



Citizens Advisory Council

2012 ANNUAL REPORT



TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I Red Line Citizens’ Advisory Council3**
- II Executive Summary4**
- III Red Line Planning Update8**
- Appendix A CAC Meetings/Dates/Locations.....10**
- Appendix B Planning Retreat11**
- Appendix C Financial Report.....14**
- Appendix D Mission of Red Line CAC17**
- Appendix E Analysis of Red Line Criteria19**
- Appendix F MTA Red Line Planning Process.....23**
- Appendix G Community Responses27**

For detailed information including future meeting of the Red Line Citizens’ Advisory Council (CAC), visit the Red Line CAC web page at: <http://www.baltimoreddline.com/project-information/citizens-advisory-council>

I 2012 RED LINE CITIZENS' ADVISORY COUNCIL



The Maryland General Assembly created the Red Line Citizens' Advisory Council (CAC) 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 NAACP

Ms. Angela Bethea-Spearman
Co-Chair
President, Uplands Community Assoc.
Chair, S. W. Development. Committee

Mr. Edward Cohen
Transit Riders Action Council of Metropolitan
Baltimore

Ms. Margie Carvella
Canton Resident

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. Michael Dickson
Greater West Hills Community Association

Mr. Jason Filippou
Executive Director,
Greektown Community Development Corporation

Mr. Emery Hines
Senior Transportation Officer
Baltimore County Department of Public Works

Mr. Jamie Kendrick
Deputy Director
Baltimore City Transportation Dept.

Ms. Brooke Lierman, Esq.
Secretary
Fells Point Residents Assoc.

Mr. George Moniodis
Greektown Development Corp.

Mr. Charles Sydnor, III, Esq.
Baltimore County Resident

Ms. Annie Williams
President, Harlem Park Neighborhood Council, Inc.

The enabling legislation indicated above, specified that the Council should have 15 members. When the Council filed its 2011 Report, Council membership included only 13 members. Since then, several new individuals have been appointed and the Council membership stands at the required 15 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.

II EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The members of the Red 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).

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.

The CAC is grateful for the support provided by the Maryland Transit Administration in the conduct of meetings and activities over the past year. The assistance of Carmen Morosan, Baltimore City Department of Planning, has been essential in the organization of the Report and validation of data. The CAC also wishes to recognize the Mayor of Baltimore and the City Department of Transportation’s Red Line Coordinator, Danyell Diggs, for their ongoing support for the Red Line.

During the past year, the CAC met in alternate months in locations along the proposed Red Line alignment. Meeting dates, location and topics of discussions for these meetings can be found in Appendix A. The associated minutes for each meeting can be found on the Maryland Transit Administration’s (MTA) website, mta.maryland.gov/transit-projects. However, the primary purpose of these meetings was to receive and review information, via presentations, and/or print media regarding the planning for the proposed “Red Line project, making sure it had in place implementation plans that will:

1. Provide 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. Consider a full range of construction alternatives, including an underground rail option.
3. Ensure 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
4. Enhance communication of information to communities regarding the planning, engineering, and construction process.

II EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (Contd.)

To improve efficiencies and the quality of our meetings, the CAC:

- Announced at the September 8, 2011 meeting, that Council meeting agendas would no longer allow for public comments. The audience was provided with a list of elected officials and encouraged to submit any comments and concerns directly to their elected representatives. Due to public concern and interests in information being presented, the CAC modified this position at our January 12, 2012, allowing individuals in the audience to ask questions about any MTA presentations provided during the meeting.
- Participated in a planning retreat that was held on September 17, 2011 and October 13, 2011. The retreat was facilitated by a consulting firm, Gray and Associates, with input from MTA Administrator Ralign Wells, and Senator Verna Jones Rodwell. The retreat focused on roles and responsibilities, team building skills, and meeting processes, including public comments.

