoing development of a system of interconnected rapid transit lines, which will improve the quality of transit in the Baltimore region and the study corridor in a cost effective and efficient manner. The Red Line Corridor Transit Project includes the general area of Woodlawn in Baltimore County on the west, through downtown Baltimore, to the Patterson Park/Canton area to the east, a distance of 14.5 miles.

Purpose

The purpose of the Red Line Corridor Transit project is to improve transportation choices for those persons living and working in the region, support ongoing and planned economic development initiatives and community revitalization, and help the region address congestion and traffic-related air quality issues. The project will connect the eastern and western communities of Baltimore City and Baltimore County with the central business district in downtown Baltimore, suburban employment centers such as the Social Security complex in Woodlawn, and new activity centers in East Baltimore. The Red Line Corridor Transit Project will be completed in a manner that avoids, minimizes, and mitigates adverse impacts on the environment and communities.

Need

There are a number of transportation problems in the region and corridor. These problems will be used as benchmarks as alternatives are developed to measure how successfully each addresses the purpose and need of the Red Line Project.

Transit Efficiency:

At the present time, existing bus service in the corridor is subject to the same traffic congestion as autos, faces incident delays, and provides limited direct connections to other transit modes. There are a variety of transit travel patterns throughout the corridor; the current bus system faces the challenge of efficiently serving these sometimes conflicting and competing trips (local vs. through trips). The purpose of this project is to improve transit service efficiency in the region and along the Red Line Corridor, and provide connections to jobs and services.

VI REVIEW OF RED LINE PLANNING PROCESS TO DATE (Continued)

Transportation Choices for East West Commuting:

Parts of the corridor currently face congestion with limited transit and system capacity improvement options for commuters traveling from the east or from the west into downtown. The purpose of this project is to improve transit opportunities in the east-west corridor, and better accommodate existing and future east-west travel demands. Its purpose is also to improve the effectiveness of public transportation for the transit-dependent user as well as those individuals within the corridor who chose to use transit as an option.

Transit System Connectivity:

Although Baltimore has a light rail system, Metro service, commuter rail, express bus and a comprehensive local bus network, better connections among the various modes and routes would enhance service to the public regionally and in the corridor. The purpose of this project is to improve system connectivity by providing a direct rapid transit connection to north-south bus and rail lines, including to MARC at the West Baltimore MARC Station, Charles Center and Shot Tower Metro Stops.

Mobility:

There are substantial numbers of residents along the Red Line who depend on transit for access to jobs, schools, shopping, events, healthcare and other services and cultural attractions. Major institutions and employers along the Red Line Corridor such as the Social Security Administration, the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services, the University of Maryland at Baltimore, Baltimore City Community College, major hospitals, the downtown business district, new cultural arts venues, as well as numerous elementary, middle and high schools, all rely on an efficient transportation network that provides mobility choices.

Community Revitalization and Economic Development:

Although development patterns are influenced by market forces and other variables not necessarily directly related to transit accessibility, there are currently unrealized opportunities for supporting existing and potential land use growth patterns that could benefit communities and businesses along the corridor. The Westside Renaissance, University of Maryland at Baltimore, Inner Harbor East, Fells Point, Canton and other nearby areas are currently experiencing major development and re-development and could benefit from additional transit access to realize their regional potential. Likewise, areas of West Baltimore have existing community revitalization initiatives such as The Uplands Redevelopment Area, Harlem Park and Rosemont, and other unrealized commercial and residential development-potential areas that could benefit from improved transit access and investment. Areas in suburban locations such as Westview and Security Square malls could realize additional development opportunities. Specifically at transit stops, localized development and/or redevelopment will be supported by the Red Line project.

Air Quality Goals and Environmental Stewardship:

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has designated the region as a moderate non-attainment area for ozone under the 8-hour standard. There are many contributors to the region's air pollution, including "point sources" such as power plants, "area-sources" such as automobile refinishing, bakeries, "off-road sources" such as mowing and construction equipment, and perhaps most significantly, motor vehicle sources. By offering an effective alternative to automobile travel for a significant portion of work and non-work travel, improved transit service in the corridor can help reduce regional emissions for motor vehicle sources by helping to reduce highway congestion and regional vehicle emissions. These reductions in motor vehicle emissions would help the Baltimore region to stay in consistency with state air quality plans as required by the Federal Clean Air Act and by ISTEA and TEA-21. This transit planning study is also expected to identify potential environmental stewardship opportunities to enhance and improve the existing natural environment and surrounding communities, and provide under-served communities with access to park, trail and other recreational opportunities.

VI REVIEW OF RED LINE PLANNING PROCESS TO DATE (Continued)

Definition of Alternatives Retained for Detailed Study

The information collected from the public and environmental resource agencies during the Scoping phase is used to identify, consider, and analyze types of transit (modes) and routes (alignments) for both the Red Line and the Purple Line that are reasonable, feasible, and practical from a technical and economic standpoint.

The MTA held open houses in the fall 2004 to receive input on selected alternatives that will be studied in greater detail. The MTA is also required by the Federal Transit Administration to study a "no-build" alternative, which compares the proposed new transit alternatives to the option of not building a new transit project.

Preliminary alternatives are currently being developed. Once this is completed, the MTA will conduct a series of workshops and community meetings to present alternatives and receive input. Public meetings will be held in spring 2005 to receive input on which alternatives should be further studied in the DEIS.

Preliminary Engineering

Further analysis of design options, project costs, benefits and impacts.

Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS)

The Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) identifies a preferred alternative, responds to comments received on the DEIS, shows compliance with related environmental statutes such as the National Historic Preservation Act, and identifies commitments made to mitigate impacts of the project.

Station Planning Process

The transit station is the area in which transit users get on and off the system and have their first impressions of the Red Line Corridor. Because of this, the planning of stations will be critical to the overall success of the Red Line Study.

DETERMINE the number and general location of stations

The proposed Red Line is a 14.5 mile east-west corridor that connects major employment, residential communities, other existing transit services, and tourism opportunities. This project has examined the various key areas along the corridor to ensure transit service is provided. These key areas include the following:

- Social Security Administration / Woodlawn
- Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS)
- Residential Communities - East and West Baltimore City and County
- West Baltimore Rail Station (MARC)
- University Center (Medical Center and University)
- Connection to existing Metro, Bus and Light Rail
- Downtown Baltimore
- Tourism and Stadium Events
- Inner Harbor East
- Fells Point and Canton
- Auto Commuters using I-70 and I-695

Because each stop made by the transit vehicle adds time to the overall trip, a rapid system requires fewer stops along the entire corridor to ensure faster commuting times. The number of stations for the Red Line Corridor must be a balance between ensuring that the key areas are provided transit service and maintaining a rapid transit system.

14 Stations are under consideration for the Red Line as currently configured.

VI REVIEW OF RED LINE PLANNING PROCESS TO DATE (Continued)

DEFINE the type of station

A station type is defined based upon the purpose of that station in its particular environment. For example, a station in the Central Business District of a city would be defined as a Walk-Up Station Type, not a Station with Parking for Regional Access

Light Rail

Light Rail Transit is an electric railway system that operates single cars or short trains along rights-of-way at ground level, on aerial structures, and in tunnels. Light Rail can also operate in the street mixed with vehicular traffic, in the median of a roadway or on a separate right-of-way. Light Rail Transit gets its power from overhead electrical lines. Maximum speeds of Light Rail trains are normally around 60 miles per hour, with the average operating speed being closer to 45 miles per hour. The actual speed largely depends on the extent to which the train is separated from cars and pedestrians.

Depending upon the specific system, the distance between Light Rail stations is shorter than with heavy rail systems due to the type of propulsion and braking systems. Fare collection is typically done at the station before boarding the train and an attendant verifies fare-purchase while the train is in motion.

Light Rail currently operates in Baltimore along the 30-mile Central Light Rail Corridor between Hunt Valley, downtown Baltimore and Glen Burnie. Spurs also serve BWI Airport and Penn Station. Light Rail has been built in several other American cities:

NEPA Process – How decisions are made

As with every significant federally funded transportation project, the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) requires that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) be prepared for the Red and Green Line Studies. The purpose of the EIS document is to conduct a thorough and public study of potential human, cultural, and natural environmental impacts for each of the transit types (modes) and routes (alignments) under consideration.

Study Steps:

Notice of Intent

The Notice of Intent (NOI) is an announcement to the public and to interested agencies that a project is being developed and that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will be prepared.

Scoping

Scoping identifies the alternatives and impacts that will be examined in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). An important part of this phase is to go out to the public for their ideas, comments and concerns. Scoping identifies the key resources and issues that the project needs to address.

Alternatives Analysis

The information collected during the Scoping phase will be used to identify, consider, and analyze types of transit (modes) and routes (alignments) that are reasonable, feasible, and practical from a technical and economic standpoint.

Data Environmental Impact Statement

The MTA will prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) that includes examination of the natural, cultural and socioeconomic environmental impacts of various alternatives. The DEIS will be available for public review prior to hearings.

2011 ANNUAL REPORT (September 2010 – July 2011)

VI REVIEW OF RED LINE PLANNING PROCESS TO DATE (Continued)

Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS)

The Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) identifies a preferred alternative, responds to comments received on the DEIS, shows compliance with related environmental statutes such as the National Historic Preservation Act, and identifies commitments made to mitigate impacts of the project.

Record of Decision

The Record of Decision (ROD) is the final step in the EIS process. The ROD is a concise report that states FTA's determination that NEPA has been completed for the proposed project. It describes the basis for the decision, identifies alternatives that were considered and summarizes specific mitigation measures that will be incorporated into the project. With a ROD, the project may proceed into final design and construction.

Public Events/Meetings

Public meetings are an important part of our outreach efforts. Meetings will be held at major decision points such as when alternatives are selected for detailed study and when the results of those studies are nearing completion. A required public hearing will be held for comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Citizens' Advisory Council

In 2006, the General Assembly passed a bill (HB1309) creating the Red Line Citizens' Advisory Council (CAC). The bill established the membership of the CAC and its role in the Red Line planning process. The CAC is responsible for advising the MTA on impacts, opportunities and community concerns about the Red Line.

The CAC has developed criteria to evaluate the Red Line's cost effectiveness, likelihood to obtain federal funding, impact on the communities it serves and whether it provides a quality transportation option.



Red Line Citizens' Advisory Council • 2011 Annual Report

Section VII

Community Response

2011 ANNUAL REPORT (September 2010 – July 2011)

VII COMMUNITY RESPONSE

The Red Line Citizens' Advisory Council (CAC) encourages written comments or concerns from individuals and organizations. Those provided during meetings are journalized in the minutes. The written comments below are re-printed as they were received. Inclusion of these comments should not be construed as an expression of agreement or support.

COMMUNITY RESPONSE ON BEHALF OF THE TRANSIT RIDERS ACTION COUNCIL OF METROPOLITAN BALTIMORE

Over the last year very little new ground has been covered at the Citizens Advisory's Committee meetings, although there has been much discussion about the line itself in public. There have also been several claims made as to the impact, positive or negative, of the Red Line. We will now address 20 of the unsubstantiated claims that have been made.

1. Claim #1: The Red Line has to be light rail because the Federal Government will only fund heavy rail in New York, Washington, and Los Angeles. This claim is false. The January 2010 Federal Standards for new start transit projects contains no prohibition or restriction on development of heavy rail except that the line must meet project justification just as is done with light rail, bus rapid transit, monorail, or any other mode. A number of cities have been looking at heavy rail expansion, including San Francisco, Cleveland, Philadelphia, and Honolulu. The Honolulu line is already under construction. After the public rejected light rail, Honolulu was able to substitute a heavy rail project in less than a year and to get approval for an automated heavy rail system.

2. Claim #2: We must build light rail to solve problems of traffic congestion. Traffic studies that were done for the Red Line show an increase in congestion on Edmondson Avenue, and on Frederick Avenue, which is the main overflow roadway for Route 40. The study was done based upon two lanes of traffic flow in the peak direction on Frederick Avenue; but Frederick Avenue is no longer configured this way. Bike lanes which have been marked on Frederick Avenue now limit that road to one traffic lane in the peak direction at all times. As a consequence the traffic study needs to be redone and is almost certain to show even more congestion.

Some people have claimed that the Red Line is necessary to get people from Harbor East to Charles Center. But the current #11 bus takes less than 10 minutes. Since the proposed Harbor East station is actually at Fleet and Eden streets, anyone in Harbor East would have to walk several blocks to reach the station, so any time saving will be minimum or zero.

3. Claim #3: The Red Line will improve Riders' Access. In point of fact every single station and stop on the Red Line is currently served by the MTA fixed route bus system. There is no place that the Red Line goes where there is not current public transit access. However, the current plan would eliminate some bus service along Edmondson Avenue in Edmondson Village. Those riders would have to walk up to a quarter mile farther than they do now. This means that over all, the Red Line would produce a net decrease in access over the current buses.

The current Red Line variation under consideration has only two stations in the downtown area from Fremont Avenue to Eden Street, one at Howard Street (but really Eutaw Street) and one at Charles Center. These stations are only five blocks apart. The Harbor East station (which is actually east of Harbor East) is only three blocks from the Fells Point station, and both are underground! There is no station between Charles Center and Eden Street. By contrast the Metro subway serves downtown at State Center, Lexington Market, Charles Center, and Shot Tower. The Central Light Rail has downtown stops at North Avenue, Penn Station, Mount Royal, Cultural Center, Centre Street, Lexington Market, Baltimore Street, Convention Center, and Camden Yards.

VII COMMUNITY RESPONSE (Continued)

4. Claim #4: The Red Line will improve mobility. The latest running time that has been presented publicly for the Red Line end-to-end is 44 minutes. The current running time on the #40 bus which parallels the Red Line on the West side but not the East side is 55 minutes between the end points of the proposed Red Line at CMMS and the Bayview Yard, a savings of only 11 minutes. While this is a slight improvement in mobility for people traveling along the Line, that population is very small and not representative of the impact of transit riders. The current proposal has the Red Line running along Boston Street where presently there are only 300 transit trips a day. There is far more ridership further north. Current riders of the transit system would have to make an extra transfer to get to where most of them are traveling on the East side. This would likely more than eat up the entire 11 minutes saved. In a number of cases, through bus trips would be terminated at the Red Line and riders would be required to transfer. While this makes sense on a fast Metro subway line, or beyond the City limits for passengers traveling a long distance, it would cost time for riders who are forced to transfer within Baltimore City. Bus riders in Forest Park and Windsor Hills are closer to the Metro subway than they are to the Red Line, but this proposal would force them onto the Red Line and would not connect their buses with the Metro subway. For these people, the Red Line would cost them time.

By comparison, our Metro subway provides vastly improved mobility to the transit riders. According to the current MTA timetables, travel from Owings Mills Metro Subway Station to Johns Hopkins Hospital takes 29 minutes. There are three bus routes, the numbers 5, 53, and 59, which parallel the subway (there is no single bus line which parallels the subway for its entire length). If those three bus lines were to be combined on a continuous route, from Owings Mills to Reisterstown Plaza on the #59, from Reisterstown Plaza to Mondawmin on the #53, and from Mondawmin through Charles Center to Johns Hopkins on the #5, the total travel time, based upon matching time points on the current schedule, would be one hour and 35 minutes. This means that the subway, which is just about the same length as the proposed light rail Red Line, provides a mobility improvement of 66 minutes, a 69.5% time saving.

5. Claim #5: Riding the subway or the Long Island Railroad saves a lot of time in New York, therefore we should build light rail in Baltimore. Subways travel at up to 70 miles per hour, frequently travel at 60 miles per hour, and average about 30 miles per hour. The Long Island Railroad has a top speed of 100 miles per hour. The Penn Line in Baltimore travels at up to 125 miles per hour. The proposed Red Line has an average speed of 19.8 miles per hour and a top speed of about 50. The subway is faster than surface traffic and light rail is slower. One cannot argue that because heavy rail is successful that light rail would be too. These are different modes operating under different conditions with different constraints. Light rail is *not* a cheaper version of heavy rail, but is a very different mode which functions differently. During the recent Baltimore Grand Prix, the subway was the *only* reliable transit crossing through downtown. It carried large crowds efficiently. The buses were ineffective, and the light rail was useless (and consequently empty).

6. Claim #6: Light rail always improves any area where it is built. At the public hearing held at North County High on May 17, 2011, 150 people showed up, 66 spoke, and 2/3 of those called for permanent closure of the station because of concerns about crime. This is not a projected concern, but a concern regarding existing conditions at an existing stop.

Light rail lines in Baltimore, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Buffalo, and Cleveland ride through areas of urban decay despite having been in place for several decades. Some people claim that this is a consequence of old style light rail cars as opposed to modern light rail cars. The claim is without foundation. There is no evidence whatsoever that replacing the rolling stock on light rail lines improves the quality in investments in urban communities. The real reason that light rail has been successful in some cities and a failure in others is actually a function of block length, traffic volumes along the right-of-way, traffic volumes at grade crossings, frequency of grade crossing, street width, sidewalk width, mobility and access improvement, and the state of the local economy. Light rail has been successful in improving land use along corridors in rapidly growing cities. Incentives have focused investment headed to those cities anyway toward light rail rights-of-way. The key point is that light rail focuses investment only if it is already on the way; it does not create investment.

VII COMMUNITY RESPONSE (Continued)

Generally speaking successful systems have been constructed mostly south of the Potomac and west of the Mississippi, areas that have been growing rapidly since World War II. The only successful light rail line in the northeast or along the Great Lakes is on Commonwealth Avenue in Boston. Commonwealth Avenue has no truck traffic, wide sidewalks and a very wide right-of-way. Clearly Baltimore does not fit the profile of cities where light rail has been successful, but rather fits the profile of cities where it has failed. In particular, the traffic load on Edmondson Avenue is at least twice as much as any other roadway in the country where light rail has been built.

7. Claim #7: Light rail Improves the air quality. The only air quality reported in the Red Line process was a statement that construction of the Red Line would have no impact upon regional air quality as a whole. No localized impact study on air quality has been done for either Edmondson Avenue or Boston Street, the two areas of street running on the alignment and the two areas where Red Line would increase congestion.

8. Claim #8: The Red Line will improve system connectivity. The Red Line proposal has four rail transfer stations. At least three of them, and possibly all four, are longer in feet than the transfer between Lexington Market subway station and the Lexington light rail stop. Many people, including Don Fry, president of the Greater Baltimore Committee, have complained that there is no connection between the subway and the Central Light Rail. If that connection is not good enough, than how can longer connections be good enough? The proposed transfer at Charles Center, if built, would be the longest in-system transfer to a newly constructed line ever built in the United States since Federal transit funding began back in the 1960s. The Howard Street station is currently being discussed with a station entrance west of Eutaw Street and on the south side of Lombard Street, requiring transferring riders to cross two or three busy streets. The proposed Marc transfer at Bayview would require walking across a 900-foot walkway above Bayview Rail Yard. Until a few years ago, every single bus line in downtown Baltimore had a transfer to the Metro subway that was shorter than any one of these proposed Red Line connections.

9. Claim #9: Because it is against the law for eminent domain to be employed to acquire houses, the Red Line is not a threat to any community. This claim is false for several reasons. The first is that the law itself sunsets three years before construction is to begin on the Red Line. Even if the law is renewed, there is still a threat to housing. As was mentioned above, the Red Line would increase congestion through Edmondson Village. Once the state accepts Federal funding for the Red Line and builds it, it cannot simply rip it out, because to do so would require the state to return planning and construction money to the Federal Government. Since the State of Maryland would not do that, it would look for ways it could leverage Federal funds to solve the resulting congestion, which would increase truck travel delivery time and cost. The resulting political pressure could very well lead to a widening of the roadway itself. That *would* require the taking of houses on at least one side of Edmondson Avenue, most likely the south side. Therefore, the Red Line could be built, all promises that it would not take houses could be kept, and Edmondson Village could still be destroyed by the conditions that the Red Line would create.

In particular, there have been questions about the width of Edmondson Avenue. Some people have claimed that Edmondson Avenue is not wide enough for light rail to be placed in the street without taking homes. While this claim is unsubstantiated, it is not entirely baseless. Preliminary engineering was done based upon certain maps showing the width of Edmondson Avenue through Edmondson Village as 76 feet wide in the cartway from curb to curb. Actual tape measures of the roadway show sections where the curb-to-curb distance is below 75 feet. This could mean that the Red Line would require taking strips of property in front of houses that might not leave sufficient space for front stairways to access front doors.

VII COMMUNITY RESPONSE (Continued)

10. Claim #10: Opposition to the Red Line is based upon construction impacts. Now that the Red Line has been approved for preliminary engineering, discussion of mitigation has eliminated most of the opposition. This is a claim that has been made by public relations people under contract to the MTA. But it does not match the public comments that have been heard by the Red Line Council at meetings. While some of the opposition, notably around Allendale, have mentioned construction issues, most of the opposition to the Red Line has been focused upon street running rail itself, rather than upon the construction phase. The primary concerns have been about roadway congestion, public safety, street parking losses, and property value impacts for the long term.

11. Claim # 11: There is no reason for concern about any impacts to those who live north or south of Edmondson Avenue. Safety, parking, and congestion concerns impact everyone who uses Edmondson Avenue, because Edmondson Avenue is the only access road for most people north of Frederick Avenue all the way to Leakin Park. Because only half as many roadways will cross Edmondson Avenue in the Village, traffic on side streets will inevitably increase. Many of the residents of Edmondson Village who do not live on Edmondson Avenue are concerned about increased demand for parking on side streets that currently have no more parking available for extra vehicles. They are also concerned that their commutes will be longer, and that as a consequence of all these factors that their property value may decline. None of these concerns can be addressed through construction mitigation activities.

12. Claim #12. Light rail systems are safe and efficient. Metro systems certainly are safe and efficient, but the Baltimore Central Light Rail is not. Henry Kay, executive director for Transit Development and Delivery, has said that while Metro is safer than light rail, Light rail is also safe because the frequency of accidents is very low, on the order of accidents per 10 million passenger miles. But while the ratio of accident per passenger mile might seem small, the *frequency* of light rail collisions is more than one every 12 days over the last six years, according to the MTA's own figures. This accident frequency has been high enough to persuade most discretionary riders not to use the system, more out of a concern for *reliability* than for safety. Whenever there is a collision on light rail, as opposed to bus, every train in the system is delayed. When a bus is in a collision, only that bus is delayed. A high collision frequency means low system reliability and low rider acceptance of the system. The Red Line proposal has so many grade crossings in Edmondson Village and Canton, where traffic volumes are high, that it could well end up with a higher accident frequency than we see on the Central Light Rail. In Houston, where the light rail also runs in the street, the system averaged one collision approximately every three days in its first year of operation.

Light rail collisions don't simply create accidents on the rails, but also tie up roadways. This would in turn have even greater impact on both congestion and property values.

13. Claim #13: Now that the Red Line is in preliminary engineering, we will address issues of safety mitigation. It is already too late to address safety. Safety must be a consideration involved in the initial planning process. It cannot be mitigated later. The MTA has not even developed safety protocols yet for the Red Line. By postponing a discussion of safety until preliminary engineering, the MTA distorted the planning process. Now that the locally preferred alternative has been chosen, it is too late to fix the mess and the planning process has reached a cul-de-sac.

14. Claim #14: Those who oppose the Red Lines are just a bunch of anti-transit NIMBYs (Not In My Back Yard). Most of the opposition to the Red Line comes from two camps: 1. Those who live near the line and who, in their view, would be negatively impacted by it; and 2. Organized transit riders. The Red Line may be the only transit project in America whose opposition consists almost entirely of those whom the Government claims it would benefit. Indeed, there might not be another transit project in the country that has more opposition than support from transit rider organizations. The major objections of the riders are that the Red Line is a big boondoggle which would have a more negative than positive impact upon transit, that it would eat up transit funds that could be used for better planned projects, and

VII COMMUNITY RESPONSE (Continued)

that it would make it impossible for Baltimore to ever develop a well connected single-transfer rail system. The so-called transit advocacy organizations which have supported the Red Line proposal represent business interests, and are composed of people who never depend upon transit!

15. Claim #15: Yes, it is difficult to plan a transit system in Baltimore, but this is the best that we can do. The Red Line planning process did not permit any public input on alternatives to either the Baltimore Regional Plan or to the Red Line proposal itself. There are other proposals that exist, but the MTA did not permit any others to go into full planning and also did not permit any others to be considered even in the initial phases. One proposal was a three-station extension of the current subway to Greektown/Bayview, which according to PB Engineering, would cost about \$583 million (at then current rather than extrapolated cost), about one fourth of the current estimated cost of the Red Line.

16. Claim #16: Since transportation planning and land use planning should be integrated, the Red Line should go where we currently have planned redevelopment. This is exactly backward. The MTA has been trying to plan a transit system based upon land *ownership* rather than based upon geography and land location. Transportation planning should depend upon geography, not land ownership, and land use should depend upon geography and transportation. So in Baltimore we have it backward. Instead of geography and transportation dictating land use, we are trying to do transportation planning *after* land use planning, rather than prior to it. The result so far has been a project that does not fit into its setting, and it doesn't appear to necessarily improve transportation. This is a direct consequence of a planning process in which developers have a great deal of input, and transit riders have been routinely listened to, responded to, and ultimately ignored.

17. Claim #17: The Federal Government will never support subway construction in Baltimore because 14 miles of tunnel would be too expensive. The Red Line proposal requires 4.2 miles of tunnel with five underground stations. There is no light rail tunnel in the United States that long. The subway proposals that MTA would not consider included one which would require one to three underground stations and 4.5 miles of tunnel for one and a half subway lines, an extension of the current subway at both ends, running from Reisterstown to Fort Howard and an east-west line running from Columbia Mall to Chase. Clearly the amount of tunnel and underground stations per alignment mile is far greater in the Red Line proposal than it would be for this Metro subway proposal.

18. Claim #18: Critics of the Red Line are simply naysayers. We need to look forward and have positive input. Opponents of the Red Line have put forward alternatives. But for over a decade the MTA has refused full study of them. To move forward with a project that may have more negative than positive impact is not a positive position. To refuse to consider any alternative except one is the negative position, and that has been what the MTA has done for more than a decade. To point out that the current proposal creates many problems and solves none is not negative but necessary.

19. Claim #19: Red Line Opposition is Marginal. Red Line opposition is broad, deep, and may exceed the number of people who support the project. For the most part, support seems to come from developers and downtown business interest and opposition is composed mostly of residents and organized transit riders. Those residents who support the project are almost entirely people who either live in areas where the line is fully grade separated, or those who don't live along the right-of-way. Transit rider support is thin and consists mostly of those who have not followed the project in detail. Generally speaking it appears that the longer a transit rider is involved in the planning process, and the more one learns about the project, the more likely it is that he or she will be opposed to it.

20. Claim #20: The Red Line will allow the construction of a high capacity rail transit system. In response to a request from the Transit Riders Action Council for a line study to ensure that the red line has sufficient capacity to handle the resulting demand after the entire rail plan has been built out, MTA, the Baltimore City Department of Transportation, and the Baltimore Regional Transportation Board all declined to run the whole system through the travel demand model. Mr. Jamie Kendrick of City DOT

2011 ANNUAL REPORT (September 2010 – July 2011)

VII COMMUNITY RESPONSE (Continued)

stated that line capacity after system buildout is *not relevant* because all that matters to the Federal Transit Administration is the existence of a 25 year long range transportation plan for the region as a whole and line demand in the year 2030!

This would mean that the 2002 Baltimore Region Rail System Plan is irrelevant to the Red Line process; but when other alternatives to this proposal were recommended by grassroots organizations, they were automatically rejected because they didn't conform to that plan! The O'Malley administration seems to want to apply rules differently, *depending upon the source of a proposal*, rather than applying standards consistently. This has only fed more fuel to the smoldering distrust of the whole Red Line project.

How did we get to this point? It is remarkable how the planning process has been ordered. A request was made for transit safety information in September 2009. The MTA said that the information was unavailable and that they were still developing safety certification protocols. In reality the MTA had the data all the time. But the Red Line Council did not see it for 22 months until July 2011 and after the Red Line went into preliminary engineering. At this point the information has been declared "late to the game," not relevant to where we are in the planning process at this time. This is another example of the way the Red Line planning process has been conducted. Relevant information is not released until it is too late to impact the process. In this way, instead of the process determining the outcome, the process has been contorted to guarantee a predetermined outcome. The result has been deep anger and distrust of the process by the opponents. As everyone knows, it is not possible to reach a political consensus if all sides are not convinced of the fairness of the process. Throughout the Red Line planning process, there has been a number of modifications to the proposal. Some of these modifications have been done to serve the interest of developers or large institutions. Most have been dictated by the engineers. Some of those changes from the engineers have coincided with residents' concerns. No resident's concern not dictated by engineers have made their way into the project. No transit riders concerns whatsoever have made their way into the project. It seems that the key to having any input is to put money on the table, as the University of Maryland is doing at the Poppleton Station.

It is noteworthy, also, who has made up the audience at Red Line Council meetings. We see a very tiny number of local shop owners, a large number of residents, and some transit riders. From time to time we see public officials. I cannot recall any downtown business leaders or developers who have attended a Red Line meeting. They do not have to. They have direct access to the governor and to the secretary of Transportation, neither of whom has ever been willing to meet with any transit riders organization representative in Metropolitan Baltimore. In addition, there is no longer transit riders' organization representation on the Citizens Advisory Committee of the Baltimore Region Transportation Board. Throughout the Red Line planning process a number of questions were raised for which the MTA had said that they did not have the information yet, but would bring it back to the Red Line Council when it became available. Sometimes a question is answered at a later time, but usually it is not. Many times concerns have been raised at Red Line Council meetings, and they have been fully discussed with the MTA, but the MTA has not taken any action nor addressed the concern. The pattern is consistent. If consideration of an issue would make the proposal look weak, or make another alternative look stronger, it is not yet fully addressed. At a later time the MTA might say "We discussed the matter earlier." Discussion without resolution is insufficient. An example would be concerns about tunnel flooding at the Eastern portal, which is in the flood plane in Canton. The MTA said that they would address the matter, but they did not clearly explain how. Based upon past performance, they would then address it after the Red Line opens and it is too late to do anything about it. The manipulation of order process has been *the* hallmark of the Red Line planning process.

It cannot be stressed too strongly that the Red Line opposition consists mostly of strongly pro-transit people, not transit opponents.

- End of Response provided by the Transit Riders Action Council of Metropolitan Baltimore



2011 ANNUAL REPORT (September 2010 – July 2011)

VII COMMUNITY RESPONSE (Continued)

IN MEMORY OF BOB KEITH

COMMENTS BY THERESA REUTER

For Years, prior to his passing, our late friend, Robert C. Keith, worked with the Citizens Advisory Council for the Red Line Transit System. I bring his memory back because, on countless occasions, as I accompanied him to and from his West Virginia farm, he would point out to me the challenge of attempting to lay a light rail along Edmondson Avenue between Franklinton Road and Cooks Lane. He shared the community's concern of how it would impact their neighborhood. It is in my memory of Bob Keith's long hard work to help the communities in Baltimore, that I returned to the Red Line meeting of July 2011 only to be denied the opportunity to speak on his behalf. Now I understand that people have disputed what Mr. Sherod said during the May 2011 meeting. What the city right of way map shows needs to be shared to the Council so it can compare it to the engineering consultant's map. With both maps to compare, the issue of the measurements along Edmondson Avenue could/would be definitely resolved.

END OF 2010 – 2011 REPORT



Red Line Citizens' Advisory Council • 2011 Annual Report

Appendix A

**CAC Meeting
Minutes –
September 2010
to July 2011**



2011 ANNUAL REPORT (September 2010 – July 2011)

Appendix A – CAC Meeting Minutes

September 9, 2010.....	1-24
November 4, 2010.....	1-25
January 13, 2011.....	1-23
March 10, 2011.....	1-25
May 12, 2011.....	1-29
July 14, 2011	1-28

**BALTIMORE RED LINE
CITIZENS' ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING**

DATE OF MEETING: September 9, 2010
TIME: 7:00 p.m.
LOCATION: Johns Hopkins Bayview Medical Center

CAC ATTENDEES:

- Angela Bethea-Spearman, Co-Chair
- Dr. Rodney Orange, Co-Chair
- Edward Cohen
- Gary Cole
- Emery Hines
- Jamie Kendrick
- George Moniodis
- Warren Smith
- Charles Sydnor
- Marty Taylor
- Annie Williams

(Absent: Christopher Costello; Sandra Conner)

ELECTED OFFICIALS OR REPRESENTATIVES:

- Danyell Diggs, Red Line Coordinator, Office of Baltimore City Mayor Stephanie Rawlings-Blake

MTA/CONSULTANT ATTENDEES:

- Henry Kay, Maryland Transit Administration (MTA)
- Diane Ratcliff, MTA
- Lorenzo Bryant, MTA
- Dudley Whitney, PB
- Rev. Anthony Brown, Rosborough Communications, Inc. (RCI)
- Tori Leonard, RCI

GENERAL PUBLIC: approximately 25

Agenda

- Welcome [*Page 1*]
- CAC Member Introductions [*Page 2*]
- Approval of Agenda [*Page 4*]
- Adoption of July 8, 2010 Meeting Minutes [*Page 4*]
- Response to Capacity Analysis by M. Taylor [*Pages 4-9*]
- Annual Report [*Pages 9-11*]
- Station Area Planning Process [*Pages 11-15*]
- Public Comment [*Pages 16-20*]
- Next Meeting Agenda [*Page 23-24*]

Dr. Rodney Orange: Good evening everyone. Angela's on her way up, but we're going to go ahead and begin the meeting. It's 7:12. On behalf of the CAC, I want to welcome each and every one of you and thank you so much for taking time out of your busy schedules, for coming to be a part of this meeting and to be able to express, at the proper time, your concerns about the east-west Red Line. My name is Dr. Rodney Orange, I'm a member of the Franklin Square Community Association, Executive Committee member of the Baltimore City branch of the NAACP. We're going to start our introductions of each of the CAC members for you.

Charles Sydnor: Good evening, my name is Charles Sydnor and I was appointed by Speaker Michael Busch on the recommendation of the legislators of the 10th district.

George Moniodis: My name is George Moniodis and I've been on the committee for about eight years and I was appointed by the Governor.

Warren Smith: My name is Warren Smith. I represent the community of West Hills, which is the 40, Cooks Lane area.

Gary Cole: Good evening, Gary Cole, Deputy Director, Department of Planning Baltimore City, appointed by the Mayor.

Jamie Kendrick: Good evening, Jamie Kendrick, Deputy Director of the City of Baltimore Department of Transportation. Just briefly if I may – I submitted on behalf of the Mayor this evening, with her signature, a letter appointing me in lieu of our new director, Mr. Khalil Zaied. I look forward to working with all of you on this important panel. I've obviously followed the work for many years.

Annie Williams: Good evening, my name is Annie Williams. I'm a member of the Harlem Park Neighborhood Council. I'm also working on the MARC Train project and was appointed through the Senate to work on the Red Line.

Marty Taylor: My name is Marty Taylor. I'm the president of the Cambridge Walk Community Association and I was appointed by Senator George Della.

Edward Cohen: Good evening, my name is Edward Cohen. I'm with the Transit Riders Action Council of Metropolitan Baltimore, the State Center Neighborhood Alliance, the West Baltimore Coalition, the Mt. Vernon-Belvedere Association and the Baltimore Regional Transportation Board's Citizens Advisory Committee. I was appointed by Senator Verna Jones of the 44th district.

Emery Hines: Good evening, my name is Emery Hines. I'm Manager of Transportation Planning for Baltimore County and I was appointed by Baltimore County Executive Jim Smith to represent him.

Moniodis: Mr. Chairman, can I just add one more thing because my mouth was full the last time? For the folks in the audience, I'm George Moniodis and I represent the Greentown Community Development Corporation. **Orange:** So this is your old neighborhood? **Moniodis:** Yes, my neighborhood. **Orange:** Alright. Can I get a motion on the approval of the agenda for tonight?

Cohen: Mr. Chairman, a point of order. **Orange:** Okay. **Cohen:** I would like to welcome Jamie Kendrick here to the table tonight and I believe that he should sit with us tonight, however, there was a problem in the past. Mr. Kendrick received a letter from the previous Mayor appointing him as an alternate and we don't have alternates – that was contrary to law last time. This time he is coming in as a replacement which is consistent with law, however there is an ambiguity in the law regarding the governmental appointees who are representing government and that ambiguity has to do with replacement. Under the law, the only way that we can be removed from office is either by resignation or death. Colonel Foxx, obviously, is no longer with the Department of Transportation, and I'm sure that, based upon the letter that Mr. Kendrick has

brought with him tonight, that it is the intention of the Mayor, since Colonel Foxx is no longer with the Department of Transportation, that Mr. Kendrick replace Colonel Foxx. However, barring the receipt of a letter from Colonel Foxx, we have a problem. I would therefore move that Mr. Kendrick be seated tonight, but that we require for his further participation in the future, that we receive a letter of resignation from Colonel Foxx so that we can be consistent with the law and there would be no ambiguity. Obviously it would not affect tonight's meeting, but we do need to make sure that there is no problem with the law.

Cole: Just a point of clarification. **Cohen:** Yes. **Cole:** Colonel Foxx did not appoint himself. **Cohen:** No, he didn't. But under the law, no member of the Council can be replaced by anyone and they must resign. So while I recognize that there is clear intent here on the part of the Mayor that Mr. Kendrick be a replacement and not a substitute for Colonel Foxx and while I have no objection to his being seated here tonight, in order that we can make sure that we are not in conflict with the law, that we should require that in the interim two months that a formal letter of resignation be received from Colonel Foxx so that there will be no legal ambiguities regarding who is seated representing the City Department of Transportation.

Cole: I don't recall some individuals that failed to attend the meetings over long periods of time sending in letters of resignation. They were replaced for non-participation. **Cohen:** Yes, they were replaced – **Cole:** So I don't really see the ambiguity. **Cohen:** The problem is they were replaced for non-participation – Colonel Foxx has not been non-participating over a period of time as they were. So they were replaced for the non-participation reason which does not apply in this case. Even if we were to apply that, there would be meetings in the interim where we would want Mr. Kendrick to be seated at the table. Those seats remained vacant until there was a determination of non-participation and clearly, we can't make that determination here. **Cole:** I feel it's a lot of to-do over nothing.

Orange: Mr. Kay, for the record, would you contact Mr. Alfred Foxx and just ask him to submit a letter of resignation, just for the record so that we don't have any problems. **Henry Kay:** Yes. **Orange:** Even though we do have a letter on the Mayor's stationery, a letter from her, signed by her appointing Mr. Jamie Kendrick, to satisfy the concerns of one of the CAC members – would you take care of that for us please? **Kay:** Certainly.

Smith: Excuse me, Mr. Chairperson, could we have that letter read into the minutes, could we all hear that letter? Because it might address Mr. Cohen's point.

Kendrick: On behalf of Dr. Orange. The letter is addressed to Mr. Ralign Wells, MTA Administrator, 6 St. Paul, Baltimore 21202. *Reads:* 'Regarding the appointment of Jamie Kendrick, Dear Mr. Wells: Pursuant to House Bill 1309 of 2006, I authorize the appointment of Jamie Kendrick to the Citizens Advisory Council for the Baltimore Corridor Transit Study Red Line. Mr. Kendrick is Deputy Director of the Baltimore City Department of Transportation, a position he has held since 2006. He is responsible for directing the review and evaluation of all development projects, traffic impact studies, urban design considerations, historical significance, economic impact of various projects. In addition, Mr. Kendrick is responsible for the administration of several divisions of the Department of Transportation including Contract Administration, Fiscal Division, Conduits, Planning, Construction, Engineering, Traffic and Legislation.' (I don't have much to do.) 'Mr. Kendrick has been working for the City for over three years. I believe that his experience in government programs and work with developers, property owners, engineers, architects, community groups, elected officials and various local, state and federal agencies will serve him and our community well on the Citizens Advisory board. If you have any questions, feel free to contact Mr. Khalil Zaid, Director, Baltimore City

Department of Transportation at 410-396-6802 or his e-mail address which is written. Sincerely, Stephanie Rawlings-Blake, Mayor, City of Baltimore.' Copied to Kaliope Parthemos, Deputy Mayor and Director Zaid. If I may, just briefly, Mr. Chairman – that letter is identical in form, save for my name and specific duties, as to the one submitted, I believe, for Mr. Cole upon, I might point out, not the resignation of Mr. McCoach, but when he departed the Department of Planning. This is in the same form and substance as Mr. Cole was seated. And so with that I would just urge the body to take into consideration that this has been the standard operating procedure of the Council.

Orange: Tori would you take this and make sure each member of the CAC gets a copy. **Cohen:** Mr. Chairman – it is clear that Mr. Kendrick is the person the Mayor wants to represent the City and as I said – I have no objection there whatsoever. But the letter itself in no way addresses a resignation by Mr. Foxx and Mr. Foxx is still an employee of the City. So that issue still remains as a matter of protocol because we have not yet received the resignation and under the law no one can be forced out by an appointing authority, per se. **Kendrick:** I would say 'per se' is an important legal distinction. **Orange:** I've asked Mr. Kay to take care of that for us. **Cohen:** And that would be satisfactory and I have no objection to Mr. Kendrick sitting in with us tonight. I just want to make sure that we do receive that official letter from Colonel Foxx, because the law specifically does not allow for the removal of people on this Council, except for non-attendance, or death or resignation.

Orange: Madame Co-Chair – would you introduce yourself? **Angela Bethea-Spearman:** Angela Bethea-Spearman, Co-Chair of the Red Line CAC, President of the Uplands Community Association and Chairperson of the Southwest Development Committee – appointed by Senator Verna Jones. **Orange:** Would you do a sick man a favor and take the meeting over? (Laughter). **Bethea-Spearman:** Where are we? **Orange:** Approval of the minutes. **Bethea-Spearman:** Do we have approval of the minutes? **Cohen:** Motion to approve. **Kendrick:** Second. **Bethea-Spearman:** All in favor. **Council:** Aye. **Bethea-Spearman:** Anybody oppose? So moved. **Cohen:** Madame Chair, as a matter of order we have not yet approved the agenda. **Williams:** I thought we did. **Kendrick:** It was the first action taken. **Bethea-Spearman:** That's what we just did. **Cohen:** We didn't approve the minutes? **Bethea-Spearman:** We're on the agenda and then we're doing the minutes. **Cohen:** Alright, my mistake. **Bethea-Spearman:** Adoption of the July 8th meeting minutes – all in favor – can we get a motion, I mean. **Cole:** Motion. **Bethea-Spearman:** Anybody second. **Smith:** Second. **Bethea-Spearman:** All in favor. **Council:** Aye. **Bethea-Spearman:** Any not in favor? So moved. Old business – Response to Capacity Analysis by M. Taylor – MTA.

Kay: Good evening everyone. You'll recall at your last meeting, at your request we had a presentation by Dudley Whitney on how – **Bethea-Spearman:** Excuse me Mr. Kay – how long will this take? **Kay:** Six minutes. **Bethea-Spearman:** Okay. **Kay:** -- a presentation on how the capacity of the Red Line, the passenger-carrying capacity was calculated, in response to questions raised by the CAC. Mr. Whitney made his presentation and then Mr. Taylor presented an analysis that he had done that made a very different conclusion about the capacity. So what we promised to do, in the intervening months, meet with Mr. Taylor, understand his methodology and review what we had done and then come back and report to you the findings from that. Dudley Whitney is back again with us this evening and he's just going to make a few short comments about what we concluded based on looking at Mr. Taylor's analysis. While Dudley talks, I'm going to hand out one page.

Dudley Whitney: Good evening, Dudley Whitney. As Henry said – Henry Kay, Lorenzo Bryant and I met with Mr. Taylor and Mr. Cohen on August 9th to look at the questions that Mr. Taylor

had raised. That was his concern that the Red Line did not have enough capacity to carry the passenger loads that we were estimating for the year 2030. So we met with them and we were looking at the formulas that Mr. Taylor used and he used a formula from the 1996 Rail Capacity Manual. The key thing is that he tied the ridership to the max load point only. Henry is handing out a simpler example than what I showed in the slide show last time about the max load point volume. The key thing here is that the max load point volume is that point in which you have the highest number of people riding between stations. It all depends on the trip patterns of the passengers where that point is. So, the top example, for instance, is an example similar to the Baltimore Metro which is primarily one directional in nature. In the morning more people are riding toward town than away from town. In the second example, it's more similar to the Central Light Rail line as well as the proposed Red Line, in which you have more balanced flows of passengers from both the west and the east side. Therefore you see the max load point volume is approximately 70-75 in the eastbound direction and about 50 passengers in the westbound direction, that's a very simple example. But if you look at the total boardings on the right-hand side – in the top example the total boardings versus max load point is about 150 percent. In the lower example it's about 347 percent. The Red Line is more similar to this second example. So if we only tie the capacity to the max load point, we're underestimating the capacity of the system. So in response, looking at both the 1996 Rail Capacity Manual as well as the 2003 Rail Capacity Manual, we provided six different formulas in response and each of those six shows that, yes, the Red Line will have enough capacity to meet the demand. After that, Mr. Taylor and Mr. Cohen then asked for additional information, which we are now collecting. That includes station-to-station passenger trips in origin-destination format, the average passenger trip length, mode of access to each station, and the current ridership on corridor bus routes. We have a follow-up meeting coming up this Monday, in the morning, in which we will address those questions. That's all I have.

Kendrick: Just a couple of questions – I want to get myself up to speed. I've been involved heavily but not always at the most technical aspect. Is part of what you're saying that the nature of the ridership, with a dispersed trip pattern, for example, on the Central Light Rail you have significant outbound boardings in the morning heading to BWI and, probably to a lesser extent, Hunt Valley because of the employment centers. Is part of what you're saying is that the analysis by Mr. Taylor and others didn't necessarily account for the multi-directional boardings during the various peaks? **Whitney:** In essence, that's correct – it did not. It was only looking at the single max load point. **Orange:** Mr. Smith.

Smith: We're talking about the Red Line, we're not talking about the Purple Line, we're not talking about the Green Line, we're not talking about any other line. **Whitney:** Correct. **Smith:** What you've just answered to him was involving all those different transportation systems, which makes your analysis correct. Which makes his answer previously correct, also, because you're using a bigger scope. We are the Red Line committee, we're focused on the Red Line and you've just put all the apples and oranges into this meeting – by your words. **Taylor:** Warren, if I may. **Smith:** Yes. **Taylor:** Just to follow up a little bit, this should be rather quick and may circumvent any of these questions. Thank you – that's exactly what we talked about. There's one other thing that we did talk about, too, which is roadway capacity. Since we're talking about the rail capacity first. Yeah, there were a number of errors in my analysis, a few minor details that were not yet available – the size of the car and things like that – we've ironed all that out. The big question where I made an error in the analysis is exactly what Dudley has been describing, which is that the model in the calculations suggests that very short trips are taken by people. Therefore if you take a trip that's a third or a quarter of the length of the line, when you get off, somebody else can get right back on. In this way, a train that can only carry two-thousand people at a time, can carry seven-thousand people per direction in the time in which it

goes the length of the line. So if that assumption is correct, which to some extent it certainly is and my numbers were very much too low based on that, then the Red Line can carry the numbers that are projected -- or may perhaps carry the number projected. We still question a little bit the extent to which this may actually occur. When looking at other cities this corresponds to a peak travel share of about 3-point-4 percent. What that means is at the highest point there's a very small number of people are on the train at one time in relation to the total number of people in the day that ride the train. What that means is that as we're looking at other cities, this is a very different line. What this would mean is that the Red Line is a very different line at least as far as this analysis goes, than any other line in the country. That may be true, but we're not sure, is the point with that.

Kendrick: If I may, to Mr. Smith's point, we're only talking about the Red Line. **Taylor:** Absolutely. **Kendrick:** Not Green, not Purple, not L.A., not Boston – **Smith:** As he factored in. **Taylor:** Well, no, he was just giving those as illustrative examples. He's done a very thorough job on the Red Line here. Regarding the rail capacity, there are some other issues that are still not yet addressed, some of which we're hoping to hit at this meeting. There's a letter that I've attached, which I sent on the 20th. Mr. Cohen and I had a chance to think and talk about what we discussed at our previous meeting and we haven't yet heard back from, hoping we could talk about it some more tomorrow, but it may still require further... The thrust of the letter, which is attached and I've passed around in the room, is that there's still some fundamental issues unanswered. First of which is system capacity with regards to build-out of a full regional rail plan. Meaning that, in modeling for the Red Line, the MTA is required by the Federal Transit Administration – this is on the second page of what I handed out, the back of the first page – to make sure that there's enough ridership to justify the costs. This is what we've been focusing on up till now, which has been done very thoroughly. But the FTA also requires that the Red Line should be a piece of a comprehensive rail plan, meaning that the region should have a full regional rail network and there's more lines planned in the future than just Red. In order to do this, the Red Line must have sufficient capacity to handle the demand of a complete system build-out. In other words, if we build three new rail lines in Baltimore, a real regional rail network like I hope we may have here one day, the Red Line must have capacity to handle it. At our last meeting, Mr. Kay explained to us that this has not yet been done by the MTA. We view this, Mr. Cohen and I, as a big problem and hope that we can have some progress on this soon, because we believe this should be a part of Alternatives Analysis planning, not Preliminary Engineering. If the LPA doesn't fit within both cost-effectiveness and build-out capacity limits, then it's the wrong selection for the Red Line and more work needs to be done. What I mean is that if we build three more rail lines then that should mean that more people are going to want to take the Red Line because we've got more ability to get people to the Red Line and the Red Line should be able to handle that. If the Red Line can't handle that then it's a problem. So as far as the rail capacity that's still unanswered to this point. I'm done on that. There's another issue which we also discussed which is roadway capacity –

Kendrick: Can we just stop – **Taylor:** -- which I'd like to get to in a minute, to be very brief. **Bethea-Spearman:** Yes, because you're about to be stopped, so you need to be brief. Go ahead, Mr. Taylor. **Taylor:** Regarding roadway capacity – we are concerned about total transportation network capacity. The big question is, is the Red Line, in removing travel lanes in the Edmondson Village area on the west side, vehicles that would have been in those lanes have to go somewhere else, well, where do they go? As of yet, in my understanding, the MTA also doesn't know the answer to this question. With the removal of a peak travel direction on the west side, total capacity of the corridor seems to be reduced. That means that the Red Line doesn't appear to have enough space on board to handle both the displaced drivers and the force-feed bus riders that will no longer be running because those buses will now be on to the Red Line. This would

mean that after building the Red Line less people will actually be able to travel between southwest Baltimore and downtown than if the Red Line isn't built. This is possible – I'm not saying that we're sure one way or the other. Current modeling for traffic includes only Edmondson and Frederick on the west side and is also similarly limited on the east side. So we've asked at the last meeting for more extensive modeling of traffic to include parallel roadways, such as on the west side. I think that's actually on the back, what I've asked for, the last page, such as Windsor Mill, Franklinton Road, Frederick Road, Wilkens Avenue, Forest Park, Hilton Street and displaced traffic on 95 and 695. There's some specific things we asked for. One thing we are also concerned about that hasn't been addressed is mobility and left turns. Currently they're not in the model in either case, specifically left turns. Right now on Edmondson Avenue, many times, especially in the evening, there are a lot of people making left turns on the westbound lane coming out of the city. Right now that actually backs up past the capacity of existing left turn lanes. So with the removal of one travel lane and the removal of many places where people can make left turns is something that's going to be important because there's only going to be certain places where left turns can be made. There has to be an increased demand at those places, because you've removed a lot of the places where people can turn. Secondly, mobility pickups are on the rise and mobility, by federal regulations, must stop at the door, whichever door is requested, front or back. If this is the front door along Edmondson Avenue, this may block the right travel lane for up to 15 minutes. With only two lanes of travel, this could be a really big problem and hasn't been in the model – I'm not really sure how to put it in the model, but again, I'm not the transit engineer. That's all I have.

Bethea-Spearman: Mr. Taylor – is that stuff in your letter? **Taylor:** It is all in the letter.

Bethea-Spearman: Mr. Kay – you all have the letter? **Kay:** Yes we do. **Bethea-Spearman:** I'm concerned, as Mr. Taylor is, about some of the stuff that he was saying just now. What would be the turn-around time that MTA could be able to address – **Kay:** Some of these items, including the mobility ridership he and Ed requested when we met previously, so we're working on having that available. I don't know whether we'll have that particular item by Monday, but – **Taylor:** Some of it's quite new – we just asked for it two weeks ago and we're only meeting tomorrow, so I understand that we may not have – **Kay:** That's right, there are additional items. So I think what we'd like to do is we'll discuss the philosophical points that they're raising about long-range planning and the capacity of the Red Line, the assumptions we've made, at our meeting on Monday. Then I think we'll have to find a way to jointly get back to you to respond to those things, but – **Taylor:** Maybe we can do it together by two months from now when we meet again.

Bethea-Spearman: I don't know about two months. I want the MTA to take their time and come back to us with some facts. **Taylor:** That's true. **Bethea-Spearman:** So we don't want to rush them – go ahead Mr. Kay. **Kay:** We can respond in that timeframe. The specific question of left turns and mobility ridership on Edmondson Avenue we can answer sooner. **Bethea-Spearman:** I've heard all of that before. **Kay:** Yeah, we can answer sooner, so we will.

Kendrick: Madame Chair, can I ask just a couple of follow-up questions? First of all, with regard to the question of 'piece of a comprehensive rail plan' – and I'm more optimistic and more of an advocate as the next guy – **Bethea-Spearman:** Let me, hold on for a minute, Jamie – I think Jamie also needs to be included in that meeting. Because we don't have the time for MTA to present, Taylor to respond, then Jamie wants to respond, I'm sure, on behalf of the Red Line side. So if you all could come together and discuss that and just bring us back finally, we don't need to hear all that -- **Kay:** Okay. We'll invite him. **Bethea-Spearman:** -- until you have something.

Kendrick: If I may just briefly, I'll go from three to one question, if I may. I'm as optimistic as the next guy about building out the whole system plan we worked on in 2002, however, isn't the horizon year, what is the horizon year for the ridership? Is it 2030? **Whitney:** All the analyses are based on FTA requirement for 2030. **Kendrick:** Maybe I can ask Mr. Hines who is the chairman of the Regional Transportation Board that must approve long-range transportation plans. Let me ask first to Mr. Kay or Mr. Whitney – is there a parallel requirement to Mr. Taylor's point that those design year ridership also reflect a design year projects funded, programmed, etc? So, for example, if we were building the Green Line in 2050, but the design year for the Red Line is 2030, are you supposed to include the – **Whitney:** It's based on the constrained long-range plan, that is approved at the moment that the study takes place. **Kendrick:** If that's true – two-for-two here in terms of my thinking – Mr. Hines -- **Hines:** Yes sir. **Kendrick:** -- are there any rail transit projects in the constrained long-range plan – as adopted at this moment -- which is the relevant plan. There's no Green Line, no Yellow Line, no Purple Line, no Orange Line. **Hines:** Not within the constrained plan. It's in the plan as – **Kendrick:** Illustrative, I believe. **Hines:** -- illustrative. But in terms of being fiscally constrained, the only thing we have there is the Red Line, because there's money to do the – **Kendrick:** So in other words, unless FTA rules differently, the MTA has certainly met the criteria in that regard. **Kay:** Yes. **Kendrick:** Finally, if I may, I know you've been in kind of a consultative process with FTA on the ridership model and capacity analyses. Has FTA raised any outstanding issues with regard to the capacity analysis, ridership model, etc. that we should be aware of? **Ratcliff:** No. **Kendrick:** Thank you.

Bethea-Spearman: Go ahead Mr. Cohen. **Cohen:** Thank you Madame Chair. Mr. Kendrick's points are correct. However it doesn't address the fundamental issue that the federal government required that the Red Line be part of a comprehensive rail plan. We are not permitted to submit an isolated project. In order to submit a project, the project must be part of a comprehensive plan. That comprehensive plan must make some kind of sense. If, in this case as Mr. Kendrick is saying, we have a regional rail plan that is dictating how we are going to design our system for the future and that rail plan doesn't even allow for enough capacity on the Red Line for the system to be built out, then that means that the Red Line is not in fact coming out of that plan. That plan is just being used as a prop, but it's not really coming out of that plan. It has to be part of that plan in order to be submitted. Therefore I would say that it has to be something where it actually does fit capacity with buildout.

Bethea-Spearman: Okay, we're going to end this. We're going to ask the Mass Transit Administration to address Mr. Taylor's issues and I guess, some of us at the table should have some of the same issues as Mr. Taylor brought out, and bring that back. Does anybody else have anything that the MTA needs to address? **Cole:** I think Mr. Hines and Mr. Dudley addressed the capacity issues. **Bethea-Spearman:** No, we want MTA to go back and address Mr. Taylor's letter so that we all can understand and get it from the professionals. From the MTA rather – I'm not saying they're not professionals – from the MTA. That's how we do things. Mr. Smith.

Smith: I have a question pertaining to what a lot of you are saying this evening. That is the possibility of this not being done. The bus rapid transit, especially on 40, is a possibility, because of the traffic constrictions of Edmondson Avenue and the left turn that you mentioned, we must look at the possibility of can we duplicate this Red Line situation over the road such as the bus rapid transit system, instead of laying tracks which destroys the street and the pattern of the road. **Taylor:** Unfortunately, at this point, there really are only two choices since we're moving forward with the LPA, and that is the LPA or the No-Build. The Alternatives Analysis, at least the choice of bus rapid transit, are now off the table. So while I agree with you, it's actually off the table and is unfortunately a moot point.

Bethea-Spearman: Okay. Sounds like we're starting back all over again, back to the beginning. We can't let that happen, because we've got to keep moving. We've pulled out bus rapid transit – the next thing we'll be talking about underground. So we're going to – **Taylor:** Madame Chair, just one last brief thing is just that, I think what Mr. Cohen was saying is that regardless of whatever date is in our requirement or otherwise, if we're not planning on building additional rail lines in the short term and the plan is long term, it still doesn't make much sense to build something that's limited. I think that is the point underneath it all. That's the real question – if we are so fortunate as to build a real regional rail network, can this be a part of it. That's the answer that we're hoping to get. **Kendrick:** Well, if we want to deal with this at a policy level and a vision for region level, then I would suggest that we probably ought not be going into left turn lanes and signal pre-emptions and average trip length. If you want to deal with it at that kind of, you know, what's good for the region, what makes the most policy sense, then let's have that discussion. But let's not say in one sense, well that's really what we're trying to answer, but we have to answer these seventy-two questions. **Cohen:** I would disagree – we can't answer the policy question unless we have the data to back up how we make the decision.

Bethea-Spearman: The reason why I asked MTA to move forward with addressing Mr. Taylor's concerns is because we are a Citizens Advisory Council, although we all may sit up here with our personal, in the end though, whatever they may be, we still have to address the citizens. And the citizens, quite frankly, have those same concerns. So whether MTA has to answer one question or a million doesn't matter to me – we expect the Mass Transit Administration to come back with the responses to Mr. Taylor's concerns, because I know the rest of the citizens have those concerns and want to know as well. So we're going to move on. **Taylor:** Thank you Madame Chair.

Bethea-Spearman: New business – Annual Report. I think you have that, don't you Gary? **Cole:** Not really. **Bethea-Spearman:** What do you mean, not really? (Laughter). I was told you would be prepared. **Taylor:** Actually Mr. Cohen is the only one present who was at both meetings. Should be quite brief. **Bethea-Spearman:** Well, I should have been told that, because I went to the chair. **Cole:** Madame Chair, what I did do is, I made copies of portions of the draft report that Mr. Costello prepared. I can hand you out that copy – it's essentially a work in progress. I'll leave it at that. **Bethea-Spearman:** When is the Annual Report due in? **Cole:** I think our goal is September. I believe last year we completed it in November or December. **Orange:** The target is September. **Bethea-Spearman:** The target is September – okay. So if the target is September, then maybe we're going to need Mr. Cohen to go ahead and give us some detail about what's going on, because when we meet again it should be in by then, right? **Orange:** Yeah. **Bethea-Spearman:** It should be in? Mr. Cohen can you go ahead and present us – Mr. Kay, oh I didn't see you.

Kay: Can I just say something about timing. We discussed this last year if you recall. I don't remember whether the report was due September 1st or September 30th, but one or the other – we're late either way. What we did last year was wrote a letter to the General – I don't know, whoever gets this -- General Assembly, explaining it would be late. That was fine. Would you like me to do that again? **Bethea-Spearman:** Yes, please. **Kay:** Okay. That would give you until your November meeting to adopt it and then we could send it in after that.

Cohen: Madame Chair, may I proceed? **Bethea-Spearman:** If we're going to wait til November, well what does the panel say? We can wait til Mr. Costello comes back or we can go ahead with it. **Cohen:** No, we really can't wait. **Bethea-Spearman:** Why can't we wait? **Cohen:** Well, that's what I was about to explain. **Bethea-Spearman:** Okay. **Cohen:** At the

subsequent meeting we discussed how this would be done and what should be done. There were a number of things that were discussed at the first meeting where Mr. Cole was present and Mr. Taylor was present and Sandra Conner was also present. Neither of them were present at the subsequent meeting. At the first meeting, there was a lively discussion about a number of topics. There were areas of agreement and areas of disagreement. There was a general feeling that certain things should be included – one of them has to do with the report that we got on the safety certification protocols. We all thought that that was something that we really weren't that interested in hearing, but it did make the point that is worth putting in, and that is that safety clearly had not been formulated yet after the LPA had been selected. Therefore it is clear that safety was not an input into the selection of the LPA. So that's simply a factual conclusion that we were able to draw. The second point is that there were a number of topics where we had requested information from the MTA during the course of the year – financing would be an example and safety would be another example, capacity issues. In many cases we made specific requests and we got back a report and the report was not an answer to what had been asked. That was a consistent theme, so there was a feeling that that is also something that should be included in the report. Those were the only two topics where there was general agreement that there was something that needed to be included here. There was a decision that every member of the Council should be given the opportunity to make a submission to the report and that any community organizations or other organizations should be able to submit based upon only those topics that were in discussion during the course of the last calendar year and not prior years. So any discussion about other topics would have to be related to something that was discussed this year and couldn't be a stand-alone topic. I would like to add that last year submissions were made to Mr. Costello in an electronic format, because the only people that are actually doing the work of putting the document together physically are Carmen Morosan of City Planning and Mr. Costello. With just two people and a limited amount of time, they cannot be re-typing everything. So we would request that everybody make any comments that they want to submit for inclusion in the report electronically only. I would also add that I think that it makes sense to have a one month deadline on that so that we can then have something that we can present at the next meeting in November and we can vote on approval of that document, rather than any further discussion about this wasn't in or that wasn't in and we need to put it in. The document should be closed within a month and any topics should be closed at the end of this meeting. So those were among the things that we discussed and that is the way that we should proceed. I would simply ask that the documents that we have so far form an outline that we would approve tonight to go forward to finalize the piecing together of the report.

Cole: Madame Chair, just a point of clarification. The only part that I really recollect is that we did have a very, very lively discussion at the first meeting. There was not much consensus on anything because of differences of opinion. Mr. Cohen characterizes that 'we' wanted this and 'we' want – I didn't see it that way. **Cohen:** I didn't say that specifically, what I said was that those were two areas where we did not have disagreement and that there was discussion including those topics. **Cole:** To tell you the truth, I don't remember any topics that we really had agreement on. But, be that as it may, Mr. Costello did put forth a summary. What makes sense to me – Chris has a summary. As Mr. Cohen said, the first meeting occurred, the next meeting was a week later – how many people showed up? **Cohen:** Three – Carmen Morosan, Chris Costello and myself. **Cole:** She's not on the committee, she's staff, so only you and Chris. **Cohen:** Right. **Cole:** We did this same thing last year. Chris is, I saw his e-mail, unfortunately he was out of town. Chris will be back in town. Chris is the chair of the subcommittee, we will get together, we have two months to get together and do a careful and hopefully in-depth analysis and prepare a decent report. I would suggest that we wait on Chris with the goal that we should try to have a viable report in November.

Bethea-Spearman: I was wondering who was at the second meeting, how many people was it. We've heard Mr. Cole, we've heard Mr. Cohen – should we wait to, what does the majority believe? I believe that we should wait for Mr. Costello – he is the chair. We seem to have some differences, 20 people can see something one way – the same thing, but everybody sees it differently. But we rely on Mr. Costello at the end of the day to bring us back the information.

Kendrick: Madame Chair I couldn't agree more. I think if there's one thing that this Council is required to produce, it's that report, so we'd better get it right.

Cohen: Madame Chair that still does not change the fact that Mr. Costello will not be able to put together a report unless we have a deadline on submissions by Council members. That is something that we can agree to and then the report can be put together and approved by the Council in November. But we still need a deadline prior to that so that – **Cole:** Let our chair do it. **Kendrick:** Let him set the deadline. **Cole:** Let him figure it out. **Taylor:** He'll set the deadline by e-mail when he gets back.

Moniodis: I have a motion to await the arrival of Mr. Costello, as a courtesy, to set up the guidelines to help do this report. **Cole:** Second. **Bethea-Spearman:** All in favor? **Council:** Aye. **Bethea-Spearman:** Opposed? Okay. **Taylor:** I would agree with Mr. Cole, by the way, regarding the first meeting. The only thing we could agree on was that we disagreed and that we needed to produce the report – two things we agreed on. We agreed on a couple of other things – I'm exaggerating a little bit. **Bethea-Spearman:** I hope you all get a little further when Mr. Costello returns. Okay, so that's been put off waiting on Mr. Costello. Station Area Planning Process. Sandra is also at the same meeting that Mr. Costello is at, some kind of transportation something. **Cohen:** TAM, the TAM meeting, annual meeting I believe. **Ratcliff:** Transportation Association meeting. **Bethea-Spearman:** Thank you. So, in her place Mr. Kay is going to give the Station Area Planning Process report.

Kay: Thank you all. Ms. Conner, we spent several days with her last week when we were going through the folks who had nominated themselves to be on the Station Area Advisory Committees. She knew at that point that she wouldn't be here to give her report. She was disappointed about that so I told her that I would just quickly summarize where we were and then she would want to talk about it in a little more depth when she gets back in November. So if that's okay with you, I'll say a little bit and then she'll say more then. If you recall, we are establishing a Station Area Advisory Committee process. This was called for in the Red Line Community Compact that we and the City agreed on. The idea here is that there are citizen committees that are looking at each one of the 20 Red Line stations over the next 15 months to provide us input in the Preliminary Engineering process. The process we used was to open the nomination process in the spring and it went on through the summer and closed in late August, for individuals or institutions or businesses to nominate themselves to be on these committees. Then we had a committee of MTA, City, County, Ms. Conner and some community representatives look at each of those nominations and then select a group of people to be on the committees themselves. So that process closed in late August. We got a total of just under 400 nominations which was really a lot and impressive. I would characterize – and I'm sure Ms. Conner's going to want to do this, too -- but I was really pleased with how many we got and how many new people there were actually. We have a lot of people who participate in this process regularly and it's always nice to see them, but it's always nice to see new people coming in, too, so we got that. The challenge then was to winnow down that list to the numbers that we had advertised, which is fewer than 20 people on each of these committees. So we looked at each of the – I don't want to use the word application – each of the nomination forms that people had filled out and submitted and then we developed a group consensus on who to include on the committees. I believe yesterday or the day before yesterday, letters went out to every one of those 400 people telling them whether or not we

could accommodate them on a committee. And that includes some of you on this committee. You may have gotten your letter already, if you haven't you'll get it tomorrow – **Williams:** I got mine. **Kay:** You got yours, okay. So we're very excited about that process. It had a sense of urgency because we'd really like to get started -- the first meetings of these groups will be later this month and we notified the members of that. They will continue on based on a schedule that they agree on at their first meeting, over what we think will be eight or 10 meetings. Each of the committees, we think, will be different in the process it uses and the frequency of its meetings. There's some basic things that we'd like them to try to consider and let us know about, but it may be that in individual neighborhoods people feel more of a need to have public meetings, open houses, workshops, meet more often and they're welcome to do that. But that won't be the case everywhere. I think a downtown committee will be quite different than one for Bayview, than one for Edmondson Village, so I think we'll see all kinds of diversity in terms of the way that process runs. The only other thing I would say is – let me pass this out – we've organized a workshop for the people who are on the committees, that will be October 9th. What we're doing is setting up a half-day program in which we're bringing to town national experts on station area planning issues. That includes station design, safety, access, land use, community visioning. I hope it will be a very engaging and fast presentation to give people an introduction to the issues so that when they go back for their second meeting, they'll be, as a group, equipped with some ideas and principles and examples from other places. This October 9th program is not mandatory, but we appreciate that it's a Saturday, but we hope people are interested enough to come and we'll soon know if they are because we sent this along with the letter. I'm handing this to you all because you're welcome to come, the program is geared toward members of the committees – some of you are members of committees, most of you aren't, but your input is important to us, too, so you're welcome to come to this program if you want to spare another Saturday.

