


FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Contract No. CH 566-151-571

Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
From MD 5 To US 301/MD 5 And The
Interchange At US 301/MD 5
Charles County, Maryland



prepared by
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

and
MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PROPOSED MD 5 RELOCATED (MD 205)
CONTRACT NO. CH 566-151-571

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
I. RECORD OF DECISION	I-1
II. COMPARISON OF ALTERNATES	II-1
III. SUMMARY OF ACTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	III-1
A. BACKGROUND	III-1
1. Project Location	III-1
2. Purpose of the Study	III-1
3. Project History	III-1
B. ALTERNATES	III-5
1. Alternates Considered But Dropped Prior to Public Hearing	III-5
a. Alternate 2	III-5
b. Alternate 3	III-5
c. Alternate 4	III-5
d. Realignment Alternates	III-6
e. Interchange Options	III-6
2. Alternates Presented at the Public Hearing	III-7
a. Alternate 1 - No-Build	III-7
b. Mainline Build Alternates	III-7
◇ Segment I	
◇ Segment II	
◇ Segment III	
c. Relocation of Sub-Station Road: Options 1, 2, & 3	III-8
d. Interchange at US 301/MD 5: Options A, B, C & D	III-9
e. Additional Modifications to the Alternates	III-10
f. Selected Build Alternates	III-11
g. Phased Construction	III-13

4

**PROPOSED MD 5 RELOCATED (MD 205)
CONTRACT NO. CH 566-151-571**

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CON'T.)

	<u>PAGE</u>
3. Service Characteristics of the Selected Alternate	III-19
a. Traffic Summary	III-19
b. Accident Summary	III-26
c. Design Characteristics of the Selected Alternate	III-26
4. Environmental Consequences of the Selected Alternate	III-31
a. Socio-Economic and Land Use	III-31
b. Natural Environment	III-32
c. Cultural Resources	III-44
d. Parks and Recreation	III-44
e. Air Quality	III-44
f. Noise Quality	III-47
C. TEAM RECOMMENDATIONS	III-56
IV. PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS	IV-1
V. CORRESPONDENCE	V-1
A. WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED SUBSEQUENT TO THE COMBINED LOCATION/DESIGN PUBLIC HEARING AND RESPONSES	V-2
B. ELECTED OFFICIALS	V-139
C. AGENCY COORDINATION	V-144

**PROPOSED MD 5 RELOCATED (MD 205)
CONTRACT NO. CH 566-151-571**

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>FIGURE</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
II-1	Comparison of Alternates	II-2
III-1	Location Map	III-3
III-2	Study Area	III-4
III-3	Segment I, Alternate 6	III-14
III-4	Segment II, Alternate 5/6 Modified	III-15
III-5	Segment III, Alternate 5/6	III-16 TO III-17
III-6	Interchange Option A	III-18
III-7	Average Daily Traffic	III-21 TO III-22
III-8	Typical Sections	III-29 TO III-30
III-9	Conceptual Wetland Mitigation Sites	III-42 TO III-43

LIST OF TABLES

III-1	Level of Service Summary	III-23 TO III-25
III-2	Wetland Impacts	III-41
III-3	Air Quality	III-45 TO III-46
III-4	Noise Abatement Criteria	III-49
III-5	Noise Quality	III-55

6

I. RECORD OF DECISION



Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

7
O. James Lighthizer
Secretary
Hal Kassoff
Administrator

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mr. William I. Slacum, Secretary
State Roads Commission

FROM: Neil J. Pedersen, Director *Neil J Pedersen*
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

DATE: September 12, 1991

SUBJECT: Contract No. CH 566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman-Beantown Road
PDMS No. 082039

The Project Planning Division is preparing a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the subject project. It is anticipated that the Federal Highway Administration will approve the document and grant Location Approval in November of 1991.

The decision was made to proceed with the FONSI recommending the following:

- Segment I: Alternate 6, with bridges across the tributaries of Jordan Swamp extended if necessary to span the entire wetland width. An interim solution will be the improvement of existing MD 205 to provide four lanes.
- Segment II: Alternate 5/6 Modified
- Segment III: Alternate 5/6
- Sub-Station Road: The development approval process will be used to encourage the extension of Pinefield Road to Sub-Station Road.
- Interchange: Option A
- Access Control: Develop access control management strategy with Charles County for all undeveloped properties along MD 205

The selection was made by Administrator Hal Kassoff at team meetings held on November 21, 1990 and July 17, 1991. A summary of the meetings and the Project Team Recommendation are enclosed.

333-1110

My telephone number is _____

8

Mr. William I. Slacum
Page Two

This information is being sent to you as part of the procedures by which you submit the action to the Administrator, receive his approval and formally record and file this action.

I concur with the above recommendation.



Hal Kassoff, Administrator

9/15/91

Date

Enclosures

cc: Mr. Robert Douglass
Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Ms. Elizabeth Homer
Mr. Edward Meehan
Mr. C. Robert Olsen
Ms. Cynthia D. Simpson



Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

O. James Lighthizer
Secretary
Hal Kassoff
Administrator

9

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mr. Hal Kassoff
Administrator

FROM: Neil J. Pedersen, Director *Neil J. Pedersen*
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

DATE: September 12, 1991

SUBJECT: Contract No. CH 566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman-Beantown Road
PDMS No. 082039

RE: DECISION DOCUMENTATION MEMORANDUM

The Location/Design Public Hearing for the Mattawoman-Beantown Road project planning study was held on February 26, 1990 at Thomas Stone High School in Waldorf, Maryland. Approximately 215 people attended the hearing. The key issues:

- o The Charles County Commissioners supported a build alternate. No specific alternate was specified.
- o The major concern expressed by the public was that no disturbance be made to the graves at the Trinity Memorial Gardens Cemetery.
- o Comments received from State and Federal agencies stated opposition to Segment I Alternate 6 versus Alternate 5 due to increased wetland impacts. A preference was given to Interchange Option A or B versus Option C or D.

Meetings were held with you on November 21, 1990 and July 17, 1991 to discuss the project planning study for Mattawoman-Beantown Road. The goal was the selection of alternates for which location and design approvals would be requested.

Present at the November 21, 1990 meeting were the following:

Hal Kassoff	State Highway Administrator
Charles R. Olsen	Chief Engineer
Edward H. Meehan	District Engineer, District No. 5
Neil J. Pedersen	Director, Office of Planning and Preliminary Engineering (OPPE)
Louis H. Ege, Jr.	Deputy Director, OPPE
Patricia Paskowski	Right-of-Way District No. 5

(301) 333-1110

My telephone number is _____

01 07 16 1991
MVA 100 51

Kenneth A. McDonald	Highway Design Division (HDD)
Fred Doerfler	HDD
Leroy Tyree	HDD
George Welton	HDD
Steve Silva	Bridge Design Division (BDD)
Charles Okehie	BDD
Nader Mondanipour	BDD
Diane Schwarzman	Traffic Projects Division
Keith Bounds	Planning and Program Development Div.
James L. Wynn	Project Planning Division (PPD)
Victor F. Janata	PPD
Barbara Allera-Bohlen	PPD
Claudia Kan	PPD
Monty Rahman	PPD
Michael J. Rothenheber	Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson

A presentation was made of alternates identified at the February 26, 1990 Location/Design Public Hearing. The proposed improvements include mainline alternates for MD 205 and interchange options for MD 205 at US 301/MD 5:

MAINLINE ALTERNATES:

The project was separated into three mainline segments with interchangeable alternates within each segment.