One of the tangible outcomes of the retreat was the creation of Subcommittees that are now meeting on the second Thursday in the interim months when the Council does not hold public meetings. The Subcommittees purpose was to prepare the agenda and content for future meetings as well as gather additional information in line with our Mission Statement. The Subcommittee meeting agendas and minutes, as well as any reports are attached. The Subcommittees are organized as follows:

- Annual Report Subcommittee:
Christopher Costello, Chair
Edward Cohen
Gary Cole
Sandra Conner
Michael Dickson
- Construction and Operation Impacts and Mitigation Subcommittee:
Jamie Kendrick, Chair
Brooke Lierman, Co-chair
Edward Cohen
Christopher Costello
Dr. Rodney Orange
- Economic Empowerment Subcommittee:
Sandra Conner, Chair
Emery Hines, Co-Chair
Gary Cole
Michael Dickson
Annie Williams
- Neighborhood and Community Development Subcommittee:
George Moniodis, Chair
Angela Bethea-Spearman
Margie Carvella
Jason Filippou
Charles Sydnor

The planning retreat agenda can be found in Appendix B of this document.

II EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (Contd.)

CAC Meetings and Other Highlights

The CAC requested MTA to provide the Council monthly reports itemizing expenditures related to the planning for the Red Line, including minority business enterprise (MBE) sub-consultant firms and their billings to date. MTA began fulfilling this request at the CAC November 10, 2011 meeting. The CAC review of these reports reveals MTA is striving to meet a satisfactory level of contracts and funds going to disadvantage contractors (MBE). The CAC will continue to monitor this report.

The CAC in addition to its meeting bi-monthly meeting agenda, provided MTA with suggestions and recommendations on locations, as well as content for several community public forums and open houses.

One of the reason the CAC formed subcommittees was to have resources in place to address its mission.

The **Construction and Operation Impacts and Mitigation** subcommittee has responsibility for addressing the impact of building and construction on the neighborhoods through with the Red Line will eventually pass. It is tasked with collecting and disseminating information about resources for those impacted by the construction, as well as working with the community to come up with creative ways to make construction more manageable for neighborhoods.

The **Economic Empowerment** subcommittee is responsible for 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. This subcommittee consistently met, inviting guest speakers from contractors assigned to the project, including MTA to discuss potential hiring needs and requirements, opportunities for internships, and the development of a pipeline of candidates to be ready to fill job opportunities for the Red Line project. It not only focused on creating jobs, but also entrepreneurial opportunities for persons on the Red Line footprint. The Economic Empowerment subcommittee also works in conjunction with the Baltimore City Red Line Community Compact Empowerment committee.

The **Neighborhood and Community Development** subcommittee is responsible for ensuring communication of information to communities regarding the planning, engineering, and construction process is meaningful and the public, in particular those who are in the Red Line footprint has an opportunity to provide input. This committee has been instrumental in some of the guidelines for public comments that we have in place at the CAC meetings, as well as making sure there are various opportunities for community involvement to resolve plans that could have an adverse impact on community safety, as well as overall development.

II EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (Contd.)

Attendance at CAC meetings, including subcommittee meetings and other public forums are key to overall success of the CAC ability to fulfill its mission. The below chart summarizes the FY 2011-2012 attendance of the CAC members and the public.

CAC MEMBERS - MEETING ATTENDANCE

NAME	2011 SEPT.	2011 NOV.	2012 JAN.	2012 MAR.	2012 MAY	2012 JULY	TOTAL
Dr. Rodney Orange ¹	No	Yes	Yes	Yes/No*	Yes/Yes*	Yes	5/6 – 1/2*
Angela Bethea-Spearman ²	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes/Yes*	Yes/Yes*	Yes	6/6 – 2/2*
Margie Carvella	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes/No*	No/Yes*	No	5/6 – 1/2*
Edward Cohen	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes/Yes*	Yes/Yes*	Yes	6/6 – 2/2*
Gary Cole	No	Yes	Yes	No/Yes*	Yes/No*	Yes	5/6 – 1/2*
Sandra Conner	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes/Yes*	Yes/Yes*	No	5/6 – 2/2*
Christopher Costello	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes/No*	Yes/Yes*	Yes	6/6 – 1/2*
Michael Dickson		Yes	Yes	Yes/Yes*	Yes/Yes*	Yes	5/5 – 1/2
Emory Hines	Yes	Yes	No	Yes/Yes*	Yes/Yes*	Yes	5/6 – 2/2*
Brooke Lierman			Yes	No/No*	Yes/No*	Yes	3/4 – 0/2*
Jamie Kendrick	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes/No*	Yes/No*	Yes	6/6 – 0/2*
George Moniodis	No	No	Yes	Yes/No*	No/No*	Yes	3/6 – 0/2*
Lois Perschetz / Jason Filippou	Yes	Yes	Yes	No/No*	No	Yes	3/5 – 1/1
Charles Sydnor, III	Yes	Yes	Yes	No/No*	Yes/Yes*	Yes	5/6 – 1/2*
Annie Williams	Yes	Yes	No	No/No*	Yes/No*	No	3/6 – 0/2*
QUORUM	10/14	13/14	13/15	11/15	12/15	11/15	

