I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study- Draft Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) M-NCPPC Comment/Response Errata- November 29, 2021

MNCPPC Ref Doc_#	No.	Page	SDEIS Section	Comment	
Comments from MNCPPC_1_SDEIS Major Issues_9.19.21 document					**Revised comments where applicable**
Major_1	1		General-RPA	*Revised RPA.* *The RPA must reflect i) the "No-Build Alternative" outside of Phase 1, and ii) include both TDM (Alternative 2) and Transit (Alternative 14) as part of the RPA.* We need affirmative assurance that future consideration of improvements outside of Phase 1 will be through a new NEPA Study. Although the area outside Phase 1 (essentially I-495 east of Old Georgetown Road), is neither specifically included as part of the RDA in the SDEIS, nor to be included in the 2022 update to Visualize 2045 being advanced by the TPB, the draft SDEIS uses language that does not clearly remove I-495 east of Old Georgetown Road from the NEPA Study. a. The SDEIS states: "There is no action or no improvements on I-495 east of the I-270 east spur to MD 5. While the Preferred Alternative does not include improvements to the remaining parts of I-495 within the scope of this Study, future improvements on the remainder of the system may still be needed in the future."	
Major_1	2		General-RPA	b. That portion of the Study area that is moving forward is still referred to as Phase 1. And AMP, the P3 concessionaire has referred to future phases in some of its own materials.	
Major_1	3		General-RPA	c. Appendix C still addresses "future phases" in its discussion of offsite storm water mitigation.	
Major_1	4		General-RPA	d. Since all of the parkland outside of Phase 1 is now classified as "avoided," then there must also be affirmative language that describes the process to be imposed in the event these natural resources are NOT avoided in the future.	
Major_1	5		General-RPA	e. If I-495 outside of Phase 1 is no longer part of this Study, then the transition areas i) to I-495 on the east spur travelling south, and ii) north from the ALB to Old Georgetown Road from the "split" are not necessary. In fact, creating the transition in this manner encourages vehicular travel to unnecessarily continue on I-495 as described in the TDM comment.	
Major_1	6		General-RPA	f. TDM such as dynamic signage is necessary to direct traffic to use the I-270/MD 200 combination for travel along the I-95 corridor as stated by Secretary Slater during the July 21, 2021 TBP discussion of the Project for reinstatement to the 2022 update to Visualize 2045. Encouraging vehicle travel on that route will open up additional capacity on the topside of I-495 for local travel needs. Project-related mitigation can also include travel demand management and transportation systems management measures, such as improvements along impacted corridors outside the project limits, including I-495 between the I-270 western spur and US 50. The addition of TSM improvements, how being implemented along I-370 as part of the I-270 Innovative Congestion Management project should be considered, including variable message signage and ramp metering.	

I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study- Draft Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) M-NCPPC Comment/Response Errata- November 29, 2021					
MNCPPC Ref Doc_#	**No.**	**Page**	**SDEIS Section**	**Comment**	
Comments from MNCPPC_1_SDEIS Major Issues_9.19.21 document					**Revised comments where applicable**
Major_1	7		General-RPA	g. In order to confirm the transit commitments made to Montgomery County that have become an agreed-upon integral part of the Project, transit should be designated as a contributing Alternative as opposed to an ancillary improvement.	
Major_2	8		General-EJ	*<u>Environmental Justice</u> . The DEIS, and now the SDEIS is inadequate in its treatment of environmental equity. The SDEIS indicates that environmental justice issues omitted from the SDEIS will be remedied in the FEIS, which is not a best practice and obstructs public comment and community input .* a. Waiting until after selection of a preferred alternative means that disproportionate impacts will not be considered in the formulation of the preferred alternative.	

I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study- Draft Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) M-NCPPC Comment/Response Errata- November 29, 2021					
MNCPPC Ref Doc_#	**No.**	**Page**	**SDEIS Section**	**Comment**	
Comments from MNCPPC_1_SDEIS Major Issues_9.19.21 document					**Revised comments where applicable**
Major_2	9		General-EJ	b. The Morningstar Tabernacle No. 88 Moses Hall and Cemetery and the Poor Farm Cemetery are listed as sites that may be culturally significant in its Community and Environmental Justice Analysis. However, the Environmental Justice discussion concerns itself primarily with current minority population concentrations and **does not address historical and ongoing injustice to small African American communities displaced by construction of the beltway and further threatened by the proposed expansion**. This issue was explicitly acknowledged as related to social justice by the National Trust for Historic Preservation in their selection of the Moses Cemetery as one of the 11 most endangered historic sites in America in 2021. This listing and the environmental justice issues raised by it should be acknowledged and discussed in the SDEIS.	
Major_2	10		General-EJ	c. On August 10th, Congress passed a once-in-a-generation investment in infrastructure throughout the U.S. with bi-partisan support. Included in the measure is a commitment to "Reconnecting Communities," a concept not even mentioned in the SDEIS. "Too often, past transportation investments divided communities or it left out the people most in need of affordable transportation options. In particular, significant portions of the interstate highway system were built through Black neighborhoods. The Federal Infrastructure Bill creates a first-ever program to reconnect communities divided by transportation infrastructure. The program will fund planning, design, demolition, and reconstruction of street grids, parks, or other infrastructure through $1 billion of dedicated funding. This concept should be included as part of this project.	

I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study- Draft Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) M-NCPPC Comment/Response Errata- November 29, 2021					
MNCPPC Ref Doc_#	**No.**	**Page**	**SDEIS Section**	**Comment**	
Comments from MNCPPC_1_SDEIS Major Issues_9.19.21 document					**Revised comments where applicable**
Major_2	11		General-EJ	d. Neither the DEIS nor the SDEIS reference any cumulative effects to specific cultural resources. Additional historical research conducted subsequent to the DEIS in Cabin John related to the Morningstar Tabernacle No. 88 Moses Hall and Cemetery and associated Gibson Grove community show that the construction of the beltway separated the fraternal hall and cemetery from the neighboring church, physically fragmented the community and contributed to the decline of these institutions. The community's decline in turn contributed to the closure and loss to fire of the Moses fraternal hall.	
Major_3	12		General-Bottleneck Issues	Shifting Bottleneck Issues Related to Project Design. *A detailed technical transportation review of the SDEIS shows impacts of "relieving" congestion at the American Legion Bridge (ALB)* ***does not eliminate congestion but shifts*** *it from the ALB vicinity (McLean and Potomac) to other areas in Maryland.* While some of these bottleneck shifts were expected, the degree of congestion resulting from the proposed project is severe on I-270 north of I-370, on the Inner Loop on the top side of the Beltway, and on the Inner Loop in Prince George's County. These bottleneck shifts are project-related impacts, and mitigation measures should be addressed in the SDEIS and included as part of project design to minimize these projected deficiencies.	
Major_3	13		General-Bottleneck Issues	a. Phase 1A and 1B should be constructed concurrently to reduce or eliminate bottlenecks on I-270.	

I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study- Draft Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) M-NCPPC Comment/Response Errata- November 29, 2021

MNCPPC Ref Doc_#	No.	Page	SDEIS Section	Comment	
Comments from MNCPPC_1_SDEIS Major Issues_9.19.21 document					**Revised comments where applicable**
Major_3	14		General-Bottleneck Issues	b. For the other bottleneck issues, we recommend the following design changes to the Preferred Alternative: i. Eliminate the managed lanes from the I-270 Eastern Spur between I-270 and I-495 because I-270 traffic headed south to the eastern spur would not use the managed lane network. The managed lanes would provide minimal travel time benefits for drivers from Gaithersburg and Rockville to most Montgomery County destinations. ii. Eliminate the managed lanes and exit/entrance ramps from I-495 between the two spurs. iii. Managed lane traffic destined to and from the Inner Loop should enter/exit the managed lane network at the River Road crossover interchange.	
Major_4	15		General	*Local Road Impact Analyses* . *Without TTI results beyond the Study area, it is more critical that the impact to the local road network be addressed sooner in order to make appropriate considerations for design* . The Interchange Access Point Approval (IAPA) study now under development must be extended beyond a single intersection since the increased congestion on I-270 and I-495 will undoubtedly lead to both peak spreading effects and local traffic diversions that have not been adequately considered to-date. When it can take over 30 minutes to travel 2 to 3 miles on some segments of the Beltway as presented in this SDEIS, traffic will not subject themselves to this on a daily basis, and they will find the shorter travel time route, regardless of local street impact. The scope therefore agreed upon by FHWA for the IAPA (performing traffic operational analyses at ramp terminal intersections and one adjacent intersection (on both sides) beyond service interchanges that are modified by the study) will be inadequate in areas where either I-270 or I-495 has very high TTIs and extreme congestion. In those areas, the study area should follow all significant diversionary traffic that switches to the local road network (defined as all non-interstate roads). The study area can be determined by adding routes on parallel routes with travel times equal to the GP lanes travel time.	
Major_5	16		General	*Bike/Ped Improvements* *are inconsistent with master plans, particularly related to design* . The commitment made during meetings to construct per local master plans must be reflected in the SDEIS.	

I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study- Draft Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) M-NCPPC Comment/Response Errata- November 29, 2021					
MNCPPC Ref Doc_#	**No.**	**Page**	**SDEIS Section**	**Comment**	
Comments from MNCPPC_1_SDEIS Major Issues_9.19.21 document					**Revised comments where applicable**
Major_6	17	page 1 and 17	General	*Parkland LOD is not final for purposes of impact resolution.* Before any work is permitted to occur on Parkland the limits and nature of the work will need to be reviewed and approved by M-NPPC and permission granted for construction to commence. Because MDOT SHA does not plan to finalize the Project's design until after it completes the NEPA review and awards a contract to a firm to undertake the project, there is significant risk that the LOD will need to be much larger than what is reflected in the SDEIS. An important aspect of avoidance and minimization is minimizing the roadway footprint while still keeping a larger LOD to address environmental issues and/or adequately restore disturbed areas to ensure that they will appropriately handle the increased drainage pressures that will result from advancing one of the Build Alternatives. Ongoing design of the Project must ensure stable tie-ins for outfalls, protection and restoration of stream banks, and improvements to resources based on Project impacts. Although MDOT SHA has committed to the following: " All possible planning to minimize harm will additionally involve an agreement document that outlines the process to continue coordination with the OWJs over Section 4(f) properties through the design phase of the project," the impacts to parkland are not known and cannot be fully addressed until design of the project is created by the P3	
Major_7	18	page 6	General-SWM Plans	*Storm Water Management plans proposed by MDOT SHA are inadequate. a. Ignoring existing untreated impervious surfaces and requiring 50% treatment only if the roadway is fully reconstructed is insufficient to protect downstream waters. Under the SDEIS, only 45% of the water quality treatment that is required is proposed to occur onsite. That is unacceptable, as on-site stormwater quality treatment must be prioritized to a minimum of 80% of the Required ESD onsite (allowing for a maximum of 20% to be treated with the use of compensatory SWM mitigation offsite). MDOT/SHA needs to be specific in their commitment to incentivize innovative technologies and techniques by the P3 to show their commitment to maximizing on-site stormwater quality treatment. These highways are among the worst water quality offenders in the County and the project needs to take more responsibility for protecting the downstream water resources, which will never be improved if we don't take the appropriate steps as part of this project.*	Parks requests more information on the 20% banking fee for providing SWM offsite. Storm Water Management plans proposed by MDOT SHA are inadequate. a. Ignoring existing untreated impervious surfaces and requiring 50% treatment only if the roadway is fully reconstructed is insufficient to protect downstream waters. Under the SDEIS, only 45% of the water quality treatment that is required is proposed to occur onsite. That is unacceptable, as on-site stormwater quality treatment must be prioritized to a minimum of 80% of the Required ESD onsite (allowing for a maximum of 20% to be treated with the use of compensatory SWM mitigation offsite). MDOT/SHA needs to be specific in their commitment to incentivize innovative technologies and techniques by the P3 to show their commitment to maximizing on-site stormwater quality treatment. These highways are among the worst water quality offenders in the County and the project needs to take more responsibility for protecting the downstream water resources, which will never be improved if we don't take the appropriate steps as part of this project.
Major_7	19	Appx A	General-SWM Plans	b. The MDE 6-digit watershed scale for offsite SWM water quality projects is meaningless to address the severe water quality impacts of the existing highways and proposed expansion. Offsite compensatory SWM mitigation must be within 1500' of the LOD. This would make the benefits seen by the compensatory mitigation meaningful to the location of the impacts and the surrounding waterways. Moreover, a maximum of 25% of the off-site compensatory stormwater IAT should come from stream restoration.	

I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study- Draft Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) M-NCPPC Comment/Response Errata- November 29, 2021					
MNCPPC Ref Doc_#	**No.**	**Page**	**SDEIS Section**	**Comment**	
Comments from MNCPPC_1_SDEIS Major Issues_9.19.21 document					**Revised comments where applicable**
Major_7	20	Section 5.1.8 page	General-SWM Plans	c. SWM opportunities should not be eliminated due to their location on Parkland. Conversely, we have spent copious amounts of time working with the MDOT/SHA project team to identify and review potential offsite compensatory SWM opportunities on Parkland when it can be effective with minimal resource impacts.	
Major_8	21	Section 5.1.8 page	General	*Inadequate 4(f) Mitigation Plan for Natural Resources* . *The SDEIS does not include enough specificity for 4(f) requirements in order for M-NCPPC to review or comment on a "mitigation plan," which requires approval by the Commission. M-NCPPC will require a thorough and implementable mitigation package to include park enhancements and extensive parkland replacement* . The parkland affected by this project has significant value due to its geographic location in a largely developed area with little "unused" land. Land acquisition is a timely process and properties to be acquired must be presented to M-NCPPC for approval before the FEIS and ROD. M-NCPPC will not consider any impact to be de minimis until parkland mitigation requirements are met and formally approved by M-NCPPC.	