Segment I begins at the southern study limits, at existing MD 5, and extends to just south of the Trinity Memorial Gardens Cemetery. Two alternates were considered in this segment.

Alternate 5 followed the basic alignment of existing MD 205, with a six-lane divided highway and an open 34-foot median. The existing traffic signal would remain at the MD 5/MD 205 intersection. Existing and approved site developments in three quadrants restrict major reconstruction of the intersection.

Alternate 6 was on relocation, splitting from existing MD 5 approximately 2400 feet south of the existing MD 5/MD 205 intersection, bridging the tributaries to the Jordan Swamp, and tying into the basic alignment of MD 205 at the north end of Segment I. The typical section was the same as for Alternate 5. The existing traffic signal at MD 5/MD 205 would remain as well as the existing segment of MD 205 between MD 5 and Alternate 6. A new signal would be installed at the split of the new roadway and the existing northbound MD 5.

While Alternate 5 has lower costs and environmental impacts compared to Alternate 6, it does not address the problem, failing to adequately handle future traffic needs at the MD 5/MD 205 intersection.

Segment II begins at the northern end of Segment I and extends to just north of the Trinity Memorial Gardens Cemetery. Alternate 5/6 proposes to utilize the existing roadway as part of the new northbound lanes, with the new southbound roadway built to the west, impacting the cemetery. Alternate 5/6 Modified avoids the cemetery impacts by utilizing the existing roadway as part of the new southbound lanes, with the new northbound roadway built to the east. The typical section for both alternates would include a transition from the Segment I typical section to a six-lane curbed divided highway and a twenty-foot curbed median.

The obvious advantage of Alternate 5/6 Modified is the avoidance of cemetery impacts.

Segment III begins at the northern end of Segment II and extends to the US 301/MD 5 intersection with MD 205. Alternate 5/6, the one build alternate presented, follows the basic alignment of existing MD 205 with slight shifts to minimize right-of-way impacts. The existing traffic signals at Pinefield Road and US 301/MD 5 would remain. The typical section from Segment II would continue and extend to just south of the railroad tracks. From there to the US 301/MD 5 intersection the outside lane in each direction would be eliminated. This minimizes right-of-way impacts to the two shopping centers. While this is only a short term answer, the long term solution requires the construction of an interchange to augment (Options A or B) or replace (Options C or D) the existing intersection.

INTERSECTION OPTIONS:

Sub-Station Road options have been studied because a minimum spacing of 750 feet is required between median openings, and Sub-Station Road, Indian Lane, and Schlagle Road all 'T' into MD 205 within 400 feet of each other. The first solution, Option 1, relocates Sub-Station Road to intersect with MD 205 approximately 850 feet to the north. Median openings would then be placed there and at Schlagle Road. Options 2 and 3 involve different relocations of Sub-Station Road to create a four-way intersection with Schlagle Road. Indian Lane would not have a median opening under any option. A connection between Schlagle Road and the cul-de-sac on Indian Lane could be provided.

INTERCHANGE OPTIONS:

There are four interchange options to augment or replace the intersection of MD 205 with US 301/MD 5.

Interchange Option A would provide directional ramps between MD 205 and US 301/MD 5 to the north. MD 205 would be relocated between the Pinefield development and the rear of the Pinefield Shopping Center and would interchange with US 301/MD 5 approximately 800 feet north of the existing intersection. Interchange movements would only be provided for US 301/MD 5 to and from the north via two-lane directional ramps. All traffic destined to and from US 301 and Western Parkway to the south would use the existing signalized intersection.

Interchange Option B is very similar to Option A. It would also provide directional ramps between MD 205 and US 301/MD 5 to the north. This option would differ along southbound US 301/MD 5. The directional ramp to MD 205 from US 301/MD 5 southbound would exit from the left. This would require southbound US 301 to be shifted westward. The existing signalized intersection would remain, similar to Option A, for the south leg of US 301 and Western Parkway.

Interchange Option C would provide a flyover ramp from southbound US 301/MD 5 to MD 205. This would replace the existing southbound double left-turns. The flyover ramp would travel behind the Chaney Building and bridge over US 301 at the existing signalized intersection location. This would require northbound MD 205 to be shifted slightly. A connection from Sub-Station Road at US 301/MD 5 to Pinefield Road would allow for the remaining movements. Additionally, a service road network behind both shopping centers would be provided to replace certain existing access points that would be removed under this option.

Interchange Option D proposes a full movement trumpet interchange. The ramps to and from southbound US 301 would loop behind the Chaney Building. Additional directional ramps would be provided for all movements. A service road network, similar to Option C, would be provided behind both shopping centers.

A presentation was then made of several variations and/or new alternates investigated by the Project Planning Team since the Location/Design Public Hearing:

Typical Section: The typical section will be a curbed, four-lane, divided highway with a curbed 20-foot median and 12-foot outside shoulders. The shoulders will be used as acceleration and deceleration lanes for turning movements, for school bus stops, and as a breakdown lane.

Segment I: The typical section for Alternate 5 was revised to a closed section as described above. The typical section for the part of Alternate 6 as far south as the southern limits of wetlands was revised to a closed section as described above but without the outside shoulders.

A new alternate, Alternate 6 Modified, was developed to reduce wetland impacts. Alternate 5 (which does not meet the transportation needs of this project) impacts 0.43 acres of wetlands, Alternate 6 impacts 1.77 acres of wetlands, and Alternate 6 Modified impacts 0.52 acres of wetlands. Alternate 6 Modified would have a design speed of 40 MPH and a total cost of approximately \$8.5 million.

Sub-Station Road: Two additional options were developed. Option 4 extended Pinefield Road from MD 205 to Sub-Station Road (similar to the connection included as part of Interchange Option C). Option 5 connected Sub-Station Road opposite Schlagle Road, but avoided any residential displacement (as in Options 2 and 3), by reducing the design speed to 20 MPH.

Interchange Options A and B: Minimum geometric criteria were employed to reduce the wetland impacts. A modification for the connection of Nike Road with the interchange ramps was investigated. Nike Road would not be extended to connect with Pinefield Road. Instead, it will 'T' into Truro Lane. The intersection of existing MD 205 with the directional ramps will be shifted south approximately 50 feet to create a four-way intersection with Truro Lane.

After a description and discussion of the alternates and impacts, the following decisions were reached:

Segment I - No decisions were achieved. Supplemental studies will be performed. (See July 17, 1991 meeting summary)

Segment II - Location/Design Approvals will be sought for Alternate 5/6 Modified.

Segment III - Location/Design Approvals will be sought for Alternate 5/6.

Sub-Station Road - Right-turn-only movements will be permitted with the reconstructed MD 205. If and when property development occurs south of the vicinity of the Pinefield Road intersection with MD 205, an extension of Pinefield Road to Sub-Station Road (Option 4) will be encouraged through the development approval process. The State Highway Administration will not build nor monetarily support the construction of this option.

Interchange Options - Location/Design Approvals will be sought for Option A with minimum geometric criteria. The modification for the connection of Nike Road will be included.

Access Control - An access control management strategy will be developed in conjunction with Charles County for all undeveloped properties along MD 205.