Bethea-Spearman: I have a question – the screening process, how did that take place Mr. Kay? And I want to know who were those people that made those decisions? I know you said communities—can we get a list of who those people were that made that decision and a list of the people that are on the committee and where they're from? **Kay:** Sure. Do you want me to tell you now who was on the selection committee? Because I can just go through it. **Bethea-Spearman:** Yes, please. **Kay:** Representing the MTA was me and Diane Ratcliff. Representing Baltimore City was Danyell Diggs, the Red Line coordinator and Laurie Feinberg, who is in the Planning Department. For the County stations we had Sharon Klotz from the County Economic Development Department and Dennis Wertz who is with the Planning Department. Then we had Ms. Conner from the CAC, we had Kelly Little from the Druid Heights Community Development Corporation. We had Ann Sherrill who runs a grant-making organization called the Baltimore Neighborhood Collaborative that's provided some of the support for the West Baltimore work, so the West Baltimore community is familiar with her – and I think that was it. So we tried to have City, County, MTA and then some community folks, too and the CAC. In terms of the process, we all reviewed all 400 of these nominations. People told us which committee they preferred to be on. In most cases we honored that, a few we thought people either made a legitimate error in terms of the one they wanted to be on or we could find one where there was room and it was closer to the place they lived. So we, in that case, shifted them to a different committee. We were more challenged in some than others. In some cases we were looking for fewer than 20 people, in some cases we got fewer than 20 nominations so that was easier. In a few places – West Baltimore was one, Edmondson Village was one – we got many, many more than 20, in some cases twice that many, I think. So that was a more competitive process, so we looked at what people wrote, who they were, their qualifications, what they told us about their own experience in their neighborhoods and what their interest was in the process. I think we also asked them what qualifications they thought they had and we used that information – to the extent that it was there – in some cases people didn't write

much so we didn't have much to go on. Generally, if people said either nothing or 'I live there' we didn't take them, because they didn't give us enough of a sense of what they were thinking. If people wrote a couple of sentences – 'I'm involved in my community,' 'I've been following this project,' 'I'm concerned about traffic' – you know, if they gave us just some sense of what they were thinking then we selected them. The only other rule we generally followed was that if people were identifying themselves as officers in a community association, we tried to have the highest-ranking person in that community association be on the committees. If there was a president, generally that's the highest-ranking person, so that's who we took and if we took the president then generally we didn't take the vice-president, the secretary or other people who were representing that association. Now in a case where it was not competitive, meaning we only got 15 nominations for 20 spots, then we didn't knock anybody out, because we didn't need to. Angela, in your area, the Edmondson Village example in particular, this is a very active community, there are lots of associations, there are businesses, schools, churches so we got a lot of nominations.

Bethea-Spearman: Were each of those associations represented – each and every one of them?

Kay: The last part of your last question answers that, which is can you get a list of all the people. I can't give you a list tonight because we haven't heard back from people yet. What we did was send a letter to them that said confirm the fact that you want to participate. If we don't hear from them pretty quickly we'll be calling them to find out, because the fact is if they don't want to do it and the numbers start falling again, we'll go back to some of the people that we had not selected the first time around. **Bethea-Spearman:** When you talk about stations, it's fine that you have businesses and churches, but nobody, I think, has the weight of the community person – nobody. That's where they live. You may come and worship, you may come and get us to spend money and you roll on wherever you live. I would be really interested in how many community people -- they should not be outnumbered by businesses and churches either on the list. **Kay:** I can tell you that's never the case. I'm thinking of a bunch of them simultaneously, but I would say that it's typical that three-quarters of the people are from the community and many of those are from a community association, I mean they identified that. Sometimes people didn't tell us and we don't know, but I would say we looked for some diversity, we looked for churches, businesses, other institutions. We were talking the other day – one of the people on the Edmondson Village committee is the principal of the Edmondson-Westside High School, so that's the kind of institution we tried to incorporate. I would say that most of the people are from the community and identified themselves that way.

Williams: I know that in my group they gave me the names of everybody in the group that's in the Harlem Park/ Franklin Square, designing the station, and I know most of the people and all of them are community. We're having an open house on the 23rd of September from 6 to 9 over at the BioPark Center. I don't know if it's for everybody, but I know that's where our group will be going so I feel -- **Kay:** That's just you. **Williams:** -- if anybody here wanted to come out and meet the people that's going to be helping to design it, then that's the night to come. You didn't announce it but in my letter today that's what was in it – we're all meeting – **Kay:** You're welcome to do that, sure. **Williams:** -- on the 23rd at the Bio Center so then it will meet there, so if the CAC people come out then you get a chance to meet everybody and talk to them and find out how they feel and see what they're doing because they are having an open house.

Bethea-Spearman: When is everybody else's open house scheduled for? **Kay:** I wouldn't use the word 'open house.' These are the first meetings of the group and they're all the week of the 20th of September. **Ratcliff:** And the 27th. **Kay:** And the 27th. **Bethea-Spearman:** Can we get a copy of those dates? **Kay:** Sure. And what we're saying is that people who are on the committee, they're the ones the meeting is focused on and the ones who are talking, certainly

other people are welcome to come and observe and members of the committee are welcome to invite people to come and observe. We also hope that members of the committee will go back to their own communities and talk about what they're doing and get feedback and report back and forth. So we looked for people who expressed an interest in doing that. **Bethea-Spearman:** Mr. Cohen.

Cohen: Thank you Madame Chair. I have several things I'd like to get clarified. Number one – there's a 30-day notification on public meetings and when did the notification go out on when and where these meetings will take place? **Kay:** We've done some thinking about how that applies in this case and we think that it doesn't because these are workgroups as opposed to public meetings. So we're not planning to publicize those nor give 30-day notice for them. Now, as I said, individual members are welcome to invite people and we'll accommodate them. **Cohen:** What about notification to the public, going forward, of the meeting times and locations? **Kay:** I guess we can do that. I think I'd like to hear from the committees themselves. I think most of them would welcome that. We hope that there's dialogue back and forth with their communities, but rather than impose that on them, I'd rather let them meet once and talk about that. If they want us to publicize their subsequent meetings – which haven't been set yet -- we will. **Cohen:** How will this Council be notified about the meetings of these committees? **Kay:** We'll send you a schedule. **Cohen:** Okay, and finally – I agree with the co-chair about the issue of community people dominating the committees – I think they should. But I think it's important to have a diversity of voices on the committee as well. I would be interested in knowing how many employees, who don't live in the community but work in the community, were included. **Kay:** You mean employees of institutions near the stations? **Cohen:** Employees of businesses or institutions – people who work near the stations in the respective areas. **Kay:** In most cases people identified themselves as that. A really good example is CMS. That's a station that has – there's a neighborhood there – but it's also dominated by a large employer. In that case we got nominations from a number of employees. Because of the importance of that institution there we did pick several of them because there was room on the committee to do that. The majority of people on that committee are still community residents and we didn't pick all the employees. If people identified themselves as having -- for example Bayview is another one – if people seemed to have a leadership role in the institution -- they were the head of facilities, they were a vice-president of something – then we picked them over someone who was just an interested rider, because we thought they would have more to say about the future of the institution, its development relative to the station than an individual employee would just planning to be a rider. **Cohen:** I think that's all fine and obviously CMS and Bayview you would have that. I am concerned, however, about other stations like Fells Point, for example – would there be employees at a station like that one where many people are employed in the area and many of the Red Line users would be people who don't live there. **Kay:** I don't think in the case of Fells Point we have any employees. **Cohen:** I am concerned because I think this is something that should have been attempted, not necessarily in large numbers, but one or two people at each of these committees would have been helpful because if all that we're going to have are people that live near a line but don't use it, then... **Kay:** We tried to get not a lot of employees, but we did look for businesses. So if you were the owner of a business or restaurant or something... I remember, several of the businesses around Harbor East nominated themselves and we looked for a representative of that business. But we didn't want to fill a committee with employees of the same institution. **Cohen:** I wouldn't want that either. But I would want to make sure that the committee included users and not simply people with property interests in the area. Thank you.

Williams: I just had one question to ask him about the topics that they're doing. Will someone in these topics talk to us about wheelchair-accessible and how to go about doing that in the station designing? Because I don't see it on here. We're going to have to think about how accessible it

will be for people in wheelchairs or on crutches and that type of thing, but I don't see that in your packet here. **Kay:** I can't recall specifically with the speaker we have whether anyone is addressing that topic. We have built it though into the topics that we hope the committees will discuss, because we think community ideas about accessibility of people with disabilities is important. The project will be designed to meet the law which is on the books and is pretty strict, but people often have other ideas about where people with disabilities might be coming from, so we have to think about accessible paths. So that will be included.

Kendrick: My sense is the session on walkability, while a common term, probably – **Kay:** Yeah. **Kendrick:** -- I would be disappointed if it didn't include wheelchairs as part of the discussion.

Cohen: Just for clarification on that point – whatever we build has to meet ADA requirements, we understand that. But that means to me that we need to make sure that we've got people that are going to raise ADA issues as they might arise in ways that would not occur to people who are not disabled themselves. **Kay:** Right – I took that to be Ms. Williams' point.

Taylor: I would just say that I'm very pleased to see how many people did respond and I assume some credit for that has to go to Ms. Diggs for all her work with the e-mail blasts and all, so just thank her for that work. **Kendrick:** And MTA staff as well, a lot of time. I have two questions – one I think is very important to the thinking of this committee. Henry, can you just assure the members of the CAC that there was – and I'm going to use a term that people may or may not be familiar with – there was no litmus test in selecting members -- 'I'm for the Red Line,' 'I'm against the Red Line,' 'I hate 4C,' 'I love 4C', etc. **Kay:** Yes, I can say that because I can't even think of an example among all those 400 where people gave us that kind of information. I'm not sure how people really feel about the project but at least in these nomination forms they were expressing a lot of interest in it – not support, but certainly interest. So we wouldn't even have had the basis to pick them based on that. **Kendrick:** I think the committee should be comfortable in that point. Then, just briefly, the other question because I know that, if I heard correctly, at least one, if not more, CAC members were selected – are there any cases in which CAC members were selected and you hit the maximum of the committee size? For example, just to pick on Ms. Williams for a moment – you may actually have mentioned this example. You had lots of applications in West Baltimore. Ms. Williams, appropriately given her leadership role in Harlem Park – I'm (inaudible), Annie, you can smack me anytime now. **Williams:** You're missing it because Kate Edwards called me and said nobody from Harlem Park had registered. **Kendrick:** My point is that the people around this table are deeply involved in the project in one way or another. And – I'm not going to say hate – but I would hate to see someone who had good community relevance, activism, et cetera, be displaced by somebody who has a pretty loud voice around this table. I'm not going to suggest that we re-look at the process, but I would suggest that if there are those cases that maybe you make the CAC aware of that or the specific members, Ms. Williams for example, could say, you know what, I've got lots of opportunities to talk about this, maybe we ought to bring in one more new voice to the process. **Kay:** Yeah, I'm not concerned about that. If I can say so, there were three CAC members who ended up on committees – Ms. Williams was one, Ms. Conner was another, Mr. Cohen was the third. In some of those cases we had more people nominating themselves than we had space so they were there and someone else isn't, but we didn't see people who would have been, based on what they wrote to us better, on the committee. **Taylor:** Is there any place that didn't have enough members that you can remember off the top of your head? Where were the low spots? **Kay:** Bayview, Bayview MARC down this way. CMS was probably fewer than 20. Harlem Park – was Harlem Park one? Poppleton. **Taylor:** Nobody lives by Social Security so that makes sense. **Kay:** Right, that's right.

Bethea-Spearman: Thank you Mr. Kay. It's now 8:20, so for the next 15 minutes we're going to open it up to public comment.

Brian O'Malley: Thank you Madame Chair. I'm Brian O'Malley with the Central Maryland Transportation Alliance. Just a clarification question. That very last question about which SAACs had fewer than 20 people – I thought I heard someone say Charles Center was one of those – is that right? **Kay:** I honestly don't remember which ones did and didn't. Downtown you have a concentration of stations and not a lot of people living there, and frankly we didn't get a lot of interest from downtown businesses, so Charles Center may have been one. Actually we ended up combining two of the downtown stations into one committee for that reason. **Cohen:** Which two? **Kay:** Government Center and Charles Center. **O'Malley:** Okay – thank you. **Kendrick:** We should be able to recruit a few City employees for that one. (Laughter). **Taylor:** It might not be the most balanced committee.

Don Sherrod: Good afternoon. For the record, Senate Bill 873 states for the record that the CAC report is due on or before September 1st. That bill is now a part of the Annotated Code of Maryland, so basically you are remiss in your duties. It didn't say that you can write a letter and get an extension, but I made a point two meetings ago – you all should have a copy of the bill, a copy of the law. Most of you don't know what the bill entails. I also brought to your attention that the MTA, according to that law, must provide you with a staff. Have you got a staff? If you had yourself a staff, you would have that report in on time, because right now it's late. I spoke with the Attorney General's office and I stated why has the MTA failed to deliver a staff to the CAC? Their question was, did they ask for one? So technically MTA is not in violation until you requisition your staff. Get a part-time engineer on the staff. We're paying for this – the taxpayers pay MTA. So we're paying for it anyway. Get a secretary. Get you a staff so you can do things timely. The other thing is that if you had a staff you can also exert some kind of oversight in these processes. For example, this station committee. Every one they named, to me, appeared to be members who signed on to the Community Compact. There was no community people. Ann Sherrill is with a non-profit. They named everybody except the community person from communities. Where are regular people on that selection committee for these people that are supposed to serve on the station committee? Where are the community people? Why did the MTA have carte blanche over that process? Why did you not at least ask for some representatives from some of these meetings that some of us continually make? Now I think the process is biased, because the MTA picks the people who are going to select. It's biased. I think once those names are submitted, before anyone is seated there should be some real oversight by you all to maybe start this process over. The second thing is this – now we're meeting way out here in Bayview, almost in Baltimore County and we meet in Baltimore County on the other end. Why do you keep passing by southwest Baltimore? The system goes totally through our district. I spoke with the principal today to clarify that there's no reason why MTA can't meet there and the principal stated for the record MTA has not contacted them in over a year. It's been over a year-and-a-half since we had the meeting – **Orange:** Which school? **Sherrod:** Edmondson High School, I'm sorry, Edmondson High School. She says there's no charge for the MTA. There's no time limit. She hoped and wished that everyone's out by 9, but you keep skipping us – what's going on? He's not doing this on purpose. Oh yes, I'm sorry – he is doing this on purpose because we had a meeting in Edmondson Village in southwest about two years ago and had 300 people there. He was there and he seemed to have gotten a little nervous because people were angry. So it's not by mistake that you keep skipping a major part of the alignment that the system goes totally through. You're the CAC – Citizens' Advisory Council – who are you supposed to advise. According to the law the MTA. Advise them, make them do the right thing. I hope you investigate – and I would like to be on that committee – on who selected the folks who selected

the folks. Okay – can we do that? **Bethea-Spearman:** I've asked for that already. **Sherrod:** I wanted just to make sure we put it on the record. Thank you very much.

Bethea-Spearman: I did ask – and I'm glad you brought that up – I would like to know who on that committee is also a part of that Compact committee, because we should not have them on everything. If that's the case, they all need to be removed and we need to actually go out there and get the citizens. You should not have the people on the Compact committee also representing on the committee for these stations. There should not be no one party monopolizing anything. They're already on the Compact committee – that's enough. We need to have other community folk. **Kendrick:** That's why I asked the litmus test question and raised the CAC question. **Bethea-Spearman:** Well that's why I want to see the list.

Taylor: One other thing – **Orange:** Mr. Smith. **Taylor:** -- I'd like on the record – oh, sorry. **Orange:** Mr. Smith. **Smith:** I'd like to take Mr. Sherrod's comment about southwest Baltimore and present it to MTA officially as for the meeting location, because I looked at the minutes which validated it, this letter here. We haven't been to west Baltimore in over a year and we need to be represented over there. What is the problem? **Bethea-Spearman:** Well while we're talking about meetings – are we finished with public comments? **Taylor:** Madame Chair I just have one last – I would just like to put for the record that I think that the term Community Compact is a little misleading in that many communities didn't actually sign on. I know Canton didn't sign on – **Bethea-Spearman:** No, they did not. **Taylor:** -- and the reason according to the Canton Community Association president is that he felt that the Compact was insufficient. I find that it's misleading the way that the Compact has represented itself as representing the entire community, because I feel like the majority of the community feels that the Community Compact is really completely insufficient and is rather a load of – well, you can finish my sentence for me. I just want that for the record that many of the communities – my community included – feel the Community Compact is insufficient.

Orange: Now you were late coming on – **Taylor:** I am. **Orange:** -- so what is your understanding of what the Community Compact is? **Taylor:** I'm sorry. **Orange:** What is your understanding of what the Community Compact is? **Sherrod:** A bad joke. **Taylor:** Well. **Kendrick:** I'd ask for order Madame Chair. **Bethea-Spearman:** Thank you. **Orange:** Why was it put together? **Taylor:** To ensure good relations between the community and the line so that the line could actually be a productive part of the communities. **Orange:** That's just one minor aspect of what we're hoping that the Community Compact will produce. There's training programs going in place to train people from the community on the jobs that will be available on the line. They're dealing now with station placement, trying to get people from the community to be involved in that process. I just didn't think it was fair to state that the Community Compact – because a few people may not be satisfied with it, they may not totally have a complete understanding of what it's doing. **Taylor:** May be true. **Orange:** So to put out that it's not serving any purpose is unfair. **Taylor:** I didn't say it was not serving any purpose – **Orange:** No you didn't say it, but you implied it.

Sherrod: Comment time – correct? Ask me that question and I'll tell you what a Community Compact is. **Orange:** What is your understanding? **Sherrod:** I'll tell you what it is. It starts off by saying that this is a document that cannot be enforced – that's the first thing it says. **Kendrick:** Where does it say that? **Sherrod:** It says it almost in the first paragraph – this is an unenforceable document – it makes clear that. So that means they can talk about job training. It can talk about education, it can talk about alignment and it can talk about economic development – it doesn't mean a thing. It's a document that was – **Kendrick:** What about the second part of that sentence? **Sherrod:** Wait a minute – **Kendrick:** What does the second part of that sentence

say? **Sherrod:** Wait a minute, wait a minute – you just got here. Now we’re talking about people that just got here – you just got here. **Kendrick:** What does the second part of the sentence say? **Sherrod:** So listen and learn. It was a document that was plagiarized -- they basically got it from the Internet -- from another area that was having problems with community input. So what they did was put together a bunch of words and that words was to get communities to buy into it. The Community Compact signers mostly are businesses, non-profit businesses, not residential folk and not community associations. Look at the document to see who signed on. The Community Compact means nothing, it has no teeth, it’s unenforceable, it’s toilet paper. **Bethea-Spearman:** We’re not going to go back and forth about the Community Compact – **Cole:** Then why are we talking about it then? **Bethea-Spearman:** We’re not going to go back and forth – **Cole:** This is the CAC -- why are we talking about it? **Bethea-Spearman:** We’re not going to go back and forth about the Community Compact statement – it’s done. The only thing we’re asking is that if they’re on – Mr. Kay – already on the Community Compact committee in any way that they not be a part of the station advisory -- there should not be the same people representing so-called communities, not the same people doing every part of the process. **Kendrick:** Should that apply to CAC members as well? **Bethea-Spearman:** That should, that should. I would think we would really want to reach out and touch people that are not participating. CAC members I don’t think should be on there either. We have a CAC representative and that’s where it should stop. Sandra Conner was chosen for that. We probably need to rethink and relook at some things. But if you’re on the CAC and you’re not Sandra Conner, you shouldn’t be on the station advisory committee. I mean you can’t have the same people doing everything, that’s just not fair.

Kendrick: I would say I agree with the chair on that point but I think there’s probably some finer grain analysis that needs to happen about how many people applied, how many were selected, do the people who may have signed the Community Compact were they the only ones, for example, who applied from their communities. I think the point is incredibly well taken, but probably requires a slightly deeper analysis, but the point is very well taken. Can I just ask one other question that was raised? **Bethea-Spearman:** Go ahead Jamie. **Orange:** I think we want to get to the audience. **Kendrick:** Absolutely, real quick though – **Bethea-Spearman:** Wait a minute Jamie. Wait until after public comment then we’ll come back. **Orange:** Yes ma’am – over here to the mic please.

Nadine Thomas: I’m Nadine Thomas and I’m from the Anchorage Tower on Boston Street. I think you know how we feel about the rapid transportation. We love it, we think it’s wonderful, but where are your minds? What are you thinking about by jamming up traffic on Boston Street by bringing it up on the surface? What could you possibly be thinking? Do you have any idea what the congestion would be – any idea at all? That’s an emergency route, we have an emergency route there in case of an emergency, in case we need to get people out of the city. What’s going to happen then? What is going to happen to the people that park on that street that can no longer park? What’s going to happen to the residents that try to cross that street? What is the safety of all these people? What is the safety of the cars that are going by that are going to be this far from the rapid transportation? I think you have a wonderful idea but I think somewhere – I hate to say it – but I think somewhere, coming up on Boston Street, you lost your brains. So could you put some things together, possibly, and rethink that part? Is that possible? **Orange:** Go ahead Mr. Kay.

Kay: Thank you, thank you very much for your comments. I’m sure you know we’ve heard from many Canton residents who’ve expressed many of these same ideas and also had a chance to respond to them. At the risk of over-generalizing I think those are all issues we considered very carefully. Those include congestion, those include pedestrian safety, those include the physical

design of the road. We think that what we're proposing is reasonable, it meets standards for safety and for operation. It is similar to light rail projects we've seen in other parts of the country in settings that are very similar to that. We have a lengthy document that goes into all those issues – that's the purpose of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. It looked at those alternatives. We've done some subsequent work at the request of the community to look into those issues in more detail. A meeting or two ago at Mr. Taylor's request, we provided a more detailed drawing of what the section would look like, which would illustrate, for example, how close a car would be to a passing train. It's close, sure it's close. **Thomas:** It's dangerous. **Kay:** Well, I would never agree that it's dangerous. We have many smart engineers who have looked at that carefully and we're comfortable with it. I'm responding that I believe that we've looked at these issues and we're satisfied with them, but I certainly appreciate the point that you're raising. We have a long design process in front of us and those are all issues that we will look at again and again and again very carefully.

Thomas: I would like to make one other comment and that is that right now we have a beautiful little island going down the center. That was partially, I understand and I could be wrong, but I understand that that was partially paid for by the federal government. Now if you decide to put the Red Line through there and dig that up, we have to pay the federal government about – what, 20 million back? An unforeseen – no? **Kendrick:** No. **Thomas:** Well we have to repay that money. **Kendrick:** Actually we don't, but that's another matter. **Thomas:** Okay, you think you can get out of that. **Kendrick:** I don't think we can get out of it, it's not required. **Thomas:** Okay, well, that's the same thing. **Kendrick:** No, there's a difference between getting out of something not being required in the first instance. **Thomas:** Thank you.

Orange: Anyone else? **Bethea-Spearman:** Any more public comment? **Orange:** Yes sir. **John Cutonilli:** My name is John Cutonilli, I live in Fells Point. Almost two years ago we had an open comment period where we are allowed to comment on the Red Line. So I submitted my comments to the Red Line and I've been trying ever since to try and get specific comments as to why the MTA has basically rejected the comments. I actually filed a Public Information Act request recently and they were not able to supply any documents whatsoever that actually indicated that they actually have looked at my comments. I guess I'm just very concerned that it doesn't appear that they've looked at my comments. I don't know about anyone else's comments. **Bethea-Spearman:** What is your name, sir? **Cutonilli:** John Cutonilli. **Bethea-Spearman:** Are you with a community association? **Cutonilli:** No ma'am. **Cutonilli:** Okay, where do you live? **Cutonilli:** I live in Fells Point. **Bethea-Spearman:** Okay. And you submitted your comments to MTA you're saying? **Cutonilli:** I submitted the comments as part of the public, whatever the – **Bethea-Spearman:** That goes to Annapolis? **Cutonilli:** No. They had open meetings as part of the – **Kendrick:** As part of the Environmental Impact Statement process? **Cutonilli:** Yes sir. **Cohen:** The public hearing process. **Kendrick:** Could I just maybe ask a question or make a point. Is it generally the practice – let's say you get 11 comments of the same nature in the DEIS process – would you literally answer the question 11 times? If for example Mr. Cutonilli's question was asked by 10 other people – **Cutonilli:** It wasn't. **Kendrick:** Well, it may or may not have been, I don't know. **Cutonilli:** I can tell you for a fact it wasn't. **Kendrick:** I know there were hundreds if not thousands of questions, comments raised.

Bethea-Spearman: Do you all recall his question? **Orange:** Often things get kind of lost, but I think that it's important for the MTA to respond to any questions that they get – **Bethea-Spearman:** No matter how many times they get it. **Orange:** -- no matter how many times they get the same question, because it's different individuals that send the questions in. So I would hope that you would take his name and find his information, just respond to it. It doesn't mean

that you have to agree to his concerns, but at least respond to the fact that you got it and what you can answer, answer.

Ratcliff: The MTA has done that. We have sent a response. We sent a report that analyzed a similar question on tunneling and alignment that Mr. Cutonilli asked. But what I also want to respond to is Jamie's question about the DEIS comments. Those came through a formal process and we've answered a number of those in frequently asked questions, a number of questions and answers that have gone on the project website. The formal response to each individual comes during the next phase of the project which we're hoping to enter. That's a one-by-one – each person who sent something in gets a response. Now it may overlap with our response to somebody with a similar question because the answer would be just the same. But at that phase – and unfortunately that's going to be well over a year from now – when we reach that portion of the formal process we'll be doing that. But in between we've tried to get information out either through newsletters, FAQs, things of that nature, in a general sense. We don't put people's names in something like that of course. But we have done several formal both through our legal office because of the Freedom of Information Act requests and from the project manager and myself to Mr. Cutonilli. **Bethea-Spearman:** Oh you have addressed Mr. Cutonilli?

Cutonilli: They've addressed it in a very terse manner, basically they've said things like, 'because of the costs' – I don't know if it's because the costs were too high or too low.

Kendrick: Mr. Cutonilli, there's a difference between they never responded and they responded with conditions. There's a big difference. I would suggest because you've made similar comments at the Transportation Board, for example, that you be a little more precise in your wording. It's one thing -- and I would go right after them if they never even sent a letter -- it's another thing if you didn't like the response. **Cutonilli:** They did respond to me and I sent them another comment back – **Kendrick:** So they did respond. You may not have liked the response, but they did respond. **Cutonilli:** Well, they responded to certain portions, but they didn't respond to other portions. I actually again, responded to them soon afterwards and then it doesn't appear that they responded in response to their comments, they didn't respond back to the comments. The way I look at it is they haven't really responded to my request.

Bethea-Spearman: What is it specifically, what part of the letter did you not get a response to?

Cutonilli: I asked for additional clarification, because they said, for example, we're rejecting it because of costs. I was asking, well okay, how much does it actually cost? I'd like a little bit more information to understand why. As far as I can tell they haven't responded back. **Bethea-Spearman:** Can you give us some idea, Mr. Kay, of what the cost is? **Ratcliff:** There were some alternate alignments as well as some tunneling alignments that you suggested we further study. **Bethea-Spearman:** Oh, further studies, we're way beyond that. **Ratcliff:** These are studies instead of the locally preferred alternative that we've chosen. There's tunneling and there are other alignments that go elsewhere in the City. **Bethea-Spearman:** Oh. **Ratcliff:** We've sent reports to Mr. Cutonilli that looked at some of that. Mr. Cohen had wanted some alternates, we studied them, some of those are on the website. We sent some responses but we're not going back to new alignments. **Bethea-Spearman:** No, no. I wouldn't think so at this point. **Ratcliff:** Those would be costly. We've explained why we picked the locally preferred alternative that we did or things of that nature, we're not going to open up new alternatives. **Bethea-Spearman:** Thank you. **Orange:** Thank you. Anyone else?

Bethea-Spearman: Okay, that will conclude public comment so we're going to go on back to the CAC. **Moniodis:** Madame Chair, I just want to correct something that was stated before.

Bethea-Spearman: Okay. **Moniodis:** About not meeting in southwest Baltimore – from what I recollect, eight out of the last 12 meetings have been held in southwest Baltimore. One at

Chadwick, one at Woodlawn, one at the conference center on Edmondson Avenue, one over at Hunting Ridge, one on Pulaski Street at an elementary school, two at the University of Maryland downtown campus. I just wanted to make the correction that we have diligently looked at southwest Baltimore.

Bethea-Spearman: I think we may have been in west Baltimore, but when you talk about southwest, which is the area where I represent, the BioTech doesn't fall under southwest. It would fall under west. I think though -- because this is really too far to be meeting, this is really way out from nowhere -- I think we need to consider either meeting at one place in a central area for all meetings or go back to the Holy Rosary if we want to be on the east side, stay at the Bio if we're going to be on the west side, but all of this coming all the way out here -- this is just way, way, way, way too far. **Kay:** If I can respond -- this is your process, you can choose the meeting locations. If you decide you want to have every meeting in the same location it would make our lives easy and we'll do that. But I think the idea of moving around was the sense we had that you wanted to make yourselves available to different communities at different times. If you want to do something differently, just tell us. **Sydnor:** Bayview is part of this Red Line, so I mean -- **Taylor:** It's not really farther than Social Security, the last meeting was much farther. This is closer for me -- **Bethea-Spearman:** I think we need to find a central location, if we can find a central location. **Sydnor:** I disagree. **Ratcliff:** The BioPark? **Bethea-Spearman:** The BioPark -- does that split east and west? Is that in the middle between east and west? **Kay:** It's probably not in the exact center, but it's close to the center. I've heard from many of you, it's a great room. I think, maybe a disadvantage is the parking isn't so great. There used to be better street parking, but they're offering more night classes so it's been a little harder. There's a garage, but people from the public would have to pay for that. There's a great circulator bus and many MTA buses that go there. The problem with central locations is they're generally downtown, which means we have to pay for them and you have to pay for parking, so we've tried not to be in downtown Baltimore, but maybe we can keep looking for something that's closer to the center. **Bethea-Spearman:** Mr. Cohen.

Cohen: Thank you Madame Chair. I agree that we had many meetings in west Baltimore and we've had meetings in western Baltimore County and that's not the same as southwest. When this line was mapped out for planning, it was broken up into five segments. Those five segments were western Baltimore County, the city line over to Hilton Parkway, Hilton Parkway to Martin Luther King, Martin Luther King to President Street, and then everything east of President Street. It's clear that if you look at the segment between Hilton Parkway and the City line, we have not been there in a while that much. I do think that rather than a central location we should try and disperse the meetings to the various segments of the line that were mapped out in the planning process. I don't think that there has been an even distribution in our meetings among those five segments. **Bethea-Spearman:** Okay, Mr. Smith.

Smith: I don't have a comment -- Mr. Cohen spoke it. But as towards our next meeting, we need to be in west Baltimore. We need to service Edmondson High School -- southwest Baltimore -- and then we can go back into what you want to pick up. We haven't been to southwest Baltimore in over a year. **Kendrick:** If the school is not available, would the new library work? **Smith:** Yes. **Bethea-Spearman:** The library's too small. **Kendrick:** That might be too small. **Cole:** Madame Chair -- just a point of clarification. The November meeting of 2009, we were at the Lockerman Bundy Elementary School. **Bethea-Spearman:** Is that southwest? That's not southwest -- that's just west. You have to be from Hilton and Edmondson Avenue -- **Sherrod:** You're the director of planning and you don't know where west and southwest is. **Bethea-Spearman:** Excuse me, excuse me Mr. Sherrod. **Cole:** It is southwest Baltimore. **Bethea-Spearman:** Excuse me. **Sherrod:** Yes ma'am. **Unknown:** I think that's the county. **Cole:** Is

it south of Baltimore Street? Lockerman Bundy is the County? **Bethea-Spearman:** No it's the city. It's the western part of the city.

Taylor: Madame Chair? **Bethea-Spearman:** Yes. **Taylor:** I agree with Mr. Smith and Mr. Cohen that distributing across the line makes some sense. I know that people from here on the east side have a hard time getting over to the west and vice versa. **Bethea-Spearman:** That's why we need a central location where it's just as difficult for you to get there as it will be for me. **Taylor:** I understand, but if we distribute it then the difficulty gets spread out, but at least that way the community members have some places where they don't have to go pay for parking or drive so far. Maybe it's not every meeting but some meetings might be made easier for some people that way. That's all I'm saying. **Bethea-Spearman:** We need to try to find a central location for these meetings because this is just getting to be a bit much. Maybe since southwest is complaining that we haven't been up there, maybe one meeting could be held at Edmondson-Westside High School, but we do need to find a central location for the meetings. I think we need to consider that. **Rev. Anthony Brown:** Madame Chair – we'll seek to do Edmondson for November and then we'll look for next year to a couple of recommendations at the November meeting for that central location. **Sydnor:** I move that we adopt what was proposed by Mr. Cohen that we rotate between the five jurisdictions for our meetings. **Taylor:** Second. **Orange:** Is that a motion? **Bethea-Spearman:** Yes, that's what he said. **Taylor:** Second.

Kendrick: Can I just make one observation. I do tend to agree with the gentlemen to my sides, but the chair's point is well taken and perhaps one way to rectify this is to not pick locations that are on the extremes of the planning area. So for example, Fells Point has been used many times. Fells Point is within the fifth area – is that right? **Taylor:** It's within the east area, that's correct. **Kendrick:** So it might be that a Fells Point or a Canton is better than a Bayview. Not better, easier. **Cohen:** Woodlawn is easier than Chadwick. Woodlawn High. **Kendrick:** Or the community center is easier than going all the way to CMS. So I think there's a balance to be struck here that's just (gestures) here-to-here and not here-to-here. **Sydnor:** I don't think Mr. Cohen's plan negates that. If they're in zones, then you pick within the zone. **Kendrick:** I was just observing for the chair, that she doesn't feel like she's driving all the way to Bayview or all the way to CMS. **Bethea-Spearman:** Seems like you just need to have a central place than going up and down the road. **Sydnor:** There is a motion on the floor. **Cohen:** Or all the way to that elementary school which was even farther out than this. **Orange:** There's a motion on the floor – are you all ready for the question? **Bethea-Spearman:** All in favor. **Moniodis:** We came the farthest and it took us 20 minutes. **Orange:** Any unreadiness?

Smith: I don't think that this was a time for a motion. It started off with Mr. Sherrod addressing Edmondson-Westside Skill Center. Since then there's been other issues about everyone deciding upon where the meeting is. I think we should delay this motion – **Orange:** No, you have to ask him to withdraw it. It's on the floor until we have a vote. **Smith:** Alright, I ask you to withdraw this motion until we decide – **Sydnor:** I don't withdraw it. I am open to making an amendment so that our next meeting will be held in whatever zone southwest Baltimore is in.

Bethea-Spearman: Okay, let's get on with the vote. **Smith:** Let's make the motion. **Bethea-Spearman:** The motion is made. **Orange:** All in favor – **Smith:** Wait a minute, he wants a clarification. **Cole:** I wanted clarification – you said you would accept an amendment. **Sydnor:** I would accept an amendment that the next meeting be held in the southwest zone. **Kendrick:** I second it. **Moniodis:** All in favor. **Cohen:** Of the amendment or the motion? **Taylor:** The motion with the amendment. **Cole:** The motion as amended. **Cohen:** Okay, alright. **Council:** Aye. **Orange:** Okay, the motion passed.

Bethea-Spearman: Next meeting agenda. **Kendrick:** Can I just respond to one point? **Bethea-Spearman:** Okay. **Orange:** Edmondson High School – I thought we agreed. **Bethea-Spearman:** I said next meeting agenda. **Orange:** Oh, oh, oh (laughter). **Bethea-Spearman:** Go ahead Jamie. **Kendrick:** I know that the chair is also the chair of the Southwest Community Development Corporation – is that right? **Bethea-Spearman:** Yes, that's my business side, yes. **Kendrick:** And in that spirit, if I recall correctly, on the selection committee for the advisory committees – Mr. Sherrod this is important, so if you'd give me 10 seconds I'd appreciate it – there were indeed community people on the selection committee for the advisory committees including a representative of, was it, the Druid Heights Community Development Corporation. I don't know the exact format and structure, staffing, etc, but I think the point ought to be made that their boundaries do include the station areas, they're actually fairly expansive boundaries. Then Ms. Conner, who is both a member of the CAC and a resident of the corridor. So I think it's a little bit inaccurate to say that there were no community people in the process. The point is well taken about the need for balance, but I think it's a little inaccurate to say there were no community people. **Bethea-Spearman:** No, you're not going to pass Sandra off as no community person. Sandra's there to represent the CAC, not whatever her community is. **Kendrick:** She's a resident of the corridor. **Bethea-Spearman:** We need community people that are not a part of the Compact statement, not a part of the CAC, but actual community people. And they don't have to hold titles. They don't have to give a big explanation because a lot of community folk are just not that articulate or whatever it may be. **Kendrick:** I'm just talking about the selection panel not the advisory committees themselves. **Bethea-Spearman:** Oh, okay. **Kendrick:** Because I believe Ms. Conner lives in Woodlawn, so she is a resident of the corridor. **Bethea-Spearman:** Well, she wasn't on there as a resident of the corridor – she's representing us. So if you all could please go back and look at that, because that is very important to me as a community leader that we have -- not the same people doing everything, that's not fair to everybody else.

Kay: Since you won't meet again for two months, we'll send you an analysis as soon as we have confirmation that people are on the committees and we'll let you know. I think you'll find that you'll be comfortable with who we have.

Orange: What are we looking for now – agenda items? **Bethea-Spearman:** Agenda items, yes. **Kay:** Can I tell you what I have? A follow-up presentation on the questions from Mr. Taylor and Mr. Cohen, the further discussion from Ms. Conner on the SAAC process – we've talked about it quite a bit tonight but I still think she's going to want to offer some perspectives. By that time we'll be in the midst of it, so she may want to talk about how it's going assuming she's still a member of a committee. The third item would be the annual report. **Bethea-Spearman:** Anybody else have anything we need to add? **Kendrick:** Just an idea, something that could be at the next meeting or the meeting thereafter. MTA is – I don't know the exact date – soon to begin demolition of the old retaining wall near the West Baltimore MARC at Pulaski Street. Setting aside the specific project for a moment, if I understand correctly, they have a pretty aggressive construction mitigation program – things like noise and dust control, hours of work – some of the things that are actually are both described in the law as well as have been raised as concerns. So it might be helpful for MTA both to update on the demolition project and also to talk about and use that as an example of trying to honor the spirit of what eventually we're going to be looking for when it's close to construction. It may not be at the next meeting, but I think in the next several meetings it would be very helpful. **Cohen:** Could we have a repetition of what the topics were that were recommended for the next meeting? **Kay:** A follow-up on our discussion about capacity, your questions about long-range planning, a report from Ms. Conner on the SAAC process at that point in time and the annual report. Then Jamie is suggesting our demolition mitigation. If I could suggest, we might want to wait until January for that. **Williams:** Isn't that

tomorrow? The Governor's coming out to Pulaski Highway tomorrow to make a dent in the wall so that they can start the demolition. That's tomorrow morning at 9:30. **Kay:** Yes, there's a groundbreaking tomorrow, but I think what's Jamie's talking about is not so much that particular project but rather the techniques we're using trying to mitigate any demolition impact.

Smith: I have a question. This wall destruction is a part of the Red Line. We haven't got a dime federally from this yet, have we? **Kay:** The project's not part of the Red Line – the project is an expansion of the parking lot at the MARC station. It accommodates the Red Line in the sense that we're not putting a parking lot where the alignment would be, but it's not part of the Red Line. **Kendrick:** It's for a second parking lot. **Smith:** It's a second parking lot of the station. This is the MARC rail project which has federal funding. **Kay:** Right. **Smith:** Because you're tying it into the Red Line which is wrong and I was questioning where you all are getting the funding from. **Kay:** There are two phases to it. The first one is being funded with one-hundred percent federal funds – it's stimulus money that we received an allocation of. We're choosing to use two-and-a-half million dollars for that project. Then the construction of the lot following is another project that's about six-million dollars and 80 percent of that will be federal funds. These are a combination of an earmark we received and also formula funds. Every year the MTA spends hundreds of millions of dollars of federal funds – **Smith:** Isn't that project kind of like mentioned in the Community Compact? **Kay:** Not specifically. **Smith:** Isn't it mentioned? Isn't that parking lot mentioned? I'm asking this question because of the jobs. Where is the community employment at? The community employment, not the professional employment, the community kids who've been trained for this type of work. **Kay:** In this particular case, the project was awarded to a contractor. We actually reached out to that contractor, we connected them with a program called Project Jump Start that is designed to recruit people from communities and make them ready for jobs. I don't know what the outcome of that was, but that contractor has his own employees – some of whom have been laid off recently and are being brought back to work to do the work. We've made them aware, as the Compact calls for, programs that are available to recruit people from the community and make them job-ready, I just don't know what the final outcome of that was. Do you know Danyell?

Danyell Diggs: They've actually hired one person, I know, from Jump Start – a 40-year-old guy, he's going to be like a safety person. They have about six minority -- DBEs and minority -- firms under Potts & Callahan. So they're doing some things as far as training to get folks ready. I also think they're going to hire an outreach person from the community for this particular job.

Cole: Madame Chair. **Bethea-Spearman:** Yes, this will be the last comment. **Cole:** I don't know whether it's an agenda item, but Mr. Kay was supposed to get us names of the planning groups for the various station areas for the next meeting. **Kay:** Yes, I'll send it out sooner. We just need some time to confirm the members and once we do I think Sandy's going to want to talk about it at the meeting itself. While we're talking about the agenda – the next meeting date is November 11th which is a holiday. So I think we're going to have to do it – **Taylor:** Today's Rosh Hashanah. **Kay:** Today's Rosh Hashanah, but November 11th is Veterans Day, so the state government is closed, so do we want to do it the day before? **Bethea-Spearman:** Maybe we could do it the 4th, maybe we need to move it up a week. We don't want to go towards the back, because that's holiday time, too. **Cohen:** Madame Chair. **Bethea-Spearman:** No, that was the last comment. **Cohen:** This is a question Madame Chair. **Bethea-Spearman:** Somebody make a motion that we close. **Sydnor:** So moved. **Cohen:** There's a question of order Madame Chair. **Bethea-Spearman:** Second – all in favor? **Council:** Aye. **Bethea-Spearman:** Thank you – I've got to ride all the way back across town.

The meeting adjourned at 9:02 p.m.

**BALTIMORE RED LINE
CITIZENS' ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING**

DATE OF MEETING: November 4, 2010
TIME: 7:00 p.m.
LOCATION: Edmondson-Westside High School

CAC ATTENDEES:

- | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|
| • Angela Bethea-Spearman, Co-Chair | • Emery Hines |
| • Dr. Rodney Orange, Co-Chair | • George Moniodis |
| • Edward Cohen | • Warren Smith |
| • Gary Cole | • Charles Sydnor |
| • Sandra Conner | • Martin Taylor |
| • Christopher Costello | • Annie Williams |

(Absent: Jamie Kendrick)

ELECTED OFFICIALS OR REPRESENTATIVES:

- Delegate Keith Haynes, Maryland General Assembly, 44th District
- Delegate Melvin Stukes, Maryland General Assembly, 44th District

MTA/CONSULTANT ATTENDEES:

- | | |
|--|---|
| • Henry Kay, Maryland Transit Administration (MTA) | • Michael Goode, Jacobs Engineering |
| • Lorenzo Bryant, MTA | • Sam Minnitte, STV |
| • Tamika Gauvin, MTA | • Kacie Levy, Rosborough Communications, Inc. (RCI) |
| • Christiaan Blake, MTA | • Tori Leonard, RCI |

GENERAL PUBLIC: 34 people signed in

Agenda

- Welcome [*Page 1*]
- CAC Member Introductions [*Pages 1-2*]
- Approval of Agenda [*Page 2*]
- Adoption of September 9, 2010 Meeting Minutes [*Page 2*]
- Joint Follow-Up Response to Capacity Analysis by M. Taylor [*Pages 2-8*]
- Annual Report [*Pages 8-11*]
- Station Area Planning Process [*Pages 11-18*]
- Public Comment [*Pages 18-22*]
- Next Meeting Agenda [*Pages 23-25*]

Angela Bethea-Spearman: We now have a quorum of eight people, so we're about to start the CAC meeting. The time is 7:08 p.m. My name is Angela Bethea-Spearman and I'm one of the co-chairs for the Red Line CAC, appointed by Senator Verna Jones in the 44th legislative district, representing the Southwest Development Committee and the Uplands Community Association. We're going to go around and start to my left with Mr. Taylor – can we start with introductions, please?

Martin Taylor: Good evening everyone. My name is Martin Taylor. I'm representing the Canton area – the mic's not on? No it's not – see if that works. It's on – I'm just not talking loud enough. I'm representing the Canton area, specifically the Cambridge Walk Community Association, where I'm president. I was appointed by Senator George Della.

Edward Cohen: Good evening, my name is Edward Cohen. I'm with the Transit Riders Action Council of Metropolitan Baltimore, the State Center Neighborhood Alliance, the West Baltimore Coalition, the Mount Vernon-Belvedere Association and the Baltimore Regional Transportation Board Citizens' Advisory Committee. I was appointed by Senator Verna Jones of the 44th district.

Emery Hines: Good evening, my name is Emery Hines. I'm from the Baltimore County Department of Public Works. I was appointed by and represent Baltimore County Executive Jim Smith.

Christopher Costello: My name is Chris Costello. I live in Westgate, which is the last neighborhood to the west before you leave the City. I'm actually listed somewhere as representing the Baltimore Metropolitan Council Citizens' Advisory Council, but I was actually appointed by the delegates in the 41st district.

Sandra Conner: Hi, my name is Sandy Conner. I am employed by Sojourner-Douglass College at the Workforce Transportation Referral Center. I was appointed to this position by the Governor.

Warren Smith: Good evening. I'm Warren Smith from the Westhills Community leadership, of the association. I was appointed by Senator, uh, what's her name? **Bethea-Spearman:** Lisa Gladden. **Smith:** Lisa Gladden. Forgive me, ma'am, I had a stroke, I can't remember everything. Thank you.

Charles Sydnor: Good evening everyone. My name is Charles Sydnor, I'm a resident of the 10th district in Baltimore County. I was asked to be on this committee by Senator Delores Kelley and appointed by Delegate Adrienne Jones.

Bethea-Spearman: Again, welcome everyone. We're going to move now to approval of the agenda. **Cohen:** Motion. **Hines:** Second. **Bethea-Spearman:** All in favor? **Council:** Aye. **Bethea-Spearman:** So approved. We're going to next move to the adoption of the September 9th meeting minutes. **Cohen:** Motion. **Costello:** Second. **Bethea-Spearman:** All in favor? **Council:** Aye. **Bethea-Spearman:** So approved. Okay, the old business that we had was Joint Follow-up Response to the Capacity Analysis by Mr. Taylor and the MTA – so how are we going to proceed?

Taylor: Mr. Kay and I talked about this earlier and where we are on this, we're actually not finished yet. We were hoping to be but it's been a busy two months for all of us. We did meet and we made a lot of progress. MTA is still working on getting us two or three things that we need. They're working on the Mobility pickups on the west side. They're working on boardings and alightings along the line and some bus routing that we'd asked for. So we're still working together, we're going to meet. We did get one thing done – this should only take a moment to go over. The MTA and the traffic engineers and Dudley Whitney from PB Engineering were able to get to us some of the responses to some of questions we had regarding traffic. What they were able to show us and we've had a little bit of a chance to talk about, but we're not anywhere near

done, is the modeling of what the traffic will look like on the entire Baltimore region's major roads with the building of the Red Line as compared to the No-Build in I think it's 2030, Henry is that correct? What we do see from our initial analysis, and we're still in discussion about this, it's by no means final. But our initial look at these numbers, what they're telling us is that about two-thousand, two hundred cars are unable or not going down Edmondson Avenue into the City from the west side, that would be if the Red Line weren't built. Now some of those cars are clearly – cars and trucks, I'm sorry -- are clearly because people are actually using the Red Line and that will take some people off the roads. But it seems from what we're seeing on the maps that the Red Line is not able to take all of those people and the traffic is being pushed around a little bit. We're still working with them on exactly what that means. We did get some initial reports on traffic in the Edmondson area and the intersection ratings were definitely worse with the Red Line built. But I don't have in front of me exactly what that was. I believe the general trend is that intersections went from A and B ratings into the D and E range, which is somewhat congested but not awful for city standards. A lot of traffic is pushed around, as far as I can tell at this point, on to Frederick Road – Frederick Avenue, excuse me – and around the Beltway's west side and on to 95 and 395. As far as people who are wanting to get into downtown and are unable to with the Red Line changes on Edmondson Avenue, particularly where there's the biggest bottleneck, but we're still working out the details. So that's, I think, about a fair summary of where we are – Henry?

Henry Kay: I don't have anything to add or further respond to that. It started, if you recall, as a conversation about the capacity of the trains themselves, we've been through some discussion with Mr. Taylor and also Mr. Cohen about that. They had follow-up questions, which we're attempting to answer. Mr. Taylor has a copy of the traffic volume map there which shows the before and after traffic volume and length of roadways. These were results that were produced by a model, so they make the best effort we can to estimate where cars will go based on constraints in the system. When you close a road, each of the cars that would otherwise use that road are going to have to be redistributed over the length of the system. What you would look for as a major problem is if there was, for example, a parallel residential street to Edmondson Avenue – there isn't – but if there was and 10-thousand cars disappeared from Edmondson Avenue and showed up on that residential street, which would be inappropriate, you would identify that and try to do something about that. We didn't see those kinds of impacts, in fact, you'd have to look pretty hard at the map to even find –

Taylor: I think I disagree with you on that point. I think there's a lot of places on the west side where the numbers go up. The question is whether the number that they're increasing is a negative impact or not. I don't know, but it's very clear that when you look at the numbers in the west side that all the roads other than Edmondson go up except maybe some where there's park and ride going on, it then goes down. **Kay:** The point I'm making is those cars have to go somewhere. Each car has to be assigned to some place – either it's out of the system because that person is on the Red Line or it's assigned to some other part of the system. I believe the link in the system that absorbs the biggest amount of change is the Beltway, which is what you'd expect. We're happy to further discuss what those changes mean, our interpretation of what the model is saying, because we appreciate that it's a specific question and we're certainly happy to follow up. This is the detail that was in the traffic analysis that was part of the DEIS for the Red Line where we compared each alternative, this is the information that we shared.

Taylor: But it wasn't published in its entirety in the DEIS. All you saw was a little snapshot that wasn't enough for the kind of questions that we're asking, which is -- the big question is does the capacity – there's three capacity issues. The first is the train itself, which we've talked about and the conclusion is that it seems that by 2030 with all the assumptions that the trains will be able to

carry enough people. There's still some disagreement about the assumptions but it seems that that's the case. Then there's the capacity of the roadway, the whole roadway network and it seems that, obviously you take 45 percent of the capacity out of Edmondson by taking the middle lane, you're going to lose roadway capacity. We're working now on that. Then the third capacity issue was the width of the street. That's another issue for another time or maybe not at all to talk about here.

Cole: I have a question for Mr. Kay. Typically when you have issues with capacity, be it over or under – how is it typically handled? **Audience member:** Can you speak into the mic, because we can't hear you. **Cole:** Typically when you have concerns about capacity, whether that capacity be over or under, how is it generally handled? **Kay:** Well, you could either do something about it or not. Frankly, in a traffic network like we have in the developed parts of this region which is where the Red Line travels – a lot of times we don't address these issues, we simply can't, there's no opportunity to widen a street, there's no opportunity to construct an additional street. We try to manage the places where it becomes the most – **Cole:** My question is about the light rail, not the street capacity. **Kay:** We either don't do something about it or we do. We can make minor adjustments to the streets themselves, the way those sections operate, or we can add mechanisms to get additional people down those streets. One of them being transit capacity – we could do that with a bus, in this case we're talking about proposing light rail. We all know we have a condition on Edmondson Avenue and other parts of the corridor where there's a lot of congestion. These roads are pretty typical actually, as Marty mentioned, for urban areas, there's a lot of congestion, which is, from a transit standpoint, a positive thing. Because it means that if you compare the level of service on a train with the experience you would have driving, you might select the train simply because it's a faster, more reliable trip. So the Red Line, one of its purposes is to absorb some of that demand and address that. Now that doesn't mean that the road is not going to be congested as a result of it. It means that all that additional capacity that exists, if the roadway that is left behind is still congested and you choose to drive on it, you're still going to experience that congestion.

Bethea-Spearman: Mr. Kay – at a point we, Council, we've got to turn the corner. **Taylor:** I understand. **Bethea-Spearman:** We've heard all of this, we keep hearing it. I know that you're new to the Council, but all of this has been addressed before. I guess the question would be – what will be done about it at this point, because a Locally Preferred Alternative has been established – whether it's the wrong mode, not the right mode, shouldn't be a train, should be a train, should it be underground, should it be on top of the ground – what options are there at this point? I look at the audience when I'm sitting here listening to you all – we don't want to give any false hopes – and I know I've mentioned this before – that it's going to change. Because quite frankly, I don't think anything is going to change. The Locally Preferred Alternative has been chosen by the Governor. I think it was very clear Tuesday night that people approve of what the Governor is doing. I don't think that it is in our best interest, as a Council that's supposed to be representing all the people, that we keep bringing up negatives. What's done is done. So where do we turn the page, where do we go from here?

Taylor: Well, I think it's important that people know what's going to happen, because we're just getting new data all the time. The LPA has changed dramatically from the DEIS – the Draft Environmental Impact Statement – 4C was very different from what we have now. So the real question is what can people expect if and, hopefully maybe, when this is built. So people on the west side should know if it's the case that all their roads are going to be much more congested than they were before. People on the east side would like to know the same thing. People would like to know if we actually build this thing is it going to make things better or is it going to make

things worse. The bottom line from the analysis that I've gotten and that we've worked with Mr. Kay and Mr. Whitney on is that things are going to be better a little bit, from my perspective.

Cole: Do I understand you to say that really the thing that is important is congestion? Forget about the environment, forget about reducing the carbon footprint, forget about energy conservation – **Taylor:** Well, all of those things get worse with the Red Line. **Cole** --forget about all of the benefits of light rail and just argue about congestion. Is that – **Taylor:** You keep bringing that up – **Cole:** Is that what I understand your concern is? **Taylor:** Absolutely not. You keep bringing up the environment. Well, we could talk about the carbon footprint – it's actually bigger with the Red Line built, by a lot. You could talk about congestion and the air quality – pollution is also bigger with the Red Line if traffic is gridlocked. People want to know are people sitting there burning gas sitting outside their front door. If the answer to that question is yes, then people have a right to know it. That's what we're trying to get at. **Cole:** That's really not what I'm hearing from you. When I -- **Taylor:** Maybe you're not listening. **Cole:** -- what I'm hearing from you is congestion, you know, destroys everything, we don't have a project – that's what I'm hearing. **Taylor:** Well if congestion's thick enough the train can't go anywhere either. **Cole:** What my alternative is, you know, there are a variety of issues with transportation – let's work on those issues. Let's make things better.

Taylor: That's the goal. But if we build a project that doesn't make things better then we're not making things better at all. **Cole:** What's your measure of making things better? Because all I see your focus is on is congestion. **Taylor:** Well, one thing making things better would be moving more people than we moved before and it wasn't at all clear until we'd actually had these meetings and it's still not completely clear that more people get to downtown and from downtown with the Red Line present than did without. That's a big question. If you're going to spend 2-billion dollars to build a transit system, you'd like to move more people than you moved before you spent 2-billion dollars.

Cole: How do you move more people with the Red Line? Don't you add more cars? **Taylor:** You can't. **Cole:** Don't you add frequent trips? **Taylor:** Well you barely can do that if the street supports it. You can't add more cars – that's the problem – this corridor – **Cole:** What kind of cars are you talking about? **Taylor:** I'm talking about train cars. You can't add more train cars. The biggest train you can run is two cars long because that's the length of the shortest block. You run longer than that, the train stops there, the roadways are congested. **Cole:** More frequency? **Taylor:** You could run more frequency only to the extent that it's supported by the roadway because the traffic still has to move both across and down the line. If a train's coming past the maximum achievable frequency – what happens is the trains back each other up. **Cole:** Do we know what that is? **Taylor:** No we don't. We have an idea of what it is and that's what the MTA would use – **Cole:** So why are we trying to kill the project? **Taylor:** Did I say we were trying to kill the project? I'm trying to figure out if we should talk about killing the project. Why are you trying to cover up what's in the project? **Cole:** I'm not trying to cover up anything. I just don't understand why all this negative stuff.

Cohen: This is stuff that we need to know about the project. **Taylor:** This isn't negative stuff, this is trying to understand what's there. **Cohen:** This is just the numbers.

Bethea-Spearman: Okay, I guess the question would be – if we found this to be true, what are we going to do about it? **Taylor:** Well that's probably above our pay grade is what I think. **Bethea-Spearman:** Oh, okay so – **Taylor:** At least then we can advise – **Smith:** I have a question. **Taylor:** -- we can do what we're mandated to do in the legislation and advise. That's the best we can do. Mr. Smith what's up? You've had your hand up for about five minutes.

Smith: Yes, it has been. **Bethea-Spearman:** I'm the chair, Mr. Taylor, and we would have gotten to Mr. Smith – **Taylor:** I'm sorry, I apologize Madame Chair – I didn't know that you saw him. **Bethea-Spearman:** -- but I wanted to give you opportunity to finish. **Taylor:** I apologize Madame Chair, no offense intended.

Smith: Isn't your report based on 2030? So what's going to happen between the time construction starts and 2030? If this is the problem we're going to have in 2030 what are we in store for in the immediate future? **Taylor:** We talked about that actually. Briefly, what happens is during construction everybody knows that you have to make compromises and to say that you wouldn't is unfair and to try to compromise a project because you're unwilling to deal with it for a year or two while you try to make things better is not fair. So we haven't really talked that much about the construction time because it's not really relevant. But the question is after construction, how does it open and then where do we go from there. We're talking about opening with trains coming about every 10 minutes, eight minutes? **Cohen:** Five minutes. **Taylor:** No, opening. **Cohen:** Oh, opening, yeah. **Taylor:** The headways are about 10 minutes and the trains will come more and more frequently over time both as we get used to the service and the MTA gets used to the service and figures out any issues. So it will actually open with significantly less capacity than it will hopefully one day be able to achieve.

Smith: What other capacity numbers are you searching for Henry? **Taylor:** I'm sorry I don't understand. **Smith:** The capacity for ridership, I believe, it was 66-thousand. **Kay:** The ridership in 2030, we're reporting that as 60-thousand. So the question for us is – can that ridership be accommodated and then how much additional capacity do we have. So, my recollection is by increasing the frequency of service we can reach a maximum of 80-something-thousand. So that allows us many decades of growth and an amount of growth that we think is reasonable. So the answer to our question is does the train service itself have the capacity to handle the demand. The answer to that is yes, to us. Madame Co-Chair, I could try to answer your question. I hope your question on the table, certainly your question for us, is not whether we're going to pick some other alternative. As you've correctly characterized, we're not going to pick another alternative. **Bethea-Spearman:** Right. **Kay:** But the reason that we're happy to continue to engage you and Mr. Taylor and Mr. Cohen is because we want to understand and we want the community to understand the impacts of the project and we want to manage those as best we can. So we don't think that the changes in traffic volume on any roadway in the region are unacceptable. We think they're alright, we think they're manageable but there's a lot of opportunity for very fine-tuning. For example, if we're going to allow left turns in some streets on Edmondson Avenue and not in others, we want to work with you and we want to work with these communities to figure out how many we should have and where they should be. And we need to get a better understanding of and carefully analyze these maps. So the question isn't, at least for me, what the alternative is going to be, the question is managing the impacts the best we can. We have a lot of work in front of us, a lot of opportunity to keep working on it.

Bethea-Spearman: But the impact should have been done before anything went to the Federal Administration. **Kay:** We characterized the impacts, at least in terms in order of magnitude and that's exactly what those maps and the traffic analysis that supported the Draft Environmental Impact Statement was about. I think I've characterized this for you previously, the whole range of impacts that we looked at, of which traffic analysis is just one, but it's important. We laid out what the traffic impacts would be of doing nothing and compared to each one of the build alternatives. In part, because of that, we picked a particular alternative, 4C, and we modified it into a Locally Preferred Alternative. So that's all been described – but as we go through the design process and we get input from the community, we can further refine that. The impacts aren't going to be worse and hopefully we can make them better, hopefully we can make them

zero, by additional work that we do as we go through the engineering process. From my standpoint, from the MTA's standpoint, the project only gets better from here in terms of how we can manage those impacts.

Bethea-Spearman: When do you go through this with the communities? **Kay:** Well, the Station Area Advisory Committee process that we're involved in now is a big part of that.

Bethea-Spearman: I thought they were supposed to be just dealing with where the stops are supposed to be, not the streets because they don't know everything about everybody's community. **Kay:** Our plan is to bring in experts on traffic impacts and be able to talk to them. A very important question to answer for streets like Edmondson and streets like Boston is what we want to do with the remaining right-of-way. We know that the transitway is a certain width, there's quite a bit more right-of-way out there – what do we do with it? Do we devote it all to thru capacity, do we devote it to one-lane thru and a bike lane and parking? We proposed an idea in the DEIS, which is have two thru lanes and one lane of parking, but it may be that the communities want something different. So in this Station Area Advisory Committee process and any engineering that goes along with it, we can talk to communities about those choices that they can make. So, yeah, locating the station is important, naming the station, designing the station, but how traffic works around that station is also a part of that process.

Bethea-Spearman: Then it's going to be a problem – because at the Edmondson Avenue station where's the community representation of the communities that are being directly impacted, that you're going to allow these community people who do not live in the community, they don't have anything to do with what's going on in the Uplands or the Rognel Heights community or their streets – how are they going to make that determination when those representatives are not on that committee? **Kay:** Well maybe Ms. Conner wants to talk about this more when we get to that place on the agenda, but the idea of a Station Area Advisory Committee, is that they do include immediate neighbors for the station, but they also include people in the larger community that that station's going to serve. All of us, in a sense, will own these stations – every person in the region who pays for the project, uses the project – it's not just the people who literally live across the street – **Bethea-Spearman:** But they're the ones that's being impacted. **Kay:** They do – and we have to have an additional, separate conversation with the people who live across the street. The Station Area Advisory Committee, because we want input from that larger community, that's not going to substitute for knocking on each door of every person who lives around those stations to talk to them about that. There will be very micro level kinds of conversations to have with people. You know, should we allow room for a tree or do you not want a tree. If we have to tear up your sidewalk, do you want the same sidewalk back or do you want a different one. I mean, those are the kind of conversations that we will have with every affected property owner in addition to the advisory committee.

Bethea-Spearman: Okay, we've been on this for about – I'm going to go to Warren. Can you just take a minute? **Smith:** Yes, please. **Bethea-Spearman:** One minute? **Smith:** Yes. Sir you're talking about a three-lane highway that's out there now. You're talking about taking two lanes or even the median for the flow of traffic. Now you're talking about a bike lane, reducing these lanes to two lanes, which means you're now taking these people's fronts. You're not going to bother the fronts? **Kay:** We would never propose an alternative that took additional property. We've talked about this many times. What we're just talking about is the options that we have to use that remaining property. We know how much room the Red Line takes up, we know how much room is out there and then we have to go through a process deciding what to do with the rest of it. **Smith:** You've all made up your mind, you have something that's in your pockets, that's in your dossier of information. Mr., Mr., -- the Korean guy, I can't remember his name. **Bethea-Spearman:** Mr. Goon. **Smith:** Mr. Goon stood up here at Edmondson High School and

showed a slide, one time where it's going to take people's fronts and move their sidewalks up – **Taylor:** They're still doing that. **Smith:** -- or back. And you're telling us that it's not going to happen. **Kay:** We're not taking any property. There may be situations where we'd have to change the grade in front of a home, but in that case we would restore it. If you want us to come back and have that conversation again—**Smith:** Yes, please. **Kay:** -- we can. We've done some additional work since then to try to further refine those designs. But all of it is premised on the idea that we would work within the right-of-way.

Hines: Just one thing Henry – **Bethea-Spearman:** This is going to be the last comment. **Hines:** It is only a comment – next time you meet, Mr. Taylor, could you please do me a favor and just pop me an e-mail, because you know I run the model also, and I'd like to see what you guys are doing, that's all. **Kay:** You could help us a lot in terms of what the county is doing, you've got the kind of knowledge that could help a lot. **Hines:** And me, too.

Taylor: Madame Chair, just – **Bethea-Spearman:** We're going to move on – that was the last comment. We're going to move on to new business and that's starting with Mr. Costello and the Annual Report.

Costello: Thank you very much Madame Chairman. For the people in the audience, as well as the members, there has been in effect a group that has been working on our annual report. Part of the legislation that created the Red Line Citizens' Advisory Committee requires that this group submit an annual report. The legislation says it's due in September, but we've always been in a situation where we've been able to get it to them before the beginning of the new legislative session, which is when they really would have time and inclination to look at such things. What this report really is is an indication of what we have been doing as a Citizens' Advisory Committee. Part of that is what we have heard from the community. While we bring to this meeting impressions and goals and objectives, one of our primary concerns is to make sure that the concerns that are being expressed by everyone in the community is reflected in this report. Of course, those concerns come up at every meeting and the minutes from those meetings are, I would say, the most complete minutes of any organization I've ever been associated with – it is verbatim. So that is part of this report – it is not in the summary of the report that I'm going to go over here. Also in the report are any handouts, materials that are passed out during the course of the meetings. And of course, any news media coverage that occurs during the year – our year runs from October to September.

Costello: The first thing in the report really is just much of what I've just said – a summary of the fact that we've been meeting, that we've been discussing various different topics relating to the planning and the concerns that relate to the planning and the possible construction of the Red Line. We've included a summary of all the topics that we've discussed, which are also what you see on the agenda for this meeting here, just simply so that the legislators, when they look through, they can see in one place the topics we've been discussing or that have been presented to us and where we've been holding meetings, which is very important to the legislators, to make sure that we're moving around the corridor that the Red Line serves. I think that you can see from that that we've been here on the west side, in the downtown area, to the east side and several locations. Of course, it makes a point of what some of the major concerns are – some of which you've just heard – about the capacity and how it's going to affect the streets over which the light rail will travel and what effect that will have on the residents in the area. Of course, the purpose for the Red Line which is improving public transportation and hopefully improving the environment. We've kept track of everybody, of ourselves, in terms of our attendance at these meetings. I think for the most part we've had very good attendance; I don't think we've had anybody who's attended fewer than 70 percent of the time. We also tracked the consultants that

come. I made one slight counting error – we had a total of, anywhere as many as seven people at a time but a total of 19 appearances by consultants or people with the MTA – no, that was legislators, 19 appearances by legislators or their representatives and 52 MTA and MTA consultants. We had a total of 144 people attend at the meetings that we held. That gives legislators a pretty good idea of pretty much what the topics were, how many people were there and how busy we have been over the past year. The next section, section three, we call it the Red Line Planning Process Update, really talks about not what the CAC is doing so much, but what the state of Maryland, MTA is doing in its planning process. This is information that's available on a number of sources. I took a good bit of this from the Red Line website which certainly legislators are free to go back and review on their own, but I thought putting it in this report would be a convenience to them to have it here in the report. The next section of the report is our mission. Now the legislation which was passed in, I guess it was 2007, no – it wasn't 2007. When was that legislation passed? 2004 or 2005? **Kay:** Six. **Costello:** Okay 2006.

Audience member: I don't want to stop you from talking, but we don't have that report in front of us – **Costello:** I know. **Audience member:** Could we get a copy? **Taylor:** You can have mine. **Costello:** If people would like them, there's some up front. **Bethea-Spearman:** These are not public until after they've gone to the legislative officials. **Costello:** Right. **Taylor:** Oh, I'm sorry, I didn't realize that. **Costello:** Right, well this is just a draft. What I'm reporting on is what our – **Bethea-Spearman (to Taylor):** Yes, you need to get it back, because they can only go out once the legislators have approved it. **Connor:** Actually, he doesn't need to go over everything, Madame Chair. **Bethea-Spearman:** Mr. Costello. **Costello:** Yes ma'am. **Bethea-Spearman:** Can you wrap up in a few minutes instead of going through the entire report? **Costello:** I can end it now, but I think there's only one correction that I want to make. On the last page in the comment section, where two of the groups made their comments available and we just had to make a slight change there where they indicate certain groups that had expressed a particular point of view and we learned after this came out that one of the groups should not be listed amongst that group, which will be changed. All of this will be updated for style and any other suggestions that come in from the members. It will be finalized, assuming that the committee votes to support this, and will go out to our legislators and it will be put on the website for the world to see. Thank you very much Madame Chair, I'd be glad to answer any questions.

