

US 301 WALDORF AREA TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT

**Coordination and Public Involvement Plan
For Compliance with SAFETEA-LU Section 6002**

**U.S. Department
of Transportation**

**Federal Highway
Administration**



Table of Contents

Section 1 #Introduction #####15#
 1.1#Purpose of the Coordination Plan #####15#
 1.2#Project Background #####15#

Section 2.#Lead/Cooperating/Participating Agencies #####18#
 2.1 Initial Coordination #####18#
 2.1.2 Cooperating Agencies #####18#
 2.1.3 Participating Agencies #####19#
 2.1.4 Section 106 Consulting Party #####19#
 2.1.5 Local Agencies #####19#

Section 3.#Coordination Points and Responsibilities #####143#
 3.1#Coordination Points #####143#
 3.1.1 Concurrence Point 1- Purpose and Need and Study Area #####144#
 3.1.2 Concurrence Point 2- ARDS #####144#
 3.1.3 Concurrence Point 3- Preferred Alternative and Conceptual
 Mitigation #####146#
 3.2 Other Opportunities for Agency Involvement #####147#
 3.2.1 Interagency Coordination #####147#

Section 4.#Opportunities for Public Input #####153#
 4.1 Public Outreach/Education #####153#
 4.1.1 Mailing List #####153#
 4.1.2 Mailings #####153#
 4.1.3 Public Meeting Advertisements #####153#
 4.1.4 Comment Forms #####153#
 4.1.5 Study Area Information Sites #####154#
 4.1.6 Project Website #####154#
 4.1.7 Fairs #####154#
 4.1.8 Open Houses /Public Workshops/ Public Meetings #####154#
 4.1.9 Elected Officials/ Local Government Briefings #####155#
 4.2 Stakeholder Groups #####156#
 4.2.1 Environmental Justice/Limited Proficiency Populations #####156#

Section 5.##Tentative Project Schedule #####157#

List of Figures

Figure 1: Project Area Map

List of Tables

Table 1: List of Lead, Co-Lead Cooperating and Participating Agencies

Table 2: Agency Contract Information

Table 3: P+1 Meetings

Table 4: IAWG Meetings

Table 5: US 301 Public Workshops

Section 1 Introduction

1.1# Purpose of the Coordination Plan

Section 6002 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU 6002) requires a project's lead agencies to establish a plan for coordinating public and agency participation during the streamlined environmental review process. SAFETEA-LU 6002 is not optional for projects requiring an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). However, for projects advanced through Environmental Assessments (EAs) or Categorical Exclusions (CEs), it may be applied at the discretion of the project's lead agencies.

The purpose of the SAFETEA-LU 6002 coordination plan is to facilitate and document the lead agencies' structured interaction with the public and other agencies as well as to inform groups of how the plan will be implemented. The coordination plan promotes an efficient, streamlined process, as well as good project management through coordination, scheduling, and early resolution of issues.

It is anticipated that the US 301 Waldorf Area Transportation Improvements Project will require an EIS due to the level of community and environmental impacts throughout the corridor. In an effort to keep all parties involved throughout the development of the

US 301 Waldorf Area Transportation Improvements Project, the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) has developed a Public Involvement Strategy. It includes public and stakeholder meetings and it has identified Environmental Justice (EJ) and Limited English Proficiency (LEP) communities. This Coordination Plan also outlines the process by which the required level of public involvement will be accomplished.

This Coordination Plan will:

- ..# Identify the early coordination efforts;
- ..# Identify cooperating and participating agencies involved in agency coordination;
- ..# Establish the timing and forum for agency involvement in defining the project's purpose and need, the study area, and the range and method of investigating alternatives, as well as their involvement in reviewing the draft EIS and the selection of the preferred alternative and mitigation strategies.
- ..# Establish the timing and forum for public participation in defining the project's purpose and need, the study area, and the range of alternatives to be investigated, as well as for opportunities to provide input on issues of concern and environmental features, and to comment on the findings presented in the DEIS.
- ..# Describe the methods that will be implemented to inform the community and interested parties about the project.

The Coordination Plan will be updated periodically to reflect any changes to the project schedule and other items that typically require updating over the course of the project.

1.2# Project Background

The Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA), in cooperation with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has prepared the following coordination plan as required by SAFETEA-LU 6002 for the proposed US 301 Waldorf Area Transportation Improvements Project. US 301 is one of the most important roadways in Prince George's and Charles Counties

and travels through one of the fastest growing areas in Maryland. In certain areas, including the Waldorf area, this growth has already overwhelmed much of the region's roadway network, including US 301 and MD 5. This level of congestion is expected to increase in the next 20 years.

The project is approximately 13 miles in length and is located in the greater Waldorf area in northern Charles County and southern Prince George's County. The southern project limit is the intersection of US 301 with Washington Avenue and Turkey Hill Road just north of the Town of La Plata. The northern limit is the US 301/MD 5 interchange area at T.B. (T.B. refers to the area in the vicinity of the MD 5 and US 301 interchange where properties owned by the Townshend and Brooke families met) in southern Prince George's County, which includes the intersection of US 301 and MD 381. The project limits were established in coordination with the FHWA, and are based on the issues identified in the *Non-Segmentation Analysis: Logical Termini and Independent Utility for the MD 5 Corridor and the US 301 Corridor Report* (June, 2005).

The purpose of the project is to: improve local traffic operations along US 301 in the Waldorf area; to facilitate the safe and efficient flow of through traffic and commuter traffic between the Waldorf area and the Washington metropolitan area while providing a cost-effective and environmentally sensitive multi-modal transportation system to support existing and future travel demand, land use, and development efforts that are consistent with smart growth planning policies; and promote and secure environmental stewardship.