I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study- Draft Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) M-NCPPC Comment/Response Errata- November 29, 2021					
MNCPPC Ref Doc_#	**No.**	**Page**	**SDEIS Section**	**Comment**	
Comments from MNCPPC_1_SDEIS Major Issues_9.19.21 document					**Revised comments where applicable**
Major_9	22		General	*Inadequate 4(f) Mitigation Plan for Historical and Cultural Resources . Section 4(f) requires avoidance of the use of historical and cultural resources unless other alternatives are demonstrated to be infeasible and contrary to the purpose and use of the undertaking. There have been no detailed design or schematic drawings shown to date that have demonstrated that alternatives were considered that would have avoided a Section 4(f) use of the Moses Hall Tabernacle and Cemetery, the Gibson Grove Church, and the Carderock Springs National Register Historic District* . Further impacts to the Gibson Grove Church, an historic resource that has already suffered cumulative adverse effects from the first Beltway construction, should not be accepted as a 4(f) alternative to avoid impacts to Moses Hall Tabernacle and Cemetery. Section 4(f) requires consideration of other design solutions must be evaluated to demonstrate avoidance is infeasible. Noting the likelihood of a 4(f) use at this stage is welcome; however, additional detailed design work should be undertaken with all stakeholders in the community to evaluate alternatives as required.	
Comments from M-NCPPC_2_MCParks SDEIS 8.19.21 document					
1	23	Page ES-1	What is the Focus of the SDEIS?	"No action or no improvements" should be characterized as the preferred No Build Alternative for portions of the study area being removed from the project	
2	24	Page ES-1	What is the Focus of the SDEIS?	Delete "While the Preferred Alternative does not include improvements to the remaining parts of I-495 within the scope of the Study, future improvements of the remainder of the system may still be needed in the future." suppositional and not relevant to the newly determined preferred alternative.	

I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study- Draft Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) M-NCPPC Comment/Response Errata- November 29, 2021

MNCPPC Ref Doc_#	No.	Page	SDEIS Section	Comment	
Comments from MNCPPC_1_SDEIS Major Issues_9.19.21 document					**Revised comments where applicable**
3	25	Page ES-3	Will comments on the DEIS be addressed?	Delete “appropriate” from first bullet on page. No value in this qualifier and misleading.	
4	26	Page ES-7	What is the Preferred Alternative?	“No action, or no improvements included at this time” should be characterized as the preferred No Build Alternative for portions of the study area being removed from the project	
5	27	Page ES-10	What Happens to the Improvements That Were Studied for the I-495, East of the I-270 East Spur?	This section does not provide a clear answer to how the areas of the study area being removed will be addressed as part of the larger NEPA process. Need a statement that clearly describes that the NEPA process for this project moving forward eliminates any consideration of a Build Alternative east of the I-270 east spur and any future consideration of improvements to these areas would need to leverage updated information and require an entirely new environmental review process.	
6	28	Page Map 23	Section Appx D	3660+00 Old farm NCA, expand planting area and include NNI control on parkland and adjacent ROW.	
7	29	Page 2-3, paragraph 3	Section 2.1	Delete “initially” as there is no commitment as part of this process to add lanes to areas of the study area that have been dropped from consideration.	
8	30	Page 2-3, paragraph 5	Section 2.1	If the study limits are to remain unchanged, the No Build Alternative should be selected for the areas of the study area where no improvements are being considered. Consideration of any improvements to the dropped portions of this study would be subject to a completely new environmental study and NEPA process that would take into account new transportation improvements, new demands on the system, and changes to natural resources. This paragraph is not clear in this regard and falsely suggests that the current study could be used as a mechanism to carry forward improvements in the areas where the No Build Alternative is being applied.	
9	31	Page 2-4, paragraph 1	Section 2.2	Delete “included at this time”.	
10	32	Page 2-4, Figure 2-2	Section 2.2	Delete “at this time”.	
11	33	Page 2-7, Table 2-1	Section 2.3.1	Remove list of the I-495 interchange locations within the Study Area and outside of Phase 1 South limits. They are no longer relevant to the project and the SDEIS is clearly intended only to focus on aspects of the project related to the new Preferred Alternative.	
12	34	Page 2-7	Section 2.3.1	Delete the last sentence of the last paragraph as it is not relevant to the SDEIS or the Preferred Alternative.	

I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study- Draft Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) M-NCPPC Comment/Response Errata- November 29, 2021					
MNCPPC Ref Doc_#	**No.**	**Page**	**SDEIS Section**	**Comment**	
Comments from MNCPPC_1_SDEIS Major Issues_9.19.21 document					**Revised comments where applicable**
13	35	Page 2-10	Section B	As stated in Parks DEIS comments, we feel that ignoring the existing untreated road pavement and requiring 50% treatment only if the roadway is fully reconstructed is insufficient to protect downstream waters. A higher goal closer to 50% of all existing untreated roadways would be more effective in protecting downstream waters.	
14	36	Page 2-11, Table 2-2	Section C	The project needs to commit to significantly improving the Provided ESD surface area to a minimum of 80% of the Required ESD onsite (allowing for a maximum of 20% to be treated with the use of compensatory SWM mitigation offsite). These highways can be considered the worst water quality offenders in the County and the Project needs to take more responsibility for protecting the downstream water resources, which will never be improved if we don't take the appropriate steps as part of this project. The Project should achieve better than this current projection.	
15	37	Page 2-11	Section C	The statement that "use of innovative technologies may reduce the compensatory stormwater management requirements" is insufficient. MDOT/SHA needs to be specific in their committal to financially incentivize innovative technologies and techniques by the P3 to show their commitment to maximizing on-site water quality treatment.	Parks requests more detail on the 20% banking fee. The statement that "use of innovative technologies may reduce the compensatory stormwater management requirements" is insufficient. MDOT/SHA needs to be specific in their committal to financially incentivize innovative technologies and techniques by the P3 to show their commitment to maximizing on-site water quality treatment.
16	38	Page 2-12, paragraph 1	Section D.a	The MDE 6-digit watershed scale for offsite SWM water quality projects is meaningless to address the severe water quality impacts of the existing highways and proposed expansion. All offsite compensatory mitigation should take place within 1500' of the approved LOD.	
17	39	Page 2-12, paragraph 2	Section D.a	The credit potential of one-acre IAT credit per 100 linear foot stream restored is based on outdated crediting methodology. The project should be held to the most recent guidance at the time of permitting; at this time that is the 2020 Wasteload Allocations Document.	
18	40	Page 2-12	Section D.b	Project needs to show a real commitment to treating additional onsite stormwater runoff (80% min) and existing offsite impervious within a meaningful distance to the project (within 1500') in order to follow through on the Study's Purpose and Need goal of Environmental Responsibility. This commitment needs to be made before a Developer is brought in and given free rein to identify projects that are prioritized by financial goals rather than environmental stewardship. For the maximum 20% water quality treatment achieved off-site, only a maximum of 25% of the IAT shall be achieved through stream restoration and outfall stabilization. The remaining 75% + shall be achieved through pavement reduction/removal, Ch 3 and Ch5 SWM practices in order to best	
19	41	Page 2-17	Section 2.3.5	Need to explicitly show on plans areas designated for temporary construction access, staging, and materials storage for further evaluation and review.	
20	42	Page 2-27	Section 2.4.1	Commitment to priority bicycle and pedestrian connections needs to include lengthening the I-270 bridge over Tuckerman Ln to accommodate future pedestrian/bicycle facilities along Tuckerman Ln and widening the existing variable-width side path along Seven Locks Rd under I-495 (Cabin John Trail).	
21	43	Page 2-27	Section 2.4.3	Need much more detail on the environmental enhancements that are mentioned in order to comment on them. Where are they, what are the limits, and how many of them are there? Parks needs specific locations and work plans outlined to concur with the project.	

I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study- Draft Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) M-NCPPC Comment/Response Errata- November 29, 2021					
MNCPPC Ref Doc_#	**No.**	**Page**	**SDEIS Section**	**Comment**	
Comments from MNCPPC_1_SDEIS Major Issues_9.19.21 document					**Revised comments where applicable**
22	44	Page 2-28	Section 2.5	Need to state more explicitly the process by which remaining parts of I-495 could progress – new NEPA process entirely.	
23	45	Page Map 4 & 5	Section Appx D	FIDS area shown for Cabin John SVP Unit 2, how are these areas being addressed?	The impacts to Cabin John SVU 2, Cabin John Regional Park, and Cabin John SVU 6 relocate the forest edge and subsequently impact forest interior on parkland. Forest "interior" refers to the area in the center of a forest which is surrounded by "edge". The forest area within 300 feet of a forest edge is considered "edge" habitat. "Interior habitat" is commonly defined as the forest area found greater than 300 feet from the forest edge. Interior habitat functions as the highest quality breeding habitat for forest interior dwelling birds (FIDS). Parks expects further coordiation to reduce forest interior impacts and to mitigate for unavoidable impactes.
24	46	Page Map 7	Section Appx D	197+00 west side Cabin John SVP Unit 2 details for construction of proposed pipe augmentation. Stream work and need LOD up stream of outfall.	197+00 west side Cabin John SVP Unit 2 continue to Coordiate with MNCPPC on the appropritate stream work and LOD needed in this location.
25	47	Page Map 7	Section Appx D	195+00 east side – Justify large LOD offset from alignment into CJ SVU2. The LOD should be as tight and minimal as possible to the alignment. Add plunge pool where outfall interfaces with stream to ensure stable transition into Cabin John Mainstem.	195+00 east side –The large LOD offset from alignment into CJ SVU2 should be as tight and minimal as possible to the alignment. Add plunge pool where outfall interfaces with stream to ensure stable transition into Cabin John Mainstem.
26	48	Page Map 8	Section Appx D	200+00 – does SHA intend to modify the bridge over Booze Creek? If so, the stream should have a natural bottom.	200+00 – since the bridge over Booze Creek will be modifed, SHA should commit to rebuilding the structure with a natural channel bottom. This would result in a net benefit to the resource, which is what SHA has commiteed to for natural resrouce protection.
27	49	Page Map 10	Section Appx D	225+00 west side – the tie in of feature 21C_C2 into Cabin John Creek must include appropriate stream structures to ensure stability, energy dissipation, and utility protection. There is an adjacent sewer crossing that should receive a sill and riffle structure for protection.	
28	50	Page Map 10	Section Appx D	225+00 west side – the proposed augmentation pipe that are under River Rd should not extend to the bank of Cabin John Creek. The end wall should be as far from the stream bank as possible.	
29	51	Page Map 9	Section Appx D	220+00 – west side - the outfall should be cut back and a stable channel with step pools built from the manhole labeled “handle 2454”	
30	52	Page Map 9	Section Appx D	220+00 – west side - a stream structure such as a crossvane and/or riffle should be built in the mainstem of rock creek in conjunction with the outfall channel to ensure the stability of the mainstem at the confluence.	
31	53	Page Map 23	Section Appx D	3685+00 East side of I270 – The LOD area along Tuckerman Lane and Old Farm Creek is too large. The LOD on the South side of Old Farm Creek should maintain the same distance from I270 as the LOD on the north side of Old Farm Creek. Access can be achieved from Tuckerman Lane adjacent to the outfall channel that runs parallel to I270 from Tuckerman Lane to Old Farm Creek. The justification for this large park impact on Map 12 is stated as the augmentation culvert, but the proposed aerial structure negates the need for the culvert.	
32	54	Page Map 23	Section Appx D	3685+00 East Side of I270 – There is an outfall channel from Tuckerman Lane adjacent to I270 that flows into Old Farm Creek on the upstream side of the culver under I270. This channel must be restored using pools/riffles/cascades if it is disturbed.	
33	55	Page Map 23	Section Appx D	3685+00 The Old Farm Creek stream channel must be rebuilt to a natural bottom that ties in with the upstream elevation of Old Farm Creek when the culvert is replaced with a highway bridge.	

I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study- Draft Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) M-NCPPC Comment/Response Errata- November 29, 2021					
MNCPPC Ref Doc_#	**No.**	**Page**	**SDEIS Section**	**Comment**	
Comments from MNCPPC_1_SDEIS Major Issues_9.19.21 document					**Revised comments where applicable**
34	56	Page Map 23	Section Appx D	3685+00 The new highway bridge spanning Old Farm Creek must allow for a natural surface trail under the bridge adjacent to the stream.	
35	57	Page Map 23	Section Appx D	3685+00 West Side I270 – On the north side of Old Farm Creek, the LOD can be enlarged to encompass an existing WSSC access road area if that is helpful to site access, staging, storage. This would shift the LOD line approximately 30ft to the north.	
36	58	Page Map 23	Section Appx D	3685+00 West Side I270 – The LOD on the south side of Old Farm Creek is too large for the proposed stream work. The stream can be access from the north. The area between Old Farm Creek and Tuckerman Lane is riparian habitat within the floodplain of Old Farm Creek. This area is important to protect due to the understory of native shrubs and the mature tree canopy.	
37	59	Page Map 23	Section Appx D	3685+00 West Side I270 – The new proposed culver under Tuckerman Lane has significant impact to the existing riparian habitat. This new pipe should be removed or use an alignment much closer to the highway since there will be a new bridge designed for this location. If the new aerial structure dictates a pipe replacement, the pipe should be as short as possible and outfall before the stream into a pool system.	
38	60	Page Map 23	Section Appx D	3685+00 west side I270 – The proposed aerial structure spanning Tuckerman Lane and Old Farm creek will result in the removal of long culvert in Old Farm Creek, Parks is supportive of this new bridge and looks forward to assisting in the design of the new stream channel underneath the bridge.	
39	61	Page Map 23	Section Appx D	3685+00 west side I270 – the note on the LOD size along Old Farm Creek states the LOD is for culvert augmentation. The new aerial structure will negate the need for culvert augmentation. The LOD in the stream should be noted as for stream restoration.	
40	62	Page Map 24	Section Appx D	3629+00 west side. The ownership of this parcel is under investigation.	
41	63	Page Map 24	Section Appx D	3625+00 daylight outfall, add step pools and stabilize overland flow.	
42	64	Page Map 24	Section Appx D	3629+00 Describe what LOD shown around outfalls needed for. Parks does not concur with the LOD needs. Eliminate LOD and temporary and permanent impacts.	
43	65	Page Map 24	Section Appx D	3640+00 west side - ensure the drainage channel that flows downslope from 3645+00 has a stable tie in to the channel from the culvert under I270. There is a new end wall proposed and the LOD does not seem to account for the other drainage channel.	
44	66	Page Map 24	Section Appx D	3640+00 west side - A fiberglass bridge per Parks Specification should be included to route the natural surface trail over the stream downstream of the end wall.	
45	67	Page Map 24	Section Appx D	3640+00 west side - The stormwater design must accommodate the rerouted natural surface trail. The trail needs to be located within well drained areas to prevent trail use issues.	
46	68	Page Map 24	Section Appx D	3640+00 west side – the outfall from the stormwater management facility must be addressed all the way to the confluence with the tributary. The limited LOD prevents this connection as it is currently shown. Enlarge the LOD or justify that the flows can be discharged in the location shown without causing erosion and future degradation.	