Bethea-Spearman: Thank you Mr. Costello. Is there any question from the Council for Mr. Costello? Go ahead Mr. Sydnor. **Sydnor:** Thank you. I just noticed a few things that I thought should be corrected – can I send those corrections to you Mr. Costello? **Costello:** Sure. Is there anything you want to throw out here to the members in case – **Sydnor:** On the second and third page, I remember when we met at the University of Maryland Baltimore, it was the same place, but I noticed on the report it was actually titled two different names. On the meeting attendance, the column for February was missing. **Costello:** We didn't meet in February – did we? **Sydnor:** It says February 2010, Woodlawn High School. **Costello:** That's a good catch – thank you very much. **Sydnor:** No problem. And my attendance should have been yes in January and no for the February meeting. Finally, for the elected officials on page 5, I recall Delegate Keith Haynes being present at the November meeting at Lockerman Bundy. **Costello:** Delegate Keith Haynes – at what meeting? **Sydnor:** Lockerman Bundy which is in November. **Cohen:** Yes, he was there. **Sydnor:** Thank you. **Costello:** I took this from the minutes, so I'll go back and double-check, but I'm sure I made a mistake. Thank you very much.

Bethea-Spearman: Any other comments about the 2010 Annual Report? Well put together, yes it was well put together. **Costello:** Carmen was a big help. **Kay:** Recently, Mr. Costello asked us to update the data tables that are on pages 11, 12 and 13. We had not gotten the numbers yet, so what we need to do is replace the numbers that are here with numbers that reflect the current

LPA. These numbers are, I think, for 4C, so we can update them. We have that ready and I'll get that to Chris tomorrow. They're not numbers you all haven't seen before, they're the same LPA numbers but I think it's important that they're accurate, so we'll get those to you. **Costello:** We had asked for them to look at the numbers and we hadn't gotten them as of today, so I'll be glad to get that. If there's no objection I'll put that in and submit it. So just to regroup, we're putting in that we had a meeting in February – right? **Cohen:** Which is listed on page 4. **Costello:** It is. I'm trying to think when did we go to every other month – it must have been after February. **Cole:** We did Woodlawn – I remember going to Woodlawn High School. **Cohen:** We skipped December. **Costello:** We did skip December, but when did we go to the alternating months? **Council member:** [Inaudible]. **Costello:** So we would have been January, March – **Bethea-Spearman:** Whenever it was, can we go back and check the minutes and correct it at that time instead of holding up the meeting? **Costello:** That's a very important point, though, thank you very much. We do need to get that straight. I'll go back and pull all the minutes and make sure I've got it correct. **Kay:** You know those are all on the website. **Costello:** Yeah they are and you e-mail them to us, so I've got that.

Bethea-Spearman: We've got a lot of e-mails. Okay, moving on – **Cole:** I just want to make one point of clarification. On page 20, under item Roman numeral seven, the community response – I just want to be clear that the responses on behalf of the Cambridge Walk Community Association and the Transit Riders Action Committee – **Cohen:** Action Council. **Cole:** Council – no, it says Committee here. **Cohen:** It says Committee, then it says, okay – **Costello:** That's my mistake. **Cohen:** It should be Council. **Costello:** It should be Council – I'll change that. **Cole:** Just some points of clarification – sometimes it appears to be somewhat confusing to me that sometimes you're speaking on your behalf. It appears sometimes you're speaking on behalf of your organizations and then sometimes you're speaking on behalf of the CAC. My point of clarification is I'm fine with you speaking on your behalf and your organizations' behalf, but I think – **Bethea-Spearman:** Who are you talking to? **Taylor:** He's talking to me and to Ed. **Bethea-Spearman:** Oh. **Cole:** Right. As long as we're clear that – **Connor:** What page? **Bethea-Spearman:** Twenty. **Cohen:** That's why it's right at the top, so that that would be clear. **Cole:** Okay. **Costello:** I did, I put that in on my own. **Taylor:** It is actually on behalf of our organizations, not on behalf of the CAC. **Cole:** Okay. **Bethea-Spearman:** No, it's not on behalf of the CAC. **Taylor:** It's in the community response section, Gary, that's the idea, that it's from the community. **Cole:** I just want to make sure that everybody understands.

Cohen: Madame Chair – motion to accept the report with corrections. **Bethea-Spearman:** Before we do the motion, shouldn't we strike members of the Red Line Citizens' Advisory Council if they're talking on behalf of their communities? **Connor:** I think so. **Bethea-Spearman:** We shouldn't have that on there. **Cohen:** I think it just identifies that we are members, not that we were speaking on behalf of the CAC. **Bethea-Spearman:** I think that this needs to be stricken and just leave the community, your organizations up there and your names. **Cohen:** I have no problem with it. **Taylor:** It doesn't say it's from the CAC, it says it's not at all from the CAC. [inaudible] If somebody actually does read this, it lets them know that these are people who are informed in the CAC process. That's just my opinion, but if you prefer that it's stricken I won't be upset. **Bethea-Spearman:** Can we get another opinion or other opinions? **Connor:** I would suggest that we remove it from this report. If anyone wants to know who you are, they can see your name because you're mentioned on the front page, so it's not necessary to add that comment at this place, on this page.

Bethea-Spearman: Okay – go ahead with your motion again Mr. Cohen, please. **Cohen:** Motion to accept the report with corrections. **Taylor:** Second. **Bethea-Spearman:** All in favor? **Council:** Aye. **Bethea-Spearman:** Anybody oppose? Okay, so moved. Submit the

report with corrections Mr. Costello. Good report, too, you all did a great job as you usually do.

Cohen: And, once again, Carmen Morosan was a great help. **Bethea-Spearman:** Miss Carmen, thank you. Now we're going to move on to the Station Area Planning process. Sandra?

Conner: Okay, if in fact you've had an opportunity to read the minutes from the September meeting, there was lots of information about the Station Area Advisory Committees, how the individuals were selected, the process that was used to get them to be on the various committees that we had. There are 20 stations altogether – we ended up with 17 Station Area Advisory Committees. I wasn't here to give my personal comments, but I believe the process was done rather fair and consistent with the process that we had designed to look at. I'd like to commend the efforts that were made by Danyell Diggs and also MTA, because they did a very extensive job of going out and trying to get people to place their applications for the particular Station Area Advisory Committees. Although I saw that Mr. Kay, in his comments in the last minutes, that we don't necessarily want to call them applications because they really weren't applications per se. But I think they did a great job getting people to get involved. One of the things I think I have a concern about – I've already shared this with our Chairperson, Ms. Bethea – is that I believe perhaps we could have been even more effective ourselves, if in fact we wanted to make sure that we had the right persons on our station area advisory committees. From a CAC perspective there is some concern about that. I believe we made every attempt to pick those persons who lived in a particular area, particular neighborhood to make sure that we had a mixture of people to get involved, to make sure we had a good mix of businesses, users of the services as well as those who live in the community. I agree with what Mr. Kay said earlier tonight also, in that what will have to happen is you can't just simply go by what the Station Area Committee folk will say or give recommendations. There will still be a need to do outreach to the people who really are impacted by what's going on in the neighborhoods and their communities. I serve on the Social Security Administration SAAC and I had some concerns myself personally, because persons who were assigned to be on that SAAC didn't live in my neighborhood. And we also found out that a lot of people were omitted and were not involved. As a matter of fact we had our first SAAC meeting and one of the roles of SAAC persons or members is to go out and inform community members of what's going on. I had an individual meeting in my neighborhood and people did not even know about the Red Line. But all of a sudden now they're concerned because it's now closer to reality than just simply seeing it on TV or in print somewhere. So these are the kinds of things that I think the SAAC will be used to get the message out to get people engaged.

Connor: I also shared with our Chairperson Angela Bethea-Spearman that we need to be engaged in looking at what we want our neighborhoods to look like. What do we want to see in our neighborhoods? It was mentioned also earlier today by Mr. Kay that we'll have an opportunity to say exactly where the station will go. What might happen to transform the neighborhood and that is what role persons will serve being on the SAACs. We may not be able to get all that we want but we can begin identifying the things we want to improve in our neighborhoods and our communities. Almost all of the 17 SAACs have had their meetings already. If you want to know more about them, information can be found about them in their minutes on the New Links, that's found on MTA's website. Then you can also just simply talk to people and individuals, just to get a sense or feel for what's going on in their meetings. I've had an opportunity to talk to some of the other Station Advisory Committee persons just to get a sense of what's going on in their meetings and I'm excited about what they're saying and what they're doing. A lot of people are really excited about the process. What I really think a lot of people got excited about was, most recently, MTA hosted a New Links meeting, a workshop for the 400 or so people who are volunteering to be on the Station Area Advisory Committees, to come and to learn from national experts, different kinds of things that would impact our neighborhoods -- where the station design would go, what troubles or opportunities for improvement would you have to go through in order

to have a station design in a certain way that you might want it to be. There were all kinds of presenters to come to tell us about their success stories throughout the country and that was quite impressive for me. But what I liked the most about the meeting that was held on October 9th, the workshop, was that Congressman Elijah Cummings was there. This was a message that I heard him say, that I think we all should more or less take into consideration -- is that we need to think in terms of not what's happening for us right now today, but be futuristic about what's going to happen in our neighborhoods, for our children and our children's children yet to come, to use the transportation systems that are being designed right now. That's my report for the Station Advisory Committee.

Bethea-Spearman: I'm going to go back, Sandra, and address Mr. Kay from the last CAC meeting. There's much concern about the people that are on these SAACs. I thought you said at the last meeting that where there was a president and a vice-president then you chose the higher office. I know for a fact that there are presidents and vice-presidents and their children serving on one committee -- that should not be. I also raised concerns about people that are a part of the Red Line Compact being involved on these SAACs. We should not be utilizing the same people, or people's favorites that they like, that they want to get along with, that they choose to work with -- but truly a community advisory council. That's not what's reflected in those councils -- not at all. You can't say to one community, we're only going to choose this person, but you take another community you've got president, vice-president, husbands, wives, lovers, sons, daughters -- I know because it's my area. I know on one other advisory SAAC you have a bunch of businesses, all that pretty much signed the Compact statement. These things are not fair, no they're not. We cannot, I don't think that the Council should sit back and just accept that. I want to know what is MTA going to do to correct that. You can clearly see if you looked at the addresses on the applications, applicants or whatever you want to call them, that you had a son and his mother coming out the same house. There was no mistake you all could have made that, no way you all made that mistake. If you had Ms. Diggs on there and somebody for Planning, they know these leaders who are presidents and vice-presidents, so that mistake shouldn't have been made. Especially when you avoided people -- for whatever the reason, I ain't going to go there -- for whatever the reason, these SAACs need to be redone. They're not fair, they're not fair. CAC people should not be on the SAACs. It's not fair to the rest of the citizens to have CAC members on the SAAC, the same people that signed the Compact statement on the SAAC, pretty much one whole group is one community on a SAAC. I mean, there's no excuse for that, there's no excuse for that.

Conner: Can I comment? **Bethea-Spearman:** Go ahead. **Conner:** I don't have the exact numbers for, I think you're talking about Allendale, we talked about the mother, the father, whoever else is all on one. The optimum number that we were working with was 20 persons. I think on that particular SAAC we did not have 20 persons. The young man that you're speaking of, the reason why he may have been added to that SAAC is because he brings certain gifts and certain talents, he brings some artistic talents that we could perhaps use, not only for that SAAC but other areas. That was perhaps the reason why he was chosen. If in fact you speak of me, and I can only speak for myself, I'm on a SAAC. Had there been -- **Bethea-Spearman:** Several of you are. **Conner:** Had there been more than 20 persons in my particular area I would have backed off. But I am on a SAAC where I am directly affected by it. I probably was the only community person on my particular SAAC that was chosen. We didn't have 20 people. The places where we didn't have a challenge was Edmondson Avenue and West Baltimore -- that was where we had more people to try to deal with placing and getting the persons to meet the number of 20. For the most part, like I said before, I believe the process was very fair and we did the best that we could based on the information that was given, to make sure we placed the people on the right SAACs.

Bethea-Spearman: But we have more information now, because I've read the list. I want to know from MTA how are you going to straighten out those SAACs? Because the way that you all have them, I'm telling you as a community representative, is not fair to the community. I don't care what you call yourselves doing, it's wrong, it's wrong.

Kay: The bottom line is we used a process that was open, we had people nominate themselves, we had a very broad-based committee of people who selected the people to actually be on the committees. They did represent individual community associations, but also members of communities who were not part of associations, they represented businesses, churches, schools – the principal of this school is on a SAAC. What we were trying to do is capture all the interests that exist in a half-mile area around the station. In some cases we had many more people than we could accommodate and we had to be selective. In some cases we had many fewer and in a few cases we combined committees because we had so many fewer. In other words, it was a situation where the people on this committee – and Ms. Conner sat there for every minute of two days of work while we were having these conversations so she knows what we went through – we just tried to create what we thought would be a good, productive group of people who can discuss these questions about these stations in these communities. I'm sorry you feel that way – we're not going to change them at this point. I don't mean to be disrespectful or disagreeable, but they've met once, sometimes twice now. They've been very positive experiences, people are happy to be there. I know there are folks who wanted to be on one and are not and are disappointed. I know that with the benefit of hindsight we realize that we picked a husband and wife, but we wouldn't have had any way of knowing that. But each of these people filled out an application or a form and offered some contribution that we thought was productive. They'll meet over the course of a year-and-a-half, we'll see what happens at the end but from the meetings that they've had and for that New Links workshop it's been very positive. We're hearing all kinds of ideas and thoughts that we haven't heard before, so I appreciate that. It doesn't take anything away from this process or your perspective on it, but I feel pretty good about it. **Bethea-Spearman:** Go ahead.

Cohen: Thank you Madame Chair. I am a member of the University Center/Howard Street SAAC. I believe that of the 15 members of that SAAC, about seven of them come from the University of Maryland, so that is a lot of overweighing and I think I may be the only resident that's on that SAAC. One of the problems that I noticed – and as Henry knows I attended a few of these but I only am a member of one, but I attended just to see how they were going and to compare – there is a lack of understanding on the part of the members of the SAACs as to what the function of the SAAC is and I wish that you would address that to us now because it did seem to be very unclear at all three of the meetings that I attended as to what is the role of the SAAC and how much it can influence this process. So could you just explain that clearly because it did seem to be a problem and I think you noticed it, too.

Kay: Thank you – I appreciate that. That's not a question that has a definitive answer because we're trying not to be overly prescriptive about this process. What we've offered in each case is a framework that lasts a certain amount of time, a certain number of meetings, a general list of topics, staffing for each one of them, a review of what we already know about the station area, a willingness to answer questions that come up, you know, it may be different. Some groups may focus entirely on design issues, some may focus entirely on traffic – we're not going to require that they both focus on both. So it's going to really depend on what the members of those groups want to talk about. I think that the conversation at the University of Maryland, for example, would be very different than it would be in Canton, because the station is physically different, the community around it is different, the issues are different – and that's fine. We just didn't feel like

we could make 20 different stations, 17 different committees exactly the same. At the first meeting we may have been too shy about trying to lay out a mission for the group, hoping that one would come from the discussion itself and so we're trying to correct that for the second and third meetings. I think that the program for each one of them will be clearer as we go along. I went to two – one on the far west side and one on the east side – they were quite different from one another -- actually I went to three – in terms of what people expected, what they brought to the table, their familiarity with the project. I was happy that we weren't predetermining what they were going to talk about, but on the other hand I do share your concern that some may meander, because if they don't come together in that way we're going to have to provide a level of staffing that helps address that.

Cohen: Another thing I think that would be helpful is this: it is clear that the facilitators have different levels of knowledge of the Red Line. So over at the Greentown/Highlandtown you had Holly who has been in MDOT and knows the Red Line and has been involved in this process for most of a decade so she could discuss what was going on. But at some of the others you had facilitators who are not even from Baltimore and they were giving out information that wasn't necessarily accurate. I think it's very important that there be somebody from MTA at each of these meetings to make sure that the information that is coming out is accurate information, because there were a few cases where it wasn't.

Kay: I appreciate that. It's a little challenging for us to cover all of them with the limited amount of staff we have, but people do deserve, if they ask a factual question about the project it should be right. **Bethea-Spearman:** Mr. Smith?

Smith: Mrs. Chairperson and Mr. Cohen, Mr. Kay, I think the family issue – father, son and mother involved – for a better perspective I think that should belong to the community. There should not be three people from one house anywhere on this committee. Why can't it be just like our house – someone's the head and the people usually filter the information to the head. Why can't that house be the same as the rest of us? We could find two people out here in this audience to represent those two people. That is wrong that it's three people in one house.

Kay: Let's be clear – people aren't voting, they're not being paid to participate in this process, I mean it's a discussion. **Smith:** It's affecting their homes. **Kay:** The way I'd put it is the way I've characterized it, which is where we saw that individual people offered something, brought something to that process we focused on that more than we did the fact that they were part of the same association. I think in many cases, we saw that people were in the same household, you know a husband and wife for example and we selected only one. I think there were cases where we didn't know people were husband and wife and we selected them both. We probably wouldn't have had we known that. But in the end the thing that mattered the most was how people were expressing their level of interest and the skills they thought they were bringing to it. I think the group will quickly recognize that people live together in the same household and we'll take that into consideration. But it's not a vote, it's a discussion. It's like any community planning process. I'm a professional planner, Mr. Cole is, Mr. Hines is, I mean, you take who comes out and you're happy to have them and you focus on what people have to offer.

Smith: But you yourself said no, you would not change. You yourself said that. That closed that process right there. And that's what made me ask the question – why can't those people be replaced? You've only had three meetings this far and you've got 20 more to go – why can't we take care of this problem now?

Kay: I don't think it's fair to people who've participated so far. It's just an imperfect process. We are happy to have the advice, but at the end of the day it's advice. It's not a vote, it's not elected officials, I mean we're not going to take it that literally. **Smith:** If that person was living somewhere else I wouldn't be opposed to that position, but they're living in the same house. The father tells the mother, 'Hey, baby this is what we're working on.' She tells him whatever her answer is and why can't the father bring it forth?

Conner: I think in the case that you're talking about – I don't have all the details or information in front of me – I don't think that we really realized that initially completely to that extent. I'm trying to remember how many persons that may have been in that particular SAAC that would have caused us to even select them to begin with anyway. If in fact somebody was not chosen it was because either they said they wanted to be in another – there was some reason, but I don't know why. I don't think we just intentionally said oh, we're going to pick these three and we're going to make them be a part of the SAAC.

Roberta Smith: I think it's a lack of communication. A lot of people don't even know about the Red Line as of yet. And like the young gentleman said, you take three people from one family. Why didn't more people in that neighborhood surrounding know about that to come and put their names down because information is not getting out to people. I live in an area where people are still asking me questions about the Red Line. I try to come to as many meetings as I can. The big thing that I'm hearing in my ear now from my neighbors in my neighborhood, the buzz is that 204 school will be closed. 'Ms. Smith is 204 school closing for the Red Line?' I do not know, I will try to go and get that information for you. So it's like it's a closed society that you have already made up your minds about some things and nobody else is going to be able to come in and voice their opinion. I believe it's written in stone. When this gentleman here said it could not be changed, it just floored me, because he said there are no decisions being made by those people or anything, so why couldn't he go to Mr. Jones or Mrs. Jones or the son and say could somebody else go in your place, would you be willing to step off of that committee? I can't see where if it wasn't stamped with something on it that it would [inaudible] like you said. I can't understand that.

Conner: I just want to comment. What is happening in the SAACs, in my particular one as a matter of fact – we kind of like control what's going to happen, what's going on in our group. So if in fact that's a problem for that particular SAAC, maybe that's where the process can be improved upon and/or changed. And to your first point –

R. Smith: I don't even know about a SAAC. I'm, just letting you know how he said the process [inaudible]. I feel that's the way a lot of this has been presented to the people. It's just, give it to them and that's it. They can either accept it, roll with it or you just...

Conner: I appreciate you bringing that comment up about a lot of folk don't know about the SAACs, etc. and what's going on with the Red Line. Actually, I'm going to take personal responsibility for it just like in my neighborhood where people didn't know. I thought I was communicating, I thought I was sharing information, but they apparently were not getting it until now when it's really right in their back door. I also said to Madame Chair that if in fact people did not know about the SAAC process and how to apply – that was our job and our role. We probably should have been out there as well pushing people to say, hey, get your applications in. We were doing this process beginning from February all the way up to August. Information was presented at some of our CAC meetings, it was on TV, it was on different places, it was out there. Unfortunately some people didn't get to hear about it and I take responsibility for anybody not

knowing about it in my area, that did not have that same opportunity. Hopefully, the other SAAC members will feel the same way.

Bethea-Spearman: Ms. Annie. **Williams:** I'm on the SAAC team, Station Advisory Committee. We in Harlem Park only have nine people on ours. It started out to be one big one and we raised so much sand until they broke it down into three. So, I'm saying if there's a problem, Mr. Kay, then -- we were supposed to have 15, we only have nine. Plus it's only two of us out of Harlem Park that is on that committee anyway and that's Arlene Fisher and myself. Everybody else is from somewhere else. You can invite one of them to join ours and that would settle that problem if you wanted to pick another person from that neighborhood, right? Do people actually have to live in that particular community? I mean he lives on the Red Line, right? So can't you kind of move him or move one of them to ours and make it an even 10 and that would solve the problem.

Kay: As part of that process we asked people to tell us what their first choice was and what their second choice was and we tried to accommodate them. So that would be a case where we've taken someone who specified one choice and putting them on another one. Whether they'd be interested in doing that I don't know. **Williams:** But you could ask. **Kay:** We're talking about a lot of people. I mean we had about 400 people nominate themselves, we ended up picking about 260, so there are plenty of people out there who were interested that we didn't accommodate. Again, there are practical limits to the size of these groups. We decided it should be 20. You could say it could have been 25 or some people could have said it could have been 10. **Williams:** We only have nine. We're a small group because they at the last minute decided to separate West Baltimore and make it West Baltimore, Harlem Park and Poppleton, which means it stretched it out. So that in that particular area nobody in Harlem Park wanted to, by that time, wanted to be on the SAAC committee. Kate Howard called me, she said 'yours has no one from Harlem Park', and that's how we ended up on the committee, not because we wanted to but because no one else in Harlem Park wanted to be on it. So we have a couple of people from Sandtown, we have people from out of the Historical Society because they work in our neighborhood that ended up on it, so that's how we came up with just nine. But it is still room for at least up to 15. **Bethea-Spearman:** Let me explain why I have a problem with it Ms. Annie. Appearance is everything -- everything. If you pick the same people that signed the Community Compact, you're picking the same people that signed the Community Compact to be on the SAAC. What's going to happen if we go further up the road and there's other processes that communities are supposed to be participating in and having a part of? What, are we going to turn around and pick the same hand-picked few that we've been dealing with since the beginning of the process? What's going to happen in the hiring process? Oh, now we're going to turn around and we're going to pick the people that's on the SAAC and we're going to hire them now? Where do you have any morals? Where do you have any ethics? That's why I have -- it's not -- let me stop the public, because it's not public comment period. We will get to that once we try to get business straight up here. But that is where I'm coming from. If you're picking the same people, recycling the same people over and over and over and over, that is not a community process. That's where I'm coming from with that. And then, my thinking is, okay, so you shut this part down -- what's going to happen when we get to the hiring and you turn around and you pick the same people, because I'm sure somebody's looking out for them, too, just like somebody on the committee was looking out for the people that are on the SAACs -- we're going to hire the same folk?

Kay: With all respect to your position, I think the situation you're describing refers to an incredibly small number of the 260 or -70 people that we selected. I mean, we were amazed and pleased that so many of the people who nominated themselves we had never heard from before. They were new people who brought new ideas, new energy, new perspectives to this process. I

mean, Ms. Connor was there representing you all and I think she can attest to that. This was not about recycling the same people again. Some of those names are familiar, because when you look at a nomination form and we say what are you interested in, what do you bring to the table and someone writes us a thoughtful paragraph, we're going to look more kindly on that person than someone who just gives us their name and nothing else. So the person who gives their name and nothing else could be, from your perspective, the best person to be on that committee but we have no way of knowing that. We had to go on what people said. I can also assure you – and Sandy can agree with this – we didn't just pick people who liked the project. Plenty of people said very critical things about the project – we wanted them, too. That means that many of them were new to the process. It was, I think, the biggest new infusion of interest in the project that we've seen in several years. **Bethea-Spearman:** We're going to end on Mr. Cole.

Cole: Just a couple of questions. With respect to the SAACs – all of those meetings are open to the public? **Kay:** Yes. **Cole:** Okay. **Bethea-Spearman:** They can't comment, though. **Cole:** They can't comment? **Bethea-Spearman:** Unh, unh. **Cole:** Can they submit written comments?

Kay: We don't try to make that overly formal and we'll see how that goes. I think the SAACs themselves would be happy to have those comments. I don't know, trying to create some time on the agenda might be unwieldy, but it will probably just depend on the meeting. But I think those folks can find a way and what we'd encourage the SAAC members to do is, again, be liaisons and ambassadors to their own communities, to go back out and talk to people and spread the word that way. That, I think, is a way to take advantage of all the community meetings that already takes place. So rather than have everyone come to a specific meeting to sit around and listen, it's a way of spreading the word in a way that works for that individual community. **Cole:** Okay. And my second question was similar to Mrs. Williams' question and that is, if there is a committee that is light in terms of membership or if you lose members, is there an opportunity to pick up additional members so that they can fully function?

Kay: I think that's a very practical suggestion and it's pretty generous on your part to welcome people who are not from your community to be on the group. It's a little logistically difficult because we would have no way of knowing – we all know individual people who would have liked to have been included and we can contact them. But of the 150 or so that we sent letters to saying 'thank you, but no thank you', we have no way of, unless we reach out to all of them again. We don't have enough spots to really accommodate them. The other thing I'd be concerned about is that members of the SAAC that have already started to meet might not feel as generous as you are about having these folks come in. That's a nice idea. For the few folks that have contacted us and say they feel very strongly about the fact that they want to participate, I don't see why we couldn't do that. We did set a limit of 20, but there are a number that are below 20, but – **Cole:** My last comment – and Madame Chair, no disrespect – but I kind of have mixed emotions about, and I'm just going to talk about CAC members being on the station committees.

Taylor: Gary, can you talk in the mic, please? **Cole:** Alright. I have mixed emotions about the CAC members being on the station area committees. That is because the information that we got from Mr. Cohen, Ms. Williams and Sandra, I think, is beneficial and can be helpful to us. Also, I think that the members can provide the station areas with some beneficial information. So I have mixed emotions. I'm not going one way or the other, but I do see the benefit of members being on a committee.

Smith: I'd like to comment on that please. **Taylor:** Quick question. **Bethea-Spearman:** What's your question, Mr. Taylor? **Taylor:** I just don't understand something Mr. Kay said.

You said these committees are, you said before like Boston Street and Edmondson you suggested two lanes and then you made a suggestion that, well, it could be one lane and a bike lane, or you know, it might be more parking. Then the question is if the SAAC isn't deciding anything, whose going to decide, is the SAAC deciding that? Then if the SAAC is deciding that and the community isn't represented there then I see that that's a problem. **Bethea-Spearman:** That's right, that's right. **Taylor:** And if the SAAC's deciding that and no one's there to tell them that the project doesn't work from a traffic perspective if they take one of the two lanes, then that's a big problem, too. I know that MTA's going to be there, but still, if the only people there are businesses like in Canton and there aren't that many community members there -- although it was better than I thought, actually, in the initial attendance, it's a problem. I agree with that, but I also agree with Mr. Cole that having the CAC members there might be helpful for both information to and from the SAAC. But anyway, could you please...?

Kay: Yeah -- they're Station Area Advisory Committees, so they're advisory in the same way that this Council is advisory. Their input is incredibly important and there are a number of things that are on the table for them to, where we can really [inaudible] their input, there are some things where we can't. I mean, if a platform has to be 12 inches high and the committee wants it to be eight inches high, there are design standards we have to adhere to so there's consistency within the system, there's safety standards, there's Americans with Disabilities Act requirements over which we don't have discretion. But there are aspects where we are very much open to suggestions, but it's an advisory committee process. We also, at the end of the day, have to reconcile the different ideas that we get from 17 different groups. We can't do 17 different things at each station, so we have to take the best ideas from each one and develop a general standard from that.

Bethea-Spearman: Mr. Sydnor, then we're going to close with Mr. Smith. **Sydnor:** Thank you. Just a question -- with regards to SAACs that are not at full capacity, is it possible to put vacancies or something along the lines of SAAC stations on the website and kind of just publicly announcing that you have X number of vacancies, so people, if they are interested, could apply?

Kay: I really do appreciate the sentiment with that suggestion. I guess I'm just sensitive to the fact that we would be inviting folks who were not from a particular community to be on a committee in that community. I mean, there's been sentiment around this table that that's the wrong thing to do if you've already done too much of that, so I'd worry about it. I mean, Ms. Williams if you want to go back to your committee and say 'I'm on the CAC, I'm aware that there are people who were not accommodated who are interested. Do people on this committee agree that we can accommodate them' and everyone says yes, then we'd be happy to facilitate that. But I don't want to go through a process of assigning these folks because I feel like it violates the idea that we asked people to nominate themselves for specific committees. **Taylor:** What if Harlem Park's got 10 spots?

Bethea-Spearman: Excuse me Mr. Taylor. The final comment is Mr. Smith. **Smith:** Mr. Kay, you and I had a conversation earlier pertaining to I-70 or Security Boulevard versus Parallel Drive. Security Boulevard was on the map. As you all are now aware of, now it's Parallel Drive, it's off of Security Boulevard. You have presented that, not before us as a committee, but before the CAC -- before the SAAC was the first time I heard about that. That's a major change. **Kay:** No, that's a little bit different than what we were talking about before, it's not a major change. The alignment along the north side of I-70, so it's going between I-70 and Parallel Drive, that's been the alignment for quite a while, it was a part of 4C, it was part of the LPA—that hasn't changed in a number of years. **Smith:** I'll have to look into my records.

Bethea-Spearman: Okay, now we're going to open it up for public comment. Please step to the right. Excuse me, can you all put that mic down there so that those that have public comment can stand to that mic and make your comments, please. Oh my goodness, oh I'm so sorry, I'm so sorry. Delegate Haynes and Delegate Stukes is with us tonight from the 44th District. (Applause). Public comments? Because your time is a-wasting – public comments? Because we stop public comments at 8:45.

Don Sherrod: We're ready now, we're ready now. **R. Smith:** Is there a definite date that the Red Line still has to move forward or is it rerun, rerun, rerun. **Bethea-Spearman:** Mr. Kay can answer for you? **Kay:** We have been on a successful schedule, starting construction – **Bethea-Spearman:** Mr. Kay, do you need a mic? **Kay:** I don't think so – 2016 and open in 2019. Many things are assumed in that schedule starting with funding. We don't have any construction funding for the project at that point. But if we did that would be the timetable. **Audience member:** So all this digging that we see going along this route has nothing to do with the Red Line? **Kay:** No -- are you talking about the work down by the MARC station? **Audience member:** Yeah. **Kay:** Yeah, well, the MTA's doing a project at the MARC station to tear down the wall and expand the parking lot. That will also serve the Red Line, but in and of itself, it's got nothing to do with the Red Line and nothing else you see here has anything to do with it. Are you referring to the lighting project, the City project? **Bethea-Spearman:** She might be, because you know Uplands has got stuff getting ready to go on, too. **Kay:** That is not Red Line activity – we are years away from moving any dirt. **R. Smith:** So you don't have any issues with 204 school. **Kay:** No, I don't. **Bethea-Spearman:** What is the name of 204 school? **Audience:** Mary Rodman. **Bethea-Spearman:** Is it Sarah M. Roach or Mary E. Rodman? **Audience:** Mary E. Rodman. **Bethea-Spearman:** I did speak to Senator Jones before the election, at one of the candidates' forums and I made mention to all of the representatives in the, well it was just the 44th District. But she did come back and report that that's not true, that that is rumor. **Sherrod:** Is it our time now? **Bethea-Spearman:** Any other public comments? Yes sir. Excuse me Mr. Sherrod, yes sir –because we know you're going to close us out, so you can just hold it for a minute. Yes sir. I can't hear you sir.

Audience member: I would like to know – any time that the Red Line is finished will my property value go down on my home? **Sherrod:** Where do you live? **Connor:** It should go up. **Audience member:** I live on the south side of Edmondson Avenue. I would like to know at any time – **Sherrod:** On Edmondson Avenue? **Bethea-Spearman:** Excuse me Mr. Sherrod – yes sir. **Audience member:** I would like to know at any time, on the south side where I live at, when the Red Line is finished will the property value of my home go down? **Bethea-Spearman:** Ms. Connor can you take that? **Connor:** I don't know for a fact, but typically what happens when you improve neighborhoods the property tends to go up. There are a lot of things that's going on – Uplands, a whole lot of opportunities for improvements – **Audience member:** Can you just give me a no or yes – **Conner/ Bethea-Spearman:** We don't know, we don't know. **Taylor:** There's no guarantee either way. **Conner:** There are no guarantees about that, right. **Taylor:** Some people think up, some people think down, but no one really knows. **Conner:** Right. **Bethea-Spearman:** Any other public comment – oh, okay.

Richard Mallory: At our first meeting for the station, it was very unclear what the point of the meeting was and what kind of issues that the advisory committee was going to be advising. Glad to hear that we're going to be told a little bit more about what direction we might need to go [inaudible] and I just want to emphasize that at least for that meeting we didn't get any direction and we do need some idea of what types of things the MTA is interested in hearing about and what it isn't. To comment on things like no we don't want it above ground, we want it

underground and so on, we're wasting our time if we're not talking about things that you're interested in making a decision on. So we do need to know where we're going.

Bethea-Spearman: Yes sir. **Audience member:** I have a suggestion on whether or not people from the CAC should be on SAACs – if they live in the neighborhood and they happen to be on the CAC then they should be on the SAAC. If they don't live in the community, they shouldn't be. Or work – I'll change that – or work. That's my suggestion for whether or not a person that's a member of the CAC should be part of the SAAC. **Bethea-Spearman:** Okay – any other public comments? **Sherrod:** Good afternoon. **Bethea-Spearman:** Just a second Mr. Sherrod. Let me let you know how much time you've got. You've got about seven minutes.

Sherrod: That'll be perfect. My name is Don Sherrod, I'm the president of the Rognel Heights Community Association. We're basically up around Woodridge and Woodington – **Taylor:** Don do you need a mic? **Sherrod:** I'm alright, I'm alright. **Taylor:** It's for the minutes. **Sherrod:** I'm alright. **Taylor:** It's for the recording, so that I can read what you've got to say later.

Sherrod: The reason we're having this conversation is because two months ago at one of these meetings I lodged a complaint and a protest against the MTA because this process was rigged, which means the so-called Station Advisory Area Committee, it was rigged. My secretary, my vice-president and myself, we both followed all the guidelines, submitted our so-called applications or nominations to be in this process. My vice-president was bumped, my secretary was bumped and we don't have 20 people on our SAAC committee and I'm going to tell you why. On our SAAC committee, most of the people on that committee I don't recognize. They aren't people that have been attending these meetings on a regular basis. The fix was in. Now, when I made my protest, the Chair asked Henry Kay how could that be? Now, Henry Kay, this is the arrogant Henry Kay who said he will not change this process. This is the person we've been dealing with for, I guess, over five years. He stood and put on the record and it's in the minutes, 'well, whenever there's a vice-president, a president and a secretary from the same community submitting their names' they only chose one. That was a lie. The Lyndhurst community got the president, the vice-president and the vice-president's son. Midtown-Edmondson has a president and a vice-president. That's on the record – this man is a liar. He lied again today because –

Bethea-Spearman: Mr. Sherrod, let's not go there. **Sherrod:** Okay, I won't go there. There was also a statement he made on the record -- and you'll see when the minutes is out today -- about he will never submit a proposal that would take people's property. Now a gentleman just asked a question, if he lives on the south side of Edmondson Avenue, on Edmondson Avenue more than likely you won't be here to talk about. The distance curb-to-curb on Edmondson Avenue, myself and a SAAC member went out there and physically measured it, it's 75 feet. This two-lane process and this process and – this is their plan that I got from the Freedom of Information, that's the only way I could get it. And also the plan that I have that gives you two dedicated lanes and no parking takes 120 feet. Now Mr. Kay kept talking about building in the right of way – the right-of-way is not curb-to-curb. Technically Route 40 is 120 feet wide from the County right on down to the City. For some reason persons along from Wildwood Parkway – and I'll say a little further out – were granted easements some time ago. So that's technically state or federal land that when they take that piece you will not get compensated. But that's still not enough. It's not just a matter of taking your lawn or taking a part of your lawn. There's two blocks of Edmondson Avenue when you come off your porch and go down the steps you've got five feet and you're in the street. So, the difference between that 88 and what they need to put two dedicated lanes in and the train that takes 24 feet according to their plan that he said he would never submit a plan that would take property, totally needs 45 feet. Now do the math. Now if a person lives on Edmondson Avenue and you've got a five-foot sidewalk, your steps and your porch, they're somewhere in your kitchen. So on the south side of Edmondson Avenue you got a

problem, you got a problem. We've been following it and following this process and coming to these meetings – I mean religiously. The other fix is that they went and got people to sit on these committees that haven't went to one Red Line meeting, don't know what the Red Line is. So they're there and we've got to give them an education – the fix was in. He's hoping that they can convince those people to be pro-Red Line. I think I've got about two more minutes. The other thing that I would like to bring to your attention about these SAAC committees – they're much to do about nothing. These are not stations, they are stops in the middle of the street. You've got to cross two lanes of traffic, stand on a sidewalk or median between – you got the train and you got two lanes of traffic on each side – how safe is that? So if we're only designing a wider piece of concrete or median and a cover that they're only required to cover 50 percent, why are we spending all that time, money and effort to design a piece of concrete and a transparent cover? What – what color paint we should paint the concrete? The cover is transparent. The process that we're involved in the SAAC thing is a way to spend money. We don't make any of this money. The politicians, the contractors, the engineers – the same engineers that built Howard Street, the Road to Nowhere – are the same ones that's your facilitators at some of these SAAC meetings. It's all about the money. So the fix has got to be in, because bills got to be paid – somebody's got to pay for those ads on TV that ran for the last three months. And people are looking for jobs. There's only about five of these 15 members – they aren't all here today – that are not in bed with the MTA. And they like that bed because that bed is warm, but they need to get out of that bed. Now, Mrs. Connor here works for Sojourner-Douglass College – conflict of interest because her employer signed the Compact. They have a partnership with MTA and they take money, they take grants from them. So that's why she didn't see anything wrong with the process—she never does. She always sides with the MTA. So I'll say she's in bed with the MTA – if they don't like it, sue me. And he's in bed with the MTA –

Unknown: That's enough. **Sherrod:** Okay, I'll close it out. **Bethea-Spearman:** Just a second ma'am, just a second. **Sherrod:** I'll just close it out by saying there's no reason why a person that's been following this process can't be on it, but again, they've got it rigged to do their bidding. And again, they want people that are really ignorant, that don't know what's going on. They don't know what's going on and it's unfair to them. They did not even know that it's a piece of concrete. They thought it was going to pull over to the curb, there was a building and one suggested a Starbucks in it. Starbucks? Be for real. So if you all want to be a part of this process, write the Governor, request that Henry Kay, spelled H-e-n-r-y K-a-y, be fired, be terminated from this process. Because anytime he'll come to you and tell you he's not going to change it – the MTA's supposed to work for us. He gets paid from us and then he's going to defend it? So, if you want to be part of this process, if you're really interested, write your Governor – don't write the Secretary – write the Governor and complain. Or – you've got some political people here, let them know and let them co-sign your letter, but continue to come out to these meetings whenever you can because you will see the hard times some of us that have been following this process for eight years is having. The whole process insofar as the Red Line is totally disingenuous – it's about big business making big money. Thank you. (Applause).

Bethea-Spearman: Okay, ma'am – give her the microphone Don, please. **Audience member:** We can talk about one another – I don't need that. I'm going to tell you what the whole thing is – get God in your life. He said anything you ask in my name I'll do it. He said I'll move your stumbling blocks. Don't call nobody out their name – pray for them. Pray for me. We come here tonight and ain't said the Lord's Prayer or nothing. God will make a way. Don't talk about the gas and electric, don't talk about the buses – talk to God about it. He spoke to the wind and the wind obeyed, He spoke to the sea and the sea backed up. He's got the power, let's talk to Him. (Applause).

Bethea-Spearman: Delegate Stukes and Delegate Haynes – did you all want to comment? I want to first let the audience know Delegate Haynes and Delegate Stukes are the delegates for the 44th District only. If you don't live in Uplands, if you're not in Allendale – a portion of it, a small portion – St. Joseph, Irvington, Beechfield, Treemount or you're going down towards the Road to Now Somewhere that used to be Nowhere, then they're not your representatives. Your representatives would be the 41st legislative district and those representatives are not here. So, they're here and we want to hear what their comments are.

Delegate Keith Haynes: First of all, let me just say good evening to everybody. **Bethea-Spearman:** Good evening. **Haynes:** Thank you very much. I don't have anything to say other than the fact that I'm glad to be here and the reason why I'm here is to listen. Not to comment, but to listen. Every now and then we pop in. As you know, the legislative session begins in January, in two months. I'm one of the ranking members on the Appropriations Committee which would deal with funding of the Red Line, so it's always important to hear comments from the communities that are affected by the Red Line as we move through not only the legislative process and the Citizens' Advisory Committee process, but also genuine comments from those residents as we move through the budgetary and fiscal process as it relates to funding the Red Line from a state perspective as well. So with that I just want to say no comment, no position, but just glad to be here to listen to your comments. Thank you very much. (Applause).

Delegate Melvin Stukes: Good evening everyone. **Audience and Council:** Good evening – you had a question? **Audience member (to Sandra Connor):** Ma'am, no disrespect to you when I was talking to you, okay? **Connor:** Okay, fine, thank you, I received that, thank you. **Stukes:** Alright, good evening again. I stand also as a delegate – let me give you the lines real quick. Anything from Athol, right here at the traffic light all the way down to Hilton, is the 41st. Okay, our lines come out there. So, you were correct in that but maybe that was a little bit clearer about the difference between the 44th and the 40th. This building here is in the 41st. If we went across to the Westside Center – **Bethea-Spearman:** Skills Center, that's 44th. **Stukes:** -- Skills Center, that's 44th. Alright so, the middle of Athol separates the two districts, okay? Now I've been in somewhat of a catch-22 position – I work for MTA. But MTA also knows that I listen to the people and the like and I represent the people and the like. I've been to the meetings on the east side because I want to hear what they have to say. I haven't been to all because it's almost impossible. But my concern as my colleague has said is to listen to it. Those at MTA know that I support the project in the sense of it's a project that needs to occur. However, I do not, I do not support that project going on the surface down the middle of Edmondson Avenue. If we didn't learn anything (applause), if we did not learn anything -- the good Lord sent a message through here during the month of February that we called a blizzard. You all know exactly what happened to Edmondson Avenue during the blizzard. Sometimes He sends messages that's as clear as the nose on your face what would happen – now can you imagine what would happen if a blizzard comes and we've got two or three trains out there on Edmondson and cars or whatever? The project needs to happen. I wish I had Bill Gates' money, I would give them the money so it can go underground. So whether I'm fired tomorrow or not, so be it, but MTA knows exactly how I feel about that. Okay, now that's it – straight, no chaser. (Applause).

Bethea-Spearman: I want to congratulate my delegates on their re-election because in the 44th we demand that our elected officials work – and they work. I wanted to do some housekeeping, too. We get a lot of complaints – I get a lot of complaints because you all are embarrassing – about the bickering amongst one another. They don't feel as though – I'm talking about the people that come to these meetings is talking about us and I wanted to take a few minutes and talk about this tonight because we all need to check ourselves. We're not anybody's keepers on this table. We don't even have to agree with one another. We all come with our own different

perspectives, but we do have to respect one another. We sit at the table and we're eating and we're supposed to be conducting business. Some of us have the nerve to talk in the mic with our mouths full, smacking in the mic – and people are complaining about us. That's not good. Some of them want to see us move forward. They feel as though some of us are only talking so that we can get in the minutes and be seen -- this is what I've been told – so that we can get in the minutes and be seen, but we're not really doing anything productive. We need to move forward, we really do need to move forward. We've heard all the arguments about whether it's 4C or it's 4Z or 4-double-B – it is what it is. If nothing else was clear, then it should have been Tuesday – Martin O'Malley is doing a great job. That's what the people of Baltimore City say. Governor O'Malley chose the Locally Preferred Alternative. We don't have to like it but we will accept it if it comes to pass. It is what it is. So to keep trying to rehash, we've really got to find a way to turn the corner. For the new members who have not been in this Council for over these two years, I would strongly advise – three years, yeah three years, that's right – I would strongly advise you to contact the MTA to make sure you get a copy of the three years worth of minutes that you missed. Mr. Sydnor did make a suggestion that to keep us moving that we can communicate with e-mail amongst one another but not make decisions. I was telling Mr. Sydnor that we're not allowed to do that, but can somebody explain why we can't do that?

Cohen: There are several reasons. Number one we want everything that we do and say to be part of a public record, that's one thing. And the other is that not all members of the Council have e-mail. So to include all members of the Council equally we should conduct our business in front of the members of the community in public. **Bethea-Spearman:** But there's nothing that says we can't do it just because you don't have an e-mail? **Cohen:** There's nothing in the law that precludes it. **Bethea-Spearman:** Okay. **Sydnor:** And before tonight's meeting what I made certain to do, I went to look at some decisions that the Attorney General had published regarding the Open Meetings Act. This question has been raised numerous times. So long as business isn't being conducted via e-mail, i.e. decisions aren't being made, there's nothing that prohibits us from e-mailing one another to talk about things. **Cohen:** Yes, there is no prohibition against that and those e-mails have been going back and forth between different members of this Council over the last three years discussing different matters on the side between members of the Council and that's perfectly legal.

Bethea-Spearman: Okay, so Mr. Sydnor, zip out your e-mails. But I do want us to make a pact – if you want to eat, then you need to get to the Council on time, because a lot of you have a problem with being on time – I hear about that, too. I'm not nobody's keeper, I'm only just one of the co-chairs, Dr. Orange is the other and our chair is in Annapolis, but out of respect for the people that we're supposed to be here serving we need to try to be on time. Please don't eat at the table. If you want to eat, sit out in the audience with everybody else. When you get finished then come on up here. Definitely if you're chewing and got stuff in your mouth, for God's sake, I mean, this is something that we should have been taught as little children – do not pick up the mic smacking and chewing and popping all in the mic. I mean come on you all – you make things harder than they have to be. Like I said, you don't have to agree with the other Council members, but it's not your job to correct them and chastise them. You know, people looking on say we're disrespectful amongst one another so how can we handle any business. So please let's give that some careful thought and can we please, please, please – because I'm telling you, we've already caused Dr. Orange to go out here sick, Mr. Keith, he has expired and then Mr. Smith down here he went out here sick. I don't plan to have a heart attack or stroke for nobody. That's stress to the Council and Mr. Cohen over there he's had some stress. This is stressful enough, please be cooperative, please be cooperative, please. You're holding the mic for what reason?

Cohen: For the agenda for the next meeting. **Bethea-Spearman:** Oh, okay – thank you. Alright then – now can we move on? I mean, can we all make that pact? **Cole:** Message received. **Bethea-Spearman:** Meeting agenda items. **Cohen:** Madame Chair, as was stated earlier there is still some work that Mr. Kay will be doing with Mr. Taylor and myself and that could go under old business – and Mr. Hines – that could go under old business since it's continuing and the work has not completed. But there was an additional item that I wanted to bring up last time that I did not have a chance to bring up for discussion and that is that the Red Line will require a reorganization of the bus system. We need to look at what the changes will be as designated by the MTA to the bus system when the Red Line is in service. So I would ask that that topic be on the agenda. Mr. Kay said that that is available. **Bethea-Spearman:** It is available?

Kay: What we've done so far is make a set of assumptions about what changes would be made for the purposes of modeling, but any of those would have to be vetted through a public process. We can describe the assumptions we made, but we need to be very clear it's not a done deal.

Bethea-Spearman: I don't think we need to do assumptions. We get into so much trouble in this Council on assuming and forecasting 20 and 30 years away. I think we really need to deal more in facts, we need to deal in facts. **Kay:** Yeah, well again, all we have are assumptions. **Bethea-Spearman:** Well, no, we don't want to hear no assumptions. **Cohen:** Madame Chair – **Bethea-Spearman:** What are the things that will be coming up that we need to be mindful of as we attempt to turn this corner? **Kay:** Well, I'd say there are two big categories – one is, as we've talked many times before, our application for federal funding. We're continuing to work on that, we continue to work with the FTA. You won't be meeting again until January – I hope by that time we have some things to report on that process – documents we've submitted, reaction from FTA. I can't promise you it'll be done by then but I can give you a report on where we are. Then the other big category are design refinements. Mr. Sherrod mentioned the Edmondson Avenue, what we call the section, which is how the project will fit on to Edmondson Avenue. We've talked about that before, but in the subsequent year-and-a-half we've done some additional work on that. We could come back and talk and understand what's out there. **Bethea-Spearman:** Say that again Mr. Kay? What did you say? Say that again.

Kay: Mr. Sherrod was presenting the section that we showed in the LPA, which was based on engineering work we had done at the time. We continue to try to refine that to get more ready for the design process and do the design process, but we can certainly come back and talk about that again if people need a refresher in terms of what's out there and what would fit. As we enter the preliminary engineering process over the next year, it will be all about engineering. So all the questions about right-of-way and limits of disturbance and things like that will have to be answered. **Bethea-Spearman:** Is that the phase we're getting ready to go into now you're saying? **Kay:** Yeah. Having said that I'm not sure what we'd present specifically, but we can go back and look at what additional work...we haven't talked about the typical section in probably a year in front of this group, so we can go back and look at any refinements we've done and bring you up to date on those. And then the other big category of work we're doing is the Station Area Advisory Committees, so we can give you an update on that – they'll have met again another one or two times and we can talk about that.

Cohen: Madame Chair -- Mr. Kay is saying that those changes to the bus service are provisional and they are because everything about this is provisional. However, there are numbers and assumptions of the project as it was presented to us going forward that depend upon those changes in bus service. It seriously affects transit riders certainly, but also many members of the community. So I would ask that it is included in the agenda. **Bethea-Spearman:** Can we please

get a – I’m not going to go back and forth with you Mr. Cohen – can somebody make a motion either way that we include this on the agenda or that we not. **Smith:** I make the motion we do not include that. **Bethea-Spearman:** Okay, now all in favor, because I’m not going to go back and forth, you’re not causing me to have no strokes and heart attack. **Council:** Aye. **Smith:** It’s too early, it’s too early. **Connor:** It’s too early. **Bethea-Spearman:** Because Mr. Kay said they would be assumptions. See, we get in trouble, I think, with a lot of assumptions, so I’m asking for a vote. **Conner:** We said aye. **Cole:** No discussion? **Bethea-Spearman:** No we don’t need to discuss nothing at 9 o’clock at night – why you got to have a discussion? (Laughter). Can we put it to a vote – that’s what we’re doing. **Taylor:** Who says no buses, vote for no talk about buses? **Smith:** Right, it’s too early. **Conner:** It’s too early. (Show of hands) **Bethea-Spearman:** Okay, well that’s the majority, so it will not be on the agenda. **Unknown:** I saw five. **Bethea-Spearman:** One, two, three, four, five, six, seven – okay that’s the majority. So we won’t include that. You’ve got something Mr. Sydnor?

Sydnor: Just a question – have we spoken about procurement and how money is being spent up to now at any of the meetings? **Kay:** We have but not in a while. So do you want an update on the budget? **Bethea-Spearman:** Yeah, that’s a good one. **Cohen:** We got a budgetary presentation before. We had asked for the financing before – we haven’t gotten that. **Taylor:** So the budget for the Red Line specifically, not the whole MTA – is that what we’re asking for? **Cohen:** The financing of the Red Line. **Bethea-Spearman:** So do we have the financing for the Red Line? **Kay:** Are you talking about the finance plan? Not yet, we might by January. That’s what I was offering is we give you an update on the FTA process that would include the financial plan, if we have it by then. When I say ‘if we have it’ – we’re going back and forth with the FTA. We’re on their timeline, we can’t really control that. So we can just put that on the agenda and I’ll tell you what we know. **Sydnor:** But I was also interested in money that has been spent on contractors...**Kay:** There are two things. One is the financial plan for the project – how we’re going to come up with the capital costs which is all future. I think Mr. Sydnor is asking about spending, we have a substantial amount of money now to support the work that we’re doing. We can talk about what the capital money’s allocated for. **Sydnor:** That’s what I’m curious about – thank you. **Bethea-Spearman:** So you will be able to come back and tell us what money you had and how it’s been spent thus far. **Kay:** Correct.

Taylor: Madame Chair are we putting on the agenda the discussion of the typical section? Was that the decision, we’re going to talk about that? **Bethea-Spearman:** Application for federal funding, design refinements, section refinements, station – we’ve got a lot of refinements on here. **Taylor:** So in that section refinement and such, it would be nice to hear what the – because we’ve heard a lot of varying things about what the catenary poles, the overhead wires, the overhead, everything is going to look like. I know that’s a concern both on the west side and the east side. So if that’s included, I think that is pretty straightforward. **Bethea-Spearman:** The catenary poles, that stuff that’s going to be over the top of the head – that’s not something that’s going to be addressed by those Station Advisory Committees? **Kay:** Well, I mean the questions are the design of the pole itself, whether it’s important to combine them with street lights. There’s an option to put them in the center of the road versus the outside – **Bethea-Spearman:** Do they know that? **Kay:** The Advisory committees? We’ll be talking about it with them. They haven’t done it yet. **Bethea-Spearman:** So is that enough for the agenda? **Council:** Yes. **Conner:** Madame Chair, I make a motion that we close the meeting. **Bethea-Spearman:** Okay, all in favor? **Council:** Aye.

The meeting adjourned at 9:06 p.m.

**BALTIMORE RED LINE
CITIZENS' ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING**

DATE OF MEETING: January 13, 2011
TIME: 7:00 p.m.
LOCATION: University of Maryland, Baltimore BioPark Life Sciences
Conference Center

CAC ATTENDEES:

- | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|
| • Angela Bethea-Spearman, Co-Chair | • Emery Hines |
| • Dr. Rodney Orange, Co-Chair | • Jamie Kendrick |
| • Edward Cohen | • George Moniodis |
| • Gary Cole | • Marty Taylor |
| • Sandra Conner | • Annie Williams |
| • Christopher Costello | |

(Absent: Charles Sydnor, Warren Smith)

ELECTED OFFICIALS OR REPRESENTATIVES:

- Calvin Anderson, Office of Baltimore City Councilwoman Helen Holton, 8th District

MTA/CONSULTANT ATTENDEES:

- | | |
|--|--|
| • Henry Kay, Maryland Transit Administration (MTA) | • Sam Minnitte, STV |
| • Diane Ratcliff, MTA | • Tom Mohler, RK&K |
| • Lorenzo Bryant, MTA | • Mark Henry, RK&K |
| • Christiaan Blake, MTA | • Carl Williams, Rosborough Communications, Inc. (RCI) |
| • Tamika Gauvin, MTA | • Tori Leonard, RCI |
| • Staycie Francisco, MTA | |

GENERAL PUBLIC: 32 people signed in

Agenda

- Welcome [*Page 1*]
- CAC Member Introductions [*Page 2*]
- Approval of Agenda [*Pages 2-3*]
- Adoption of November 4th Meeting Minutes [*Page 3*]
- Follow-Up Response to Capacity Analysis by M. Taylor [*Pages 3-4*]
- Introduction of Community Liaisons [*Pages 4-6,20*]
- Status of FTA New Starts Process [*Pages 6-7*]
- Design Options for Edmondson Avenue Segment [*Pages 7-20*]
- Public Comment [*Pages 20-21*]
- Next Meeting Agenda [*Page 21-23*]

Dr. Rodney Orange: Good evening ladies and gentlemen. We're going to begin this January 13th meeting of the Red Line Advisory Council. If there are any other Council members that are

not up front, please come up front. Good evening and thank you so much for your attendance tonight. My name is Dr. Rodney Orange and we're going to have the introductions of the CAC members – and we'll start on my left.

Annie Williams: Good evening, my name is Annie Williams. I'm a resident of Harlem Park and I was appointed by the Senate.

George Moniodis: My name is George Moniodis and I'm President of Greektown CDC and I represent the CDC for the Red Line. Thank you.

Emery Hines: Good evening, my name is Emery Hines and I represent Baltimore County Executive Kevin Kamenetz.

Jamie Kendrick: Jamie Kendrick, I'm the Deputy Director for the City Department of Transportation.

Gary Cole: Good evening, Gary Cole, Deputy Director, Department of Planning, appointed by the Mayor of Baltimore City.

Orange: Dr. Rodney Orange, one of the co-chairs of the Red Line Citizens' Advisory Council. The other co-chair, Ms. Angela Bethea, she's running a little late, but we're expecting her to arrive around 7:30. She's been very instrumental in these meetings and her absence is always noted, but we're going to move forward because we do have a lot we want to try to get to this evening.

Sandra Conner: Good evening, my name is Sandra Conner, I'm the Governor's appointee for the Red Line. I'm also on the Social Security SAAC. **Orange:** Tell them what the SAAC is. Some may not know what the SAAC is. **Conner:** Station Advisory – **Henry Kay:** Station Area – **Conner:** [Station Area Advisory Committees](#).

Martin Taylor: Good evening, I'm Marty Taylor, a resident of the Canton area. I was appointed by Senator George Della.

Edward Cohen: I'm Edward Cohen, I'm with the Transit Riders Action Council of Metropolitan Baltimore, the Mount Vernon-Belvedere Association and I'm on the Howard Street/University Center SAAC.

Christopher Costello: Hi, Chris Costello, I live in Westgate and I was appointed by the delegates in the 41st District.

Orange: Okay, thank you. Approval of the [agenda](#) -- any objections to the agenda?

Kendrick: Mr. Chairman, just real quick. I'll speak towards the microphone. The Edmondson Avenue presentation, I suspect, is pretty substantive. So, while I don't think we need to change the agenda, I'd just encourage my colleagues to make sure we leave a good amount of time for the technical review and discussion. I suspect it's going to be pretty important to a lot of folks in this room.

Orange: Okay. **Cohen:** Mr. Chairman? **Orange:** Yes. **Cohen:** I spoke with you prior to the meeting about some housekeeping issues and I'd like to know when you'd like me to bring that matter up. **Orange:** I thought you had already discussed it with – **Cohen:** Well, I think it needs

to be dealt with by the Council as a whole. Two issues – one is the issue of vacancies and two is the issue of material on the website. **Orange:** Okay, we'll hold that until comments. **Cohen:** Okay, thank you.

Orange: We're on the agenda, approval of the agenda. Any concerns about the agenda for tonight? **Cole:** Motion to approve the agenda. **Unknown:** Second. **Orange:** Second. Approved and seconded – all in favor? **Council:** Aye. **Orange:** Adoption of the [November 4th meeting minutes](#)? As always, we have some excellent minutes – yes, Mr. Cole. **Cole:** I do have one small correction and that is in the introduction of the members, I do not see my name. Also, Mrs. Williams was here – **Williams:** I was here, but I was running late because I went to another meeting. Our names are in here, just not – **Cohen:** In the introductions. **Orange:** In the introductions. Okay. Anything else? **Conner:** I make a motion that we approve the minutes as submitted, however, I do have one or two typos that I need to give you later. **Orange:** With corrections, any opposition? All in favor? **Council:** Aye. **Orange:** Alright. Old business – 'Follow-Up Response to Capacity Analysis by M. Taylor' – MTA.

Henry Kay: Mr. Taylor had raised some questions about the capacity of the light rail vehicles that we were contemplating for the project. We addressed those questions as well as some about modeling and traffic allocation in a meeting or two with him. I think as of the last meeting we had two remaining data items outstanding. We've provided those. One was data on boardings and alightings by bus stop of bus lines in that corridor. Within the last day or two I provided that to Mr. Taylor and Mr. Cohen. Then the other was boardings by Mobility paratransit riders in the Edmondson Avenue corridor. I think Mr. Cohen received that information directly – you didn't, okay. I'm sorry – they told me you got that. So that is, along with the Wildwood section boardings, I have it sitting on my desk, so I'll get that to you. I think with that, that ends that, at least what we understood to be our obligations under that agenda item.

Cohen: Yes, as Mr. Kay said, he just recently sent out the data about the corridor. I received it in the mail today, Mr. Taylor received it in the mail yesterday. Neither one of us has had a chance to thoroughly review the document yet. And I still have not received the other document that was just mentioned, nor did I receive the safety document which Mr. Kay told me that Mr. Lorenzo Bryant will be bringing tonight. So it appears that the material is moving, but we haven't had a chance to look at it yet. **Orange:** Okay. Do you have any other concerns about this Mr. Taylor? **Taylor:** [Inaudible] may need a final look. **Orange:** Sure. Well hopefully, you'll have time to review the information during the interim, before our next meeting and maybe that will be one of the agenda items we'll consider for the next meeting.

Kendrick: Mr. Chairman, just real quick, because I think it's relevant to the discussion we're about to have. If you look at last month's minutes, the top of page three, I think, with Taylor talking, towards the end of his comments. The City has advocated for a long time throughout this process, not necessarily that the Red Line be, we haven't necessarily advocated that the Red Line be on the surface, I mean, ideal conditions everywhere with an infinite amount of money to spend would be in tunnel everywhere. But to the extent that we are on the surface, one of the arguments that we've been making is that it will help to bring Edmondson Avenue back to a neighborhood street with cars that are moving slower, with traffic that is thru traffic being pushed around to the highways where it's more appropriate. So if I read Mr. Taylor's statement correct, he said 'a lot of the traffic is pushed around, as far as I can tell onto Frederick Road (referring to Frederick Avenue)' and then my more important point here 'around the Beltway's west side and onto I-95 and 395.' From the City's perspective, that's part of the point here, is that to the extent that we can calm traffic on Edmondson Avenue and push the thru commuter traffic either onto the Red

Line or back onto the freeway where it should be, I think that's a pretty important achievement for this project. So I just wanted to note that as we head into this next discussion.

Taylor: So, just one comment about that – it's a question of how much, right? Obviously if Edmondson Avenue, to really talk about it as not having much traffic, you've got to reduce the traffic substantially. There is some traffic pushed because there's more demand than there is capacity, so people can't be on Edmondson. But the unfortunate things that happen, that are sort of against what that goal would be are that in the off-peak times the lights are all green. What'll happen is actually the traffic will be moving much faster on Edmondson. Those are probably off-peak times or times when there would be pedestrians around. So, to some extent I think some of the traffic will be moved but to the extent that Edmondson will have, you know – slow moving traffic is one thing, but when it's bumper-to-bumper slow moving traffic, or at least relatively congested slow-moving traffic making exhaust, that's a different story. I guess the point is that, I don't really know that we have enough information to make the conclusion that you've made at this point, although I see the point you're trying to make.

Orange: Okay, we're going to move ahead. New business – 'Introduction of Community Liaisons.'

Kay: We have some good news. We've proceeded with a commitment in terms of public involvement that we've been talking about for some time, which is the hiring of Community Liaisons. What I'd like to do is introduce Tamika Gauvin, who is with the Red Line project team. She's going to talk to you a little bit about the Community Liaison program and then you'll meet the liaisons themselves.

Tamika Gauvin: Good evening everyone. My name is Tamika Gauvin, as Henry mentioned, and I am the MTA's Red Line Community Outreach Coordinator. I'm going to have the Community Liaisons introduce themselves to you in a minute, but I just wanted to provide some background to how we got here with the Community Liaisons. [The Red Line Community Compact](#) made a call for Community Liaisons and particularly called for liaisons as it relates to mitigating construction impacts. The liaisons were to serve to promote early and frequent communication in regards to construction. But in talking to transit agencies around the country, we learned that it was beneficial to have liaisons on board before, not only for construction, but for phases earlier in the project, so that they could build relationships and help to promote meaningful community engagement through the life of the project. So that being said, we started our application process in September and we conducted a broad outreach effort, sending our job announcement to the community associations in the corridor, to area schools, posted it in the *Baltimore Sun*, etc. Recently, we actually brought these liaisons on board, we hired five liaisons for the five coverage areas– and they'll tell you their coverage areas and there's also a [coverage map](#) that Tori is handing out. These liaisons will be reaching out to the communities and to the stakeholders in the corridor to introduce themselves and to get acquainted with some of the concerns for the communities. For the life of the project, they'll serve not only to convey information to stakeholders, but will be bringing information back to the MTA for the purpose of including it in the project. I think at that point, I've covered my points and I'll hand over the mic to the liaisons. And actually there are liaison assistants, too. One of our liaisons, I should say, John Enny, couldn't be here this evening. He's attending the Bayview and Highlandtown SAAC meetings. One of our liaisons will be coming in a little earlier, so hopefully we can just introduce her as she comes in. We have two community liaison assistants tonight and they'll introduce themselves as well.

Lisa Kramer: Hi everyone. My name is Lisa Kramer. I am the Community Liaison for the downtown stations – I’ve got everything from Harlem Park in the west to the Inner Harbor. A little bit about my background and where I come from. I’ve done a lot of work in the City, building communities, or coalitions within communities, and just working to promote a lot of non-profit causes. I’ve worked with the Maryland Assembly on school-based health care, doing community outreach for them, building awareness about the school-based health care centers that are in the entire state of Maryland. The last legislative session I was with the Maryland Budget and Tax Policy Institute, advocating for a balanced approach on the state budget. Prior to this I had worked more in politics. I had done a number of campaigns and traveled around the country, working in Indiana and New Mexico for that. I’m excited with this job, because this actually does bring me back home to an issue that I really care about. I’m excited to work with the communities and I’ve gotten to go to a couple of SAAC meetings already. That’s been a very promising part and I look forward to working with all of you.

Charisse Lue: Hello everyone, I’m Charisse Lue. I’ll be the Community Liaison for the stations west of Harlem Park within the City limits. I come to you with a long history of non-profit work, usually in economic development. I’m excited about this project, I am invested within this project. I also am a City resident, a west side resident and I’m looking forward to working with everyone.

Roxana Beyranvand: Hello everyone, my name is Roxana Beyranvand. I’m a Community Liaison Assistant and I will be assisting Charisse and Lisa. I was born in D.C. and raised in Gaithersburg, Maryland, but I’ve been a resident of Baltimore City for the past five years. I’m in school, I’m currently a master’s student at the College of Notre Dame of Maryland studying communications.

Rachel Myrowitz: Hi, good evening, my name is Rachel Myrowitz. I’m working in the Inner Harbor East, Fells Point and Canton areas. Also non-profit organization background -- I’ve enjoyed working with One Less Car previous to this job. We worked on transit in Baltimore City. I look forward to working with all of you.

Crystal House: Good evening everyone, my name is Crystal House. I’m a Community Liaison Assistant, I’ll be working in the County area along with Keisha Trent – she’ll be in a little bit later as Ms. Gauvin said. I come with a vast background in education. I also had the opportunity to work on the Baltimore Red Line internship program this summer, so I was able to gain a wealth of knowledge on the Baltimore Red Line project in its entirety this summer. I’m also in school at Morgan State, where I’m pursuing my Master’s in City and Regional Planning.

Costello: Will we be able to communicate with the liaisons [inaudible]. **Kay:** Absolutely. The idea of the liaisons is that they’re very available and very visible. This is their full-time job, really, to be representing the project and be a liaison between any community organization, churches, businesses that are in these geographic areas, which means they’ll be very available to you in terms of information you need, groups you want them to meet with, questions you need answered, so they’ll be available for you. **Costello:** There are a lot of people in the community that I send them out information that pertains to this, sometimes they come and ask who do they contact, so this will be great, I can just refer them to a liaison. **Gauvin:** Yes, and we’ll be posting their information on the website and the liaisons will be contacting community associations. If there was any specific person or group that you wanted us to contact, feel free to let us know, we’d like to hear that, but they’ll definitely be contacting many associations and stakeholders, businesses, et cetera, over the next few months. They’ll be busy with that. Yes?

Cohen: Yes, thank you. I noticed that the boundaries between the zones has changed. In the earlier part of the planning process, for example, Harlem Park and Poppleton would have been in Zone 2 – we aren't using the same geographic boundaries that we had before, which were the City line and Martin Luther King, President Street as the partitions. **Gauvin:** The inconsistency you're referring to was related to the liaisons? **Cohen:** What I'm saying is that the zones that you have here for the liaisons does not correspond to the zones that were involved in the planning process at an earlier stage. And I'm just wondering if...