At the November 21, 1990 meeting, no decision was reached on an alternate for Segment I. A second meeting was held on July 17, 1991 to select the alternate for Segment I. Present at this meeting were the following:

Hal Kassoff	State Highway Administrator
Charles R. Olsen	Chief Engineer
Neil J. Pedersen	Director, Office of Planning and Preliminary Engineering (OPPE)
Robert Douglass	Deputy Chief Engineer - Highway Development
Louis H. Ege, Jr.	Deputy Director, OPPE
Larry Elliott	Deputy District Engineer - Traffic, District No. 5
Patricia Paskowski	Right-of-Way District No. 5
Joanne Jewett	Right-of-Way District No. 5
Fred Lees	District No. 5
Stephen Drumm	Chief, Highway Design Division (HDD)
John Jordan	HDD
Kenneth A. McDonald	HDD
Fred Doerfler	HDD
George Welton	HDD
Steve Silva	Bridge Design Division
Victor F. Janata	PPD
Barbara Allera-Bohlen	PPD
Claudia Kan	PPD
Monty Rahman	PPD
Gordon Dailey	Office of the Chief Engineer
Michael J. Rothenheber	Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson

Five alternates were presented for discussion: Alternates 5 and 6, previously described, and three new alternates, developed to satisfy the project need, while reducing wetland impacts. The new alternates were:

Alternate 6 Modified (Option I) At-Grade Intersection

This alternate would be on relocation. A design speed of 40 MPH was established. This shifted the three intersections proposed for Alternate 6 in tighter to each other. The alignment avoided Wetland 8, while increasing the impacts to Wetland 7, which is upstream. The proposed southbound MD 5 Relocated would require a left fork to existing southbound MD 5.

Alternate 6 Modified (Option I) Underpass

This alternate is the same as the previous alternate, except that it eliminates the intersection between existing and proposed MD 5. The existing grade differential between the north and southbound lanes of existing MD 5 makes it convenient to build the proposed southbound MD 5 Relocated as an underpass of existing northbound MD 5, then merging with existing southbound MD 5.

Alternate 6 Modified (Option J) Underpass

This alternate is very similar to the previous alternate. It would vary in that a double left-turn would be provided for proposed southbound MD 5 Relocated instead of a left fork movement.


After a description and discussion of the alternates and impacts, the following decisions were reached:

Because no other alternate in Segment I provided the consistency of design speed, the continuity of alignment, and the adequacy of level of service, the Administrator selected Alternate 6 as the one for which location and design approvals would be requested. In order to reduce wetland impacts, the Administrator directed that the proposed bridges crossing the tributaries to the Jordan Swamp be increased to such lengths as to satisfy the environmental agencies, to the extent that they may have to span the entire wetland width.

Recognizing that Alternate 6 is an ultimate solution, which may only be implemented in the distant future, the Administrator directed that a Segment I interim solution alternate be identified. This would involve the upgrading of existing shoulders and striping to provide four undivided lanes for the part of existing MD 205 between MD 5 and Poplar Hill-Beantown Road. The 0.3 miles part of existing MD 205 to the north would require grading, paving, and some minor right-of-way acquisition to provide four undivided lanes. Left turns from this interim alternate would be prohibited, except at Poplar Hill-Beantown Road.

With your concurrence of our understanding of decisions reached on November 21, 1990 and July 17, 1991, we will proceed with the development of the Finding of No Significant Impact document to seek location approval from the Federal Highway Administration.

CONCURRENCE:



9/16/91

Hal Kasso
Administrator

Date

NJP/as

cc: Attendees

- Mr. Charles B. Adams
- Ms. Susan K. Bauer
- Mr. John D. Bruck
- Mr. Anthony M. Capizzi
- Mr. John M. Contestabile
- Mr. Robert J. Finck
- Mr. Joseph Finkle
- Mr. Earle S. Freedman
- Mr. James K. Gatley
- Mr. John H. Grauer
- Ms. Angela B. Hawkins
- Mr. Thomas Hicks
- Mr. Robert J. Houst
- Mr. Vernon J. Kral
- Ms. Cynthia D. Simpson
- Mr. Thomas C. Watts
- Mr. Michael J. Zezeski

II. COMPARISON OF ALTERNATES

II. COMPARISON OF ALTERNATES

The State Highway Administration (SHA) has decided to seek Location/Design Approval for: Segment I, Alternate 6; Segment II, Alternate 5/6 Modified; Segment III, Alternate 5/6; and Interchange Option A. These improvements are described in Section III.

PROPOSED MD 5 RELOCATED SUMMARY OF ALTERNATES TABLE

	ALTERNATE	LENGTH OF ALT. (MILES)	DISPLACEMENTS				PROPERTIES AFFECTED					RIGHT-OF-WAY REQ. (AC.)					RELOC. GRAVE SITES	HISTOR. / ARCHLG.	MAJOR STREAM X INGS	RAIL ROAD X INGS	WOODLANDS (AC.)	WETLANDS (AC.)	100 YR FLOOD PLAIN (AC.)	PRIME FARM LAND (AC.)	EST. COST (X \$ MILLIONS 1990)		
			RES.	COMM.	CHURCH/NON-PROFIT	TOTAL	RES.	COMM.	CHURCH	REC.	TOTAL	RES.	COMM.	CHURCH	REC.	TOTAL									ENG. & R.O.W.	CONST.	TOTAL
SEGMENT I	ALTERNATE 5	0.6	0	0	0	0	7	1	0	0	8	9	1	0	0	10	0	0	1	0	2	0.4	1.0	0	0.8	4.7	5.5
	S.B.A. ALTERNATE 6 ULTIMATE	0.8	0	0	0	0	8	1	0	0	9	21	1	0	0	22	0	0	2	0	2	1.0	1.0	0	1.5	14.2	15.7
	S.B.A. ALTERNATE 6 INTERIM	0.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.1	1.0	1.1
SEGMENT II	ALTERNATE 5/6	0.6	0	0	0	0	14	2	0	0	16	4	1	0	0	5	1500	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1.5	2.7	4.2
	S.B.A. ALTERNATE 5/6 MODIFIED	0.6	(2)	(1)	0	3	12	3	0	0	15	2	3	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1.1	2.9	4.0
SEGMENT III	S.B.A. ALTERNATE 5/6	2.0	(2)	0	(2)	4	34	7	1	0	42	20	1	1	0	22	0	0	0	1	8	1.5	0	0	3.0	17.5	20.5
* RELOCATION OF SUB-STATION ROAD	OPTION 1	0.24	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	4	5	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	3	0.4	0	0	0.1	0.6	0.7
	OPTION 2	0.16	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0.2	0.2	0.4
	OPTION 3	0.14	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0.2	0.2	0.4
	OPTION 4	.41	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	6	5	1	0	0	6	0	0	0	1	3	0.1	0	0	0.8	0.9	1.7
	OPTION 5	0.10	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0.1	0.2	0.3
INTERCHANGE OPTIONS	S.B.A. OPTION A	-	(4)	(2)	0	6	14	4	0	0	18	13	7	0	0	20	0	0	1	1	1	0.8	1.5	0.8	8.5	16.7	25.2
	OPTION B	-	3	2	0	5	13	4	0	0	17	12	6	0	0	18	0	0	1	1	1	1.1	1.4	0.5	7.4	17.2	24.6
	OPTION C	-	0	3	0	3	6	15	0	1	22	8	8	0	5	21	0	0	1	2	2	2.5	1.4	0.4	11.4	17.3	28.7
	OPTION D	-	0	4	0	4	4	15	0	0	19	8	9	0	0	17	0	0	1	1	2	2.0	1.9	0.4	12.4	19.5	31.9
TOTAL SELECTED BUILD ALTERNATE		-	8	3	2	13	68	15	1	0	84	56	12	1	0	69	0	0	4	2	12	3.3	2.5	0.8	14.2	52.3	66.5

S.B.A. = SELECTED BUILD ALTERNATE

* THE NO-BUILD OPTION IS THE SELECTED ALTERNATE FOR THE RELOCATION OF SUB-STATION ROAD.

