

**Testimony to Planning Commissioners**  
**November 1 Public Hearing**  
**Sector Study (Draft version #4, August 31, 2018)**

***Introduction***

My name is Peter Bittner. I live in the Eastport section of Annapolis, at 5 President Point Drive, Unit 5A3.

I have followed with great interest the evolution of this Forest Drive-Eastport Corridor Study. I responded to both of the community surveys, attended the public discussions held by P&Z, reviewed all previous drafts, and listened to the discussions at the work sessions held by the Planning Commission.

I appreciate the significant effort that went into this study. It has valuable information and many good solutions. City staff and the commissioners have devoted considerable time to improving the product from earlier drafts.

***Comments***

Most of us are not land use planners or traffic engineers. Neither am I. My concerns about the study are based on what I believe are common sense observations regarding responsive and responsible governance. My view is that government is not responsible when it offers long term plans without considering how they will be funded. The study is not grounded in the reality of paying for the solutions offered. Other plans have followed the same course and sit on shelves.

1. The study ignores or fails to address the results of Community Survey #1. The survey asked, "What do you not like about the study area?". Respondents indicated, "Traffic when there was an accident" and "Traffic on a day-to-day basis." When asked, "What is the most important to focus on?", two of the top three items were transportation and environment.

What is it about this straightforward concern that the planners and consultants don't get? The study indicates that even with improvements there will still be failed intersections (level of service E or F). See tables on pp C-31/32. The study should call for investments in vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure and construction of same, before recommending any land use and zoning changes.

2. The 2009 Comprehensive Plan called for a number of infrastructure improvements. All the improvements required funding. Those on Forest Drive are the responsibility of the County.
  - a. Many of improvements suggested by the Sector Study are the same as those in the 9 year old Comp Plan. We have not come very far.
  - b. The study indicates that the State and County have not identified this sector as a priority area for future road improvements (p 31).
  - c. If the improvements were not made previously, what confidence can we have that they will be made now?
  - d. If the City could not provide funding previously, why can we expect it now?
  - e. A 2015 Forest Drive Corridor Analysis (p 3) states that under "Future Condition – Adequate Public Facilities Improvements... the improvements at the Forest Drive/Hillsmere/Bay Ridge Ave intersection will be provided by and assigned to an individual development..." To our knowledge no developer has been required to pay for improvements to that intersection. Why not?

3. The State, County and City have responsibilities in the study area. The very nature of these overlapping jurisdictional responsibilities suggests there should be a memorandum of understanding as to how to jointly address infrastructure improvements – identifying what are the priorities, what feasibility studies need to be done, what cost estimates are required and who/how is putting up the money. The implementation/action plan identifies a set of planning and financing items to be addressed in the near (yrs 1-3) and mid-term (yrs 4-6). This is not good enough. Some aspects of this planning should be incorporated into the Sector Study.
4. The pipeline of projects in various stages of development (Appendix A) totals 1,261 units. However, it is incomplete. Thus, the study underestimates the volume of traffic. The traffic shed should be expanded slightly to include another 670 units in areas near Parole and on Admiral Cochran Drive. New traffic models that include these projects should be run.
5. The Study (Appendices, p C-50) indicates that commuter destinations have changed substantially from 2000 to 2015. Over those years there was a 26.6% decline in the percentage of workers who both reside and work in the City. As of 2015 almost 80% of residents work outside the City and many are driving to locations further away from their homes in the City. There is no indication that this trend to commute outside of the City will change.

In brief, more people are driving and more are driving to locations outside the City because that is where the higher paying jobs are located. Taking public transit is not an option until there is reasonable service. Public transport requires substantial public investment as well as coordination with and funding from other jurisdictions. Realistic plans to improve public transit and increase its use should be a separate effort initiated by the City in the near term as the staff prepares the 2019 Comprehensive Plan.

6. The City's Finance Department should be an active participant in planning and executing the many actions needed to improve mobility. The implementation action plan does not cite the Finance Department as having any responsibility. It should.
7. The City's Budget Committee and Finance Director bear responsibility for requesting funds for infrastructure improvements. The City Council has an obligation to approve funds. Until there is a realistic plan, there is no basis to even solicit funding.

Conclusions. The study provides useful updated information and good solutions for the key themes, but it does not address the #1 issue raised by citizens. The study is not a real plan. It adds little substance to what was already known about the need for serious money to be invested in solving the corridor's near term and long term mobility (pedestrian, bicycle, vehicular and public transit) problems. The study has deficiencies and is not complete. This is not responsible governance.