I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study- Draft Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) M-NCPPC Comment/Response Errata- November 29, 2021

MNCPPC Ref Doc_#	No.	Page	SDEIS Section	Comment	
Comments from MNCPPC_1_SDEIS Major Issues_9.19.21 document					**Revised comments where applicable**
47	69	Page Map 24	Section Appx D	3635+00 west side – tighten the LOD (90-degree corner) so that it is closer to the SWM facility and does not impact the natural surface trails.	
48	70	Page Map 24	Section Appx D	3630+60 east side – LOD should not extend upstream of the confluence between Cabin John creek and the tributary, remove this large LOD "bump out". Parks does not agree with impacts to stable stream to tie-in grade 130 ft up stream of the crossing.	
49	71	Page Map 24	Section Appx D	3630+60 east side – the outfall from the highway should be a cascade or other stable system.	
50	72	Page Map 24	Section Appx D	3630+60 east side – Parks does not concur with the need for the augmentation culvert. Provide more analysis of the existing pipe system.	
51	73	Page Map 24	Section Appx D	3630+60 east side – tighten the LOD on the east side of the stormwater facility, the LOD should not go up the slope.	
52	74	Page Map 24	Section Appx D	3641+50 east side –The stream stabilization work should take place even if augmentation not found to be necessary.	
53	75		Appendix D	Final ROW in locations of impact to Parkland will need to be coordinated with and approved by Parks.	Final ROW in locations of impact to Parkland will need to be coordinated with and approved by Parks and identified in the FEIS/ROD. A procedure for dealing with ROW expansion after the ROD must be approved in the FEIS/ROD.
54	76	Page 5-1	Section 5.1.1	Since this 4(f) chapter in the SDIES does not replace the 4(f) information from the DEIS, all of Parks previous comments related to 4(f) still stand.	
55	77	Page 5-2	Section 5.1.2	"There is no action, or no improvements included at this time on I-495 east of the I-270 east spur (shown in light blue in Figure 5-1)." Please clarify this statement, what does this mean for the rest of the alignment. Will a new NEPA review, DEIS, FEIS, and ROD be completed if SHA decided to move forward with "improvements" on the rest of I-495?	
56	78	Page 5-3	Section 5.1.3	Montgomery Parks does not consider the coordination on the park land affected by the preferred alternative to be sufficient to this point and much more effort to minimize impacts is needed. The comments provided here reference many instances of LOD modification that will need further coordination.	Montgomery Parks does not consider the coordination on the park land affected by the preferred alternative to be sufficient to this point and much more effort to minimize impacts is needed. The comments provided here reference many instances of LOD modification that will need further coordination. SHA must clarify how the opportunities for additional impact minimization and further adjustment of the LOD during Final Design will occur; the process should be in the FEIS/ROD.
57	79	Page 5-6, Table 5-1		Some Parks have "Constructive Use" impacts as well as Permanent and Temporary. These need to be accounted for in this table and in all discussions regarding Park impacts and mitigation. Examples of constructive use may include impacts to tree CRZs outside of the LOD, impacts to trails outside of the LOD, impacts to campgrounds near the LOD, etc.	Parks beleives that some park locations have "Constructive Use" impacts as well as Permanent and Temporary. These need to be accounted for in this table and in all discussions regarding Park impacts and mitigation. Examples of constructive use may include impacts to tree CRZs outside of the LOD, impacts to trails outside of the LOD, impacts to campgrounds near the LOD, etc.
58	80	Page 5-5	Section 5.2.1	Table 5-1 – Cabin John Regional – the impact can only be considered *de minimis* once the required parkland mitigation requirements are met and approved by M-NCPPC. There has not been a significant effort by SHA to present a sufficient parkland mitigation package at this point.	A complete Park Mitigation package must be approved by MNCPPC.
59	81	Page 5-5	Section 5.2.1	Table 5-1 – Cabin John SVU2 – the impact can only be considered *de minimis* once the required parkland mitigation requirements are met and approved by M-NCPPC. There has not been a significant effort by SHA to present a sufficient parkland mitigation package at this point.	Table 5-1 – Cabin John SVU2 – There has not been a enough effort by SHA to present a sufficient parkland mitigation package at this point. A complete Park Mitigation package must be approved by MNCPPC.
60	82	Page 5-5	Section 5.2.1	Table 5-1 – Tilden Woods Stream Valley Park – the impact can only be considered *de minimis* once the required parkland mitigation requirements are met and approved by M-NCPPC. There has not been significant effort by SHA to present a sufficient parkland mitigation package at this point.	Table 5-1 – Tilden Woods Stream Valley Park – There has not been a enough effort by SHA to present a sufficient parkland mitigation package at this point. A complete Park Mitigation package must be approved by MNCPPC.

I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study- Draft Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) M-NCPPC Comment/Response Errata- November 29, 2021

MNCPPC Ref Doc_#	No.	Page	SDEIS Section	Comment	
Comments from MNCPPC_1_SDEIS Major Issues_9.19.21 document					**Revised comments where applicable**
61	83	Page 5-5	Section 5.2.1	Table 5-1 – Old Farm Neighborhood Conservation Area – the impact can only be considered de minimis once the required parkland mitigation requirements are met and approved by M-NCPPC. There has not been significant effort by SHA to present a sufficient parkland mitigation package at this point.	Table 5-1 – Old Farm Neighborhood Conservation Area– There has not been a enough effort by SHA to present a sufficient parkland mitigation package at this point. A complete Park Mitigation package must be approved by MNCPPC.
62	84	Page 5-5	Section 5.2.1	Table 5-1 – Cabin John SVU6 – the impact can only be considered de minimis once the required parkland mitigation requirements are met and approved by M-NCPPC. There has not been a significant effort by SHA to present a sufficient parkland mitigation package at this point.	Table 5-1 – Cabin John SVU6 - There has not been a enough effort by SHA to present a sufficient parkland mitigation package at this point. A complete Park Mitigation package must be approved by MNCPPC.
63	85	Page 5-5	Section 5.2.1	"Therefore, the Preferred Alternative would avoid the use of 37 Section 4(f) properties that were previously reported as Section 4(f) uses in the DEIS and Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation, totaling approximately 105 acres." If SHA is going to consider the park properties on the rest of the alignment as avoided, then this implies that any proposed future "improvements" would require a completely new NEPA process.	
64	86	Page 5-23	Section 5.2.8	"No recreational facilities within Cabin John Stream Valley Park Unit 2 would be impacted by the Preferred Alternative." This statement is false. Any further development of the existing highway is detrimental to the park user experience on the natural surface trail.	"No recreational facilities within Cabin John Stream Valley Park Unit 2 would be impacted by the Preferred Alternative." This statement is false. Any further development of the existing highway is detrimental to the park user experience on the natural surface trail even if the actua trail is not removed or relocated for the new highway alignment
65	87	Page 5-5	Section 5.2	Until a robust, complete, and implementable mitigation plan detailing on site mitigation and restoration and parkland replacement is proposed and approved by M-NCPPC no concurrence on the 4(f) status can be provided.	
66	88	Page 5-23	Section 5.2.8	LOD adjustments are required adjacent to Cabin John creek where the outfalls enter the stream. To ensure long-term stability in Cabin John creek, stream stabilization is required in the mainstem at the outfalls due to the increased flows from the new highway.	LOD adjustments are required adjacent to Cabin John creek where the outfalls enter the stream. To ensure long-term stability in Cabin John creek, stream stabilization is required in the mainstem at the outfalls due to the increased flows from the new highway. SHA needs to define the process for how opportunities for additional impact minimization and further adjustment of the LOD during Final Design will occur.
67	89	Page 5-28	Section 5.2.11	"No other recreational facilities would be impacted by the Preferred Alternative." It is Parks position that any widening will have an adverse impact on the public use campground, even if the actual campsites are not physically impacted. For example, noise and visual experience of the campground will be diminished by any increase in the highway size.	
68	90	Page 5-28	Section 5.2.11	Parks has made numerous comments linked to App D that detail the numerous LOD modifications that are still required.	
69	91	Page 5-28	Section 5.2.11	"Expansion of the LOD in certain areas was in response to M-NCPPC's comments to ensure stable outfall channels." We appreciate these changes and believe that providing stable outfalls is essential due to the large increases in stormwater runoff that are not being fully treated.	
70	92	Page 5-28	Section 5.2.11	The relocation of the trail impacted by the proposed SWM facility should not be considered mitigation. The project is directly affecting the trail and it must be rebuilt as part of the project. Mitigation for the trail disturbance will also be required that will be above and beyond the relocation and rebuilding of the impacted trail section.	As SHA has stated to Parks, the relocation of the trail impacted by the proposed SWM facility should not be considered mitigation. The project is directly affecting the trail and it must be rebuilt as part of the project. Mitigation for the trail disturbance will also be required that will be above and beyond the relocation and rebuilding of the impacted trail section.
71	93	Page 5-28	Section 5.2.11	Noise/visual barrier should be pursued for all areas of parkland. Parks expectation that any areas shown with retaining wall adjacent to parkland within Phase 1 South, should also incorporate noise wall/visual barrier and vegetative barrier where appropriate.	

I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study- Draft Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) M-NCPPC Comment/Response Errata- November 29, 2021					
MNCPPC Ref Doc_#	**No.**	**Page**	**SDEIS Section**	**Comment**	
Comments from MNCPPC_1_SDEIS Major Issues_9.19.21 document					**Revised comments where applicable**
72	94	Page 5-30	Section 5.2.12	I-270 should pass over Old Farm Creek via a roadway bridge and the existing culvert should be removed allowing Old Farm Creek to have a natural channel bottom. This would represent a significant improvement to the existing condition and is reasonable considering the numerous aquatic resource impacts posed by this project.	
73	95	Page 5-30	Section 5.2.12	The LOD on the east side I-270 in Tilden Woods SVP should more closely resemble the LOD submitted with the DEIS. Parks does not support the larger LOD. Is the larger LOD intended for the new aerial structure spanning Old Farm Creek? If so, Parks looks forward to discussing this in further detail.	
74	96	Page 5-31	Section 5.2.13	Tree planting should be maximized at Old Farm NCA. NNI control is expected to be park of the tree planting and be applied the entire parcel.	
75	97	Page 5-33	Section 5.2.14	"The Preferred Alternative would not impact to Cabin John Trail, or any other recreational facilities in Cabin John Stream Valley Park Unit 6." Remove this reference as there are no trails in CJ SVU 6.	
76	98	Page 5-33	Section 5.2.14	The LOD on the west side of I-270 is too large. It needs to be tighter around the SWM facility and not go further than the confluence.	
77	99	Page Map 24	Section Appx D	3620+00 west side. Remove LOD bump out at existing and recently restored outfall	
78	100	Page 5-33	Section 5.2.14	Parks does not concur with the need for an augmentation culvert and the associated impacts	
79	101	Page 5-50	Section 5.3	"The Preferred Alternative presented in this SDEIS would not avoid the use of all Section 4(f) properties. It would, however, avoid the use of 37 Section 4(f) properties for which impacts totaling roughly 105 acres as were reported in the DEIS (Table 5-2). Those 105 acres of impact to 37 properties would be fully avoided by the Preferred Alternative. " M-NCPPC takes this statement to mean that any future improvements to the highway outside of the Phase 1 area would need a new and separate NEPA process.	
80	102	Page 5-51	Section 5.4.1	"All possible planning to minimize harm will additionally involve an agreement document that outlines the process to continue coordination with the OWJs over Section 4(f) properties through the design phase of the project." M-NCPPC Montgomery Parks will continue to require extensive review of all impacts to Parkland with the goal to continue to minimize those impacts. Before any work is permitted to occur on Parkland a Park Construction Permit must be issued.	
81	103	Page 5-51	Section 5.4.2	"Consideration of improvements to those remaining parts would have to advance separately, and would be subject to additional environmental studies, and analysis and collaboration with the public, stakeholders, and agencies." Change this sentence to "Consideration of improvements to those remaining parts would have to advance separately, and would be subject to a new NEPA study, independent of the previous Phase 1 studies, and new collaboration with the public, stakeholders, and agencies.	

I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study- Draft Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) M-NCPPC Comment/Response Errata- November 29, 2021

MNCPPC Ref Doc_#	No.	Page	SDEIS Section	Comment	
Comments from MNCPPC_1_SDEIS Major Issues_9.19.21 document					**Revised comments where applicable**
82	104	Page 5-52	Section 5.4.5	M-NCPPC will require a thorough and implementable mitigation package to include extensive parkland replacement. The parkland affected by this project has significant value due to its geographic location in a largely developed area with little "unused" land. SHA must recognize that land acquisition is a timely process and properties should be acquired and presented to M-NCPPC as soon as possible so that M-NCPPC can approve the properties as part of the 4(f) discussion. Leading to the FIES and ROD.	
83	105	Page 5-61	Section 5.7	"Based on the information presented in the Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation and this Updated Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation, FHWA and MDOT SHA have reached a preliminary conclusion that the Preferred Alternative is the alternative with least overall harm." Add to the end of the statement "due to avoiding the parks and natural resources involved in the alternatives that include the rest of I-495.	
84	106	Page 4-10	Section 4.4.2	It needs to be stated clearly that any future improvements on the rest of I-495 not in Phase 1 would require a new and separate NEPA process since those resources and properties are being considered avoided for the purpose of this NEPA study.	
85	107	Page 4-10	Section 4.4.3	M-NCPPC is requesting the creation of a clear and concise set of figures and digital GIS data that shows the new proposed ROW after construction.	Before any MOU, mitigation package approveal, or publication of the FEIS/ROD, M-NCPPC will require the review of a clear and concise set of figures and digital GIS data that shows the new proposed ROW after construction.
86	108	Page 4-16	Section 4.4.3 B b	Table 4-9 SHA must provide documentation to prove the use of Capper-Cramton funds to purchase Cabin John Regional Park and Cabin John SVU2. M-NCPPC does not consider those parks to have been purchased with Capper-Cramton Funds.	
87	109	Page 4-17	Section 4.4.3 B c	It needs to be stated clearly that any future improvements on the rest of I-495 not in Phase 1 would require a new and separate NEPA process since those resources and properties are being considered avoided for the purpose of this NEPA study.	
88	110	Page 1 Paragraph 1	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan	Phase I South is the only area being evaluated at this time. All other areas should be specified as no build.	
89	111	Page 1 Paragraph 2	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan Part 1	The project needs to commit to significantly improving the Provided ESD surface area to a minimum of 80% of the Required ESD onsite (allowing for a maximum of 20% to be treated with the use of compensatory SWM mitigation offsite). These highways can be considered the worst water quality offenders in the County and the Project needs to take more responsibility for protecting the downstream water resources, which will never be improved if we don't take the appropriate steps as part of this project. The Project must try harder.	
90	112	Page 1 Paragraph 2	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan Part 1	As the SDEIS only covers Phase I South and specifies that all other areas are no build with the selected alternative, this entire document should only address Phase I South.	