Maximum attendance by members is expected. Members missing three regular meetings during a twelve-month period shall be automatically reviewed by the CAC.

*Subcommittee meeting

MEETING ATTENDANCE – GENERAL PUBLIC

2011		2012				TOTAL
SEPT.	NOV.	JAN.	MAR.	MAY	JULY	
16	17	12	14	14	25	98

¹ Co-Chair

² Co-Chair

III RED LINE PLANNING UPDATE

The proposed Red Line is an 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

III RED LINE PLANNING UPDATE (Contd.)

RED LINE KEY FACTS

Mode	Light Rail	
Overall Length	14.1 miles	
	Surface	8.7 miles
	Tunnel	4.7 miles (Cooks Lane & Downtown)
	Aerial	0.7 miles (over I-695 and ramps; Woodlawn Drive; and between Highlandtown/Greektown & Bayview Campus Station)
Stations	19	
	Surface	14
	Underground	5
Capital Cost	\$2.2 Billion (\$YOE)	
Average Daily Ridership in 2030	50,000	
FTA Cost-Effectiveness Rating	\$22.77	
Vehicles	28 LRT vehicles	
Maintenance Facility	At Calverton Road bounded by Franklinton Road, Franklin Street, and Amtrak	
One-Way Travel Time	Woodlawn to Bayview – 45 min.	
Frequency of Service (Peak/Off Peak)	7 minutes / 10 minutes	

Appendix A – G appear on the following pages

This document contains several appendix, A = the CAC Meetings/Agenda/Locations; B = The CAC Planning Retreat; C = The Financial Report; D = Mission of the Red Line CAC; E = Analysis of Red Line Criteria; F = MTA Red Line Planning Process; and G = Community Comments, that the CAC uses as references to guide its fulfillment of HB 1309/SB873, as information for first time readers of the Red Line CAC Annual Report. These documents will be updated as the project progresses.

Appendix A - CAC MEETINGS, DATES AND LOCATIONS

<p>September 8, 2011 <i>Christ the King Church, Woodlawn</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Adoption of Annual Report 2. Format for Special Meetings for Edmondson Ave. Residents 3. What Happens During Preliminary Engineering Phase 4. SAAC Proposed Modifications to Locally Preferred Alternative 5. Project Expenditures to Date <p>November 10, 2011 <i>Holy Rosary Church</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Subcommittee Reports: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neighborhood & Community Development • Economic Development • Construction Impacts & Mitigation • Annual Report 2. Federal Designation as Expedited Project 3. Report on Special Meetings for Edmondson Ave. Residents 4. Report on Boston Street Open House 5. Report from Rail-Volution <p>January 12, 2012 <i>Perkins Square Baptist Church</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Subcommittee Reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neighborhood and Community Development • Economic Empowerment • Construction and Operation Impact and Mitigation 2. MTA Reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding Status • Design Status • Meetings for I-70 Communities • Station Area Advisory Committee Progress 	<p>March 8, 2012 <i>UMB Bio-Park Life Sciences Ctr.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Subcommittee Reports: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neighborhood & Community Development • Economic Development • Construction Impacts & Mitigation 2. MTA Reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding Status • Station Area Advisory Committee Updates • I-70 Public Meeting Summary <p>May 12, 2012 <i>Holy Rosary Church</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Subcommittee Reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neighborhood and Community Development • Economic Empowerment • Construction and Operation Impacts and Mitigation 2. MTA Reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment Opportunities • Funding Status – Federal and State • Station Area Advisory Committee Updates • I-70 Public Meeting Summary <p>July 12, 2012 <i>St. William of York</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Subcommittee Reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Report 2. MTA Reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Screening Updated Project Video • Project Discussion • Funding Status - Federal and State • Summary of Open Houses
---	--