Alternatives to be evaluated include: (1) No-Build; (2) Transportation System Management (TSM)/Travel Demand Management (TDM) solutions; (3) Upgrades to the existing corridor; (4) an Eastern Bypass alternative; and (5) a Western Bypass alternative. The alternatives to be investigated in the EIS will be developed and refined based on input from agencies and the public during the initial coordination/scoping period, as well as during subsequent agency and public involvement opportunities.

In addition to compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) through preparation of an EIS, SHA anticipates that this project will require the following permits:

- °# U.S. Army Corps of Engineers – Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit
- °# Maryland Department of the Environment- Approved Sediment and Erosion Control Plan
- °# Maryland Department of the Environment- Approved Stormwater Management Plan
- °# Maryland Department of the Environment- Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification
- °# Maryland Department of the Environment- Nontidal Wetland and Waterways Permit
- °# Maryland Department of Natural Resources- Approved Reforestation Plan
- °# Maryland Department of Natural Resources- Roadside Tree Permit
- °# State Board of Public Works- Priority Funding Areas law compliance

Figure 1: Project Area Map



Section 2. Lead/Cooperating/Participating Agencies

2.1 Initial Coordination

On March 22, 2007, SHA formally notified FHWA in writing of its intent to initiate the NEPA EIS process for this project in conformance with the requirements of SAFETEA-LU. The initial coordination/scoping process was initiated in order to obtain comments and input from agencies and the public to help determine the purpose and need for the project, alternatives to be evaluated, and the issues that will be examined as part of the EIS process.

FHWA, with assistance from SHA, has submitted a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an EIS, as required by CEQ regulations 40 CFR 1501.7. The NOI was published in the Federal Register. Notification of the preparation of the EIS was also published in the project area newspapers.

SHA is preparing this Coordination Plan that was distributed to the agencies in November 2007. The following describes the involvement of agencies in the environmental review process for an EIS document. The lead agencies of the project (FHWA and SHA) divide the task of sending formal letters inviting state and federal agencies to participate in the project.

2.1. 2 Cooperating Agencies

Cooperating Agencies are those governmental agencies specifically requested by the lead agency to participate during the environmental evaluation process for the project. FHWA's NEPA regulations (23 CFR 771.111d (d)) require that those federal agencies with jurisdiction by law with permitting or land transfer authority be invited to be Cooperating Agencies for an EIS. These Cooperating Agencies are also invited to be participating agencies. Cooperating and Participating Agencies that have been sent invitations for this project include the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the Maryland Department of the Environment. Cooperating and Participating Agencies for the project, as well as their responsibilities are listed in Table 1 (See page 7); their contact information is included in Table 2.

The Cooperating Agencies for this project have roles and responsibilities that include, but are not limited to:

- ...# Participating in the NEPA process starting at the earliest possible time, especially with regard to the development of the purpose and need statement, range of alternatives, and methodologies;
- ...# Identifying, as early as practicable, any issues of concern regarding the project's potential environmental or socioeconomic impacts. Cooperating Agencies are also allowed to participate in the issue resolution process;
- ...# Providing meaningful and timely input on unresolved issues; and
- ...# Reviewing and providing comment on the preliminary draft DEIS and the preferred alternative.

If new information reveals the need to request another agency to serve as a Cooperating Agency, SHA/FHWA will issue that agency an invitation.

2.1.3 Participating Agencies

SAFETEA-LU (Section 6002) identifies Participating Agencies as federal and non- federal governmental agencies that may have interest in the project because of their jurisdictional authority, special expertise and/or statewide interest. These agencies are formally invited to participate in the environmental review of the project for EIS documents. The following Federal and State agencies have been invited as Participating Agencies on the project: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, National Marine Fisheries Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Maryland Department of Environment, Maryland Transit Administration, Maryland Historical Trust, Maryland Transportation Authority, Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Charles County Department of Planning and Growth Management, Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation, Washington Council of Governments, and the Tri- County Council of Southern Maryland. Participating Agencies and their responsibilities are also presented in Table 1. Their contact information is included in Table 2.

The Participating Agencies have identified opportunities for meaningful participation in the decision-making process for the project. Specific opportunities are provided via the agency concurrence points that have been defined for this project.

The Participating Agencies' role in the development of the above project will include, but not be limited to, the following as they relate to each agency's area of expertise:

- ...# Provide meaningful and early input on defining the purpose and need, determining the range of alternatives to be considered, and identifying the methodologies and level of detail required in alternative analysis;
- ...# Participate in coordination meetings and joint field reviews as appropriate; and
- ...# Provide timely review and comment on the draft and/or final environmental documents to reflect the views and concerns of their agency on the adequacy of the document, alternatives considered, and the anticipated impacts and mitigation.

If new information indicates that an agency not previously requested to be a Participating Agency does indeed have authority, jurisdiction, acknowledged expertise or information relevant to the project, then SHA, in consultation with FHWA, will extend an invitation to that agency.

2.1.4 Section 106 Consulting Party

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires the federal agency or its designee (in this case SHA) to identify and work with the appropriate parties that need to be involved in the process of identifying the effects of a proposed project to historic and archeological resources. As a part of the consultation requirements for Section 106, the Maryland Historical Trust has agreed to be a Participating Agency for the project.

If new information reveals the need to request another agency or organization to serve as a consulting party, SHA will issue that agency an invitation.

2.1.5 Local Agencies

Coordination has also been initiated with Charles and Prince George's Counties. Scoping meetings were held January 31st and February 1, 2006 in order to present the project and solicit

feedback from the counties prior to developing the Purpose and Need Statement and preliminary alternatives. Each county has agreed to be a Participating Agency on the project.

