



HANOVER STREET CORRIDOR STUDY
includes the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Bridge



Community Advisory Panel (CAP) Meeting #2
Wednesday, July 20, 2016 – 10:00 AM to 12:00 PM

MEETING NOTES

MEETING ATTENDEES

Name	Organization
Rupert Denney	Baltimore Industrial Group
Lavinia Costley	Lakeland
Dave Urbanek	Riverside
Jim Flannery	Brightside Associates
Jill Johnson	MedStar Harbor Hospital
Lonnie Katzen	Hanover Bridge LLC (Hanover Street Shopping Center)
Kimi Darrell	Sagamore Development
Tyrese Jones	Cherry Hill Coalition
Valorie LaCour	Baltimore City Department of Transportation – Planning Division
Betty Smoot	Baltimore City Department of Transportation – Planning Division
Linda Taylor-Newton	Baltimore City Department of Transportation – Planning Division
Janie Tiedeman	AECOM
Josh Crunkleton	AECOM
Nick Corda	AECOM
Christine Graziano	AECOM
Odessa Phillip	Assedo Consulting
Gayle Watkins	Assedo Consulting

MEETING PURPOSE

The purpose of the meeting was to present existing conditions data and the economic market analysis of the Hanover Street Corridor Study to the Community Advisory Panel (CAP).

DISCUSSION

Odessa Phillip, Community Outreach Manager for the project, began the meeting by welcoming attendees to the meeting and asked each person at the table to give their name and the community group that they represented.

Following initial introductions, Odessa explained that the project team intends to post all CAP and Interagency Advisory Group (IAG) meeting minutes to the project website showing the name of the CAP member and their organization. Odessa asked if everyone would be comfortable with the information being shared as long as no phone numbers or email addresses would be included on the website.

Janie Tiedeman, Project Manager for the Study Team, began the PowerPoint presentation by giving an overview of the study area. She explained that the existing conditions tech memo is the first deliverable for the Hanover Street Corridor Study and will be included as part of the final report for the study. Janie

mentioned that the project team would be sharing the information in the presentation with the general public at the September 15, 2016 public meeting. Janie stated that the next phase of the project will include the analysis of the existing transportation network.

BRIDGE/STRUCTURES DISCUSSION

Nick Corda, Lead Bridge Engineer for the Study Team, provided information about the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Bridge. He indicated that there are actually five bridges in the corridor – the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Bridge, as well as two where Hanover Street crosses the CSX Railroad tracks (owned by Baltimore City) and the ramp structures onto and from northbound and southbound I-95 (owned by MDTA).

Nick explained that the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Bridge is a historical structure, built in 1916 and rehabilitated in 1970 and 1992, and has a Rall style moveable span which is a unique operating system for the drawbridge. There are only two or three bridges like this in the country. Last year, the bridge was only opened two times for recreational use. It was partially opened six times for maintenance purposes as well. This fact is important to the team as we assess the long-term question of whether being able to open the bridge is a design requirement.

A review of the historical records for the bridge show that the bridge has a concrete and timber pile design and in the middle spans, there are sections which look like arches but are in fact structural steel trusses that are encased in concrete in the shape of an arch.

There are potential concerns about the steel rivets which are beneath the concrete encasement because they have not been individually evaluated. Steel riveted connections are known to have specific structural life.

Nick explained one recommendation from this study could be in-depth structural testing in a future stage of project development, similar to what has been done on other bridges in the City.

Rupert Denney asked if the previously estimated \$150 million bridge replacement cost estimate assumes people would still be able to cross the bridge. He also asked if the previously estimated \$20 million bridge rehabilitation cost includes replacing the timber piles. He indicated that the Port has facilities that are on timber piles if the team would like to discuss potential issues. Nick indicated that any bridge replacement would attempt to ensure that people could travel during the construction period and that the bridge rehabilitation costs previously estimated only include superficial rehabilitation to the bridge deck, etc. and not more in-depth structural work.

Lonnie Katzen asked who is going to fund the bridge. He also commented that crossing the bridge should remain a key point, and that closing the bridge would be detrimental to the corridor. Janie answered that no funding is currently in-place and that part of the study will be to identify potential funding mechanisms.

Dave Urbanek expressed confusion about the purpose of the current project and asked when a more detailed bridge inspection is going to occur. Nick explained that inspections are completed bi-annually along with specialty inspections for the drawbridge but these do not involve in-depth assessments on the condition of subsurface bridge components (piers, structural steel, etc.). A potential recommendation from this study may be to conduct in-depth bridge inspections to guide the rehabilitation process.