Appendix B – PLANNING RETREAT

The agenda for this strategic planning effort was as follows:

- Opening - Henry Kay / MTA
 - Purpose of the retreat
 - Hopes for the Day
 - Introduction of Facilitators
- Speakers/Dialogue: State Representatives and Secretary
 - Hopes for Retreat
 - Expectations of CAC Work
 - Acknowledgement of CAC Member Contributions
- Setting the Stage (Team Building Exercise)
 - CAC Introductions
 - What contribution each Council Member can make (skills and insights they bring)
 - Accomplishments of Council
 - Hopes for impact of their work for the next year
- Purpose and Mission SB 873
 - Discuss Original Purpose
 - Review and obtain alignment regarding Mission
 - Identify what elements of their charter are priorities and why for 2011-2012
- Purpose and Mission SB 873 - Continued
 - CAC Strategy and strategic plan that work for all persons along the redline
 - Identify key areas of focus for different portions of the Red Line Corridor and why they are important
 - Obtain commitment for the priorities for the net fiscal year
- CAC Processes for Efficiency
 - Meeting Processes
 - Public Comments (continue, discontinue, approach)
 - Security (Policing is needed for all CAC meetings)
 - Agendas
 - Other areas to TBA
 - Budget Related Expenditures
 - Pre-Meeting Food reimbursement

Following the initial retreat, the facilitator summarized the activities and decisions taken as follows:

I Overview

This is a summary of key points from the 09/17/2011 CAC Retreat's opening session with the MTA Administrator Ralign Wells and Senator Verna Jones-Rodwell. It includes a list of key themes from the group discussions and break-out sessions. This summary also includes, as a part of the Next Steps Section, the agenda for part two of the CAC Retreat on October 13, 2011. A complete report will be provided after the conclusion of the second session.

II Key Points

Opening Conversation with MTA Administrator Ralign Wells and Senator Verna Jones Rodwell

MTA Administrator Ralign Wells' Expectations for the CAC

- Act as a conduit between MTA and the community on all aspects of the project
- Advise MTA and the community - examining the impact, constraints or limitations of the project
- Define how you want information to flow from MTA to the Council to support your roles

MTA Administrator clarification of Henry Kay's CEO Special Projects Role

- CEO New Starts Projects – CAC's supports Red Line project success
- Focus on budget
- Particular concerns for Federal and State Funding
- Provide CAC with MTA updates and respond to information requests from CAC

Appendix B – PLANNING RETREAT (Contd.)

Senator Jones-Rodwell - Expectations for the CAC

Counsel Advisement

- Advise on changes vs. the entire plan – major policy issues
- Keep your eyes on the big picture, stay involved with all phases of the project
- Identify areas to examine and re-examine
- Follow the guidelines of the legislation

Community Engagement

- Get information from community and report information to community
- Be accountable to the community
- Be creative in obtaining information from the community outside of meetings e.g. surveying community organizations

III Council Processes

- Consider bringing CAC's together to do some capacity building
- Decide on a decision making process
- Be a representative forum with an active interest in the planning and construction of the Red Line
- Outline guiding principles
- Look at your structure and processes
- CAC appears to be in the storming phase of the natural progression of the formation of groups (forming, storming, norming, transforming)