Table 1: List of Lead, Co-lead Cooperating and Participating Agencies

Agency Name	Role	Responsibilities
Federal Highway Administration (Del-Mar Division)	Lead Agency	Manage 6002 process; prepare EIS; provide opportunity for public & participating/cooperating agency involvement
Maryland State Highway Administration	Co-lead Agency	Manage 6002 process; prepare EIS; provide opportunity for public & participating/cooperating agency involvement
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Cooperating Agency Participating Agency	Section 404 permit jurisdiction Provide comments on purpose and need & range of alternatives, Alternatives Retained for Detailed Studies, Preferred Alternative and Conceptual Mitigation, Draft Environmental Impact Statement, and the Final Environmental Impact Statement
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	Cooperating Agency Participating Agency	Provide comments on purpose and need & range of alternatives, Preferred Alternative and Conceptual Mitigation, Draft Environmental Impact Statement, and the Final Environmental Impact Statement
Maryland Department of Environment	Cooperating Agency Participating Agency	Provide comments on purpose and need & range of alternatives, Preferred Alternative and Conceptual Mitigation, Draft Environmental Impact Statement, and the Final Environmental Impact Statement
National Marine Fisheries Service	Participating Agency	Provide comments on purpose and need & range of alternatives
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Participating Agency	Provide comments on purpose and need & range of alternatives
Maryland Transit Administration	Participating Agency	Provide comments on purpose and need & range of alternatives
Maryland Transportation Authority	Participating Agency	Provide comments on purpose and need & range of alternatives
Maryland Department of Planning	Participating Agency	Provide comments on purpose and need & range of alternatives
Maryland Historical Trust	Participating Agency	Provide comments on purpose and need & range of alternatives
Maryland Department of Natural Resources	Participating Agency	Provide comments on purpose and need & range of alternatives
Charles County Department of Planning and Growth Management	Participating Agency	Provide comments on purpose and need & range of alternatives
Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission	Participating Agency	Provide comments on purpose and need & range of alternatives
Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation	Participating Agency	Provide comments on purpose and need & range of alternatives

Agency Name	Role	Responsibilities
Tri-County Council of Southern Maryland	Participating Agency	Provide comments on purpose and need & range of alternatives
Washington Council of Governments	Participating Agency	Provide comments on purpose and need & range of alternatives

Table 2: Agency Contact Information

Agency	Role	Contact Person/Title	Address
Federal Highway Administration	Lead Agency	Mr. Daniel W. Johnson Environmental Program Manager	10 South Howard Street, Suite 2450 Baltimore, MD 21201 DanW.Johnson@fhwa.dot.gov
Maryland State Highway Administration	Co-Lead Agency	Mr. Steve Hawtof Project Manager	707 N. Calvert Street Baltimore, MD 21202 shawtof@sha.state.md.us
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Cooperating Agency Participating Agency	Mr. Paul Wettlaufer Attn: Mr. Steve Harman	City Crescent Building 10 South Howard Street, Room 11000 Baltimore, MD 21201 paul.wettlaufer@nab02.usace.army.mil
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	Cooperating Agency Participating Agency	Mr. Bill Arguto Attn: Mr. Kevin Mager	1650 Arch Street (3PM52) Philadelphia, PA 19103 magerr.kevin@epa.gov
Maryland Department of Environment	Cooperating Agency Participating Agency	Mr. Elder Ghigarelli Deputy Program Administrator Attn: Mr. Steve Hurt	1800 Washington Blvd, Baltimore, MD 21230 shurt@mde.state.md.us
National Marine Fishery Service	Participating Agency	Mr. John Nichols	410 Severn Avenue Annapolis, MD 21403 john.nichols@noaa.gov
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Participating Agency	Mr. Robert Zepp Attn: Mr. William Schultz	177 Admiral Cochrane Drive Annapolis, MD 21401 bill_schultz@fws.gov
Maryland Transit Administration	Participating Agency	Ms. Diane Ratcliff Director of Planning Attn: Ms. Jennifer Weeks	6 Saint Paul Street. Baltimore, MD 21202 Jweeks1@mtamaryland.com
Maryland Transportation Authority	Participating Agency	Mr. Dennis Simpson Deputy Director Attn: Mr. Glen Smith	2310 Broening Highway Suite 150 Baltimore, MD 21224 gsmith2@mdta.state.md.us
Maryland Department of Planning	Participating Agency	Ms. Bihui Xu Manager of Transportation Planning	301 W. Preston Street Suite 1101 Baltimore, MD 21201 bxu@mdp.state.md.us

US 301 Waldorf Area Transportation Improvements Project
SAFETEA-LU 6002 Coordination Plan
April 2008

Agency	Role	Contact Person/Title	Address
Maryland Historical Trust	Participating Agency	Mr. Rodney Little Director Attn: Elizabeth Cole	100 Community Place, Crownsville, MD 21032 bcole@mdp.state.md.us
Maryland Department of Natural Resources	Participating Agency	Mr. Ray Dintaman Director Attn: Mr. Greg Golden	580 Taylor Avenue Tawes State Office Building Annapolis, MD 21401 ggolden@dnr.state.md.us
Charles County Department of Planning and Growth Management	Participating Agency	Mr. Reed Faasen Acting Director of Planning Attn: Mr. Jason Groth	PO Box 2150 La Plata, MD 20646 grothj@charlescounty.org
Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission	Participating Agency	Dr. Fern Piret Planning Director Attn: Glenn Burton	14741 Gov. Oden Bowie Drive Upper Marlboro, MD 20772 glen.burton@ppd.mncppc.org
Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation	Participating Agency	Mr. Haitham Hijazi Director Attn: Mr. Vic Weissberg	9400 Peppercorn Place, Suite 300 Largo, MD 20774 vweissberg@co.pg.md.us
Tri-County Council of Southern Maryland	Participating Agency	Mr. Wayne Clark Executive Director Attn: Mr. Tony Chinyere	P. O. Box 745 Hughesville, MD 20637 achinyere@tccsmd.org
Washington Council of Governments	Participating Agency	Mr. Michael Clifford Policy Planning Manager	777 N Capitol St NE # 300 Washington, DC 20002 mclifford@mwkog.com