Gauvin: Yes, they do not correspond exactly with that. The way we looked at taking this corridor and breaking it up, we looked at communities that had similar characteristics, had, probably, similar concerns and so when the liaisons did connect with stakeholders they were looking at a body of similar concerns and characteristics of the communities and possibly issues that are related to the construction. **Cohen:** Well, at an earlier stage, one of the boundaries was Hilton Parkway, between zones. The concerns that I've heard from the communities east and west of Hilton Parkway seem to be different. So, I don't know that those four stations – Rosemont and the MARC station and Allendale and Edmondson Village – really break down as a group with common concerns. I think that the concerns east and west of Hilton Parkway are significantly different.

Kendrick: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure we need to spend a lot of time debating that – **Conner:** I don't either. **Kendrick:** -- we've got some pretty weighty issues on the agenda tonight. I suggest we move along. **Moniodis:** If the staff could provide us with the telephone numbers also by e-mail, so that we can have them. **Gauvin:** [Inaudible]. **Kay:** If I could suggest, I think the most helpful thing would be if we get you a map with their pictures and names on it and their contact information. I think that's a good way to have folks who represent their communities – a face. As long as you don't mind having your face on the website. **Gauvin:** Actually, the materials will have the bios of each and contact information.

Kendrick: Mr. Chairman, just briefly – it's not easy to exceed my expectations in life. When we put together, for example, the Community Compact, my presumption was that maybe we'd get three liaisons in the planning/engineering process and then maybe double that when we got to construction. Here we are starting with two, three, four, five, six, seven people and we've got a good ways to go in this project. So I just want to thank the MTA for doing that and then also say to the liaisons directly – I do hope that you're in this for the long haul. It is easy to come and go in work like this, but I hope I speak for everybody around the table when I say this is a project that's going to take a few more years to get underway. We're going to need you to be some of the theme of consistency throughout this project, so the more that you can embed yourself into these communities and become a known entity, not just today, but when shovels start to move, I think the better off the entire project will be. So welcome – thank you.

Orange: From CAC members – any other concerns, Community Liaisons? **Williams:** I have one concern. When everybody says Harlem Park, it kind of struck me, but we are also Franklin Square. I want people to make sure they understand that it's just not Harlem Park by itself. Franklin Square is also in with Harlem Park. **Orange:** Okay. Alright, we're going to move ahead. "Status of the FTA New Starts Process" – MTA.

Diane Ratcliff: I'm going to be presenting that – I'll pass this around. Good evening, I'm Diane Ratcliff, Director of Planning at the MTA. I just want to give you a brief snapshot of where we are in the New Starts process. Many of you have heard what a long road this has been to reach this almost final step in the New Starts process. For those of you that this is new to, the Federal Transit Administration, our federal authorizing agency who will eventually provide up to 50

percent of the funding for the final design and the construction of this project, needs to approve the project as it moves through different steps. The first major hurdle is the entry into Preliminary Engineering. We've been working on that for this past year. It's been a give and take situation with the Federal Transit Administration. There are 50-some documents we've been submitting, having reviewed, comments. They cover things like how are we going to manage the project, what's our real estate process. A lot of it is just showing compliance with the federal regulations that are out there that govern all these types of projects that use federal funds. Where we are now – and as you can see by the [diagram](#) – we're just at the step before official entry into Preliminary Engineering. We're down to a few documents, so we're talking to the FTA about the costs of the project, and we're just talking about decimals on the escalation and contingency portion of that. And then, last little edits on our travel forecasting report and then the final one will be the finance plan. I know the minutes reflect we might have had more to share with you tonight on that – we don't, but we expect that document to be sent to FTA in January and to start receiving their comments on that. We anticipate then that to be about a 60-day process, then there's a processing stage after we request the official entry into Preliminary Engineering. Then following that there's a 10-day Congressional release. So we expect by early, mid-May, optimistically, maybe a little bit later if things take more time as we go along, to be officially into Preliminary Engineering. Even though the project will continue for those of you monitoring or watching what we're doing, this is a huge step in the official stage of the project and we're really looking forward to reaching that. Questions?

Taylor: I just think from what you're saying, it sounds like we're not where the arrow is on here, we're actually a step back, right, until May? Because we're not in PE yet. **Ratcliff:** No. We're almost into PE. If you'll notice, it's closer to the box in the diagram than it was last time, but it's not touching the PE box, it's a subtlety maybe, but I didn't want to have it actually go into the PE box until we reached that step. **Taylor:** Mr. Sydnor asked a question two meetings ago about the financial plan – do we have that? **Ratcliff:** No we don't. Okay, Jamie to keep you moving along, I'll give them back the microphone.

Orange: Are there any other questions from the CAC? Everyone satisfied? 'Design Options for Edmondson Avenue Segment.'

Kay: At your last meeting -- we were at Edmondson High School -- during the public comment period Mr. Don Sherrod made a presentation. I think he displayed some of the plan sheets that we had used from an earlier part of the public involvement process. He raised an issue that has come up many times in this process, which is how we will be handling the section, the cross-section of Edmondson Avenue, how will we work within the right-of-way that's out there, the existing, developed street, how we will fit the Red Line and all the associated infrastructure with that, and travel lanes and a sidewalk and the private yards that exist out there. Since that time that we developed the drawings he was showing, we've, of course, picked our Locally Preferred Alternative, we know we're on the surface of Edmondson Avenue, and so we've had the time and the funding to develop those concepts a little bit further. Now what we're looking at is a series of choices of options that we need to make in that section as well as other sections of the corridor, but this is one where we recognize that there's quite a bit at stake. So what we've arranged to do is have Tom Mohler, who's from RK&K, one of the firms that's consulting with us on the project -- his firm has been doing this work -- to present to you where we are today. If you can, listen in particular to his characterization of the choices that we need to make and the trade-offs within those choices, because the role of this group, the role of community associations in that part of the corridor and actually individual property owners, and the City, I suppose, will end up making a very big difference. So these are all sort of the same from the MTA's standpoint in the sense

that they provide for a transitway in the center of the roadway, but then how we handle the rest of the right-of-way, we have a number of options, so Tom's prepared to discuss those with you.

Tom Mohler: Good evening, thank you Henry. To get us started, we wanted to present, as Henry suggested, our current thinking of where we're at in this corridor, specifically in the area between Wildwood and Hilton Parkway. [\[Presentation\]](#) To kind of set the stage for our discussion, you can see some criteria I have up here closely related to the transitway and other characteristics through the corridor that are fairly firm. So for instance, transitway width. We're looking at a width in the middle of 24 feet, 4 inches with side catenary poles – I'll explain side catenary poles a little bit later with the diagrams to explain that. With center catenary poles, that transit width needs to be a little bit wider at 26 feet, 9 inches. The lane widths for cars and trucks traveling down the road is going to be 10 feet minimum – 10 feet is the same width of lanes you have out there today. The sidewalk width, absolute minimum that would be chosen anywhere in the corridor is 5 foot, 6 inches – which includes a 5-foot sidewalk and 6-inch curb. And then, especially through this area, one of the criteria we're working with is having no unsignalized crossings of the transitway for safety reasons. So any of the cross streets that would cross the transitway would be at a traffic signal. Now as Henry indicated, there are a number of flexible elements that we're looking to work with the CAC, with the SAACs, with other community outreach to get the best input on these options. These include the location of signals and left turns, bus stop locations, what we characterize as the composition of the bus stops, whether in-lane or pull-off bus stops, the location of full-time parking that can be accommodated in this area and, as I indicated in the prior slide, the location of the catenary poles. So let me walk through each of these flexible elements in a little more detail. When I say locations of signals and left turns, here is an example of that. You see on the left-hand side of the screen, a traffic signal proposed and coming into it from the right-hand side of the screen a left-turn lane that develops in addition to the two thru lanes, a left-turn lane would be built to make that turn there. So at each of those signals we would have left turns, but we wouldn't necessarily have the left turns at what are currently unsignalized locations today.

Mohler: The number of bus stops along the street, I think is pretty self-explanatory. Those we'll work through with the community as far as the exact location of those and how many would we have – but certainly they'd be flexible, what I described earlier as either an in-lane bus stop or a pull-off bus stop. You take a look at this graphic here – the in-lane at the top is literally that. So the bus would stop in one of the thru lanes, pick up and discharge passengers and continue on. The other option you see in the lower one is a pull-off bus stop where they would literally pull off the two thru lanes, pick up and discharge passengers and then enter back into the traffic flow. So those are two options there that we can explore. Location of full-time parking – we have proposed full-time parking at the curb in an 8-foot lane, but those locations wouldn't necessarily be along the whole street. We would look to have that in places where it was kind of desirable. As I indicated before, a clear option is a center catenary pole versus a side cat pole. What I mean by that is, as you can see here, the top graphic in this stretch of Edmondson Avenue shows side poles and the side poles are literally put on the back of the sidewalk and the wires span across the street to carry the center wire down the middle of the road to power the vehicles. On the other hand, a center cat pole goes between the two tracks and that's why it needs to be a little wider. So the side pole option creates a transitway of 24 feet, 4 inches – as indicated before. The center cat pole option creates a transitway of 26 feet, 9 inches. So the side pole's narrower in the transitway, center pole is wider in the transitway. In addition, something else you should pick up here is what I said before – with the wires that would span the street, the side poles, they would literally have to span pole-to-pole, back-of-sidewalk to back-of-sidewalk and with the center catenary pole, they'd be directly over the transitway. So each of these flexible items have trade-offs. So if we're looking to make the roadway narrower – less signals, left turns, in-lane bus

stops, less pull-off bus stops, less parking, side catenary poles – those are all options for working towards the narrower section. A wider section would include more signals, more left turns, pull-off bus stops, more parking and center catenary poles – all of which affect the location of the back of the sidewalk, which we’re going to spend some time getting into detail here. So to try to – yes?

Kendrick: Just real quick – when you put that chart like that, some of this can be mix and match.

Mohler: Absolutely. **Kendrick:** In X block it could be these three things and in Y block – to some extent. **Mohler:** Absolutely, absolutely. So to illustrate what happens with the sidewalks and what happens with the roadway and the transitway, we picked a spot here between Allendale and Mt. Holly, largely because there’s a lot going on right here. You can see in the blue there the proposed station platforms. You can also see we’ve got left turns at the traffic signal that’s proposed here at Allendale. In addition, you’ll see as I get into a couple more slides, on the north side it’s on one of the hillsides through this stretch and on the south side it’s a flat spot, so the topography here plays into it, too. What you’re going to see here, those red lines that are vertical up and down the street, those would be the side cat pole options and that’s where those wires would be. And then here on this option would be the center cat poles. You can also see, in the prior version we show here, the in-lane bus stops and the next one I’ll show you is the pull-off bus stops. So we try to show you potentially what could be a narrower section here and a wider section here. Again, those flexible items, what we choose with them, will affect those widths. So that’s looking two dimensional, straight down. To describe it a little better, we picked the same block, the same location and we’re going to take a picture looking westbound on the north side of the street, as the arrow shows here. So you can see here the existing conditions with the existing sidewalk there shown in blue. If we choose the side catenary option, which is one of the narrower sections, we would need to shift the sidewalk back, the back of the sidewalk back, 2 feet 9 inches from where it is today. If we chose the center catenary option, which is a little wider because you have a pole in the middle and you have to separate the tracks a little bit, it would be 1 foot further back, or 3 feet 9 inches from the existing back-of-sidewalk to the proposed back-of-sidewalk.

Mohler: Now we get a lot of questions, how would you build that, especially at this spot with the hillside there? It’s a little hard to visualize, so bear with me a minute. What we’ve developed here is more of a cartoon look that makes it a little easier to explain this. You can see here, the same section. In general, the houses there have porches, steps coming down from the porches, a landing and then steps down to the street. As you can see here, what I chose to illustrate is the wider section, or the 3 foot 9 inch shift back, the other was 2 feet 9 inches. We’re going to try to describe the widest section to give you a flavor of what the largest impacts would be. So what we would literally do is rebuild the hillside and push it back in towards the houses. So we would rebuild the hillside, rebuild all the steps back in further as shown here in the blue portion. So we would literally slide that hillside back, slide the steps back and reconstruct the whole hillside along this stretch. There, we have the relocated steps there. To show you a little more graphically, we’re now going back to the same original picture that we started this sequence on, you see here a rendering of what it might look like with that hillside slid back and the steps reconstructed. Something else I want to point out, too is – as I indicated before – this block has a station in it so that fence, or the railing you see on the left-hand side of the screen, is a railing at the back of the station platform. It is not a railing through the whole corridor – it is only at the station platform. We’re trying to give you as realistic a view as we can imagine here right now today with what we know is going on–

Taylor: Is MTA going to plant nice little trees like that? **Mohler:** MTA is very much open to landscaping this corridor. We also describe or show the fences as new fences, so anything that we would disrupt, the MTA is absolutely open to rebuilding.

Conner: Even though you mainly disrupt a few houses, is it conceivable that you would make it have a seamless look about them, the whole footprint so to speak, so you just don't have this particular block looking nice and other blocks within that same area... **Mohler:** I think that would absolutely be a goal with the input from lots of groups such as the CAC.

Angela Bethea-Spearman: Good evening Mr. Mohler – sorry I'm late. It's a little wider up at that part of Edmondson Avenue. If you're taking that kind of property, you're taking that kind of land in this part, what happens when you get to the bottom of Edmondson Avenue, where their steps are already right at the sidewalk? **Mohler:** Sure. This is a location where we are trying to depict that – this is at Allendale, at one of the narrower sections. You can see here the steps are right at the bottom of the sidewalk – **Bethea-Spearman:** No, no, no, no – that's not at the bottom of the steps. [Inaudible] On Edmondson Avenue, where they're trying to do a bus stop at Edmondson and Hilton – and there's some blocks coming up [inaudible] their steps are right there at the sidewalk. **Kendrick:** You mean the porch steps Angela, right? **Bethea-Spearman:** Yeah, right there at that sidewalk, you don't have this kind of space – **Taylor:** Take these whole lower steps away – **Bethea-Spearman:** Excuse me – what happens with the people's property? **Mohler:** What I can do is when we're through this block, we have plan sheets for the rest of this stretch of the roadway. We can look at the specific location you're referring to there and have a discussion on that. I can get to that a little bit right after this, okay? **Bethea-Spearman:** I would like for this presentation to be done again and it needs to be done at Edmondson High School where the people that are being impacted can see what is being proposed. That is very important. No, they're not going to come all the way down here. So we need to have that on the agenda, that when we get back to Edmondson High School, this entire presentation be done again, to explain it to the people that's being impacted.

Mohler: Sure. So we went through the existing photo, we went through what could be proposed today to give you a sense of, a little bit more, of what that might look like. We also developed a tool here that we used to show the existing and the new. We can spend some time during q-and-a to go back to these if you'd like. So again I'll show you there, existing –

Kendrick: Can I go back to Ms. Conner's question just for a second, in terms of having a uniform look of the corridor. I think at the barest of minimums, the entire corridor, just because of the nature of the project, gets a new sidewalk, for example, and landscaping. At the barest of minimums, just given the nature of construction, the move of the curbs no matter what – to some extent that will occur just no matter where you put this thing. **Taylor:** Could you go back to the picture for one moment? **Mohler:** One of the other interesting things in this corridor is every block is different – we've got some flat areas, we've got some hillside areas, we've got other areas such as churches and so forth that we want to respect. Each block has a very interesting characteristic. What I've shown here for you is what is at this block. I wouldn't want anyone to walk away from this meeting thinking it's 3 feet 9 inches the whole way – it varies. Again, we're happy to look at any specific location people would like us to look at and explain some of the same dimensions and so forth.

Bethea-Spearman: On the right side of the street going east, you showed that it could possibly take 3 feet 9 inches – what happens on the other side of the street? **Mohler:** That's a great question – that's my very next slide – **Taylor:** Following up on what she just asked. My understanding of what's going on down by Dennison and Edgewood in the lower area, is that that part, that set of steps right here is basically coming right up to the sidewalk. So it's easy to see what happens when you have this whole thing buffered. The part that's interesting is where that

buffer's not there. I'm just making sure I understand – is that right, is that how it is down there?

Bethea-Spearman: He understands it. **Taylor:** I just want to make sure I understand it.

Williams: My question is – how will you monitor the noise when the trains are coming in? I would like to know how the noise is going to be monitored and will it disturb those people on either side. **Mohler:** Well, there are a number of techniques we'd use. First of all, with it being an electric-powered vehicle it should be quieter than buses and other, trucks and so forth, with very loud engines. There are other techniques to do to soften the noise, for instance a lot of vehicles would have skirts around them so that any of the noise from the wheel-rail interface is dampened and there are several other techniques as well we could explore. **Williams:** As well as putting different windows in people's houses shielding the noise from that window. **Mohler:** I think that's something that could be explored, yes. We're going to need MTA to weigh in on that. **Williams:** I was just asking because if you're putting that in, we need to make sure about the noise level and how it's going to disturb – whether it's during the day or the evening. We have homeowners there that wasn't really looking for this and we're getting ready to shift something in there, so how will we appease those homeowners in that particular area with the noise and what's going to be happening.

Mohler: We know that replacing windows is another technique that can be used to help dampen the noise. **Bethea-Spearman:** That's the same thing that I proposed to Jamie Bridges when we met probably about a year ago, soundproofing those neighbors' homes that did not move into the neighborhood to be impacted by a train. And I also proposed that money be found and put aside to move the neighbors who just don't want to deal with that. **Kendrick:** If I may, I think you meant Kendrick, not Bridges, but here I am. You should come up – that's your chair. Two things – one, Ms. Annie and I had the chance to travel to Seattle a couple of years ago to look at a corridor very similar. That was indeed one of the strategies that they used was to install a heavier duty window with, I'm not a window expert, but the point is exactly well taken. And I should also say the City in the bond issuance that was approved by the voters this fall, included one-point-eight million dollars for what we're calling the Red Line Community Development Fund. Now obviously we're a couple of years away from construction and I think we have some other ideas about how that money is used now, but I think it's certainly an indication of the City's interest in working on those types of things. Angela asked about where people's houses or steps come right up to the sidewalk, off their porch. Rebuilding porches is something we've seen in areas. So I think it's all on the table and really has to be thought through on a block-by-block and even house-by-house situation. But I think, at least from the City's perspective, it's something we're very, I would say, more than open to.

Cole: Could you go back to the cartoon? I'm looking at these steps, then you have a hill angled, then you have more steps. I guess my question is if the old steps had problems, is also refurbishing the old steps an option? **Mohler:** Certainly. We absolutely would maintain anyone's assets, we wouldn't want to do anything to disrupt that. **Bethea-Spearman:** That's fine that you would throw all this stuff out that you would consider, but what would be assuring for the people that live there is that there needs to be a community benefit agreement that the State or the City or the federal or whoever it is, you are committed, this is a legally binding contract that you will do these things. We can talk this pie-in-the-sky stuff all we want but that's not helping the people that live on Edmondson Avenue.

Kendrick: Can I just – two points without totally interrupting Tom's thing – I think there are two places where you end up with legally binding agreements in this corridor. One is when the Final Environmental Impact Statement is approved and the Record of Decision is approved by the federal government, MTA commits to certain mitigation measures as part of that. Some of those

are incredibly specific like 'at 3227 Edmondson Avenue we will do X' and some of those are a little broader, kind of corridor-wide – so that's one. And that Record of Decision is a legally binding, federal document, it doesn't get more legally binding than that. Then on a property-by-property basis – we're dealing with this on Reisterstown Road right now where we're doing some streetscape work, if let's say, for example, this is the right-of-way and I'm sitting in somebody's yard in order to construct, say, the new sidewalk or the cat pole -- as the agency I have to get a temporary construction easement in order to stand in your yard to construct this sidewalk. That becomes a whole negotiation process between the property owner and the City and the agency. So, there are two very clear points at which that legally binding agreement has to happen.

Bethea-Spearman: Will that be shared with those neighbors so that they're working with MTA – not MTA telling them – **Kendrick:** No, no, no – I think that right-of – **Bethea-Spearman:** -- so that they can see that and have input in that process. **Kendrick:** Absolutely. That temporary construction easement, the latter one which is the even more specific one -- or it might even be a different kind of easement agreement – is something that's got to be signed by each and every property owner and is a legal document. It's recorded in the various land records and things like that.

Williams: Is this where the liaisons out here will step in and help with those types of things?

Kendrick: I would imagine so, yes. **Mohler:** As well as right-of-way agents and other people who oversee these property issues. **Conner:** That was my question as well – who would be responsible for making sure that these kinds of agreements are made with the individual property owners? **Kendrick:** They have to be. **Conner:** And Angela, I think you made a good request to suggest that this be done again on the west side, Edmondson or somewhere. However, I think it's going to behoove us or somebody to get the message out to them to make sure that they are there. So we need to decide tonight before we leave, who's going to take that responsibility to make sure that they're all notified and at least get the notification that they should be there. **Bethea-Spearman:** And it can't just be a blanket notice that we have a Red Line [inaudible], you've got to be specific. You're talking about something that can impact their property, that's what needs to be in that notification. **Orange:** Tom – can we move on?

Cohen: On this photograph, this idealized drawing you have right here, if you go back to the photograph just before it, if you look at the line at the top, it looks like the sidewalk has moved back but it doesn't look like the top of the hill has been relocated anywhere. So the drawing doesn't show me that the hill has been shaved back without changing the steepness of the steps. I'm assuming that that's what you're talking about – that is, narrowing the landing area of this hill. **Mohler:** Correct, we're keeping the hill at the same slope – we tried to do the best we can to depict it here, sometimes graphic representations are a little challenging [inaudible]. **Cohen:** The problem of course is, as was mentioned by Madame Chair, is that down around Edgewood and Dennison you have one side or the other of the roadway where there's no hill and no lawn, where the sidewalk goes straight up to the wall of the house. And that's the area, that's where you have the greatest bottleneck and therefore that's the critical zone, where, if it doesn't fit there, it just doesn't fit. Whereas we always knew that because of these lawns, it would fit in here somehow. But that's the area that is most critical. **Mohler:** Okay, thank you.

Bethea-Spearman: Can you do a depiction like you're doing tonight for those blocks? Can we have that ready before we get to the Edmondson Avenue area? Don't show us this -- we need to see Edmondson and Hilton, the six blocks that are the narrowest part [inaudible]. **Taylor:** I have a question – **Mohler:** More specifically – yes, we can do that. **Taylor:** On the west side, in those areas, what percentage of the properties are rented and what percentage are owners? I'm just curious because I believe the people in those communities that are renting, they don't have any voice at all. **Bethea-Spearman:** Well, yes they do – **Kendrick:** They do. Under the – **Taylor:**

[Inaudible]. **Kendrick:** Hang on, under the Uniform Act they do have a voice in the process. So you've got to understand the Uniform – **Taylor:** I'm talking about the easement process. **Kendrick:** No, no, in the easement process, under the Uniform Act, residents have rights – property owner or renter. Tenants have rights under the Uniform Act, so don't just say they have no voice if that's not entirely legally true. **Taylor:** Not entirely a voice, they can't make decisions – **Kendrick:** Let me try to be more specific – it's not at all legally true. **Orange:** Can we move on?

Mohler: We'll do that. So, to present as full a picture just in this block, we want to look at the other side of the street as well. So we're going to show a picture here, again looking west on the south side of the street as this arrow depicts here, which is shown here in this existing photo here. Now in this slide is a spot where we could have a bus stop or we could not have a bus stop. That bus stop could be in-lane, that bus stop could be pull-off. What we decided to show you here is the widest possible location or scenario. So if you look at the existing sidewalk, there shown in blue, we're going to show you a pull-off bus stop and what the ramifications of that would look like. So as depicted here, if there's a pull-off bus stop, that back of sidewalk would need to move back at this spot. And again, each block is different, so at this spot it would be 14 feet 1 inch. If we did not have that pull-off bus stop, it would be 4 feet 4 inches as shown here. To give you a better idea of what that would totally look like, is a rendering that looks something like this. So again, using that same tool showing you existing and sliding it over to proposed. **Bethea-Spearman:** How much would you shorten those people's lawns? **Mohler:** By 14 feet 1 inch. **Bethea-Spearman:** You're taking 14 feet of their lawn away? **Kendrick:** Under this option. **Mohler:** Under this option – again, we don't have to have a bus stop here, that bus stop does not have to be a pull-off bus stop. This is one of the flexible elements that I talked about at the beginning of the presentation. What I'm trying to show you is what the worst-case scenario would be. The best-case scenario would be you wouldn't have a bus stop or that bus stop would be in that curb lane.

Cohen: Are you saying you wouldn't have a bus stop at a point like Edmondson where there's a station? **Mohler:** As we conceived it here, there is a bus stop. **Cohen:** Right, but you're saying – **Mohler:** What I'm saying is that the location of that bus stop – whether it's at this specific location or the corner of the next block, we're certainly open to position that bus stop with input from the community, from the CAC and other people. **Cohen:** So in other words, you would consider putting up a situation where the nearest bus to the station is a block away from the station as buses run right by it. **Mohler:** If that's what collectively all the input is, that is something the MTA would take into account in making that decision. **Cohen:** Well, that's certainly not seamless. **Kendrick:** Can I ask Mr. Kay a question or two? In the existing thinking of, kind of given your knowledge of transit systems around the country, if you get off of Amtrak at 30th Street Station in Pennsylvania, I'm sorry, Philadelphia – how far do you have to walk to get to SEPTA? About a block? **Kay:** You know, I don't know. **Cohen:** No, across the street. **Williams:** Ed, we had to walk quite a ways, didn't we? **Cohen:** From 30th Street it's across the street. There used to be an underground connection that was closed because of construction. **Kendrick:** It's a block, to go in certain directions, it's a block. **Cohen:** From 30th Street – **Kendrick:** I got off there every day for three years going to grad school. To go in certain directions, it's a block. My point is, a block is a lot of different things to a lot of different people. I'll give you the Westport example – from Westport Station to Annapolis Road is two-and-a-half blocks. It's not like it's an eternity. **Cole:** But these are only options, Ed. These are only options. These are only alternatives. **Cohen:** Yes they are, but the argument is being made that we do it this way to make for walkable communities. **Kendrick:** Nobody's making any argument, but somebody's laying options on the table. **Cole:** Just to show you, just to show you -- **Kendrick:** Nobody's arguing for anything. **Cole:** -- if this is the option you want, this is the

impact. **Cohen:** Well, but the point is that you're putting in options that are not very walkable. **Kendrick:** Then choose the more walkable option. **Cole:** Then don't choose that option. **Kendrick:** That's why they're called options. It's like a menu. **Cohen:** What we see is what we've seen so often in this process – where some alternatives are presented to say that you're presenting alternatives, but they aren't very functional and then you end up with the one alternative that you guys want. **Kendrick:** Or more pointedly, the one that you don't. **Cohen:** Either way, what you're doing is you're funneling it so that ends up being one rather than a real set of choices. **Kendrick:** You're making rational public policy decisions, is what you're doing.

Conner: I suggest that we continue the presentation because until the actual people impacted by this would have a direct say – we can give our opinion of what we think, but they're the ones that really would have to make a final decision as to what will happen and what their communities would look like. **Cohen:** But it depends upon the choices they are presented. **Kendrick:** And we're about 20 slides into choices so far. It seems like a lot to me.

Mohler: So – those are the choices. Recapping the flexible elements that I spoke about at the beginning of this presentation -- the locations of signals and left turns, the location and number of them -- definitely a flexible element. The number of bus stops in this corridor – definitely a flexible element, number and location. In-lane versus pull-off bus stops, if you have a bus stop at a specific spot – definitely a flexible element. Location of full-time parking – a flexible element. And the catenary pole location, whether that's in the center of the transitway or on the side – flexible element. So that summarizes where we're at with that specific block. There's additional information that we can come back another time and try to depict it. I've got plan sheets here that I can go through if you'd like to. Henry, if you want to wrap up with this.

Kay: If I could, I just want to put a finer point on a point that Tom has made, too, which is that those options are options. I mean, we can make a choice, the community can make a choice, the City can make a choice between those, but they do have pros and cons. So for example, if you create a pull-off bus stop, which is what we were showing there where you move back the yard that 14 feet, which I would agree if I lived there I'd find that to be a lot. What that means is that from a traffic standpoint when a bus stops to pick up passengers, it doesn't stop the traffic behind it, so it's a benefit to drivers. It's a dis-benefit to the person who lives there because the street has come closer to their house. And it's actually a dis-benefit to the people on the bus because they have to wait until there's a gap in traffic for that bus to pull back in traffic and proceed on its route. I have my own personal opinion about what choice I would make in that setting, but the point we're trying to make here is that we want to lay options on the table and let the community decide what it wants. Some are better, some are worse and some depend – whether they're better or worse – on your own perspective. So what Tom, again, is attempting to show is sort of a range of least to worst. We have many options in between -- as Jamie pointed out, it sort of depends on which of those flexible options you end up choosing in any particular setting.

Williams: At our SAAC meeting the other night, we had a whole bunch of us together, you also said that you may change the bus lanes that ran up and down there also. So, the thing of it is, if you change the bus lanes and not have those buses running up and down there you wouldn't have to do that anyway. **Kay:** That's true, I mean, a setting where you don't have bus service now. On Edmondson Avenue, there will always be bus service on Edmondson Avenue, there's always going to be a need for it. From a transit service standpoint, it will lie under the Red Line. The Red Line will provide the faster, longer-distance trips, the local bus service will still be there to provide that block-by-block. So, what you may do is take the Red Line to the center of the community, transfer to a bus and maybe ride the last five blocks, if you want to end up in a specific location. I suspect there will be less bus service than there is now. There won't be as

much needed given the number of people who will be on the Red Line, but there will still be some. But there are streets in the corridor where bus service may not be needed at all when the Red Line is there. If we could just turn to this slide for a second. What we've done so far, is try to define from an engineering standpoint what these options are. These are based on very precise surveys, information and property lines that we did not have before, because you know at this point we're only looking at one Locally Preferred Alternative, so we are focused on Edmondson Avenue in a way that we have not been focused before. So we have lots of new information. What we want to do with this information – we can do variations on this presentation, we can develop the same kind of information for other specific blocks or individual properties, based on what people want, is essentially start a process of discussing that. We want to discuss it with the City – which has something to say about how the right-of-way is managed. The impacts on utilities – the City has opinions through its planning process, its housing, its transportation agencies, we'll have to work with, we'll need a number of permits from the City and so it matters in the end a lot what it thinks.

Kay: We need to continue to define these options, so where people point out issues to us, for example, you know this is a valuable corner to maintain open space because there's an active commercial use there, so maybe it's more important to protect it and do the widening on the other side. That could refine our thinking. We want the Station Area Advisory Committees in this corridor to see this presentation and variations like it and tell us what they think. You're seeing it first, but this is meant to be shown to the SAACS – not all of them, because some of them don't care, they're not in this corridor. For those that are in this corridor, they need to see this presentation so they can be aware of these choices and give us input on that. Then there are the existing community associations, there are the property owners, there are businesses that are active in these corridors – all these people will probably have something to say about these choices and we're interested in input from them, too. We'll do this through individual meetings – I mean, this is a big public presentation – we can do the same thing out at Edmondson High School to make it more convenient for folks. We will do it at SAAC meetings, at community association meetings. Our liaisons are available, they'll understand this material and be able to present it, if that makes sense. And then finally, the last bullet there, is that we want to head toward some public workshops in which we can develop a vast range of information, we can set it up at stations, we can publicize it a lot. People can come in, we can do it at the high school if that's the right place, people can come in and talk to us. Tom or one of his counterparts can really be looking at a map and talk to a property owner about a specific house and what the impact would be in that place with each of these options. That's the way this information is going to get out there. So really for the first time in this process, we have that kind of information about impacts in this corridor. We're happy to get to this point because a lot of questions have been out there, people are challenged to kind of understand what these impacts are. We're very challenged to communicate them, so we've finally reached a point where we can do those things. So, again, we'll start a process with the SAACs, we've shown it to you, we'll be contacting the community associations and offering to show it, but we'll be heading within the next, I don't know, couple of months toward a set of public workshops where we'll go into it in detail as well. Yes ma'am?

Conner: At what point will we know how individual residents will be compensated? For example, if we have to take 14 feet away from homes, where will there be a listing of various compensations that MTA and/or the City will make to them. When can we expect to have that?

Kay: We won't know what that is until we are relatively far through the engineering process. So that we will know for an individual piece of property exactly what the impact will be. Are we a foot into their property or 6 inches? That property will have a value and the impact of our construction will have a value. That will be appraised by multiple, independent appraisers and

people will be compensated for that. So we won't know till further along in the engineering process. I think that what's probably more important to establish as a principle is our approaches to mitigation. For example, an approach that Tom expressed – which is that if we grade your yard and remove your steps and remove your fence, we will replace those things with something that is the same or better than what you had. In fact, to the extent that you want to weigh in – if you didn't have a fence before and you want one, we can do that. If you had one and don't want one, we can do that. If all the people on a block get together and decide what they want, we can do that. Those are relatively simple mechanisms to make people whole and we can commit to those in a series of agreements. And then, those drive how we treat each individual property owner. So once we know what the menu of mitigations are, we sit down with the property owner and we say, okay, we see that you have steps and a fence, you don't have a railing – would you like a railing? – and we'd put this back. So we work it out property owner by property owner based on that set of parameters. I just want you to know that our approach is making people whole, at least. I think there will be many opportunities to make things better. I mean, the picture Tom showed of that particular block, you can see some of the steps are deteriorated -- some are fine, some are deteriorated. But at the end of the day, everybody gets a new sidewalk and everybody gets new steps – that's just a starting point. Whether you want a tree, you know, will end up being up to you. **Conner:** I think to appease folks we need to start out this presentation by saying this is what we are looking at, some approaches to the whole. Then folks might be a little bit more informed and receptive. **Mohler:** That's a great suggestion.

Bethea-Spearman: I just think, it seems like this is kind of backwards. It seems like the impact on people's property should have been submitted before we even submitted anything to even try to put it above ground on Edmondson Avenue. How could we make a decision, this is what it's going to be, that you haven't considered the impact? Now you're like, oh, there's the impact. A lot of this stuff has been talked about for more than three years. So what did you submit to the federal government when it came to the people's concerns about the impact of taking their property, because we've heard it for years.

Kay: If you think back to the philosophy of the [Draft Environmental Impact Statement](#) – that's what that was about. So what that attempted to do is lay out for public information a much wider variety of options – some less impactful than this. Because for example, they were on another street. Or more impactful in the sense that they maintained three thru lanes as opposed to two thru lanes which is what we're talking about here. We did enough engineering work at that time to be able to get a general sense of that. So we knew that, for example, we would be moving back a sidewalk one to – I'm just making up these numbers --- one to five feet, not 20 to 50 feet. We were able to characterize an order of magnitude what those impacts were. While we weren't able to say it's 4 feet, 4 inches we knew that it was about that much. You may recall there were a number of discussions with west side communities about that, because those numbers were in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. So that was the philosophy we used that led us to select this particular alternative. Now we didn't pick an alternative that had zero impact like, for example, a tunnel because there were other reasons we couldn't do that – we couldn't afford to do that. So what we picked was an alternative that achieved the goal of the project and did have some impacts but they were relatively small, but they're not zero. We didn't pick the one that had zero because, again, there were other reasons we couldn't do it. So, Angela, exactly what you're expressing was the philosophy of the DEIS. But we're beyond that now. We're more at a point where we're now trying to refine that engineering to a point where we know that it's 4 feet 4 inches, not 4 feet 6 inches, not 3 feet 2 inches and we can describe to people exactly what it is.

Bethea-Spearman: Or it could be 14 feet. **Kay:** If that option was chosen, but I think we both know that's not very likely to happen. We want to be able to characterize it because it's a

legitimate option, but I don't think anyone's going to embrace it. I don't think we're going to find too many homeowners or community associations that are going to embrace that. **Bethea-Spearman:** I think it would be nice that by the time we get back to Edmondson Avenue – and we need to make that sooner rather than later – that we have this entire corridor, especially starting at Edmondson and Hilton – worked out with the cartoons, with drawings, with the cars jumping and everything moving, sidewalks going back – there needs to be a clear picture. They can better comprehend what they see than a lot of technical talk. **Kay:** I would put that question to the CAC. We did this in one specific location on both sides of the street – do people agree this was an effective way to communicate the change? I mean, we've used some unsuccessful techniques before – showing people section drawings doesn't seem to really work, so this is what Tom has come up with. Is this an effective way to show the information?

Costello: I think it is very effective and it certainly is very appealing. But if there is a section of Edmondson where this isn't going to work or the most difficult part of this section to make this work that's probably going to be the most convincing presentation, because you're saying 'this is the worst situation we have to work with, we have less area here and here's what we can accomplish or we can't.' Right now I can hear people thinking 'well, that works good in that particular spot, but maybe it's not going to work in the other area.'

Mohler: First of all, there is not a section where we can't make it work. **Costello:** Yeah, okay. **Mohler:** What is the best or the worst section, it's really subject to somebody's personal interpretation. What might be worse for you might be okay for me. If I'm a property owner, that bus stop, pull-off bus stop, is worse. For somebody traveling by car through the corridor, that pull-off bus stop may not be worse. What I just quickly put up here is a plan – on the left side is Wildwood Parkway, on the right side is Hilton Parkway. So we do have it laid out conceptually. In this particular option, you can see, is center catenary poles and off-street bus stops. So that's one of the wider sections. I could, if I wanted to, zoom into a particular section and scroll through this and show you a depiction of what it might look like in any particular block. I also, just to reinforce that there are flexible options here, I can switch it to an option with the side catenary poles, as depicted here and, as you can see here, the in-lane bus stops, which makes it all narrower. Again, if you want to get really specific information, we can come back at a subsequent meeting. If you pick a specific block, we can get you those exact same dimensions that we depicted earlier in those renderings.

Kay: Can you zoom in and interpret the colors? **Kendrick:** Before you do, can we go back and answer your question earlier? I think the short answer is yeah, this is effective, however, I think logically a lot of the questions like Angela's are coming up and so I do think we need to, at some level, need to be prepared to lay out some of those issues as well about what the process is. Because this could literally scare the hell out of somebody. Or somebody could say 'I don't care, do what you want, write me a check and let's be done with it' and everywhere in between. I would also suggest that, while I appreciate the 60 or 70 people that are here tonight – the farther you are away from the screen, the lighter the room, the harder it gets to see. I think almost a block-by-block, sitting in somebody's house on the block saying 'let's look at this map and see what this is all about' is probably the most effective approach.

Conner: I was thinking too, if it was possible or feasible, could you actually have handouts, block-to-block, that someone could look at and take it from there. I like the cartoon rendition of what you did more so than this because it's easier to follow. I can really see what was transforming and being changed. **Mohler:** Sure. **Cole:** So, again, with this presentation, I like the graphic nature of it [inaudible]. **Bethea-Spearman:** And it shouldn't be a door-to-door thing, because if you're sitting in somebody's living room and everybody's giving their own

interpretations, people perceive things differently. It needs to be out in the open at all times. The cartoon view, I think that's much better than this view, but we need to see that entire corridor --

Kendrick: I agree. **Bethea-Spearman:** --starting from Edmondson and Hilton where the street is not wide. **Kendrick:** I just would make the point that at a certain point you will be in an individual property owner discussion-slash-negotiation about the best way to proceed, at which point you don't want to do that in the auditorium of Edmondson High School. **Bethea-Spearman:** But as far as everybody seeing, understanding and perceiving what they see, we need to hear what everybody has to say.

Mohler: So to help understand this drawing -- back to what Mr. Kay asked for -- I'm going to walk away from the mic for a second. What you see here, in tan, are proposed sidewalks. What you see in kind of the grey stipple pattern is where the existing sidewalks are. So in this particular block between Hilton and Dennison, what is conceived with this option with the side catenary poles, if you see on the north side, that proposed sidewalk lines up -- I'm going to say exactly or almost exactly -- the proposed sidewalk lines up almost exactly with the existing sidewalk. On the south side of the street, we can actually, in certain areas, go a little narrower. Existing sidewalk here, proposed sidewalk there. So again, I just want to stress, you really have to look at this on a block-by-block and a case-by-case basis to really understand specifically what's going on. Yes sir? **Taylor:** When you have the side catenary poles right there where there's that big red block in the middle of the sidewalk -- how much room is there actually to walk past the catenary poles? **Mohler:** The sidewalk is 5 feet 6 inches wide. The base of the catenary pole would be the back of the sidewalk and I think it's 3 feet 6 -- would you still be able to walk by Mark? **Mark Henry:** It's wide enough for ADA requirements without using the curb.

Cohen: Okay, so one wheelchair goes past and waits for the other? **Mohler:** Yes. **Kendrick:** Seriously, I mean, so heading up the steep hill on Edmondson Avenue, how many times annually does that occur? **Cohen:** What's that? **Kendrick:** How many times annually does that occur? **Cohen:** I don't know. Have you counted it? I haven't counted it. **Kendrick:** Go for it. Have a great time tomorrow when it's cold.

Audience member: The difference between what we saw in the previous schematics is so severe where there was a station and there was a side pole [inaudible] why it's so severe in terms of the impact [inaudible]. **Mohler:** That's correct. This particular [inaudible] by the side catenary poles and in-lane bus stops. So it's one of the narrower options that we have. **Williams:** Where is the one with the center catenary poles? **Taylor:** Is it wide enough the whole way for center catenary? **Mohler:** For this stretch? **Taylor:** Through the whole stretch. Could you do center catenary the whole way if that was the decision? **Mohler:** Yes. We'd just have to weigh that with the extra impacts on the side of the road. **Williams:** And where you do that, that means that the person in the wheelchair runs along the sidewalk, they're able to, those poles aren't taking up the sidewalk. **Mohler:** With the center option, that's correct.

Cohen: But people will have to pass each other in alternating single file -- this is not my concept of walkability. **Taylor:** With the side catenary poles. **Cohen:** Yeah. **Kendrick:** Having to wait for those three people would be really rough. We really should delve deep into that. **Cohen:** It's a matter of inviting. You're talking about -- **Kendrick:** It's a matter of practicality, Ed. I mean, let's be serious. **Cohen:** You're saying it's a matter of practicality, but what it's really saying is we're going to put this in regardless of impacts and we're not going to care what our goals are. **Kendrick:** No, I've not heard anybody say that at all. What we've said is there are a range of options. We have to sit around the table on a block-by-block basis and weigh the pros and the cons. You could decide that you want a 12-foot sidewalk and one travel lane. **Taylor:** That's ridiculous. **Kendrick:** But so is the idea that two people in wheelchairs couldn't wait 10

seconds for one to pass. **Taylor:** A 34-inch curb is not that wide. One wheelchair and that's it going by – **Kendrick:** That's the point. So somebody would have to wait. **Cohen:** That's not inviting. We've been constantly – **Kendrick:** Nor are these meetings when we focus on the ridiculous scenarios. **Cohen:** Please let me finish my statement before you interrupt me. **Kendrick:** Please. **Cohen:** We've been constantly told that this project is about walkability. We talked about the reduction of traffic on Edmondson Avenue to improve walkability and livability. But if the sidewalks are too narrow to be inviting and people are standing right next to a traffic lane on something that's 3 feet 4 inches wide that is not inviting, that is not walkable. What we're doing is we're giving up both traffic capacity and replace it with trucks and we're forcing people off and crowding up other roadways and we're not getting walkability either. **Kendrick:** Which option do you prefer? **Cohen:** What's that? **Kendrick:** Which option – given that we've laid out a dozen – which option – **Cohen:** I want an option that didn't require making that Hobson's choice. **Kendrick:** Well, here we are, right? We're at that point. **Orange:** But we don't have to make any decisions tonight. **Mohler:** And keep in mind, Mr. Cohen, what I presented in the beginning was we were looking at a 5-foot 6-inch sidewalk at a minimum. If we got a lot of input that wanted it to be wider and it was acceptable to go there and create more property impacts – that's an option. I presented the minimum – **Cohen:** Down in this particular area between Edgewood and Hilton, you really don't have any space, so you don't really have a whole bunch of options because you have no space to work with down here. **Kendrick:** You could decide not to put a bus stop there. I mean, literally, you can mix and match these choices as many different kinds of salads as you would like to make in a salad shop.

Orange: Mr. Mohler – do you have some more? You're done? **Taylor:** I think the point is that there are places that are about 75 feet wide, right? If you add the minimum things you're at 75 feet, so there are a couple of places where the only choice is side or center catenary, right? **Mohler:** As you can see here, parking's another option. **Taylor:** But that's wider than 75 feet. **Mohler:** It would be in this spot as depicted here. But again, each block is different. **Taylor:** Absolutely. There are a couple of blocks where there aren't many choices.

Kay: Marty – I'm sorry, excuse me – are you saying there are some places where the right-of-way is only 75 feet? **Taylor:** I thought there was – **Cohen:** No, the roadway, the width of the cartway is only 75 feet wide. **Taylor:** Isn't there a couple of places, the very narrowest places down at the bottom of the hill, aren't they about 76 feet wide? **Cohen:** In fact, I was speaking with Don Sherrod about this. He and Nate Payer have gone out with a tape measure and actually measured the roadway in various places. They checked it against Google Earth and Google Earth showed the same thing. According to Mr. Sherrod, when he contacted Lorenzo Bryant about that, Lorenzo said he could not confirm or deny the width of the cartway in that area. So, I'll go with Google Earth and the tape measure at this point. **Kendrick:** You say the cartway or the back of right-of-way to back of right-of-way – there's a difference. **Cohen:** The right-of-way is 120 feet wide. You could take everybody's house and still be in the right-of-way. **Mohler:** The right-of-way in this spot is 100 feet wide, curb-to-curb. **Kendrick:** And somebody's house wouldn't be in the right-of-way because it then wouldn't be the right-of-way. But other than that – **Cohen:** Some of them are partly in the right-of-way. **Kay:** There are no houses in the right-of-way.

Orange: We're going to move on. We've gotten the presentation and Mr. Mohler we thank you for that. **Mohler:** You're welcome. **Orange:** We hope that when we do schedule the west side, Mr. Kay, that we have him on the agenda to present this when we're at Edmondson High School. At this point – **Kendrick:** Can I just go back one point – because Mr. Cohen likes to make very fine points. So – **Orange:** No, no – we're moving on. **Kendrick:** Just real quick – **Orange:** We're moving on, we're moving on. Hold on – we're moving on. **Kendrick:** Just show us which houses are in the right-of-way. Help me – because it's an important public policy issue.

Orange: Yes. **Gauvin:** The last Community Liaison is here – could she introduce herself?

Orange: Yes. Come up to the microphone.

Keisha Trent: Good evening everyone. My name is Keisha Trent, I'm the Community Liaison for the County corridor, which is the CMS, Social Security Administration, Security Square Mall and the I-70 Park and Ride. Prior to this, I worked with the Baltimore City Housing Department and I've worked in revitalizing neighborhoods, helping communities revitalize their neighborhoods through land development. Prior to that I worked with Enterprise Community Partners doing capacity-building and training for community organizations. Thank you, good to be here, thank you.

Orange: Alright, we're going to go into our section for public comment and questions. If we have people in the audience that have questions at this time, we would like for you to come up, use the mic to ask your question. Do we have anyone that has any questions about the presentation tonight or any question about other information that you're concerned about? **Don Sherrod:** Yes I do – which mic should I use? **Orange:** Wait a minute, wait a minute. Okay – Mr. Sherrod you've got three minutes.

Sherrod: Thank you very much. My name is Don Sherrod, President of Rognel Heights Community Association. Part of the reason for this meeting is that I brought to the attention of MTA two months ago questions about the right-of-way as it relates to Edmondson Avenue. Every drawing that MTA put out in the last four or five years showed a curb-to-curb measurement of 88 feet. It's 74 to 75 feet. Now, this presentation that was just given by Tom Mohler of RKK – and I want to be specific because I want to get this on the record. He and Henry Kay knows that the scenario that they've presented – meaning two lanes going east, two lanes going west and two trains will be built in the right-of-way which is 120 feet. They need every inch of that 120 feet. I physically went out there to measure, myself and it was backed up by a member of TRAC, because we wanted to see beyond that 88 feet where that 120 feet would fall. In some cases it fell on people's lawns, but in some places it would have fell into people's living rooms, dining rooms. Now, what they don't tell you and the reason for this meeting was about the right-of-way. Each block the property is situated a little closer or inside the right-of-way. You've got to understand – U.S. Route 40 – now they state at one point it's 100 feet. I have their maps and I have their larger maps that I brought two months ago. It's 120 feet all the way down to Hilton Street. Some of the homes are actually built in the right-of-way of U.S. Route 40. Curb-to-curb, that they never mention, is 88 feet. You can't fit two lanes, two trains, two lanes, buffer zones in 88 feet. Every scenario that they put on a map took 120 feet. So if they can build this in this 88 feet plus, what is it? 3 feet 4 inches or 3 feet 9 inches -- let's give them 4 feet – impossible. I know it, they know it. Some of you hearing this for the first time, you may not know what I'm talking about. Some of you know it, don't care. But my purpose is getting this on the record because I gave a presentation and Henry Kay knows specifically, this meeting was supposed to be specifically about curb-to-curb versus where people's property lines are. And how will you compensate those people? Well, my understanding is that if your property is in that 120 feet right-of-way, you get no compensation, no compensation. So that lawn that they'll be taking – no compensation. If the house is actually built on the highway, maybe, by some law, they may get some kind of compensation. So they are purposely – and I again, for the record – misleading and deceiving you. This meeting about all of this don't mean much to anybody to come into a meeting the first time. This was about what is curb-to-curb. They say 88 – it's 74 to 75 feet. The actual width of U.S. Route 40 is 120 and some of the people's homes are on the highway. They need to tell you this and they need to tell those homeowners this. Now, for the record I do have a map of MTA, with their logo on it, undated but to scale -- the purpose again, is

to get this on the record -- that states again the alternative is two trains, two lanes east, two lanes west takes 120 feet.

Cole: Can you give us your map? **Sherrod:** Yes. It really won't mean anything -- I mean, you all can pass it around and look at the scenario down below -- just pass it around. It'll show that the train being in the center takes 24 feet. Mr. Mohler mentioned it takes 24 feet. **Cole:** Twenty-four? **Sherrod:** Yes, that's what he said. Their scenarios states two lanes going east, two lanes going west and they also promised, in some cases, full-time parking -- impossible. Two lanes, two trains, another two lanes takes 120 feet and that's without any parking. **Cole:** So far you've only -- **Kendrick:** You're up to 40 feet. **Cole:** -- 64 feet. **Sherrod:** Their drawings show some buffering in there, but it also shows, again, that it takes every bit of that 120 feet and for the last four years they've changed the presentation. They always say they'll build within the right-of-way and you all think 'oh, it's the curb', it's 120 feet and they stated we'll need a few feet past that. So this is for the record. Henry Kay knows it, Tom Mohler of RKK knows it -- let me put your name on the record -- Diane Ratcliff knows it, some of the members of the CAC knows it. Jamie Kendrick has a map that shows a Red Line from Hilton Street right on down to Wildwood Parkway and shows where that line hits your lawn and where it cuts through your property. **Kendrick:** I do? **Sherrod:** Thank you. **Orange:** Thank you. **Kendrick:** I have that map? Can you make sure I know where it is, because I can't find it. **Orange:** Yes George -- do you have a mic over there George?

Moniodis: Could and would you provide the Chairmen with precise documentation as to what you were talking about as far as going into living rooms and such? **Sherrod:** Absolutely. Besides that -- one more thing. I have the original copy of the right-of-way map that I received through Freedom of Information from the last administration, Republican administration, that shows the true lines, dedicated lines at right-of-way. They didn't want to give it up, but I got it and I'll have that when I come. Yeah Jamie -- you know I have it, but -- **Kendrick:** You said I had it. **Sherrod:** You do, you do, but -- **Kendrick:** I'm not sure I do. **Sherrod:** But it's important that you make these meetings, I mean, whether they are in Edmondson, whether they're here, whether they're in Canton, whether they're in Woodlawn -- you've got to continue to make these meetings, because every meeting that they go to across town, the story seems to change. So it's important that you come to the meetings. Every community leader, or so-called leader, should have the maps of their area. I have mine -- ask MTA for yours. You should have those maps. Thank you.

Orange: Alright, any other questions or comments? Alright, Madame Chair -- agenda items for the [next meeting](#)? **Bethea-Spearman:** Okay -- by the next meeting Mr. Kay, would we be able to follow up and do this whole corridor on Edmondson Avenue -- where is the next meeting? **Kay:** We could go back to the west. **Bethea-Spearman:** No, let's go to the east if that's where we're supposed to be, let's go to the east. That will give you more time to, when we get back to the west. **Kay:** That is no problem. If you're talking two months or if you're talking four months, that's not a problem. **Taylor:** It'd be great to be at Holy Rosary. **Bethea-Spearman:** Do you have something like this for the east side as far as well -- or they didn't need that because they have underground? **Kay:** We have the engineering work done but we don't have a cartoon presentation of it -- **Taylor:** What people on the east side would like to see if you're going to do a cartoon, people really are concerned about the portal area. **Mohler:** The portal area. **Taylor:** People on the east side are most worried about the portal area. **Mohler:** Okay. **Taylor:** And the trees that are going to be taken around the Anchorage and all of that, where that portal width needs to be.

Kay: We have the engineering worked out as the basis for these drawings. We can develop these kinds of drawings for the presentation at that time. So we'll plan to do an east side meeting, we'll have an east side version of this presentation. Marty – if you don't mind -- we'll be in touch with you about the specific locations to show. **Taylor:** That would be great. I'll talk with the CCA because I know they have some concerns and I know some people farther west will have some – or east – will have some concerns, too.

Bethea-Spearman: Okay, besides the east thing, do we have anything else coming up for the MTA as far as the process about where will we be and anything else new to report that we should be knowing? **Kay:** Yeah, Diane is saying there's a public involvement process going on -- **Bethea-Spearman:** Public involvement about what? **Kay/Ratcliff:** [Inaudible] – agenda items or just – **Orange:** Agenda items. **Bethea-Spearman:** Can we get a status report of the Station Advisory Councils to see what each of those groups are doing? Any other agenda items that anybody can think of? **Conner:** Marty and Mr. Cohen are supposed to bring closure to the item on the capacity issue – **Cohen:** And safety. **Conner:** -- and safety issues. **Taylor:** We just got those documents. **Bethea-Spearman:** That was supposed to have been closed this meeting. **Taylor:** We just got the documents yesterday. **Bethea-Spearman:** It will close next meeting. **Kay:** We'll call it closure on the agenda. **Bethea-Spearman:** Was there any other agenda items as we move – please don't go back over the past three years. Moving forward, is there anything else – none of us wants to hear anything about the past three years because we're beyond that. Is there anything new that we need to be talking about that's coming up as it relates to a project that's going to be built?

Cohen: Madame Chair, we do have some housekeeping matters that we need to address. One is that we're still short two members of our statutory membership and so we need to make sure that the appointing authorities are aware that there's two more members that need to be appointed to the Council. **Bethea-Spearman:** We don't have two short members. **Cohen:** Yes, we do. **Bethea-Spearman:** Who are the two short members? Milo [Milani] was replaced -- **Christiaan Blake:** [Inaudible] Senator Jones to replace, Miss – **Cohen:** Cunningham. **Blake:** Cunningham, Dorothy Cunningham [inaudible]. **Bethea-Spearman:** I thought we did that. **Cohen:** David Smallwood is another. **Bethea-Spearman:** We've done those. We've had 15 Council members – go back and look at the minutes. **Cohen:** But 17 was the number. **Bethea-Spearman:** Oh, okay, so you're saying that we still don't have anybody for Cunningham and we still don't have anybody for – **Orange:** Smallwood. **Bethea-Spearman:** So who took Milo's place – we have Sydnor, we have Marty. **Costello:** Marty took Bob's place. **Taylor:** Bob Keith. **Bethea-Spearman:** You're Keith. **Taylor:** I'm for Bob Keith – yeah, that's right, may he rest in peace. **Bethea-Spearman:** But of 17, we still have the majority which is 15. Oh, okay. **Orange:** What was the other issue?

Cohen: The other matter was that the presentations that we get, such as the one we had tonight, they don't directly show up in our minutes and they do appear elsewhere. But there is not a direct link on the website to any presentations that we have received or that we have gotten, in the text of the website itself. I would simply ask that we request that any materials that have been presented to this Council also be referenced by a link at the point at which they were made in our meeting minutes. It could be done in the future, but also could be done retroactively so that the public can read it and understand what has transpired. **Bethea-Spearman:** I think that's the problem – you put it out there, they're not going to read it, they're not going to understand it. What do the other members – because I'm thinking, I thought I heard Mr. Kay say this was done for us tonight, but this has not been shown to anybody. **Kay:** I guess what Mr. Cohen is suggesting that with the record of the meeting we place all those documents on the website – we've been doing that. **Taylor:** No, a link to the PowerPoints, for example, has not been done.

It would be great if those, like the Flash document, the PowerPoint, in my opinion. For example, we had a presentation from Dudley Whitney recently where we talked about [capacity](#) – that PowerPoint file was never posted online after it had already been discussed at the meeting, so perhaps next to the meeting link could be a link to the PowerPoint file, the flash file. **Kay:** Let me say, that is our goal to do that. **Taylor:** That would be great – **Cole:** Did we get a paper handout? **Taylor:** We did, we got paper handouts, but nobody else could see it. **Cohen:** The public can't follow the discussion – **Taylor:** I'm not asking for anything new, just to follow the discussion I think it's helpful. **Bethea-Spearman:** Sandy? **Conner:** Is it possible that we could get a draft of the approaches that would be used to compensate the residents? We rattled off a lot of things but what are some what-ifs that we could possibly share. **Kay:** I think we've got to make that a work item, so we might come to you with a presentation on a standard approach, what people are legally entitled to and then we can start to build [inaudible] approach to that. If I could suggest that if we don't have time to do that on the next agenda, but the one after that. **Bethea-Spearman:** So do we have enough items for this agenda? Can somebody make a motion that we – **Orange:** No, wait a minute. **Hines:** Just a question – do we have Mr. Sherrod on the agenda? **Bethea-Spearman:** Mr. Sherrod on the agenda? **Hines:** Yes, he was supposed to be bringing some more detail. **Bethea-Spearman:** Did he ask to go on the agenda? **Hines:** I thought there was some conversation to suggest that he should. **Bethea-Spearman:** Did you ask to go on the agenda Mr. Sherrod? **Sherrod:** [Inaudible] (Laughter) **Bethea-Spearman:** Let's wait until we get to Edmondson High School, not on the next one.

Kendrick: If I may -- Mr. Moniodis and I were talking. It's important when we're in public forums like this to make sure that we share facts. So there's a map rolled up – I don't know what it showed, it could have been a map of the Grand Prix track for all I know. Or it could have been a map of an alternative that was three years ago. **Sherrod:** Or a map of your house. **Kendrick:** It could have been a map of my house – you can go on Google Earth and find that, too. I think it's important that if we're going to say as a matter of fact that there is a line going through somebody's living room, that we put the evidence on the table. I'm happy to have Mr. Sherrod meet with the City surveyor to go through as many documents as they like, but at the end of the day I think – shoot, I think the Mayor would want to know if this is going through somebody's house. So, you know, let's put the evidence on the table. I would ask that we give Mr. Sherrod 15 minutes either at the next meeting or the meeting thereafter to help us with that documentation. **Cohen:** Yes and it should be at the meeting thereafter. **Bethea-Spearman:** Yeah, I agree. **Cohen:** In the area impacted. **Kendrick:** I suspect he'll need all four months to find that documentation. **Bethea-Spearman:** Dr. Orange?

Orange: Yes – did all the members of the CAC receive a copy of the Annual Report? **Council members:** Yes, yes, I did. **Orange:** Did everybody receive a copy? **Cohen:** I didn't receive a hard copy, no, not a final copy. I received a working copy. **Bethea-Spearman:** Did they get it on e-mail? **Cohen:** I received a working copy, but I didn't receive a final. **Costello:** I got one in the mail. **Orange:** I got one in the mail, too. That's what I was asking – if everyone had gotten one. You didn't get one? **Cohen:** No I didn't. **Unknown:** Ed, do you need one? **Orange:** I hope there would be one, the final report, to read. **Kay:** We sent everyone one, but we could get another one. **Orange:** Well, that's why I asked the question because I didn't want to make the assumption that everyone got one. Okay – motion for adjournment. (Moted and seconded). Thank you. We want to thank everyone for coming out. We'll be meeting again in March, so be looking out for the notifications.

The meeting adjourned at 8:49 p.m.

**BALTIMORE RED LINE
CITIZENS' ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING**

DATE OF MEETING: March 10, 2011
TIME: 7:00 p.m.
LOCATION: Holy Rosary Church

CAC ATTENDEES:

- Angela Bethea-Spearman, Co-Chair
- Dr. Rodney Orange, Co-Chair
- Edward Cohen
- Gary Cole
- Sandra Conner
- Christopher Costello
- Emery Hines
- Jamie Kendrick
- Charles Sydnor
- Marty Taylor
- Annie Williams

(**Absent:** George Moniodis, Warren Smith)

GENERAL PUBLIC: 17 people signed in

ELECTED OFFICIALS OR REPRESENTATIVES:

- Brigid Smith, Office of Congressman John Sarbanes

MTA/CONSULTANT ATTENDEES:

- Henry Kay, Maryland Transit Administration (MTA)
- Lorenzo Bryant, MTA
- Christiaan Blake, MTA
- Tamika Gauvin, MTA
- Sam Minnitte, STV
- Tom Mohler, RK&K
- Steve Kolarz, RK&K
- Dr. Anthony Brown, Rosborough Communications, Inc. (RCI)
- Tori Leonard, RCI

RED LINE COMMUNITY LIAISONS/ STAFF:

- Roxana Beyranvand
- John Enny (Canton Crossing-Bayview Campus)
- Lisa Kramer (Harlem Park-Government Center/Inner Harbor)
- Charisse Lue (Edmondson Village – West Baltimore MARC)
- Rachel Myrowitz (Inner Harbor East–Canton)
- George Shardlow
- Keisha Trent (CMS-I-70 Park and Ride)

Agenda:

- Welcome [*Page 1*]
- CAC Member Introductions [*Pages 1-3*]
- Approval of Agenda [*Page 3*]
- Adoption of January 13th Meeting Minutes [*Page 3*]
- Final Follow-Up Response to Capacity Analysis by M. Taylor [*Pages 3-4*]
- Design Options for Boston Street Segment [*Pages 4-16*]
- Update on Station Area Advisory Committees [*Pages 16-19*]

- Map Documentation of Project Impacts [*Pages 19-20*]
- Public Comment [*Pages 21-22*]
- Next Meeting Agenda [*Pages 22-25*]

Dr. Rodney Orange: Good evening everyone. Can you hear me? We're going to begin this March 10 meeting of the Red Line Advisory Council. We want to thank everyone in attendance for making the effort to come tonight. When we consider the weather and the distance that some people had to come, we're really appreciative of your attendance here tonight. We're going to start with introduction of the CAC members. If you would Ms. Williams, would you start? We want to try to be sure that everyone that has something to say tonight will wait till they have a microphone available because our recording secretary had difficulty in hearing or understanding some of the people that spoke at our last meeting. So at least, let's try to – not only CAC members -- but when we have public comments or questions from the audience that we be sure to have a mic. Okay, thank you.

Annie Williams: Thank you. Good evening, my name is Annie Williams and I'm a resident of Harlem Park. I was, for the Red Line, appointed by the Senate.

Edward Cohen: My name is Edward Cohen. I'm a member of the Transit Riders Action Council of Metropolitan Baltimore and the Howard Street station advisory committee. I was appointed by Senator Verna Jones.

Sandra Conner: Good evening, my name is Sandra Conner. I was appointed by the Governor and I'm also a member of the Social Security Administration station advisory committee.

Gary Cole: Good evening, my name is Gary Cole, Deputy Director, Department of Planning for Baltimore City, appointed by the Mayor of Baltimore City.

Angela Bethea-Spearman: Angela Bethea-Spearman, President of the Uplands Community Association, Chairperson of the Southwest Development Committee and appointed by the Senate, the 44th – [repeats at request of audience member], appointed by Senator Verna Jones, 44th District.

Orange: Good evening, my name is Dr. Rodney Orange, I'm one of the co-chairs of the Citizens' Advisory Council. Again, I want to thank each and every one of you for coming out tonight. I was appointed by Senator Verna Jones.

Jamie Kendrick: Good evening. Jamie Kendrick, Deputy Director of Baltimore City Department of Transportation, appointed also by the Mayor.

Christopher Costello: My name is Chris Costello. I'm from the Westgate community, near Edmondson and the City line on the west side. I was appointed by the delegates from the 41st legislative district.

Charles Sydnor: Good evening, my name is Charles Sydnor. I am a resident of Baltimore County, appointed by the House members of the 10th district.

Emery Hines: Good evening, my name is Emery Hines. I'm representing Baltimore County Executive Kevin Kamenetz.

Martin Taylor: Good evening, my name is Marty Taylor. I was appointed by the former Senator George Della and I represent the Canton area.

Orange: Okay – did we get everyone? Alright – approval of the agenda. **Kendrick:** Move to approve. **Cole:** Second. **Orange:** It's been properly moved and seconded that we accept the agenda for this evening – all in favor? **Council:** Aye. **Orange:** Opposed? Adoption of the January 13th meeting minutes. **Kendrick:** Move for approval. **Cole:** Second. **Orange:** Approved and seconded with whatever corrections are necessary – all in favor? **Council:** Aye. **Orange:** Opposed? Now we're going to go to Old Business. 'Final Follow-up Response to Capacity Analysis by M. Taylor' – MTA. Mr. Kay.

Henry Kay: Yes, thank you. Good evening everyone, thank you for coming out on this wet night. This is an item that we've been discussing for a couple of months now. It was the result, if you'll recall, of a conversation that we had with Mr. Taylor and also Mr. Cohen. They asked for a couple of types of information – as of the last meeting I think that we've provided nearly all of it. Then in the meantime, we did get the last couple of pieces. That included complete accident information for MTA's metro, light rail and bus modes. Then Mr. Cohen was interested in vehicle revenue trips – this is the number of trips that a light rail train or bus makes in revenue service and so just within the last couple of days Lorenzo got that information to them. I believe that – **Cohen:** No, he said that he has had trouble with the year 2009 and the year 2010 was not yet available. **Lorenzo Bryant:** They are here. **Kay:** He has them with him and I have a copy here, so we'll have to get those to you. So this is 2005 through 2010. That should be the last piece of information that we owe you.

Cohen: Okay, so that means that I will be receiving these documents here tonight and I will be able to review them and report back at our next meeting. **Taylor:** I guess we're back on the agenda [inaudible] is to follow up on it again next time? **Kendrick:** Mr. Chair, just real quick, I'm just trying to figure out – going on month five at that point – what is it at this point, five months in, that we're still probing? **Orange:** Mr. Taylor had some concerns. **Kendrick:** I'm just trying to understand at this point given, you know, to my sense we have not identified a fatal flaw at this point. **Orange:** Microphone Mr. Taylor.

Taylor: I guess that at this point where we are is that we have a system that may have barely enough capacity for the ridership we've talked about. We've got a system that just ekes it out, barely. What else do we have Ed? We've got bus routings that, some of them, don't make that much sense to us, but... **Cohen:** We also had requested something about the system build-out, that if the system were built out, we wanted to make sure that the Red Line had capacity to absorb the build-out of the system from the 2002 plan and that had not yet been done. **Taylor:** Actually Mr. Kay declined to do that at this time, because it's too expensive. My gut feeling is that it doesn't have enough capacity because it barely has enough capacity to run as it is. But that's a gut feeling and we'd have to do the analysis to say for sure. **Cohen:** I asked the Baltimore Regional Transportation Board if they would do it since Mr. Kay has said that he thought that it was their responsibility. **Taylor:** That's right, I remember that it was both expensive and their responsibility. What did they say to that? **Cohen:** Mr. Kendrick, speaking at the table, declined. He said that the Board would not be interested in doing it. **Kendrick:** Obviously I didn't – and Mr. Hines can correct me if I'm wrong – I can't speak for the Board, a majority can speak for the Board, Mr. Hines is the chairman and can correct me. I guess what I'm getting at here – and Mr. Kay can defend the characterization if he wants – but my recollection is that this 50-year analysis, if you will, of the full build-out of the Regional Rail System Plan, while theoretically relevant is not technically required. In fact, if you look at the metropolitan area long-range transportation plan, the only one that allows any of these projects to be funded – there is nothing in there about

any future project beyond the Red Line. And so, that is the constrained document by which Emery and I live every day in our roles on the Transportation Board – number one. Number two – it seems to me that there’s a lot of issues for us to get to and we can do this one more month, that’s fine, I don’t care at this point. But at a certain point it seems like we ought to get to the substance of the matters as we move into Preliminary Engineering. I’m not sure that this is one of them. I think if somebody had asked planners in the D.C. Metro in 1965, ’67 as they were really getting into PE in their first phase and continued to build out their system, nobody could have imagined the amount of capacity and yet they’re technically over capacity and yet surviving every day, carrying, you know, hundreds of thousands of people every day.