IV Themes for Personal Why's for Being on CAC

- Being committed to protect the interest of people and communities
- Identify opportunities to connect people with jobs
- Desire for a world class transportation system
- Provide information for informed decisions
- Utilize knowledge of transportation to support social and economic justice
- Drive economic development
- Take an active role for the communities where we live or have grown up
- Ensure the transportation mistakes of the past are not repeated with the Red Line

V Group Discussion Themes

- Many members of the group experience frustration when time is spent going over items from the past and not moving forward with new items
- Group not completely aligned or clear about the execution of the "advising" role
- Identified key process areas for CAC efficiency
- Mission work
- Public comment
- Gathering Information from the public
- Meeting agenda process
- Identify guiding principles for CAC efficiency
- Decision making
- A way to "agree to disagree" and come to closure on discussion items
- Communication
- How to obtain opinions, information and questions from the public
- Time for inter-Council communications about mission work
- Examine ways to be more strategic
- Diverse perspectives about the benefits and role of public comment in CAC meetings

Appendix B – PLANNING RETREAT (Contd.)

VI Next Steps

Opening Retreat Segment

- Requested a more detailed update about federal and state funding
- Organization chart related to the Secretary and MTA Red Line
- Justin Hayes: Senator Mikulski update on Surface Transit Bill in six months

Break-Out Groups

- Sub committees to address mission
- Identify subcommittee leader and members
- Gathering information from the public
- Meeting/agenda process
- Finalize the draft process

Reconvene CAC Retreat October 13, 2011 (complete initial retreat open agenda items)

- Alignment of CAC roles with the mission
- Identify process to determine core goals
- Identify guiding principles for efficiency
- Finalize leadership and members for the three sub committees
- Economic Empowerment – Jobs, MBE, Workforce Development
- Construction and Operating Impact/Mitigation – Property Issues/Parking
- Neighborhood and Community Development
- Members of the “Gathering Information From the Public” group define next steps
- Members of the “Meeting/Agenda Process” group define next steps

Appendix C - FINANCIAL REPORT

Maryland Transit Administration – Line 41

DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION PROGRAM

PROJECT: Baltimore Red Line

DESCRIPTION: Construct a 14-mile light rail line between Woodlawn area in western Baltimore County and Bayview Medical Center located within Baltimore City.

JUSTIFICATION: The Red Line will improve transit mobility in an east-west corridor of the Baltimore region. This project is intended to address traffic congestion, provide better connectivity to existing transit service, support new and future transit-oriented economic development and revitalization efforts and address regional air quality issues. The Red Line will connect to MARC, Light Rail and Metro Subway.



SMART GROWTH STATUS: Project Not Location Specific Not Subject to PFA Law

Project Inside PFA Grandfathered
 Project Outside PFA Exception Will Be Required
 PFA Status Yet to Be Determined Exception Granted

ASSOCIATED IMPROVEMENTS:
MARC West Baltimore Station Parking Expansion (ARRA) - Line 11

STATUS: Preliminary engineering and preparation of a Final Environmental Impact Statement are underway. Subject to federal approval, Final Design is scheduled to begin in the budget year.

SIGNIFICANT CHANGE FROM FY 2012 - 17 CTP: Cost decreased \$29.4 million due to no longer available federal funding previously programmed.

USAGE: Average daily ridership in 2030 is estimated to be 57,000.

POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE:		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FEDERAL		<input type="checkbox"/> GENERAL		<input type="checkbox"/> OTHER		
PHASE	TOTAL				PROJECTED CASH REQUIREMENTS FOR PLANNING PURPOSES ONLY				SIX YEAR TOTAL	BALANCE TO COMPLETE
	ESTIMATED COST (\$000)	EXPEND THRU 2012	CURRENT YEAR 2013	BUDGET YEAR 2014	2015	2016	2017	2018		
Planning	60,799	60,799	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engineering	143,600	44,700	58,420	40,480	0	0	0	0	0	98,900
Right-of-way	10,000	0	10,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	10,000
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	214,399	105,499	68,420	40,480	0	0	0	0	0	108,900
Federal-Aid	68,583	21,783	18,880	27,920	0	0	0	0	0	46,800

0862

Appendix C - FINANCIAL REPORT (Contd.)