I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study- Draft Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) M-NCPPC Comment/Response Errata- November 29, 2021

MNCPPC Ref Doc_#	No.	Page	SDEIS Section	Comment	
Comments from MNCPPC_1_SDEIS Major Issues_9.19.21 document					**Revised comments where applicable**
91	113	Page 1 Paragraph 2 Last sentence	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan Part 1	Clarify Phase I south (There is also Phase I north).	
92	114	Page 1 Paragraph 3	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan Part 1	Need to be more specific about how more environmental impacts won't result from this SWM effort and how they will be mitigated for. As the P3 can choose any sites (not just from this list) to move forward with, limitations on the amount of environmental resources allowed to be impacted cumulatively for this effort need to be set. Mitigation is not sufficient to compensate for impacts resulting from compensatory offsite SWM.	
93	115	Page 1 Paragraph 3	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan Part 1	Instead of prioritizing existing MDOT SHA ROW for offsite compensatory mitigation in a large geographic area (that becomes meaningless on a 6-digit HUC scale it is so large), instead this effort should be to concentrate on all untreated impervious areas within 1500' of the LOD. This would make the benefits seen by the compensatory mitigation meaningful to the location of the impacts and the surrounding waterways.	
94	116	Page 2 Figure 1-1	Appendix C	"Future Phases" is inconsistent with the rest of the SDEIS document. "No Build" should be used instead.	
95	117	Page 3 Paragraph 1	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan Part 1	Stating that it is "desirable" for SWM to be met onsite is insufficient. The on-site SWM efforts shown are not enough; currently less than 45% of stormwater water quality treatment is proposed onsite. The percentage of on-site SWM treatment should be at least 80%, and then the remaining 20% that is offsite should occur within 1500' of the LOD corridor.	
96	118	Page 3 Paragraph 1	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan Part 1	The MDE 6-digit watershed is too large in this case and puts the compensatory SWM sites too far away from the impacts. All off-site compensatory SWM mitigation should occur within 1500' of the LOD to be proximate and meaningful in its effect on the local water quality.	
97	119	Page 3 Paragraph 4	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan Part 1	Property owners of proposed sites need to be notified sooner. Parks owns some of the proposed sites and we were previously unaware of their inclusion in this plan. We do not approve the use of any of these sites (or the LODs shown) without separate, further coordination to understand the impacts these are mitigating for.	
98	120	Page 3 Paragraph 4	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan Part 1	The MDE 6-digit watershed, even overlaid with the Federal 8-digit HUC, is too large in this case and puts the compensatory SWM sites too far away from the impacts. All off-site compensatory SWM mitigation should occur within 1500' of the LOD to be proximate and meaningful in its effect on the local water quality.	
99	121	Page 4 Figure 2-1	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan Part 1	Specify that this document only covers Phase I south. All other areas should be labeled "No Improvements"	
100	122	Page 5 Paragraph 1 and Paragraph 2	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan Part 1	The SDEIS only covers Phase I south Alternative 9. The rest of alternative 9 is no improvements and those impacts should not be included in this document.	
101	123	Page 5 Paragraph 3	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan Part 1	Be more specific about how the P3 will be incentivized to provide as much on-site SWM as possible. A minimum of 80% of water quality WM should be required to be treated onsite, with strong incentives to treat the remaining 20% on-site as well (or maybe through disincentivizing off-site compensatory SWM). All off-site SWM should be withing 1500' of the LOD.	

I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study- Draft Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) M-NCPPC Comment/Response Errata- November 29, 2021

MNCPPC Ref Doc_#	No.	Page	SDEIS Section	Comment	
Comments from MNCPPC_1_SDEIS Major Issues_9.19.21 document					**Revised comments where applicable**
102	124	Page 5 Paragraph 4	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan Part 1	Omit information for full alternative 9. It is confusing and not relevant – No Improvements are proposed there as the No Build option was selected for that area. Thus there should be no SWM treatment required for the area with no improvements.	
103	125	Page 5 Paragraph 4	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan Part 1	92 onsite /114 offsite is less than 45% treated onsite. This is an unacceptable onsite/offsite ratio. A minimum of 167 acres of water quality SWM should be provided onsite.	
104	126	Page 5 Paragraph 5	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan Part 1	Should be the number for Phase I South only (206), not the 351. Where no improvements/no build are proposed, there should not be impacts.	
105	127	Page 6 Table 3-1	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan Part 1	This table is incredibly confusing. Simplify it by including only Phase I south numbers and dropping anything related to what you are calling future phases, which are really where there are No Improvements/No Build proposed.	
106	128	Page 6	Appendix C Section 4.1 Part 1	MDOT SHA should consider outfall stabilization (using environmentally sensitive techniques) to be a type of compensatory SWM mitigation. SHA owns a plethora of severely eroding outfalls which send tons of sediment downstream each year. Given the status of SHA's storm drain infrastructure, this technique shows real improvement to the local waterways.	MDOT SHA should restore degraded outfalls in addtion to the required SWM.SHA owns a plethora of severely eroding outfalls which send tons of sediment downstream each year. Given the status of SHA's storm drain infrastructure, this technique shows real improvement to the local waterways. Outfall restoration could help SHA reach their stated goal of a net benefit to affectetd resources.
107	129	Page 6	Appendix C Section 4.1 Part 1	Impervious removal, Chapter 3, and Chapter 5 facilities should account for at least 75% of the SWM compensatory mitigation, with stream restoration accounting for no more than 25% of the IAT.	
108	130	Page 6	Appendix C Section 4.1 Part 1	All compensatory SWM sites should be within 1500' of LOD corridor for Phase I South.	
109	131	Page 7	Appendix C Section 4.1 Part 1	Stream restoration for compensatory SWM mitigation should only take place in close proximity (1500') of the impacts and should only be proposed in watersheds with ample stormwater management already in place (low % of untreated impervious).	
110	132	Page 7	Appendix C Section 4.1 Part 1	Specify stringent measures associated with tree loss for compensatory SWM sites. Since these sites could be avoided by choosing other sites, the threshold for tree loss should be low.	
111	133	Page 7	Appendix C Section 4.1 Part 1	The credit potential of one-acre IAT credit per 100 linear foot stream restored is based on outdated crediting methodology. The project should be held to the most recent guidance at the time of permitting; at this time that is the June 2020 Wasteload Allocations Document.	
112	134	Page 7	Appendix C Section 4.1 Part 1	Of the 1,174 compensatory SWM sites, any outside of the corridor 1500' around the LOD should be automatically eliminated from this project.	
113	135	Page 8	Appendix C Section 4.2.1 Part 1	Parks will need to review and approve any compensatory mitigation sites on Parkland for cultural resources impacts.	
114	136	Page 9	Appendix C Section 4.2.6 Part 1	Only the most minimal wetlands and waterways impacts should be accepted, and to the lowest quality resources.	
115	137	Page 9	Appendix C Section 4.2.8 Part 1	After reviewing the maps, it is not true that all compensatory SWM sites that would incur a use of a Section 4(f) properties were eliminated. There are several stream restoration sites as well as a few Chapters 3/5 sites. Edit this statement for accuracy.	

I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study- Draft Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) M-NCPPC Comment/Response Errata- November 29, 2021

MNCPPC Ref Doc_#	No.	Page	SDEIS Section	Comment	
Comments from MNCPPC_1_SDEIS Major Issues_9.19.21 document					**Revised comments where applicable**
116	138	Page 9	Appendix C Section 4.2.8 Part 1	Montgomery Parks does not feel that good potential SWM opportunities should be eliminated due to their location on Parkland. Conversely, we have spent copious amounts of time working with the MDOT/SHA project team to identify and review potential offsite compensatory SWM opportunities on Parkland. Our priority remains to lessen the effects that this highway expansion will have on downstream waterways and properties, many of which are Parkland. Montgomery Parks is committed to being a partner in finding solutions to treat stormwater runoff and hold the project accountable for its environmental impacts. This includes the use of Parkland for compensatory stormwater mitigation when it can be effective.	
117	139	Page 11	Appendix C Section 4.4 Part 1	See above. If sites fit all other criteria for compensatory SWM mitigation and are on Parkland, they should be discussed with the landowner and considered (not just unduly removed from consideration).	
118	140	Page 13 Table 4-3	Appendix C Part 1	Sites outside of the 1500' buffer surrounding the LOD should be removed from consideration. The majority of these 754 sites aren't even proximate to the impervious being installed.	
119	141	Page 13	Appendix C Section 5 Part 1	The P3 should be held strictly accountable for treating a minimum of 80% of the SWM water quality onsite, and the remaining maximum of 20% within 1500' of the corridor.	
120	142	Page 14	Appendix C Section 5.1.8 Part 1	This is inaccurate; section 4(f) land is included in this document.	
121	143	Page 16 Table 6-1	Appendix C Part 1	Table should include information for Phase I South only. All other areas are No Improvements/No Build.	
122	144	Page 17 Figure 6-1	Appendix C Part 1	This map shows how far away so many of the proposed sites are currently. All sites outside of within 1500' of the Phase I south LOD should be eliminated.	
123	145	Page 18 Figure 6-2	Appendix C Part 1	Delete graphic. Not relevant to Phase I South.	
124	146	Page 20 Table 6-2	Appendix C Part 1	This table should include Phase I South only.	
125	147	Page 20 Table 6-2	Appendix C Part 1	All sites not within 1500' of the LOD should be removed from consideration for this project.	
126	148	Page 20 Table 6-2	Appendix C Part 1	Although the document states that parkland sites were removed, it appears that multiple park sites still remain on this list. Any sites will have to be vetted by Park staff prior to use and have all approvals/permissions issued prior to construction. To date no permissions have been granted or LODs approved for use of any Parkland for SWM compensatory mitigation. Parks are willing to work with the project team on good quality opportunities and coordinate accordingly as needed but need to be a part of the decision making and approval process.	
127	149	Appendix A Page A-3 Table A-4	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan Part 1	Stream restoration crediting should be updated to June 2020 Wasteload Allocations document guidance.	
128	150	Appendix A Page A-3 Table A-4	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan Part 1	MDOT SHA should consider outfall stabilization (using environmentally sensitive techniques) to be a type of compensatory SWM mitigation. SHA owns a plethora of severely eroding outfalls which send tons of sediment downstream each year. Given the status of SHA's storm drain infrastructure, this technique could help improve the local waterways.	MDOT SHA should restore degraded outfalls in addtion to the required SWM.SHA owns a plethora of severely eroding outfalls which send tons of sediment downstream each year. Given the status of SHA's storm drain infrastructure, this technique shows real improvement to the local waterways. Outfall restoration could help SHA reach their stated goal of a net benefit to affectetd resources.

I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study- Draft Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) M-NCPPC Comment/Response Errata- November 29, 2021					
MNCPPC Ref Doc_#	**No.**	**Page**	**SDEIS Section**	**Comment**	
Comments from MNCPPC_1_SDEIS Major Issues_9.19.21 document					**Revised comments where applicable**
129	151	Appendix A Page A-4 Table A-3 and paragraph above	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan Part 1	Only numbers relevant to the development of Phase I south should be included. All other areas have no improvements proposed.	
130	152	Appendix A Page A-4 Table A-4	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan Part 1	Table should reflect only Phase I south. Sites further than 1500' outside of the LOD should be eliminated.	
131	153	Appendix A Page A-4 Table A-4	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan Part 1	Site summary needs to include the type of IAT crediting used. Stream restoration should only be used for a maximum of 25% of credits needed.	
132	154	Appendix A Table A-5	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan Part 1	Table should reflect only Phase I south. Sites further than 1500' outside of the LOD should be eliminated.	
133	155	Appendix A Table A-5	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan Part 1	Although the document states that parkland sites were removed, it appears that multiple park sites still remain on this list. Any sites will have to be vetted by Park staff prior to use and have all approvals/permissions issued prior to construction. To date no permissions have been granted or LODs approved for use of any Parkland for SWM compensatory mitigation. Parks are willing to work with the project team on good quality opportunities and coordinate accordingly as needed, but need to be a part of the decision making and approval process.	
134	156	Appendix B Page E	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan Part 1	All park sites will need to be evaluated by Parks Cultural Resources staff.	
135	157	Appendix C Page C	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan Part 1	Forest impacts in Parkland will also require Park mitigation.	
136	158	Appendix D	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan Part 2	Should reflect only Phase I south. Sites further than 1500' outside of the LOD should be eliminated.	
137	159	Appendix E	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan Part 2	Should reflect only Phase I south. Sites further than 1500' outside of the LOD should be eliminated.	
138	160	Appendix F	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan Part 3	Should reflect only Phase I south. Sites further than 1500' outside of the LOD should be eliminated.	
139	161	Appendix G	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan Part 3	Should reflect only Phase I south. Sites further than 1500' outside of the LOD should be eliminated.	
140	162	Appendix G Page G-1 last paragraph	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan Part 3	Parkland use may also require Parkland mitigation. Parkland use shall require coordination with and approval by Parks.	
141	163	Appendix H	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan Part 3	Should reflect only Phase I south. Sites further than 1500' outside of the LOD should be eliminated.	