Section 3. Agency Coordination Points and Responsibilities

3.1 Agency Coordination Points, Information Requirements and Responsibilities

The table below lists the required coordination points. It specifies the information required at each point, who is responsible for transmitting that information and the responsibilities of the lead, cooperating and participating agencies. It is followed by a more detailed discussion of the process for coordination at four key milestones:

- °# Purpose and Need and Study Area (P&N)
- °# Alternatives Retained for Detailed Study (ARDS)
- °# Preliminary Draft DEIS Document
- °# Preferred Alternative and Conceptual Mitigation (PACM)

Coordination Point	Task	Agency Responsible	Action Item	Agency Responsible
Notice of Intent (NOI)	Send participating agencies a copy of the NOI; publish notice in newspaper; invite agencies and public to public scoping meeting	FHWA SHA	Comments on NOI	ACOE USFWS
Purpose and Need (P&N)	Provide participating agencies and public with draft purpose and need statement via letters; solicit comments; hold scoping meeting	FHWA SHA	Comments on Purpose and Need	Cooperating & Participating
Range of Alternatives (ARDS)	Provide participating agencies and public with information regarding alternatives being considered via letters; solicit comments; hold scoping meeting	FHWA SHA	Concurrence/Comments	Cooperating & Participating
Collaboration on impact assessment methodologies	Environmental Methodology Matrix	SHA	Agreement on Matrix- August 2006	Cooperating & Participating
Circulation of DEIS	Evaluate all reasonable alternatives and discuss the reasons why other alternatives, which may have been considered were eliminated from the study. Provide agencies with timely review and comments on DEIS which would summarize the studies, reviews, consultations, and coordination required by environmental laws.	FHWA SHA	Concurrence/Comments	Cooperating & Participating
Preferred Alternative/Conceptual Mitigation (PACM)	Provide agencies with rationale for preferred alternatives	FHWA SHA	Concurrence/Comments	Cooperating & Participating
Circulation of FEIS	Provide agencies with timely review of SHA alternatives and associated impacts and mitigation strategies	FHWA SHA	Concurrence/Comments	Cooperating & Participating
Issue ROD	ROD should be signed 30 days after publication of the FEIS notice in the Federal Register or 90 days after publication of a DEIS	FHWA SHA	Concurrence/Comments	FHWA

Coordination Point	Task	Agency Responsible	Action Item	Agency Responsible
Issue Section 404 Permit		ACOE MDE		ACOE/ MDE

3.1.1 Agency Coordination Point 1 - Purpose and Need and Study Area (P&N)

The Draft Purpose and Need was distributed to the Interagency Working Group (IAWG) in March 2006. After several monthly IAWG meeting discussions, the agencies were provided with an updated draft purpose and need package. They were given 45 days from receipt of the updated package to review and provide a response. A reminder was sent to the agencies 14 days before the end of the review period. At the end of the 45-day period, SHA received concurrence. SHA assumed concurrence from those agencies from whom it has not heard from at the end of the 45-day period. The IAWG had monthly discussions about the Purpose and Need and provided final concurrence in January 2007. The output of Concurrence Point 1 included concurrence from the participating agencies on:

- ..# The purpose and need and the study are of the project;
- ..# The draft coordination plan;
- ..# Appropriate methodologies to be used and the level of detail required in the analysis of each alternative; and
- ..# Preliminary range of alternatives to be considered, including different modes.

Additionally, the agencies will continue to provide input on environmental features and resources of concern as we move through the study process.

Based on the output of Concurrence Point 1, SHA has revised the Purpose and Need statement, the study area description, the coordination plan, and the draft methodologies and the public will once again be given the opportunity to provide input on the Purpose and Need statement and alternatives to be evaluated.

3.1.2 Agency Coordination Point 2 - Alternatives Retained for Detailed Study (ARDS)

Based on the output of Concurrence Point 1, as well as the Alternatives Public Workshop on alternatives, and any general alternatives analysis conducted during the project development process, SHA has prepared an Alternatives Retained for Detailed Study (ARDS) package. The package was forwarded to the participating agencies and included the following information:

- ..# Revised purpose and need statement and study area;
- ..# Revised methodologies to be used and level of detail required in the analysis of each alternative (if needed);
- ..# A summary table of all project alternatives to be evaluated and their effectiveness in addressing the purpose and need of the project, as well as a map showing the location of the project alternatives;
- ..# Qualitative results of the preliminary alternatives analysis and environmental screening (based on existing data source and GIS inventories);
- ..# Discussion of the No-Build Alternative;

- ..# Narrative describing the rationale why each of the proposed alternatives is being considered into the DEIS, including what alternatives were considered for inclusion but later eliminated along with the rationale why they were abandoned; and
- ..# Where substantial impacts are anticipated, refined scopes and methodologies of studies, including the spatial and temporal limits of indirect and cumulative impact analyses.