**BALTIMORE RED LINE
MTA CONTRACT 1264B - PROGRAM MANAGEMENT CONSULTANT SERVICES
RED LINE PMC - FY12/FY13 ANNUAL WORK PLAN**

expended thru 9/28/2012

Type of Firm	FIRM NAME	Budget	Total to Date	% Labor Dollars Spent
Prime	Jacobs	\$ 4,705,818	\$ 2,932,296	62.3%
Prime	STV	\$ 4,214,830	\$ 2,702,177	64.1%
DBE	Cho, Benn, Holback	\$ 205,436	\$ 58,722	28.6%
DBE	DACCO Sci, Inc.	\$ 174,779	\$ 97,798	56.0%
DBE	Diversified Engineering and Inspection	\$ 176,295	\$ 81,168	46.0%
DBE	Diversified Property Services	\$ 398,808	\$ 196,335	49.2%
DBE	Envision Consultants	\$ 406,031	\$ 232,794	57.3%
DBE	Findling	\$ 164,900	\$ -	0.0%
DBE	Floura Teeter Landscape Architects	\$ 122,816	\$ 16,786	13.7%
DBE	Keville Enterprises	\$ 272,175	\$ 120,843	44.4%
DBE	Phoenix Engineering	\$ 634,620	\$ 307,842	48.5%
DBE	Prime Engineering	\$ 404,394	\$ 188,139	46.5%
DBE	RJM Engineering	\$ 512,685	\$ 139,279	27.2%
DBE	Rosborough Communications	\$ 1,070,734	\$ 928,342	86.7%
DBE	Straughan Environmental Services	\$ 780,508	\$ 296,485	38.0%
DBE	Tuhin Basu	\$ 124,918	\$ -	0.0%
Non-DBE	BBP & Associates	\$ 169,260	\$ 38,545	22.8%
Non-DBE	Gannett Fleming, Inc.	\$ 3,632,729	\$ 1,932,143	53.2%
Non-DBE	Gardiner & Theobald	\$ 195,124	\$ 111,510	57.2%
Non-DBE	Whitman Requardt & Associates	\$ 3,236,874	\$ 1,644,081	50.8%
Non-DBE	Wallace Montgomery	\$ 1,604,169	\$ 812,685	50.7%
Prime	Direct Expenses	\$ 1,505,812	\$ 943,606	62.7%
DBE	Direct Expenses	\$ 97,262	\$ 69,109	71.1%
Non-DBE	Direct Expenses	\$ 54,039	\$ 43,781	81.0%
TOTAL		24,865,014	13,894,466	55.9%
Prime Firm Total (Labor + Directs)		\$ 10,426,460	\$ 6,578,080	63%
DBE Firm Total (Labor + Directs)		\$ 5,546,360	\$ 2,733,642	49%
Non-DBE Firm Total (Labor + Directs)		\$ 8,892,194	\$ 4,582,745	52%
TOTAL		\$ 24,865,014	\$ 13,894,466	55.9%

DBE Participation	
Total DBE Invoiced*	\$ 2,733,642
Current Period %	N/A
DBE Participation to Date	19.67%

*Includes Labor and Direct Expenses

Appendix C - FINANCIAL REPORT (Contd.)



DBE Report - Total Contract (FY11-FY13)

RLGEC Task Order No. 1 Value –	\$	8,278,860
RLGEC Task Order No. 2 Value –	\$	31,836,778
RLGEC Task Order No. 3 Value –	\$	37,298,671
	\$	<u>77,414,310</u>
 Contractual Goal (25%) =	\$	19,353,577