FIGURE II-1

III. SUMMARY OF ACTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

III. SUMMARY OF ACTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. BACKGROUND

1. Project Location

Proposed MD 5 Relocated is located in the north central part of Charles County near Waldorf. The alignment follows along MD 205 (formerly Mattawoman-Beantown Road) from MD 5 (Waldorf-Leonardtown Road) to US 301/MD 5 (Blue Star Memorial Highway). MD 205 is currently being used as a bypass of US 301 through the congested Waldorf area. Figures I-1 and I-2 depict the project location and the study area, respectively.

MD 205 is currently a two-lane roadway which extends from MD 5 (Waldorf-Leonardtown Road) to US 301/MD 5. Access is uncontrolled and signalized intersections are located at the northern and southern terminus and at Pinefield Road. A box culvert on relocation was recently constructed over the tributary to the Jordan Swamp.

The project consists of upgrading and widening MD 205 to a four-lane divided roadway with shoulders from MD 5 to US 301/MD 5. An interchange at US 301/MD 5 is also proposed.

2. Purpose of the Study



The purpose of this study is to increase capacity and improve the safety to Proposed MD 5 Relocated (Existing MD 205). This roadway is currently being used as a bypass of the congested Waldorf area connecting MD 5 with US 301/MD 5. It links several suburban communities including St. Charles, Beantown, Waldorf, and Pinefield; aides in the transportation of goods and services, and acts as a highly important commuter route between the eastern half of Charles County and St. Mary's County with Prince George's County, Washington D.C., and further north. The objective of the mainline alternates and interchange options proposed are to alleviate existing congestion due to insufficient capacity and provide for continued safe and efficient operation into the future. The proposed improvements will also enhance the existing MD 5 corridor as additional traffic will be diverted away from existing MD 5 to Proposed MD 5 Relocated.

3. Project History

Proposed MD 5 Relocated is currently designated with signs as MD 205. It has recently been transferred to the State Highway Administration from Charles County when it was designated as Mattawoman-Beantown Road. This project is currently included in the Maryland Department of Transportation's Consolidated Transportation Program (FY 1989-1994) for planning and engineering and in the Highway Needs Inventory. This project is also included within the Charles County, Maryland Comprehensive Land Use Plan (1988). These improvements are consistent with other major study transportation improvements that are programmed for planning, design and/or construction. These include:

- ◊ MD 5 (Waldorf-Leonardtown Road): This project will widen existing MD 5 to five lanes from US 301 to Post Office Road.

- ◇ US 301 (Blue Star Memorial Highway): This project will widen existing US 301 to six lanes from south of Smallwood Drive to south of US 301/MD 5 interchange at T.B.
- ◇ MD 228 (Berry Road): This project will dualize existing MD 228 from US 301 to Bealle Hill Road and construct a new/relocated dual highway between MD 228 and MD 210.
- ◇ MD 5: This project will reconstruct MD 5 to: upgrade two at-grade intersections north of I-95; reconstruct interchanges at I-95 and US 301 and construct six new interchanges and two right-on/right-off partial interchanges.
- ◇ MD 210 (Indian Head Highway): This project will reconstruct existing MD 210 to a 6 lane divided highway from south of Old Fort Road to MD 414.
- ◇ US 301 (Blue Star Memorial Highway): A planning study is underway to widen and control access on existing US 301 from MD 5 at T.B. to US 50.
- ◇ Washington Bypass: A planning study is underway for an eastern bypass of the Washington Metropolitan Area through part of Charles County.
- ◇ US 301 (Blue Star Memorial Highway): A planning study is underway to provide interchanges along US 301 with Billingsly Road, Smallwood Drive, and MD 5/MD 228.
- ◇ Western Parkway (Charles County): This project will provide a new 4-lane divided roadway from Billingsly Road to MD 205.
- ◇ Billingsly Road (Developers Road): This project will provide a new 2-lane roadway between US 301 and MD 5. Charles County will provide the roadway from MD 5 (7300') and the developer will provide the remainder.
- ◇ US 301 bridge over Mattawoman Creek (Charles County): will improve this bridge upon completion of Western Parkway.
- ◇ Middletown Road (Charles County): This project will ultimately provide a 4-lane improvement from Billingsly Road to MD 228.




Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

**PROPOSED MD. 5 RELOCATED
(MD. 205)**

LOCATION MAP


CH 266-131-571N
SCALE: NOT TO SCALE

FIGURE III-1



LIMIT OF STUDY

LIMIT OF STUDY



Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

PROPOSED MD. 5 RELOCATED
(MD. 205)

STUDY AREA

CH 566-151-571N
SCALE: 1" = 2000'

FIGURE III-2

B. ALTERNATES

1. Alternates Considered But Dropped Prior to Public Hearing

a. Alternate 2

Alternate 2 proposed a 5 lane curbed section with a minimum right-of-way requirement of 80 feet. The middle lane would be striped to serve as a continuous center turn lane. The configuration of this alternate basically follows the existing alignment with widened roadway edges and slight east-west shifts to minimize impacts to adjacent properties. This alternate, of all build alternates, is the least disruptive to adjacent land owners. This alternate was dropped because it did not provide adequate safety or traffic capacity in the design year, 2015. This alternate would have increased the accident rate to 488 accidents/100 MVM, while the statewide average is 202 accidents/100 MVM. Additionally, the roadway would operate at level of service (LOS) F in the design year 2015. Travel demands are forecasted for 20 years beyond the anticipated construction completion to justify the major expenditure of funds.

b. Alternate 3

Alternate 3 proposed a four lane, divided curbed section with no access controls and a minimum right-of-way requirement of 100 feet. This option would have a 20 foot wide curbed median and would have similar alignment shifts as Alternate 2 to minimize residential impacts. A service road would be provided along residential areas in the vicinity of Pinefield and Council Oak Road. This would reduce the number of conflict points, protect existing residents from the roadway, and would result in superior traffic operation and safety over Alternate 2. Left turn bays would be provided at all median crossovers to allow "U" turns. This alternate was dropped because it did not provide adequate traffic capacity in the design year, 2015. The roadway would operate at LOS F which does not justify the major expenditure of funds.

c. Alternate 4

Alternate 4 proposed a four (4) lane, divided, curbed section with partial access controls and has a minimum right-of-way requirement of 100 feet for the mainline and approximately 40 feet for service roads. In a similar fashion to Alternate 3, Alternate 4 is proposed with mainline shifts off of the existing road while maintaining the same basic configuration as the existing alignment. The shifts minimize impacts to adjacent properties and provide for service road access. The service roads are proposed to ensure all properties have a way to access the mainline while maintaining the integrity of the roadway facility. An alignment option in the vicinity of Trinity Memorial Gardens Cemetery shifts the roadway to the east. Alternate 4 would impact the Trinity Memorial Gardens Cemetery, but would avoid major impacts to the residences across from the cemetery. Alternate 4 Modified would avoid the cemetery, but would have greater impacts to the residential area and would provide rear access to the properties. This alternate was dropped because it did not provide adequate traffic capacity in the design year, 2015. The roadway would operate at LOS F which does not justify the major expenditure of funds.

d. Realignment Alternates

As part of the Eastern Bypass Corridor Study, an alignment behind the Pinefield Community was investigated. The existing roadway would have remained for local traffic and the new alignment would have been for through traffic. This alternate was dropped because it had 11 displacements, over 26 acres of wetland impacts, and a construction cost of over \$250 million.