The participating agencies were given a minimum of 30 days from receipt of the package to review and provide a written response and a reminder was sent to the agencies 14 days before the end of the review period. At the end of the 30-day period, SHA has received a written concurrence, a non-concurrence, a request for a 15-day time extension, or request for cessation of formal concurrence from each agency. SHA has assumed concurrence from those agencies from whom it has not heard at the end of the 30-day period. The output of Concurrence Point 2 included concurrence from the participating agencies on:

- ..# The alternatives to be carried forward into the DEIS;
- ..# Any revisions to the purpose and need statement and the study area of the project;
- ..# Revisions to the coordination plan; and
- ..# The refined scopes and methodologies to be used and the level of detail required in the analysis of each alternative.

3.1.3 Agency Coordination Point 3 - Preliminary Draft EIS Document

Based on the output of Coordination Point 2 and the subsequent detailed investigation of alternatives and analysis of impacts, SHA will prepare and forward a Preliminary DEIS document to the cooperating agencies for their review and comment.

The cooperating agencies will be given 30 days from receipt of the document to review and provide a response. At the end of the 30-day period, SHA will receive comments from the agencies.

The output of Coordination Point 3 should include comments from the cooperating agencies on the adequacy of the preliminary draft DEIS. The agencies will be asked to specify whether additional information is needed to fulfill other applicable environmental reviews or consultation requirements. In addition, the participating agencies will specify any additional information needed to comment adequately on the draft DEIS analysis of site-specific effects associated with the granting or approving by the agency of necessary permits, licenses, or entitlements.

Based on the output from this concurrence point, SHA will finalize the DEIS for submittal to FHWA. Based on FHWA's approval of the DEIS for circulation, a Public Hearing will be conducted in accordance with NEPA requirements.

#

3.1.4 Agency Coordination Point 4 – Selection of a Preferred Alternative

Based on the output from Coordination Point 3, and a review of comments and suggestions received from the Public Hearing and from the regulatory agencies, the Project Team will decide on a preferred alternative at a meeting in consultation with FHWA and other interested parties. The team's choice of the preferred alternative will be presented at a Recommendation Meeting held with the Director of the Office of Planning and Preliminary Engineering.

The preferred alternative will then be presented to the regulatory agencies at an Interagency Review Meeting for their review and comment. The meeting provides the opportunity for the Project Team to present the preferred alternative and address comments raised by the regulatory agencies as a result of their review of the DEIS and previous Interagency Review Meetings.

A Recommendation Meeting will be held with SHA's Administrator to present the preferred alternative for the project and to reach a consensus. The alternatives presented at the Public Hearing will be briefly shown, along with any modifications made since the Hearing. The justification for the preferred alternative will be thoroughly presented, including any avoidance, minimization and mitigation measures, maintenance of traffic, as well as possible enhancement and stewardship opportunities.

3.1. 5 Agency Coordination Point 5 - Preferred Alternative and Conceptual Mitigation (PACM)

Based on the output of Coordination Point 4, along with SHA and FHWA's consideration of any issues, concerns and/or opportunities identified during the public hearings and comment period for the DEIS, SHA will prepare a Preferred Alternative and Conceptual Mitigation Package. The package to be forwarded to the agencies may include the following information:

- ..# Narrative describing the various elements of the preferred alternative;
- ..# Rationale for recommending the preferred alternative;
- ..# A preliminary mitigation summary describing the various elements of the proposed mitigation, including a map locating the elements of the preferred alternative and preliminary mitigation; and
- ..# A summary of major public and agency comments and responses to those comments.

The agencies will be given 30 days from receipt of the package to review and provide a response. At the end of the 30-day period, SHA will receive a concurrence or a non-concurrence from the concurring agencies and comments from the commenting agencies.

The output of Concurrence Point 3 should include a written concurrence from the participating agencies on the selection of the preferred alternative and preliminary mitigation. When avoidance of impacts to a resource is not practicable, participating agencies with jurisdiction by law or social expertise will assist SHA in determining appropriate and practicable mitigation, including all practicable measures to minimize harm. If the agency determines that it does not have enough information to make a recommendation on mitigation measures, it will comment to that effect. If the project impacts are deemed substantial by a regulatory agency to the extent that permits would probably be denied, the participating agencies will advise the lead agencies to modify the project to reduce impacts. If this is not effective, the signatory agencies to the P+1 (Principals + 1) will implement issue resolution to see if the project can be appropriately modified.

3.1. 6 Agency Coordination Point 6 – Final EIS Document

Based on the output of Coordination Point 5, along with SHA and FHWA's consideration of any issues, concerns and/or opportunities identified during the Public Hearing and comment period

for the DEIS, as well as comments from the regulatory agencies, SHA will prepare the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) document for submittal to FHWA. Based on FHWA's approval of the FEIS, the FEIS will be made available for public and agency review for a minimum of 30 days. This period is the last period during which comments on the environmental evaluation process will be received from the public and agencies. Upon addressing the comments received in the comment period, the FEIS will be forwarded by SHA to FHWA with a request for a Record of Decision (ROD).

3.2 Other Opportunities for Agency Involvement

Those agencies that are not "Participating Agencies" as defined in SAFETEA-LU will also have opportunities to provide input and comments on the project as it moves forward. The database of agencies developed as part of the Initial Coordination efforts will be maintained and updated throughout the EIS process. Those agencies that responded to the initial coordination and those that participated in public meetings and/or provided input/comments during the preparation of the DEIS will receive notification of the availability of the DEIS.

Comments may be received at any point during the development of the EIS analysis.