Rupert mentioned that current bus routes do not connect the Cherry Hill Community. He asked how much of the estimated cost will be used to accommodate bicycles and how adding bike lanes could affect the ultimate cost of the bridge. He also asked if it's federally mandated to add bike lanes to bridge projects and indicated that since he does not currently see cyclists on the bridge, it may not be worth the added expense to place bike lanes on the bridge in the future.

Janie explained that it is important for the team to evaluate all of the potential transportation uses in the project corridor. She said that linking communities that have low access to vehicles to job opportunities downtown and throughout the city is important and that we don't want to cut these households off from future opportunities.

Nick explained that the cost to add bike lanes in the context of rebuilding or rehabilitating (if it does not require additional widening of the bridge) is not a significant cost.

Valorie LaCour, BCDOT Planning Division Chief, clarified the purpose of the study to provide multimodal access and highlighted the challenges for people trying to access the city's center without a car.

Betty Smoot, BCDOT Lead Transportation Planner for the project, clarified that rebuilding and rehabilitation each have different pros and cons and that the project team will be balancing all of these interests to make recommendations for the corridor.

Dave asked hypothetically, if the recommendation was to retain the bridge, and then a bridge inspection is done that determines the bridge cannot be retained, what would be done at that point. Additionally, Lonnie asked how the bridge could be demolished if it is a historical site already and if the historic look of the bridge would be a consideration if a new bridge was built. Janie stated that historic bridges can be demolished and rebuilt, after a significant regulatory and public involvement process is conducted, if they are deemed unsafe or unable to support traffic requirements. The aesthetics of any new bridge would be a significant consideration.

EXISTING CONDITIONS DISCUSSION

Josh Crunkleton, Project Engineer for the Study Team, discussed the roadway characteristics and existing conditions of the Hanover Street corridor. He highlighted the pedestrian and bicycle facilities, truck route information, transit routes and facilities, traffic data collection, and a summary of crash data in the project corridor.

ECONOMIC MARKET ANALYSIS DISCUSSION

Christine Graziano, Lead Economist for the Study Team, presented data about the economic market analysis for the study area. She indicated that the study gathered data from a number of sources including: review of data from area master plans and interviews with property and business owners and community leaders. One of the findings is that the study area consists of young working-aged adults, which is very encouraging. Generally, large numbers of young people in an area indicate a large child population. The fact that there are working aged-people can lead to potential economic growth.

The area also shows a large educational divide, which coupled with the economic divide, creates challenges for the region. The general conclusion is that connecting job training and employers with residents is a key goal.

Transit connections are very challenging between residential areas and the Fairfield Industrial Area, from residences to downtown, and even within the communities. During the interview process, frustration was expressed about the Charm City Circulator not picking up residents in Cherry Hill despite the fleet being housed in Cherry Hill. Food deserts are located in the southern portion of the study area and there are not incentives to create new supermarkets due to the lack of demand and the existence of two supermarkets north of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Bridge, highlighting the need for corridor connectivity.

ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION

Rupert explained that the industrial sector is most concerned by the potential for a do-nothing or delayed approach. The fear is that the longer the delay, the greater the risk that the bridge would deteriorate to the point that weight restrictions would need to be placed on the structure. He further elaborated that the trucking industry already cuts through many local neighborhoods because of tolls in the area. Any inability to cross the bridge could potentially have a severe economic impact on the corridor.

Rupert also expressed that it is not relevant to maintain the reversible lanes on the bridge since they appear to be underutilized. Removing a lane to add bike lanes would be fine in his opinion if a jersey barrier is installed to increase safety and separate vehicular traffic from bicycle traffic. He mentioned that there are currently many fuel deliveries during overnight hours and wondered what the peak hour was for truck volumes. He reminded the team that the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Bridge is an emergency route off of I-95 and that the Coast Guard and other enforcement/safety personnel rely on it when responding to emergencies and potential crisis situations/terrorism threats.

Janie provided an overview of the schedule and reiterated that the final deliverable for the project will be a master plan document for the corridor that can be used to guide the recommendation and advance the project.

Odessa closed the meeting and thanked everyone for coming. She also encouraged CAP members to email her with any thoughts, concerns or questions (odessa.phillip@baltimorecity.gov).

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
Email Public Meeting invitation to the CAP	Odessa/Betty	