Three modifications were developed that realigned MD 205 beginning just south of Idlewood Trailer Park to MD 5 and travelled behind the Trinity Memorial Gardens Cemetery. These alternates were developed to avoid impacts to the cemetery and/or displacements. The three alternates provided either a trumpet interchange with MD 5, a flyover interchange with MD 5, or an at-grade intersection. The three modifications resulted in impacts to Wetland Site 7 of 4 acres, 4 acres, and 6 acres of wetland impact respectively. These alternates were dropped because of the increased construction costs, right-of-way, and wetland impacts.

e. Interchange Options

A two-lane flyover ramp (40 MPH) in conjunction with Segment I, Alternate 5 at the intersection of MD 205/MD 5/St. Charles Parkway was investigated. An additional 1.4 acres of wetland impacts would be required from Wetland Site 7 and 8. The intersection would still not adequately handle the transportation needs of this project. A design year 2015 LOS E/F (V/C = .91/1.17) is anticipated. Due to the increased wetland impacts and construction costs, and inadequate traffic operations this alternate was dropped.

Numerous additional interchange options were investigated for the intersection of MD 205 with US 301/MD 5 in the north. These included various 1/4 cloverleaf interchange options. These options were dropped due to increased right-of-way impacts and displacements versus Option C (See Section III.B.2.d for Option C) which was presented at the Public Hearing.

Variations of the interchange options were investigated which had US 301/MD 5 bridge over MD 205. These were dropped due to increased right-of-way impacts and costs.

A modification of Interchange Option A (See Section III.B.2.d for Option A) was developed that avoided the relocation of two commercial establishments. This modification shifted the ramps further east towards the railroad tracks. This option was dropped because it impacted additional wetlands (approximately 1 acre), created an additional crossing of Mattawoman Creek, and had increased construction costs.

2. Alternates Presented At The Public Hearing

a. Alternate 1: No-Build

Alternate 1 is the No-Build alternate. It would provide no capacity improvements to Mattawoman-Beantown Road. Spot safety and intersection improvements would still be made as needed. As traffic volumes continue to grow, traffic delays and the length of the peak hours will expand. This will only increase the already high accident rate. The No-Build Alternate is not considered to be a reasonable solution to the growing traffic demands. As a result, the No-Build alternate was not selected.

b. Mainline Build Alternates

General Description

The project has been separated into three segments with interchangeable alternates within each segment. The first segment would begin at MD 5 (southern terminus) and extends to just south of Trinity Memorial Gardens Cemetery (+4000'), the second segment ties-in with Segment I and extends to just north of Trinity Memorial Gardens Cemetery (+3000'), and the third segment ties-in with Segment II and extends to the end of MD 205 at the intersection of US 301/MD 5 (+10,400'). The typical sections for the project are depicted on Figure III-8A and III-8B.

Segment I

Segment I begins at MD 5 (southern terminus) and extends to just south of Trinity Memorial Gardens Cemetery. Within this segment there are two alternates. Alternate 5 would follow the basic alignment of existing MD 205. The typical section would include a 6-lane, divided roadway with 10' shoulders and an open median of 34'. The open typical section corresponds to the open typical section on MD 5 south of the study area. The existing traffic signal at MD 205/MD 5 would remain. Construction and development in three quadrants approved by Charles County restrict major reconstruction of the intersection and leaves an unacceptable LOS F*. The box culvert over the tributary to Jordan Swamp would be extended. Alternate 5 was not selected because it did not provide adequate traffic capacity in the design year, 2015.

Alternate 6 would be on relocation and is the selected alternate. Alternate 6 would begin approximately 2400' south of the existing MD 5/MD 205 intersection and proceed on new location in a northwesterly direction, and bridge the tributaries to the Jordan Swamp and related wetlands, and would tie into MD 205 just south of the cemetery. The typical section would be the same as Alternate 5. The existing traffic signal at MD 205/MD 5 would remain, and a new signal, at the split, for the new southbound roadway and existing northbound MD 5 would be added. The relocation would obtain an acceptable intersection level of service that Alternate 5 would not. This would eliminate any need for an interchange.

* See P. III-22 for Level of Service description.

Segment II

Segment II would tie into Segment I and would extend to just north of Trinity Memorial Gardens Cemetery (+3000'). Within this segment, there would also be two alternates. Alternate 5/6 would construct the new roadway to the west of the existing roadway and traverse through the cemetery. This alternate was not selected due to the impacts to the cemetery. Alternate 5/6 Modified, would construct the new roadway to the east of the existing roadway avoiding all impacts to the graves at the cemetery. The typical section for both alternates would include a transition from the Segment I typical section (6-lane open median) to a 6-lane, divided roadway with a 20' curbed median.

Segment III

Segment III would tie into Segment II and would extend to the intersection of US 301/MD 5 (+10,400'). Within this segment, there is one alternate. Alternate 5/6 would follow the basic alignment of existing MD 205 with slight shifts to minimize right-of-way impacts. The existing traffic signals at Pinefield Road and US 301/MD 5 would remain. The typical section from Segment II a six-lane, divided roadway with 20' curbed median would extend to just south of the railroad tracks. From the railroad tracks to the intersection with US 301/MD 5 the roadway would include a four-lane, divided roadway with curbed median. This would minimize right-of-way impacts to the two shopping centers. Although this short (+700') 4-lane section would not provide an adequate level-of-service by the year 2000, it is anticipated that an interchange option would be constructed prior to this because the US 301/MD 5 intersection will have an unacceptable traffic congestion by then.

c. Relocation of Sub-Station Road: Options 1,2 & 3

Median openings would be provided at cross roads. A minimum spacing of 750' is required between openings. Sub-Station Road, Indian Lane, and Schlagle Road all tee into MD 205 within 400' of each other. Therefore, a safe median opening could not be provided at all of these intersections. Because of this, several options were studied. The first option, Relocated Sub-Station Road Option 1, would relocate Sub-Station Road to the north (approximately 850'). A median opening would be placed at Relocated Sub-Station Road and at Schlagle Road. Options 2 and 3 would each relocate Sub-Station to create a 4-way intersection with Schlagle Road. Indian Lane would not have a median opening with any option. A connection between Schlagle Road and the cul-de-sac on Indian Lane could be provided. Only one of the three options would be constructed. Option 1 was not selected due to the wetland impacts, and Options 2 and 3 were not selected due to the residential displacements and poor geometries.

d. Interchange at US 301/MD 5: Options A,B,C & D

There are four interchange options for the intersection of MD 205 with US 301/ MD 5. The interchange options could be built at a later date than the mainline alternates. An interchange is required at this intersection because of LOS F/F is anticipated by the year 2000.

Interchange Option A, the selected alternate, would provide directional ramps between MD 205 and US 301 to the north. MD 205 would be relocated between the Pinefield Development and the rear of the Pinefield Shopping Center and would tie into US 301 approximately 800 feet north of the existing intersection. Interchanging movements would only be provided for US 301 to and from the north via two-lane directional ramps. All traffic destined to and from US 301 to the south would use the existing signalized intersection.