I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study- Draft Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) M-NCPPC Comment/Response Errata- November 29, 2021

MNCPPC Ref Doc_#	No.	Page	SDEIS Section	Comment	
Comments from MNCPPC_1_SDEIS Major Issues_9.19.21 document					**Revised comments where applicable**
142	164	Appendix H Page H-1 Section 2	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan Part 3	Although the document states that parkland sites were removed, it appears that multiple park sites still remain on this list. Any sites will have to be vetted by Park staff prior to use and have all approvals/permissions issued prior to construction. To date no permissions have been granted or LODs approved for use of any Parkland for SWM compensatory mitigation. Parks are willing to work with the project team on good quality opportunities and coordinate accordingly as needed but need to be a part of the decision making and approval process.	
143	165	Appendix H Page H-1/2 Table H-1	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan Part 3	Any Montgomery Parks sites will have to be vetted by Park staff prior to use and have all approvals/permissions issued prior to construction. To date no permissions have been granted or LODs approved for use of any specific Parkland for SWM compensatory mitigation. Parks are ready to work with the project team on good quality opportunities to effectively treat stormwater on Parkland and be a partner in lessening the effects of this roadway on downstream waterways.	
144	166	Appendix H Table H-2	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan Part 3	Any Montgomery Parks sites will have to be vetted by Park staff prior to use and have all approvals/permissions issued prior to construction. To date no permissions have been granted or LODs approved for use of any specific Parkland for SWM compensatory mitigation. Parks are ready to work with the project team on good quality opportunities to effectively treat stormwater on Parkland and be a partner in lessening the effects of this roadway on downstream waterways.	
145	167	Appendix I	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan Part 3	Should reflect only Phase I south. Sites further than 1500' outside of the LOD should be eliminated.	
146	168	Appendix J	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan Part 3	Should reflect only Phase I south. Sites further than 1500' outside of the LOD should be eliminated.	
147	169	Appendix J	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan	Electronic utility information is available from most utility owners and could have better informed of this investigation.	
148	170	Appendix K	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan Part 3	Should reflect only Phase I south. Sites further than 1500' outside of the LOD should be eliminated.	
149	171	Appendix M	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan Part 3	Should reflect only Phase I south. Sites further than 1500' outside of the LOD should be eliminated.	
150	172	Appendix L	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan Part 3	Should reflect only Phase I south. Sites further than 1500' outside of the LOD should be eliminated.	
151	173	Appendix L Map 25 Site WAS 4457	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan	Coordination with M-NCPPC and WSSC is needed for approval of use of this site. LOD not approved.	

I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study- Draft Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) M-NCPPC Comment/Response Errata- November 29, 2021

MNCPPC Ref Doc_#	No.	Page	SDEIS Section	Comment	
Comments from MNCPPC_1_SDEIS Major Issues_9.19.21 document					**Revised comments where applicable**
152	174	Appendix L Map 36	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan	Coordination with M-NCPPC is needed for approval of use of this site. LOD not approved.	
153	175	Appendix L Map 38 WAS 4038	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan	Coordination with M-NCPPC is needed for approval of use of this site. LOD not approved.	
154	176	Appendix L Map 40 MPOC_008	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan	Coordination with M-NCPPC is needed for approval of use of this site. LOD not approved.	
155	177	Appendix L Map 101 MPAO_0022-Backup	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan	Coordination with M-NCPPC is needed for approval of use of this site. LOD not approved.	
156	178	Appendix L Map 106 WAS-2505 & WAS-2506	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan	Coordination with M-NCPPC is needed for approval of use of this site. LOD not approved.	
157	179	Appendix L Map 108 MO_0029	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan	Coordination with M-NCPPC is needed for approval of use of this site. LOD not approved.	
158	180	Appendix L Map 115 all sites	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan	Coordination with M-NCPPC is needed for approval of use of this site. LOD not approved.	
159	181	Appendix L Map 136 MO_00018	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan	Coordination with M-NCPPC is needed for approval of use of this site. LOD not approved.	
160	182	Appendix L Map 186 MPAO_0014	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan	Coordination with M-NCPPC is needed for approval of use of this site. LOD not approved.	
161	183	Appendix L Map 208 SSS-150023	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan	Coordination with M-NCPPC is needed for approval of use of this site. LOD not approved.	
162	184	Appendix L Map 210 MPOC_009	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan	Coordination with M-NCPPC is needed for approval of use of this site. LOD not approved.	
163	185	Appendix L Map 211 MO_00047A	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan	Coordination with M-NCPPC is needed for approval of use of this site. LOD not approved.	
164	186	Appendix L Map 212 WAS_5308	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan	Coordination with M-NCPPC is needed for approval of use of this site. LOD not approved.	
165	187	Appendix L Map 213 MPAO_0015	Appendix C Compensatory SW Mitigation Plan	Coordination with M-NCPPC is needed for approval of use of this site. LOD not approved.	

I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study- Draft Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) M-NCPPC Comment/Response Errata- November 29, 2021

MNCPPC Ref Doc_#	No.	Page	SDEIS Section	Comment	
Comments from MNCPPC_1_SDEIS Major Issues_9.19.21 document					**Revised comments where applicable**
166	188	Page 4-27	Chapter 4 4.6.3 Environmental Consequences	Noise/visual barrier should be pursued for all areas of parkland. Parks expectation that any areas shown with retaining wall adjacent to parkland within Phase 1 South, should also incorporate noise wall/visual barrier. In addition to the noise/visual barriers requires landscape plantings adjacent to all wall/barrier locations, include planting of specifically designed vegetative buffers. This would consist of plantings at least 5m wide with a diverse type of woody plants planted at a higher density. As far as the Visual Screening Options memo, Parks would like some discussion about the construction techniques and minimum footprints required to construct Timber Noise Barriers and Concrete Noise Barriers in conjunction with/on top of retaining walls. The LOD construction offset to the proposed retaining walls is shown in the most recent plans at approx. 15', Parks needs to understand any additional impacts being incurred as a result of adding this element to the design. Parks could be open to a combination of timber and concrete noise barriers along all parkland and would want to work with them to identify what is most appropriate in each area and look at heights that would be meaningful.	
167	189	Map 8	Environmental Resource Mapping Appx D	Add noise wall STA 192+50 to 197+00 on west side and 195+00 to 220+00 on east side.	
168	190	Map 9	Environmental Resource Mapping Appx D	Add noise wall STA 203+00 to 220+00 and along River Road on east side.	
169	191	Map 23	Environmental Resource Mapping Appx D	Add noise wall STA 3683+00 to 3680+00 along east side and STA 3684+00 to 3669+00.	
170	192	Map 23	Environmental Resource Mapping Appx D	Add noise wall STA 3669+00 to 3619+00 on west side.	
171	193	Page 4-10	Section 4.4.3 B b	Parks does not recognize any NCPC authority over the Cabin John Regional Park or Cabin John SVU2. SHA and NCPC will have to provide clear documentation that those parks were purchased with Capper-Cramton funds.	
172	194	Page 4-55	Chapter 4 Section 4.11.4	M-NCPPC expects E&S measures beyond what is required to protect aquatic resources on park land	
173	195	Page 4-57	Chapter 4 Section 4.12.3	SHA is considering the impact area of the preferred alternative to have been significantly reduced, this implies that the rest of the alignment outside of Phase 1 should be clearly labeled as "no build" and any future improvements would require a new NEPA process.	
174	196	Page 4-57	Chapter 4 Section 4.12.3	Indirect impacts to wetlands and waterways should be mitigated for by the construction of environmental stewardship projects design to enhance and protect the environment.	
175	197	Page 4-63 to 4-72	Chapter 4 Section 4.13	Parks requires further coordination for the impacts to wetlands and waterways on parkland as listed in table 4-24, 4-26 and 4-27.	

I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study- Draft Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) M-NCPPC Comment/Response Errata- November 29, 2021					
MNCPPC Ref Doc_#	**No.**	**Page**	**SDEIS Section**	**Comment**	
Comments from MNCPPC_1_SDEIS Major Issues_9.19.21 document					**Revised comments where applicable**
176	198	Page 4-63 to 4-72	Chapter 4 Section 4.13	Parks requires further coordination for the impacts to forest impacts on parkland and potential mitigation.	
177	199	Page 4-71	Chapter 4 Section 4.13.3	Parks requires further coordination for the increase in impervious areas, 98.2 acres of impervious added to Cabin John Creek watershed and other impacts listed in Table 4-28. Discuss BMPs being employed and long-term water quality impacts. SHA should commit to environmental stewardship projects in the watershed that are above and beyond required stormwater management and 404 mitigation.	
178	200	Page 4-71	Chapter 4 Section 4.13.4	Parks requires further coordination for avoidance and minimization through design and construction. Work to coordinate retention and addition of riparian buffers as well as aquatic passage through structures. Retain floodplain access and preserve existing stream buffers. Increase SWM techniques to improve water quality.	
179	201	Page 4-73	Chapter 4 Section 4.14.4	The project needs to commit to significantly improving the Provided ESD surface area to a minimum of 80% of the Required ESD onsite (allowing for a maximum of 20% to be treated with the use of compensatory SWM mitigation offsite). These highways can be considered the worst water quality offenders in the County and the Project needs to take more responsibility for protecting the downstream water resources, which will never be improved if we don't take the appropriate steps as part of this project.	
180	202	Page 4-75	Chapter 4 Section 4.15.3	Parks requires further coordination for culvert augmentations and floodplain encroachments on Parkland to reduce impacts to hydrologic function and wildlife habitat.	
181	203	Page 4-76	Chapter 4 Section 4.16.2	Further coordination on impacts to forested areas on Parkland, including impacts FIDS habitat species and NNI treatment. Coordinate reforestation on and offsite. SDEIS lists 9.5 acres of potential tree planting opportunities on M-NCPPC Parkland.	
182	204	Page 4-82	Chapter 4 Section 4.18.2	Indirect impacts to wetlands and waterways should be mitigated for by the construction of environmental stewardship projects design to enhance and protect the environment.	
183	205	Page ES-11	Section ES	This table notes that there are 2 historic properties where the adverse effect cannot yet be determined. It should also note that there are a number of outstanding evaluations to determine if properties are eligible for the NR or not. The total number of Historic Properties is not yet determined, nor is the adverse effect on them.	

I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study- Draft Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) M-NCPPC Comment/Response Errata- November 29, 2021

MNCPPC Ref Doc_#	No.	Page	SDEIS Section	Comment	
Comments from MNCPPC_1_SDEIS Major Issues_9.19.21 document					**Revised comments where applicable**
184	206	Page 4-4	Section Table 4-1	Same as above.	
185	207	Page 4-25	Section 106 Consult	SDEIS states two archaeological sites were identified on BARC in Montgomery County. BARC is in PG County, not Montgomery.	
186	208	Page 4-28	Section Archaeological Resources	Same as above – BARC and sites 18PR113 and 18PR1190 are in PG County, based on the site forms in MHT's MEDUSA system.	
187	209		General	We reiterate our ongoing concern that the DEIS is being reviewed before all the potential Historic Properties have been fully evaluated under Section 106 of NHPA and without a clear understanding of the number and kind of Historic Properties within the APE. This work is also happening before the Programmatic Agreement is finalized and the preferred APE is clearly defined. The project impacts to Historic Properties are currently not fully known.	
Comments from MNCPPC_3_MCPlanning_SDEIS_8.19.21					
1	1		General	**TTIs for Managed Lanes**: TTI results are not presented for the managed lanes in any of the documentation. Please provide this information. We assume that it is typically better than either the No Build or the Preferred Alternative. It would be useful to know where the managed lanes will be more heavily used/constrained along the facility.	
2	2		ES-11 and Chapter 3	**Generalization/Overstatements on Project Benefit:** The paragraph summarizing the Preferred Alternative's Transportation & Traffic conditions states that the Preferred Alternative will ""increase speeds, improve reliability, and reduce travel times and delays." In reviewing the Chapter 3 (Transportation & Traffic), however, there appear to be multiple segments where this will not be the case. It appears to be inaccurate to make this assertion without further detail and refinement.	
3	3	ES-11		**Need for More Environmental Metrics:** Table ES-1 should include additional environmental metrics, such as those pertaining to air quality & emissions, indirect impacts of how this project may enable environmentally damaging development patterns, how this project may erode Non-Auto Drive Mode Share efforts, and impacts to VMT.	
4	4		Section 3.1.4	**Effects of Covid-19:** It may be helpful to include a line on the COVID Traffic Impacts graph in the SDEIS that shows where trending traffic growth would have been expected to be were the pandemic not to have occurred. Even if traffic were to return to the 0% mark on this graph, there remains a year and a half of lost traffic growth that would have extended the ""normal target"" above the 0% line. This also does not capture that the timing and nature of trips has shifted during the pandemic.	
5	5		Section 2.3.7 & 2.4	Where BRT facilities are master planned, please include BRT facilities across the 270 and 495 corridors at interchanges.	