Taylor: Yeah, but they have a dedicated right-of-way and real Metro systems – this is a system that could never be anything bigger than a capillary. It’s a small-capacity system that is good enough for the plan that we’ve determined, but if anybody wants to build a real transit system in Baltimore the capacity analysis has shown that this will never actually do the trick of being an artery of an east-west transit line. It’s good enough for now – maybe. And that’s kind of what the conclusions that we were best able to determine were – it is also the best thing that we could possibly build on the surface across town -- perhaps.

Cole: Point of order. **Kendrick:** I’m just glad to hear we’ve acknowledged that much, but very good. Thank you.

Orange: ‘New Business – [Design Options for Boston Street Segment.](#)’

Kay: Thank you. You’ll recall at our last meeting, we were at the BioPark and we had an extended discussion about the Edmondson Avenue section of the project – about the width of the project, a variety of design options that affect the width and how that would apply in a particular block. Mr. Mohler from RK&K was able to show some simulations of how that looked. What we said we would do this time is come back with a similar discussion for the Boston Street section – the other significant at-grade section, and we would do it when we were on this side of town, where we would have people in the community available to see it. So we’re ready to make that presentation tonight. I also thought, if you’ll indulge me, before we do that, I want to show you the video simulation for this end of the corridor. If you recall, we’ve seen the center piece, we’ve seen the west side piece, but the east side piece is now completed. A few folks in the community have had a chance to see it, but no one else has. So consider this the debut of the video simulation for the east end. I think it’s a very appropriate way to set up this topic, because I think it helps people visualize what we’re talking about and then we can come back to Boston Street in Tom’s presentation and talk about it in more detail. This is 12 minutes? Yes – and narrated as it was before.

(RED LINE [VIDEO](#) PLAYS FOR 12 MINUTES)

Taylor: Henry – before we go on, there’s just a couple of things in here that – I’ve now seen this video probably six times. There are a couple of things in here that need to be -- I guess the first is that there are a lot of things that are certainly not proven that are said in there. It’s just quick so many times, there’s no evidence of that, but anyway a couple of other things. The underground stations are unmanned – you might want to mention that. I don’t know why you guys keep bringing up this single lane thing on Boston Street. We know it’s not possible, we know it can’t be done. This idea of putting Boston Street as a single lane, then you show the Boston Street-O’Donnell connector, which has exactly the opposite point. The point of the Boston Street-O’Donnell connector is to funnel more traffic from I-95 to downtown. The reason that that’s being built and was proposed is because Conkling Street doesn’t have the capacity right now to

handle the traffic that's supposed to come down Boston. So you're going to build more traffic onto Boston that way and then funnel it down to one lane and it just congests the whole east side. We all know that – so why keep talking about a single lane when it doesn't work, it makes traffic not work on the entire east side and helps congest 95. I guess those are the three biggest points I've got. It seems to be that this is a complaint I've heard from a lot of people about this project – which is that a bunch of options are proposed that are totally not viable, really to just do the only option that is viable, which is in this case to build the two lanes as was shown in the video. It just seems like a giant waste of time, everybody's time. I don't understand why you keep doing it.

Cole: I've never heard of the single-lane option. **Taylor:** Well, you saw it in the video as a proposed option. It says two lanes, but then there might be one lane and we need to talk about it.

Orange: Mr. Kay.

Kay: What I'd like to suggest we do is move on to Tom Mohler's presentation because he's prepared to go into that issue in a lot more detail. This was meant to set you up, you know, it does provide a lot of, I think, helpful information about Boston Street, but it also of course gives some context to the rest of the east side which you and maybe folks in the audience haven't had a chance to see, visualize before. I'll just say to conclude this presentation of the video – like the other two before it, this will be available on the [website](#), so if folks want to take another look at it, look at it more carefully, it's available there. We'll also be showing it to each of the Station Area Advisory Committees on the east side because it facilitates a discussion about what people want and what options are really possible. So with that, let me turn the microphone over to Tom and he'll walk you through a more detailed discussion of Boston Street. **Orange:** Do you have a question Mr. Kendrick?

Kendrick: Just real quick, if I may Mr. Chairman. **Orange:** Excuse me, Mr. Kay, we have a question. **Kendrick:** Just real quick, more of a comment, since Marty offered a couple of points. One is, first of all from the City's perspective, the one-lane option is absolutely a viable alternative, in the same vein that we talk about for Edmondson Avenue, trying to calm the traffic. Going to a single lane on Boston Street plus parking is absolutely viable and can be balanced with other corridors in the area. **Taylor:** Which corridors? **Kendrick:** Eastern Avenue, Orleans Street – **Taylor:** They're all full. **Kendrick:** -- if I could continue Mr. Chairman, I didn't interrupt Mr. Taylor. The second point about O'Donnell is I don't think the purpose of O'Donnell was clearly articulated by Mr. Taylor because in fact the purpose is to bring traffic into several developments that are immediate to the eastern part of the corridor and to separate truck traffic in concert with the City's Maritime Industrial Zone Overlay District, to separate trucks that might otherwise find their way down Boston Street today. I hope that the audience won't be prejudiced by the comments heretofore because I think that as we did on the west side there are a lot of options and pieces that can be puzzled together to find a project that works for the community.

Orange: Let's continue please.

Tom Mohler: Thank you and good evening everyone. I appreciate the opportunity to present Boston Street to you. I want to start off by reminding you of some of the things we covered at our last meeting. What you see behind you on the first slide is some of the Red Line criteria that we work with. If you recall, the minimum transitway width we're looking at is 24 feet 4 inches with side catenary poles and 26 feet 9 inches with center catenary poles. A minimum lane width of 10 feet, a minimum sidewalk width of 5 feet plus a 6-inch curb for a total of 5 feet 6 inches. And, on major streets such as Boston Street, traffic would only cross the transitway at a signal. Those are some of the basic criteria. But as we presented with Edmondson Avenue, there are also a number

of flexible elements. So reminding you of those that we discussed – locations of traffic signals and left turns are certainly flexible, locations and hours of parking is another flexible item and the catenary pole location as I indicated in the previous slide is flexible between the center of the transitway or on the side of the roadway. To remind you of what that might look like there are two diagrams here. One with side poles at the top and one with center poles at the bottom, showing there the dimensions and how it would have to widen if that pole was in the middle and the tracks would have to be spread a little bit further apart to accommodate that pole. So again – 24 feet 4 inches with side poles with span wires across the transitway and the roadway, 26 feet 9 inches with a center pole.

Mohler: Another aspect that we always want to point out to this is the visual impacts of it and how that appears. So what you see here is a side pole, the span wires are shown in blue and below, the center pole shows wires overhead so it would be a much narrower appearance with the center poles and more overhead wires with the side poles. We always want to point out all aspects we can think of associated with any characteristic. Some other flexible elements we talked about was the number of bus stop locations along the street and the type of bus stop. What I mean by the type of bus stop is either an in-lane bus stop or a pull-off bus stop that you can see here in these diagrams. Keep in mind that in-lane bus stops are more efficient for the transit rider and they take up less space because they are literally in a travel lane. A pull-off bus stop impacts vehicular traffic less and requires a wider area – that's when the bus would literally pull out of the lane and over to the sidewalk area for boarding. A new characteristic we want to share with you tonight that would apply to Boston Street and also Edmondson Avenue is in discussions with the City as we're beginning to refine our options is the possibility of pedestrian-only signals. So you can picture possibly some of those along Edmondson Avenue between traffic signals or possibly including them at key locations along Boston Street. So to show you – you've probably seen some pedestrian-only signals – here's some shown in diagrams here. We would certainly work with the community, with the City and others to work through these. One of the newer signals is a HAWK-type system which is shown in the upper right-hand corner, but some of them also look more similar to regular traffic signals as shown in the lower part. Now, one of the characteristics that's unique to Boston Street is the opportunity to have one or two traffic lanes. We're going to spend a lot of time walking through that, looking at various diagrams and renderings trying to show and relate to you how we're conceiving those two options. Just to summarize those flexible elements – if you remember, there's many that can add up to a narrower section and many that can add up to a wider section and they're shown here in that chart. So the narrower section would include less signals and left turns, less parking, side catenary poles, in-lane bus stops, less vehicular lanes. Those are all characteristics that could lend itself to a narrower section. The wider section would include more signals, more left turns, more parking, center catenary poles spread us out a little bit, pull-off bus stops need a little more room and more vehicular lanes would clearly spread it out.

Mohler: So, what I want to start with is the portal area on Boston Street. To orient you here – that's the pink area that's shown in the middle of the diagram. You saw in the video –

Unknown: Do you have a pointer? **Mohler:** -- I don't have a pointer, sorry – that is the area where the train came up through the ground at surface level. So it's kind of the open area where the train comes up through. Again, that's the pink area in the middle. To the right we're showing green, which is where the green track is that the MTA is investigating now as a potential option in the way we address the light rail tracks at the street level, that's an investigation underway. So looking at this option, the first one we're showing here is the one-lane option. On either side of the portal what we're showing is one vehicular lane that is 18 feet wide. One of the first questions we always get is why 18 feet wide. That is generally a requirement by the Fire Marshal so that he's able to pass an emergency vehicle past a disabled vehicle. So the minimum we can

go there in this situation with a curb on one side and a small wall protecting that open area of the portal would be 18 feet. In this section then, we would have to have no parking. For illustrative purposes we're going to show center catenary poles. What you can see in the red on the left-hand side, are bus pull-offs – again that's another flexible element. That bus stop would literally pull out of the one single travel lane so cars could continue to get by.

Taylor: Tom, one thing, here's a question if you don't mind going back. Where's the portal actually opening – isn't it right after this intersection where it starts, in kind of the purple section?

Mohler: Steve – could you go up there and point to it please? **Steve Kolarz:** The actual point at which the light rail goes from basically having a cover over its head to having nothing over its head is right here. You can see the green in the median island behind it and then here the pink track, that's the embedded track where the light rail [inaudible] and back up to surface. **Taylor:**

How far back does cut-and-cover go? **Kolarz:** Cut-and-cover goes roughly back to Wagner Street, it's actually right here. **Mohler:** I should introduce Steve Kolarz who's one of our engineers who is working closely with me and others on this project, especially in this area of town. He knows quite a bit about it and you can ask either of us questions throughout this. So we picked a spot to start to show you renderings on how this might look. This is a spot relatively across from Potomac Insurance. Marty – if you remember, this is an area you identified as one you'd like to see, in some correspondence with Mr. Kay. So we're looking -- standing across from Potomac Insurance -- we're looking east towards the portal area. The way it looks today is portrayed in this photograph up there. What's out there now is two 12-foot lanes, a 10-foot sidewalk and off-peak parking. So there's parking allowed in the curb lane outside of rush hour. This is actually a great view so I'm glad Mr. Taylor identified it for us because it's where our improvements really start to take shape. So on the near side of the intersection that sidewalk doesn't change at all. On the far side of this intersection is where you start to see a difference in where the sidewalk's placed and how the Red Line shares the area with vehicular traffic. For this particular option with one lane at the far side of the intersection, the sidewalk would move back roughly one foot and that's it. So to show you what that might look like, we've developed a rendering here showing again that one 18-foot lane, a 9-and-a-half foot sidewalk – the reason it's 9-and-a-half feet is we moved the back of sidewalk back to the right-of-way line, we can't quite fit 10 feet in with all the other dimensions that we have to meet. So we can fit a 9-and-a-half foot sidewalk. There would not be any parking. You also see there that we have replaced the median and sidewalk trees – because they'll get affected during construction. Certainly the MTA is very committed to streetscaping and landscaping as part of this project.

Kendrick: And there's no lane in that lane, but sidewalk effects on the north side where the Can Company and the insurance company are? **Mohler:** There are similar effects on the north side.

We've generally taken the photos on the south side, so that's how we've characterized it, but it's very similar on north and south side. **Kolarz:** It does narrow on the north side because of the Can Company, there is no pushback on the back of the sidewalk because the Can Company's against the sidewalk. **Cohen:** How much sidewalk space would there be in that area? **Kolarz:**

Under this option, I believe it's 8 feet. **Cohen:** Would the roadway narrow at that point or not? **Kolarz:** No, the roadway continues to hold that 18 feet. **Cohen:** [Inaudible]. **Kolarz:** No,

today the sidewalks – **Cohen:** You're right but it cuts back to 8 feet. **Mohler:** Correct. Okay – so the next option for the two lanes – this is again the same area, the same portal area. We're looking at two vehicular lanes during peak period. Off-peak there would be parking in the curb lane. Again, we've depicted this with center catenary poles and in-lane bus stops, so that bus would be stopping in an area where parking was prohibited all the time, so it would be stopping in that curb lane which is why we're characterizing it that way, as an in-lane. So to share with you what that may look like, the exact same spot here. Again, two 12-foot lanes, 10-foot sidewalk, off-peak parking is what's currently out there today. To accommodate this option,

again, on the near side of this intersection, the one at the lower part of the screen, there would be no change in the back of the sidewalk. It's a little hard to see and we have some other renderings further down that will depict this better – is that the back of the sidewalk would have to move back 6 feet at the far side of the intersection. So because this is two lanes this is wider. To show you what that might look like, we've developed this rendering where, again, we'd have two 12-foot lanes, the sidewalk here would narrow to 6 feet, there would be off-peak parking allowed and because we had to move the sidewalk back 6 feet we would have to shift that berm that you saw there and all those pine trees that you saw there back. So we would re-do that and replant those.

Audience member: How much would you be going back on that property? **Mohler:** Six feet. I'm sorry, wait a minute, I'm sorry – we'd move the back of sidewalk back 6 feet. The property impact is – **Kolarz:** Today the right-of-way line is about – it varies actually because it's skewed to the roadway – but it's about a foot to 2 feet off the back of sidewalk so we'd be 4 to 5 feet into the property. **Audience member:** But you're taking the entire priority of the property, knocking down all the trees, you would be destroying our property, our parking lot, too.

Mohler: If we chose – no, we're not impacting the parking lot, there's – **Audience member:** [Inaudible] you're impacting the parking lot – **Mohler:** -- okay, let me try and explain. The berm occupies a portion of the landscaped area between your parking lot and the street. If we chose – if, if – we chose the two-lane option, we'd have to move it back, move the back of sidewalk back 6 feet, so that would be 4 to 5 feet into the property. We would shift that berm in the property and we would replant the trees. **Audience member:** Listen, there's not enough room. **Audience member:** That property is only 5 feet. **Mohler:** I'm sorry – what's only 5 feet? **Audience member:** From the sidewalk to the curb of the parking lot is only 5 feet – if that. **Audience member:** You couldn't put trees in between the parking lots. **Mohler:** We can look at a detailed plan later, but – **Audience member:** We live there -- **Mohler:** Okay, alright, I understand – **Audience member:** -- you're not telling the truth.

Mohler: Let's go on. So – another location that Mr. Taylor I believe you asked us to look at is the location across from Starbucks. So you can see that's roughly where that red arrow is there and we're looking west back towards the portal area. You can see the grassed area in the lower left-hand corner is the area we were just talking about, where that berm occupies today. We do have a little bit of room between the parking and the street there to re-work that berm. So to give you an idea of what that would look like. This is how it looks today with two 12-foot lanes, a 10-foot sidewalk and off-peak parking. That's a view existing today, again, looking west back towards the portal area. For this one-lane option, again, that back of sidewalk would only need to move back 1 foot. This rendering here would show you what that would look like if the one-lane option were adopted. You can see the portal there in the middle, where it's coming up from the ground area to the grassed area again, which is an option that MTA is looking into, to street level. You can see a turn lane that is developed there and I'll explain that in the next couple of slides in a minute. So that presents a one-lane option. Let's see, for the two-lane option, looking at the same area, again, two 12-foot lanes, 10-foot sidewalk, off-peak parking. The back of sidewalk would need to shift back about 6 feet, so again we would reconstruct the berm, we would replant the trees. So we would have an option that would look similar to this view. Again, this option would have two 12-foot lanes, a narrower sidewalk – this is only 6 feet wide. We could do off-peak parking and again, those berm trees are shown as replaced. Shifting a little further eastward, we thought it would be a good idea to show you the area around Lakewood Avenue to depict the Canton station for you. In this particular spot again, you're going to see one vehicular lane. In some areas we were able to fit full-time parking which can be seen up in the upper right-hand corner in front of St. Casimir's Park. We've depicted center catenary poles and bus pull-off stops consistent with the other renderings. One unique aspect to explain on this one is with the one-

lane option we're able to put a new traffic signal in at the other Safeway entrance which is the left traffic signal that's shown there. That is unique to the one-lane option – we are not able to fit a turn lane in, which was depicted in that last rendering, to put in that traffic signal under the two-lane option. So, to give you an idea what that may look like – here we are looking down on the area. We've taken some pictures and developed renderings, roughly at that red spot, looking eastward, towards the Canton station area. This is an image, it's a photo of what it looks like out there today. There are two 12-foot through lanes, a sidewalk on the right-hand side is a 20-foot wide sidewalk, there is no parking allowed in this area. To give you an idea what that would look like if the one lane was adopted, you can see here one 10-foot lane – and the reason we can go to 10 feet instead of 18 feet is we have that turn lane next to it so we still have a total of 18 feet clear distance. Again, we would not put parking back in front of the Shipyard Condominiums. I think that gives you a pretty good picture of what the one-lane option would look like looking towards that station.

Mohler: For two lanes we would have, obviously, two vehicular lanes during the peak period, similar to what's out there today, off-peak parking in the curb lanes and we've depicted center catenary poles and in-lane bus stops consistent with what we showed you out towards the portal. Same area, we're looking at two 12-foot lanes, a 20-foot sidewalk on the right, because the building's there, we're not moving the back of sidewalk back this time, so we're not providing that dimension for you and again, no parking in this area. A rendering of the two-lane option would look similar to this. Now to accommodate that, again, we have two 10-foot thru lanes, the sidewalk would have to drop back to 6 feet in this area. Naturally, we would not have parking in the area, consistent with today.

Taylor: You are able to maintain that light there? **Mohler:** Yes. That light was at the Safeway entrance, the right Safeway entrance, not the smaller one that's not there today.

Mohler: Moving further east, we sort of have different characteristics going on. Further east, the Brewer's Hill/ Canton Crossing area is where we have several different locations for the station platform. What you also see there is parking at this station. You can see the pink spots are bus layover spots where MTA would layover buses to facilitate transfer passengers between the Red Line and the buses in this area. So this particular option shows the station as it was in the video off to the north side of Boston Street. The station platform is depicted there in the light blue with the sidewalks in tan around it. Again, the bus layover spots are those diagonal sawtooth bus spots that are shown in pink.

Audience member: You said that there was parking there – are there plans to have additional beyond what's there if you're taking away quite a bit? **Mohler:** That's correct. **Audience member:** More parking -- **Mohler:** More parking. **Audience member:** -- more parking than is currently there today? **Mohler:** Yes. So, to try – **Kendrick:** Tom, can I just speak to that real quick because it's a little complicated. The land is owned, as you probably know, by Exxon and the City is entering into a lease agreement for that higher large triangular portion and how we situate parking depends a lot on north side, south side access to Brewer's Hill, how Eaton Street cuts through there, etc. In sum, yes, there will be more parking than there is today, but we do recognize that we have to protect that lower parking area for Brewer's Hill. There's a lot of moving parts, puzzle pieces, there but the short answer is yes. **Audience member:** My concern is that parking lot is already overloaded and it appears that with that corridor, plus the initial stops, plus the bus stop, that's it's not going to have additional parking, in fact it's going to have a significantly larger load. **Kendrick:** There's a net increase, again, depending on how you piece things together, it could be a net increase of 30 or a net increase of 300.

Mohler: So, one of the spots we wanted to take photos and a rendering from is shown here – Steve, if you would – with the red dot, looking east roughly, towards the Conkling Street intersection. Mr. Taylor, I believe that was another area you said would be a good spot to look at and it is, it's a very interesting view. When you go to how that looks like at the street level – Boston Street's a little wider out in this area. So that's what it looks like today. If the north option was selected you can see the tracks would bear to the north – again, as we showed in the video. You can see the station platform a little further off in the distance there and the extra parking and the bus layover facility would be on the north side of Boston Street. We also have an option with the platform in the center of the street, which is similar to where we've shown platforms in other locations, especially along Edmondson Avenue. You can see here for this particular option we've shown the parking on the south side and the bus layover on the north side. Some of those are interchangeable – we could very easily flip-flop those, we can also locate them all on one side. So for this particular concept with the center station we've depicted with the buses to the north and the parking to the south. Looking at the same intersection at Conkling Street – here's what it looks like today. If the platform was in the middle, it would look similar to this. So you can see the buses on the left-hand side and some parking on the right-hand side.

Audience member: Excuse me, I have a question. Isn't there a development proposed on the south side of Boston Street that's been approved by the City Planning Department, putting hotels and other buildings that would make that less possible?

Kendrick: A couple of things, if I may. There is an approved Planned Unit Development for Canton, the Canton Crossing side which is what you're referring to. Obviously, given the economy that is in lots of flux, but the short answer there is yes. But again, there's lots of moving parts here, the owner has expressed an interest, for example in rearranging their parcel to accommodate this or depending if we end up on the south side, so again there's lots of flexibility as this moves forward.

Mohler: Okay – and a third option we have would be if the platform was on the south side of the street. That's shown here. Again, with some of those parts interchangeable – we've shown parking on the south side of the station, the bus layover turnaround facility is on the north side, so between Boston Street and the platform.

Taylor: Tom, I'm confused about that option. **Mohler:** Sure, back up Steve. **Taylor:** So you're going to cross the south lane of traffic and then cross both lanes of traffic again in another 20 yards? **Mohler:** Well, it's a little further than 20 yards. No, actually we wouldn't. If you remember, O'Donnell Street is assumed to be in, that connector would be there – **Taylor:** So you'd be on the other side. **Mohler:** So we'd be on the right-hand side of O'Donnell Street as we went northward and you'd have to cross Boston Street which would be a smaller leg off of O'Donnell Street. It's not as significant of a crossing back again, okay?

Cohen: O'Donnell was put in, according to what Mr. Kendrick said earlier tonight, to accommodate certain developments such as what Ed Hale was doing -- clearly the money is not there so the question rises what happens to O'Donnell, does it go forward and if it doesn't what does that do to the plan? **Kendrick:** It's the city's intent to construct O'Donnell. We believe that there is significant development potential in the area – whether that is next year or seven years from now, but the development potential is very well known. We intend to continue with – we're in design now – so we intend to continue. **Cohen:** If it's say seven years from now – **Kendrick:** Probably on the inside. **Cohen:** -- that would be beyond what we're talking about. **Kendrick:** I said the development would be. We are in design for O'Donnell Street today and intent to be under construction by say, early 2014, if I recall the timeline correctly.

Mohler: So some of this construction would be concurrent with the Red Line? **Kendrick:** Correct. **Mohler:** So we clearly need to take both into account at this point in time. Again, this is one of three options. This option has a station on the south side. The exact same photo, looking towards the Conkling intersection. You can see here how the tracks would bear to the right, to the south side of the street. We have the bus layover and the parking on the south side of the street, too. This particular station also looks interesting from the other direction and we've depicted that as well. I think, Mr. Taylor, one spot you recommended would be as if Eaton Street was extended, so roughly where that is looking west. So we've done the same renderings for those locations. To show you what it looks like today, that's an existing photo of what's out there. The station on the north side, you can see the bus on the north side, you can see the station all the way on the right-hand side of that with the train standing at the station there. So looking at that same spot, this is the way it would look like today for the north side. For the south side, you can see it depicted here in the next renderings -- I'm sorry, the middle, the center station, here in the middle of the street. You can see the trains there laying over at that station waiting to pick up passengers.

Cohen: What's the width of the lanes right there? **Mohler:** These are two 12-foot lanes. So, again the third option looking at the same direction, with a station on the south side of the street. A little harder to see, you can see the bus layover, if you remember that, the bus layover was between Boston Street and the platform. The platform's beyond that, so looking at the same exact view you wouldn't see much of it from this angle. Okay? **Taylor:** While we're on the topic -- Mr. Kendrick what is the city's status on Eaton Street? Is that planned to be extended now or not? **Kendrick:** It is -- it's funny I just was e-mailing Mr. Jurkiewicz as we were sitting here because it's in discussion. I think from the city's perspective it is a necessary part of this whole conversation. From the developer's -- I don't want to over-characterize the developer's perspective -- I think the developer has a very different view of that notwithstanding the PUD, so I think that's something we're going to have to wrestle through over the course of the next year. As a matter of fact we had been in design up until about three weeks ago on the lower part of Eaton Street, but have not been able to come to agreement with Brewer's Hill and how that would work. **Taylor:** Thank you. **Cole:** I would just like to also offer a word of caution in response to Mr. Bowden's remark about the Canton Crossing project. Although the south station may be a possibility, I think there's going to be a lot more planning and investigation before that action can be locked in, even though that development is in somewhat of flux. But still additional research would be needed.

Mohler: Mr. Cole it's interesting that you note that, this summary slide -- our next step is a lot of outreach, a lot of gathering of comments, especially from the community, the developers, Baltimore City. You can see in the top bullet, we will be continuing to refine options and hopefully narrow down options to one solution by the time we end planning and we start going more harder into the engineering. The Station Area Advisory Committees are very important to us, to gain their input. We will be reaching out to other community associations, major property owners, other stakeholders and we are planning public workshops in May. So those are some of our next steps to continue to gather input, comments and ideas. So, I think that concludes --

Audience member: Can I ask you a question? **Mohler:** -- Boston Street -- yes sir. **Audience member:** I apologize because I came a little late, but I just wanted to ask, just by way of summary--the track comes out of the underground somewhere on Boston Street, is that right? **Mohler:** Correct. **Audience member:** Where on Boston Street did you say that was coming out? I had two or three questions just by way of summary. **Mohler:** Okay, it comes out roughly the Hudson/Montford intersection, is the rough area. **Kolarz:** Just east of the Hudson/Montford

intersection. **Audience member:** Where the Can – ? **Mohler:** Yes, right in front of the Can Company. **Audience member:** -- because I had heard it was in front of where the Safeway and the Anchorage were. **Mohler:** No. It's west of there. **Audience member:** It's west of there. **Mohler:** Correct. **Audience member:** And you indicated that there were these options – option one and option two as far as single lane versus double lane. Who's going to determine which one of those options is taken ultimately?

Mohler: Ultimately, I think that's probably the City's issue to straighten out. The MTA will have the tracks in the middle of the street, of course the City would have lots of input. Jamie – I don't know if you want to say anything further to that. **Kendrick:** I said earlier – I don't know if you were here – that the City generally favors the single-lane option. There's obviously lots of issues to be worked through in terms of fire access, clear distances. There's a 16 versus 18 versus 20 issue to discuss with the Fire Marshal, but I think, in general, we tend to favor the single-lane option but it's a lot of collaboration with the Station Advisory Committees, with the immediate neighbors and property owners, with MTA, you name it. **Audience member:** Okay, my last question is – I don't know how many members actually live on Boston Street or in that area or travel it on a daily basis. Is there a show of hands of how many of you live on Boston Street? How about on this major committee here? Nobody. Well if you live on that – excuse me, there is -- thank you Mr. Taylor. **Kendrick:** Just so you know, that's the nature of how the committee was established by the legislature. **Audience member:** The reason I'm asking that as a preliminary question is because if you live on Boston Street – I live in the Anchorage – and if you try to make a left-hand turn out of the Anchorage during morning rush hour, it's extremely difficult. I can tell you that the stream of traffic going along there in a single lane as it exists now is extremely difficult. The cars come barreling down the road in a single lane. It just seems to me, as input from a resident -- I've been living there for about seven years now --if there's going to be improvement by virtue of all this money being spent on the road, I know everybody gets put off by the fact that we don't have an overpass where the train comes down, further down the road which would have been a fantastic thing to improve for traffic, but since we have this situation... Having two lanes for traffic could potentially be such an improvement to that whole situation, I can't even dream of what the construction situation is going to be like, to have to make a left-hand turn for all the people heading towards I-83, towards Harbor East or going up towards Fayette Street. I've talked to neighbors who just say to me they're just going to have to avoid Boston Street in their lifestyle, completely, for a number of years. It's a nightmare there already to make a left-hand turn. To maintain a single lane and to add to the single lane the problem with the trains coming down the road, stopping and going, it just sounds like to me if you combine that along with the construction that's going to go on for three years, you're going to have a potential nightmare there, keeping it in that single lane situation. That's all I wanted to say. **Mohler:** Thank you.

Kendrick: Just real quick – on the train overpass at Haven Street, roughly, that's the intent of O'Donnell Street, is to get up and over and put people on O'Donnell – **Audience member:** You have to go and detour around it though. **Kendrick:** Yeah, but it still takes you to 95, 895, etc.

Bethea-Spearman: Mr. Sydnor. **Sydnor:** Mr. Mohler – what I wanted to find out – you said that the community associations and the community at large would be solicited – what method would you use to solicit their input? I understand we have the S-A-A-Cs, but how will the message get out to others that public comment is wanted? **Mohler:** We often are going out to speak at community association meetings, for instance, we were just at one two night ago at the Bayview Community Association. We are always looking for those opportunities. Then the workshops that I mentioned in May are going to be full public workshops so anyone from the public is clearly going to be invited to work with us. I think Mr. Minnitte will speak a little later

on – he’s handling that whole process for us. If you have an idea, I encourage you to talk to Sam and we can certainly work in any presentation that you might be thinking about. **Sydnor:** And if community associations wanted you to come speak, do they contact MTA or what’s the process?

Kay: If I could, I’ll answer the question, but we can have a longer discussion about that on the next agenda item because that’s what Sam will be talking about. Yes, we get, probably on almost a daily basis, a request to come out and talk to community associations. There are multiple levels. We talked about the Community Liaisons who are specifically there to create those connections and make sure we’re available to do that. We have a variety of folks from the project – Tom is there, but there are other folks – Steve, too – who are knowledgeable, so there’s hardly a situation where we can’t be represented and talk to people in detail. I would also say, as long as I’m on that subject, this presentation to you tonight will be on your website, so for anyone in the audience who wants to take a closer look at it, it will be available for that purpose. We can also, as I said, come out by invitation and go through it in a lot of detail. These kinds of issues will be the subject of those public workshops in the spring. I think it’s often easier for people if they can really look at a map closely and we can talk about specific issues with them one-on-one. I hope this is a helpful overview for you, but I realize it’s a little frustrating to get into these details in this setting.

Gary Bowden: I have a question. **Bethea-Spearman:** Certainly. **Bowden:** My name is Gary Bowden. Although I sit on the City’s advisory group for urban design and architectural review panel for the City, I’m actually here today more speaking as a resident of Boston Street and Canton Cove Condominiums in particular. The point I would like to suggest is that in the requirements of the design of the right-of-way of Boston Street, that more credibility be given to the impact of the tree edges along Boston Street. Currently, since the latest and most recent redesign of Boston Street, the island down the middle of the street has served to humanize what would otherwise be a very wide street. The proposals that suggest two lanes including the right-of-way for the transit lines are beginning to approach 100, 108, 110 feet before anything other than roadway is viewed. I know that has to be that way as long as we’re running down the middle of the street. But I would suggest that in the criteria that are being formulated –and you listed them, sidewalks of a certain width, parking of a certain width, all of the requirements, the one requirement that wasn’t considered as a line item is the tree edge definition of Boston Street. When you show, for instance, the section going past the Shipyards, it just further shows how inhumane sometimes the relationship of curb, sidewalk and building can be without trees. So I would like to see if in your criteria, so that the net effect was gaining more not losing something, is the idea of a tree-edged Boston Street is included in your criteria – it isn’t now. I think it must be if we’re going to have a humanized edge of Boston Street, of a 110-foot wide Boston Street.

Mohler: Thank you, I appreciate that comment and I agree wholeheartedly with that comment. In some of the renderings tonight where we had wider sidewalks we did try to depict trees in the sidewalk area. So where we were having 9-and-a-half, 10-foot sidewalks I tried to consistently show them, so we do intend to do that. Where the sidewalk gets narrower, in the 6-foot range, we can’t do that and still have the sidewalk to be ADA compatible. So it kind of depends on options, but – **Bowden:** I’m suggesting that the tree thing shouldn’t be optional, when you can do it, but it be a requirement of the design of Boston Street. **Mohler:** I follow you, okay. I appreciate the thought.

Taylor: Along those same lines, one other place that would look rather intimidating – I was just struck by your rendering at the stations, where the two lanes cross. Standing there it’s just an intimidating amount of things going on there as either a pedestrian or a driver, there’s six lanes plus – including the vehicles anyway – two lanes of traffic plus the vehicles, six lanes, four lanes,

things crisscrossing over each other. It's a little scary looking. That's going to be a very challenging area even with trees planted, which will help probably at least make it look a little bit more humane. But that's going to be a very challenging area which right now is actually a rather nice looking area. **Kendrick:** We hear a lot about the pedestrian challenges. Councilman [Jim] Kraft and myself have walked the corridor, we've added a lot of these pedestrian paddles that you see on Boston, done a lot of re-striping of the crosswalks. I agree, it's a big challenge but I do think one of the benefits of the one-lane option – it's actually one lane plus parking in most places, it's not just called one lane – **Mohler:** Once you get east of the portal, correct.

Kendrick: -- yes, once you get east of the portal – is that it does tend to calm traffic. The parking barrier does tend to calm traffic. It gives you shorter walking distances if you do bumpouts on the edges of those. I think there's actually a pretty significant way to shrink that walk distance for pedestrians. Yeah, if you're sitting out in an island, it can be, but there's definitely ways to mitigate it.

Orange: Mr. Cohen. **Cohen:** Thank you Mr. Chairman. One of the things that concerns me about trees and tree lines is that if the trees are too close to the curb, then pedestrians become invisible to traffic when they try and step out. I think we have to be very conscious of that because there's a safety factor. This has already come into play in the planting of trees along the landscaping on Charles Street. It is now not so easy to make sure that you can see the traffic when you cross and the traffic can see you. So we need to be aware of the safety aspects of where the trees are located and that they not be set too close to the curb.

Orange: A gentleman in the audience had a question? **Dan Tracy:** My name is Dan Tracy and I live on Boston Street. I've been appointed to the Canton SAAC, I'm on there. I just wanted to mention very briefly – we've been getting a lot of information recently. We've been working with these gentlemen, showing the different plans, different options. In response to the gentleman earlier talking about the traffic on Boston Street – that's why I wanted to get involved. It's terrible right now. It's dangerous and if anything separates the waterfront from the rest of Canton, it's the traffic on Boston Street right now. I can't speak for my SAAC – we haven't even gotten a real consensus yet, but I can speak for myself and some others on the SAAC – we're very strongly supportive of the one-lane option. Part of the reason is that it will calm traffic down. What we'll have as Mr. Kendrick pointed out, we'll have these little bumpouts where there is parking which will make a shorter distance. There will be more opportunities for greening the area, which I think is a very important consideration. As was shown, there's an additional brand new signaled intersection right at the exit of the Safeway parking lot. The distance between the intersection at Hudson Street and the intersection at O'Donnell is about a quarter of a mile. Everybody in our neighborhood crosses over to the Can Company right in the middle, which makes it additionally dangerous. This new intersection with crosswalks and signal is not in the middle, but it's at least in another place where we can cross safely. This is very important, I think, to us and also for a couple of the places like Anchorage Towers, Anchorage Marina and our present lot where we have to go right because the train's there, this will give us an opportunity where we can make our left turn to go left a lot sooner. So I just wanted to mention the fact that we are working on this, but we look at the one-lane option as a real benefit. It changes what is a dangerous highway down to more of a neighborhood street which is what we're hoping to see come from all this. That's all I have to say.

Bethea-Spearman: I have a question for you – excuse me, excuse me. You serve on a SAAC and you're talking about the same intersection as the gentleman spoke to back there, how are you going to -- ? **Tracy:** We probably live within a block of each other. **Bethea-Spearman:** -- he preferred the two-lane and he doesn't serve on the SAAC. You prefer the one-lane – so how are you going to consider his point of view? That's what I want to know. **Tracy:** I don't know – as

I said, I don't speak for the whole SAAC, we have 15 people. Unfortunately – **Bethea-Spearman:** So you have folk on your SAAC that prefer the two-lane as well? **Tracy:** There's one person that did say something about that. **Bethea-Spearman:** One person. **Tracy:** Yeah, but I have to tell you, at our last meeting we had five out of 15 people show up for our meeting, so that's not a very good representative group. **Bethea-Spearman:** No that's not. **Tracy:** We called another meeting in April where we'll have, hopefully, most of them to get a real consensus and have a good debate about it. But there are a number of issues involved as they said, but I'm just speaking up for myself when I say, the whole reason I got involved is to calm traffic down on Boston Street and I think the one-lane option will do that. **Bethea-Spearman:** Thank you.

Audience member: I'm not a highway expert, so I don't know the so-called calming effect of the single lane versus the double lane and all that, but it sounded like a lot of the people on this committee maybe don't travel down Boston Street all the time like a lot of the citizens do. This is all about the people that are going to be living there and if you live there, there are a lot of people – I hate to classify by age – but there are a lot of very young people that tend to speed very fast. On Friday and Saturday nights they're parking along Boston Street to go to the bars down on Canton Square. You really need to take into consideration these sorts of things. And what the gentleman said about the crosswalk – is there a crosswalk scheduled for that area right there near either the Anchorage or down by the marina? **Kolarz:** The Safeway's driveways, it would be east of that building where Starbucks – **Audience member:** Right there? Okay, great. So that was great to have another crosswalk there. The last question I wanted to ask was – and you may have already said this – I know there's a lot of options you have to go over , ifs, ands and buts that are involved in the whole plan, but having been involved in the program for as long as you have, if you had to give a non-binding, off-the-cuff, guesstimate –guesstimate -- of when construction – a small window – of when you would think construction might begin on this and when – okay, I'll point to you then – when construction might begin, roughly? And when it might end and be complete – I think some people might be curious about that.

Kay: Thank you. At this point, the current schedule on the project calls for us to be in that kind of construction, the kind that might be disruptive to the street, starting in 2016. The construction period we're talking about now is about 60 months for the entire project. But the period of time where any one segment, for example, Boston Street, would be under construction would be much less than that. I don't know Tom if you have any sense of the duration of construction in a place like that – **Mohler:** About two years. **Kay:** -- yeah it's about two years for that particular segment. **Audience member:** [Inaudible]. **Kay:** I can't say that it would happen at the beginning of that period of time, but it would be sometime in there. The tunnels are the most time-consuming part of it, surface sections are easier. I would also say, I'm sure there are folks here that recall the major reconstruction of Boston a few years ago, you know that the overall project from beginning to end has a duration like that, but how it affects you individually, the turn you want to make, whether the particular section of the street you're using is affected, is even shorter than that. It's 63 months for the entire project, 14 miles including those substantial tunnels – that's about what we're talking about now. **Audience member:** But there will be disruption somewhere along [inaudible]. **Kay:** Somewhere along that 14-mile corridor, yeah. So if there's construction going on in Woodlawn, it's probably not going to affect you that much.

Bethea-Spearman: We need to move on. **Taylor:** Can I just share one last thing here? **Bethea-Spearman:** No, we need to move on. We're going to take this gentleman as the last comment. **Audience member:** I don't think I need a microphone. You're familiar with the Anchorage Townhouse, correct? How are you going to be able to turn left during construction? **Kolarz:** Under this design, at Anchorage Townhome lots currently, the eastern entrance would have to make a right above that signal and U-turn to head back. The other end of the lot would

still have access. **Kolarz:** The SAAC did bring up the suggestion, though, of placing a driveway opposite the Hudson/Montford intersection directly into the lot, so then you could [inaudible] the lights which would stop traffic. **Audience member:** So that's the only way we could make a left? **Kolarz:** Correct. **Audience member:** How about for the Anchorage Towers – would they still be able to turn left from the garage? **Kolarz:** Out of the parking garage? We've been looking at a right to make a left turn or a U-turn, make a right out of the parking lot and turn at the next intersection. **Audience member:** You have to make a right, go all the way down to the next U-turn? **Kolarz:** The next U-turn would be that new light at the Safeway, for the one-lane option. For the two-lane it would be at Eaton.

Bethea-Spearman: Mr. Mohler will stay behind after the meeting for any further comments. We're going to move on to the 'Update on the Station Area Advisory Committees.' **Kay:** Thank you. Let me bring up Sam Minnitte here. Sam is the manager of our outreach initiatives. He's going to give us an update on the SAAC process. Sam, for the sake of the committee I'd say, keep it brief.

Sam Minnitte: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Members of the Council, thank you so much for the opportunity to be here tonight. I will be brief and walk through these quickly so I apologize if we move too quickly. As Henry has indicated, we can come back to your next meeting and provide more of an in-depth presentation, if that would be the Council's pleasure. Before I begin though, I would like to make just one quick comment. One gentleman here is from one of our SAACs – is there anyone else from any of our SAACs here this evening? I know there's a couple of members – please hold your hands up. They're an important feature of our public outreach so if you have questions, please talk with them afterwards. I'd also like our Community Liaisons, who were introduced at the last CAC meeting, if they're here if they wouldn't mind standing up. [*Liaisons stand*]. They're all here --wonderful. Thank you all for being here. They're also the key component of our outreach program. Please talk with them – each of them represents a distinct area within the alignment and they're here tonight not only to be a resource but also to provide any information in addition to being a resource throughout the project. We're here to just update you on the Station Area Advisory Committees, our SAACs. I'll walk through each of these slides – happy to answer any questions. Just by way of background, community-centered station design, development and stewardship was their purpose, basically generated out of the [Community Compact](#). There are, as we know, 20 proposed light rail stations. Again, the idea is to integrate those stations into the community. The opportunity to participate, engage community stakeholders and station area residents, businesses, churches, organizations and institutions. The SAAC schedule – they began in September of 2010, let me back up a minute. Pardon my back, for the members of the audience. The SAACs will have eight to nine sessions, we are currently entering session four which basically is around the end of this month, early into next month. There will be two sessions to session four. The SAACs will also outreach to their respective communities. I think that's going to begin very soon – I'm going to speak to that at the end of my brief presentation. I think Tom had mentioned in his presentation that we will be looking to public meetings, basically workshops and open houses in the spring of 2011.

Minnitte: SAAC objectives – community-centered station design and early and continuous support for public involvement within our process. This is to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act – NEPA – as maybe some of you have heard. The SAACs will be informed of options available in station design. As we've just begun to address some of the stations here in the Canton area, discussing engineering, designs and options with public opportunities for comment and for criticism. The work output – you can see all of the work output by going to www.baltimoredline.com/SAACs. If you take a look at that, you will see all

of the mapping output that's been done through the three sessions again starting in September of last year, working up to this point of this year. Why don't we just move to the next slide. Step 1 – this is the process we've been in through sessions one through three – was station area visioning. Basically, what does the community really look like and what do we mean by that in planning. We can grab a Google map, we can see what it looks like – chances are about 50 percent of it's wrong, it's no criticism of Google, but until we sit down and work with the community, we won't know what's really important or how the does the community really function, particularly within about a half-mile or so of where that station is going to be. We want to set our base map for each of the station areas – again, not just simply to get a picture but also to set something and memorialize what the community's map looks like from an aerial standpoint. Now we're looking at neighborhoods within those maps and starting to identify physical features. This is in the case of Highlandtown/Greektown – not just looking at maps in meetings, but each of these groups have gone out as a group – which is important – walked through the communities, start to look at and identify important areas, not only how the community functions today, but in some cases their vision for how it will look in the future. Again, looking at vision area, we as planners will take a look at a map, draw the circle and that means relatively little. What we really need to do is sit down, work with the community and start to push the edges out, bring them in to see where the important features are and what's really important in terms of functioning from a transportation standpoint for a community. Again, some of the mapping that's available here, looking at another example, Howard Street/University Center, again pointing out particular areas within the community that have to be captured as opposed to the nice little circle, we now start to see edges formed that really identify the community. Again, we ask each of our SAACs to address these questions and then again we will start to move out from the SAACs into the communities. We'll speak to that in a moment, but, what do they value? What stays the same? Where are there opportunities for improvement and change? Here we're looking at, again, mapping some of the issues where we want stability but then again where we want opportunities for change. This is West Baltimore MARC station area. Again, I'm giving you samples of different mapping, you can see each of these base maps as they apply to each of our station areas by going to baltimoredredline.com. Looking at Edmondson Village – intermodal connections obviously a very key issue at all of our stations, but particularly along this corridor the SAACs have identified the connections and the analysis of those connections for other modes of transportation including bike, pedestrian and certainly bus connections. We've now asked them to start, as we start to move into session four which really starts looking at station location, we're now asking them to start to look at guiding principles, those things that will start to really identify the vision for the future. You can see like this particular map for the CMS station which is at the far end, the west end of the alignment, really begins to capture where the community sees impact and ultimately a vision from the station.

Minnitte: Next steps – importantly, we do have, station locations have been introduced in our first meetings. Again, there are two session to session four so the team will be presenting some options and some engineering issues for the SAACs. They will come back after comment and then report back to those SAACs in terms of trying to address where they've heard community comment on some of the specifics. Lastly, we do have a series of four public workshops and [open houses](#) that will be scheduled starting in May. I have those dates here although we don't have them up on the slide, but Saturday, May 7th at Edmondson High School – and these will be posted fairly shortly on our website – Wednesday, May 11th at Woodlawn High School; Saturday, May 14th right here at Holy Rosary and Tuesday the 17th at the University of Maryland downtown, the SMC Center. **Cohen:** Where will that be posted Sam? **Minnitte:** They will be on the website, but this is really early, actually. Henry gave me the okay tonight to go ahead and provide the dates so you're the first to hear them. They haven't even been cemented enough in my mind to remember them offhand. You'll see them in a number of locations – on our website,

we actually were finalizing a promotional effort today to make sure we use all the media that we can, including door hangers and other methods to reach out to the public, newsletter, all the usual means that we undertake to inform the public. **Conner:** Do you have the times for these?

Minnitte: Rev. Brown – do we have the times yet for these?

Dr. Anthony Brown: The evening meetings will be 5:30 to 8:30 p.m., the Saturday meetings will be 9 a.m. until noon. **Minnitte:** Thank you for pointing out that two are Saturdays and two are weekdays, again, the opportunity is to try to provide every opportunity, whether it's an evening or a Saturday to accommodate the public. **Unknown:** Are there going to be mailings to people? **Minnitte:** Yes, there will be a significant mailer or two, both electronic and hard copy, signage, and then opportunities to actually go door-to-door. Any other questions? Madame Chairman.

Bethea-Spearman: We would like a SAAC update and I'm really interested and very concerned that in the SAAC meetings and I haven't missed a one just yet, that there's poor participation in those SAACs – very poor participation, but yet they're saying they're representing the community – and they are not. And the ones that are supposed to be a representation of the communities are not taking the information back to their communities – which most of the time happens, even in community associations. Many of us leaders go to community meetings and the information never makes it back to the communities where we're supposed to be representing. We do it here even on the CAC. I think as a backup that MTA or somebody needs to be producing newsletters, you need to be producing newsletters as a – I don't know if they need to go out quarterly, monthly – whenever there are changes, whatever you're coming up with that are making concrete changes, because what will happen – and it's going to happen if you're making changes in somebody's community, banking on a SAAC member who does not take information back – who are you to be making changes in our community where we live. So I would suggest that you have another forum for communication, not rely on SAAC members because they're not relaying that information.

Minnitte: We certainly share your concern in terms of the attendance. I think in a process that's this long, as you indicate, even in very established community associations, it's always a challenge to keep people at the table over a long period of time and then make sure we take that information -- we'll certainly do that. **Bethea-Spearman:** If the newsletters get to be too costly what you could probably do is hold -- if not a quarterly – a bi-yearly and invite the entire – **Minnitte:** Workshops. **Bethea-Spearman:** -- community at large to report out what you have thus far done, in a larger place at least twice that year, since you're going to be going on for a while, or three times, so that – **Minnitte:** That's a good suggestion. **Bethea-Spearman:** You can't say you've had no opportunity to know what was going on, because in addition to the SAACs, MTA took the extra step to make sure that everybody still knew what was going on. **Minnitte:** Very good – we'll take that into consideration. Any other questions about public involvement, communications – yes sir?

Bowden: I'm sorry – I didn't mean to take the floor so much, I know how frustrating that is. A question that has come up in my mind – I think the focus on the stations themselves gives the communities to give very good input. In the Canton area, though, there is one more physical element of that line that needs to have attention, too and that's the place where this line comes out of the ground and onto the street and how long and what kind of walls and what kind of edges does that give to the feeling of Boston Street. So although I think the stations are covered, would you advise me how input is collected on such a major element as the place where this comes up out of the ground?

Minnitte: Well, I think there's basically two ways. One, as we went – and I'm sorry I went through those maps so quickly – but one of the ideas, one of the concerns has always been, areas of interest in the community, the portal area has come up several times. If you think about the SAAC process, it's probably going to be about a 15-month, 18-month process, so our SAAC members have really been engaged mostly on that station area issue. Now that we start to branch out beyond station, station location, and start looking into other areas of interest, concern, sensitivity for the community, like a portal, particularly in this area – that will start to address that not only in our, what we're going to do is bi-monthly newsletters, but will certainly start making that a focus when we do our public workshops. I can only speak to the workshops now in May, but once we get to that workshop, when we start collecting public comments and we hear concerns like that, what we'll do is, again, using another resource for public involvement, we call it our Speakers Bureau, but it's basically the opportunity to request a speaker. We can actually have some of our team – folks like Tom Mohler and Steve – come out and just spend an evening on a meeting just focused on that portal or wherever those areas of interest are. I hope that answers your question.

Bowden: That answers my question – there will be a time but it isn't under anybody's microscope. **Minnitte:** That's a good point, no, we understand. Thank you for bringing it up.

Bethea-Spearman: Thank you – that's going to conclude public comment. We do encourage you, welcome you to come back [audience dissents] – no, no, no, no, that will conclude public comment. We're going to go on to 'Map Documentation of Project Impacts' that Mr. Sherrod has. It is now 8:39 and Mr. Sherrod, please, you have until five of nine with your presentation.

Don Sherrod: Let me make it clear here – in January I was requested by the board to make this study and my research known over in the Edmondson Avenue area. That was made clear by the Chair – **Bethea-Spearman:** I wasn't here. **Sherrod:** No, no – you were there. **Bethea-**

Spearman: Oh I was? **Sherrod:** Yeah – and you specifically asked that when they challenged my report about the right-of-way measurements on Edmondson Avenue as opposed to the curbside measurements which we'll get to – **Bethea-Spearman:** So who put – ? **Sherrod:** --

you spoke that I should have that presentation – **Bethea-Spearman:** On Edmondson Avenue. **Sherrod:** -- where it would be relevant. But in my research I found some critical information that's of interest to the people of Boston Street, but I don't want to get bumped off my

Edmondson Avenue presentation. In five minutes I can wrap that up, but I don't want to get bumped. When I'm on that agenda I don't want to be last – make me first or second, okay?

Bethea-Spearman: We're going to put you on for Edmondson Avenue? **Sherrod:** Yes. **Bethea-Spearman:** Are you going to talk tonight on Boston Street? **Sherrod:** Yes. Because in

doing my research there was synonymous findings and I found that it's very critical to the residents of Boston Street. I raised my hand, I wasn't called – **Bethea-Spearman:** So, wait a minute Don. Are you doing a presentation on Boston Street? **Sherrod:** Since you have me on

the agenda. **Bethea-Spearman:** Or are you going to do a public comment? **Sherrod:** Well, you have me on the agenda – as long as you don't bump me off – **Bethea-Spearman:** No, no, no, no.

Sherrod: Okay – **Bethea-Spearman:** No, no, no, no – you want to do – **Sherrod:** I'll do the presentation. **Bethea-Spearman:** You want to do a public comment, right? Or do you want to

do your presentation on the Edmondson Avenue side? You're going to do your presentation on the west side? **Sherrod:** Yes. **Bethea-Spearman:** Okay – and you're going to do your public

comment tonight? **Sherrod:** Yes. **Bethea-Spearman:** Because if you do that then you can allow for them to have more public comment. **Sherrod:** So should I wait? **Bethea-Spearman:**

Yeah – you're going to wait on your presentation until we get to Edmondson Avenue – right?

Cohen: But you want public comment on Boston Street. **Bethea-Spearman:** You're going to

do your public comment on Boston – we’re not bumping you from your presentation. **Sherrod:** Okay. Should I go now? **Orange:** Yeah, go now.

Bethea-Spearman: On your public comment. Let me get it clear because I just said we’re finished with public comment, so Mr. Sherrod is going to do his presentation when we get to the west side on Edmondson – **Sherrod:** And make me first or second. **Bethea-Spearman:** -- we will determine the place at that time, but right now we’re going to continue. Let me correct that, he was already decided from this meeting, so we’re going to continue on that. And we’re going to continue with public comment for the next 15 minutes. Mr. Sherrod. **Sherrod:** Thank you very much. **Bethea-Spearman:** You’re welcome.

Kendrick: Real quick, Don, I want to offer to you, and I asked him to come tonight because I thought we were doing this – Jay Filippone, if you could stand up real quick. Jay is the City’s Chief of Surveys, so all of the land records in the City, all the property lines fall under his division and he’s available to you as you develop your presentation over the next several weeks. **Sherrod:** Very good. Also, while you’re here, the residents of Boston Street and Canton should have a copy of your right-of-way map, which I do for west Baltimore. That’s critical because if you listen to Mr. Mohler and Henry Kay speak, they keep making references to the right-of-way, the right-of-way. Some properties, if you have front lawns, sidewalks, steps and porches, are in the right-of-way. So you’ll never hear them speak of curb-to-curb. The closer you are to that curb the more your property is in jeopardy. East and west of Boston Street at Lakewood, your right-of-way starts out at being 80 feet. It goes at some points up to 140 feet as you go further east. Now in that 80-foot scenario, putting two trains on a median with left turns and two lanes, your property is in jeopardy. You’re talking about trees – your parking is in jeopardy also. According to the DEIS – that’s their application to the federal government -- in some scenarios you’ll lose 436 parking spaces. In some cases a little below 200, some as varied as 300. Someone, as I did for Edmondson Avenue, must go measure every street intersection. Then compare it to your right-of-way map because the 80-foot right-of-way is not curb-to-curb. Curb-to-curb may be in that 80-foot right-of-way, 70 feet. On Edmondson Avenue we have a scenario where the right-of-way is 100 feet, but curb-to-curb averages 75 feet. In my area, the sidewalk is in jeopardy, the steps are in jeopardy and the building porch is in jeopardy. When they purchased those properties, as in every property in Baltimore City, you’re purchasing those properties with the right-of-way in the easements, subject to restrictions. There’s no warranty either expressed or implied, which means you will not be compensated for it and if it’s in the public domain, you have no rights over it except pay taxes, sweep it, cut the grass. You need to have someone to go out and physically measure it. Do you have the right-of-way map for Boston Street here? You can get them for Darryl here. **Jay Filippone:** There are different maps for different areas, some have specifics – **Sherrod:** We’ll talk about it, we’ll talk about it. But the other thing is this – you will have no left turns. The scenario that they are building for us – two trains in the median, again what they call ground-level with a dedicated – **Bethea-Spearman:** Are you talking about Edmondson Avenue? **Sherrod:** No, no, no – I’m talking about Boston Street here. **Bethea-Spearman:** Okay. **Sherrod:** This is all Boston. **Bethea-Spearman:** Okay. **Sherrod:** All Boston. **Bethea-Spearman:** Okay. **Sherrod:** Elevated means that the trains will be on the median about six inches off the ground. You will not be driving over them, you will not be stepping on them unless you’re at a station area. If you’re requiring a left-turn lane, because it’s in the center you need two left-turn lanes – one going east and one going west – they will never talk about that. They never talk about the measurements, they never talk about the curb-to-curb. That’s what you should have them coming here to speak to you about. Thank you very much. (Applause)

Bethea-Spearman: You're welcome. Okay, now moving on, that will conclude public comment. Moving on to the meeting agenda, I received a – **[Question from audience member]:** [Inaudible]. **Bethea-Spearman:** -- no, the public comment time ended. He was the last of the public comment because they were commenting during the whole time. **Darryl Jurkiewicz:** But it's on the agenda. **Bethea-Spearman:** No, you commented all during the meeting – **Jurkiewicz:** No I didn't, I didn't comment -- **Bethea-Spearman:** No – **Jurkiewicz:** -- and I want to comment. **Bethea-Spearman:** Okay, you're going to be the last comment. You cannot comment during the meeting – which Dr. Orange made you aware of before, everybody that was present, he made you aware that you're not to interrupt during the meeting. **Jurkiewicz:** I did not. **Bethea-Spearman:** Many did, so once you started you broke the rule. So then when it comes time for public comment, you can't keep public commenting all night, there has to be some order. **Jurkiewicz:** Then maybe if you stuck to the agenda – **Bethea-Spearman:** There has to be some order. **Jurkiewicz:** -- and started on time. **Bethea-Spearman:** So, you're going to be the last comment.

Jurkiewicz: I'm Darryl Jurkiewicz, I'm the President of the Canton Community Association and I'm also on the Canton Crossing SAAC committee. At our last meeting, both developers from Brewers Hill and Canton Crossing preferred the center station. Neither one of them wants the park-and-ride on their property or the property that they would like to develop. That was the first time we've seen or heard about the bus layovers. All three groups, mainly the Canton Community Association, both developers, if there is going to be a park-and-ride and a bus layover, it should be as close to Haven Street, if not on the east side of Haven Street where the other undevelopable land is, where the tanks used to be. **Bethea-Spearman:** Is that something, Mr. Jurkiewicz, that you all are discussing in your SAAC? **Jurkiewicz:** Yes. **Kendrick:** That's largely why we have the SAACs. **Bethea-Spearman:** Okay. So I 'm trying to figure out why you're bringing it to the CAC, what did they tell you in the SAAC? **Kendrick:** It's relevant to the presentation that was given earlier. **Bethea-Spearman:** But you brought it up in the SAAC. **Jurkiewicz:** Yes. **Bethea-Spearman:** What happened in the SAAC when you brought it up? **Jurkiewicz:** They asked the engineers to consider centering the station and moving the park-and-ride and the bus layovers as close to, if not across Haven Street because – **Bethea-Spearman:** So are they going to do it? What are they going to do Mr. Kay, do you know?

Kay: We're still working on it. You saw the options, but as Jamie indicated [inaudible] analysis. We've heard that comment – **Kendrick:** They showed one of the center options, they showed a north -- just real quick because I know you know this Darryl, but for the record, probably the first 120, 140 feet north of Boston is actually not the developer's property. **Jurkiewicz:** I know, it's Exxon property. **Kendrick:** They like to speak as if it is. **Jurkiewicz:** The same way on the south side, it's still Exxon property that Ed Hale has a lease on. Ken Jones, who represented Ed Hale for the Canton Crossing development, stated that the latest plan is for retail all along the south side of Boston Street, on the curbside not set back like originally. **Kendrick:** I think the last plan we all saw was the Target about three football fields back and a sea of parking. **Jurkiewicz:** Right. **Kendrick:** But you know it's probably going to evolve six more times between now and – **Jurkiewicz:** I know, if it ever happens.

Bethea-Spearman: Well, I guess we're back to when something comes out, who's going to make the final decision? Because it wouldn't be no need of having a SAAC, I mean, who's making the final decision here? You've got the CAC – we have no power. Now is the SAAC another committee with no power? **Kendrick:** If you want to frame it that way, but I think Darryl – **Jurkiewicz:** Let me just say we do have influence on our elected officials. **Kendrick:** I think that's the point – is that the – **Bethea-Spearman:** But elections are gone. **Jurkiewicz:** Not the City's, the City's is coming up. **Bethea-Spearman:** But you don't have no power over

the State, you don't have no power over the State. O'Malley – he's in. **Kendrick:** If I may – the Canton discussion is probably the best discussion that I've heard thus far, is exactly the kind of discussion that the City and the MTA are trying to have about people's perspectives on north side, south side, middle. That process will play out over the course of months. Ultimately someone – the City and/or the MTA, the MTA or the City – will have to decide, but it will be a better decision for six to nine months worth of debate. I would hope you would agree with that. **Jurkiewicz:** Yes. It's ongoing, I mean, it's been ongoing for five, seven years. Thank you.

Bethea-Spearman: Thank you. Okay, moving on to the agenda, because we had a comment – [discussion off mic].

Carolyn Boitnott: I wanted to ask a question. I'm Carolyn Boitnott and I really just wanted to know where the whole process is in terms of the federal government's approval. I mean, we talk about these very specific things and it's my understanding that we still don't know that it's been approved. So I'd just like to understand – has the federal government approved it and what the estimated timing is that we'll know something? **Bethea-Spearman/Orange:** Mr. Kay?

Kay: Thank you for that question. It's important to keep that perspective in mind. This is a project the federal government calls a New Start, which I know you know, which is the name of the category of funding that will pay for probably half of it. The process of having a project approved as a New Start project is incremental, there are three or four steps along the way where there's a formal sign-off and then years of work in between those two. So at this point what we're headed for is permission to enter the Preliminary Engineering phase. We're talking to the federal government about that now, they're reviewing the project, the MTA as an agency, the availability of money to pay for the project. We expect that sometime later this spring they'll give us an answer about that, which we expect to be yes. We'll move into Preliminary Engineering – that's a two-year long process. At the end of that we ask their permission again to enter Final Design – that's about a two-year long process. During that time they give us their final approval which is a Full Funding Grant Agreement, a formal document that promises that they'll put up their share of the money and we'll put up our share of the money. Once we have that in hand construction begins. So, at any point along the way -- that's about four years from now – any point along the way, they could stop, we could stop, but it really isn't until that Full Funding Grant Agreement is done that we really have the final formal sign-off from the FTA.

Bethea-Spearman: That will conclude public comment. Mr. Kay can you tell me – we're going to start on the agenda now – where do we go for the next meeting? **Kay:** We are at Edmondson High School. **Bethea-Spearman:** Oh my god (laughter). **Kendrick:** When do we go back to Woodlawn or are we never going back that far? **Sydnor:** We should. **Bethea-Spearman:** Jamie can we deal with that later, because we need to get the agenda, it's going on 9 o'clock. Can we deal with that later Jamie? **Kendrick:** Absolutely. **Bethea-Spearman:** This is agenda time, thank you. Okay so we're going back to Edmondson High School. We've got Mr. Sherrod doing a presentation at Edmondson High School – that's one of the items on the agenda. **Orange:** And the other presentation. **Bethea-Spearman:** What other presentation Dr. Orange? **Orange:** That we saw – **Bethea-Spearman:** Oh yes, we've got to do that presentation on – **Orange:** Edmondson Avenue. **Bethea-Spearman:** -- Mr. Mohler's got to come back. **Kendrick:** The same one he did at the BioPark last time. **Orange:** Right. **Bethea-Spearman:** Oh – and I had a request. A neighbor called -- one of the people sitting in the audience – called me and he wanted to know could it be worked out that community people can go out there with you all when you measure Edmondson Avenue -- and they want Mr. Cohen's group to be out there-- so that they can verify and watch you both measure the width of Edmondson Avenue. Particularly, it was Edmondson and Hilton. We want to watch you measure back to Wildwood

Parkway so that they can see what you all see. Because they didn't understand how you all could come with one set of numbers and Mr. Sherrod keeps talking about another set of numbers. So they want to know can it be a community thing. I said I would bring that back to ask. **Kay:** What I would suggest is that we'll ask our Liaison to facilitate that, get everybody out there at the same time. **Bethea-Spearman:** I don't want to see. **Kendrick:** Can we wait until it warms up, think about May? **Kay:** We'll find a good time to do that. **Bethea-Spearman:** Okay. **Taylor:** Maybe the west side communities will want to do what we did on the east side, which is find a couple of places the community will really want to see – **Bethea-Spearman:** I will relay what Mr. Kay said, because I believe they may have called you but I think you told him to call me. **Kendrick:** I think it was Danyell [Diggs] they talked to. I asked them to call Danyell and that predicated this – **Bethea-Spearman:** He told me that somebody told him to call me, and I'm like, what? **Kendrick:** I don't know about call you, but he spoke at length with Danyell and that's when we brought Jay in.

Kay: If I could, I think what Mr. Taylor was suggesting actually is that when we made the Edmondson presentation, you made several comments that there were other places along the corridor that you'd like to see drawings done of, not that you thought that what we depicted wasn't representative. **Bethea-Spearman:** Would that be prepared? **Kay:** We can do that. **Taylor:** What I was suggesting is that you, the communities, figure out what spots you'd like to see, which is what we did for the east side and that's why they showed us what they showed us because the Canton community all came together and said we'd like to see this spot and that spot. **Bethea-Spearman:** But Mr. Kay knows because I've already showed him that. **Kay:** I'll be in touch with you. **Bethea-Spearman:** Okay, so then we have that, we have Mr. Sherrod. I also spoke with Mr. Sydnor and that's what you have before you. I'm going to let Mr. Sydnor explain.

Sydnor: I've sat on this committee for just over a year and one of the things that I noticed was that I thought we may need a little bit more organization on how we approach some things. There's a whole bunch of moving pieces and it's too much for us sitting as a committee of one to really address. The only committee that I know that we have created was our [Annual Report](#) committee. So what I did, under the Advisory Council's charge, I went and looked at the bill that created us. I listed out the four points of items that we're supposed to be considering and on the back, just from that information, I came up with four different committees just as a starting point. What I'd like to ask the committee is that we look at this and maybe at the next meeting develop your own committees and at least have a discussion on how we can better organize ourselves so that we could be of better service to the citizens.

Bethea-Spearman: I think that's a great idea. **Kendrick:** I agree, diving into some of these issues, especially as we get in towards real design and real construction. **Bethea-Spearman:** I think a lot of things need to be pulled out of the committee -- **Sydnor:** Exactly – the committee would be reporting back. **Bethea-Spearman:** -- like Mr. Taylor's issue. This will be the fifth meeting we come back and it's still not together and it really has nothing to do with the direction we're going in, because we have turned the corner. We have got to catch up, not only catch up – and keep up with MTA. Whether we agree or disagree, they're moving, quickly, and we have to keep up. **Sydnor:** There's nothing written in stone, it's just a preliminary starting point for us just to start coming up with some ideas on how we need to organize ourselves and deal with the issues that we were organized to deal with.

Bethea-Spearman: I think, Mr. Kay, we need to know where we are federally as well. I'd like to know, where are we on the timeline? Do we have a timeline? Can we get a timeline so that we can keep up with what you know, what MTA knows? Where are we in the process? Where are

we with funding? **Cole:** That would be item number three – **Bethea-Spearman:** Wait a minute – please, please let me stay focused. I started off with a migraine, I don't need to leave with one. Where are we with the funding, are we going to be able to get this funding? I know that we had a talk a little earlier about funding and what was this legislation that we were talking about? When are these hearings?

Costello: The hearings have already been held – **Bethea-Spearman:** My lord, we've missed them. **Costello:** No, what you have not missed is the ability to talk to your legislators as to whether you want to see funding, more funding than we have, funding that we need to continue to improve our transportation system. There's House Bill 1001 and Senate Bill 714, are the two bills. They call for various different methods – whether it's a gas tax – **Bethea-Spearman:** Eleven hundred? **Costello:** One-thousand one. **Bethea-Spearman:** One-thousand and one. **Costello:** And 714 in the Senate. It's really very questionable at this point whether any legislation is going to pass because a lot of people are very concerned about increasing the gas tax at a time when gas prices are so high. It's now a question of whether or not citizens are going to support an increase which would probably be about 50 dollars a year in increased costs for gas. That would be the increased cost of gas tax – **Bethea-Spearman:** Fifty a year. **Costello:** The interesting thing is that raising the gas tax if any doesn't necessarily mean your gas automatically goes up a penny, but it is an increase in the gas tax, in that sense, is what they're proposing. It may be less, it may be phased in, other options that they're talking about – but the question is whether or not it's justified. If you want to have a Red Line, there's no money to pay for it. In fact there's not enough money to maintain the system that we have right now. So we're making decisions as to what we build and repair in a very desperate sort of system. That's my concern.