Interchange Option B is very similar to Option A. It would also provide directional ramps between MD 205 and US 301 to the north. This option would differ along southbound US 301. The directional ramp to MD 205 would exit from the median. This would require southbound US 301 to be relocated to the west. The existing signalized intersection would remain, similar to Option A, for southbound US 301 and Western Parkway. This alternate was not selected because Option A is more conventional with the right side exit versus Option B with the left side exit.

Interchange Option C would provide a flyover ramp from southbound US 301 to MD 205. This would eliminate the existing southbound double left turns. The flyover ramp would travel behind the Chaney Building and bridge over US 301 at the existing signalized intersection location. This would require northbound MD 205 to be shifted slightly. A connection from Sub-Station Road at US 301/MD 5 to Pinefield Road would allow for the remaining movements. Additionally, a service road network behind both shopping centers would be provided to replace certain existing access points that would be removed under this option. Option C was not selected because Option A has better overall traffic operations and an easier, safer construction period creating less delays.

Interchange Option D proposes a full movement trumpet interchange. The ramps to and from southbound US 301 would loop behind the Chaney Building. Additional directional ramps would be provided for all movements (replacing the connection from Sub-Station Road & Pinefield Road). A service road network, similar to Option C, would be provided behind both shopping centers. Option D was not selected because Option A has better overall traffic operations and an easier, safer construction period creating less delays.

e. Additional Modifications to the Alternates

Following the Public Hearing, several additional modifications to the alternates were investigated. The investigation was completed in response to comments received at the Public Hearing, and comments received from various agencies.

Within Segment I in the effort to minimize wetland impacts, both Alternate 5 and Alternate 6 were investigated with a closed typical section. Alternate 5 would have a 20' curbed median and outside curbed section the entire length. Alternate 6 would have a 20' curbed median and outside curbed section from the bridge crossing of Jordan Swamp to Segment II. From MD 5 to the bridge an open typical section would be provided. This would reduce the wetland impacts. Alternate 5 wetland impacts would reduce from 0.64 acres to 0.35 acres and Alternate 6 wetland impacts would reduce from 2.01 acres to 1.77 acres. This typical section with Alternate 6 was selected.

An investigation to shift the Segment I, Alternate 5 widening from the east to the west side over the box culvert was completed. This would avoid a recent SHA wetland mitigation project. Alternate 5 was not selected because it did not provide adequate traffic capacity in the design year, 2015.

An investigation to bridge the wetlands in Segment I, Alternate 6 in conjunction with a closed typical section was completed. This would reduce the wetland impacts from 1.77 acres to 1.03 acres. This modification was selected in conjunction with Alternate 6.

Segment I: Alternate 6 proposed to provide a two-way intersection for southbound Proposed MD 5 Relocated and existing MD 5. It is anticipated that this intersection would operate at LOS B/C (AM/PM) in the design year 2015. Potential problems with the close proximity of the signalized intersections may occur. A cost analyses was completed to determine the incremental increase in construction cost to replace the intersection with an underpass. Southbound Proposed MD 5 Relocated would travel under existing northbound MD 5. An incremental construction cost of \$1.6 million over the at-grade intersection is expected for the underpass. This modification was not selected due to the high cost with only marginal benefit.

Existing MD 5 southbound is 20' lower in elevation then MD 5 northbound, just south of the intersection with MD 205. The southbound roadway currently has a vertical sag curve design speed of 30 MPH over the Jordan Swamp tributary. Two options were developed to increase the design speed of the vertical sag curve. An existing median averaging 90' (varies from 45' to 110') would be reduced to 54' for both options. This would help in maintenance of traffic and eliminating right-of-way impacts as the new southbound roadway is raised over 20'. An option to increase the design speed to 50 MPH (2100' to roadway replaced) would have a construction cost of \$3,200,000. An option to increase the design speed to 60 MPH (2900' of roadway replaced) would have a construction cost of \$3,500,000. This modification was not selected because there is no traffic operations or safety concerns today due to the geometries that would justify the expenditure of funds.

Eleven (11) various modifications were investigated for Segment I, Alternate 6. These modifications were developed to reduce the wetland impacts. This was accomplished by varying the design speed from the 50 MPH originally proposed down to as low as 20 MPH. While these options reduced the wetland impacts marginally (maximum 0.5 acres), they increased the potential accident rate and reduced the operational integrity of the roadway by reducing the design speed lower than Maryland Standards. These modifications were not selected for safety concerns.

Two additional options for the Relocation of Sub-Station Road were investigated. Option 4 would relocate Sub-Station Road to tie-in with MD 205 across from Pinefield Road creating a four-way intersection. This connection was shown as part of Interchange Option C at the Public Hearing. Option 5 would relocate Sub-Station Road to create a four-way intersection with Schlagle Road, similiar to Option 2 and 3. Option 5 would have a design speed under 20 MPH but would avoid the residential displacement associated with Option 2 and 3. Option 4 was not selected due to the high cost of this option. Option 5 was not selected due to the unsafe geometrics.

Modifications to Interchange Option A were investigated to reduce wetland impacts. One modification reduced the design speed of the ramps from the 50 MPH proposed to as low as 40 MPH. This reduced the wetland impacts by less than 0.1 acres. This was not selected because the lower design speed did not provide any appreciable reduction in wetland impacts. Another option realigned US 301/MD 5 to reduced the existing median from $\pm 50'$ to $22'$. This required 2500' of US 301/MD 5 to be realigned and reduced the wetland impact by 0.35 acres. This modification was dropped due to the high cost with only a small reduction in wetland impacts.

A modification for the connection of Nike Road with Interchange Option A was investigated. Nike Road would not be extended to connect with Pinefield Road. Instead it will connect into Truro Lane with a tee intersection. The intersection of Existing MD 205 with the directional ramps will be shifted south approximately 50' to create a four-way intersection with Truro Lane. This would eliminate property acquisition from five residences and reduce the amount of impact to two additional properties. This modification was selected.

Location for a park-n-ride was investigated. It is desirable for the location to be at the southern limits of the project and have ultimately 200 parking spaces (100 parking spaces initially). A park-n-ride will be provided if a suitable parcel of land is available with a willing seller, funding is available, and the parcel is not needed for wetland mitigation.

f. Selected Build Alternates

Segment I, Interim

Due to funding constraints, it is anticipated that initially the existing roadway within Segment I would be upgraded to an undivided four-lane section. The existing shoulder will be upgraded to allow it to be used as a through traffic lane. The existing box culvert for the tributary to Jordan Swamp will be used but will not be impacted. The lane widths over the box

32

culvert will be reduced to 11'. Left turns will be prohibited except at Poplar Hill-Beantown Road and MD 5. A free right lane will be added from St. Charles Parkway to southbound MD 5. The lane configuration of MD 205 southbound at the intersection of MD 5 will be upgraded. Currently there is a left turn, left turn and through lane, through lane, and right turn lane. This will be changed to two left turn lanes, two through lanes, a right turn lane.

Segment I - Ultimate

The Selected Build Alternate within Segment I is Alternate 6. This will be modified to allow a dual bridge crossing of the entire wetland area over the Jordan Swamp tributary. This modification has been included to minimize wetland impacts.

The typical section will provide for a four-lane, divided roadway with shoulders and an open median of 34' minimum from MD 5 to the bridge over the Jordan Swamp tributary. From the bridge to tie-in with Segment II, the typical section would be a four-lane, divided roadway with 20' curbed median and 12' outside traffic bearing shoulders. No median breaks will be provided except at the intersection with existing MD 205 and Poplar Hill-Beantown Road. See Figure III-3.

