

INITIAL LISTENING TOUR WITH STAKEHOLDERS
City of Baltimore, Office of Transportation
Thursday November 14, 2002 @ 1:00 to 2:00 PM
@ Baltimore City – 417 E. Fayette Street, Baltimore, MD 21202 (Room 625)

.. **Attendees:** Frank Murphy (Chief of Traffic Engineering, Office of Transportation)
David Wallace, RK&K Engineers

DISCLAIMER

The following summarizes the notes taken by David Wallace on November 14, 2002 during his listening tour with representatives of Baltimore City Office of Transportation. These notes do not represent the official position of Baltimore City Office of Transportation, nor have they been reviewed or approved by them.

- A. In assessing options for the reconstruction of Charles Street, must focus on the following existing specific problems:**
1. Two (2) southbound lanes, separated by a median, create the “death lane confusion”.
 2. Narrowness of eastside service drive and tightness for parking.
 3. Missed opportunities for southbound parking associated with two separate southbound lanes (i.e., if the two lanes were together, the curb/west lane could be parking during off-peak periods).
- B. From the City’s transportation perspective, the following are the three top issues:**
1. Charles Street is a very important north/south transportation corridor, not only for the Charles/Maryland/Cathedral one-way pairs, but also the 28th St./29th St. + Art Museum Drive to 33rd St. connections. Three (3) northbound lanes are a necessity.
 2. Major land uses east and west of Charles Street necessitate the focus on safe pedestrian crossings.
 3. As a City-wide transportation strategy, one community’s traffic problems **cannot** be solved by sending traffic through another community.
- C. Assessment of potential strategies/options that could be considered as a part of a revised compromise plan:**
1. **Narrow median in 33rd Street between St. Paul Street and Charles Street** ⇒ while conceptually OK, maybe difficult to implement due to narrowness of 33rd Street ... but probably merits further consideration.
 2. **Creation of a “pedestrian crossing table” across Charles Street in vicinity of 34th Street** ⇒ Not comfortable with this solution, creates too large/too wide of a pedestrian area which can result in severe problems. For example, carrying Lexington Mall pavers across the north/south streets tended to invite pedestrians into oncoming traffic; after a number of severe accidents, these pavers were removed and replaced with normal roadway pavement. Clear demarcation of pedestrian crossings must be provided.

City of Baltimore, Office of Transportation
Thursday November 14, 2002 @ 1:00 to 2:00 PM

3. **Bollards** ⇒ poor substitutes for a curb.
4. **Fence in the median to help control pedestrians** ⇒ good idea, probably should be considered. Helps reinforce the three keys for safe pedestrian crossings ⇒
 - “Tell them/direct them to where it is safe to cross”
 - “Tell them when it is safe to cross”
 - “Make sure it is safe and easy to cross.
5. **Northbound Charles Street left turn at University Parkway** ⇒ good approach, okay to be accommodated in the median; must calculate/provide adequate left turn lane length.
6. **Northbound Charles Street left turn at Art Museum Drive for BMA/Johns Hopkins University** ⇒ okay for operations, but will likely create challenges in design. Again, must calculate/provide adequate left turn lane length. In addition, how will the BMA close this left turn when they close Art Museum Drive? (as they frequently do).
7. **Bicycle accommodation** ⇒ good transportation solution, good for community. Unfortunately, results in a loss of green space. Not comfortable with bicycles along service drive, okay (but not wedded to) bicycle lanes adjacent to median. The heavy right turns from northbound Charles Street to 33rd Street and southbound right turns from Charles Street to Art Museum Drive compound the provision of bicycle lanes along the more conventional right side location. In addition, bicycle path continuity to the north and south needs to be better defined. How best to connect to downtown?
8. **Provision of pedestrian bridge (by JHU)** ⇒ tougher to do on east side, but may have merits. Previous and successful examples within Baltimore City include Loyola College’s pedestrian bridge across Charles Street north of Coldspring Lane (a very successful application, wherein Loyola College dramatically reoriented their east/west pedestrian movements to reinforce utilization of this bridge). Boys Latin, Bryn Mawr , Gilman and Roland Park schools have also provided bridges. These five institutions paid for their bridges. Unsure about the funding for the Morgan State University pedestrian bridges.

City of Baltimore, Office of Transportation
Thursday November 14, 2002 @ 1:00 to 2:00 PM

Relative Rank of Concern	Description of Issue/Concern	DEGREE OF CONCERN				
		LOW		HIGH		
		1	2	3	4	5
1	Charles Street is a very important north/south transportation corridor, not only for the Charles/Maryland/Cathedral one-way pairs, but also the 28 th St./29 th St. + Art Museum Drive to 33 rd St. connections. Three (3) northbound lanes are a necessity.					.
2	Major land uses east and west of Charles Street necessitate the focus on safe pedestrian crossings.					.
3	As a City-wide transportation strategy, one community's traffic problems cannot be solved by sending traffic through another community.					.