	Funds Allocated	Billed to Date
AB Consultants	\$425,011	\$82,805
Chesapeake Environmental	\$647,492	\$412,497
Clark Transportation	\$0	\$0
Coastal Resources	\$324,711	\$211,588
E2CR	\$5,763,299	\$3,609,615
EAC/A	\$576,378	\$291,054
Gallop	\$161,372	\$120,843
Geotrack	\$11,815	\$11,815
GL Communications	\$1,297,619	\$750,464
Intellect	\$0	\$0
J.A. Rice	\$686,369	\$576,983
KGP Design Studio	\$911,890	\$576,077
Mahan Rykiel	\$292,150	\$167,132
MIMAR Architects	\$903,954	\$547,304
Remline	\$1,063,950	\$683,773
Sabra, Wang	\$2,496,265	\$1,296,064
Sidm Associates	\$2,171,680	\$735,766
Virginkar & Associates	\$0	\$0
Yu & Associates	\$265,379	\$149,839
TOTAL	\$17,999,334	\$10,223,618

Total RLGEC thru 9/28 =	\$	50,283,111
Total RLGEC DBE thru 9/28 =	\$	10,223,618
Current DBE participation for Task 1,2&3 thru 9/28 =		20.3%

Appendix D - MISSION OF RED LINE CITIZENS ADVISORY COUNCIL

The Red Line 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; and 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 15 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.

Based on the current authorized 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.

Appendix D - MISSION OF RED LINE CAC (Contd.)

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 Council 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.

CAC efforts on behalf of the citizens and the legislature are separate and independent from the Maryland Transit Administration's Red Line 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 first hand about issues and concerns of local citizens regarding the Red Line Project.

Appendix E - 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	21	*	**	***

* 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 so 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.*

5.2.0 Mission No. 2 - Ensure that the Red Line project takes into consideration 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	<i>Review DEIS alternatives</i>			N. A	N. A	N. A	N. A
2	<i>Review TRAC alternative + Fells Point alternative</i>			N. A	N. A	N. A	N. A
3	<i>Minimum Operable Segments</i>			N. A	N. A	N. A	N. A

Appendix E - ANALYSIS OF THE RED LINE CRITERIA (Contd.)

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)
18,410	21,900	3.7	30%	45	14,148	*	**	N. A	18,170

* 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)
75,000	*	**	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.

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> • MTA should consult the public on major decision with regard to the study	MTA will provide documentation
2	<i>Representativeness</i> • The public participants should comprise a broadly representative sample of the population of the affected communities • Community planning participation	MTA will provide documentation
3	<i>Transparency</i> • 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> • The number of stakeholders (individuals, groups, organizations) involved • Participation by local academic institutions and professional service providers in design and development	MTA will provide documentation

Appendix E - ANALYSIS OF THE RED LINE CRITERIA (Contd.)

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				

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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 by the CAC.

Appendix E - ANALYSIS OF THE RED LINE CRITERIA (Contd.)

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	October 3, 2008
90 day comment period	Oct. 2008 to Jan. 2009
Public Hearings	November 2008
Selection of Locally Preferred Alternative	August 2009
Next Steps - Enter the New Starts Process and Initiate Preliminary Engineering / Final EIS	June 2011
Final Design	2013 - 2015
Right of Way Acquisition & Begin Construction	2015

Appendix F - MTA REVIEW OF RED LINE PLANNING PROCESS

Describe the New Start Opportunity Process

The proposed Red Line is an 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.

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.

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

Appendix F - MTA REVIEW OF RED LINE PLANNING PROCESS (Contd.)

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.

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 of 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.

Appendix F - MTA REVIEW OF RED LINE PLANNING PROCESS (Contd.)

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 an 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 Western 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.

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:

Appendix F - MTA REVIEW OF RED LINE PLANNING PROCESS (Contd.)

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.

Draft 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.

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.

Appendix G - 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 agreement or support of these comments on the part of the CAC.

Transit Riders Action Council of Metropolitan Baltimore (TRAC) - forwarded by: Edward Cohen

TRAC wishes the elected officials, to whom this report is addressed, to know that information requested by one or more members of the Red Line CAC between the initial distribution of the DEIS and the date for completion of this report were not provided by MTA:

- Maps depicting the right-of-way and property lines on Edmondson Ave. between Hilton and Wildwood Parkway;
- Proposed changes in bus connections in the Redline areas;
- Pedestrian and vehicle safety study;
- Revised Traffic Study for reduction of peak direction traffic capacity on Frederic Ave. with added bike lanes;
- Localized air quality study in the vicinity of Edmondson Village based on a revised traffic study;
- Model of System Capacity given the demands of full rail system build-out; and
- Comparative Project Justification Rating for Heavy Rail vs. Locally Preferred Alternative.