I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study- Draft Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) M-NCPPC Comment/Response Errata- November 29, 2021

MNCPPC Ref Doc_#	No.	Page	SDEIS Section	Comment	
Comments from MNCPPC_1_SDEIS Major Issues_9.19.21 document					**Revised comments where applicable**
6	6		Chapter 3	**Ramp Operational Analyses:** For this section and in general, have operational analyses been performed for the interchange ramps and ramp terminal intersections on the interchange cross streets? Section 3.3.6 provides information about overall network delay to the local roadway network, but there is language about some increased delays around managed lane entrance points on the cross streets. Were just the ramps and ramp terminal intersections modeled, or did the model continue on either side of the interchange to get a clearer representation of these cross street operations in the vicinities of interchanges? We want to be sure that operational benefits to the freeway system do not result in operational failures or safety concerns on the ramps or cross streets, so it would be beneficial to have an idea of any localized issues as well.	
7	7		Section 3.3	**AADT Increases with Proposed Project:** Table 3-3 shows 2045 Build Traffic. The Build alternatives show ADTs that are higher than No-Build. It may be helpful to discuss this growth in the context of induced demand and diverted trips: are these additional trips new trips? Are they trips that were occurring at different times, or that were using different routes? Are they trips that have shifted from non-auto modes? All these trip types need to quantified to fairly understand how the proposed project is changing mode choice and travel characteristics.	
8	8		Section 3.3	**Travel Speeds**: While this section alludes to more detailed travel speed information in Appendix A, it may be helpful to provide a general note highlighting any significant speed benefits or impedances experienced on a segment level, which may be watered down by taking an average of a much longer corridor.	
9	9		Section 3.3.2	**System-Wide Delay**: The Delay metric appears to combine both General Purpose and Managed Lanes. As such, this is not a particularly useful metric.	
10	10		Section 3.3.3	**Worsening of General Purpose Lanes:** This project claims to improve traffic, but the project's analysis finds that in there are significant segments where the General Purpose lanes worsen significantly as compared to No Build conditions. Does MDOT accept degraded performance of the General Purpose lanes in the interest of providing priced managed lanes? Penalizing current users of these roads does not seem to be consistent with the stated policy objectives of this program. If MDOT does accept this outcome, it is imperative that equity be considered, and actions be incorporated into the project to address the needs of users that are most adversely impacted.	
11	11		Section 3.3.3	**Project Purpose and Need and Proposed Project:** The project's Purpose & Need includes creating new options for users, but the Preferred Alternative instead appear to reduce options available to users unable to afford or otherwise access the managed lanes	
12	12		Section 3.3.5	**Level of Service Metric**: The Level of Service metric appears to combine both General Purpose and Managed Lanes. As such, this is not a particularly useful metric. The aggregate nature of this metric may allow the effects of the managed lanes or the general purpose lanes to be over representative, and we urge that this metric account separately for managed lanes and general purpose lanes.	

I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study- Draft Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) M-NCPPC Comment/Response Errata- November 29, 2021					
MNCPPC Ref Doc_#	**No.**	**Page**	**SDEIS Section**	**Comment**	
Comments from MNCPPC_1_SDEIS Major Issues_9.19.21 document					**Revised comments where applicable**
13	13		General	**I-270 ICMS Project:** The ICMS document stated that there would be transportation benefits from their proposed actions up to 2040 and beyond. Given that this was a $100M investment from the state, how much of those improvements will actually contribute to alleviating the 2045 No Build condition? How much of the Preferred Alternative actually removes or significantly modifies the improvements spent on the ICMS project? Clearly, given the abrupt decision of the MDOT SHA design team to re-design the build alternatives on I-270 mid-stream to eliminate the express/local lane system, why was this not considered in the ICMS project? In hindsight, this appears to be a very shortsighted, short-term decision that will never achieve the cost-benefit ratios projected.	
14	14		Section 4.1	This section should include information on how this project will affect land use & zoning beyond the immediate impacts of the project. This includes a focus on how this may affect environmentally damaging development patterns and efforts toward Non-Auto Driver Mode Share (NADMS) goals.	
15	15		Section 4.8.1	This page includes the following statement: "Because the new Preferred Alternative, Alternative 9: Phase 1 South, includes no action for the majority of the study area, the affected network was updated to focus on just those segments near the project area..." This does not appear to be an appropriate assumption, as the Transportation & Traffic chapter demonstrates that the Preferred Alternative will have increased vehicle volumes throughout the entire study area, and additional congestion in multiple segments within the study area. These impacts must be included for a complete analysis. It is also unclear whether local roadways have been included in this analysis, particularly noting the lack of Transportation & Traffic information on these same roadways.	

I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study- Draft Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) M-NCPPC Comment/Response Errata- November 29, 2021					
MNCPPC Ref Doc_#	**No.**	**Page**	**SDEIS Section**	**Comment**	
Comments from MNCPPC_1_SDEIS Major Issues_9.19.21 document					**Revised comments where applicable**
16	16		Section 4.8.1	**GHG Emissions:** This page includes the following statement: "GHG emissions on the affected transportation network for all modeled Build Alternatives in the DEIS are projected to be lower in the opening (2025) and design (2040) years compared to base year conditions. All Build Alternatives are projected to slightly increase annual tailpipe GHG emissions by an average of 1.4 percent compared to the No Build Alternative in 2040." First, it sounds like the 1st sentence says this will have lower emissions, but the 2nd sentence says this will have higher emissions. How do these differ? Is it that the 1st sentence appears to account for *all* GHG emissions, and the 2nd sentence appears to focus only on tailpipe GHG emissions? More detail is needed. Second, if this is asserting that the project will reduce emissions: much more detail is needed on methodology and assumptions, as this result seems counterintuitive given that the project is increasing vehicle volumes and VMT. Noting the State's interest in Electric Vehicles: if electric vehicles are a substantive part of this reduction, it will be important to account for the impacts of the electric vehicles themselves. Electric vehicles have substantial impacts: - Extracting the resources needed for their production (particularly their batteries) - Impacts of production - Energy requirements, which at present is generated through unsustainable & polluting sources - Severely impactful waste issues (again largely due to the batteries) - EVs are still vehicles: they demand pavements (concrete and asphalt; both depend on highly impactful cement and petroleum production) and pose safety	
17	17	Table 3-9, page 3-12	Section 3.3.4	**Percent of Lane-Miles Operating at LOS F:** Do these results include the managed lane-miles or just the general-purpose lane-miles? If it includes the managed lanes, we request that this section be modified to also provide a comparison of percent lane-miles between the No Build and the Preferred Alternative in the General-Purpose Lanes only.	

I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study- Draft Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) M-NCPPC Comment/Response Errata- November 29, 2021					
MNCPPC Ref Doc_#	**No.**	**Page**	**SDEIS Section**	**Comment**	
Comments from MNCPPC_1_SDEIS Major Issues_9.19.21 document					**Revised comments where applicable**
18	18	Page 3-12 (Data obtained from Appendix A, Attachment F Link Evaluation Results)	Section 3.3.4	**I-495 east of I-270 LOS F conditions**: It is stated that "29 percent of the lane miles would continue to operate at LOS F in the design year of 2045 under the Preferred Alternative, primarily in areas along I-495 east of the I-270 east spur that would have no action." This statement does not seem accurate, as AM peak hour conditions will grow considerably worse overall in certain sections of I-495 due to the proposed project. The localized summary of impacts has not been presented in Table 3-9 or anywhere in the SDEIS. Between MD 355 (I-270 East Spur) and I-95, there are 52 Inner Loop analysis segments totaling 8.8 miles. During the 2045 AM Peak Hour, 20 of these segments (3.4 miles or 39 percent of this section of I-495) operate at LOS F in the No Build Condition, but 46 segments (8.28 miles or 94 percent of this section of I-495) operate at LOS F with the Preferred Alternative in place. Clearly, neither the Chapter 3 presentation nor Appendix A provides any of this fine-grained analysis or conclusions. The data in Attachment F had to be combed through to discover this significant impact. This evaluation should be enhanced to look at discrete sections of I-270 and I-495 where significant congestion effects should be noted, acknowledged, and considered for mitigation through modification of the proposed project by design element changes or toll strategy modifications. This degradation seems to be a significant impact of the proposed project, but it has been overlooked using a simplistic and abbreviated summary of LOS F conditions. Frankly, an over-simplification of analysis results is not isolated to this one example. To often, EISs in the interest of brevity, shorten presentations so much to the point where any significant conclusions are not discernable to the average reader. The DEIS chapters are intended to lay out the **significant impacts** with more detail provided in Appendices. This document misses this on LOS F, and many of the other transportation metrics studied	
19	19	Page 3-9	Section 3.3 (page 9 of 16)	**2045 Inner Loop PM Peak Hour VISSIM Travel Speed in the Managed Lanes**: During the PM peak hour, the route from the GW Parkway to the I-270 West Spur is projected is projected to take only 4.2 minutes for a 4.3-mile section of road (61 mph), not the 23 mph reported in Table 3-5. The 4.2-minute travel time was obtained from Appendix A - Attachment D – Travel Time Matrices for the ETL (PM Peak Hour). There must be an error in one of these travel time/speed measurements as they do not match.	
20	20	Page 3-11	Section 3.3.3	**Table 3-8 – TTI Results for General Purpose Lanes**: The preferred alternative appears to cause a significant congestion effect on one area outside the project limits, specifically during the 2045 AM peak hour on the Inner Loop between I-270 and I-95 ("top side" of the Beltway) where the TTI increases from No Build conditions of 1.3 to 2.7 in the General Purpose Lanes (208% increase). During the 2045 PM peak hour, the Inner Loop from VA 193 to I-270 West Spur also shows a decrease from No Build conditions of 6.6 to 6.9. What is causing the reduction in non-tolled TTI in each of these sections?	

I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study- Draft Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) M-NCPPC Comment/Response Errata- November 29, 2021					
MNCPPC Ref Doc_#	**No.**	**Page**	**SDEIS Section**	**Comment**	
Comments from MNCPPC_1_SDEIS Major Issues_9.19.21 document					**Revised comments where applicable**
21	21	Appendix A, Page 3-11 and Appendix A, Attachment D and B	Section 3.3.3	**2045 Inner Loop PM Peak Hours TTIs**: The TTIs for the Inner Loop PM peak hour from VA 193 to I-270 do not seem to match with travel time data provided in Appendix A, Attachment D. Is congested TTI defined based on the posted speed limit of 55 mph or based on observations of existing off-peak speeds on that stretch of road? The travel time for this 5.1-mile segment for the managed lanes is shown as 5.3 minutes in Appendix A, Attachment D (page 133 of 184). This equates to an average speed of 58 mph. What is the TTI in the Managed Lanes through this same section? As an example, could you provide the TTI calculations for this segment for Alt 1, GP lanes and the Managed Lanes?	
22	22	Attachment D and B	Appendix A	**2045 PM Peak Hour Travel Times from VA 193 to I-270 and Delay/Demand Imbalance**: Alternative 1 (No Build) has a 38.6-minute travel time and the Preferred Alternative - GP lanes has a 40.1-minute travel time. The managed lanes have a 5.3-minute travel time. The travel time differential through this section seems totally unbalanced, as a managed lane toll strategy should seek to achieve a much lower speed than is forecast and still operate acceptably (by reducing the toll) until a 45-mph average speed is achieved in the managed lanes. 2,535 vph is the projected Inner Loop 6-7 PM toll volume at the ALB (page 101 of 184, Appendix A, Attachment B). Using MDOT SHA's vphpl lane max for a managed lane of 1700 vphpl, it appears that there is excess room in the PM Inner Loop managed lanes for an additional 865 vehicles during the highest 6-7 PM peak hour (more in the other 3 PM hours). This would represent a 13 percent reduction in volumes in the GP lanes if the toll was lowered to induce more traffic to use the managed lanes to achieve this balance. This might help to mitigate the poor GP lane conditions, so it is at least better than Alternative 1 (No Build). In general, it seems that this type of critical thinking and manual toll adjustments should have been a standard step in the toll assignment process. It is easy to diagnose, and likely can be fixed with a few iterative model runs with reduced tolls when this occurs.	
23	23	Page 123	Appendix A SDEIS Traffic Evaluation Memo – Attachment C	**2045 AM Peak Hour SB I-270 Congestion**: Per the I-270 SB Speed AM profile, peak hour speeds will be disrupted significantly on the MD 121 to Middlebrook Road segment of I-270 during the 2045 AM peak hour due to the addition of the proposed project. This is likely to seriously increase travel delay for commuters living in UpCounty Montgomery County and Frederick County. Please provide more travel time summaries for more common travel patterns, including Frederick to Rockville, Clarksburg to the GW Parkway, and Clarksburg to MD 97. Please explain why increased congestion is projected to occur many miles upstream from the project area. We anticipate that instead of this very long delay, you would continue to see worsened peak spreading into the shoulder hours during the AM commute period. This project seems to be setting up the need for Phase 1B by design. In that sense, I think it is clear that the segmentation of this project on I-270 into Phase 1A and Phase 1B was not fully thought out, as widening on Phase 1A precipitates the need for Phase 1B. From early on, the constraint at the Montgomery/Frederick County line has been identified as a major bottleneck that is more of immediate action.	

I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study- Draft Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) M-NCPPC Comment/Response Errata- November 29, 2021					
MNCPPC Ref Doc_#	**No.**	**Page**	**SDEIS Section**	**Comment**	
Comments from MNCPPC_1_SDEIS Major Issues_9.19.21 document					**Revised comments where applicable**
24	24	Page 125	Appendix A SDEIS Traffic Evaluation Memo – Attachment C	**2045 AM Peak Hour Inner Loop Congestion in Prince George's County**: Per the I-495 Inner Loop Speed PM profile, peak hour speeds will be disrupted significantly on the US 1 to US 50 sections of the Inner Loop during the 2045 PM peak hour due to the addition of the proposed project. Please explain why this project-related impact is projected to occur in Prince George's County?	
25	25		Section 3.3.1	**Managed Lane versus General Purpose Lane Speeds**: The General Purpose lanes are projected to operate at nearly the same speed as the Managed Lanes in the segments listed below, which may affect the usefulness of the Managed Lanes. This could in-turn affect how much traffic chooses to instead remain in the General Purpose lanes, and it is unclear how this evaluated such feedback processes & whether an equilibrium was identified. This may also affect the HOT lanes' financial viability. This, in general, highlights a serious concern with how managed lane volumes were estimated. - AM peak, 495 Outer Loop between 270 and GW Pkwy (8% faster) - AM peak, 495 Inner Loop between GW Pkwy and 270 (13% faster) - AM peak, NB 270 between 495 and 370 (3% faster) - AM peak, SB 270 between 370 and 495 (16% faster) - PM peak, 495 Outer Loop between 270 and GW Pkwy (13% faster) - PM peak, SB 270 between 370 and 495 (equal speed)	
26	26		Appendix D SDEIS Traffic Evaluation Memo – Attachment D Travel Time Matrix	**Review of Travel Time Projections**: A review was conducted of travel time savings using travel time projections provided in Attachment D. Note that this data is limited to the project study area, not the modeled area, so travel time data on I-270 north of I-370 was not provided. See the AM and PM peak hour tables below for typical Montgomery County O-D pairs. Expanding the attachment D data to show the entire I-270 corridor studied would have been useful. In addition, given that there appears to be some very large regional traffic shifts on I-495 between the Maryland and Virginia sides, it would be useful to see travel time data for larger segments of I-495 in Virginia (i.e., VA 193 to Tysons, Tysons to I-95, and I-95 to MD 414. Please provide similar data for the I-495 Virginia segments and more O-D travel time summaries for UpCounty Montgomery County and Frederick County commuters.	