Recommendation. The study should not be approved by the Planning Commission or City Council. It should be used as input to the 2019 Comprehensive Plan.

**TO THE COMMISSIONERS:** You will not be acting responsibly if you approve this plan

**RESIDENTIAL PIPELINE: Citizen Group's Projections as of October 25, 2018**

Based on P&Z Sep 28, 2018 Report

	Name	Type	# Units	Comments
<b>City Pipeline</b>				
1	Towne Courts	Mx	42	
2	Terrapin Station	R	6	
3	Bowman Hsing for Vets	R	2	additional units
4	Timothy Gardens	R	14	
5	141 West ST	Mx	24	
6	9 St Mary's	R	9	
7	285 West ST	R	18	
8	Parole Place	MX	158	
9	Ann Towns -Neal Farm	R	50	
10	Rocky Gorge	R	46	
11	SAYC	Mx	9	
12	Eastport Sail Loft	Mx	11	
13	Woodsback Marina	R	2	
14	Lofts@Eastport Lding	Mx	98	
15	Enclave on Spa	R	36	
16	Village Greens, Phase III	Mx	89	
17	Villages @ Prov Pt	Mx	285	Plus 48 health center suites
18	Primrose Hill	R	26	
19	Central Park	R	45	
20	Ches Grove	R	42	
21	Griscom Sq	R	12	
22	Thomas Woods	R	10	
23	Parkside Preserve	R	130	
24	Bay Village Asst Living	Mx	88	
25	51 Franklin	R	9	
26	HACA Eastport Terrace		TBD	85 units currently
27	HACA Harbour House		TBD	273 units currently
28	HACA Newtowne		TBD	
29	Watergate		TBD	300 apts currently; maybe doubled if redeveloped
<b>Subtotal: City</b>			<b>1261</b>	

<b>County Pipeline</b>				
1	Maris Apts: West St	R	293	Open and leasing
2	James Apts: Adm Cochran & Rt 2	R	236	Open and leasing
3	Admiral Sq TH: Adm Cochran & Rt 2	R	92	62 are completed
4	Cove TH: Adm Cochran & Rt 2	R	50	Under construction
<b>Subtotal: County</b>			<b>671</b>	

<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1932</b>
--------------	-------------

*Note : Mx is mixed use and R is residential*

**3.2.7** Ensure that the two opportunity areas in this sector help catalyze greater transit service in the City. The 2009 Plan states that they should be developed to promote a high demand for public transit on the corridor to encourage the effective provision of transit city-wide. In other words, the development of the opportunity area and its transit demand should have a positive spillover effect on the quality of City transit service. Development should demand service to such a degree that residents elsewhere in the corridor and City benefit by virtue of their proximity to the bus routes serving these two sites.

**3.2.8** Incentivize access changes to corridor frontage properties that have driveways that back onto the arterial or that lack access to a side or parallel street in order to reduce congestion from cars backing into traffic or waiting to make left hand turns.

**3.2.9** Attract and enhance services and businesses that serve the City and peninsula so that people do not need to travel out to the County as often.



**3.3 Mobility: Vehicular and Transit**

The primary issues under this theme include capacity analysis and managing congestion in cooperation with the County as well as making improvements to transit.

Figure Sixteen: Example from Issue/Possible Solutions Spreadsheet

MOBILITY - VEHICULAR AND TRANSIT	
ISSUES FROM STEP ONE	POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS FOR STEP TWO
<b>ROAD ADEQUACY AND CAPACITY</b>	Develop a traffic model to better understand and project City and peninsula traffic
Develop a more balanced urban planning-based evaluation method for assessing development traffic impacts	
Develop a better method to forecast city mobility, accessibility and road capacity	
Sector Plan traffic models should anticipate approved & planned developments	
Study models need to use better data with current traffic counts	Revise the current City traffic study procedures and traffic API requirements to include the new traffic model and to include multi-modal trips as well as non-vehicular mitigation strategies and performance measures
<b>POLICIES &amp; REGULATIONS</b>	
Emergencies - plan for peninsula evacuation & create more emergency routes	
Incidents - Prevent grid lock during traffic incidents, Need multi-jurisdictional incident policy/plan/ strategies	
Events - protect community mobility during city events downtown and in Eastport	
Promote greater state, county & city coordination of corridor improvement, management & beautification	
Need better tools to understand impacts of added traffic in the city & peninsula	
Need better tools to understand traffic benefits of low scale walkable mixed use neighborhoods	

Goal: Formalize inter-jurisdictional cooperation with the mission of having shared design guidelines, complete streets development, public transit improvements, and investments in new technology that helps improve road capacity.