3.2.1 Interagency Coordination

With a project of the magnitude of the US 301 Waldorf Area Transportation Improvements, interagency coordination early and throughout the study process is imperative to a successful outcome. With that in mind, members of the US 301 team initiated coordination with Federal, State, and local agencies at an Interagency workshop held on January 31st and February 1st, 2006. The result of the workshop was the development of two coordination groups, the Principals + 1 (P+1) and the Interagency Working group (IAWG).

The following sections describe the groups and the agency roles in addressing issues and making decisions.

Principals + 1

The purpose of the Principals + 1 (P+1) group is to build agreements on issues of policy related to key milestones and to reach agreement on components of the (DEIS) and related regulatory conclusions. The group's goal is to reach consensus whenever reasonably possible and to promptly identify any issues on which consensus cannot be reached. A consensus agreement is one that all group members can support, built by identifying and exploring all parties' interests and by developing an outcome that satisfies these interests to the greatest extent possible. Individuals are not expected to restrict themselves to the prior positions held by their agencies, if full agency consensus is not possible, the lead agency may use the group's work to make decisions in line with their regulatory authority or may elevate the issue to the Federal Task Force.

The P+1 group consists of executive/policy level principals (P) and one staff person (+1) from Federal and State regulatory agencies. These members include the:

- ...# Federal Highway Administration
- ...# Maryland State Highway Administration
- ...# U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- ...# US Environmental Protection Agency
- ...# Maryland Department of the Environment

- ..# U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- ..# National Marine Fisheries Service
- ..# Maryland Department of Transportation
- ..# Maryland Transit Administration
- ..# Maryland Transportation Authority
- ..# Maryland Department of Planning
- ..# Maryland Historical Trust/ Maryland State Historic Preservation Office
- ..# Maryland Department of Natural Resources (DNR).

At their initial meeting on September 5, 2006, the principals reviewed and discussed a list of significant issues and began the process of addressing them. This group will meet periodically to continue that dialogue, maintain project oversight, provide policy and substantive direction, and address any new policy issues that may be raised from the IAWG. Table 3 - details P+1 meeting dates and major agenda items.

Table 3: P+1 Meetings

Date of Meeting	Major Agenda Items
September 5, 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ..# SHA’s Approach to the Study and Mega Projects ..# Principles for Working Together on the Study ..# Draft Proposed “Purpose and Need” Statement ..# Developing and Preserving preliminary Concepts for Alternatives, and SMART Map Development ..# Identify Other Critical Issues for the Study and for Consideration by the Principals ..# Proposed Dispute Resolution Process ..# Future P+1 Meetings ..# Wrap Up and Next Steps
Date of Meeting	Major Agenda Items
July 20, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ..# Update on Project activities since the last meeting ..# Transit in the Project Corridor ..# Concepts for Alternatives to be Retained for Detailed Study ..# Identify other Critical Issues for the Study and the Principals ..# Future P+1 Meetings ..# Wrap Up and Next Steps

Date of Meeting	Major Agenda Items
October 24, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ..# Update on Project activities since the last meeting ..# Review of Alternatives Retained for Detailed Study ..# Discussion of Strategies for Section 404 permit application process ..# Discussion of Performance Targets for Environmental Stewardship Initiative ..# Review of project milestones and schedule ..# Future P+1 meetings ..# Wrap Up and Next Steps

Interagency Working Group (IAWG)

The purpose of the IAWG is to: provide input and technical expertise; guide the preparation of information in the environmental documents and permits applications for the US 301 project. The group consists of environmental managers or regulatory staff from federal, state, and local agencies involved in the project. The groups goals are to: build trust; communication and cooperation; identify and resolve issues early and quickly; recognize and respect agency roles and responsibilities and to work in partnership to develop technical methodologies and analysis.

The IAWG began its coordination meetings on January 31 and February 1, 2006. This group meets at least once a month to review avoidance and minimization alternatives, mitigation and Environmental Stewardship opportunities, and to address specific agency information and requirements associated with the project. Cooperating agencies include the following:

- ..# U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- ..# U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
- ..# Maryland Department of Environment

The IAWG meetings are facilitated by a neutral third party who aids in the timely resolution of any disputes. A three step hierarchy dispute resolution process is followed, if and when disputes occur that cannot be resolved. The IAWG meeting agendas are lengthy, allowing for review and thorough discussion of engineering and environmental studies. Table 4 details IAWG meeting dates and major agenda items.

Table 4: IAWG Meetings

Date of Meeting	Major Agenda Items
January 31 & February 1, 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ..# Purpose, role and composition of IAWG ..# Overview of Previous Study ..# Approach to the Current Study ..# Bus Tour of the Corridors ..# Next Steps
March 16, 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ..# IAWG and P+1 Process ..# Definition of Key Terms Discussion ..# Discussion of Purpose and Need ..# Presentation and Discussion of Traffic Analysis ..# Discussion of Environmental Matrix and Gap Analysis for Natural Resources ..# Summary and Next Steps
April 12, 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ..# Discussion of Pending and Potential Development Projects ..# Presentation and Discussion of Transit ..# Logical Termini Analysis and Decision Overview and Discussion ..# Environmental Analysis and Documentation Matrix for Natural Resources ..# Summary and Next Steps
May 5, 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ..# Study Process ..# Draft Proposed “Purpose and Need” Statement ..# Proposed Approach to Potential Development Projects ..# Revised Environmental Stewardship Definition ..# Environmental Analysis and Documentation Matrix for Social and Economic Resources ..# Summary and Next Steps
June 14, 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ..# Study Limits and the Revised Draft Proposed “Purpose and Need” Statement ..# Presentation and Discussion of Green Infrastructure Elements ..# Working Session on Preliminary Concepts for Alternatives ..# Summary and Next Steps
July 12, 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ..# No Meeting was held this month