I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study- Draft Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) M-NCPPC Comment/Response Errata- November 29, 2021					
MNCPPC Ref Doc_#	**No.**	**Page**	**SDEIS Section**	**Comment**	
Comments from MNCPPC_1_SDEIS Major Issues_9.19.21 document					**Revised comments where applicable**
27	27		Appendix D SDEIS Traffic Evaluation Memo – Attachment D Travel Time Matrix	**Impact of Managed Lanes System on General Purpose Traffic:** : Based on observation of the data reported in the tables above, here are some areas of concern: 1) The 2045 AM peak hour trip from the GW Parkway to MD 97 (Inner Loop) increases from Alternative 1 - No Build to Preferred Alternative General Purpose Lanes by 8.3 minutes (63 percent increase). 2) The 2045 AM peak hour trip from MD 189 (Falls Road) to I-95 (I-270 and Inner Loop) increases by 14.3 minutes (62 percent increase). 3) the 2045 AM peak hour trip from MD 190 to MD 355 (Inner Loop) increases by 4.7 minutes (200% increase). 4) The 2045 PM peak hour trip from the GW Parkway to MD 189 (Falls Road) increases by 10 minutes (31% increase). Question 1: How does MDOT SHA justify making 2045 traffic conditions worse (Alternative 1 – No Build versus the Proposed Project - GP Lanes) for the benefit of toll paying drivers for these locations? These travel time losses are being incurred by the commuting population and essentially subsidizing the cost of the managed lanes as a result. Wherever possible, the toll strategy should be adjusted to ensure that GP Lane travel times are no worse than Alternative 1 – No Build conditions. This is basic traffic impact mitigation, and this evaluation should be conducted for all locations where this impact to GP traffic is projected. Question 2: Any worsening of the General Purpose lanes to benefit Tolled Lanes presents a major equity issue that needs to be directly and substantively addressed. How will this be addressed from an equity/environmental justice lens?	
28	28		Appendix D SDEIS Traffic Evaluation Memo – Attachment D Travel Time Matrix	**Travel Time Benefit of Managed Lanes for Montgomery County users**: Using the data in the previous tables, here are some areas of concern: 1) During the 2045 AM peak hour, none of the typical O-D patterns in Montgomery County show any benefits of using the managed lanes at all with projected travel time savings ranging from 0.3 to 1.6 minutes. 2) During the 2045 PM peak hour, the GW Parkway to MD 97 route shows a 39-minute travel time savings, although, this travel time savings is earned over a very short section of the Inner Loop between the GW Parkway and the I-270 west spur. 3) During the 2045 PM peak hour, the GW Parkway to MD 189 (Falls Road) route shows a 33-minute travel time savings; however, this is only a 23-minute net travel time savings over No Build conditions. 4) During the 2045 PM peak hour for all other Montgomery County patterns evaluated, the projected travel time benefits are negligible (ranging rom 0.4 to 1.1 minutes). Question 1 from this data: Why does this proposed project provide almost no travel time benefits for the vast majority of Montgomery County commuters? Question 2 from this data: The modeling assumptions seem suspect as a result, as most Montgomery County commuters will learn pretty quickly that the Managed Lanes have little benefit to their daily commute trip. Who are the actual projected users of these Managed Lanes? Who benefits and is that reflected in the modeling assumptions? Understanding the O-D patterns of ALB users would help to understand who these managed lanes are designed for. We recommend that select link analyses be conducted using the travel demand model in order to provide more detail and clarity.	

I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study- Draft Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) M-NCPPC Comment/Response Errata- November 29, 2021					
MNCPPC Ref Doc_#	**No.**	**Page**	**SDEIS Section**	**Comment**	
Comments from MNCPPC_1_SDEIS Major Issues_9.19.21 document					**Revised comments where applicable**
29	29		Appendix D SDEIS Traffic Evaluation Memo – Attachment D Travel Time Matrix	**Travel Time Impacts on I-495 in Prince George's County**: On observation of data reported in the previous tables, the travel time on I-495 between MD 5 and MD 97 was evaluated. During the 2045 PM peak hour, a very anomalous result was found with the MD 5 to MD 97 route (Outer Loop) showing a 36-minute travel time benefit between the No Build and the Preferred Alternative. Based on 2045 PM peak hour Inner Loop results on the northeastern side of the Beltway, it appears that a dramatic regional shift is projected from traffic with an origin in Virginia and with a Maryland destination that now (and during the 2045 No Build condition) uses I-495 in Virginia crossing the Woodrow Wilson bridge. Lacking travel time data for I-495 in most of Virginia, this is speculative. Question from this review: What is causing this significant travel time savings from a regional perspective? To what extent is Prince George's County projected to benefit or projected to be impacted by a project so far away from their jurisdiction?	
30	30	Pages 144 and 155	Appendix A SDEIS Traffic Evaluation Memo – Attachment F	**AM Peak Hour Bottleneck Shift to Top Side of Beltway – Level of Service**: A comparison of the link evaluation results for the I-495 Inner Loop 2045 AM Peak Hour shows how Inner Loop congestion will increase due to the addition of the proposed project. Comparing graphics on page 144 and 155, you can see the extent of congestion between the I-270 Western Spur to MD 193 caused by the project increases significantly, jamming up the entire top side of the Beltway, as more traffic is allowed to funnel into the top side of the Beltway than it can handle. This will be devastating to AM peak hour traffic conditions on the top side of the Inner Loop within most of Montgomery County during the 2045 AM peak hour. In the 2045 No Build condition, only 4 of the total 48 road segments evaluated were projected with Level of Service F conditions between the I-270 western spur and MD 193. With the preferred alternative, a total of 41 out of the total 48 road segments are projected to operate at Level of Service F conditions during the 2045 AM peak hour.	
31	31	Pages 147 and 159	Appendix A SDEIS Traffic Evaluation Memo – Attachment F	**Increased Southbound Congestion at Existing I-270 Bottleneck at Montgomery/Frederick County Line**: A comparison of the link evaluation results for the I-270 SB 2045 AM Peak Hour shows how I-270 SB congestion will increase due to the addition of the proposed project. Comparing graphics on page 147 and 159, one can see the extent of congestion between four segments north of MD 121 to Middlebrook Road caused by the project. In the 2045 No Build condition, only 9 of the total 25 road segments evaluated were projected with Level of Service F conditions within this area. With the preferred alternative, a total of 24 out of the total 25 road segments are projected to operate at Level of Service F conditions during the 2045 AM peak hour. The projected worsening of traffic conditions in this section of I-270 seems to be caused by the presence of additional capacity downstream, with more drivers willing to suffer through this congestion in the Clarksburg area. Even if this results in a faster commute for some, it does increase the intensity of the existing bottleneck congestion.	

I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study- Draft Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) M-NCPPC Comment/Response Errata- November 29, 2021					
MNCPPC Ref Doc_#	**No.**	**Page**	**SDEIS Section**	**Comment**	
Comments from MNCPPC_1_SDEIS Major Issues_9.19.21 document					**Revised comments where applicable**
32	32	Pages 152 and 164	Appendix A SDEIS Traffic Evaluation Memo – Attachment F	**Increased Northbound Congestion at Existing I-270 Bottleneck at Montgomery/Frederick County Line**: A comparison of the link evaluation results for the I-270 NB 2045 PM Peak Hour shows how I-270 NB congestion will increase due to the addition of the proposed project. Comparing graphics on page 152 and 164, one can see the extent of NB I-270 congestion between MD 121 to MD 85 caused by the project. In the 2045 PM peak hour No Build condition, only 7 of the total 51 road segments evaluated were projected with Level of Service F conditions within this area. With the preferred alternative, a total of 43 out of the total 51 road segments are projected to operate at Level of Service F conditions during the 2045 AM peak hour. This is clearly an example of the existing ALB bottleneck being shifted to north of the Managed Lane project terminus.	
33	33	Pages 148 and 160	Appendix A SDEIS Traffic Evaluation Memo – Attachment F	**Regional Outer Loop Traffic Diversions Impact I-495 in Prince George's County**: A comparison of the link evaluation results for the I-495 Outer Loop 2045 PM Peak Hour shows how Outer Loop congestion is projected to increase due to the addition of the proposed project. Comparing graphics on page 148 and 160, one can see the extent of Outer Loop congestion between MD 5 and US 50 caused by the project, jamming up the entire southeastern side of the Beltway. In the 2045 PM peak hour No Build condition, only 11 of the total 54 road segments evaluated were projected with Level of Service F conditions between MD 5 and US 50. With the preferred alternative, a total of 41 out of the total 54 road segments are projected to operate at Level of Service F conditions during the 2045 PM peak hour. Please explain why this level of traffic congestion is projected along this segment of the Beltway, as this section of I-495 is far away from the project limits?	
34	34	Pages 150 and 162	Appendix A SDEIS Traffic Evaluation Memo – Attachment F	**Regional Inner Loop Traffic Diversions Impact I-495 in Prince George's County**: A comparison of the link evaluation results for the I-495 Inner Loop 2045 PM Peak Hour shows how Inner Loop congestion is projected to increase due to the addition of the proposed project. Comparing graphics on page 150 and 162, one can see the extent of Inner Loop congestion between US Route 1 and US Route 50 caused by the project, jamming up the entire northeastern side of the Beltway. In the 2045 No Build condition, only 8 of the total 36 road segments evaluated were projected with Level of Service F conditions between US 1 and US 50. With the preferred alternative, a total of 34 out of the total 36 road segments evaluated are projected to operate at Level of Service F conditions during the 2045 PM peak hour. Please explain why this level of traffic congestion is projected along this segment of the Beltway, as this section of I-495 is far away from the project limits?	
35	35	Pages 152 and 164)	Appendix A SDEIS Traffic Evaluation Memo – Attachment F	**Delay increases on I-270**: With the addition of the proposed project during the 2045 PM peak hour, almost all general-purpose travel lane segments on NB I-270 between Middlebrook Road and MD 121 (21 out of 22 segments) are projected to experience increases in delay. How will the P3 contractor mitigate this project-related impact? Their profits are essentially exacerbating this congestion increase at the expense of UpCounty Montgomery County and Frederick County taxpayers.	

I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study- Draft Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) M-NCPPC Comment/Response Errata- November 29, 2021					
MNCPPC Ref Doc_#	**No.**	**Page**	**SDEIS Section**	**Comment**	
Comments from MNCPPC_1_SDEIS Major Issues_9.19.21 document					**Revised comments where applicable**
36	36		General	**Bottleneck Issues Related to Project Design**: Most of the issues identified above clearly show impacts of relieving the congestion at the American Legion Bridge (ALB). In all cases, this does not eliminate congestion but shifts it from the ALB vicinity (McLean and Potomac) to other areas in Maryland. While some of these bottleneck shifts were expected, the degree of congestion resulting from the proposed project is severe on I-270 north of I-370, on the Inner Loop on the top side of the Beltway, and very surprisingly, on the Inner Loop in Prince George's County. More attention needs to be spent on the project design to mitigate these projected deficiencies. For I-270, a solution would be to more closely link Phase 1A and 1B so that they are constructed concurrently. For the other bottleneck issues, we are recommending the following design changes to the Preferred Alternative: 1) Eliminate the managed lanes from the I-270 Eastern Spur between I-270 and Old Georgetown Road, 2) Eliminate the managed lanes and exit/entrance ramps from I-495 between the I-270 west spur and Old Georgetown Road, 3) Managed lane traffic destined to and from I-495 to the east of the I-270 west spur ("top side of the Beltway")would enter/exit the managed lane network at the River Road crossover interchange. It is uncertain that this crossover has adequate capacity, but this limitation is likely to help reduce the "Top Side" bottleneck discussed earlier. 4) I-270 Montgomery County drivers headed to the eastern spur would not use the Managed Lane network at all. Clearly, for most Montgomery County travelers, the managed lanes would provide minimal travel time benefits for drivers from Gaithersburg and Rockville to most Montgomery County destinations.	
37	37		General	**Proportional highway/transit investment based on where bottleneck congestion is created by the Project**: Since this project is clearly shifting the congestion almost as much as it is actually reducing the congestion, MDOT SHA should actively plan to invest in the areas where bottleneck congestion will be created or worsened.	

I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study- Draft Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) M-NCPPC Comment/Response Errata- November 29, 2021					
MNCPPC Ref Doc_#	**No.**	**Page**	**SDEIS Section**	**Comment**	
Comments from MNCPPC_1_SDEIS Major Issues_9.19.21 document					**Revised comments where applicable**
38	38		General	**Bottleneck Congestion leads to Local Street Diversions/Congestion**: We have never been satisfied with the extremely simplistic local street evaluation presented in the DEIS and SDEIS. We are expecting to see more detail from MDOT SHA (and be included in the review process) for the Interchange Access Point Approval (IAPA) study now under development. The increased congestion on I-270 and I-495 will undoubtedly lead to both peak spreading effects and local traffic diversions that have not been adequately considered to-date. When it can take over 30 minutes (TTIs greater than 6.0) to travel 2 to 3 miles on some segments of the Beltway as presented in this SDEIS, drivers will not subject themselves to this on a daily basis, and they will seek to find the shorter travel time route, regardless of local street impact. The scope therefore agreed upon by FHWA for the IAPA (performing traffic operational analyses at ramp terminal intersections and one adjacent intersection (on both sides) beyond service interchanges that are modified by the study, when within one mile) is likely to be inadequate in areas where either I-270 or I-495 exhibits very high projected TTIs and extreme congestion. In those areas, the study area should follow all significant diversionary traffic that switches to the local road network (defined as all non-interstate roads). In the Clarksburg area, this includes many parallel roads, including MD 355, MD 28, Thurston Road, State Quarry Road, and Price's Distillery Road. Along the Beltway, any parallel road or road that crosses I-495 may be the recipient of significant diversion traffic depending on location of projected congestion. This includes Seven Locks Road, Burdette Road, and Democracy Boulevard. The study area can be determined by adding routes on parallel routes with travel times equal to the GP lanes travel time.	
39	39		General	**Need for Improved Performance Data for I-270 north of I-370**: All of the evaluation material in Chapter 3 does not report comparable transportation performance metrics (travel time, delay, Level of Service, TTI) within the I-270 modeled area to the north of I-370 where the proposed action may create congestion. Without this information, it is difficult to determine travel time and delay for commuters living north of I-370, including Germantown, Clarksburg, and Frederick County residents. From a review of the link evaluation results presented in Appendix A, Attachment F, it is clear that I-270 to the north of I-370 will experience greater congestion with the proposed project. This was demonstrated in Attachment F mentioned in Comments 14 and 15 above. Please provide more detailed performance metrics for I-270 to the north of I-370 so that the full transportation effects of this bottleneck condition can be assessed.	