Segment II

The Selected Build Alternate within Segment II is Alternate 5/6 Modified. The typical section would include a four-lane, divided roadway with a 20' curbed median and 12' outside traffic bearing shoulder throughout the entire segment. A median opening will be provided at Trinity Memorial Gardens Cemetery. A second median opening will be provided for Charles County Sand and Gravel a minimum of 750' north of the first median opening. The exact placement of the opening will be coordinated with Charles County Sand and Gravel. See Figure III-4.

Segment III

The Selected Build Alternate within Segment III is Alternate 5/6. The typical section will be a four-lane, divided roadway with a 20' curbed median. A 12' outside traffic bearing shoulder will be provided from Segment II to the Conrail Railroad tracks. Median openings will be provided at Idlewood Trailer Park, Council Oak Drive, Schlagle Road, Pinefield Road, Nike Road, Conrail Railroad, and at the southern entrance to Pinefield Shopping Center across from Dash-In.

The curb line in front of the Pinefield Community will be maintained to its present location. All widening will be constructed away from the Pinefield Community.

The curbed median between the Pinefield Shopping Center and Pinefield South Shopping Center will be reduced to 4' with turn lane. The outside curb line adjacent to Pinefield South Shopping Center will be maintained to its present location. All widening should be constructed to the other side. Currently, a 17' space exists between the roadway curb and the parking lot curb line. After the required widening is constructed, a 4' space will remain

between the roadway curb and parking lot curb line. This recommendation is made so that no parking spaces are removed from either shopping center. See Figure III-5A and III-5B.

Relocation of Sub-Station Road

The Selected Build Alternate for the Relocation of Sub-Station Road will be the no-build alternate. A right in/right out will be provided at existing Sub-Station Road and Proposed MD 5 Relocated. The options investigated created either wetland impacts, displacements, or unsafe geometries, while traffic operations did not require the improvements.

Interchange at US 301/MD 5

The Selected Build Alternate for the interchange at US 301/MD 5 will be Option A. The modification for the connection of Nike Road will be included.

Two lane ramps will be provided with a 50 MPH design speed. An at-grade crossing of Conrail Railroad will be provided. The northbound ramp will bridge over Wetland 1 and Mattawoman Creek. The southbound ramp will bridge over Wetland 2A (including Mattawoman Creek) and US 301/MD 5. Minimum acceptable geometries will be used to minimize wetland impacts.

Access Control










An Access Control Management Strategy will be developed in conjunction with Charles County for all undeveloped properties along MD 205. The Access Control Management Strategy will coordinate proposed improvements to a common access point where possible.

g. Phased Construction

This project may be constructed in stages based on traffic requirements and funding availability. Initial construction of the mainline will include Segment II, Alternate 5/6 Modified and Segment III, Alternate 5/6. Within Segment I, it is anticipated that initially Segment I, Interim will be constructed. This would upgrade the existing roadway to an undivided four-lane section. This would be accomplished by upgrading the existing shoulder for traffic. It is anticipated that a four-lane mainline section will provide adequate level of service to approximately the year 2012. The intersection with Existing MD 5/St. Charles Parkway is anticipated to reach LOS F in approximately the year 2011 in the AM peak hour and 1998 in the PM peak hour. Segment I, Ultimate (Alternate 6) would be constructed at a later time when the intersection operations with MD 5 approaches unmanageable levels and funding is available.

If funding is available, Interchange Option A will be constructed in the initial stage. Interchange Option A remains a vital part of the solution. If funding is not available, Segment III, Alternate 5/6 will be constructed initially. Upon obtaining funds, Interchange Option A would be constructed. The improvements completed with Segment III, Alternate 5/6 are also part of interchange Option A except for the intersection area at Turo Lane which would require reconstruction.

LEGEND

-  PROPOSED ROADWAY
-  EXISTING ROADWAY
-  EXISTING RIGHT-OF-WAY
-  PROPOSED RIGHT-OF-WAY
-  R-11 ■ AIR/NOISE RECEPTOR SITES
-  DIS. 7 □ DISPLACEMENT
-  WETLANDS (W-1)
-  FLOOD PLAINS
-  PROPOSED U.S. 301 WIDENING


NOTE:

1. Segment I, interim will upgrade the existing shoulder to be used as a travel lane and include minor adjustments at the intersection with Existing MD 5/ St. Charles Parkway (See P III-11 for descriptions of improvement).
2. No median openings will be provided with Segment I, Ultimate (Alternate 6) except at the intersection with Existing MD 205 / Poplar Hill-beantown Road.

SELECTED BUILD ALTERNATE


**PROPOSED MD 5 RELOCATED
SEGMENT I, ULTIMATE
ALTERNATE 6**

SCALE: 1" = 400' FIGURE III - 3












MATCH LINE, SEE SEGMENT II FIGURES III - 4

MATCH LINE, SEE SEGMENT III FIGURE III - 5B



LEGEND

-  PROPOSED ROADWAY
-  EXISTING ROADWAY
-  EXISTING RIGHT-OF-WAY
-  PROPOSED RIGHT-OF-WAY
-  R-11 ■ AIR/NOISE RECEPTOR SITES
-  DIS. 7 □ DISPLACEMENT
-  WETLANDS (W-1)
-  FLOOD PLAINS
-  PROPOSED U.S. 301 WIDENING


NOTE:

1. Median openings would be provided at Idlewood Traller Park and Council Oak Drive.










SELECTED BUILD ALTERNATE

PROPOSED MD 5 RELOCATED
SEGMENT III
ALTERNATE 5/6

SCALE : 1"=400' FIGURE III-5A




LEGEND

-  PROPOSED ROADWAY
-  EXISTING ROADWAY
-  EXISTING RIGHT-OF-WAY
-  PROPOSED RIGHT-OF-WAY
-  R-11 ■ AIR/NOISE RECEPTOR SITES
-  DIS. 7 □ DISPLACEMENT
-  WETLANDS (W-1)
-  FLOOD PLAINS
-  PROPOSED U.S. 301 WIDENING

NOTE:
 1. Median openings would be provided at Schlagle Road, Pinefield Road, Nike Road, Conrell Railroad and the southern entrance to Pinefield Shopping Center across from Dosh-In.

SELECTED BUILD ALTERNATE

**PROPOSED MD 5 RELOCATED
 SEGMENT III
 ALTERNATE 5/6**
 SCALE : 1"=400' FIGURE III-5B



3. Service Characteristics of the Selected Alternate

a. Traffic Summary

MD 205 is currently a two lane, uncontrolled access road that connects MD 5 with US 301/MD 5. There are 65 driveways which directly access the roadway. This road functions as a urban minor arterial and acts as a bypass of the MD 5/US 301 intersection in Waldorf. It currently has three signalized intersections. The first signal is at the southern limits at MD 205. The second signal is near the northern end of the project at the intersection with Pinefield Road (the access route to the Pinefield subdivision). The third signalized intersection is at the northern limits of MD 205 at US 301/MD 5. This intersection has commercial development or proposed commercial development in all four quadrants.

Currently this road experiences congestion during peak periods (6:00 a.m. to 8:30 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.). Daily delays occur today at the signalized intersections of MD 5 and US 301/MD 5 due to lack of capacity. This is expected to worsen as traffic volumes increase. A review of the Average Daily Traffic (ADT) reveals an approximate 40% projected increase of traffic between the 1987 ADT and 2015 No-Build ADT on the existing roadway. (See Figure III-7). This will only make the existing traffic congestion, delays, and accidents more severe.