Date of Meeting	Major Agenda Items
August 8, 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ..# Preliminary Concepts for Alternatives ..# Mapping Tool Demonstration ..# White Paper on Proposed Approach to Transit ..# Planning for the Principals meeting ..# Presentation and Discussion of Proposed Approach to Environmental Stewardship ..# Summary and Next Steps
September 13, 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ..# No Meeting was held this month
October 11, 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ..# Rural Legacy Program and Charles County Water Quality Program ..# Follow Up from P+1 Meeting ..# Results of the Field Review ..# Development Proposals and Impact on Preliminary Concepts for Alternatives ..# Summary and Next Steps
November 8, 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ..# Environmental Stewardship-Update and Discussion ..# Bus Rapid Transit Presentation and Discussion ..# Revised Draft Proposed Purpose and Need Statement ..# Results of Field Reviews ..# Development Proposals and Impact on Preliminary Concepts for Alternatives ..# Summary and Next Steps
December 13, 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ..# Revised Draft Proposed Purpose and Need Statement ..# Proposed Preliminary Concepts for Alternatives to be Dismissed and Not Studied in Detail ..# Brief Process Check ..# Summary and Next Steps
January 10, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ..# Proposed Preliminary Concepts for Alternatives to be Dismissed ..# Upgrade Option North of Cedarville Road ..# Summary and Next Steps
February 21, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ..# Cultural Resources Presentation and Discussion ..# Proposed Preliminary Concepts for Alternatives to be Dismissed ..# Upgrade Option North of Cedarville Road ..# Summary and Next Steps

Date of Meeting	Major Agenda Items
March 14, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ..# Upgrade Concepts ..# Discussion on Public Workshops ..# Access Management Updates ..# Green Highways Charrette Overview ..# Summary and Next Steps
April 11, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ..# No Meeting was held this month
May 9, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ..# Environmental Stewardship Update ..# Discussion of Upgrade Build Traffic ..# Mattawoman West & Timothy Branch East Dismissal ..# Access Management Update ..# Summary and Next Steps
June 13, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ..# Field Review Discussion ..# Upgrade and Bypass Build Traffic Discussion ..# Mattawoman West and TB East Dismissal Discussions ..# Access Management Update ..# Summary and Next Steps
July 11, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ..# Charles County Watershed Protection Plan ..# Upgrade Build Traffic Discussion ..# Alternative 2 (Modified) Discussion ..# Dismissal of Alternatives ..# Discussion of Alternatives to be Considered for Dismissal ..# Summary and Next Steps
August 8, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ..# Indirect and Cumulative Effects (ICE) Scoping ..# Upgrade Preliminary Engineering Review ..# Summary and Next Steps
September 12, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ..# Upgrade Engineering Review Discussion ..# Environmental Stewardship Update Summary of Natural Resource Working Group (NRWG) Focus Group ..# Alternates Retained for Detailed Study (ARDS) Review Submission ..# Summary and Next Steps
October 10, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ..# Proposed Stormwater Management Approach ..# Field Reviews and Next Steps ..# Community Resource Working Group (CRWG) Approach and Discussion ..# Alternates Retained for Detailed Study (ARDS) Concurrence ..# P+1 Meeting Preparation ..# Summary and Next Steps
November 14, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ..# P+1 Follow-up ..# Engineering Review ..# (ICE) Boundary Presentation ..# Summary and Next Steps

Section 4. OPPORTUNITIES FOR PUBLIC INPUT

As required by NEPA and SHA, a project specific Public Involvement Plan was developed for public input. The strategies have been documented throughout the overall coordination plan. This plan describes strategies for encouraging public input and describes the opportunities to be provided to the public to encourage early and ongoing involvement in the project development process. As required by SAFETEA-LU Section 6002, the public will be provided opportunities to provide specific input on the Purpose and Need and the range of alternatives.

4.1 Public Outreach/Education

4.1.1 Mailing List

An initial project mailing list has been created for distribution of a bulk mailing, which was used to distribute the Purpose and Need/Project Newsletter. The mailing list also includes targeted stakeholders, and the recipients of these mailings will also have the opportunity to add their names/addresses to the project mailing list as well as comment on the Purpose and Need. As appropriate persons, organizations, and agencies on this list will also receive other correspondence related to the project. Names of the persons and organizations attending public meetings or requesting additional information will be added.

4.1.2 Mailings

A series of mailings have/will occur throughout project milestones to persons and organizations on the project mailing list. A tentative schedule of mailings is as follows:

- ...# April 2006- Initiation Advertisement Letter
- ...# Spring 2006- Purpose and Need Newsletter with survey
- ...# Early Spring 2007- Alternates Public Workshop Notice
- ...# Spring 2007- Alternates Public Workshop Brochure
- ...# Summer 2007- Informational Meetings Newsletter
- ...# Fall 2008- Public Hearing Notice
- ...# Fall 2008- Public Hearing Brochure
- ...# Summer/Fall 2009- Location/Design Approval Newsletter

4.1.3 Public Meeting Advertisements

Advertisements have and will continue to run in local and regional newspapers to announce the major public meetings. The list of local newspapers include

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| ...# Gazette-UM Zone | ...# Washington Post |
| ...# PG Post | ...# Washington Hispanic |
| ...# PG Sentinel | ...# Maryland Independent |
| ...# D.C. Examiner (Prince George's) | ...# Enquirer Gazette |
| ...# Washington Times | |

Notices will also be distributed through the SHA website, mailing list, and project website.

4.1.4 Comment Forms

Comment forms have and will continue to be provided at all public meetings to encourage participants to provide their comments on all aspects of the project. The

comment form will also be available on the project website. Comments may be provided electronically or in writing. Comments will be accepted at any time during the EIS process and will be reviewed and incorporated as appropriate.