Bethea-Spearman: Can I ask Mr. Kay something? I work in Montgomery County and I see the ICC every single day and it looks like it's practically finished. So, did the ICC get all of its money? The rumors on the street are they were going to get their money to finish, but we're not going to get our money for the Red Line. **Costello:** The ICC is a toll road. **Bethea-Spearman:** We're not going to get our money for the Red Line? **Costello:** But Madame Chairman, the ICC is funded by tolls. **Bethea-Spearman:** Oh, they've got a different funding. They didn't need the state money. **Kendrick:** Not entirely. **Kay:** I'm not an expert on it, but the ICC is about a 2-billion dollar project. About a third is done and opened just a couple of weeks ago. It's being funded in a variety of ways, the largest share of which is the tolls that people will pay to ride on it and of course the tolls that – **Bethea-Spearman:** Right now they're riding it for free to test it. **Kay:** Well, they started introducing tolls on Monday. **Bethea-Spearman:** So they've started paying? **Kay:** Yeah – and actually it's a little more complicated because it really has to do with tolls that everyone in the state pays because it goes into one pot and that pot pays for those projects. But the state also borrowed money to build that and the tolls are, in part, paying back that and future federal aid is paying back that. The point is none of those dollars would have been available for the Red Line. But the Red Line and an equivalent project in the Washington region – the Purple Line – are coming up behind the ICC. Plenty of people, including folks in the General Assembly, feel that that was a big highway investment and it's time for a big transit investment. So we're hoping that – **Bethea-Spearman:** So where are they with the Purple Line? **Kay:** Same place Red Line is – exactly. Yeah, that's the other half of my life. **Bethea-Spearman:** So if the federal funding is being cut with the federal budget cuts – because President Obama is not going to get nowhere near the money that he was banking on before – nowhere near. We're about to take a layoff, so believe me we know. So what does that mean for transportation projects? **Kay:** It's too early to know. I mean, the President's budget does include more money for New Starts projects than any prior transit budget, but I think you're absolutely right – nobody thinks that budget is going to get through Congress. But I don't have any insight about that that any of you don't have. It's very hard to predict. I would also say by

the time this project really is ramped up and under construction and needs a lot of federal money, we'll have a new authorization, we'll have a different Congress, the circumstances could be better, they could be worse. If they're worse, then we won't be doing the project, it's just what it comes down to. We hope that's not the case, but that's the reality of...you know, we're setting ourselves up. **Bethea-Spearman:** If that's the case, I need a job right now in the planning process.

Orange: Motion for adjournment, Madame Chair? [Second]. **Bethea-Spearman:** What was the agenda, Mr. Kay? **Kay:** Mr. Sherrod's Edmondson Avenue presentation, Mr. Cohen's and Mr. Taylor's follow-up, a report on – **Bethea-Spearman:** Let me be clear – if it's not straight, don't put it on the agenda. **Kay:** -- a re-do of the Edmondson Avenue presentation with some new views and an update on the project timeline. **Bethea-Spearman:** Talk to the people on Edmondson Avenue about the SAACs as well. [Cohen asks question regarding federal/state funding]. **Bethea-Spearman:** We have that Mr. Cohen. **Kendrick:** We'll have the discussion next time. [Cohen continues]. **Bethea-Spearman:** Okay, but can you discuss it with Mr. Kay? Everyone wants to shut down. **Kendrick:** Madame Chair, can we wrap up? We've got the document, we can go through it – it's time to go home. **Cohen:** Well, he's always interrupting me. **Bethea-Spearman:** Don't be rude. **Kendrick:** I'm a bad man – bad, bad man, get that for the record (laughter). **Bethea-Spearman:** Don't be rude Jamie. Mr. Sydnor. **Sydnor:** Madame Chair I just wanted to make certain that our discussion is on the agenda. **Kendrick:** The committee discussion. **Sydnor:** Right. **Bethea-Spearman:** That's too many things – is that five things on one agenda? **Cole:** It's five. **Bethea-Spearman:** That's too many things – can you tell me what they are again? **Cole:** Well, the update shouldn't take that long. **Bethea-Spearman:** What update shouldn't take that long? **Kendrick:** Can we suggest that you and Mr. Orange work it out between here and there. **Cole:** The federal update. **Bethea-Spearman:** The federal update shouldn't take that long? We're not going to cut him (Sherrod) short, not when we sat here and listened to this stuff tonight. Let Mr. Kay talk please.

Kay: I have them in a different order, but – Mr. Cohen, Mr. Taylor conclusion, Don Sherrod, Edmondson Avenue section, Mr. Sydnor's committees and the project timeline – that's five items. **Bethea-Spearman:** Okay – did somebody make a motion – **Taylor:** Motion to accept the agenda – **Cole:** Second. **Taylor:** -- and a motion to adjourn. **Cole:** Second. **Bethea-Spearman:** Alright.

The meeting adjourned at 9:08 p.m.

###

**BALTIMORE RED LINE
CITIZENS' ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING**

DATE OF MEETING: May 12, 2011
TIME: 7:00 p.m.
LOCATION: Edmondson High School

CAC ATTENDEES:

- Angela Bethea-Spearman, Co-Chair
- Dr. Rodney Orange, Co-Chair
- Edward Cohen
- Gary Cole
- Sandra Conner
- Christopher Costello
- Emery Hines
- Jamie Kendrick
- George Moniodis
- Warren Smith
- Charles Sydnor
- Annie Williams

(Absent: Marty Taylor)

GENERAL PUBLIC: 95 people signed in – approximately 150 in attendance

ELECTED OFFICIALS OR REPRESENTATIVES:

- Delegate Nathaniel Oaks, Maryland General Assembly, 41st District
- Councilwoman Helen Holton, Baltimore City Council, 8th District

MTA/CONSULTANT ATTENDEES:

- Henry Kay, Maryland Transit Administration (MTA)
- Lorenzo Bryant, MTA
- Christiaan Blake, MTA
- Tamika Gauvin, MTA
- Sam Minnitte, STV
- Tom Mohler, RK&K
- Mark Henry, RK&K
- Dr. Anthony Brown, Rosborough Communications, Inc. (RCI)
- Tori Leonard, RCI
- Carl Williams, RCI

RED LINE COMMUNITY LIAISONS/ STAFF:

- Roxana Beyranvand
- John Enny (Canton Crossing-Bayview Campus)
- Crystal House
- Lisa Kramer (Harlem Park-Government Center/Inner Harbor)
- Charisse Lue (Edmondson Village – West Baltimore MARC)
- Rachel Myrowitz (Inner Harbor East-Canton)
- George Shardlow
- Keisha Trent (CMS-I-70 Park and Ride)

Agenda:

- Welcome [Page 2]
- CAC Member Introductions [Page 2]
- Approval of Agenda [Page 3]

- Adoption of March 10th Meeting Minutes [*Page 3*]
- CAC Vacancies [*Pages 3-4*]
- Update on Project Outreach Activities [*Pages 4-7*]
- Status of FTA New Starts Process [*Pages 7-8*]
- Map Documentation of Project Impacts [*Pages 8-11*]
- Design Options for Edmondson Avenue Segment [*Pages 11-19*]
- CAC Committees [*Pages 19-22*]
- Public Comment [*Pages 22-25*]
- Next Meeting Agenda [*Pages 25-29*]

Co-Chair Angela Bethea Spearman calls the meeting to order, welcomes those in attendance and asks the CAC members to introduce themselves.

Annie Williams: My name is Annie Williams and I live in Harlem Park and I was appointed by the Senate. (Audience member asks question). To hear you all's complaints – that's about all I can do and then at the end of the year we make a summary and send it down to the Governor.

Warren Smith: Good evening, I'm Warren Smith. I was the President of West Hills Community – I'm just a fighter now.

Charles Sydnor: Good evening, my name is Charles Sydnor. I was appointed to represent the 10th District of Baltimore County.

Gary Cole: Good evening, my name is Gary Cole. I am the Deputy Director of Baltimore City and I was appointed by the Mayor of the City. I'm sorry – Deputy Director of the Department of Planning – Gary Cole.

Edward Cohen: Good evening, my name is Edward Cohen. I'm with the Transit Riders Action Council of Metropolitan Baltimore, Mt. Vernon-Belvedere Association and I'm a member of the Howard Street station SAAC and I was appointed by Senator Verna Jones-Rodwell. Edward Cohen.

Emery Hines: Good evening, my name is Emery Hines. I was appointed by and I represent Baltimore County Executive Kevin Kamenetz.

Bethea-Spearman: Thank you. Again we want to welcome everyone to the May – we're doing introductions Ms. Conner.

Sandra Conner: Hi, my name is Sandra Conner. I was appointed by the Governor and I represent the Social Security Administration station.

Bethea-Spearman: Mr. Costello. **Christopher Costello:** Good evening everybody – what a great crowd. My name is Chris Costello. I was appointed by the delegates of the 41st District and I live over here in Westgate.

Bethea-Spearman: Okay – that was the introductions of the Citizens' Advisory Council members – at least those that have come thus far. The first order of business will be the approval of the [agenda](#) – Mr. Cohen?

Cohen: Yes, Madame Chair. There was something that was scheduled originally here. I had a discussion with you and I had a separate discussion with Mr. Kay, and the safety report -- based upon conversations between pairs of us, individually and in pairs -- was that we should push the item of safety to the next meeting so that there would be enough time here. What's listed here does not include it and I just wanted that for the record. I move that we adopt the agenda as listed.

Bethea-Spearman: All in favor? (Aye). All opposed? So approved. The next item on the agenda will be the adoption of the March 10th meeting minutes. (Motion/second) All in favor? (Aye) So approved, so we're going to move on to the next item on the agenda -- New Business -- (question from audience regarding conduct of Council business). Yes, the Council meeting is among us and the visitors are able to listen and from 8:30 to 8:45 then you can comment. **Audience:** We can't hear you. **Bethea-Spearman:** Okay, we'll try to speak a little louder, yes ma'am. Okay, we're going to move on to the new business -- CAC Vacancies -- who's discussing that? Oh, okay, Mr. Kay. Can you first introduce yourself Mr. Kay?

(Audience asks if there are any more copies of the agenda). **Henry Kay:** We don't, I'm sorry, I apologize, we don't have any more agendas. My name is Henry Kay, I'm with MTA. I'm here to do a couple of things on the agenda this evening, starting with this one which is a report on the status of membership on the CAC. What I've handed out to the members of the committee is a listing of the members by appointee, by appointer, including the number of people that each of those persons appoints. The majority of members of the CAC, as you recall, are appointed either by the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House of Delegates. We currently have two vacancies -- one from the Senators and one from the Delegates. Below you'll see a count by district. There are four districts that comprise the Red Line corridor, four districts that are represented on this Council. At this point we have, as you can see, more representation from the 41st and 44th, less from the 10th and 46th -- so it's just something to keep in mind in terms of balance on the Council. What we have done at MTA is notify the office of the Senate President and the office of the Speaker of the House that we do have vacancies. We asked them to urge the members of their delegations to work on appointing new members. The work is important, it's important that we have a full group, it makes it easier to have a quorum, we get better representation of the corridor in general. So, that could be a day, a week, a month, a year in terms of when they respond. It is up to them, but we have notified them of the vacancies.

Bethea-Spearman: Yes. **Cohen:** Thank you Mr. Kay. As we have discussed a number of times in the past, when new people come on to the Council, it is very, very difficult for them to get up to speed on what's been going on. It's been so detailed and it's gone on for such a long time. It's entirely up to the appointing office who is appointed, but I think it might be useful information that they can use as they see fit, to supply them with some type of documentation of what people have been attending. You have records of who's been attending and if those could be sent to the appointing authorities. If they decide to use it they could. If they decide not to they won't, but at least it would be available to them and it's relevant information. **Kay:** Any other questions?

Bethea-Spearman: Questions from the audience come at 8:30 to 8:45. (Comment from audience). No ma'am, but we stop at 15 minutes, but we -- (Audience comments on why they can't ask questions). Excuse me, this is the part about coming to a Citizens

Advisory Council meeting. It's open to the public to observe. We do not stop and take questions from the audience. The Citizens Advisory Council was set up by the legislators that Mr. Kay just described, for the whole entire Red Line – the County part, the City part – and that's what this Council is for. The Council is appointed by each of the elected officials. We have the 41st involved, the 40th involved, the 44th, the 10th, the 46th. We've got the Baltimore County representative, the Mayor has two representatives, the Governor has two representatives and that's what this Council was set up for – to listen, take concerns, to advise the MTA, we can't tell them what to do, we can only advise them what to do. This is our – (comment from audience). No, no, the Red Line goes from Johns Hopkins Bayview all the way to I-70 and Social Security. This Council up here covers some portion of that line from east to west. For the two vacancies we have on the Council – whose locations are they from Mr. Kay? What districts are they?

Kay: Well, they could have been from any of the districts, because it's really up to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House to decide what the distribution is. In theory they can appoint everybody from the same district. **Bethea-Spearman:** Okay. We need to move on Mr. Cohen, we have to move on. Go ahead.

Cohen: Mr. Kay, I'm not sure about this, but I believe that the [enabling legislation](#) specified the representation by district – that's something at least you can look into, in the law that created the Council, before we decide that it's entirely open. I could be wrong, but it's certainly worth checking out. Thank you Madame Chair.

Bethea-Spearman: We're going to move on now, we're going on to Update on Project Outreach Activities and that report comes from the Mass Transit Administration.

Kay: Let me introduce Ms. Tamika Gauvin, she's our Outreach Coordinator and she's going to report on outreach activities that are going on now, thank you.

Tamika Gauvin: Good evening. I'm going to go quickly through these slides and give you some updates on what has been going on on the outreach front. They're going to cover mainly the bullets that you see here. As some of you know, we've just finished our second Open House, I'll touch a bit on that, but that's been a big focus for our outreach since the last time we met in March – I'll touch on that in a minute. Next slide please. I want to start with the [Station Area Advisory Committees](#). Just to give some background on what the Station Area Advisory Committees are – they are groups of community stakeholders, which includes businesses, residents, different organizations, churches, etc. They are convening together to develop recommendations for the MTA on station area visioning and the station location. These committees were actually a mandate from the [Community Compact](#). The Red Line Community Compact is actually a document that the City put together – some more background – that outlined some larger goals for the Red Line. One of the goals was to have stations that fit into communities and these Station Area Advisory Committees are helping us to get toward that, to get to stations that integrate well into the communities in the corridor. These SAACs, as we call them, have been meeting since September. They started looking at the larger view of some of the opportunities for the Red Line, some of the development they want to see, things they want to keep the same – a bigger vision of the station areas. Then they drilled down into the station locations to look at the options for station locations in each of the station areas. Next slide please. As I mentioned, they began in September 2010, there was an extensive outreach effort to get members for these committees. We had about 400 nominations and from that selected about 270 people. There was a very extensive effort

to choose our SAAC members. For six months they have been, again, focusing on these station area vision and station location options. They will continue to meet into 2020 (sic) and the work that they've been doing so far to develop these recommendations are the focus of our [open houses](#).

Gauvin: There are four open houses – two of them have passed. One on May 7th was held right here at Edmondson High School and one was held yesterday evening at Woodlawn High School. Next slide please. So, the SAAC objectives. I mentioned that the goal is to make sure that these stations fit into the communities and the SAACs are also charged with communicating with communities. So, fitting the stations into the communities, making sure that there is a larger communication to get input and to, again, keep this information flow at large. Next slide. The SAACs were working around four major themes – what is the vision area, they outlined what they considered the area that is of impact for the station area and where they want to see the development I talked about, opportunities for development, where things should stay the same, et cetera, what they felt was important, what they valued. They developed vision goals and guiding principles to help them develop their recommendations. Do they want pedestrian-friendly communities, things of that nature that will help them through the process make some of the recommendations to the MTA. Station location – that was of big importance to the SAACs – where the station platforms would be located. Next slide. At the Open House, there were a series of boards for each SAAC. There are 17 SAACs – I might not have mentioned that – for the 20 stations. We gave a general overview, I should say, of the Red Line so for those people who were attending who didn't know about the Red Line, we did that. We also looked at each station and looked at the work that the SAACs have been doing for each station. We wanted to get input – that was the major goal – to get input from the community. What the SAACs have been working on is not final, their recommendations, and we wanted to get input to make sure that we were all on target in these SAACs. Next slide please.

Gauvin: So again, here are the dates and the locations – two of them have passed, the next two will happen on May 14th and May 17th. I have brought some flyers if anyone's interested in more details about those two Open Houses. Next slide please. Here's some pictures from the May 7th and May 11th Open Houses. The Open Houses were well-attended, many people came out to have input. We are compiling the responses, the comments and we will summarize them, but there was an overwhelming response to the Open Houses. Again, we have two more to go so hopefully we will keep this momentum. Community meetings – another thing that we've been working on. So just to wrap up on the Open Houses and the SAACs – we've been working on getting those Open Houses ready, getting the SAACs prepared to the point where they could present at these Open Houses, because the SAAC members actually are the ones presenting to the communities, talking to the communities about these recommendations that they're developing within their committees. Another outreach effort is, just generally, community meetings that we're attending. The Liaisons, some of the Red Line staff are meeting with communities to talk through some of their concerns – be it station locations, some impacts and so that's ongoing, but I wanted to highlight three that have happened since March. One was the Edmondson Avenue measurement that happened on April 30th and there's more information on that coming up so I won't dwell on that too long. But essentially that was organized to measure the distance between the north and south boundaries of Edmondson Avenue at specific locations and to measure the impacts that improvements would have on these specific areas that were selected. That was community-driven, that was a request that came from the community and we worked

with the community to organize that meeting and our Community Liaison Charisse Lue was also involved in the organization of that meeting. Anchorage Townhomes – at the last meeting in March some community members expressed concern about the impacts to the property outside of Anchorage Homes on Boston Street. From that our Community Liaison Rachel Myrowitz worked with the community members to convene a meeting where we again looked at the impacts at this area, walked them through it. There's going to be on-going dialogue about that meeting. Last, the Maintenance Facility Tour. Some SAAC members from Rosemont and West Baltimore and the Community Liaisons met on April 30th as well and went on a tour of the existing yard and shop on North Avenue. We did that to see what these shops look like, what happens at these areas, what we could expect for the future Red Line yard and shop. That was very informative. So, those are three things and the last bullet point essentially means that these dialogues are on-going. We're available to answer concerns, convene meetings where we talk through concerns or questions. These are not the end-all, be-all – for the life of this project we expect many more meetings and they're available for that. Next slide please.

Gauvin: Soil borings – since we last met, a series of soil borings have started. They're going to run between April and August, about 16 borings are going to be done along the corridor, mainly in the – I shouldn't say along the corridor, but in the Cooks Lane and downtown areas. We did a mailing to notify the communities that are affected by this. The Liaisons have been doing literature drops in the neighborhoods, it's on the website, we did extensive outreach notification to make communities aware of these soil borings. They'll be ongoing until about August. Next slide, [Community Liaisons](#). The Community Liaisons are really sprinkled through everything I just mentioned. They are our ground team who are doing these meetings, organizing these meetings, working with SAAC members to get the word out, to get the word out about soil borings – they really complement the work that we do and they're valuable in that one-on-one and continuing the dialogue between MTA and community stakeholders. Just to read this quickly – so, yes, they're doing that. I want to highlight that we are on [Facebook](#), we just launched on Facebook, so if you are on Facebook, please look for us there. That's another level of our outreach, it's new for us, so it's exciting and that's another way the Community Liaisons will keep dialogue going. Next slide – next steps. The SAACs will continue – we're going to have a fifth round of meetings in June, the dates are not set yet, but in June we'll be meeting. Then we're going to slow down during the summer, so we will not be meeting in the summer, but we'll start up again in September to continue some of the work that we've been doing – looking at stations and working with community members to get the word out and get input. The Community Liaisons are going to keep doing what they're doing and that is, again, attending meetings, organizing meetings, getting you the information that you want and need. They're going to be attending a lot of events – the summer's coming so there will be a number of opportunities for them to get the word out to large numbers of people so we can continue to raise awareness of the project. And that is it.

Bethea-Spearman: No questions at this time. Comment period is 8:30 to 8:45. (Audience member wants to ask Ms. Gauvin a question). No, she can't answer questions, she can't answer questions at this time. You can talk to her back there, just you and her, but not here, okay? Yes.

Cole: Madame Chair, Ms. Gauvin mentioned the handout. On the bottom of the handout it looks like the web page or the web address for the MTA and the [Red Line](#), so

if you're able to go on the Internet, it is a wealth of information and knowledge about the proposal, the various stations and all relevant information. I just wanted to get that out there. **Bethea-Spearman:** Mr. Cohen.

Cohen: Thank you Madame Chair. I see that Mr. Chris Blake is here in the back of the room. There's a concern that I have about the way scheduling has been done on these workshops. Workshops have been scheduled fine if you only look at the workshops, but they are in conflict with MTA public hearings – at least the workshop for the Howard Street and downtown area is in conflict with an MTA public hearing, exact time but a meeting place in a different jurisdiction. I'm hoping that the MTA can avoid conflicts like this in the future and I'm wondering what the MTA can tell us about this at this time. I heard that Mr. Blake would be the person – he is present.

Bethea-Spearman: Okay, since we have so many here this evening and it seems like you had specific questions, we're going to go on with our order of business. But if you do have specific questions, Mr. Kay is available – where's your staff at Mr. Kay? They're here and they can take your specific questions in the back, because we must be out of here by 9 o'clock and we're going to stick to our agenda. So if you have specific questions they can do that as we continue on with business. Okay? Alright. **Cohen:** If I could just get a response to what the MTA will do about scheduling conflicts of their own events.

Kay: Since Mr. Cohen called on Mr. Blake, called him out in the back of the room, we'll have him address this directly. He and Mr. Cohen have talked about this already.

Christiaan Blake: I'll answer the question Mr. Kay. Good evening everybody. What Mr. Cohen is referring to is on Tuesday, there's going to be a Red Line workshop – which I encourage all of you to attend. That's related to your project. There is also a public hearing regarding a Light Rail station in Linthicum, Maryland, Anne Arundel County – it has no impact on any of you in here – as I guess – at this moment. It's a distraction, I think we're not spending our time wisely using it to discuss Anne Arundel County. You have your own concerns. Let's watch the video, let's discuss the Red Line project because that's what you're here for – not to talk about something in Anne Arundel County. Thank you.

Bethea-Spearman: No -- we're going to stop that right there. Mr. Blake has addressed that, so we're going to move on. I do want to recognize the 41st District Delegate Nathaniel Oaks. Moving on to the Status of FTA New Starts Process – that's the next item on the agenda.

Kay: Yes ma'am – I can give a brief report on that. I think the last time we discussed this issue I reminded you that the next major milestone in the Federal Transit Administration approval of the Red Line is entry into Preliminary Engineering. So everything we've done to date has been part of the planning phase. When FTA gives us permission we'll start Preliminary Engineering, that's about a two-year long phase. We've been working with FTA for that approval, it was scheduled to come to an end in early June. We are on schedule, we talked to FTA just last week about it. They are going through their final approvals, talking to their own Administrator, referring it to members of Congress which I think they do as a courtesy and then we expect to be hearing from them in early June. We're prepared at this point with work plans and funding to hit the ground running as of July 1st for Preliminary Engineering. If you recall

that's about a two-year long phase. A lot of the work that we're doing now with the Station Area Advisory Committees, with meetings with the communities, are designed to have us understand issues so that we can really move expeditiously through PE. If we are going to change the project in any minor way, if we're going to move a station from one street corner to another, we need to know that now. That's what has driven our Station Area Advisory Committee schedule – so it's working out very well. (Audience attempts to ask questions).

Bethea-Spearman: Okay, we can take your questions at 8:30 to 8:45 or you can ask specific questions, you can ask specific questions in the rear of the room. We cannot interrupt the normal run of our meeting for questions – that's at 8:30 to 8:45. But we do have the same staff here now that is willing to take whatever your question or concern is but they have to do it to the rear of the room. The Map Documentation and Project Impacts is from a community leader representative, Mr. Donnell Sherrod. Mr. Sherrod, are you ready? Okay, we're ready. I would ask the Council to please keep your comments to yourself and let the community representative represent and present. We want to also recognize Councilwoman Helen Holton from the 8th Councilmanic District.

Don Sherrod: Good evening, good evening. My name is Don Sherrod, I'm the President of Rognel Heights Community Association. I've been the President of Rognel Heights Community Association for over 10 years. This process, this Red Line process, meaning the contracts that's been letted and this plan for the Red Line – two trains in the middle of Edmondson Avenue – has been going on for maybe over 12 years. For over 10 years I've been attending these meetings and a few of us have been attending these meetings. MTA has been denying that they will be taking any property along the corridor of Edmondson Avenue – it's not true. In the last few months, recently now, they have admitted and it's on the record, they will be taking land, what they call within the right-of-way of U.S. Route 40, which is Edmondson Avenue and beyond the right-of-way. Every fence is gone, every retaining wall is gone. If you're in the 33-hundred block you know what's going on over there. You've got your porch, you have your steps, you have the curb, then you're in the street. I have a map here tonight that's going to show – this is a map from them – that's going to show you where the property lines are. It's an aerial photograph, very large for you to see, it's going to show where certain homes your steps is in the highway basically, your porch is in the highway and they're going beyond what they call the right-of-way – it's right up to your door. Why are you here tonight? You're here because MTA don't want you here. It only costs us a nickel apiece to get you here. The MTA, for this Red Line study, has a dedicated budget of 200-million dollars and they're going through it like sharks, going through it like sharks on a feeding frenzy. No oversight, everybody's got their hand stuck in. Instead of contractors bidding against each other, they form a syndicate. Billable hours. If you look at all the MTA people here tonight – some is in the audience with you. This process tonight is probably costing us 10-thousand dollars or more, but yet the food that's here that we're paying for, half of it they grabbed and ran to the back. They won't give you water – but that's not what we're here for. I've got 15 minutes and they're cutting me off, so let me continue. Let's get back to the reason why MTA don't want you here. They don't want you here because, again, information is what?

Sherrod: That's the first thing. You fear information, you fear people with information. Now the reason I'm up here is because for 10 years I've been collecting the information. I've been following them all over town except for the meetings that they won't allow me to attend – which means I don't know about them. I've got a copy of their application to

the government that was filed on September 2, 2008, full of deceptions, full of misinformation and full of public relations comments. I also have their CD and DVD which constitutes over 4-thousand pages, almost 5-thousand pages they submitted to the government saying all is quiet on the western front. They say you want this, they say you need this. Now remember the 'Road to Nowhere' – you remember? They told the government they wanted that and they needed that. They ran those people out of there, giving them an average amount of two-thousand dollars. Those people then moved west along Edmondson Avenue and they're back again 30 years later because there's no bigger business in this country than a minority neighborhood when they want to put a transportation project through it. Now, the young lady mentioned, on April 30th, Saturday before last, a few of us neighborhood people got out there with the MTA. We're either going to prove you're going to take property or disprove it. We went out there to measure at least three places, maybe four. You know how many we got done? One – and it proved they tried to lie their way out of it. But they proved, we proved and they proved -- because again this Council person, liaison person was there – then we proved that they will be taking property. Every lie they try to say 'well we'll take a few pieces from here, then we'll take' – no. If they do that, that 25 feet got to come from somewhere. What they also don't want you to know – because we're going to talk about Baltimore's best-kept secrets. The first secret is that 10 years ago when the engineers got this contract, they were letting five contracts, MTA 0961A, MTA 0961B and a series of three others with A, B and C. At that time, they went out and they measured Edmondson Avenue and you know what they found? The only way you can get this project up Edmondson Avenue safely was to put it underground. But they weren't going to spend that money in an African-American community now, come on now, not going to happen. They said if we put it on the surface, we not only have to take land on each side, we've got to take the homes on each side. Once you take the homes on each side, you will now be standing on Edmondson Avenue, riding up the street on the train, looking at somebody's back alley or looking at somebody's back porch. So they're going – and I'm going to show you the information they have here today, and most of it I got through Freedom of Information, they didn't volunteer it to me – that they will be going at least one block deep north and possibly two and west – not north, south at least two blocks.

Sherrod: Also, what I have here from them is a large aerial photograph map of Edmondson Avenue with all your homes, all your homes. I can tell you who everybody is in here. How do I know that? Not just your addresses. In this aerial photograph superimposed on the roof is your name, the liber number, your folio number which means I've got a copy of your deed. I've already done my pre-title work for your homes. Now why would I have that and why would they have that? I can then tell you how much you paid for your house, when you bought your house, the balance of your house, who financed your house – see. But that's what they're doing. The reason they want to know that information and they've got it again so we can see in real time. Because if they say 'oh well, Ms. Jones' house or Mr. Joe's house or Ms. So-and-So', they will know if Mr. Joe is single, an elderly man. While I was out putting out fliers yesterday there was a blind woman – I think she owned a house, but she took a flier anyway. But they would know if you're strong, if you're weak, if you're single, if you've got a husband, if your house is under water. They can do cross-references, they can find out if your credit is good, if your credit is bad, so they'll know how to deal with you. And – the average price they have in mind of giving you for your home is 25-thousand dollars. If you've got a mortgage you can mitigate that. But it's 25-thousand dollars. The reason they can do that, the reason they can do that is because you're unorganized, so they'll pick you off

one by one. And not only they are working against you, your politicians, your state Delegate Nat Oaks – there he is standing there – Nat Oaks, your Senator Lisa Gladden, your Delegate Rosenberg and your Delegate Jill Carter. They all signed the letter supporting this. When I spoke to at least three of them – they told me they were supporting it but yet they sent a letter to the MTA supporting – oh yes they did, oh yes they did.

Bethea-Spearman: Excuse me Mr. Sherrod – I don't want you to run out of time – is this a part of your presentation? **Sherrod:** Yes ma'am. **Bethea-Spearman:** You have nine minutes. **Sherrod:** I've got nine minutes – thank you very much. I've got nine minutes, let me move along, let me move along. Moving right along. Also to understand what's going on in this project, you've got to recognize two things. The players involved – that's one thing. And you've got to follow the money. This is the Governor's project – this is your government at work. The Executive Director of Transportation and Delivery is this man, Henry Kay. Stand up and say hi to the people, so you'll know who they are. (Comments from the audience). Wait a minute, hold on, hold on you'll have time. Also, part of this whole scheme, this is a scheme, it's a racket, you've got a group of contractors – consultants and engineers – most of them are the same ones that designed the 'Road to Nowhere.' You think they're going to get it right this time? They're the same ones that made all those promises – all this transit-oriented development, all the new homes that's coming, all the stores that's coming, the quality of your life will be enhanced – since when do you think these people – because they're all white – care about the quality of the life of anybody on Edmondson Avenue at anytime. Forty years later they're back again, 40 years later they're back again because they can make money off of you. They go to the Governor and say 'ok these poor folks here, you know we need to uplift the quality of those folks' life', but when they come to you they're going to have your politicians, some of your community leaders are working with them – they always get a few good negroes, there's always a few good negroes here. So the scheme is, by the time you know what's going on, it'll be too late. First they said no property, no property will be taken, they said it for years, no property. Then it was well, we won't be taking property, just within the right-of-way. You don't know what the right-of-way is, you don't know what the right-of-way is and most of the people here thought it was curb-to-curb – no. It's 25 feet beyond the curb – that's right, 25 feet beyond the curb. Now, not only have they admitted 'well we'll need a few feet beyond the right-of-way' and they're saying 'well instead of three lanes now you'll have two lanes.' Two lanes, so you're going to push the traffic where? On your sidewalk. And if they start doing that, when they first drive the first shovel, they will drive Edmondson Avenue to ancient medieval times. They will eviscerate Edmondson Avenue and even if you don't want to move you'll have to move. So, it's the MTA – I don't get a dime for this, I don't get a dime for walking out putting out fliers. They make the money. Open up those, I think we've got the aerial photographs. We've got enough time here – and make sure you have it right-side up – roll it all out. This is the important one – this is Edmondson Avenue from the Edmondson Avenue bridge and if you can you have time to take a look at it and you can find your homes. Every home, every business is there. Then you'll see the property line in blue superimposed – come closer, I've only got about four minutes. So these light blue represents your property line -- if you can look down on it in the yellow and I have some magnifying glasses here – you will see your name on your roof, on your property.

Sherrod: You will see your liber and folio number because, again, they already have done the pre-title work to your homes. That's nothing new. As you saw in the flier – no

matter what, don't sign anything, don't sign anything and don't let them in your house. Hold on, quiet it down, I only have three minutes here. Wait a minute, I only have three minutes, I only have three – hold up, hold up, hold up, I'm down to three minutes. Your politicians is involved, your Senators is involved, some of your neighbors are involved, the community leaders – Edmondson Village has signed on with them and Lower Edmondson Village community has signed on with them and some of those people on the Council has signed on and working to your disinterest. If you think I'm wrong – stand up Henry Kay, stand up here with me. Now, this man – he won't tell you, so you'll know, you've got to recognize who the players are. When you came in today, they say sign in. How many said why? How many said why? Don't be led like lambs and sheep. Even in the novel, the movie 'The Silence of the Lambs' don't just follow the shepherds, that was a metaphor, the movie – this is real life, real time. So when you see them slaughtering the sheep ahead of you, why is the sheep not crying out or turning around? Don't just come to meetings and sign things without asking. Everyone signing – why are you signing things? You don't know. You come to these meetings, you come to these meetings, they control everything except this 15 minutes. Every meeting, they have a 200-million dollar budget, they control everything – who speaks, what time you get here, if you eat or if you don't eat, what time you go home, what time you can get in – and nobody asks anything. Don't sign anything or your homes will be gone or your businesses will be gone and you'll wonder why. You'll get a letter in the mail and a check for 25-thousand dollars and wonder what happened. Organize! Organize! Talk to your neighbors! Organize! They know you are not organized. I think I've got one minute. Some of you are thinking 'well St. Bernadine is out there, they won't mess with St. Bernadine, Mt. Olive' and so on – I'm going to give you a quote from the Attorney General being interviewed in Minneapolis, Minnesota and St. Paul, and the quote goes like this – he was Attorney General at the time – and that quote states this, there was not many black people in Minneapolis and St. Paul at that time, this is an interview, they were in real nice homes, too. We took the homes three blocks wide by a mile long of every black man, every black child, along with their churches and we gave them on average six-thousand dollars and set them a-loose upon society. During the Road to Nowhere – **Bethea-Spearman:** Time is up Mr. Sherrod – **Sherrod:** -- the average amount was two-thousand. **Bethea-Spearman:** -- time is up. **Sherrod:** That's what I said – they're going to cut me off.

Bethea-Spearman: If you have further questions and inquiries with Mr. Sherrod, he will be standing in the back to take your questions and concerns. As we move on to the next item on the agenda, we're going to go through the Design Options for the Edmondson Avenue Segment of the corridor. I just want to add, I understand that you're upset, but I just want to add, the next portion of the film that you'll see is the actual simulation of the train that will be going through Edmondson Avenue – for those that are interested in staying. I want to say this before we move on, I want to say this before we move on we all have elected officials that we get out here and we vote for. I believe if you have a problem, then we need to question our elected officials who are supposed to be following the process, okay? So, Mr. Kay, can you continue on with the next portion please?

Kay: My name is Henry Kay. Mr. Sherrod mentioned me, I'm with the MTA, I'm responsible for this project as well as other projects like it. If you're walking out the door, I understand if you have things to do and places to go – you've heard what you need to – but we have a lot of additional important information that I think is worth staying for. In fact, we have a number of facts that we want to show you that address the issues that

Mr. Don Sherrod raised. I realize that he's given you a flier – it talked about the meeting starting at 6:30. This meeting starts at 7 and for that I apologize, it's always started at 7. I had a chance to see that flier and it makes a number of statements about MTA's motivation, about this project that are untrue. I've frankly never seen something that is so untrue with regard to this project. The most important aspect of that is that no house will be bought for this project – no house. I'm standing here today, it's May of 2011 – we are buying no houses for this project. We have a presentation that we're going to start in a few minutes that's going to address that. We do not have to buy any houses to build the Red Line. We can put it in writing.

Bethea-Spearman: Excuse me. Delegate Oaks – can you come up please? Can you come up Delegate Oaks, because the 41st is your district. Then Councilwoman Holton – we want you to come up with Delegate Oaks. Just explain the process Delegate Oaks, just explain the process. You don't want to talk to the people? Okay. Do you Councilwoman Holton?

Councilwoman Helen Holton: Excuse me, I just want to say for the record -- from the very beginning of this process I took a position that if the Red Line were to go through in the 8th District, my request, my desire, my plea was that it be underground in the entire 8th District. I have never once deviated from that position, I have advocated for that position from day one and continue to – and continue to against everyone else who says – you know, I'm not going to stand here and say we don't need improvements in mass transportation because we do. But looking at Edmondson Avenue, particularly the 3-thousand block where the homes come almost to the curb, areas like St. Bernadine's, Mt. Olive, the 4-thousand block where there are few homes there – it is inconceivable to me that they can put two trains, two lanes of traffic and room for cars to park without going into and extending beyond – and it should be underground. That has been my position from day one. Anyone who has heard me speak about the Red Line, I've always said in the 8th District it should be underground, as a safety measure, as a measure to preserve the neighborhoods and communities along Edmondson Avenue. Thank you.

Delegate Nathaniel Oaks: My purpose in coming tonight was to talk to you all about what we did as legislators trying to preserve your rights and your property. The thing that you sent us to Annapolis to do is to pass laws, pass bills that's going to protect your interests – that's what we did. (Audience interrupts). Well, I'm not going to try to compete with, they have a video that they're going to show that will clearly explain what is going on. We had a map by the gentleman over there that a whole lot of people didn't get to see. So at this point, I'm not going to compete with that. So therefore I'm going to turn it back over and I hope that you all go ahead and show the video. **Bethea-Spearman:** Thank you.

Kay: If you recall from your January meeting when we were last in this part of the corridor we showed a presentation and it went into some detail with regard to how the project will be fit into the street, addressing exactly Councilwoman Holton's question about how you're going to fit two tracks, lanes of traffic, parking and sidewalks within the area that's available to build without taking any of those houses. So what you've asked us to do is come back again in this neighborhood where there's so much interest in this issue and go through this [presentation](#) again. Now what we've done is developed a lot of additional views. We have multiple images of each block along the corridor. What Tom Mohler will do is introduce it and he'll show you a map that shows you – it's actually

not a video, it's a PowerPoint presentation – but it's very explicit about how this works. What you'll be able to do is ask Tom to show you views within any one block. So if you don't see the block that you want, we can go to another block and you can see that one as well. So let me just make a couple of comments by way of introduction in terms of the philosophy we used when we designed the project in this corridor and started this process. First of all, we recognized that along Edmondson Avenue every block is different. The right-of-way varies in width – we know exactly what it is, but it does vary in width. It gets narrower as you get down toward the park, it gets wider as you get out toward the county. If you look at the blocks, and people are very familiar with them, you've got blocks where you've got rowhouses fronting on the street across from rowhouses that are set back above the street with terraces and stairs that lead up.

Kay: So each block has a unique character and the design had to reflect that unique character. So in every case we looked at those blocks individually and came up with a design that minimized the impacts. So, for example, if a row of homes are closer to the street and we have to take a foot or two to fit the project in, we took the foot or two from the other side, the side that could best accommodate the change, so we're not going to create a situation where you're already close to the street and you're getting closer. That didn't seem reasonable, it didn't seem like something that was going to enhance the community. So these are the guiding principles that we used and we directed our engineers to use. If we were to absolutely minimize the impact of any house, that we needed in every case to balance all the needs in the corridor – the Red Line, traffic capacity, turn lanes, full-time parking for residents – these are all things that we'd like to fit on every block and in most cases we were able to fit on every block. In some areas – depending on the width that's out there already and depending on the configuration of the homes – the street is widened by a few feet, not by more. In some cases it is not, so you really have to look at each block individually to understand what is being done. We're prepared to show you that detail and we can sit down with anybody at anytime and show them that detail, too. And the final point I would make, you know, it's been explosive this evening, but you can see it there in writing – no homes are displaced by this project. It is prohibited by state law and we are abiding by that law. So with that – no homes are taken, it's a state law and we are following that law. That law refers explicitly to the Red Line and to the MTA. It isn't general, it isn't ambiguous, it's quite clear it refers to this project.

Bethea-Spearman: Mr. Sherrod, we really can't hear. Now we were quiet and we allowed you – thank you, thank you. Can everybody – we're getting ready to start rolling the film – can everybody see from where they're sitting, because they're some seats in the middle if you can't. So I'm going to assume everybody can see. So we're ready.

Kay: So I'd just make that point again – there's a law on the books, no houses can be taken. That is a product of concern of your legislative delegation. They submitted that law to the legislature, MTA supported that law, it was passed. We all agree that that is the case. So with that as my way of introduction, I'm going to introduce Mr. Mohler. I just want to make sure that people's expectations are correct. We do have a film that we've shown a number of times -- we've been showing it at the Open Houses, we do have video simulations – that's actually not what we intended to show tonight. This presentation allows you to have a much more detailed view of those individual houses, if you all recall that presentation. We thought it was a more helpful way to represent that view.

Smith: Just a moment – Mr. Kay, you’re saying that you don’t have the actual film, the actual design? You’re just showing us more copies of what we’ve seen before? **Kay:** No – it’s a PowerPoint presentation. I can’t recall if it was a meeting you were at Mr. Smith or not, but we showed a number of views of a particularly narrow block down by the park. But what we were asked to do was develop more views of other blocks. So we have representations of the impact of the project in every block of the corridor. It’s not a film but it has photographs so you can see precisely what the impact is. Without further ado, let me turn this over to Mr. Mohler and have him start moving through these.

Tom Mohler: Thank you Mr. Kay. Good evening to everyone. I also want to introduce Mark Henry here who is behind the computer. He is an engineer working with me on the project and will help with some details. Through the guiding principles that Mr. Kay just spoke about we also developed some criteria. Just to share that with you – we are working with a minimum transitway width where the Red Line would be of 24 feet 4 inches with side catenary poles. I’ll get in a little later to describe what that means. If we use center catenary poles it would be 26 feet 9 inches. We do have a minimum lane width – that’s a vehicular lane width – of 10 feet, which is the same width that’s out there today. And we’re looking at a minimum sidewalk width of 5 feet plus a 6-inch curb for a total width of 5 feet 6 inches. The other thing we want to cover is that we don’t have any crossings other than at signalized intersections. So you can cross the Red Line at a signalized intersection, but there are a number of unsignalized intersections that are out there today, where we would have a curb in front of that and we consider that a safety reason to not have those unsignalized crossings. In working through this corridor there are a number of flexible elements. To summarize some of what we’ve presented before – we can discuss and consider the location of traffic signals and left-turn lanes – those are flexible and can be moved. The location of full-time parking – we are proposing, although there’s three lanes out there today, during peak periods we are proposing two full-time lanes and then in part of the area where that third lane is to put in full-time parking as opposed to part-time parking. And we’re flexible on the catenary pole location. The catenary is the system that powers the Red Line – whether those poles are in the center of the transitway or on the sides is another consideration to be flexible. To give you an idea of what that looks like, although it’s a little washed out right here – Mark, if you’d do one more click for me – again, I’m showing on the top picture, you can see poles on the outside of the sidewalks with wires across the road – (audience member asks for more details) – okay, well, I’ll try and describe it to you. Anthony, could you point to the poles that are on the side of the roadway, where that cursor is right there? And then wires that go across the road – that’s where it’s 24 feet 4 inches wide. Or a pole in the middle between the two transit lines with the wires above it and that would need to be a little wider, because there’s a pole between them, of 26 feet 9 inches.

Mohler: Now, there are also visual implications with that. The poles are on the side, we have to have wires that span the road to support the wires that power the trains. You can see that in the top picture in the very dark lines. In the bottom picture, with the center poles, those wires are directly over the transitway. So that’s an option out there that we’re exploring with the community as to what the preferences are. In addition, some of the flexible elements are where we wind up with the number of bus stops and what those bus stops look like. What I mean by the type of bus stop – we can have either an in-lane bus stop, which is a bus stop literally in that travel lane where the bus would stop, drop off, pick up and continue or a pull-off bus stop which is on the bottom there. To give you an idea of the difference between them – the in-lane bus stop is more

efficient for transit and takes up less space. The pull-off bus stop impacts vehicular traffic less because it pulls out of the travel lane, but takes up a wider area. So again, those are options. Now we've also discussed with the city about the possibility of putting in a pedestrian signal in certain areas instead of a full signal where traffic would turn. We can also put in pedestrian signals to provide for safer crossing. What some of those might look like is what you see here. There's a new type of signal in the upper right-hand corner that's more of a traditional type of pedestrian signal in the lower part there. We have conceptually shown them on our plans at two locations here. You can see Mt. Holly Street on the left and Edgewood Street on the right. Again, those can be moved wherever the community and the city decide they're most advantageous for safe crossings of the road. So to sum up some of those flexible elements – they do have an impact on the back of the sidewalk. Narrower attributes that contribute to a narrower section would include less traffic signals, less left turns, less parking, using side catenary poles and in-lane bus stops. A wider section would result from more traffic signals and left turns, more parking, use of center catenary poles and use of pull-off bus stops. These can also be intermingled. So for instance, we could have center cat poles and pull-off bus stops, we can have center cat poles and in-lane bus stops. These are all flexible elements that can be put together.

Mohler: To answer some of the questions about property – when you combine these flexible elements there are some combinations that result in no property taken, there are some combinations that could result in a sliver of somebody's front yard taken. A sliver is a couple of feet wide. If a sliver is needed the owner would be paid for it. If a sliver is permanently needed, the owner would be paid. If some room is temporarily needed for construction, the owner would be paid. And I also want to highlight that some of the other physical improvements will include, what we've considered, new curb and sidewalk through this whole stretch, new paving, new landscaping and streetscaping, new or replaced fencing if it's impacted and if the stairs are impacted, we will reconstruct the stairs at our cost. (Audience member asks question about stairs). I will get to stairs in a little bit. So to give you an idea of what that looks like – this is here at Allendale and the station at Allendale and what I'm showing here are side catenary poles and Anthony, if you would point to the red lines across the road, that is those span wires that are across the road with the side catenary poles and in-lane bus stops. This is the narrowest section. Mark, if you could go on one more – the widest section that could go through here is with center catenary poles down the middle and a pull-off bus stop which you could see in the lower left-hand corner. So those are how some things can be combined into different options. Now we often get a lot of questions 'well, how would you build that especially where there are homes up on a hill?' What we've taken here is a representative location between Allendale and Mt. Holly and I'm going to show you some images looking uphill or towards the west. You can see the blue shown here shows the existing sidewalk and under the side catenary pole option at this spot – and it changes in every block, I want to emphasize that – at this particular spot where there's a station we would need to move the back of sidewalk back 2 feet 9 inches – that's the narrower one. The wider one with the center cat poles, we would need to move the sidewalk back 3 feet 9 inches. So how would we do that? If I go forward to here, I'm going to show you a series of images then that are more pictorial to show you how we would go about doing that. Mark, go ahead and roll through those. You can see it here with the homes depicted up on the hillside and our improvements there as we just showed, moving back 3 feet 9 inches, we would slide the sidewalk back, we would actually slide the hillside back and the stairs back so that landing between the stairs from the porches and the stairs down to the street would be narrower, but we would slide that hillside back there.

So now to give you an idea of what that looks like, on a rendering, I want to walk you through that and explain how it would be constructed. So with that, that hillside moving back in this particular spot, would look something like that. Now I have a number of other locations I also want to show. Let me just do one more thing – I can also show you here in this image – we've got a sliding scale there (audience member asks a question about parking) – I'll get into parking in just a second – that can show you the before and after at this particular spot. Mr. Kendrick – did you have a quick question?

Jamie Kendrick: I heard a couple of people asking about steps and trees – just so I'm clear. If the steps are moved an inch or a foot, the steps would be rebuilt at the MTA's cost?

Mohler: If the steps are moved they would be rebuilt at MTA's cost—that's correct.

Kendrick: Even if they're cracked and all that stuff today they'd still be rebuilt? **Mohler:**

Absolutely – new steps. **Kendrick:** Two – and typically that won't occur in front of one

house, that would occur – **Mohler:** In a block. **Kendrick:** -- three or four in a block. So

two is – I saw some fences up there and likewise if the fence were touched or needed to

be moved, the fence would be replaced, is that correct? **Mohler:** Absolutely – if the

property owner wanted us to do that. **Kendrick:** Let me ask him again, I'm losing my

voice as well. If we could go back to the first one – if the MTA, in order to build this, had

to move the hill and/or the steps – let's take the steps – back an inch or a foot, am I

correct that MTA would be responsible for moving the steps and rebuilding them whether

or not they're in good condition or bad condition? **Mohler:** At MTA's cost – that is

correct. **Kendrick:** Okay – and then fences. If a fence is kind of falling down today or

28 years old, it doesn't matter if it's in good shape or bad shape, if they have to move the

fence, it would be, not just moved, but replaced at MTA's cost – is that right? **Mohler:** If

the homeowner wanted us to put back a fence, it would be put back at the MTA's cost,

absolutely correct. **Kendrick:** Very good. **Bethea-Spearman:** Can we move on?

Kendrick: Thank you – I just want to make sure people understand.

Mohler: So what I have here is a map from Wildwood to Hilton and I know you can't read it but we can zoom in to it. What we've depicted here is a scenario with center catenary poles and in-lane bus stops, which is one of the combinations I spoke of earlier.

We have a series of renderings developed all along the corridor, we have 14 different

locations, we can show you what it would look like under that scenario with center cat

poles and in-lane bus stops. Mark, maybe one of the first areas I could ask you to go to

is down at Hilton Parkway because I know we get a lot of questions there because it is

very narrow and it's probably the narrowest. If I could ask you to click on 14, you can

see that up there in the button, I'm going to then show you a similar type of rendering

and differences with dimensions of what it would look like here as we're looking down

eastward, down the hill towards Hilton Parkway. Under that scenario with center cat

poles, in-lane bus stops – what we're showing here is no shift, no shift in the back of

sidewalk. It stays in the exact same location it is today, but what you will see in the light

blue there is full-time parking that is 8 feet wide. Mark, I'll ask you to go one more

(audience member asks about the same block on the other side of the street) – that's

right and that's a – okay, let's go Mark back to the map –

Kendrick: Where there's no parking today – is that what you're asking? **Audience:** No

yard. **Kendrick:** No yard. But there's no parking either, right? **Audience:** You can't

park full-time. **Kendrick:** Full-time, not full-time.

Mohler: We acknowledge that we are not able to put back full-time parking in every block, everywhere along the whole corridor. I will show you some locations where we're able to put back full-time parking – and again, it's a trade-off. If we have a left-turn lane, it's difficult for us to put in parking. (Audience asks where neighborhood residents are supposed to park). What we have done is try to do the best we can to balance between left-turn lanes, signals, parking and other attributes. What we did do is come out and do a survey of when people are parking, where they're parking today and we added up how many spaces apart and I will say we're putting back, we're putting back the same number of spaces that are used today. Not the same number that are available today – but the same number that are used today from the survey that we did. So showing you the other side of the street, if I could here, this is looking uphill – the back of sidewalk does not change, but there is no parking on this side. I'll show you the sidewalk there is, again, in yellow, and a rendering of what it would then look is similar to that. (Audience interrupts with questions and comments).

Bethea-Spearman: Excuse me – he has to finish the presentation. We have to be out of the school at a certain time and then you all want to have time for comments. So please let him finish the presentation.

Mohler: Mark, if I could ask you to go back to the map again and let's go to the west end. I'm going to go up to the Wildwood Parkway area – and again, I'm happy to go to any location somebody would like, any block somebody would like.

Bethea-Spearman: Mr. Mohler, can we – excuse me – can we start at Edmondson and Hilton where the Council asked you the last time we talked about the map and then we'll work from – **Mohler:** That's what I just did – **Bethea-Spearman:** -- Edmondson and Hilton and then work (audience interrupts) – excuse me, excuse me. We can't – okay, we can end the Council meeting right now and then nobody would get any information. **Audience:** We don't have it anyway. **Bethea-Spearman:** Okay, well then, somebody make a motion that the meeting be adjourned. Because if we're not going to listen and everybody wants to keep hollering, we're not going to get anything accomplished. Okay, so can we start at Edmondson and Hilton – **Mohler:** I'd be happy to go back there. **Bethea-Spearman:** --because we went Wildwood Parkway when we were at the Biotech Center.

Mohler: Right. Mark, just show 14, pull that up real quick again. And again, 14 is looking down towards Hilton Madame Chair. **Bethea-Spearman:** Where is this, where is this? **Kendrick:** This is the last block before Hilton Parkway. **Mohler:** The last block before Hilton Parkway, before Hilton Street. Mark, just go through it real quick – that's the sidewalk – it doesn't move in this spot – and we show full-time parking on the south side of Edmondson Avenue. **Bethea-Spearman:** That's the narrowest point of Edmondson Avenue. **Mohler:** Yes. We don't have any parking on the north side of the street, we have full-time parking on the south side of the street, we're able to do that. That block is at Denison Street to Hilton Street and we're able to fit that in again with parking on the south side, no parking on the north side, the transitway in the middle. **Bethea-Spearman:** Are there homes on that south side where it's no parking? **Kendrick:** No parking's on the north side. **Mohler:** No parking's on the north side and there are homes there, yes. **Bethea-Spearman:** So where are they going to park at? **Mohler:** They would park either a block up or across the street. (Audience interrupts with comments) So, Mark if you would then go back to the map and let's go to 1 or 2,

back up at Wildwood Parkway and let's click on 1. You can see here, this is – yes Mr. Cohen.

Cohen: You were talking about the block between Denison and Hilton and you showed the side of the street where there is space to move things back. I think the people are more concerned with that side of the street between Denison and Edgewood and on that block on the other side of the street where there is no space for lawns and you can't take anything because you're going to narrow the sidewalk anyway. That's what people wanted to see and that's what we asked for last time. **Mohler:** I showed that. **Kendrick:** Pay attention Ed. **Cohen:** Show both blocks – pay attention Jamie.

Mohler: Here at Wildwood Parkway – Mark, go ahead and show the next one – where we would need to, again under that same scenario with center catenary poles and in-lane bus stops – we would need to move the sidewalk back 3 feet 5 inches as shown there in yellow, at the near side of the intersection. Into the distance the sidewalk doesn't move. So it would look something like that – Mark, let's just show that sliding scale on the lower right, and show before and after, again, so people are picking up – the sidewalk does shift back in the near side and it doesn't shift anywhere in the far side. Why don't we do the other side of the street at this location, too – I think that would be image 2. That is looking in the west direction and in this direction what we've conceived here – go ahead and click it – would be showing a shift in the sidewalk of 3 feet but we have fit in 8 feet of permanent parking. And again, just to show you what it would look like, that's there. And that's a trade-off – if we didn't put parking there we wouldn't shift the sidewalk back. We shifted the sidewalk back 3 feet so we were able to fit 8 feet of parking.

Kay: Explain that permanent parking means full-time. **Mohler:** Permanent parking is full-time, people would not have to move their cars in the morning or the evening –

Audience member: From 4 to 6, like now, you don't have to move? **Mohler:** We would take away the prohibition from parking.

Smith: Sir, could you show that film again, that last slide please? **Bethea-Spearman:** Mr. Mohler, are you getting ready to wrap up? **Smith:** Right there. You're saying that two vehicles are going to be used, traffic – I'm talking about two going north and west – are going to be using regular parking roadway, right? Then you say that it's going to be 17 feet for the train – how large is this train, the space that's needed for the train?

Mohler: It depends on whether it's a center or side cat pole – **Smith:** Right there.

Mohler: Right there with the center cat pole that number was 26-4, 26-9 something like that, yes sir. **Smith:** Now you're going to shorten this lady's walkway for the parking of the vehicle. **Mohler:** We didn't shorten the walkway, we moved it 3 feet. **Smith:** Okay. How did America grow more land? **Mohler:** I don't follow you sir. **Smith:** I know you don't because what's happening on this picture – this is inaccurate, this is inaccurate.

Mohler: I've got a lot of confidence that it is accurate. **Smith:** Okay – I live there, you're a visitor, there's a difference, alright? **Mohler:** Okay. **Smith:** That vehicle that's parked on the right-hand is a little closer to that lady's house than what you're stating.

Smith: The road is only 57 feet now, or 50 – it's what? **Mohler:** The transitway is yes.

Smith: They're going to widen it yes. But the reality of it is we want real pictures, not his imagery, because supposing it's more or less closer to this lady's lawnway. You know what? This is the same conversation I had with you all on Cooks Lane. When you came out to Cooks Lane and told us everything was going to go, everything was going to work, I went out and I measured and that's what forced you all underground at Cooks

Lane. You're going to end up doing the same on Edmondson Avenue. You're going to go underground because the moment you think that you're going to be on people's walkways, you mentioned their steps going up the way – I had a stroke folks, forgive me -- and it's not right. We're supposed to see some realistic pictures. We've been working with you and your group for months, for months and we're still seeing 'this is going to work because I said so.' In reality – it isn't. Underground – I'm sorry it's going to blow your budget out the water but it makes you take a smaller paycheck if you want it to work. You need to put this underground, underground.

Mohler: I understand and respect your position. We are trying to share these as accurately as we can. We are showing the sidewalks shifting in that picture and I think that's about as best we can do to try and describe it.

Bethea-Spearman: Mr. Mohler, thank you. We're going to move on to the next item on the agenda. Mr. Sydnor – **Mohler:** We've got other locations, sir, but if somebody wanted to see another spot we can do that now or we can do it after the meeting.

Bethea-Spearman: Okay. Go ahead. **Kay:** Thank you Mr. Mohler. One thing I would just say for the benefit of the Council, for the benefit of the audience – we are ready, willing and able to go out and stand with anybody in any location of this corridor, with maps, with measuring tapes as we did with Mr. Sherrod and his group a couple of weekends ago – we will do that anywhere. It is sometimes easier to be in the field and see how this works. We can see what 3 feet looks like, we can see what 29 feet looks like. We can depict it on pictures but we are always willing to do this, so if you live on Edmondson Avenue, own a house on Edmondson Avenue or your mother, sister, brother, cousin does and you want to see what it's going to be like where you are, let us know and we will come and show you. I think that's the best thing we can offer.

Mohler: We are also more than willing to bring this presentation out anywhere and we can go through, we covered, I think, four locations – we have 10 other locations and we'd be happy to show them at anytime more specifically.

Bethea-Spearman: Okay, we're going to move on. Mr. Sydnor we're ready.

Sydnor: Thank you. At our last meeting one of the things that I noted was that right now we're acting as a committee of one, acting as a committee of one with a lot of moving pieces that are going on. I think a lot of things are probably getting by us and we're not as organized as we could be and as good of a benefit to the community as we could be. So what I did, and what I suggested at our last meeting, was that we go look back at the enabling legislation, at the things that we were charged with and to possibly start developing some committees that the members of this board would be able to sit on and report back to the full board, so that we could gather more information in a better manner than what we're doing currently. So as I said at the last meeting, I distributed some things to you all and just wanted to discuss it this evening and that is to determine whether or not that would be a good idea. So that the audience knows – and I'm reading from the enabling legislation – this Advisory Council was formed to advise the Administrator on major policy matters in the Baltimore Corridor Transit Study Red Line, including compensation for property owners whose property is damaged during the construction of any Red Line project, redevelopment of commercial areas surrounding the Red Line transit corridor in Baltimore City and Baltimore County and providing hiring preferences as provided under the law. Consideration of a full-range of construction alternatives including underground rail options, insuring the Red Line project benefits the

communities through which it will travel, uses an inclusive planning process including the consultation of community residents, businesses and institutions in the corridor, is planned to maximize the likelihood that federal funding would be gained for the project. It includes – excuse me, I'm reading this off of my computer –

Kendrick: Do you want the printed copy Charles? **Sydnor:** Do you have a printed copy? Thank you. I appreciate that. It includes during its planning phase the distribution of factual information that allows the community to compare the costs, benefits, impacts of all construction alternatives, favors alignments that produce the least negative community impacts practicable and places a priority on maintaining the study schedule. So with that I wanted to open the floor to the Advisory Council to what kind of ideas we had on what kind of committees would be established so that we could, again, do a much better job than what we have been doing.

Kendrick: Madame Chair, may I? **Bethea-Spearman:** Sure. **Kendrick:** Thank you. There was a young lady sitting, I think, in the third row who asked a question about jobs, right? (Audience member responds) I thought that was you in the hat in the back – good afternoon. It's one of the things we've talked about a lot around this table, but never really sunk our teeth into. So I think Mr. Sydnor's proposal for smaller working groups of this Council and frankly, if we want to open it up slightly broader, to have members of the public at large on the committees – not on this Council, but on the committees – all the better. But I think focusing on a couple of key issues that are clearly of concern – property impacts – that's why we had a hundred-and-a-quarter people here tonight, right? Jobs – that the young lady in the back mentioned. Neighborhood redevelopment opportunities. That's the things I've heard sitting here in the last hour-and-a-half or so. I think this Council ought to really start to dig in. Mr. Cohen has made the point a number of times, and you have even more forcefully, that the SAAC processes really dig into a lot of these alignment issues. Not to say we shouldn't really dig in on the alignments and the precise station locations, but we can take a slightly more global view of the project and let the SAACs really dig in on, you know, is it at this corner or a hundred feet from that corner. So I would agree with Mr. Sydnor that we need to rethink what it is we do around this table and focus on those four or five issues that the law said and I think we're hearing from folks tonight.

Smith: Jamie, may I ask you a question please? **Kendrick:** Certainly. **Smith:** And Mr. Cole, you also. You all work for the City of Baltimore – **Kendrick:** Correct. **Smith:** -- and you all can do hiring – **Kendrick:** Correct. **Smith:** -- and you all sit on this Council – **Kendrick:** Correct. **Smith:** -- and this Council, you all state that 30 percent of employment is supposed to be within the City. **Kendrick:** It does? **Smith:** Yes. That's the state law. **Kendrick:** It is? **Smith:** Now when is the City, when is the City with our black mayor, going to do some hiring within – **Kendrick:** Let's start with facts – I don't know, I'm not aware of any law -- Madame Chair I don't know if you are, Mr. Sydnor has the law with him – does it say anything about – I'm not saying that we shouldn't hire locally, I'm not saying we shouldn't, but we should set a target of – okay. Very good. **Smith:** So when are you all going to adopt it? **Kendrick:** I can tell you, for example, on the Uplands project – **Smith:** No, we're talking about this project, the project we're sitting here for, we're sitting here for the Red Line. **Kendrick:** We haven't put the project out to bid yet. **Smith:** You've got to get people trained – **Kendrick:** Absolutely. **Smith:** When are you going to open up opportunity for us?

Kendrick: Can I give you an example? Because we see this exact issue, that we can't just wait till the project is bid and then hope that people show up with the right skills. So I'll give you two examples. One is right next door at the Uplands project. We have – help me Angela – Monumental Construction has been given an incentive. The contractors have hired, mostly Monumental has hired, six people from within a quarter-mile of where we sit tonight on this project. There's a question that I think is fair to ask, when a contractor bids on a job do they already have their own workforce? Ninety percent of the time, yeah. Right – that's why you have a business, you know this, you own a trucking business, you're an employee – I don't know if you had other employees at any time – **Smith:** I have other employees. **Kendrick:** But if you bid on a contract, you would come to that contract with those three people, four people, seven people. You wouldn't necessarily lay them off when you got that contract to go and hire three other people, right? **Smith:** You asked me in particular about my business. **Kendrick:** I guess the question is, would you lay off, if you had three existing employees when you bid on a contract, would you lay off those three when you bid on a contract in order to hire three different people? **Smith:** I'd lay off the weakest one because of the City's government.

Cole: Let me just chime in Jamie. In addition to the Advisory Council, there is the Community Compact. Within the Community Compact there are a number of commitments that both the City and the MTA has made. Commitments with respect to hiring for jobs, first-source hiring, commitments with respect to, in addition to the Red Line the City is also wanting to invest in assisting in the rehabilitation and the improvement of the various properties within the corridor. Additionally – and Jamie correct me if I'm wrong – but an economic development report was prepared by the University of Baltimore – **Kendrick:** Correct. **Cole:** -- that identified both the permanent jobs and the construction jobs (audience indicates time for public comment) – **Kendrick:** Let me just make one more point. **Audience:** It's 8:30. **Kendrick:** That's fine. **Cole:** It also identified the time period that is needed to train people for jobs.

Sydnor: Madame Chair, if I could I would like to get back to the question that I asked about – **Bethea-Spearman:** Yeah, nobody's answered it. **Sydnor:** I'd love for someone to make a motion -- **Bethea-Spearman:** I think employment needs to be one of them. **Sydnor:** -- or at least make some sort of a motion that we look into having these committees formed. **Costello:** I'd like to make a motion that in fact we do proceed with your recommendation and that we come prepared and make this an agenda item next month and hopefully come prepared to decide on that. Would that be helpful? (Second). We have a second. **Bethea-Spearman:** All in favor? **Council:** Aye.

Bethea-Spearman: Okay, now moving on to the community comment – can you get that mic over there.

Audience member: What I'd like to ask is, it seems as though to me that everything has been carved in stone regarding what they're going to do with the Red Line and individuals' property from Hilton to Edmondson and Wildwood and so on. So, that's not what I want, in regard to someone taking a portion of my property, at all. I would really prefer that it go underground, which is something I voted on early on at some of the meetings, more than once. If there is something that could be done at this point to alleviate on-ground and go underground, I would greatly – along with others I'm sure— appreciate that. The other part is, if for some reason it's not going to happen, since I am

one of the owners that live on Edmondson Avenue, is there a way that – I'm not interested but it's good to know that they're going to pay me if they take a portion of my property – but what I would like to know, for peace of mind and a little more sound barrier, could it be addressed to someone that I would like to have some soundproof windows put in my home?

Bethea-Spearman: Oh, yeah – we're talking about that on the Council. **Audience member:** It's been mentioned but no one presented it when I was at meetings. So if that's something that would be done, I would greatly appreciate that. Anyone else that wants to question, come on please. You need to come to the mic so everybody can hear it.

Audience member: Good evening to everybody. It's my understanding that the residents of Edmondson Village are not interested in the poles, the stop lights, the bus stops, the sliver of taken property, the lack of parking – they don't want the Red Line. Am I wrong? (Applause) There's some residents who have been here and they have lived in Edmondson Village for nearly 50 years. They've paid their taxes, they've put in their dues, it's their property – who is anybody to come and take what's theirs. It's been done forever in history. Edmondson Village you need to get together and stick together and let them know you are going to fight to stop this crap because you don't want it. (Applause). **Audience:** We don't want it! **Bethea-Spearman:** Can you please just tell us your name.

Delores Wallace: I live on Edmondson Avenue in the – **Bethea-Spearman:** Please tell us your name. **Wallace:** My name is Delores Wallace. I hadn't heard about the train coming and the citizens and the children is our future. Those trains run fast. Old people – and I'm old, I'm 65 – I can't cross that street very well. I know that a lot of people is going to perish because the train is going too fast and they cannot stop. You people need to think about and put it underground or put it somewhere else. We don't need no more, because I look out my windows and it's just like a racetrack going up Edmondson Avenue. When I get to one side of the street, I have to wait to cross to the other side. Sometime it takes me about 10 minutes to go across the street. Our kids are our future. Please do not accept this Red Line thing. We're talking about our houses and some trees and the gravity, but our life is at stake. Please think about that. Thank you.

Gertrude Hack: My name is Gertrude Hack, I'm president of the Allendale Community Association. Many of my members live on Edmondson Avenue. They walk off their steps onto the sidewalk. If it can't go underground, we don't want it. Number one – if they're going to operate the Red Line like they do the transportation, we are devastated. The double buses go past my house – I live on Culver Street – with only the bus driver on there around noon. Who needs a double bus at noon? Nobody in their right mind. The peak transportation is when people go to work, when they get off from work – that is when it's needed. If we don't have anybody to understand that, we don't need the Red Line and we don't need people that are routing the buses, because a child can do better. Thank you.

Gene Scriber: Good evening. My name is Gene Scriber. I've been on Edmondson Avenue for 45 years, living in that same house. The transit engineers, what they were showing you, that's computer, that's not actually what it is, that's computer. You can make a computer make the street wide and make them short. We don't need this in Edmondson Village – no we don't. We have enough traffic coming up Edmondson

Avenue morning and evening. What we need is you to fix Edmondson Village up and not with no train – we don't need no train there. What's the train for? For you all to get from the County to the City – that's it. We don't need it and we're going to fight against you, too. Thank you.

Laurel Mendes: Is it acceptable if I ask the engineers a question? My name is Laurel Mendes, I'm the vice-president of the Edmondson Village Community Association. I have a question for the engineers. Was a study done of the underground option for Edmondson Village? Because as I understand it there are some concerns about stability of these older buildings and underground construction. I will sit down and take my answer and hand off the microphone.

Kay: Yes – you're taking us back in history a little bit to answer that question, but yes. The current project, the current definition of the Red Line is what we call the [Locally Preferred Alternative](#) and it was one of many alternatives that were looked at including a tunnel. There was Alternative 4D that included end-to-end tunneling on the Red Line including the section along Edmondson Avenue. In the end the project that we went with was a combination of surface and tunnel. It's tunnel under Cooks Lane, it's tunnel under downtown and surface on Edmondson and surface on other parts of the corridor. It was a complicated decision – it was based on impacts, it was based on cost, it was based on access. Constructing a tunnel is very expensive, very complex, it's disruptive in its own right. For anyone who remembers the construction of the Metro tunnel through downtown it was a very disruptive project. I appreciate that when it's done it's invisible, but along the way it's a very complicated project.