Transit Riders Action Council of Metropolitan Baltimore (TRAC) - forwarded by: Christopher Field, President <http://www.GetOnTRAC.org>

Before the FEIS is filed, the traffic studies must be redone because road conditions have changed significantly since the DEIS. Specifically, in West Baltimore, there are 6 East/West roads across the Gwynns Falls: Wilkens Ave (US 1), Frederick Ave., Baltimore St., Edmondson Ave., Franklinton Rd., and Windsor Mills Rd. Baltimore St. and Franklinton Rd. are not suitable as alternative routes because of their small size. Wilkens Ave. and Windsor Mills Rd. are rather distant from Edmondson Ave. to use as alternatives. Therefore, the DEIS shows Frederick Ave. as the primary alternative parallel road to Edmondson Ave. Since the DEIS modeling, Frederick Ave. has been narrowed from 2 lanes in peak direction to a single lane. Without being able to pass left turning or parallel parking vehicles, it seems the capacity of Frederick Ave. is reduced to LESS THAN HALF the value used for the DEIS modeling. Therefore, the traffic modeling needs to be redone.

The congestion on Edmondson Ave. and Frederick Ave. induced by the Red Line is likely to lower Edmondson's traffic grade significantly; potentially enough to drive away all of the development that is supposed to be stimulated by the Red Line.

The congestion we expect on the reduced capacity Edmondson and Frederick Ave. will likely increase, not decrease as claimed, local air pollution unless all of the displaced drivers become Red Line riders, which is unlikely. Eventually, the increased Edmondson Ave congestion will force an expansion of the road back to three lanes each way. Since many of the houses close to the road are already within the right of way, these houses can be taken without little or no compensation.

The MTA developed the DEIS travel model without ever providing a list of local bus line connections and routes. At a minimum, the MTA has failed to provide an essential list of bus system changes that would be implemented after Red Line construction. Without a description of bus line changes, it is impossible for anyone to verify (or have confidence in) MTA calculations of bus to Red Line transfers and to really understand the rider benefit.

In addition to not providing a list of bus line changes, the MTA has failed to provide a safety report. In 2001, Baltimore's Central light rail was subject to service disruptions several times a month due to collisions with cars. I don't know what the current incident frequency is but in light of the previous results it is very important to have a safety study for the proposed line.

APPENDIX G - COMMUNITY RESPONSE (Contd.)

The rider benefit has been inflated. The Red Line's rider benefit was compared to the local bus #23, a very slow East/West bus line through the central business district. The Quick Bus #40 follows more closely the proposed Red Line route. The #40 takes 55 minutes while the Red Line is expected to take 47 minutes. The 8 minute, end to end time reduction is not impressive.

To save construction money, there will be no crossovers in the tunnel under downtown Baltimore. This means if there is any maintenance or vehicle troubles in the tunnel, the minimum headways will double, which will result in significantly longer travel times.

There were public hearings about the DEIS. One of these was at Edmondson High School. At that meeting Don Sherrod shared a map that he claimed proved that many of the houses were in the Edmondson right of way. Henry Kay promised the Red Line CAC to share that map with them, which he has failed to do in over a years since then.

The MTA has not done any travel demand analysis of a fully built Baltimore rail system. Therefore, it is not known what passenger loads the Red Line will incur (or need to support) after construction of other proposed rail lines. Unlike in Washington, DC, where trains could be extended from 6 to 8 cars when demand increases, the Red Line will have little or no capacity expansion potential because of various construction cost cutting efforts.

Finally, the MTA is not planning to have any public hearings on the FEIS. Public hearings are an important part of the process (and are fundamentally different from public comment) because it is the ONLY way that members of the public can hear unfiltered comments and critiques from others. Without PUBLIC hearings, the MTA is able to hide all negative information or views.