Principal Solutions to Achieve Goal:

**3.3.1** Revise the current City traffic study procedures and traffic adequate public facilities requirements to include assessment of multi-modal trips and non-vehicular mitigation, as well as other items described in Appendix D. Coordinate with the County on procedures for County roads.

**3.3.2** Establish complete street standards for the City and require all future city street improvements to address all modes of travel in their improvements.

Supporting Solutions:

**3.3.3** Plan for low-scale transit-oriented infill along the corridor and at the two opportunity sites to better support greater transit use.

**3.3.4** Work with the County and the State to further improve the Fairfax Road/Chinquapin Round Road/Bywater Road segment.

**3.3.5** Support at the City-level use of new technologies and business models that reduce the number of daily trips city households need to make in private vehicles through ridesharing, driverless vehicles, etc.

**3.3.6** Envision the City as a series of Ped-shed-scaled neighborhoods and districts that measure about one mile across.

**3.3.7** Improve City bus service in the Forest Drive Corridor—strive for more frequent, inexpensive and efficient service.

**3.3.8** Improve City services with routing and span-of-service info at bus stops and improved bus boarding accessibility.

**3.3.9** Review the location of the well-used Robinwood bus stop pair to address safety issues. Either relocate it to allow pedestrians to cross Forest Drive at the planned traffic signal nearby or add a mid-block pedestrian crossing to improve visibility and warnings.

3.3.10 Improve other local street grids to create network redundancy and route choices. \$

3.3.11 Evaluate areas of speeding and add traffic calming measures on local streets where cut through traffic moves too fast. \$

3.3.12 Install smart traffic signals (intelligent transportation systems) on City streets that are capable of better managing congestion generally as well as during events and emergencies and can coordinate with County and State signals that now provide coordinated management on the corridor. \$

3.3.13 Expand the new BMC refined model to create a refined city-wide traffic model to better understand and project City traffic at the network level.

3.3.14 Implement the street network connections planned for in the Comprehensive Plan for the creation of network redundancy and better access management on the main corridor. \$

3.3.15 Work with the State and County to establish a commuter transit bus line that can tie to existing and future regional routes. Plan for stops at the two opportunity sites and a supporting park and ride lot and/or kiss and ride at the eastern end of the corridor. \$

3.3.16 Improve local public transit in the Eastport area to better serve tourists and event traffic.

3.3.17 Work with the State and County to establish an intermodal transit center near the City line adjacent to Parole that can tie into other regional services. \$

3.3.18 Reconnect existing closed streets, gaps and cul-de-sacs where possible to allow for bike and pedestrian travel. \$

## MOBILITY: BIKE AND PEDESTRIAN



### 3.4 Mobility: Bike and Pedestrian

The primary issues under this theme include encouraging the kind of development that will promote more pedestrian and bicycling options.

Goal: Promote a shift from auto-oriented development to multimodal development by investing in strategic upgrades to the pedestrian and bicycle networks.

#### Principal Solutions to Achieve Goal:

3.4.1 The City should make investments in other modes of transportation and make funding for bike and pedestrian infrastructure improvements a higher priority.

3.4.2 Prioritize improvement at the intersections and gaps in the network located within a quarter mile of major destinations such as schools, parks and neighborhood shopping areas, bus stops, the recreation center, and the library.

3.4.3 Provide safe walking routes to schools and encourage private schools to provide bus services, to reduce the education rush hour (routes should be off Forest Drive where practicable).

#### Supporting Solutions:

3.4.4 Fill in missing sidewalk connections and gaps along both sides of Forest Drive where applicable (near Annapolis Middle School and dense retail areas). ✓

3.4.5 Work with the County to incorporate a continuous East/West bike route along the corridor as a part of the coordinated City/County ultimate complete street planning. At a minimum, plan for a continuous multipurpose path on the corridor. Extend the route from Route 2 to Edgewood Road in the East. ✓

3.4.5 Reconnect existing closed streets and cul-de-sacs to allow for bike and pedestrian travel at a minimum. Where possible, restore full traffic use. Louis Street is one example of a needed reconnection. ✓