Nyla Walters: Excuse me sir, if I could say something. At one or more of the meetings that I attended, when it was – yes, my name is Nyla Walters. At one or two of the meetings that I attended, when we discussed the underground tunnel – because we were very comfortable with that as opposed to above ground – and the only answer, believe it or not, that I got from that meeting was, if we go underground we're going to have many of the same problems that the homeowners are complaining about now, is the rats surfacing. Yes, yes, yes – that was the answer. So instead of going underground, causing homeowners in the area that complain about having rats in their area, that would produce more rats. That was the solution that I received. And I'm sure if there's anyone that attended the meeting they heard the same thing, so it wasn't a money thing. So you've got to talk money and animals, or rodents. So, I'm just saying, we were just told about the rodents.

Gwen Tyson: Gwen Tyson from Edgewood Street. What I would like to say to everyone, you know it's so hard to get people to come out, to get your neighbor next door to come, because this room should be filled, I mean full. If you don't, and I mean don't, tell your Congressman, tell your Senator – write them, let the federal government know that this is not something that you really want. You don't want somebody to take land that you own, because when you have land you have a lot, you have a lot. And they don't want you to have a lot. People don't realize, owning land is a privilege and it's a privilege that you have. The President has a line that you can call to let him know that this is not something that you want in your neighborhood. So everybody has to come together to do it. People will complain later, but they won't come out now. Now is what you need, it's what you need.

Beatrice Hawkins: Hi, my name is Beatrice Hawkins, I'm the secretary of the Rognel Heights Community Association. I know a lot of you and I'm really pleased to see each and every one of you who have taken the time to come out tonight. My concern is that we have rights and I am so tired of them thinking that they can bamboozle us and tell us a few nice things and take our rights away. We have the right to say what we want in our community and what we don't want and they cannot come in and dictate to us what we should have and what we shouldn't have. Now I'm thinking about my grandchildren, my great-grandchildren, my family members who are going to be up and down that corridor, those who own property who don't have a backyard, as we say, now. They are going to take all of the parking spaces on one side. What about my grandmother? She's got to walk four or five blocks or two blocks up the road to park her car on a parking lot and then walk four blocks back down. The Red Line is going to be on top of surface in our area. That means all of the crime can get off of the train right in front of your door. Then when you go out to Ten Hills and all the other places, it goes down underground so they're well protected. Come on let's look at the big picture, okay? Stop dumping on us. You're not going to look out for us – it's a money thing. You saw an opportunity to get money from the federal government and you found out where you could stick it to us at but we're not going to stand back and take it. What about the children that go to the schools in this area? How many of them do you think are going to walk three or four blocks to a stop that allows them to cross? No, they're going to cross those train tracks and your kids are going to be destroyed and my grandbabies are going to be destroyed because somebody wants to make millions and billions of dollars. I say, say no. Let us continue to come together, stronger and stronger. Let tonight be the beginning. Thank you Mr. Sherrod, I celebrate you and I applaud you. Thank you for giving us the opportunity to stand here and I hope all of you all know that we are not going to take this sitting down.

Lawrence Bell: Amen, amen. My name is Lawrence Bell. Let me say before I get started, I am not running for office. Anything I say has nothing to do with running for office, I have no intention of running for office. I agree with you 100 percent. The reason I'm here – I'm a citizen, I used to represent this area many years ago. I'm an African American and I am tired of seeing all over this country – if you want to find a black community, you follow where the highway is. I look at the impact down the road there – that was one of the largest black owner-occupied neighborhoods in the whole city at one time. When they fought for that, they destroyed a neighborhood, but down in Fells Point, people like Barbara Mikulski fought against it. You all remember that? And she became a councilperson because she fought against that. One lesson that I learned in politics, if I don't remember anything else, is that ain't no such thing as can't, it's just won't. The only reason why this is above ground is because they want to save money. They can put it under the ground. I support your councilperson, I support you Brother Sherrod. What you've got to do, I think, my humble suggestion – and I'm willing to help you any way I can and black people will be mad at me, too, I'm see them right now looking at me funny – but this meeting has to be in a forum where people can hear you. I think these are honorable people, but they don't make the decision. This meeting needs to go to City Hall, it needs to go to Annapolis, you have to have a bus if possible. I'm going to talk to Sherrod about this later – if we can organize and get 100, 200, 300 people down – I know the Councilwoman will tell you, I know long ago when I was down at City Hall – if you can get 200 or more people in the Council chamber on Monday night at 4 o'clock, 4:30, you won't have to say anything. They're going to wonder why you're out there. I used to sit on the other side. How many people here will make a commitment right now to make that, it's a small sacrifice, to be there on a Monday night.

Okay? Now if somebody could take your names down, remind you of when to do it, it's got to be coordinated. You've got to make sure the Mayor knows that, her new chief of staff Mr. O'Malley – I guess he's got the state and the City, I'm not supposed to say that, but that's true. You've got to get to them now because ain't no such thing as can't, it's just won't. Can I get an amen to that? **Audience:** Amen! **Bell:** Alright, thank you so much.

Bethea-Spearman: That closes out the public comments and so now we're going to move on to the next area of the agenda which is the agenda for the next meeting.

Cohen: Madame Chair, there are a number of items that need to be looked at. Obviously the safety report that we've been waiting for for a year-and-a-half will be ready. It was pulled off from this meeting and it should be on the agenda for the next meeting. There is also another issue and that is the issue of public safety on the Red Line that is – I'm sorry, of public security which is a separate issue from public safety. Mr. Blake said that the hearing down in Anne Arundel County is not relevant to the Red Line but it is because what they're doing at that hearing is to hold a hearing to close down the Light Rail station at night because the people in the community are concerned about the crime. I think that the issue of crime is one that is relevant to the Red Line as well as it is to the Central Light Rail line, despite what Mr. Blake said. So I think that the issue of public security as well as public safety should be something that we include. Also the issue of the financing of the Red Line, because there is this statement from the legislative analyst down in Annapolis, of the MTA budget, Mr. Jonathan Martin. In his official report to the legislature he wrote, regardless of how the increase in revenue is estimated in the Red Line financial plan, the department's ability to pay for the transit line relies on the need for an increase in revenue totaling at least 800-million dollars. For perspective, an 800-million dollar increase in revenue would require a motor fuel tax increase of approximately 27 cents. The legislature is only talking about a special session for 10 cents. So all of those topics need to be included – one, the safety report, two, something about public security along the Red Line and finally, the financing of the Red Line. Thank you.

Kendrick: Madame Chair? **Costello:** Can I go next Jamie, just real quick? **Kendrick:** Sure. **Costello:** Madame Chair? **Bethea-Spearman:** Yes. **Costello:** I passed out the perennial outline of the report. We have two meetings after this before the report is due. I would recommend that this be, at least the outline, be on the agenda for the next meeting. In the meantime, I would like to hear from anyone that would be willing to serve on a committee meeting. I think we should probably start the meetings in June, with your permission, so that we have something – **Bethea-Spearman:** Is this the same thing that Mr. Sydnor is talking about? **Costello:** No, he's acknowledging that we have a report committee already. What I'm saying is that, certainly at the next meeting, which would be July, we can work up the other committees, but in the meantime I think that I'm going to go ahead and suggest that probably in June, we've been doing them on Mondays, probably the second Monday in June and then again the Monday prior to the next meeting we'll get a group of people together who are willing to work on the report and have something to show you at the next meeting. **Bethea-Spearman:** So we'll be on time this year? **Costello:** I'm not really worried about that, but I just think we ought to get started.

Kendrick: Madame Chair? **Bethea-Spearman:** Go ahead. **Kendrick:** I have a number of things I'd like to propose, but I won't, because I think we owe it to Mr. Sydnor,

having brought a thoughtful proposal this evening, to set aside some time – **Bethea-Spearman:** That should be the first thing. **Kendrick:** -- we should give it a good 15 to 20 minutes to really think about how it is we organize ourselves and our work going forward. Because I do fear that to some extent we're not given enough time to work through, think through the issues that we're hearing here.

Bethea-Spearman: We heard a lot of issues tonight, but the only dilemma the CAC has is that all of those issues, that's two or three years back. Once the Governor made his determination, and everybody apparently thought he'd done a good job, he got re-elected. So he came and he made that a big news thing, and many of us were there, and he chose a locally preferred alternative. I don't want us to get caught up in, keep going back two and three and four and five years because that time has passed. I do applaud the communities for coming out because this is the most we've seen in Edmondson Village in the almost four years we've been meeting. **Kendrick:** I think it's great. **Bethea-Spearman:** So I do applaud that and I do like the fact that they walked away with, you need to take action. Nothing is a done deal yet. I think I heard that they're doing what they need to do. **Kendrick:** Absolutely. **Bethea-Spearman:** But we cannot as a Council keep visiting that. The preferred alternative has been chosen, whether it was what we wanted or didn't like or felt as though it could have been different – that's neither here nor there now. **Kendrick:** I agree. I guess my point was so for example, these right-of-way issues, let's assume, because I think you're right it's not going underground. So how does – **Bethea-Spearman:** Yeah, not unless somebody's got another 500-million dollars. **Kendrick:** So the young lady that was sitting next to Councilwoman Holton, Ms. Walters, asked some good questions about how am I compensated? Are they going to fix my windows? There are answers to those questions, we just haven't had a chance to really dig into them as a Council, to hear from the MTA on them, to understand what the federal laws are.

Bethea-Spearman: Well, there goes a committee right there – we need to know about compensation. **Sydnor:** That's part of the charge. **Kendrick:** Councilman Bell raised the issue of 40 years ago when the Highway to Nowhere was built and nobody will disagree to that, that was a bad decision, right? **Bethea-Spearman:** Absolutely, but the one downtown called the light rail, that was a bad decision, too. **Kendrick:** But what came out of that really bad decision was something called the Uniform Relocation Act which required that property owners be compensated in a certain way. So I think 40 years later we ought to understand what those requirements are today. Because 40 years ago people were shafted. So I think really digging into that would be helpful.

Bethea-Spearman: You need to be on that committee, Jamie. **Kendrick:** I'm happy to be. **Bethea-Spearman:** You've got one to sign up. And I want to be on that one, too. Right now we're just taking ideas. Go ahead Warren. **Smith:** I'd like to put the idea of community benefit agreements as stated -- **Bethea-Spearman:** Yes, that's compensation. **Smith:** Right – as stated today, the City's covered, but we neighborhoods are not. You all have your own plans, your own ideas – that's your neighborhood and unless you have it in writing, the state does not have to listen to it. Community benefit agreement should be – **Bethea-Spearman:** I think that's something that we could talk about – **Smith:** -- we can talk about it. **Bethea-Spearman:** That needs to be on that agenda that Sydnor – and the same thing with that compensation – **Smith:** Right. **Bethea-Spearman:** -- because that's real important. Now that we can probably have some – **Smith:** -- and employment also. **Bethea-Spearman:** -- and employment, absolutely.

Cole: Madame Chair, I, too, would like to thank the community for coming out. This is probably one of the best-attended meetings that I've experienced. But at the same time the questions asked also indicate that we have to do a better job in providing the community with information. So for sure, in keeping with Mr. Sydnor's request, I think one of those committees should deal with getting correct and accurate information to the community – on whatever their concerns may be.

Bethea-Spearman: I listened to Mr. Sherrod say earlier that he went out and he delivered fliers and I think or maybe, I don't know what all is entailed with the Liaisons jobs, but I know Allendale by itself has 15-hundred homes. It seems like it would be better that they go door-to-door or have a group of people going door-to-door, because if he surely could do it and get that kind of turnout then you're absolutely right – all of our mailings, our postcards, well not ours – MTA's – mailings and postcards and so-called e-mails, it's just not getting it, it's not getting it. It needs to be physical bodies out there on that street getting those fliers in those people's doors and on their cars and all of that. Because I'm sure it's a lot of money doing it the way we're doing it – I keep saying we, ain't no we because I ain't a part of MTA – but the way the MTA is doing it. Maybe some serious consideration needs to be given to do that and I'm sure no one Community Liaison can do that. Because like I said, Allendale has 15-hundred homes by itself.

Cohen: Madame Chair? **Bethea-Spearman:** Yes. **Kendrick:** We have reached the appointed hour. **Cohen:** Madame Chair there is something else. At the Open Houses that have already taken place, the LPA is considerably different from what we were shown. It is now traveling along Security Boulevard north of the mall rather than south of the mall by 70. There is discussion about putting an underground station closer to UM for Poppleton and there is also a complete change in the order of the stations over by Bayview – it will go to the hospital before it goes to Bayview Yard where the railroad is. So the LPA is not immutable, it is changing as we speak and we need to understand what the changes are and know that it is not unfixable.

Bethea-Spearman: You know what Mr. Cohen – I was at the Woodlawn station last night. I was not aware that that train was changing. You all have added even more underground out there but yet you continue to tell Edmondson Avenue folk that we can't get underground. **Kendrick:** It's not underground there. **Cohen:** It's not underground there but it is north of the mall instead of south of the mall and they're looking at a new underground station where Poppleton was going to be above ground. It will be moved further south into the tunnel for extra money. **Bethea-Spearman:** No – Mr. Kay, that's a problem, that's a problem. I think after Mr. Sydnor's committees, we need as the CAC, because I definitely want to see, what changes have been made through those SAACs that you all have agreed to – we need to see that. Because if anybody else gets any more underground – anybody, I don't care who it is, the folk over there on the east side, I don't care if it's Poppleton – there's going to be a problem, there's going to be a problem. Because I live over here, too. And you know my opinion about that, I try not to have an opinion because my job is to try to co-chair, but we cannot allow – and I know we only advise, but then you're forcing us to a point where we're going to have to join in because we can't allow this outright discrimination, we just can't allow that.

Kay: There's no more tunnels. We'll go through the changes – **Bethea-Spearman:** That needs to be the second thing on the agenda. Don't bring no slideshow, we don't want to see no slideshow. We want to see the actual simulation of stuff moving as we

did at that Biotech Center, which is what I thought we were bringing into the Edmondson Village area tonight, but we brought a slideshow. **Kay:** We can't show you a video of changes though. **Bethea-Spearman:** Oh no? **Kay:** That's far longer. That video took us a year to make. **Bethea-Spearman:** Oh, okay. So what would you be able to show us? **Kendrick:** Probably a slide show. **Kay:** It's not that many changes. **Bethea-Spearman:** Be quiet Jamie. Is it a slide show? **Kay:** How about if we bring maps? We have to show you something. **Bethea-Spearman:** I think we need to see something big. **Conner:** I think we have enough agenda items. **Bethea-Spearman:** No we haven't even finalized the agenda, but it's not going to be all of these things everybody talked about, that's not going to happen. I think the first thing we have to do is get Sydnor's thing back on the agenda, we took off Cohen for the safety, we will get that on the agenda – **Council members:** Security and safety. **Bethea-Spearman:** No, no, no, no – we're not doing all of that, we're going to do safety. Other people had things they wanted to put on the agenda too. We need to know what's going on with all of these changes across the alignment. We may have room for one more thing.

Kendrick: I think we spend a lot of time trying to pack so much in we never really get to dig into it. **Bethea-Spearman:** That's the problem. **Kendrick:** I think we ought to just keep it to three and – **Bethea-Spearman:** Three – and let it roll from there? I think that's a good idea. Yes Ms. Annie.

Williams: Not this time, but somewhere in the future I would like for us, or someone to come in and talk to us about, I notice we're trying to put in new sidewalks for people and take away the stairs and put in new stairs and new fences and build it up, but somewhere down the line all of this is going to have to be paid for, which means people that own property, their taxes are going to be increased. Somewhere along the line -- nobody has even said anything about increased taxes. It's going to have to come up, it's going to have to come up. I'm not saying the next meeting, but somewhere in there we need to have somebody to let us know. The City's going to have to increase property taxes for when they start doing new stuff like this. When the Red Line comes through people's taxes are going to be increased because of new development and stuff. It needs to be talked about.

Kendrick: So for the next meeting we have alignment – **Williams:** I didn't say the next meeting. **Kendrick:** No, no – **Williams:** I'm just saying, somewhere down the line – I'll bring it up again because – **Bethea-Spearman:** Ms. Tori will have it in the notes, because you know she records everything that's said. **Williams:** Yes, I'm not saying the next meeting, but I am saying by the end of the year we need to start looking at the increase on property taxes that's going to be coming down the line.

Bethea-Spearman: Okay, so the first thing on the agenda, we have Mr. Sydnor. The second thing we have on the agenda is Mr. Cohen. We need to see the whole entire line, the changes, you know, that came out of the SAACs. **Kay:** Some did, some were just things people brought to our attention – we'll go through them. **Bethea-Spearman:** Okay. I'm thinking financing needs to be addressed. **Kendrick:** Too much – next agenda. **Bethea-Spearman:** No, I don't think it'll take Mr. Kay - -and I think Mr. Kay can tell us where we are with the financing, how much money's been spent to date, how much are the changes going to cost that have been made through SAACs or however the changes were made, how are they going to be paid for. Because if you're coming up with more money then you're going to have to find some for Edmondson Avenue. That's

how that's going to roll. Underground – they ain't going to find no 500-million, that's a lot.

Costello: Madame Chair, before we adjourn – we will have a meeting for the report committee June 13th and June 14th depending on availability, at the City Planning office, that's on Fayette Street, right? **Bethea-Spearman:** Four-seventeen. **Costello:** Four-seventeen. **Bethea-Spearman:** East Fayette. **Costello:** The 14th's not good? Okay, how about the week before, the 7th? **Cohen:** Mondays are good. **Costello:** Monday the 14th of July. **Kendrick:** We need to get out of here before they kick us out. **Bethea-Spearman:** Oh yeah, it's 9 o'clock, we've got to get out. **Kendrick:** Move to adjourn. **Bethea-Spearman:** I forgot all about that, oh my God, so sorry, so sorry. We adjourned the meeting? So approved.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:05 p.m.

**BALTIMORE RED LINE
CITIZENS' ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING**

DATE OF MEETING: July 14, 2011
TIME: 7:00 p.m.
LOCATION: University of Maryland, Baltimore BioPark

CAC ATTENDEES:

- | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|
| • Angela Bethea-Spearman, Co-Chair | • Emery Hines |
| • Dr. Rodney Orange, Co-Chair | • George Moniodis |
| • Edward Cohen | • Warren Smith |
| • Gary Cole | • Charles Sydnor |
| • Sandra Conner | • Marty Taylor |
| • Christopher Costello | • Annie Williams |

(Absent: Jamie Kendrick)

GENERAL PUBLIC: 34 people signed in

ELECTED OFFICIALS OR REPRESENTATIVES:

- Councilwoman Helen Holton, Baltimore City Council, 8th District
- David Fraser, Office of Delegate Keiffer Mitchell, Maryland General Assembly, 44th District
- Kristen Harbeson, Office of Delegate Maggie McIntosh, Maryland General Assembly, 43rd District

MTA/CONSULTANT ATTENDEES:

- | | |
|--|---|
| • Henry Kay, Maryland Transit Administration (MTA) | • Sgt. Bryan E. White, MTA Police |
| • Lorenzo Bryant, MTA | • Tom Mohler, RK&K |
| • Patrick Fleming, MTA | • Tori Leonard, Rosborough Communications, Inc. (RCI) |
| • Tamika Gauvin, MTA | • Carl Williams, RCI |
| • Sam Minnitte, STV | |

RED LINE COMMUNITY LIAISONS/ STAFF:

- | | |
|--|---|
| • Roxana Beyranvand | • George Shardlow |
| • Rachel Myrowitz (Inner Harbor East-Canton) | • Keisha Trent (CMS-I-70 Park and Ride) |

Agenda:

- Welcome [*Page 2*]
- CAC Member Introductions [*Page 2*]
- Approval of Agenda [*Page 3*]
- Adoption of May 12th Meeting Minutes [*Page 3*]
- Safety and Security [*Pages 3-8*]
- Proposal for CAC Committees [*Pages 8-10*]

- Proposed Modifications to Locally Preferred Alternative [*Pages 11-21*]
- Project Expenditures to Date [*Pages 26-27*]
- Framework for Special Edmondson Avenue Meeting [*Pages 21-24*]
- Next Meeting Agenda [*Pages 26-27*]

Dr. Rodney Orange: Good evening everyone. I'm Dr. Rodney Orange, one of the co-chairs of the [Red Line Advisory Council](#). We're going to start this meeting this evening, July 14th and we certainly thank you for your presence this evening. At the last meeting there was a lot of concern and members of the audience had questions as we moved along. I'm going to ask of you to try to hold your questions until we get to our comment period. So if you do have a question, if you have paper, write it down and hold on to it until we get to our comment period. The reason for that is we are on a time limit at these meetings and we need to try to complete our business as a Council – we welcome your attendance – but we need to try to complete our business as a Council before we take any questions, because very often it causes the meeting to be prolonged and in many cases we don't finish our business, because we have a time limit in the locations that we are fortunate to have the opportunity to be at. I'm going to ask the CAC members at this point to give introductions, starting at my left with Mr. Smith.

Warren Smith: Good evening you all. I'm Warren Smith, I used to be President of the West Hills Community and I'm very proactive with the CAC.

Charles Sydnor: Good evening. Charles Sydnor, resident of Baltimore County.

George Moniodis: Good evening, I'm George Moniodis, President of Greentown Community Development Corporation.

Annie Williams: Annie Williams, good evening everyone. I'm from Harlem Park.

Gary Cole: Good evening, Gary Cole, Deputy Director, Department of Planning.

Angela Bethea-Spearman: Angela Bethea-Spearman, Chairperson of the Southwest Development Committee, President of Uplands Community Association and appointed by Senator Verna L. Jones, 44th Legislative District.

Orange: Again, Dr. Rodney Orange, appointed by Delegate Nathaniel Oaks.

Edward Cohen: Good evening, my name is Edward Cohen. I'm with the Transit Riders Action Council of Metropolitan Baltimore, the Mt. Vernon-Belvedere Association, the Howard Street station SAAC and I was appointed by Senator Verna Jones-Rodwell of the 44th Legislative District.

Christopher Costello: Good evening, my name is Chris Costello. I'm a resident of the Westgate community, which is in the area of Ten Hills, the western border of the City going out Route 40, Edmondson Avenue and I was appointed by the delegates from the 41st District.

Emery Hines: Good evening, my name is Emery Hines. I'm Manager of Transportation Planning for Baltimore County.

Orange: Okay, thank you members. Approval of the [agenda](#) – can I get a motion?

Cohen: Mr. Co-Chair, we approved the [minutes of the last meeting](#) and the minutes of our proceedings were accurate, however they did not contain the public comment at the end and we need to get the public comments from the end for next month's meeting so that we can go back and review that and approve those minutes over again because they did not contain the public comment. I do move for the approval of these minutes which do contain the public comments.

Orange: We're on the agenda. **Cohen:** I'm sorry, I'm sorry. I move for approval of the agenda. **Orange:** Second. (Second). Moved and seconded – all in favor? **Council:** Aye. **Orange:** Okay, you can keep on with the [May 12th meeting minutes](#). **Cohen:** Yes, as I said the March minutes that we approved at the May meeting contained correct minutes for what occurred in our portion of the meeting, but it did not include the public comment at the end. I noticed this later and I think that this is something that we will need to have another look at in September.

Orange: Tori, is there any reason for that? Did you...What are you talking about, the March meeting? **Cohen:** What I'm saying is that the minutes that we approved in May for the March meeting did not contain the public participation portion. It contained everything that we did here at the table, but it did not contain the public participation portion for the March meeting. **Kay:** I believe the comments occurred in the body of the meeting – we'll check. **Cohen:** I'll go back and look at it and you please go back and look also, because I do believe that they were missing, but I'll go back and look at them.

Taylor: I'm looking at them right now and they go all the way to the motion for adjournment. **Bethea-Spearman:** We're not talking about these minutes. **Taylor:** I'm looking at the March ones. **Bethea-Spearman:** Oh, you have yours. **Taylor:** Yeah, I've got it on my phone here. That's the one that was over on the east side at Holy Rosary, anyway, I think they're fine.

Orange: We're going into old business. **Bethea-Spearman:** Thank you Dr. Orange. Safety and Security – Mr. Cohen.

Cohen: Thank you Madame Co-Chair. There is a [sheet](#) that Dr. Orange will be passing around to the members of the Council. I had tried to get this put on a disc so that we could put it up on the screen for the public, but there was a problem in coordination with the MTA and with the consultant and it couldn't be done in time, but this will serve our needs as members of the committee. Since this will be in the record, the public will get a chance to see it, although not at this meeting. Twenty-two months ago, I had requested this and this was something that was put on the agenda and this is something that kept not showing up or not coming up. So now 22 months later we get this. I had asked for certain data from the MTA that they annually report to the Federal Transit Administration having to do with collisions between MTA vehicles and other vehicles on the road in service and between MTA vehicles in service and pedestrians. This information was finally made available and it is here now and I want to go through it with you. It should not have taken 22 months for us to get information that the MTA already had. What they said to us was that they didn't have these measures. What they did have were the components of the measures. So if you look at things like collisions per 100-million unlinked trips which is in the third column on the first line – they had the collisions, they had the number of trips, they simply didn't have anything that contained the division quotient. Well, I mean, that's not hard to put together, to figure out how to do a division.

So, this is something that we should have had and from now on I think we'll be able to get it in a more timely fashion. Going over the content of this – what this table does is, it takes the years 2005 through 2010 and takes data that was provided to me by MTA from those years that they report to the federal government. The data was all MTA's. I sat down with Mr. Sam Minnitte of STV engineering consultants who was assigned by Henry Kay to work with me and we went over the categories to be included that would provide the totals for the collisions and we just took the numbers for the passenger trips, passenger miles, vehicle revenue trips and vehicle revenue miles which the MTA provided.

Cohen: The collision incidents were totaled and you can see the number of collisions in the first column and in every single row, as you can see, those three numbers are the same. They're the total number of collisions involved – for Metro, for light rail, for bus, which are the three modes that MTA directly operates and, in terms of rail lines, that MTA constructed. So this does not include contract services like MARC or commuter bus or even the paratransit service which is mixed between direct operation by MTA and contractors. The number of collisions are shown in the first column for every category. In the first line the collisions by annual unlinked passenger trips – you can see the collisions per 100-million unlinked trips and it's listed for Metro, for light rail and for bus. Then in the last column it's the ratio compared to Metro, so that we can see what the magnitude is of difference. In general, for most of this, Metro is about two orders of magnitude less likely to be involved in a collision. Then we see light rail and we see bus. We see it compared in different ways. We see it compared by passenger trips, by passenger miles, by vehicle revenue trips and by vehicle revenue miles. All the data was aggregated over the six-year period. It was broken down in the data that was given to me year-by-year, but I don't think it's very informative and I think it would just clutter up what we're looking at to look at that.

Taylor: [Comment inaudible].

Cohen: Let me just get to the last column and then I'll do that. As I say, that last column shows the actual ratios. If you get to the last two parts of the table, the days between collisions by service line and the days between collisions by service branch. A service line is a service line that's designated by MTA – it might be the Central Light line, it might be the Metro subway line, it might be the number 3 bus line – but it's composed, in some cases, of multiple branches. So, for example, the light rail has a branch that goes to Penn Station, one branch that goes to Penn Station. The other two branches do not. They have a branch that goes from Cromwell to Hunt Valley and they have a branch that goes from the airport to Hunt Valley. They have short services that do not go all the way. So for example they have service that goes from Cromwell to Timonium. That was not counted as a branch in this table. That was short service and short service was just included within the branches. In order to be counted as a branch, there had to be a change in the routing and there also had to be stops that were different. So for example, the Penn to Camden service stops at Penn Station, the other two service branches do not. The one from Cromwell to Hunt Valley stops at Cromwell and it stops at Ferndale, the other two do not. The one that goes to the airport stops at BWI Business Park and the airport terminal and the other two service branches do not. So that's the way this was broken down. The light rail has three service branches, the Metro has one, the MTA bus system has 56 service lines and 155 service branches at this time. Now the number of service branches did vary over the six-year period, but it doesn't vary by that much and so I just used the current number of service branches.

The ratio of the service branches to the lines is approximately the same for both bus and light rail – it's approximately three-to-one. It's exactly three-to-one for the light rail, it is approximately three-to-one for the buses where you've got 155 branches and 56 lines.

Cohen: If you look down at the bottom on the far right in the last column, this is the part that I think is most relevant. It says ratio compared to Metro and then at the very bottom it says the average period between collisions by service branch has a 16-point-3 percent longer duration for the bus than the light rail. If you look at that last part, where it says ratio compared to Metro, in the very bottom right, you see three numbers – the one-point-zero, the 15-point-3 and the 13-point-2. That is the ratio of how long these periods are between collisions on average. So the light rail, on average, per branch, had a collision every 35-point-7 days, the Metro every 547-point-8 days. So therefore the light rail had it 15-point-3 times more frequently than the Metro. The bus was 13-point-2 times more frequently than the Metro and as it says at the bottom, it was essentially 16-point-3 percent more frequent for the light rail than for the bus. The importance of this is that if you look at that frequency, if you look at every, 11-point-9 days in the column that says average number of days between collisions in the line above, where it's 547-point-8, 11-point-9 and 15-point-zero – that's how many days there are between collisions on a service line.

Cohen: So the current light rail has had a collision approximately every 12 days during the six-year period covered in the data that MTA supplied. If a bus line has a collision frequency of once every 15 days, which we see, when such collisions occur traffic can get around the bus by taking another roadway and the buses themselves can get around the bus. So while there is some disruption it is not the kind of disruption that shuts everything down. When the light rail gets in a collision, things are different. If it happens on Howard Street, the impact to traffic is obviously minimal because there's very little traffic and there are plenty of alternative pass ways. If it happens somewhere else then the opportunity to avoid a traffic build-up becomes more difficult. Furthermore, what happens with rail is that when you have a disruption in rail, it tends to impact the entire line because they're all on the same track and they're lined up behind each other. So what we would have, if we have a collision every 12 days on light rail and it's in a corridor such as Edmondson Avenue where we have extremely high traffic buildups, then that means that we can expect some type of incident that backs up the line and backs up the roadway for anywhere from a half-an-hour to two hours each time this happens. If a bus got in an accident, again, you can get around it, but if the train gets in an accident, the trains can't get around it so you're backing up the line and when it's an intermodal accident then it could back up both the tracks and the line. So this impacts both the reliability of the line and the rider attraction. If you have something where people say 'well this thing gets in a collision every 12 days and even if I'm not on that train, I'll be late for work because I'll be stuck because the whole system will be slowed down by it,' then people will not want to use such a system because they can't rely on it to get to work and they're afraid that they will risk their jobs. So it depresses the attraction for the choice riders. Now, Marty, question.

Taylor: [Portions inaudible] How does Metro have collisions?

Cohen: I think this might be something like a sideswipe. I did not go over every bit of data in the yard, but this was supposed to be revenue service, but I'm not sure that it was but I didn't get to check it.

Taylor: So what we're looking at is that over a six-year period, there were four collisions of the Metro which we don't really understand – **Cohen:** And all of them were in the same year, 2006. **Taylor:** Right. So the Metro basically doesn't have collisions. There were 200 collisions in the light rail, which averages one about every 12 days and the bus has about a same frequency of collision based on how many buses there are. This would have been really interesting 22 months ago – **Cohen:** Yes. **Taylor:** -- when we were talking about different possibilities for a plan for the Red Line, when we weren't locked in as we are now to an LPA. What this very clearly shows is something that many of us already knew, was that a light rail train is not as safe as a Metro train because it collides more. Now how serious the collisions are this data doesn't say, how much of a risk it is, this data doesn't say, but we knew this, that the light rail, like the Red Line is going to be if we ever build it, is going to be less safe, less effective, less fast than a Metro would be. But unfortunately, a Metro is off the table and the only thing that we can say – and sadly the Metro is off the table in my eyes – but the only thing that we can say based on this data is that the choice that we have going forward wasn't the safest thing that could have possibly been built, but it's what we've got. Unfortunately, while this was interesting, I don't know what this changes now.

Cohen: It doesn't change much now – you're right. But it should have – **Taylor:** It would have been really interesting 22 months ago. **Cohen:** -- it should have been provided to us 22 months ago. **Taylor:** Anyway, so I guess the bottom line is that you're 90..., probably almost infinitely more likely to have a collision on the light rail or bus than on Metro which I think is very clearly shown here.

Bethea-Spearman: We're going to close with Mr. Cole. **Cole:** Mr. Cohen, just a couple of questions. **Cohen:** Sure. **Cole:** I know you aggregated the data. **Cohen:** Yes, I've got the data right here if you want to look at it afterwards. **Cole:** What I want to know is, by the years, could you discern a trend? For instance – **Cohen:** Yes. **Cole:** -- are accidents, collisions on the rise? Are they decreasing or they're flat? **Cohen:** They tend to be fairly flat for the bus. For the Metro they were zero every year except 2006. For the light rail they tend to be increasing. The number of accidents listed here, starting in 2005, year-by-year was 13, then 16, then 27, then 40, then 51 in 2009 and then it dropped down to 36 in 2010. So it was one every seven-point-one days in 2009. **Cole:** And how did that compare with the ridership for those years? Was the ridership, flat? The same? Did it go up? Did it decrease? **Cohen:** The ridership varied. It was two-point-five times, it looks like it's two-point-five million unlinked passenger trips, but that can't be right. **Cole:** And one last question – **Cohen:** Well, it did go up from two-point-five times 10 to the negative six, in the data that I got from Mr. Minnitte, to two-point-seven, to four-point-zero to five-point-one to five-point-eight to six-point.

Cole: One last question, Mr. Cohen. Did the MTA provide you with any data with respect to, for instance, as a result of the collision, indicated that there was X time that the traffic was stopped. **Cohen:** I said that there's a range of time. **Cole:** Right, but I'm saying, did you get any information as to the duration of the – **Cohen:** No, the duration was not in the data. **Cole:** How could you come up with those duration periods? **Cohen:** The duration periods are based upon discussions that I've had over the years with MTA regarding accidents on light rail, but it was not anything that was data-based, it was based upon discussions with MTA over a period of years regarding different incidents. **Cole:** So a collision could be a minute or two hours? **Cohen:** It's not likely to be a minute, because if there's a collision, then there have to be reports made, so it would be very difficult for it to be a minute. There normally have to be police on the

scene because we're talking about collisions between vehicles or collisions between vehicles and pedestrians. So normally, you're going to wait for the police to arrive, you're going to make sure that emergency vehicles have access and all that sort of thing. This is not like where two private automobiles bump at a light and the people decide, well, forget about it, neither one of us is going to report it. When you're involved with an agency like the MTA, which is involved in public transport, there's no option to do that, so there have to be reports and there have to be examinations.

Smith: Mr. Ed Cohen, in your data you emphasize that the traffic in the accident would be stopped up and people would lose their jobs. Well, on Edmondson Avenue there's traffic to the left and there's traffic to the right of Edmondson Avenue. Why won't the people use those streets – have you factored in that? **Cohen:** I have considered the issue of that and obviously there's a real difference between north of Edmondson Avenue and south of Edmondson Avenue. If you have an accident that backs up Edmondson Avenue, the people that live south of Edmondson Avenue at least have the option of using side streets to try and drive over towards Frederick Avenue. But if you are, say, in the vicinity of Edgewood and Harlem, then if you want to get out and traffic is blocked up on Edmondson Avenue, you've got to go west into Hunting Ridge and then go north to get into Franklinton Road and come back through Leakin Park to get back to Route 40 at Franklinton and Route 40. So it is not the same impact on people north of the park as it is on people south of the park. Those who live north of the park would be much more inconvenienced than those who live south.

Smith: I have to agree with Marty – this information would have been accurate 22 months ago, but today, it has no place in this discussion. **Cohen:** What is important is that this is information that was requested 22 months ago and that the MTA had it. We wanted it in a timely fashion and were legally entitled to it and we didn't get it in a timely fashion when it would have made a difference and that is not the fault of anyone here at this table, but the MTA was supposed to provide it and they didn't and they had the data.

Taylor: Gary – to answer your question – **Bethea-Spearman:** We need to move on. **Taylor:** -- about the correlation – sorry, just one sentence – because I copied the numbers down as he said it. The accidents correlated very nicely with ridership during 2005 to 2009, increasing pretty much linearly with the ridership. But then in 2010 the ridership still increased but the MTA did a better job. So it looks like you guys are doing a better job being safer – for whatever that's worth.

Bethea-Spearman: Moving right along – did you want to comment, MTA, Mr. Kay?

Kay: The challenge we had was understanding exactly what he [Cohen] wanted. In the end we were able to give him safety data which does include collisions. He did a great deal of work to cull out what this definition of collision was. I think if he'd been a little clearer at the beginning about what was the purpose of using the information, we could have been more helpful in terms of providing it. Certainly, I think you've seen much evidence of that, we do our best to provide information to respond to your requests. With regard to the larger question he's asking, there's no question that a light rail line is going to have more accidents per any measure than a Metro line. A Metro line, our subway line, is fully grade-separated and you can reasonably expect zero accidents ever in that circumstance. It's separated from traffic physically and the trains are separated from each other by an automated computer-controlled signal system. I suspect those four incidents that occurred in the yard where the trains are operated manually. They're

not in revenue service where the trains are automatic. With regard to light rail, I mean, it's the nature of light rail. It's out on the street, the cars can drive across the tracks, pedestrians can drive across the tracks – there are going to be collisions. Each one is unfortunate and we do everything we can to design the system to minimize them, to address problems that we can identify that create trends. Given the number of miles of light rail service we provide, the number of hours, the number of people we carry – I think if you look at that accident rate compared to any other aspect of your life such as the likelihood that you will trip and fall down the stairs, the likelihood that you will have a car accident on the way home or the likelihood that a rock will fall out of the sky when you're walking down the street – those I would guess are much greater than the likelihood that you'll be injured in an accident on the light rail train. So while the numbers are higher relative to Metro, they're still so close to zero that they're inconsequential. And whether or not we have this specific analysis in front of us when we were differentiating between heavy rail and light rail, it would not have been a differentiating factor. It's not significant when you compare it to all the other variables that we used to differentiate when looking at different modes.

Cohen: Mr. Kay, I would – **Kay:** Yeah, I'm sorry, I grant you that was a very long time.
Cohen: Mr. Kay –

Bethea-Spearman: Moving right along – no, no – moving right along, we're going to go to the Proposal for the CAC Committees, we're going to turn that over to Mr. Sydnor.

Sydnor: Good evening everyone. I actually don't want this to be turned over to me, because in our last meeting it was put on the table and said we would all come with some ideas as to committees that we would possibly be able to look at and begin to organize, or re-organize, ourselves. At the last meeting I proposed a few committees. One, the annual report committee, is already established, but a compensation committee, commercial redevelopment committee, a procurement committee. Each of the three committees are based upon the actual House Bill language, the law's language as areas the CAC should be advising upon. So with that, I open the floor for everybody else on the Committee. (Asked to repeat list of committees). Compensation committee, whose job would be to study and report on damages that may be incurred by property owners and just compensation for those whose property is damaged during the construction of any Red Line project. Commercial redevelopment committee to study and report on proposals for redevelopment of commercial areas surrounding the Red Line transit corridor in Baltimore City and Baltimore County. Procurement committee to study and report on methods for providing preference in hiring for construction jobs for the construction of any Red Line transit project to 1, residents of the legislative districts in which the Red Line transit project will be constructed, 2, residents of legislative districts adjacent to that same line.

Orange: Mr. Sydnor, as I read the minutes of the last meeting, in my mind, some of the committees you have recommended, we are kind of like, maybe getting out ahead of them and not really having any – at this point – as far as, let's say, compensation, at this point, in my mind, is not an issue because construction hasn't started yet and my thinking was, as we enter into certain areas or issues come up, I think it would be beneficial to then formulate a committee to look at that particular issue, because right now compensation, there's no need to put a committee together because we don't have any issues on compensation to deal with. We haven't started construction yet. Congratulations to the MTA, they just recently got approval from the federal government

to enter into Primary (sic) Engineering and we congratulate them on that. So, I don't want us to get too far ahead in examining things that don't exist. The Annual Report Committee, thanks to Mr. Costello, we're on top of that. The other committees or the other issues that the legislators have given us the direction to examine, I think we would be better off to create those as we move forward than to try to get ahead of them when we don't have an issue. That's just my feeling.

Conner: I think that these are very viable committees for us to consider and I would suggest that we look at us getting engaged in these particular committees and beginning to look at the guidelines as to how we will go forward in the event that we do get granted to go forward with the actual design and implementation of the Red Line. So I agree with you Dr. Orange, to some extent, however I think it will be a good idea for us to begin putting in the groundwork that we need to do. For example, what will the compensation be for homeowners? When we were in the Edmondson Avenue location at our last meeting, one of the things that came up was 'how will I be compensated'? I would like for us at least to be proactive and say we looked at it, these are some guidelines that we'd like to have us consider, at that time when it should come upon us. I'd rather be proactive than to be reactive.

Smith: I'd like this committee to consider community benefit agreements. Everyone is entitled to a community benefit agreement, but no one seems to take control of it. This committee can take control of it. Put those communities that have the same plea together, present it to the developer. That would work because the City is protecting itself with their plan – no one is protecting the community, no one do the residents have to turn the community benefit into. So why can't this committee take that on.

Bethea-Spearman: [Portions inaudible – stresses that process is not there yet, community benefit agreements go deeper than the Community Compact.] We here around the table need to be committed, now rather than later, to one of these three committees.

Smith: The compensation committee will pick up the community benefit agreement.

Bethea-Spearman: That's okay, that's up to the compensation committee.

Cohen: Madame Chair. **Bethea-Spearman:** Yes. **Cohen:** I agree that the committee that Mr. Smith talked about makes a lot of sense. I also think that the topics that Mr. Sydnor raised make sense and I also agree with Dr. Orange that at least partially we're not ready for that. I do wonder, however, whether or not we need all of those committees to be separate or whether or not one or two committees could handle the material, because we won't be dealing with those issues simultaneously necessarily and there is some overlap. I'd just like to hear your thoughts on that.

Sydnor: Again, these were just three committees that I pulled from just looking at the law. I'm not married to any of them. In fact, what I was looking for tonight was some input from the rest of the CAC as to what committees would be good, viable committees. I do agree with you Dr. Orange that at this point there's nothing to be compensated, but there will be. There's been discussions about the possibility of windows being replaced and things of that nature for homes that may possibly be damaged in the future, so it's going to happen and it's an issue that we do have to take up. Regarding procurement, I'm assuming businesses are providing certain services now – this is happening. What

companies have been procured to provide what services for this project – I don't know except for the services that we generally benefit from for these meetings. These are tasks that were placed down within the law by the legislature. Again, I'm looking to you all to figure out how best to reorganize, because the way we're organized now it's not working.

Bethea-Spearman: [Portions inaudible -- suggested Council discuss further at its retreat and stressed a need for clearer direction from the legislative leadership.]

Cole: Just a few suggestions -- I like Mr. Sydnor's idea. Just a recommendation in terms of compensation, if you're talking about first-source hiring, training, hopefully that can all be looked at at the same time. We talked about commercial development – I would also offer that we look at residential development in the corridor. Then one very important item that Mr. Cohen mentioned at the beginning of the meeting about safety, I would also suggest that let's not forget about safety and see what we can do in terms of improving safety.

Costello: In many ways we are a committee of one, but if we're going to get out ahead of the agenda and this might be what Mr. Sydnor is referring to. We tend to sit here and receive information that's offered to us. For us to get more information we as individuals and as a committee have to work a little harder. I know there's a lot of information because of MTA, when we work on the report, we meet at the Planning Department, I tell you, I've learned a lot about this that I wouldn't pick up at meetings, by the activities which hopefully have been of some value to the committee. Also, we have a very good resource in the Mayor's Red Line coordinator who's doing a pretty good job. I guess you're all getting the publications that come out of there. That's something that we sit here, Danyell comes to the meetings and she's very good about keeping the public informed. We never seem to actually interact or communicate directly with her or the executives of the two jurisdictions. The engineering firms that have certain responsibilities to coordinate various different things – very interesting. Now I don't know that that's going to change anything about this, but as far as being better informed as committee members, an opportunity to actually meet with people and then we can be more or better prepared to kind of direct our agenda rather than simply have it directed at us. If that makes any sense to anybody. (Council members concur). That's not a motion. (Laughter)

Bethea-Spearman: Anybody else?

Taylor: I just want to say that I think you did a really nice job thinking about what all the issues are going forward. I have to agree with pretty much everything everybody said, that some of it we're not ready for. Some of it we may be starting to be ready for, but it's not clear which way we should go and I think that needs to be clarified as you mentioned. But all of it really will require more work on our part, it seems to me, to stay ahead of the issues instead of being a little bit behind them. I guess this is the one that's the most striking of things we've been behind in the time I've been here, but people are going to have to be willing to put them time in. I guess we'll decide that more at the retreat.

Bethea-Spearman: Thank you Mr. Sydnor. **Sydnor:** Thank you all for the consideration. **Bethea-Spearman:** Welcome Councilwoman Holton. **Councilwoman**

Helen Holton: Thank you Madame Chair. **Bethea-Spearman:** Moving on to the new business – [Proposed Modification of Locally Preferred Alternative](#).

Kay: Thank you. I'm trying to recall the discussion at your last meeting, but I believe it was raised by those of you who were able to attend our [Open Houses](#) in May and noted some displays we had there which showed possible changes to the LPA that we were considering. There are a number of sources for those changes – some were coming from our own technical work and further refinement of the engineering. Some were coming out of the [Station Area Advisory Committee](#) process. It sort of ends up being a mixed bag. So we have now, I'd say, about 10 discreet modifications that we're considering, all of which, I believe improve the project in terms of making it either operate more reliably and efficiently, lowering costs or shifting impacts away from commercial owners or home owners. So what we would like to do tonight is go through those with you. Now, I'll warn you – it's a lot of detail. Mr. Mohler is here to present it – he's famous for this. I would say that, if you could, let him move through the changes. He'll go through the corridor from west to east – let him talk about all of them and then if you want to come back and discuss some in more detail you can. Because I think what you will see is that there are two or three that are more interesting and the rest are fairly minor and intuitive. But I want to give you a chance to see what they all are. Then if you want to follow up further at another meeting, you can do that as well. So with that said, Madame Co-Chair – how much time do you want to take on this? You tell me, because Tom can – **Bethea-Spearman:** How much time is he going to need? (Laughter).

Kay: It's 10 til 8 – I'd say, if you can try to go through these, Tom, in about 10 minutes – (laughter) – and give the committee a sample of what we mean. But leave some time so we can come back and discuss them in more detail later on. I think we need to get through the corridor because I really wanted to put all these in front of you so you have a chance to see what they all are. **Taylor:** He doesn't talk quite as fast as you do. **Kay:** He doesn't talk as fast as I can, but he's armed with a PowerPoint. So if you could – I mean it's certainly up to you – but I would suggest you hold your questions, you might find it better in the end. **Bethea-Spearman:** Ten minutes might be a little too fast, he might need to take about 15.

Tom Mohler: Fifteen – thank you Mr. Kay, Ms. Spearman. I will try and get through them as quickly as I can. So what you have shown up here is the LPA map that we published back in January of 2010, shortly after the LPA was announced. As Mr. Kay said, I'm going to walk through this alignment west to east and describe some refinements that are under consideration right now. Starting out at the west end between the Center for Medicaid and Medicare, or CMS, to Rolling Road, we have a very subtle change in the alignment. As I go through, as Mr. Kay said, some of these are subtle, some of these are more significant. For this particular one, this is an LPA plan that we put together in January 2010. It shows the Red Line on the south side of Security Boulevard. At the left-hand side of the screen you can see the station there is a center station between the tracks. At the request of the SAAC, we were asked to move the alignment northward and we are able to do that by shifting the alignment and narrowing the median of Security Boulevard so that we were out of a tree buffer that is between Security Boulevard and the homes there. We also switched to, and you can see here, it is what you're going to see as I go through – the yellow is the LPA and it's a very subtle change there to the refinement that we're considering. We also changed the side platforms to allow bus drop-offs that you can see with a u-turn at the end of Security

Boulevard. So two very subtle changes there that I think benefitted this end of the project.

Taylor: That's the end of the line, right? **Mohler:** That is the west end of the line, that is correct. Moving eastward, as we go across the Security Square Mall area, we have another refinement here. This is the LPA refinement where we came down Rolling Road on the left-hand side of the screen and sort of cut through the mall property and had a station in the northeast corner of the mall. We received a lot of input from the mall owners requesting a move to the edge of the property so that we wouldn't interfere with future expansion or revitalization of the mall. So we did shift the alignment to be along Security Boulevard and at the request of the SAAC, we shifted the station and the parking lot from the area that you saw on the LPA plan to the area between the two entrance roads to the mall area.

Mohler: Moving further east then, as we cross over the Beltway, over 695, and we go towards the I-70 area, you can see the LPA plan here cut perpendicularly across the Beltway and then cut behind the Security office building there and then up towards I-70 as you moved east towards Woodlawn Avenue. To take better advantage of public right-of-way, we looked at shifting that alignment right along the ramp of I-70 and that's been, as we've spoken to Social Security Administration, something that they concur with as well, as a benefit to the project, just taking better advantage of public right-of-way. You can see there where the original alignment cut through some commercial areas and now it's more on public right-of-way. Taking a little bit bigger area and this is a more significant change – the area between the Beltway and the end of I-70 we've taken a hard look at and we've gotten feedback through the SAAC process, we've gotten feedback by having some discussions with Baltimore County, with the State Highway Administration given that it's I-70, with Social Security Administration, General Services Administration and some other stakeholders. What a lot of interest was started with was as were along I-70, between I-70 and Parallel Drive, we were looking for an opportunity to reconfigure an underutilized interstate. I think everyone knows, anyone that's driven down here, it was an interstate that was intended to go all the way through into Baltimore City. There's a big cloverleaf interchange at Security Boulevard that is way underutilized and trying to do something more fitting to the area. One of the first suggestions was to shift the Red Line from where it was shown in that LPA plan to the blue area and actually be on the footprint of I-70. In order to accomplish that we also looked at shifting I-70 to Parallel Drive. As we started to debate different concepts, we began to realize that there's a lot of duplication between Parallel Drive and I-70. I-70, again, is that interstate of a lot of lanes out there that just aren't used and will never be used. So that is a refinement that we are considering now and we are creating a new entrance there to the Social Security Administration to provide better access in and out of their facility.

Mohler: Moving a little further east at the end of I-70, we also took a look at the park-and-ride lot here. We've always been a little challenged because the station here is down low, the parking lot is up high, it was always a very cumbersome area to get to the station from the park-and-ride lot and it's a very cumbersome alignment -- as you can see it twists here and goes down to Cooks Lane. So we looked at shifting the park-and-ride to west of Ingleside Avenue – in the green spot that I have there – and showing you something like that where we have a new park-and-ride lot here, the ability to expand it there. The Red Line again is in the old I-70 footprint and the I-70 traffic is along Parallel Drive to an at-grade intersection with Ingleside Avenue that then would come up to Security Boulevard. So to take a look at that, kind of from an end-to-end standpoint from

I-695 to Security Boulevard, you can see it there where the Red Line is along the I-70 footprint and goes straight into the Cooks Lane tunnel now. So we took out a lot of awkward turns and twists that would slow the operations down. We have shifted I-70 traffic to Parallel Drive and we have shifted the park-and-ride lot from this northwest corner of the cloverleaf to being alongside of Parallel Drive and alongside of the Red Line. So we see lots of benefits – this being a more significant change, where as we said initially, we are avoiding impacts, those environmental features, the tree buffer between I-70 and Parallel Drive. We are converting a very underutilized interstate to what we believe can look like an enhanced boulevard. With that new intersection we provide better access to Social Security, we allow for a more accessible station and parking to be phased in over time if it's needed. In discussions with the County, all that green that you saw there that was removed creates more opportunity for TOD potential for the County. It allows an opportunity to remove a whole lot of pavement out there that is not used and that would go a long way to helping the state meet water quality goals and lastly it's going to improve the Red Line operations by creating that more direct route into the Cooks Lane tunnel.

Mohler: Another spot where we have a refinement that is very strongly under consideration is the Edmondson Village area. This is the LPA where you can see the station there at Swann Avenue as it was located when the LPA was originally announced. And through some suggestions from the SAAC we've studied various different locations and are looking to implement a change where we're shifting it westward to be a mid-block station with a pedestrian signal to accommodate the pedestrian safely getting to the station platform. As you can see it was originally proposed there in yellow and shifted to the blue location in mid-block in front of the Westside Skills Center. Moving further east -- in the Rosemont area we have another refinement we are looking at here. The LPA plan as shown here had the Red Line coming down to Franklin Street and the station located in that turn there, which is a very sharp turn and there's a fair amount of high-speed traffic that comes here and makes this turn and does not necessarily stop at the stop light there. Through some suggestions from the SAAC and some other ideas we are looking at having that station, instead of located here, located up on Edmondson Avenue which is a much calmer, safer area for a station platform to be, much safer environment for pedestrians. You can see here, shifting from that yellow location to this location and the Red Line coming then down the center of Franklinton Road and across Franklin Street as it was originally conceived. Another change we are looking at is in the Yard and Shop area. This was the original configuration for the Yard and Shop between Franklinton Road, Warwick Avenue roughly. We recently learned that the Department of Corrections has closed the facility that was at the front here, that we were intentionally avoiding and through discussions with them, they are open to turning that property over to the MTA and then expanding the yard into a different configuration to take advantage of that and have less of it in the tail track over Warwick Avenue here. So we think that's a much better benefit to the operations within the yard.

Mohler: Over on Martin Luther King Boulevard, we are faced with the original concept where we started the tunnel along Martin Luther King, made a very tight turn to get under Lombard Street. This presents a lot of challenges from a tunneling standpoint. We've got quite a few individuals on our tunneling team working through this. The complexities to tunnel there start with an open cut, which you can see here as depicted in one of the videos that we have shown at previous meetings, then transitions into what we call a cut-and-cover. That's when we brace the sides, dig down so the Red Line

would be underneath. This type of construction would have to be done across Martin Luther King Boulevard, so we would have to stage traffic around it. It becomes very cumbersome and very costly and has a lot of impact to traffic as we do that. In addition, another different type of tunneling technique would be needed to cross through the very tight turn to get to Lombard Street here. That would require a mining type of operation that you can see here, with the construction equipment there to make that tight turn. A tunnel boring machine cannot make a turn this tight and in order to do the mining technique here, all of these pipes that are at surface here in this particular application, it's a soil-freezing type application to stabilize the soil above the mining operation so it requires both work above ground and below ground to get through this spot. Then, ultimately, another construction technique where we switch to boring starting at where we go to this straight area and then tunnel bore, TBM, all the way across Lombard Street and all the way over to Boston Street. You can see that depicted up here with a tunnel boring machine there that would have to get to this spot underground, would likely be loaded through what we call a launch box and dropped into this area. So there's a lot of steps to fit this particular geometry that are time-consuming and costly.

Mohler: What we are looking at right now is an option where instead of along Martin Luther King of tunneling up Fremont Avenue and moving the station from the surface there to underground closer to where we are here. By doing that the tunneling complexity that I just described with the three, four, five different tunneling techniques – we've got to get equipment in, got to get it back out again, got to get new equipment in – so the tunneling complexity is significantly reduced. If we start with a tunnel boring machine up here in the ditch and use the tunnel boring machine all the way you can see the curve here is not as sharp, we don't have to cut-and-cover through Martin Luther King. We don't have to do the mining technique – it is one operation all the way from beginning to end, so there are no vehicular impacts on Martin Luther King. At the cemetery here in this corner the tunnel will be lower, we don't have to do the ground improvements I showed you with all those pipes at surface. The tunnel boring machine would then be launched from a more appropriate place as opposed to dropped into the middle of the street down here as I showed before. The Poppleton station would then be shifted, as I said, from here at surface to roughly Baltimore Street underground which is a very, very strong desire of the SAAC. What we found that by doing more detailed cost estimates that because of the complexity along Martin Luther King that this option with the underground station is a comparable cost to those different tunneling techniques along Martin Luther King.

Mohler: Moving to the next step, a little further east, a refinement that we're considering at the Charles Center and Government Center stations, at these two stations, they're fairly close together. You can see Charles Center here on the left, Government Center on the right. We also have a crossover to the right-hand side of the Government Center station, that cross-over is another underground facility like a station. It's a large open area where trains can cross from one track to another. You can also see the Charles Center Metro station up there. What we are looking at doing is to save the costs of a station box without – and still covering – the same geographic area, we are looking at the possibility of consolidating these three underground elements into a single location. So what we're looking to do is shift the Charles Center station, instead of the west side of Light Street, to the east side of Light Street as well as the pedestrian tunnel we would shift from the west side of Light Street to the east side of Light Street. We would then move the crossover from here to the east side of the Charles Center station which starts to extend, if you can see the box further westward and then we'll see if we can move this

headhouse to an extended portion to the east side of the crossover. So what that looks like is then depicted here and you can still see the pedestrian tunnel between the two facilities. You can see entrances here, an entrance here over to the east of South Street, kind of where the open parking lot is, right looking down onto the Inner Harbor. This is the crossover facility that I told you before that we moved over here. The platform would be here and we could look at another possible station entrance on Calvert Street.

Taylor: The old station on this map is between South Street, the next one to the east?

Mohler: No, the old station is a little bit further, is another two blocks east of there.

Taylor: Okay, you zoomed in a little bit.

Mohler: We zoomed in, correct. I can back up a second to there, you can see South Street is here I believe. The other one was over here and we've extended, we've basically shifted that headhouse from here to here. In the process we were able to reduce the costs of one underground station box. What that also allows us to do is a very interesting, positive refinement at the President Street area. Because we've moved that station a little further west we can then go down deeper underground and it allows us to shift the alignment over from what's currently planned to the east of President Street, we can shift that westward to actually be under President Street because we can get deeper and get underneath the Constellation Energy building that was prohibiting us turning sharper down President Street before. So you can see there a revised alignment where we'll make, again, much better use of public right-of-way by being under President Street rather than being under homes and restaurants of Little Italy. The next spot I'd like to describe is at the Canton station as we come back up to surface on Boston Street. As originally planned the station is over here, kind of in front of a park and at the request of the SAAC, we were asked to move that station further west into an area where there's more pedestrian activity and move it closer to the driveway entrance for the Safeway store. We have done a lot of studies for that, we can accomplish that but only for the one-lane option on Boston Street. So we are very seriously considering that location but it is hinged on another decision that we're not quite ready to make at this point, with the one versus two lanes on Boston Street. You can see that there, where the station has been shifted to in front of the Safeway there as opposed to over in front of the park there.

Mohler: Moving over to the Canton Crossing/Brewers Hill area – you can see the LPA there. Boston Street is straight across here and the original LPA had us moving out of Boston Street to the north side of Boston Street and then up through the Exxon property to hook up to the Norfolk Southern right-of-way. At the request of the SAAC, we were asked to look to bring that station further south to put it in the middle of Boston Street to give more room for Brewers Hill to expand and also to be closer to the Canton Crossing development that's currently in planning to be built on the south side of Boston Street. And we are able to do that, which you can see here is that station then located in the middle of Boston Street and the alignment then moves off of Boston Street and up towards Haven as the O'Donnell alignment comes up. The last refinements that we're looking at is over all the way on the east end of the project. The alignment that takes us from the Norfolk Southern corridor all the way over to the Bayview Campus and Bayview MARC. The LPA is shown here at a much larger scale – you can see the Norfolk Southern corridor here. It was originally planned to turn and go on bridge or an aerial structure over the Norfolk Southern intermodal facility, along 895, to a Bayview MARC station and then into the Bayview Campus and a station on Mason Lord Drive. Through

coordinating with the SAAC and Johns Hopkins we were asked to shift this station to a more central location on the existing campus. It was originally conceived over to the east side because it was thought the campus would expand in that direction. That may ultimately be the center of campus, Johns Hopkins has refined their plans, asked us to come back to more the center of the existing campus and the Bayview community also likes that shift. In addition, we're always looking out to preserve the future extension of the Red Line down to Dundalk/ Turner's Station. We also looked at revising a better station sequence, placing the MARC station at the terminus. So we're looking at a plan where we're still coming up the Norfolk Southern corridor, we're taking along a bridge to the south side of Lombard Street, we would then pick up the Bayview campus station here on Alpha Commons Drive, continue up to the Bayview MARC station and have the terminus at the large park-and-ride lot there. That's an option that's met with a lot of positive feedback from Hopkins, from the Bayview community, from a number of other stakeholders we've reached out to. So – yes sir.

Moniodis: Where is the portal for Eastern and Haven Street – for the light rail? As it crosses Eastern Avenue, is it on the south side or is it on the north side – the station?

Mohler: The station as conceived in the LPA is on the south side of Eastern Avenue.

Bethea-Spearman: Have you finished the whole presentation? **Mohler:** I have ma'am. I don't know if I did that in 10 or 15 minutes – I did my best to – **Bethea-Spearman:** No, before they start asking questions. **Mohler:** -- speed through it and I'm happy to answer any questions. **Bethea-Spearman:** Can we have the lights on please? Mr. Cohen.

Cohen: Thank you Madame Co-Chair. Tom, I've got several questions. One has to do with the area that we just looked at. You said that it would be crossing further south instead of along Lombard Street, it would be crossing south of Lombard and I believe that at one of the presentations it was stated that it would be running across Pratt Street to get over 895 and be up at the level of the hill to get into Alpha Commons. What will be the impacts on the area around Pratt Street west of 895?

Mohler: If I can look at the screen – you're talking about this area in here? **Cohen:** Right, that's correct. **Mohler:** We would be coming up on an embankment here, then we'd start bridging this spot, we bridge from there to the end of this pink spot over there, so we're in aerial structure through here. I don't know if there's a particular impact you're concerned of. We are over the two rail lines – the Norfolk Southern and CSX rail lines – we are over property here – **Cohen:** Is that industrial? **Mohler:** All of that is, I would call it industrial, yeah. **Cohen:** Okay, the second question has to do with the discussion that you had regarding Charles Center and Government Center. What impacts would this shift have on any future Yellow Line, if it were underground? Is that being taken into consideration in the engineering? **Mohler:** The Yellow Line is still, as I recall, proposed to be down Light Street, so it still would have a connection to the west end of the station. **Cohen:** Okay, third – there was discussion at the Howard Street SAAC that the University of Maryland wants another station in the vicinity of Greene or Penn and Lombard Street underground. There was no discussion about that in your presentation – can you tell us anything about that? Is that going anywhere or is that now by the wayside, what's the story? **Mohler:** That is not a refinement we're currently looking at. **Cohen:** Okay, so that's at the moment off the table? **Mohler:** Yes. **Cohen:** Okay, with regard to the area along I-70 – the median is where you would be putting it along the traffic lanes, some of the traffic lanes along I-70 as it's currently organized. **Mohler:** The Red Line would be in the footprint of the westbound lanes. **Cohen:** Okay,

so then there wouldn't be any impacts on the trees in that area between Parallel Road and the – **Mohler:** No, that's one of the benefits of shifting the alignment from that area between I-70 and Parallel Drive where all those trees are, to being on top of I-70. We would no longer have to clear those trees. **Cohen:** Okay, and finally – what is the net cost change of all of these refinements? **Mohler:** We have not completed that, that's work now that we've come to this level, our next step is then to start re-costing the project. **Cohen:** Okay, do you expect it to go up or down? Or about the same? **Mohler:** It's too soon for me. We've studied costs in discreet areas, we've not calculated end-to-end costs at this point.

Kay: What I would add is that I think we focused the most on the large changes – Fremont Avenue, the realignment off of Martin Luther King, the downtown stations – and have a sense that if they're reasonably close to each other because we didn't want to further develop, propose to you or the SAACs things that would ultimately be infeasible based on costs. So I can't say that dollar-for-dollar it would be the same, but we're reasonably sure that these are all cost-effective things to do. Some are cheaper. **Cohen:** Thank you.

Bethea-Spearman: Mr. Sydnor. **Sydnor:** Good evening. With regards to this Woodlawn Drive to I-70 park-and-ride – once the eastbound traffic is redirected to Parallel Drive, is that all of the traffic or what happens to the rest of the east side of I-70?

Mohler: Some of the traffic will, with the new entrance into Social Security Administration, some of the traffic that was going to Social Security Administration – again a big driver there with people coming in, would come off and come in here and would not continue down Parallel Drive. **Sydnor:** The rest of the lane does continue then. **Mohler:** The rest of the lane does continue – I'll try and trace it here – it does continue over to Parallel Drive, goes down Parallel Drive to an at-grade intersection here. Traffic then can turn left there to Security Boulevard and go either north or south on Security Boulevard. **Sydnor:** So, what happens to the rest of I-70 eastbound? Oh, it's gone, okay.

Taylor: The cloverleaf is all gone also? **Mohler:** Yes sir. I'll try and describe to you there, it's kind of hard to pick up with this projector – but we're showing green from roughly this spot all the way through here, and this whole area is turned back, pavement would be, could be removed by either MTA or the State Highway Administration to help with those water quality goals. **Sydnor:** So then it's re-greened? **Mohler:** Yes. **Bethea-Spearman:** Mr. Smith.

Smith: I have a concern about – it's not my district—but I have a concern about Edmondson Avenue. You've made your changes in east Baltimore, you've added tunnels, you saved money. Edmondson Avenue is against you all – put a tunnel down the middle of Edmondson Avenue, you're saving money.

Kay: Our estimate of the costs of a tunnel through that section of Edmondson Avenue was hundreds of millions of dollars. If we save money at all through these refinements, it is not going to be enough to pay for that. We feel that the Edmondson Avenue section works, it's a good solution from a transit standpoint, it allows us to have more stations because surface stations are less expensive so we can increase access to the line, it will operate reliably and safely, it won't harm property. So we felt we had a good solution there. Through this process of refinement, if we'd been able to come up with something different there or better or if we had gotten input that would have allowed us to do

something different, we would have considered it, but at this point we didn't see anything better than what we already have. **Bethea-Spearman:** Mr. Taylor.

Taylor: Perhaps this is something that would go on an agenda for next time, but we've been talking a little bit about costs and changes. I've noticed through the last numbers that have come out with the changes to PE that the costs, the ridership are all a little bit different than they were before and maybe that could be discussed either now or probably better later, just to see where we are as to where we've been because they're quite different from what I saw.

Kay: I can address that quickly and if you want to discuss it more we can. With regard to ridership – the number we've been using for the past two years probably was 60-thousand riders a day in the year 2030. We accepted a refinement of the model about six or seven months ago that reduced that to 57-thousand riders a day in the year 2030. So, down three-thousand riders I don't consider significant. And nobody tattoo that on your arm because it will change again when we do another run of the model. So 60 to 57. The costs – it's really just a definitional question. We have up until this point been talking about the project in current year dollars, year 2010 dollars, so that number was 1-point-8 billion. For the purposes of the Federal Transit Administration's approval to enter PE, which Dr. Orange mentioned, and also with the long-range plan that the Baltimore Metropolitan Council adopts for the region, they prefer to talk year-of-expenditure dollars. So each component of the project that is built, at some point in time the dollars associated with that component are inflated to that year. When you do that, that prior number 1-point-8 becomes 2-point-2 billion. So it's the same number, because you're paying for it in future dollars that are worth less than today's dollar. But there's no definitional change and there's no real change in the cost estimate itself. It's just a question of how you're counting for inflation.

Bethea-Spearman: Can we stick to this part of the discussion? Are there any more comments, questions, suggestions on what Mr. Mohler just presented?

Cole: Mr. Kay or Mr. Mohler – the modifications that we just looked at, are these the modifications that are currently being vetted and basically you've kind of locked in on? Or is there a possibility that you'll lose some of them? **Kay:** I'd say it's a process. I mean sharing them with you tonight is part of this because we like to run changes by you to get your feedback on them. As I mentioned we showed them at the Open Houses, we discussed them in a lot of detail with all the SAACs. One or two of the SAACs have yet to meet and will do that within the next couple of weeks. We want to discuss them with the Federal Transit Administration, we want to finish the detailed cost estimate – so all those things have to happen before we even say we're going with these. We're presenting them to you tonight because we think that there's a good chance that they'll work out, that they're positive changes that we would go with.

Bethea-Spearman: Any CAC members that we have not heard from on this issue?

That we have NOT heard from? Okay Mr. Hines, okay Mr. Hines. **Hines:** I assume you're going to append these to the minutes as usual so I can take more time to look at it the future, because I'm not as fast as other folks? **Kay:** Yes. **Hines:** Thank you.

Bethea-Spearman: Anybody else that we have NOT heard from on this issue? Okay, now I'm going to ask some questions. Why do we now have three stops on Edmondson Avenue? Allendale stop needs to be moved -- and I know that came out of that Saturday meeting -- Allendale stop needs to be moved further away from the station stop

that you all keep calling Edmondson Village that is not Edmondson Village. Be very clear – Uplands and Rognel Heights is not Edmondson Village. You need to get the history so we can get the stop's name straight first. We are not Edmondson Village.