I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study- Draft Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) M-NCPPC Comment/Response Errata- November 29, 2021

MNCPPC Ref Doc_#	No.	Page	SDEIS Section	Comment	
Comments from MNCPPC_1_SDEIS Major Issues_9.19.21 document					**Revised comments where applicable**
40	40		General	**Lack of Feedback Loop in Modeling Process – Assumptions versus Results**: While we recognize that simplistic assumptions are often needed to evaluate transportation projects, the tolling assumptions with Managed Lanes do not mesh with the travel demand shown using the managed lanes versus the travel time benefit provided. Unfortunately, there is no information provided to validate the validity of the managed lane use assumptions. When large portions of the managed lanes show little to no travel time benefit, who is using the managed lanes and what percent of the driving population do they represent? Are the estimates used reasonable? What are the origins and destinations of these managed lane users? They can't be most local Montgomery County trips, as preceding comments in this submission clearly show pretty clearly that most typical O-D commuting pairs within the County have little use or benefit from the managed lanes.	
41	41		General	**Percent of Total Demand Using Managed Lanes**: A review was conducted of the peak hour travel demand presented in Appendix A - Attachments A (Peak Period Volumes) and Attachment B (Travel Demand Tables). Link demand on each segment of I-495 and I-270 within the project area was projected. Based on this review, the percent of total demand using the managed lanes over the four-hour commuting periods are shown in the following four tables: I-270 AM, I-270 PM, I-495 AM, and I-495 PM. For each, managed lane demand varied by hour between 6 and 10 AM and between 3 and 7 PM. Questions related to these tables are provided in following comments.	
42	42		Appendix A Attachments A and B	**Percentage of total demand using managed lanes on I-270 Western Spur During the AM Peak hours:** Between 27 and 39 percent of total demand uses the Managed Lanes on Southbound I-270 approaching I-495 during the AM peak hours. This entire travel path only shows a 2.5-minute savings using the Managed Lanes along its 14-mile tolled length. Between 42 and 52 percent of total demand uses the Managed Lanes on Northbound I-270 just north of I-495 during the AM peak hours. This entire path only shows a 1.3-minute travel time savings over its 14-mile tolled length. How are the percent demand achieved using the managed lanes possible if the travel time benefit is so small (in other words, why pay when it is not worth the cost)?	
43	43		Appendix A Attachments A and B	**Percentage of total demand using managed lanes on I-270 Western Spur During the PM Peak hours:** Between 42 and 45 percent of total demand uses the Managed Lanes on Southbound I-270 approaching I-495 during the PM peak hours. This entire travel path only shows a 1.3-minute savings using the Managed Lanes along its 14-mile tolled length. Between 39 and 41 percent of total demand uses the Managed Lanes on Northbound I-270 just north of I-495 during the PM peak hours. This entire path shows a 38-minute travel time savings over its 14-mile tolled length. Again, the demand allocated to the managed lanes and the methodology for this is questioned. There are just too many inconsistencies between demand and travel time benefits.	

I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study- Draft Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) M-NCPPC Comment/Response Errata- November 29, 2021

MNCPPC Ref Doc_#	No.	Page	SDEIS Section	Comment	
Comments from MNCPPC_1_SDEIS Major Issues_9.19.21 document					**Revised comments where applicable**
44	44		Modeling Process	**Modeling process detailed in DEIS Traffic Technical Report:** Validation versus travel time benefits: Recognizing that there was some iterative modeling adjustments used to achieve a 45 mph average travel speed or higher and keep the maximum lane volume in the 1600-1700 vehicles per hour range in the Managed Lanes, shouldn't there have also been an iterative process to adjust modeling adjustments based on some screenline O-D pair travel time assessments? For example, for the demand volume estimated to travel between I-370 and the ALB, does the actual travel time benefit and cost paid to achieve that benefit mesh with measured managed lane toll rates and cost per mile or cost per minute saved used across the country on similar managed lane facilities now in operation?	
45	45	Page 99 of 84	Appendix A, Attachment B	**2045 PM Peak Hour Inner Loop Volumes:** The hourly volumes presented in Attachments B and D do not match. The table below shows a summary for the 2045 PM Peak Hour Inner Loop GP Lane Volumes. Please explain this discrepancy. It appears that this discrepancy is not isolated to these three sections.	
46	46	Page 2-23		**Bike lane definition.** Separated bike lanes do not have to be located "on-street" as stated in the "Bike lane" definition. Per the Montgomery County Bicycle Master Plan, separated bike lanes "are exclusive bikeways that combine the user experience of a sidepath with the on-street infrastructure of a conventional bike lane. They are physically separated from motor vehicle traffic and distinct from the sidewalk. They operate one-way or two-way."	
47	47	Page 2-23		**Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities:** The SDEIS is inconsistent with the "Design Recommendation / Implication" identified in the "MLS Existing Bridge Inventory_Montgomery Ped-Bike Facilities_12-11-2020_All.pdf" document. Specifically, the SDEIS states: "The preliminary design approach for facilities along crossroads where the crossroad bridge would be reconstructed is to replace, upgrade or provide new pedestrian/bicycle facilities consistent with the master plan, where adjacent connections on either side of the bridge currently exist." However, the "Design Recommendation" included in the "MLS Existing Bridge Inventory_Montgomery Ped-Bike Facilities_12-11-2020_All.pdf" document recommended that the project add pedestrian and bicycle facility on most crossroads regardless of whether adjacent connections on either side of the bridge currently exist. Please remove: "The preliminary design approach for facilities along crossroads where the crossroad bridge would be reconstructed is to replace, upgrade or provide new pedestrian/bicycle facilities consistent with the master plan, where adjacent connections on either side of the bridge currently exist." as it conflicts with previous agreements.	
48	48	Page 2-23		Add a statement to the last paragraph that expresses this sentiment: "Where the I-495 and I-270 mainline or ramps cross under a roadway or pedestrian/bicycle facility and the bridge would be replaced, the cross road bridge would construct pedestrian and bicycle facilities over the structure."	
49	49	Page 2-23		**Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities**: Identify the pedestrian and bicycle facilities to be constructed by the project and the pedestrian and bicycle facilities to be accommodated by the project based on the "MLS Existing Bridge Inventory_Montgomery Ped-Bike Facilities_12-11-2020_All.pdf" document.	

I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study- Draft Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) M-NCPPC Comment/Response Errata- November 29, 2021					
MNCPPC Ref Doc_#	**No.**	**Page**	**SDEIS Section**	**Comment**	
Comments from MNCPPC_1_SDEIS Major Issues_9.19.21 document					**Revised comments where applicable**
50	50	Page 2-23		**Design Parameters**: Indicate that pedestrian and bicycle facilities will be designed in accordance with Montgomery County's Complete Streets Design Guide and Montgomery's Planning Bicycle Master Plan Facility Design Toolkit	
51	51	Page 2-27		**Enhancements**: "Lengthening the I-270 bridge over Tuckerman Lane to accommodate future pedestrian/bicycle facilities along Tuckerman Lane" should be identified as an enhancement, as it appears to meet the conditions at the bottom of page 2-23.	
52	52	Page 4-33	Section 4.7.3	Archaeological investigations at the Poor Farm Cemetery site remain deferred. This has prevented adequate consideration of the effects to this site in the DEIS and SDEIS and under Section 4F.	
53	53	Pages 4-79-82	Section 4.2.1	The SDEIS environmental justice discussion should incorporate findings from the May 2021 technical report about Morningstar Tabernacle No. 88 Moses Hall and Cemetery (M:35-212). This report provides detailed historical background about the cemetery and the historical African American community along Seven Locks road that was displaced by the original construction of the beltway. Construction was routed through the middle of the community leaving the church and fraternal hall and cemetery on opposite sides of the highway. Archaeological survey showed that the cemetery is larger in extent and closer to the ROW and LOD than understood at the time of the DEIS. This new information highlights the vulnerability of the church and cemetery to the managed lanes project and should be discussed in the Environmental Justice and Cumulative Impacts sections of the SDEIS. The DEIS identifies the Morningstar Tabernacle No. 88 Moses Hall and Cemetery and the Poor Farm Cemetery as sites that may be culturally significant in its Community and Environmental Justice Analysis. However, the Environmental Justice discussion concerns itself primarily with current minority population concentrations and does not address historical and ongoing injustice to small African American communities displaced by construction of the beltway and further threatened by the proposed expansion. This issue was explicitly acknowledged as related to social justice by the National Trust for Historic Preservation in their selection of the Moses Cemetery as one of the 11 most endangered historic sites in America in 2021. This listing and the environmental justice issues raised by it should be acknowledged and discussed in the SDEIS. Likewise, environmental justice issues are mentioned with respect to the Poor Farm Cemetery site in the DEIS. This site contains the remains of an unknown number of individuals, many of them African American. African American burial sites have frequently suffered from inadequate consideration during	

I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study- Draft Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) M-NCPPC Comment/Response Errata- November 29, 2021					
MNCPPC Ref Doc_#	**No.**	**Page**	**SDEIS Section**	**Comment**	
Comments from MNCPPC_1_SDEIS Major Issues_9.19.21 document					**Revised comments where applicable**
54	54	Pages 4-82-83	Section 4.22	Neither the DEIS nor the SDEIS reference any cumulative effects to specific cultural resources. Additional historical research conducted subsequent to the DEIS in Cabin John related to the Morningstar Tabernacle No. 88 Moses Hall and Cemetery and associated Gibson Grove community show that the construction of the beltway separated the fraternal hall and cemetery from the neighboring church, physically fragmented the community and contributed to the decline of these institutions. The community's decline in turn contributed to the closure and loss to fire of the Moses fraternal hall. Zoning limitations on the church parcel arising from the proximity of the beltway have significantly delayed repair and rehabilitation of the church following a fire in the mid-2000s. The initial construction of the Beltway resulted in an oddly-shaped parcel and this has made it challenging for the property owners to move new construction permitting through zoning reviews. These cumulative delays to the rehabilitation, created in part from the Beltway's construction, should be accounted as part of the DEIS review of cumulative impacts. The descendant community continues in the area, but the remaining cultural institutions are threatened by the proposed expansion of the Beltway.	
55	55		4(f)	Archaeological investigations at the Poor Farm Cemetery site remain deferred, thus it has not been evaluated for eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places. This has prevented the site from being discussed as a historic site under the Section 4(f) analysis in the DEIS and SDEIS.	
56	56		4(f)	The 4F evaluation does not take into account those portions of the Moses Hall and Cemetery that already exist within the footprint and right of way of the existing Beltway. Recent land records research and other information provided demonstrates evidence for this and because there has not been a final boundary determination, it cannot yet be ruled out of the analysis. Therefore the Permanent Impact cannot be avoided under any scenario and should account for acreage already within the footprint of the current Beltway. Additionally, the construction of a noise barrier should not be taken as the de facto solution for noise abatement at this property. Avoiding the use associated with the retaining wall requires additional study of potential mitigation efforts such as quiet pavement technology or additional roadway designs. Until those solutions have been demonstrated as infeasible, they must be explored to avoid the adverse effects and the required use of the property for the retaining walls under 4F.	

I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study- Draft Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) M-NCPPC Comment/Response Errata- November 29, 2021					
MNCPPC Ref Doc_#	**No.**	**Page**	**SDEIS Section**	**Comment**	
Comments from MNCPPC_1_SDEIS Major Issues_9.19.21 document					**Revised comments where applicable**
57	57		4(f)	Additional use of the Gibson Grove Church site in order to minimize impacts to the Moses Hall Cemetery must be avoided. As noted above, Section 4F requires avoidance of these uses unless other alternatives are demonstrated to be infeasible and contrary to the purpose and use of the undertaking. There have been no design or schematic drawings shown to date that have demonstrated that alternatives were considered. Further impacts to the Gibson Grove Church, an historic resource that has already suffered cumulative adverse effects from the first Beltway construction, should not be accepted as a 4F alternative to avoid impacts to Moses Hall. Other design solutions must be evaluated.	
58	58		4(f)	As noted above, 4F uses and impacts to the Carderock Springs Historic District from retaining walls and design changes meant to protect Gibson Grove and the Moses Hall Cemetery do not include any evaluation of design alternatives for review. This all calls into question what exactly they are doing. If all 3 of these resources are suffering from 4F uses and encroachments to protect each other, but they are all having adverse effects, what is being achieved here? We are all in the dark without a chance to sit at the table and design this all out as a group. It is unacceptable under 4F. 4F requires avoidance, different from Section 106. Only if the 'use' of the property is DEMONSTRATED that it cannot be avoided, then it can be done, but there must be discussion and consideration of the options.	
59	59		Chapter 3	Provide an O-D Matrix of travel times for the No-Build, Managed and General Purpose lanes for each access point along I-270 and I-495 (with accompanying narrative, as needed). This will help better understand flows, identify specifically failing pairings, and better tailor responses to these needs. This is especially important considering it is our understanding that many/most trips along these facilities are relatively short in nature, using the interstate for only a few interchanges. Therefore longer & larger systemic effects may be of less utility to actual users.	