4.1.5 Study Area Information Sites

A notice of availability of documents for public review and comment will be published in the local papers. The notice will identify where documents will be available for public review, how the public can provide input, and who to contact with comments or for additional information. Copies of the documents and project literature will be available for public review at county offices. This information will also be available on SHA and the project websites.

4.1.6 Project Website

A website, *www.us301waldorf.org*, was established in May 2006, and will continuously be updated with newsletters, project background, project schedule, environmental processes, public meeting announcements and transcripts, and other project information as needed.

4.1.7 Fairs

The US 301 project team attended the Southern Maryland Realtor Trade and Fair Show in May 2007. The US 301 team also staffed the Charles County Business to Business Expo in October 2007. At both events, project staff provided information about the project as well as the March 2007 workshop brochures to interested parties. The team will continue to look for opportunities to discuss the project and provide information.

4.1.8 Open Houses /Public Workshops/ Public Meetings

Public meetings will be held at project milestones, with interim meetings as requested. A minimum of 14 days notice will be provided prior to each meeting, with at least 30 days for submittal of comments after each meeting. A tentative schedule of major public meetings is as follows:

- ..# Spring 2007 – Alternates Public Workshop
- ..# Summer 2007- Community Meetings
- ..# Winter 2008—Informational Meetings
- ..# Fall 2008- Location/Design Public Hearing
- ..# Spring 2009- Possible additional Informational Meeting prior to the Selected Alternative

Three Alternatives Public Workshops were held in March 2007 at three different locations throughout the study area. Public workshop locations and times are detailed in Table 5. Environmental Stewardship Focus groups were held July 10, 2007 in Prince George's County with local officials, July 18, 2007 in Charles County with local officials and July 19, 2007 with Non Government Organizations. The Project Team also met with the Charles County Chamber of Commerce on May 10, 2007.

Table 5: US 301 Public Workshops

Public Workshops		
Tuesday, March 20, 2007 5:30-8:30 PM Mattawoman Middle School Gymnasium 10145 Berry Road Waldorf, MD 20603	Thursday, March 22, 2007 5:30-8:30 PM Gwynn Park Middle School Cafeteria 8000 Dyson Road Brandywine, MD 20613	Saturday, March 24 2007 9:00 AM- 1:00PM Thomas Stone High School Multi-Purpose Cafeteria 3785 Leonardtown Road Waldorf, MD 20601

The purpose of the workshops were to acquaint the public with the US 301 Waldorf Area Transportation Improvements Project and to present a summary of project-related conceptual engineering alternatives and environmental concerns. Numerous citizens, including residents, elected officials and the media, took the opportunity to provide feedback to SHA by speaking with project team members at the workshops or by submitting comment cards.

Prior to the public workshops, a brochure was mailed to individuals on the project mailing list and all property owners and residents within the study area. This brochure was also available for distribution at the public workshops. The brochure included background information, as well as an explanation of materials that would be available at the workshops. As a feedback mechanism, a comment card was included with the brochure that gave citizens the opportunity to submit comments via postage-paid mail or at the workshops. Approximately 400 comments were received during the comment period.

4.1.9 Elected Officials/Local Government Briefings

Briefings with local government officials will be used as an opportunity to introduce the project to the local officials, provide updates at project milestones, and facilitate the flow of information, between the officials, SHA and FHWA. SHA will continue to coordinate briefings.

A Scoping Meeting (prior to the Alternates Public Workshop) was held in March 2007, which was attended by representatives from Charles and Prince George’s Counties. Additional meetings and briefings will occur at various milestones during the project, to be determined by the Project Team as requested by local officials.

The Project Team has met with the Charles County Chamber of Commerce in May 2007 to discuss the project status, alternatives (East and West Bypasses and Upgrade Alternatives and its effect on the commercial developments) environmental stewardship and watershed approach, Town of La Plata, Land Use, Transit in the study area. The team is also preparing to meet with the Town of La Plata to discuss Access Management opportunities for the US 301 area.

The Team met with the Prince George’s County Transportation Housing and Environmental Committee to provide an update on the project as well as to listen to their concerns.

4.2 Stakeholder Groups

The Project Team developed a specific mailing list for stakeholders, and will meet with any stakeholder groups requesting a meeting. More than 150 letters were sent in June 2007 to invite community associations to meet with the project team so they could listen to their concerns and discuss the project. To date, the Project Team has met with three of these community associations.

4.2.1 Environmental Justice/Limited Proficiency Populations

Populations in the project area requiring outreach to ensure they have access to information and opportunity to make comments, regardless of their race, religion, age, income or disability will be identified. Preliminary findings through 2000 census data information indicate that no minority or low-income income populations exist within the project area. However, through additional research, minorities have been identified that are working and living within the project area. Non-traditional outreach strategies may be initiated if EJ/LEP after further research. These include:

- ..# Neighborhood Outreach Activities
- ..# Minority Business Outreach Activities
- ..# Community and Grassroots Service Organizational Outreach Activities
- ..# Elected Officials Outreach Activities
- ..# American Indian Tribes

Section 5. Tentative Project Schedule

Coordination Point	Date	Agency Responsible
Notice of Intent to Adopt	March 2007	FHWA SHA
Purpose and Need	January 2007	FHWA SHA
Alternatives Retained for Detailed Study	December 2007	FHWA SHA
Draft Environmental Impact Statement	March 2008	FHWA SHA
Select Preferred Alternative	September 2009	FHWA SHA
Final Environmental Impact Statement	June 2010	FHWA SHA
Issue ROD	October 2010	FHWA SHA