Mohler: We'd be happy to revisit the station stop name. It's named for the shopping center, but I recognize what the communities are. **Bethea-Spearman:** That's the shopping center, but that area is not Edmondson Village. And you just named another station you put on Edmondson Avenue which I thought was a good move. Where did you say that station was coming off of Franklin Street and you're putting it where on Edmondson Avenue? You moved it off of Franklin Street and you put it on Edmondson Avenue – where did you put it on Edmondson Avenue? **Mohler:** Right behind you on the screen there. Instead of coming down on Franklin Avenue, we have shifted it up to Edmondson Avenue. **Bethea-Spearman:** Edmondson and what? **Mohler:** Poplar Grove – Franklinton, Poplar Grove area. **Bethea-Spearman:** Is that where the phone company, where the bread company is? **Audience:** Yes, it's where the bread company phone company is right there. **Bethea-Spearman:** Okay, so is that station closer to service the people that are at Edmondson and Hilton? Because I know if you're looking at your numbers – what train station is servicing the people at Edmondson and Hilton? Not the Allendale station stop – that don't need to be there, and it surely isn't the one we're calling Edmondson Village station stop. So who is picking up and collecting that section of people if you're not willing to move the Allendale station stop? There's a lot of people at Edmondson and Hilton. I mean, the SAAC people, they don't live in that area. Apparently – and I don't want to knock the SAACs – but you have to use other resources other than SAACs to reach out to those communities. If there was some door-to-door foot traffic, those people would not go for you not giving them a station stop. That train station at Edmondson and Hilton -- they need it, too, more so than the people at Edmondson and Allendale. Edmondson and Allendale can use that one you're calling Edmondson Village, you're right there at it, just a few blocks. I mean, just a few blocks, they can go a few blocks up the street if you really want to take the train. Why not use that station.

Mohler: As you've seen, we're open to shifting stations, we've done that already with – **Bethea-Spearman:** But they're not telling you to do it in the SAACs, so... **Mohler:** We have not gotten that comment back from the SAAC, the Allendale SAAC, as best I know. One of the reasons it's at where it's at – if you located it right on Hilton, it would be all the way at the bottom of the hill – Allendale's halfway up the hill roughly. So the people that live along the hillside, then, would have to walk further to get all the way down to Hilton. Then you've got Gwynns Falls Park on the right-hand side where nobody's living, so we're often better to locate a station where we have people living on both sides of it. So that's why we're halfway up the hill. If you have an idea for a refinement -- **Bethea-Spearman:** There's a lot of folks at that bus stop at Edmondson and Hilton, all the time. You can compare it to that Allendale where you have it – I mean if you're going by statistics. You compare it to where you have it now and you compare it to the ridership at that corner, it's going to outwear it any time of the day.

Kay: Obviously what's happening is that people who live along Hilton south of Edmondson Avenue are coming up to that intersection to get all the bus services that's on Edmondson now and they can't do that if it was further down. **Bethea-Spearman:** Yeah, and to not give them no service, that's not right and they have no representation on that SAAC. **Kay:** With regard to that question – I mean, we recognize the SAACs for what they are. They are representative of the community but they're very few numbers.

Bethea-Spearman: We're not going to go there – **Kay:** There are a very small number of people on them. Some of them have 10 people or fewer on them and fewer than that can even show up at a meeting. So we use them as a way to sort of take the temperature of the community and have people raise issues, but – **Bethea-Spearman:** Please try to reach out. **Kay:** We will and I think there's an item on your agenda later on for another meeting on Edmondson Avenue and that may be the place to do that. But regardless of whether we do that or not, we in a couple of places in the corridor – not just on the west side but on the east side as well – we need to take these ideas back to communities directly, to community associations, to elected officials, because we recognize that the SAACs don't substitute for that direct input from those communities, we recognize that. **Bethea-Spearman:** I just don't want them to be left out. **Kay:** I appreciate that. **Bethea-Spearman:** This is more personal – I'm not finished, please, I let everybody take their chance. I ride I-70, quite a bit, I love it. Now we cannot – because quite a few of us ride I-70 – now we cannot come off of I-70 to get on Cooks Lane? What is happening there, what is going on with I-70? I'm not understanding what I'm seeing or hearing.

Mohler: You can still go down Cooks Lane from I-70. Currently, the way you – **Bethea-Spearman:** Can I come off of 29 on 70, off of 70 to Cooks Lane? **Mohler:** Yes ma'am, yes ma'am. **Bethea-Spearman:** So they didn't get over there and mess with that? **Mohler:** No – it's a different route, it's a different route, okay, but you can still get there. **Bethea-Spearman:** So we can still get on Cooks Lane from 70? **Mohler:** Absolutely, absolutely. Under this configuration you'd come down Parallel Drive, make a left on Ingleside Avenue, then a right on Security Boulevard into Cooks Lane. **Bethea-Spearman:** Okay, I didn't understand that but I'm sure we'll get it straight. I'm looking at it but I don't understand what I'm looking at, I ain't going to sit up here and try to pretend. **Mohler:** See, if you want to follow the...you'd come down Parallel Drive – **Bethea-Spearman:** Where is Parallel Drive? **Mohler:** Right here, right here where the red dot is. **Bethea-Spearman:** I don't know nothing about Parallel Drive. I'm coming from D.C. on the Beltway. I'm driving 29, I hit 70 and I hit Cooks Lane – I don't know about Parallel Drive. **Conner:** It's parallel to I-70. **Mohler:** So you'd still come over the Beltway, here where the red dot is, you'd drive along this way, along here – **Bethea-Spearman:** That's 29? **Mohler:** No, no, no ma'am. This is 695. **Bethea-Spearman:** I don't take 695. **Mohler:** I know that, you'd be coming across – 29 is way over here, way off the screen to the left. **Bethea-Spearman:** I'm trying to get to 70. **Mohler:** That's correct. So you're on 70, this is 70 here – **Bethea-Spearman:** Okay. **Mohler:** Okay, so to get to Cooks Lane you're going this way, make a left there and a right here and Cooks Lane is right there.

Taylor: You have a little dog-leg at the end, it's the same thing, you just have a little bit of a dog-leg the last half-mile. **Holton:** You won't go on the cloverleaf anymore. **Mohler:** That's right. **Holton:** You won't come down and around and come off – **Mohler:** Currently you come down to the end of 70, turn around and go that way. Instead of going that movement, you're going this way. **Bethea-Spearman:** I'll figure it out, I guess I'll get home. (Laughter) Just a second – I'm not finished. Did we say that we took some – not we, let me get it straight, the CAC didn't do it – did I hear you say we took something from above ground and placed it underground at MLK and Poppleton? **Mohler:** That is something we are looking at, the Poppleton station, correct. **Bethea-Spearman:** I guess my next question would be – once we finish all of these changes that you all choose to adopt, can we get that cost-benefit at one of the CAC meetings?

Mohler: Yes. **Bethea-Spearman:** That would be very important. And Ms. Annie, we're going to turn it over and finish with you. Take the floor Ms. Annie.

Williams: Number one, in the SAAC meetings we do have, we're planning on when we go back in September, having another public meeting and everybody in the Allendale section can come out and complain at that particular meeting. **Bethea-Spearman:** Now ain't that something Ms. Annie. That's beautiful. **Williams:** They can come out and complain. That's why we had the public part of the SAAC meeting so the community can actually get out there and complain. Number two, the Poppleton part, we had them do some research and the engineers found out there is a big pipe running right down the side of it where the sewer goes out to the Bay or something. So instead of taking that whole pipe up and trying to replace it with something else so they could put that underground cover thing there, they decided to try to move it over. We had a big conversation about that, those pipes that are running down there and they really don't want to move. So that was one of the points of putting that underground station, moving it over to Fremont instead of running it right down the side of MLK. Because I'm part of the SAAC – **Mohler:** Thank you ma'am. **Williams:** -- I wanted to try to explain why they were trying to move it over to Fremont.

Mohler: Correct. There's a lot of utility impacts along Martin Luther King that you don't have on Poppleton and that contributes to the cost difference, thank you. **Williams:** You didn't bring it out so people could understand why you were moving it over to Fremont. **Mohler:** I did not – appreciate you reminding me.

Bethea-Spearman: Thank you Ms. Annie for closing us out. You come with such energy girl – it's alright. **Taylor:** I've got one more question. **Bethea-Spearman:** No, Ms. Annie closed us out. **Taylor:** I've got one more, I asked one before. **Bethea-Spearman:** No, no – ask it after the meeting to Mr. Mohler please. Framework for Edmondson Avenue meeting, okay now. Let us all jump on this at one time – thank you Mr. Mohler. **Mohler:** You're welcome. **Williams:** I'd like to ask a question before we get to – it's about the framework – **Bethea-Spearman:** Okay.

Williams: -- but I need to ask Mr. Kay the question about when will we get this retreat together? I mean, we keep playing around with the numbers, but actually I would appreciate a retreat before we went to Edmondson Avenue. We want to be truly prepared to help those people understand what's going on on Edmondson Avenue. And if I don't half understand it myself, then I can't represent the people if I'm struggling with it myself, because with the moving of the properties back. I can understand you moving the sides two to five feet over and taking people's sidewalks, but nobody has really explained to them that it's an eminent domain thing and we need to bring all this out so people will understand, period. I had myself – and I'm not trying to take up time – but several months ago I had a neighbor that had her sidewalk fixed and because she owns her house and the property that she's paying in her mortgage, they charged her 700 dollars to fix that sidewalk. In the process, they sent it somewhere down in Tennessee to somebody that she didn't know and when it finally got back to her, the thing was almost 7, 8-thousand dollars. What I'm saying is, people don't know really what eminent domain really means and how it works with the MTA or with the City, then we have a problem right here on Edmondson Avenue. It needs to be researched and it needs to come up and we need to explain to people about eminent domain as it relates to why you do certain things.

Bethea-Spearman: Ms. Annie, I'm going to let Mr. Kay handle that, but I don't think we want to say the wrong terminology. I don't think it's eminent domain that we want to keep throwing out there, but I think we're going to let Mr. Kay answer that because I'm with you. You know me and you have had this conversation, we don't like -- nobody likes -- getting beat up on. It's not eminent domain, I can't think of what the term --

Holton: Easement. **Bethea-Spearman:** Easement -- and I'm like you, we don't really understand what's going on either. It's going to have to be a City education and a state education and just an all-around education for all of us and that is a part of the framework for the Edmondson Avenue. I don't know who wants to start. Planning is right here, then we've got Mr. Kay right there. So between the two of them they're going to help us with this framework for Edmondson Avenue because those are some of the things that we do want to address so that we can understand, so that we can get it together for the folk on Edmondson Avenue. So I guess we'll put Mr. Kay out there first then we're going to turn it over to Mr. Cole and between him and Mr. Cole they're going to help us out.

Kay: Madame Co-Chair, you and I have not discussed this, so I'm imagining what you're talking about when you talk about a framework for a special Edmondson Avenue meeting. I assume that, this is a follow-up to the prior meeting of the CAC in which there was a lot of representation of the neighborhoods there and a lot of misunderstanding about what the impacts of the project would be. We had, as you recall, a few weeks before that, or a few days even, an Open House that we had sponsored in that same location in which we thought we conveyed a lot of very good information to people. So the question is for us, or the challenge is for us, is just to be able to do that enough times to make ourselves available enough so that people have access to whatever information they need. So I guess what I would suggest is that under the auspices of the CAC we organize another open house that focuses on the Edmondson Avenue community. We can do it at the high school, if you can come up with a different location we can do that as well. I think what we need to do is just have as much time as it takes, as many tables and representatives of our engineering team available to be able to look on a house-by-house basis at what the implications of the project are. I think when people come to understand that when we're acquiring property that it's 12 inches or 18 inches, it's not two blocks -- that it makes a very big difference in terms of the way they feel about the project. And people deserve to know that and we have the information to be able to communicate that, we just need a mechanism to do it. So we can do outreach to get people to a meeting, it can be on one occasion, it can be on two occasions, it can be on eight occasions if that's what you'd like. We'd have very detailed maps available and people who are knowledgeable about them. We'd be able to focus on individual properties, individual blocks. I also think we do need to discuss or be prepared to discuss this issue of property acquisition. I mean eminent domain is a power of the government to acquire property against people's will -- that's actually very rarely used. I can't recall the MTA ever using eminent domain, because normally when you come to a property owner with an appraised value of a property that you're talking about then you can come to an amicable agreement about it. But I think we need to discuss what eminent domain means, when it's used, what the process is, how a court is involved, what kinds of rights people have under the law. So perhaps we can have a work station or some area set aside in this meeting where people can sit down and talk one-on-one with someone who's an expert at that. **Unknown:** As long as they don't work at MTA.

Kay: Well, we can find people who are experts. All these issues are covered by city and state and federal laws, so the process we follow is laid out in law, we don't actually

have a lot of choice about deviating from it. I don't mean to oversimplify it, but I guess what I'd be offering is under the auspices of the CAC we would go back and again hold one or two or a series of open houses for the Edmondson Avenue community where people could get this detailed information.

Bethea-Spearman: I think it would be a two-parter Mr. Kay. My thinking and my suggestion – and everybody else can come with theirs – it does not need to be an open forum, not the whole entire meeting. When I say Edmondson Avenue, I mean just that – not back streets, not side streets – I'm talking strictly folks that live on Edmondson Avenue, businesses, religious facilities, strictly Edmondson Avenue. I think that part could be public where you talk about easements so we can all understand, including them, about easements – that part. But when it comes to their individual questions that probably can be in a room in the school or a room off the cafeteria to talk to those people individually, without interruptions of any kind, to put them at ease. I do understand that they've gotten letters and I think that might have helped some to touch and feel -- **Kay:** I do agree with that. **Bethea-Spearman:** -- is so, so important. Mr. Moniodis.

Moniodis: Along Edmondson Avenue, will all the sidewalks and curbs be re-done?

Kay: Yes. **Moniodis:** Let me ask a question Mr. Cole. Mr. Cole, as a member of Baltimore City government, can there be a moratorium on replacing these curbs when they have to be replaced at the time of construction, so that the homeowners won't have this additional expense right now? **Kay:** You mean in the meantime, in the meantime.

Moniodis: In the meantime. **Cole:** That's certainly something we can look into.

Taylor: We're talking about a very long time, 10 years, eight years, we don't have a real timeline here, right? I mean if a curb needs to be replaced do you really want to wait 10 years? **Cole:** Well the question is can we have a moratorium on replacement of all sidewalks and the response is that it's certainly something that we can look into. I can't give him a definitive answer, but it's a valid concern and it's certainly something we can look into. Back to Mr. Kay's suggestion – Angela, I think that when Mr. Kay was talking about Edmondson Avenue and having a new look and the public information, you were talking about an open house not a CAC meeting – is that my understanding? And you were saying you would be amenable to having as many meetings as you needed or open houses as you needed in order to get out the information. **Bethea-Spearman:** Okay, so it wouldn't be a special CAC meeting. **Cole:** Right.

Conner: Is it possible that you can develop a glossary of terms so that people can walk away with a better understanding of terms like LPA and PE and different terms that we may use in a CAC meeting. Is it possible we can have a glossary of terms? Also, if we could possibly go back through – we talked about the framework – if we could possibly go back through the minutes of the last meeting that we had and see if there were any salient points or issues that came out of that meeting and make sure that we have a definitive answer to give people. I would suggest that we use that as a framework approach as well.

Kay: Sure. What I would just say in terms of timing that it doesn't make sense to do this during the summer. We don't really have time to put it together and people aren't generally available anyway. So there's kind of a window of opportunity between early September and maybe mid-November. After mid-November people start to get into the holidays so we try not to do things then. We don't have any big public meetings coming up for the project in that timeframe, so it would be possible to put something like this

together. To the extent that we can conclude that the refinements that Mr. Mohler described are ones we want to go with, we do need to be going into communities about that, but I wasn't seeing that we would do it in the context of big meetings, it would really be on a community association-by-community association. Some of them we could cover at this same meeting on Edmondson Avenue because we're having it anyway.

Conner: Will you also have the drawings like we saw of the east side completed that you can show them? **Kay:** Yes. **Conner:** The actual layout, what it will look like going completely up Edmondson Avenue – would that be available? **Kay:** Sure. So maybe what we can do is come back to you at your September meeting with a game plan for this meeting that's focused on Edmondson Avenue. We would describe what we would be showing, how we'd be staffing it, what kind of outreach we would do ahead of time, location, dates, format and get some feedback from you. Then if you were satisfied that was meeting your needs, we would run with it then. I'd say from that point on we would probably need at least six weeks to put it together so we'd be talking mid-October. But in any case we'd get it wrapped up by mid-November when that meeting season closes in the fall.

Taylor: Speaking of our next meeting, where is our next meeting? **Kay:** Do you know Tori – our next meeting of the CAC? Do you know where? We know when but we don't know where. **Leonard:** It's Holy Rosary. **Kay:** Holy Rosary, okay. So your next meeting, September 8th, Holy Rosary.

Bethea-Spearman: I think Mr. Sydnor asked that that next meeting be held in Baltimore County. **Sydnor:** That's correct. **Kay:** That's true – if that's your consensus we can set that up alternatively. If that's the preference then the immediate one after that is going to have to be on the east side.

Taylor: Speaking of east side, I just kind of noticed that, you talked about nobody like getting beat up. I was trying to ask some questions about the east side and I'm looking around and I think I'm the only one on the whole committee that lives on the east side. Most people live on the west side. I know George, you represent the east side from interest, but I'm the only one on the whole committee that lives on the east side of the line. Was that always the case? I know some people have been (picks up mic) – I'm the only one on this committee – we talk about the SAAC membership not being representative. This committee's membership is not representative at all. I mean you've got six or seven stations east of President Street and I'm the only one who lives in that entire region. I don't know if that was always the case, if that's a mistake or something that happened in the design of the committee. **Conner:** Bob Keith lived on the east side. **Taylor:** Bob Keith – well I'm the replacement for Bob Keith. But this is a very west side-heavy committee. The line is west side-heavy, too but not to this extent. I feel like the east side is getting a little bit neglected here and perhaps we've talked before about membership. Perhaps somebody else should be added from the east side so that the east side can have more than one voice here. **Moniodis:** I'm in Greektown every day. **Taylor:** I know you're there all the time, but you don't live there. You grew up there and you spent some time there. **Moniodis:** I live there. **Taylor:** I thought you lived in Catonsville? **Moniodis:** I live on Woodside, but I'm in Greektown more than anything. **Conner:** I'm on the east side as well, working. **Taylor:** You don't live there.

Kay: I think I could maybe address that. We discussed this a few minutes last meeting. There are several vacancies on the CAC now. The way the law is structured is that we,

the MTA, can't really control the mix of people. It's up to the senators and delegates who appoint people. There are more legislative districts on the west side of the corridor, it's just the way the arrangement is, so you kind of have things working against you from that standpoint. However, we've been in touch with Senator Ferguson and the delegates in the district on the east side about being active, making sure people are appointed to represent them. So we're trying to bring to their attention that they're underrepresented. I think everyone agrees with that so we're hoping that through that process and then working with either the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House we end up getting more representation from the east side.

Taylor: I don't mean to in any way detract from – George, you know I don't mean any detraction or anything. You are Greentown, I understand that. It's just that there aren't the people. Thank you Henry, that's what I wanted to say, thank you.

Cohen: Madame Chair, this raises an issue that was raised at the last meeting which is the issue of the fact that the committee is short, I believe, two members. I'd just like to know how things are proceeding on that front. **Kay:** We've notified everyone that you're short members and they promise us that they're going to move to appoint people.

Cohen: I also raised the issue last time that the law itself might designate where the replacements have to come from and you were going to look into that – did you? **Kay:** I confirmed that it does not. What it says is that a certain number represent the House of Delegates, a certain number represent the Senate and then some are appointed directly by the executives. It doesn't specify what district they come from. Under the law, everyone could come from the same district. **Cohen:** But it does specify that in total they must come from a set of four districts. **Kay:** Yes. Five appointed by the Senate representing four districts, five from the House of Delegates in four districts. **Cohen:** Okay, thank you.

Bethea-Spearman: Standing agenda items – can we get to the agenda? Mr. Costello.

Costello: Madame Chairman, thank you very much. The next meeting, September, is the meeting in which the report is due. Normally what we've done is worked on it in September because we've included the September meeting in the report. But Mr. Kay has notified me that the Secretary wants to have the report in September. So in order to really do that, the committee would have to base the report on the meetings as of today and then September would have to go into the next report. That leads into the agenda – we may want the report to take up a significant portion of that meeting. If we're going to comply with what Mr. Kay has said – actually he didn't say it, he said it's coming from the Secretary's office – we need to dedicate some time for that. The other thing about that is of course, we have the minutes of the meeting -- pardon?

Bethea-Spearman: I thought the report went to our legislators? **Costello:** It does but Mr. Kay is – **Bethea-Spearman:** Why is it going to the Secretary? **Costello:** No, it's not going to the Secretary although the Secretary puts it up on the website and they are saying that they don't want to ask for further delays, when I asked why. Because now what we do is we say we're not going to have it ready by September, can we extend the due date and we've been putting it in after November or around November. So our committee met last Monday and talked about how we can do this. We can have a report ready to go, including this meeting, that shouldn't be any real problem. I don't know that anything is going to happen in September that is going to be earth-shattering so that's fine. But the committee should be ready to approve the report if we're going to have it to

the Secretary in September, by the end of September. The other thing, of course, is that we have as a result we've scheduled two meetings in August for the report workgroup – one on the 15th and I think the other one was on the 29th. Both will be at 6 p.m. at the Office of Planning at Fayette and Gay streets. **Cole:** In the Phoebe Stanton Room on the 8th Floor. **Costello:** The Phoebe Stanton Room – I didn't know that. If it please the chairs and the committee, we'd like to do that. Also, we have the minutes and we have a relatively small workgroup, it's a very good workgroup. I want to thank Gary Cole, Mr. Cohen and Carmen Morosan who has been helping us – but anybody is welcome to come. Certainly there are two areas of the Red Line that have drawn a lot of attention. One is on the west side in the Edmondson Avenue area. We have the minutes but sometimes there may be people who represent those areas on the Red Line who would like to see something specifically representing the attitudes or concerns of those areas. We do have a public portion of the report where people can emphasize things that they think need to be emphasized. I think we've had comments on safety, we need to make sure that we get that in there. Marty, I think you've had something on utilization or capacity and certainly if there are other concerns. I say this so that anybody who has something that they feel needs to be represented in the report get it to us and we will make sure that it's included. Other than that the report will be what we have. Thank you.

Bethea-Spearman: Thank you. Okay – items for the next agenda. I thought we said – it might have been in an e-mail – that we would use standard items for the agendas. Do you remember what those standard items were Sandra?

Conner: One was costs – we wanted to make sure every meeting that we got information on costs. One was also to get a project update, to see what improvements may have been done on the design, the LPA itself. I think that was pretty much the basis of what we had, the critical points that we wanted to make sure we discussed at each meeting.

Taylor: I guess I'd like to see an update on where we are with all of this – not necessarily in the detail we got today but just, you know, progress. Is there any drastic ridership change, if the station's gone downtown does that make things different, that kind of thing. That shouldn't be very long.

Bethea-Spearman: Do we have anything coming up? You didn't discuss the approval for the next phase that MTA is going into. **Kay:** I think it would be worth it. As you all know, we marked a major transition of the project in the past couple of weeks from the planning phase to the preliminary engineering phase, that was a major accomplishment on our parts to get FTA approval for that. I think maybe it would be worth discussing with you what PE is, what we expect to get done in those two years, what sort of documents we'll be looking at developing during that time. We've discussed it a little bit at a high level with you, but I think we'd get into more detail. So if I could suggest for an agenda – we need to talk about the Annual Report, Mr. Costello and his committee have something to present. I think we need to present to you a format for this special Edmondson Avenue meeting and a timeframe for doing that. We can talk about what is PE. We can give you an update on this process of modifying the LPA and what the reaction was from community groups we meet with, the SAACs, the FTA. Ms. Conner, when you say costs, are you talking about project expenditures? **Conner:** Project expenditures. **Kay:** Okay, I actually have a report to hand out to you today that I can continue to develop for you as we go forward if the format works. Maybe I'll give it to

you and next time we can discuss whether that was what you had in mind. So I think that's a good agenda.

Williams: I would like for you to go back through this official elections thing and put on everybody's – you've left off Councilman Jim Kraft, he's not on here. **Kay:** Yeah, Ms. Williams that – **Williams:** There's nobody on here from Baltimore County. You don't have Sarbanes, isn't Sarbanes supposed to be on here? **Kay:** That [list](#) simply represents this particular geography – that's the central part of the corridor. I guess what I thought we would do – Angela if you have a different idea about it tell me -- but I was thinking as the meetings move around that list might change – **Conner:** Right.

Bethea-Spearman: From now on, when you have a public comment, on the table for each area we go into, instead of beating up on us, beat up on your elected officials. That's where your comments go to. This is the central area, these are the ones you talk to. You have an issue, those are the ones you vote for, those are who you take your issues to – okay? That's where your issues go, this is what this is on the table for. It will change as we go around to all of the areas we meet. We're not your elected officials, we are the Citizens Advisory Council, we do our best, but we're not gods. Neither are they, but those are the ones you elected. We've been beat on for four years – it stops. We're not going into 2012 getting beat up no more. You got issues – hold your elected officials accountable. That's what these sheets are on the table for.

Williams: I thought the 41st District was represented – I don't see them on here.

Bethea-Spearman: Is this the 41st District we're in tonight? **Williams:** No. **Bethea-**

Spearman: Oh, okay. Wherever we're at Ms. Annie. **Williams:** Oh, okay, okay.

Conner: Can I also suggest then since this is the process that we're implementing that each location that we go we give out the information on the elected officials. If you get any details or any data as to what happened as a result of this process, could you give us a readout to let us know what has been reported or complained? **Bethea-Spearman:** Enough is enough, we've had enough heart attacks and strokes up here – no more. Did you have something? Councilwoman Holton – she's bold, she's here tonight, she's bold. Councilwoman Holton, did you have something you want to close us out on?

Holton: Yes I do. **Bethea-Spearman:** Okay. **Holton:** Good evening everyone. I would like to say this. I think everyone here knows my position and so I'm always mindful about when I see refinements to the line and cost saving-measures. What would be helpful, at least for me, is to understand the delta of the cost-saving measures. In those cost-saving measures I think there are three stations on Edmondson Avenue and the possibility of eliminating a station or repositioning – in my mind every cost savings gets us one step closer to putting more of Edmondson Avenue underground and maybe shifting where it goes. I know you don't want to hear that now, but I live by the philosophy, how do you eat an elephant? One bite at a time, you don't have to eat the whole thing. So if you're getting incremental cost savings along the way, you can kind of pull those together and extend where the train might come above ground on Edmondson Avenue. As you continue to refine, refine, refine then who knows – we might all wake up one day and find out there's been enough savings along other areas along the line to have Edmondson Avenue underground rather than this blanket statement, 'no, it's not acceptable, we're not doing it, it costs hundreds of millions of dollars.' Well, every nickel, dime and penny that is saved by refinements someplace else could go towards that effort. Maybe we don't need three station stops along Edmondson Avenue, maybe we

can get by with two as they're being positioned and looked at. I would just ask that you be open to the consideration that anything is possible, if you're open to receiving what might come of it and if all the minds that are focused on making sure this is the best line that it can be, I'd rather that we be slow and right than fast and wrong. So I would like to see as you're doing cost presentations at the next meeting to give a cost breakdown that shows what it was going to cost before the refinement and what the cost looks like after the refinement. Because I'd hate to see that some of these refinements are increasing costs, I would hope that they are reducing costs and looking at those cost savings. I understand circumstances and different things occur, but I'm not ruling out that Edmondson Avenue may be underground one day. Thank you.

Cohen: Madame Chair? **Bethea-Spearman:** Yes. **Cohen:** At a previous meeting, Mr. Kay mentioned Rail~Volution and I was wondering if he could just give us some updated information about that very briefly, in less than a minute.

Bethea-Spearman: No, not at 9:03 he can't. Mr. Kay, can you modify that request to what Councilwoman Holton said – that we find out what the costs was before those changes and what it is afterwards. Somebody make a motion that we adjourn the meeting. Okay, I guess we're all in favor – everybody have a good evening. We have to take a picture Mr. Smith.

Don Sherrod: What about community comment? **Conner:** There aren't any. **Bethea-Spearman:** Your community comments go to your elected officials. I just explained that, I just explained that.

The meeting adjourned at 9:04 p.m.



Red Line Citizens' Advisory Council • 2011 Annual Report

Appendix B

**Media Coverage of
the Red Line –
September 2010
to July 2011**

Appendix B – List of Articles

**\$90 Million Proposed for New Light Rail Lines
Transit Money Stands Out in Flat Spending Plan**
The Baltimore Sun, September 20, 2010

Baltimore Collecting \$19M Living Cities Grant for Subway Line, Housing
Citybizlist, October 28, 2010

Five U.S. Cities Awarded \$80 Million for Urban Revitalization
Smartplanet.com, October 28, 2010

The Purple and Red Lines Will Benefit All of Maryland
Greater Greater Washington, February 9, 2011

The Red Line Inspires Design Contest
Urbanite Magazine, March 8, 2011

Events and Updates to the Proposed Baltimore Red Line Light Rail System Plan
Baltimore Going Green Examiner, May 4, 2011

MTA Plans Open Houses on Red Line Station Designs
The Baltimore Sun, May 4, 2011

Baltimore Co. Residents Encouraged to Provide Input for Red Line Station Planning
Citybizlist, May 4, 2011

Baltimore and Washington Above-Ground Transit Projects
AirTransport.com, May 6, 2011

West Baltimoreans React to Red Line Plans
The Baltimore Sun, May 7, 2011

Red Line Gets Federal Go-Ahead for Next Phase
The Baltimore Sun, May 7, 2011

Planning for Baltimore's Red Line Moves Forward
The Daily Record, June 28, 2011

Sedum on the Tracks
Landscape Architecture Magazine, July, 2011

\$90 Million Proposed for New Light Rail Lines

Transit Money Stands Out in Flat Spending Plan

The Baltimore Sun
Michael Dresser
September 20, 2010

The O'Malley administration is proposing an infusion of almost \$90 million for engineering of two new transit systems — including Baltimore's east-west Red Line — as part of an otherwise flat \$9.4 billion transportation spending plan for the next six years.

Unlike plans of the past two years, the 2011-2016 Consolidated Transportation Program is not a litany of recession-related deferrals of transportation expansion and maintenance projects.

"The great news is we didn't have to cut. That's what I'd like to shout from the rooftops," Maryland Transportation Secretary Beverly Swaim-Staley said Monday. She unveiled the draft version of the plan in Towson at the first of a series of meetings held annually across the state.

While the spending plan doesn't return Maryland to the heady days of three years ago, when it made plans for \$10.6 billion in transportation funding, it does represent a modest rebound. Two years ago, with the recession cutting deeply into revenue, Maryland was forced to slash more than \$2 billion in planned spending. Last year, it managed a modest increase to \$9.1 billion, but only because of the federal stimulus program.

Swaim-Staley said that revenue from the state's leading sources of transportation dollars, which include the gas tax, vehicle registration fees and the titling tax, have stabilized in recent months. But she cautioned that the Transportation Trust Fund is hardly flush.

"We are still in some very choppy waters," she said.

Transportation officials pointed to the new spending on the Red Line in Baltimore and the Purple Line in the Washington suburbs as the highlight of the new plan. For preliminary engineering work, the plan calls for spending \$41.5 million on the 14.5-mile Red Line from Woodlawn to Bayview, and \$48 million on the 16-mile Purple Line between New Carrollton and Bethesda.

The allocation of state funding is expected to bring in federal matching funds of more than \$225 million, transportation officials said.

Including the money for the transit lines represents a political statement by Gov. Martin O'Malley. His Republican challenger in the November election, former Gov. Robert L. Ehrlich Jr., has said he would pull the plug on O'Malley's plan to build the two transit systems as light rail lines, arguing that the state does not have enough money for the projects.

Andy Barth, a spokesman for the Ehrlich campaign, criticized the decision to allocate the money for the transit lines.

"Building the Red and Purple lines would cost the taxpayers of Maryland at least \$3.6 billion," Barth said. "Bob Ehrlich believes we need to fix what's broken now, and the MARC trains, plus Washington Metro's Red Line, certainly have plenty that needs fixing."

If Ehrlich were to win the election and rescind the plans, the proposed funding would not be wasted, because most of it is not scheduled to begin flowing until the 2013 and 2014 budget years.

Swaim-Staley said it is important for the state to put the money on the table at a time when the Federal Transit Administration will be evaluating competing projects from around the country.

"We just want to make sure we're in the game," she said. "We think we have good, strong projects and we want to be there at the head of the line."

Each year, Maryland prepares a new version of a six-year transportation spending plan showing additions, deletions and revisions since the previous year's outline. Each September, the Maryland Transportation Department releases a draft of the plan and starts a statewide tour so top officials can brief local leaders. After receiving comments from local officials and the public, the department submits a final version of the plan to the General Assembly.

At the Towson event, State Highway Administrator Neil J. Pedersen said his agency is making steady progress on two major Beltway projects: the replacement of the Charles Street and Liberty Road bridges. The projects are expected to be substantially completed by 2013.

Pedersen said that during the current budget year, the state will conduct engineering work and acquire rights of way to widen the Beltway from Security Boulevard to Interstate 95 to the south. Also in the plan is similar work on the Beltway segment from Interstate 83 to Interstate 95 north. Both segments, among the region's most congested roads, are expected to be upgraded eventually to eight lanes at a combined cost of more than \$1 billion.

Baltimore Collecting \$19M Living Cities Grant for Subway Line, Housing

citybizlist.com

October 28, 2010

Mayor Rawlings-Blake is traveling to Detroit to attend and participate in a panel discussion at the National Philanthropic Collaborative's announcement of \$19 million for Baltimore as part of the Living Cities Integration Initiative.

Living Cities is a collaborative of 22 of the world's largest foundations and financial institutions. The Baltimore Integration Partnership focuses on preparing residents for opportunities created by the construction of the Red Line, a 14-mile east-west transit line. Through the Integration Initiative, Baltimore is eligible for up to \$19 million in grants, loans, and Program-Related Investments (PRIs) to support its efforts. PRIs are flexible, low-cost loans provided at below-market rates to support charitable activity.

"This is a concrete opportunity to advance two of our most important goals: connecting residents to real jobs and driving investment to city neighborhoods," said Mayor Rawlings-Blake.

Living Cities resources will help Baltimore create a model for how neighborhood, regional, city, and state economic development and transportation investments can benefit low-income people by driving and/or integrating workforce development, affordable housing, and neighborhood amenities. Funding will result in at least 1,200 residents being connected to job pipeline services; 400 units of mixed-income housing being built; and 346,000 square feet of mixed-use commercial space being developed.

The Baltimore Integration Partnership will build on Baltimore's Workforce Funders' Collaborative, which helped launch programs in biotechnology, healthcare, and construction, moving low-income city residents into careers, and the Baltimore Neighborhood Collaborative's efforts to promote transit-centered community development.

As part of its application, Baltimore's public, private, philanthropic, and non-profit sectors agreed to work together on the initiative. The Association of Baltimore Area Grantmakers coordinated the application. Partners in the effort are the Office of Mayor Stephanie Rawlings-Blake, the Office of Governor Martin O'Malley, The Annie E. Casey Foundation, Goldseker Foundation, Baltimore Workforce Funders Collaborative, Associated Black Charities, Baltimore Neighborhood Collaborative, Johns Hopkins University and Medical Institutions, Maryland Institute College of Art, Job Opportunities Task Force, Central Baltimore Partnership, Central Maryland Transportation Alliance, and the East Baltimore Development Inc.

The Reinvestment Fund will serve as the financial intermediary, making targeted investments in projects that advance the initiative's goals.

The Integration Initiative is an effort to leverage the financial investment, influence, and leadership of Living Cities members to create a new framework for solving complex problems. It encourages local leaders to work together to challenge obsolete conventional wisdom, "rewire" the systems

that are critical to making our cities places of opportunity for low-income people, and drive the private market to work on behalf of low-income people. The Integration Initiative seeks to institutionalize these changes through a focus on changing local, state, and federal policy. The support to Baltimore is part of up to \$80 million that will be invested in five metropolitan areas.

Other cities chosen for the Integration Initiative are Cleveland, Detroit, Newark, and the Twin Cities region of Minneapolis/St. Paul. The announcement was made during a launch event at the Charles H. Wright Museum of African American History in Detroit.

Five U.S. Cities Awarded \$80 Million for Urban Revitalization

Smartplanet.com

Andrew Nusca

October 28, 2010

Living Cities on Thursday awarded five troubled American cities with \$80 million for the development and revitalization of neighborhoods with low-income residents.

The organization, a collaborative of 22 foundations and financial institutions, seeks to address “intractable problems” in Baltimore, Cleveland, Detroit, Newark and Minneapolis-St. Paul by offering financial packages of grants and loans that, with help from the public, private, philanthropic and non-profit sectors.

The aim: improve “access to opportunity” for low-income people, including education, housing, transit, healthcare and employment.

“Cities need flexible resources to help them move innovation from the periphery to the mainstream, to integrate change across disciplines, geographies, sectors and funding sources,” Living Cities CEO Ben Hecht said in a statement.

The project, which Living Cities calls its “Integration Initiative,” has four primary objectives:

- 1. Create a framework for solving complex problems.** Remove bureaucratic silos and get policy in lockstep through communication among leaders in government, philanthropy, the non-profit sector and the business community.
- 2. Challenge conventional wisdom, a.k.a. “disrupt.”** What we’ve got now is outdated and based on false or obsolete assumptions. (Example: the nine-month school year, which was born from summer harvests.)

- 3. Drive the private market to work on behalf of low-income people.** Attract private sector capital by structuring investments in underserved markets to balance risk and reward. Examples: grocery stores and financial services.

- 4. Create a “new normal.”** Go beyond the pilot program. Re-prioritize funding and use data to track what’s going on to ensure accountability for results.

The project also includes \$50 million in intermediate-term commercial debt provided by Living Cities financial members, to be used for buying land and property, constructing affordable housing and developing mixed use facilities.

It’s no surprise, then, that the five cities chosen are spread along America’s Rust Belt, which has suffered as manufacturing jobs have declined.

Can Living Cities create a “new normal” in these metropolitan areas, some of which have been plagued by working class problems for decades?

Here’s a look at what each city is doing:

- **Baltimore, Md. (up to \$19 million):** Create job opportunities and improve neighborhoods in Central and East Baltimore. Build the Red Line, a 14-mile east-west transit line. Partners: Johns Hopkins University, the Annie E. Casey Foundation, city and state government and non-profits.
- **Cleveland, Ohio (up to \$15 million):** Create local jobs and opportunities by implementing programs for procurement,

hiring, employee incentives and capital investment. Partners: the Cleveland Clinic, University Hospitals and Case Western Reserve University.

- **Detroit, Mich. (up to \$17 million):** Concentrate population and activity in sustainable city corridors (e.g. the Woodward Corridor). Create a model for older industrial cities, reuse vacant land and expand opportunity.
- **Newark, N.J. (up to \$15 million):** Alleviate environmental conditions that create barriers to residents' advancement. Create a "wellness economy" that improves supply of and demand for safe, healthy and affordable options. Invest in housing, public safety, access to healthcare, green space, fresh and healthy foods and employment.
- **Minneapolis and St. Paul, Minn. (up to \$16 million):** "Substantial investments" in three regional transit lines to better serve low income people and connect the Twin Cities. Create and preserve transit-accessible affordable housing and mixed-use, mixed-income developments. Help small businesses deal with transit construction, link residents with job opportunities and make transit corridors attractive to private investment.

Writing in the Chronicle of Philanthropy last week, Hecht says the time is ripe for change with regard to American cities and the philanthropy that supports them:

In the midst of the rapid change that we are witnessing, philanthropy must not squander this opportunity to reinvent itself. We are in a time of crisis. We cannot center our work on practices and principles from a century ago. We must address our contemporary reality. And our efforts must go far beyond a scattershot approach. They must become the new normal.

What do you think: can the neighborhood be a lever for change in the systems that drive cities and regions?

The Purple and Red Lines will benefit all of Maryland

Greater Greater Washington
Calvin Wilk
February 9, 2011

Maryland state senator E.J. Pipkin of Cecil County is drafting legislation to require counties to pay for constructing mass transit projects by themselves without state help. They would still be required to contribute to the state's transportation trust fund as they do now.

While there is something to be said for paying one's own way, the legislation being cosponsored by Frederick County's David Brinkley would be like cutting off one's nose to spite one's face.

Pipkin's misguided legislation neglects the fact that the Purple Line and the Baltimore Red Line will bring economic development and therefore more tax revenue to the state. Maryland should make investments that increase its tax revenues, not shrink its tax base because of parochial concerns.

From the article:

"If you live—as I do—in a rural area, you don't share those hopes and dreams of mass transit as you have in the urban areas," Pipkin said Monday during a panel discussion on Maryland's economy and infrastructure.

He said the state's rural counties have dire transportation needs that aren't being met by the dwindling pot of state transportation dollars allocated to road and bridge repair.

The solution to having too little transportation money isn't to cut off infrastructure investment in the parts of the state that contribute the most tax revenue. The wealthy urban parts of Maryland never complain about subsidizing rural road projects. The rural parts can't afford to do it on their own. Since we are one state, it has never been an issue whether or not to contribute to the infrastructure and standard of living of the less affluent counties.

Then, why does Pipkin want to punish the parts of the state that have benefitted his constituents for so many decades? Demonizing the wealthy parts of the state who aren't represented by members of his political party is political red meat to a large group of his constituents.

I grew up in Cecil County and my parents live in Senator Pipkin's district. Many people from the Upper Eastern Shore think of Baltimore and Washington as far away places that are alien. His legislation would message well to people who view mass transit as an unfamiliar big-city amenity.

However, it's Pipkin's job to represent his district's monetary interests, not to appeal to their misinformed views about the urban parts of Maryland. His constituents will benefit from the tax revenue generated by the economic development from the Purple and Red Lines.

It is also logically inconsistent that Pipkin is targeting light rail projects but not the ICC. Because of the sticker shock from the ICC, the state is considering raising tolls to cross the Baltimore Harbor, the Susquehanna River, and the Chesapeake Bay. Why isn't Pipkin decrying the huge chunk of the Maryland transportation budget that is going to constructing the ICC?

Transportation funding in Maryland should not be a parochial argument about roads vs. rails. It's about building infrastructure that is appropriate to the communities it serves as they envision themselves in the future. Senator Pipkin's constituents deserve far-sighted representation that will generate economic development in all of Maryland, benefiting his constituents through increased tax revenue to fund more state services.

The Red Line Inspires Design Contest

The Urbanite Magazine

March 8, 2011

[UrbaniteBaltimore](#)

Urbanite Project: The Open City Challenge

Announcing the Open City Competition Exhibition, opening June 17!

[Back in 2007](#), we at *Urbanite* were trying to find a way to encourage innovation in the city, and we knew one of the best ways to do that was to bring together folks from different disciplines and viewpoints. So we launched the Urbanite Project. We matched up unlikely teams of two or three, putting an architect with a neurosurgeon, or a writer with an environmental lawyer, and asked them to collaborate on a project of their choosing. To us, the end result wasn't the point—although several projects had physical manifestations, including the 2007 “Black + White = Green” project, which brought together a multi-racial crowd under the banner of care for the environment during the inaugural EcoFest. It was the collaboration between these people from very different worlds—who might never have met had we not introduced them—that we thought was vitally important.

This year, we're taking the project a step further, focusing on these ideas coming to fruition.

Introducing **Urbanite Project: Open City Competition**, a project of [Urbanite](#), the year-long [Exhibition Development Seminar](#) at Maryland Institute College of Art, [the D center](#), the [Maryland Transit Administration](#), and the [Baltimore City Department of Transportation](#).

We're inviting self-organized teams to compete for \$10,000 in prize money and the chance to implement their solution to a pressing city issue: the quality-of-life issues brought about by the construction of the [Red Line](#).

The proposed Red Line is a 14-mile, light rail transit line that will run east-west from Woodlawn through downtown Baltimore, Fells Point, and Canton to the Johns Hopkins Bayview Medical Center Campus. It will link up with the existing Light Rail, Metro subway, and MARC train lines, creating a comprehensive transportation system. When constructed, the Red Line will run mostly in the median of existing roadways, with a few miles of tunnels.

Baltimore, whose neighborhoods were once connected by a network of streetcars, is now served by one light rail line and one subway line, which do not serve many of the city's neighborhoods in East and West Baltimore. The Red Line has the potential to not only alleviate traffic and provide all the usual public transit benefits, but also create connections between communities that are traditionally disconnected.

In addition to these potential benefits, one major drawback of the Red Line is that construction could dramatically disrupt life in the communities through which it is to pass: noise, dust, traffic disruption, and limited pedestrian walkways. Construction is estimated to begin within five years and could last up to five additional years.

While many look at the construction period and see nothing but hassle and inconvenience, this kind of disruption also brings opportunities. For several years, sections of this town are going to be torn up, with traffic stopped or slowed and pedestrian access limited. We think we can take advantage of this period to create a unique, vibrant, productive urban space. Call it creative urban design, installation art, whatever: We have an opportunity to turn this construction period into an economic benefit, help open up conduits of travel and communication along the route, and potentially leave a lasting positive impact on the city.

How about a string of community gardens along the route, with cookouts to draw the neighboring communities together? How about turning much of the line into a walking mall, bringing new businesses and art galleries to formerly boarded-up storefronts? How about designing artwork to mask construction walls?

The deadline for entries is June 3. For more information, [>download the RFP here](#) and sign up to receive e-mail updates (coming soon) on the competition and the information session, scheduled for March 8.

***Note:** Individuals directly associated with the D center and the Exhibition Development Seminar at MICA, as well as employees of the MTA and Baltimore City DOT and their consultants whose work directly relates to the development of the Red Line, will not be eligible for entry into the Challenge.*

Urbanite Project: Open City Competition Sponsors

- McDaniel College
- Massage Heights
- The Walters Art Museum
- D:center
- MICA
- Red Line
- MTA
- Baltimore City DOT

Baltimore Co. Residents Encouraged to Provide Input for Red Line Station Planning

Citybizlist
May 4, 2011

For six months, more than 250 community stakeholders have been meeting to provide input on how 20 stations along the proposed Baltimore Red Line can be designed to best serve their communities. Those Station Area Advisory Committee (SAAC) members will share their findings with the public at open houses to be held in various locations in the Red Line corridor.

One of the Red Line Open Houses will take place in Baltimore County for the public to attend and give input:

• **Wednesday, May 11, 2011**

5:30 - 8:30 p.m.

Woodlawn High School (Cafeteria)

1801 Woodlawn Drive

Baltimore, MD 21207

Stations: Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Security Square Mall, Social Security Administration, I-70 Park-and-Ride

Accessible by bus routes #15, 44, 57, 77

The 17 SAACs are comprised of community stakeholders who advise the MTA on station location and design options, ways to make the area around the stations more accommodating for pedestrians, associated modifications to adjacent streets, and what kind of development should occur in the station area.

"This is the public's opportunity to get one-on-one information and provide input on the proposed Red Line stations that will serve the communities of Windsor Mill, Woodlawn and Gwynn Oak. I encourage County residents to take advantage of the Open House on May 11," said Baltimore County Executive Kevin Kamenetz.

Each interactive open house will feature a specific group of station areas. The public is invited to stop in to review displays, ask questions and provide feedback to the MTA and their community's representative on the SAACs. There are no time-specific presentations planned - the public is invited to walk in at anytime during the open house hours. Information on the project status, schedule and funding will also be available.

The Red Line is a proposed 14-mile, east-west rail line connecting the areas of Woodlawn, Edmondson Village, West Baltimore, downtown Baltimore, Inner Harbor East, Fells Point, Canton and the Johns Hopkins Bayview Medical Center campus in eastern Baltimore City. Through downtown and in a one-mile section near Leakin Park the Red Line will run in new tunnels; in other areas it will operate in dedicated lanes. The project is expected to cost \$1.8 billion to build. Pending approval from the Federal Transit Administration and funding, construction of the Red Line could begin in 2016.

More information on the Red Line is available on the project website at www.baltimoreredline.com. The site also includes a map of the route, key facts about the project and video simulations of the major west, downtown and east segments of the transit line.

Events and Updates to the Proposed Baltimore Red Line Light Rail System Plan

Baltimore Going Green Examiner

Laura Hupp

May 4, 2011

The Red Line Rail System is the new system plan in Southeast Baltimore. The red line would be a 14-mile east-west transit line. This line would connect the areas of Woodlawn, Edmondson Village, West Baltimore, Downtown Baltimore, Inner Harbor East, Fells Point, Canton and the Johns Hopkins Bayview Medical Center Campus. The potential benefits of the rail system include increased property values, decreased traffic congestion and improved quality of life.

As the Preliminary Engineering phase for the proposed light rail transit system approaches, the MTA is continuing to conduct geological studies, exploring subsurface soil, rock and groundwater conditions, especially in areas where tunnels are proposed through August of 2011 according to the Maryland Department of Transportation. This will be done in the Cooks Lane, Downtown and Fells Point areas.

A community-friendly aspect of this plan is the Department of Transportation's attempts to include ideas and feedback from the surrounding residents on what they'd like to see in the red line transit stop. The MTA Red Line Project Team and community members of the Station Area Advisory Committees (SAAC) are holding an information Open House and workshop for Baltimore residents so that you can be involved in the latest Red Line planning.

The next Open Houses are:

- **Saturday, May 7th, 9:00 a.m. – Noon**
Edmondson High School - Cafeteria, 501 Athol Avenue, Baltimore, MD 21229
Accessible by Bus Routes: #20, 23, 40

- **Wednesday, May 11th, 5:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.**
Woodlawn High School - Cafeteria, 1801 Woodlawn Drive, Baltimore, MD 21207
Accessible by Bus Routes: #15, 44, 57, 77
- **Saturday, May 14th, 9:00 a.m. – Noon**
Hampstead Hill Academy, 500 S. Linwood Avenue, Baltimore, MD 21224
Accessible by Bus Routes: #7, 10, 13
- **Tuesday, May 17th, 5:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.**
University of Maryland, Baltimore, SMC Campus Center – Ballrooms A & B, 621 West Lombard Street, Baltimore, MD 21201
Accessible by Bus Routes: #1, 7, 10, 20, 27, 30, 35, 36, 48. By Light Rail: University Ctr./ Baltimore St. Station. By Metro: Lexington Market Station. By Charm City Circulator: Orange Route. Accessible Parking at Pratt St. Garage (646 W. Pratt, corner of W. Pratt & S. Greene). Go to the 3rd Floor, East Side of the garage and take walkway to 2nd Floor Ballroom Entrance.

Public transportation is beneficial to city health as it reduces congestion, carbon footprint and gasoline consumption. According to the American Public Transportation Association (APTA), nationwide "households near public transit drive an average of 4400 fewer miles than households with no access to public transit; this equates to an individual household reduction of 223 gallons per year" of gasoline. In addition, communities that invest in public transit reduce the nation's carbon emissions by 37 million metric tons annually: "equivalent to if New York City; Washington, DC; Atlanta; Denver; and Los Angeles combined stopping using electricity" according to the APTA.

Additional information about the Red Line can be found at [*http://www.balTIMORERedLine.com*](http://www.balTIMORERedLine.com).

Statistics on Public Transportation can be found at [*http://www.apta.com/mediacenter/ptbenefits/Pages/default.aspx*](http://www.apta.com/mediacenter/ptbenefits/Pages/default.aspx)

Below is a link to the Southeast Community Development Corporation's Transit-Oriented Development Charrette Plan and Report:

[*http://www.southeastcdc.org/docs/Highlandtown-Greektown%20TOD%20FINAL%20\(2\).pdf*](http://www.southeastcdc.org/docs/Highlandtown-Greektown%20TOD%20FINAL%20(2).pdf)

MTA Plans Open Houses On Red Line Station Designs

The Baltimore Sun

Michael Dresser

May 4, 2011

The Maryland Transit Administration will hold a series of open houses this month for local residents to share their views about proposed designs for the 20 light rail stations planned for the east-west Red Line.

The MTA will begin holding the four sessions Saturday with a meeting at Edmondson High School. Others will take place on the 11th, 14th and 17th of this month.

At the open houses, members of the Red Line Station Area Advisory Committee will display the results of their work over the past six months. According to the MTA, 250 community "stakeholders" have been participating in discussions aimed at planning locations, designs, access, development implications and other matters relating to stations along the planned 14-mile light rail line from Woodlawn to Bayview.

The MTA said the advisory committees are a part of its public involvement program for the proposed \$1.8 billion transit line, for which the agency plans to seek federal financing to match an expected 50 percent state share. According to the MTA, if the project goes smoothly, construction could start in 2016.

Each of the meetings will focus on several of the stations planned for stops near the meeting sites.

The MTA released the following schedule, along with information on which stations will be discussed and how to get to the meeting sites by bus:

• **Saturday, May 7, 2011**

9:00 a.m. – 12 noon
Edmondson High School (Cafeteria)
501 Athol Avenue
Baltimore, MD 21229

Stations: Edmondson Village, Allendale, Rosemont, West Baltimore MARC, Harlem Park, Poppleton

Accessible by bus routes #20, 23, 40

• **Wednesday, May 11, 2011**

5:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.
Woodlawn High School (Cafeteria)
1801 Woodlawn Drive
Baltimore, MD 21207

Stations: Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Security Square Mall, Social Security Administration, I-70 Park-and-Ride

Accessible by bus routes #15, 44, 57, 77

• **Saturday, May 14, 2011**

9:00 a.m. – 12 noon
Hampstead Hill Academy (Cafeteria)
500 S. Linwood Avenue
Baltimore, MD 21224

Stations: Canton, Canton Crossing, Highlandtown/Greektown, Bayview MARC, Johns Hopkins Bayview Medical Center Campus

Accessible by bus lines #7, 10, 13

• **Tuesday, May 17th, 2011**

5:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.
University of Maryland, Baltimore SMC
Campus Center, Ballrooms A & B
621 W. Lombard Street Baltimore, MD 21201

Stations: Howard Street/University Center, Charles Center, Government Center/Inner Harbor, Inner Harbor East, Fells Point

Accessible by bus routes #1, 7, 10, 20, 27, 30, 35, 36, 48

By Light Rail: University Center/Baltimore Street station

By Metro: Lexington Market station

By Charm City Circulator: Orange

Baltimore and Washington Above-Ground Transit Projects

AltTransport.com

Armin Rosen

May 6, 2011

Although its ribbon-cutting could be more than a decade in the future, Baltimore's long sought-after east-west light rail line is one step closer to being built. The Maryland Transit Authority, which operates Baltimore's light rail, bus and subway lines, as well as the state-wide MARC commuter train system, is slated to begin holding community meetings on the Red Line's routing and station design, the Baltimore Sun is reporting:

At the open houses, members of the Red Line Station Area Advisory Committee will display results of their work over the past six months. According to the MTA, 250 community "stakeholders" have been participating in discussions aimed at planning locations, designs, access, development implications and other matters relating to stations along the 14-mile line from Woodlawn to Bayview.

The Sun says that construction of the new line could begin in 2016. And about an hour down I-95, it's recently been announced that Washington, DC's first streetcar line (at least since the city's original system was dismantled in the early 60's) will open in late 2012. Better still, DC's streetcar project, which includes the construction of a line between Anacostia and downtown, as well as a shorter K St. line linking points within the downtown, will be getting a boost in city funding through 2017:

Scott Kubly, who directs DDOT's streetcar project, applauded the mayor's proposed 2012 budget, which adds an additional \$99.3 million to spend over the next 6 years for planning and construction beyond this initial segment.

In both Baltimore and Washington, above-ground transit systems could be crucial in

revitalizing under-performing parts of the city. The H St. corridor in DC is a burgeoning arts and entertainment district; it's also so difficult to access at that, until recently, H St. businesses had to pay for shuttle bus service between metro stations and their neighborhood. A streetcar line will make the area more accessible, and fill in the long-lamented gap between the Washington, DC Metro's red and orange lines.

Baltimore, meanwhile, already has four rapid transit lines: a subway system running from the downtown to the northern suburb of Owings Mills, along with three light rail routes that basically run along the same north-south axis. Baltimore's subway and light rail system is basically built to link the city's often-affluent suburbs to its polished downtown—and does little to connect its impoverished eastern and western neighborhoods either with the downtown or with each other. The red line would help rectify this situation, the Baltimore of 2020 will likely be a more socially cohesive and prosperous place because of long-term transit decisions that are being made right now. Washington DC and Baltimore are both case studies in how there's more at stake in transit studies than just how we get around.

West Baltimoreans React to Red Line Plans

The Baltimore Sun

Childs Walker

May 7, 2011

Many welcome line but worry funding won't materialize to improve neighborhoods

Colin Kelly grew up along Edmondson Avenue, and he struggled to wrap his mind around the image of an above-ground train passing safely down the middle of the busy, four-lane artery.

"Man, a curb ain't going to do nothing about it," he said Saturday morning as he listened to a Maryland Transit Administration official address Kelly's safety concerns regarding the proposed Red Line, which would run down Edmondson Avenue on its way to East Baltimore.

But as the former bus driver watched a computerized depiction of the train cruising gently along the median, he softened his tune.

"On that film, it looks good," he said. "I guess it's time for it."

The MTA hoped to answer questions and concerns such as those raised by Kelly at a Red Line open house Saturday at Edmondson-Westside High School, the first of four gatherings the agency will host this month in key neighborhoods along the proposed east-west rail corridor. The line would run from Johns Hopkins Bayview Medical Center in East Baltimore to the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services on Security Boulevard in western Baltimore County.

"We not only want to keep the community informed; we want them actively involved," said MTA spokesman Terry Owens.

MTA officials filled the Edmondson High cafeteria with large poster boards depicting the Red Line route and describing potential

development in the neighborhoods around each stop. Plans for each of the 20 stops were developed by advisory committees made up of local activists and others with an interest in the neighborhoods. Residents were invited to submit questions and comments, which Owens said the MTA will incorporate as it continues to plan the stops.

MTA officials hope to receive federal funding this year to start detailed planning and engineering work in anticipation of construction, which could begin in 2016. They ultimately hope to secure enough federal money to match the state's 50 percent share of the \$1.8 billion project.

Many of the local objections to the Red Line have arisen in West Baltimore, where residents worry that streets are too narrow to accommodate a surface transit line.

Most residents and activists who attended Saturday's meeting, however, seemed to welcome the Red Line concept. They said they're tired of having to catch a bus or hop in their cars every time they want to go downtown or across to Canton and Fells Point.

"This is long overdue," said Floyd Aaron, who has lived in West Baltimore for four years. "I've worked in D.C., and I've seen what the Metro has done for neighborhoods there. Baltimore needs to move into the next century."

Neighbors were not as convinced that funding would materialize to clear out vacant properties and spur new residential and commercial development around the stops.

"I'm encouraged, but I want to see some dollars spill into the community," said Zelda Robinson, an activist from the Midtown-Edmondson neighborhood. "The line itself

looks beautiful, but I want to see the communities around it looking just as beautiful."

The plans displayed yesterday included spaces for developments of shops, apartments and offices in neighborhoods such as Poppleton and Harlem Park. The boards listed goals such as preserving Edmondson Avenue and Baltimore Street as historic commercial "main streets" and expanding Hollins Market.

But much of the money for such efforts would probably have to come from private sources.

"I just hope this will wake people up to do something with these properties, the vacant ones," Aaron said. "This line might attract people from outside the area, and who needs to see those eyesores? We need a Starbucks, some place where people can use Wi-Fi, a place where people can go to socialize instead of loitering on the corners."

Red Line Gets Federal Go-Ahead for Next Phase

The Baltimore Sun

Michael Dresser

May 7, 2011

East-west rail line project for city clears a crucial hurdle

The Maryland Transit Administration's proposed Red Line in Baltimore has received U.S. approval to move to the next phase of development, a strong indication that the east-west light rail line will eventually qualify for federal funding.

Gov. Martin O'Malley plans to announce Tuesday that the Federal Transit Administration has given the state the green light to move into what is known as preliminary engineering, or PE — a phase that would take the project beyond the conceptual stage and into specific planning.

The approval would start a roughly two-year planning process for the 14 1/2-mile line from Woodlawn to Bayview — a project that the federal agency estimated would cost a total of \$2.2 billion with inflation. The state previously described the Red Line as a \$1.8 billion project in 2010 dollars.

The decision does not mean the federal government has agreed to pay for the project's construction. Henry Kay, the MTA's deputy administrator for planning, said that decision would be made later. But he said the federal action means the Red Line has survived a process that weeds out many projects.

"It's a big deal," Kay said. "PE approval really represents a major milestone."

But opponents of the project questioned the importance of the federal action.

"The reality of this is that there's no money," said Benjamin Rosenberg, a resident of Canton. "The likelihood of the funding in the next couple years is zero."

Kay said the PE process will cost about \$65 million. He said that many of the engineering contracts have been awarded and that work has been awaiting federal approval. He said the state would likely pay most of the upfront costs but would be eligible for federal reimbursement when money becomes available.

While the Red Line has the enthusiastic support of the O'Malley administration, Mayor Stephanie Rawlings-Blake and most city elected officials, it faces opposition from some residents of neighborhoods in its path — especially those in Canton and West Baltimore.

Plans for the Red Line call for the tracks to run in one long tunnel under downtown and Fells Point and in one shorter tunnel under Cooks Lane in West Baltimore. The rest of the route would run above ground, including sections on Boston Street and Edmondson Avenue.

Advocates contend the Red Line is needed to relieve traffic congestion and to provide an attractive transit alternative to reach some of the city's major employment centers, including the Inner Harbor, Harbor East, the University of Maryland professional schools and the Johns Hopkins Bayview Medical Center.

"Baltimore has been underserved by public transit," said Sen. Benjamin L. Cardin. "We are now closer to having a truly integrated, regional transit system that will help transform our city and our region, adding a convenient, affordable east-west alternative to the ever-increasing gridlock."

But opponents maintain that a light rail line would detract from the ambience of the neighborhoods it runs through and would fail to attract the ridership officials have projected.

In fact, while they gave the Red Line the OK to move to the next step, federal officials may have also given opponents ammunition by lowering the estimates of daily ridership from 60,000 to 57,000 and hanging a higher price tag on the project.

Kay said it's not unusual for ridership estimates to fluctuate during the planning of a transit line. And he noted that the agency approved the move to the next step despite the lower ridership figures.

"When they signed off on 57,000 they agreed we're making reasonable assumptions," he said.

The new, \$2.2 billion figure represents a difference in the way the federal agency computes costs and the way the state does, Kay said.

"It's not because the price has gone up or we've changed the scope" of the project, he said.

Nevertheless, the federal estimate would also raise the amount of money the state would have to come up with to pay its likely 50 percent share of the project.

Planning for Baltimore's Red Line Moves Forward

The Daily Record

Nicholas Sohr

June 28, 2011

U.S. rail planners have moved Baltimore's Red Line one step closer to gaining the critical federal backing needed to see the \$2.2 billion east-west light rail project to completion.

"Now we're on the short list," said Henry Kay, the Maryland Transit Administration's executive director of transit development and delivery.

"This is not a federal commitment to fund the project," he said. "But the way I look at it we're among a very small number of projects nationally that the [Federal Transit Administration] is considering funding."

On the FTA's go-ahead, the Red Line enters the "preliminary engineering" stage that will bring more detailed plans, final environmental studies and more accurate cost projections for the 14.5-mile light rail line from Woodlawn in Baltimore County to Johns Hopkins Bayview Medical Center on the east side of the city. The state announced the Red Line milestone Tuesday morning.

"By granting permission for a project to enter preliminary engineering, the FTA signals that the project has merit and a high likelihood of ultimate success," Gov. Martin O'Malley said in a prepared statement.

The rail line would be funded with a mix of federal and state dollars. Under the FTA's "New Starts" program the president's budget must recommend the project for funding. The administration can pay for up to 80 percent of the project, although some recent financing splits have been as low as 50-50. That would leave Maryland with a bill of between \$440 million and \$1.1 billion.

"We can afford the project," Transportation Secretary Beverley K. Swaim-Staley said. "We would have to make some choices between some projects and some particular things that

we do, but we can afford this even within the existing revenue forecasts."

The FTA estimates construction of the Red Line would cost \$2.2 billion when accounting for inflation. The state had predicted a \$1.8 billion price tag in 2010 dollars.

Maryland's transportation plan includes \$132.6 million for engineering on the Red Line project over the next three years and nearly \$43 million for property acquisition along the route.

The FTA also lowered ridership projections by 5 percent to 57,000 per day in 2030 from the most recent state forecast of 60,000. Kay, the MTA official, said the change was made because the FTA thought downtown employment figures were overstated in the state numbers.

"They didn't think downtown stations would produce as much ridership," he said.

The route includes 20 stations. Most of the track would be at street level, save for a tunnel under Cooks Lane just inside the city's western border, another tunnel through downtown, Fells Point and into Canton and an elevated section on the east side of town.

The plan still faces opposition from community groups that raise concerns about the noise, traffic and other elements that come with rail.

"Our waterfront is our most valuable asset," said Greg Marsh, a member of the Canton Community Association board of directors who lives a half-block from the proposed route on Boston Street. "And they're going to have a train running in front of it? I take my kids down all the time to walk through that park, and it's already bad enough on a busy day with the car traffic."

But transportation officials say the rail line will ease traffic on congested roads and tie together disparate train and bus lines in MTA's patchwork network. The Red Line would link travelers to two MARC lines, the north-south light rail line and the city's Metro line.

The move to preliminary engineering is the second FTA sign-off on the project.

"This is an early, but important hurdle for the Red Line project to achieve," said Donald C. Fry, president and CEO of the Greater Baltimore Committee and a former lawmaker who helped set transportation policy. "This is a process where many projects are sorted out and don't have a chance to move forward."

The next step, expected in 2013, will be the final design phase and concurrent negotiation of the project's financing. Construction is expected to start in 2015, setting the line up for a 2020 opening.

"Baltimore has been underserved by public transit," U.S. Sen. Ben Cardin said in a statement. "We are now closer to having a truly integrated, regional transit system that will help transform our city and our region, adding a convenient, affordable east-west alternative to the ever-increasing gridlock."

FOREGROUND / **NOW**

SEDUM ON THE TRACKS

BALTIMORE TESTS A PLAN TO TAKE TRANSIT TO THE NEXT LEVEL OF SUSTAINABILITY.



Light rail transit (LRT) is an environmentally friendly way to get around. But the team behind a proposed new LRT project in Baltimore is experimenting with making it even more sustainable by greening the tracks—growing plants alongside and in between rails, which are usually set in concrete or ballast.



keep the project as green, inviting, and unobtrusive as possible, and in following the city's sustainability plan, an interdisciplinary team including landscape architects from Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson (JMT) and Mahan Rykiel Associates has been exploring greening options. Replacing some hardscaped surfaces with plants would not only improve the tracks' appearance, it would also reduce impervious surface area and help to mitigate noise, dust, and the urban heat island effect.

Green tracks are not an entirely novel concept, but there are not a lot of examples that would apply directly to this project. Like green roofs, green tracks are more common in Europe, especially Germany, where the climate is less extreme. A 2009 study by the Red Line team found that there are a few installations in the United States—in Kenosha, Wisconsin; Fort Collins, Colorado; and New Orleans—but these are all on streetcar lines, with

LEFT

Replacing hardscape with plants would improve the tracks' ecological performance as well as their appearance.

BOTTOM

A *Sedum* mix often used on green roofs has performed well in trials.

IMAGE CREDITS

Courtesy JMT

If funding is secured and construction proceeds as planned in 2013, the Baltimore Red Line will run east-west through the city between the Woodland community and the medical center of Johns Hopkins University. Most of the tracks would be built in the medians of existing roads. As part of an effort by the Maryland Transit Administration (MTA) to

different length, scale, and frequency compared to LRT. After studying data from existing installations, the team recommended a construction approach that would fix rails to below-grade concrete slabs, with soil mix or green roof-type growing medium applied on top to rail height.

But before committing to this kind of investment, the MTA and the design team wanted to test the concept. So four sites on existing LRT lines were retrofitted with greenery. Plants in this kind of situation need to be tough and low maintenance, so *Sedum* species known for durability on green roofs were tested, as was pedestrian-tolerant turfgrass.

A year into the two-year experiment, things are going well, says Jon Conner, ASLA, of JMT. Plants are growing successfully on most sites, he says, and data suggests that good plant coverage is reducing ambient temperatures a bit during the city's sweltering summers. *Sedum* species seem to be outperforming turf and fit into the city's hope to spend less time and effort maintaining grass. But the turf does stand up to foot traffic better. The team is also learning that some sites are better candidates than others. "At the Cultural Center, there's a lot of activity, and desire lines formed in part of the planted area," says Conner, indicating that people were crossing tracks in unsafe places. "That's probably not a good candidate for greening." ●