Conrail Railroad currently crosses MD 205 just south of the intersection with US 301/MD 5. Currently the crossing is used four to eight times a day during non-peak hours and does not affect traffic operations. No grade separation is required with the Selected Build Alternate as the railroad useage is not anticipated to change. The Selected Build Alternate is consistent with the Maryland Statewide Commuter Assistance Study.

A projected increase in traffic volumes will result in a reduction of the vehicle operating speeds. It is estimated that the traffic operating speeds (assuming a six-lane facility) for Proposed MD 5 Relocated will be:

<u>1995</u>	<u>Peak</u>	<u>Off Peak</u>
No Build	10 MPH*	40 MPH
Build	40 MPH	40 MPH
<u>2015</u>		
No Build	10 MPH*	40 MPH
Build	30 MPH	40 MPH

* A 10 MPH operating speed signifies a stop and go condition.

Proposed MD 5 Relocated will be classified as an intermediate arterial by MSHA classifications or urban minor arterial by FHWA classification. Detailed traffic reveals an existing Average Daily Traffic (ADT) of 17,400 (at Council Oak Drive) to 21,800 (at US 301/MD 5) vehicles and a design year (2015) build ADT of 40,300 (at Council Oak Drive) to 47,400 (at US 301/MD 5) vehicles. The build ADT reveals an increase of approximately 125% over existing traffic.

The traffic analysis reflects the flexibility to expand to six-lanes when and if the need arises.

Quality of traffic flow along a roadway is measured in terms of levels-of-service (LOS). Level-of-service (LOS) is dependent upon highway geometry, highway capacity, and traffic characteristics and volumes. The Transportation Research Boards's HIGHWAY CAPACITY MANUAL, defines level-of-service as follows:

- ◇ LOS A: Free Flow
- ◇ LOS B: Stable flow; the presence of others in the traffic stream begins to be noticeable.
- ◇ LOS C: Stable flow; the presence of others in the traffic stream begins to significantly affect interactions.
- ◇ LOS D: High density, stable flow; the presence of others in the traffic stream begins to severely affect speed and freedom to maneuver.
- ◇ LOS E: Operating conditions at or near the capacity level. All speeds are reduced to a low, but relatively uniform value.
- ◇ LOS F: Forced or breakdown flow.

A Level-of-Service Summary for the various segments validate the necessity for the necessity for the Selected Build Alternate, intersection improvements and interchange improvements. The traffic analysis reflects the flexibility to expand to six lanes when and if the need arises.

**U.S. 301/
MD. 5**

62000
78425 (78425)
119500 (119500)

**NIKE
DRIVE**

450
5150 (5150)
6750 (6750)

**PINEFIELD
DRIVE**

6800
7775 (7775)
10200 (10200)



**INDIAN
LANE**

400
450 (450)
600 (600)

**SCHAGLE
ROAD**

200
1300 (1300)
4000 (4000)

3050
5625 (4500)
12000 (5500)

21800
29100 (26025)
47400 (30000)

19700
26700 (23625)
44250 (26850)

18500
25325 (22250)
42450 (25050)

17800
24475 (21400)
41150 (23750)

17600
24225 (21150)
40850 (23450)

17500
24125 (21050)
40350 (23300)

PROPOSED

MD. 5

RELOCATED

52000
63350 (67700)
91700 (111000)

**U.S. 301/
MD. 5**

2200
2750 (2750)
4100 (4100)

**SUB-STATION
ROAD**

LEGEND:

1987 ADT

1995 BUILD (NO-BUILD) ADT

2015 BUILD (NO-BUILD) ADT



PROPOSED MD. 5 RELOCATED (MD. 205)

AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC

CH 566-151-571N

SCALE: NONE

FIGURE: III-7A



**POPLAR HILL/
BEANTOWN RD. MD. 5**

5250	23975
6900 (6900)	33375 (33375)
11125 (11125)	56500 (56500)

17500	17400	17600	17450	20000	12925
24125 (21050)	24475 (21400)	24700 (21625)	24500 (21475)	27900 (24825)	18075 (17575)
40350 (23300)	40275 (24575)	40575 (24875)	40275 (24575)	47500 (30000)	28500 (22575)

PROPOSED

MD.

5

RELOCATED

1450
2000 (2000)
3075 (3075)
**COUNCIL OAK
DRIVE**

500
575 (575)
750 (750)
**IDLEWOOD
TRAILER PARK**

900
1200 (1200)
1900 (1900)
MILL ROAD

23600
30700 (32075)
51300 (53455)
MD. 5

LEGEND:

1987 ADT

1995 BUILD (NO-BUILD) ADT

2015 BUILD (NO-BUILD) ADT



Maryland Department of Transportation
STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

PROPOSED MD. 5 RELOCATED (MD. 205)

AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC

CH 566-151-571N

SCALE: NONE

FIGURE: III-7B

TABLE III - 1
LEVEL-OF-SERVICE SUMMARY

SEGMENT I

From MD 5 to just south of Trinity Memorial Gardens Cemetery

<u>Interim</u>	<u>2012</u>			
1) Mainline	E			
2) Existing MD 5/St. Charles Parkway/ MD 205 Intersection				
<u>Approximate Year</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2111</u>
AM peak	E	F		
PM peak			E	F
<u>Mainline: Ultimate, Alternate 6</u>	<u>2015</u>			
No Build	F			
Build	C			
<u>Intersections: Ultimate Alternate 6</u>	<u>2015 (AM/PM)</u>			
1) Existing MD 5 Northbound and Southbound Connection				
No-Build	N.A.			
Build	B/C			
2) Northbound St. Charles Parkway Extended and Southbound Connection				
No-Build	N.A.			
Build	A/B			
3) Existing MD 5 and St. Charles Parkway				
No-Build	F/F			
Build	D/D			

SEGMENT II

From just south of to just north of Trinity Memorial Gardens Cemetery

<u>Mainline</u>	<u>2015</u>
No-Build	F
Build	C

Note: This traffic analysis reflects the flexibility to expand to six-lanes when and if the need arises.

TABLE III -1
LEVEL-OF-SERVICE SUMMARY
SEGMENT III

From north of Trinity Memorial Gardens Cemetery to US 301/MD 5

<u>Mainline</u>	<u>2015</u>
No-Build	F
Build	C/D*

* The mainline build LOS (2015) would be LOS C from Segment II to Idlewood Trailer Park and LOS D from Idlewood Trailer Park to the intersection of US 301/MD 5.

<u>Intersection</u>	<u>2015 (AM/PM)</u>
1) Idlewood Trailer Park No-Build Build	E/C B/A
2) Council Oak Drive No-Build Build	E/C C/A
3) Sub-Station Road No-Build Option 4	F/E B/A
4) Pinefield Road No-Build Build	F/F B/C
5) Nike Road No-Build Build	F/F D/A
6) US 301-MD 5/MD 205 No-Build Build*	F/F F/F

* The Build condition reflects a mainline build alternate and not an interchange build option.

Note: This traffic analysis reflects the flexibility to expand to six lanes when and if the need arises.

TABLE III -1
LEVEL-OF-SERVICE- SUMMARY
INTERCHANGE OPTION A

	<u>2015 (AM/PM)</u>
1) US 301-MD 5/MD 205 No-Build*	F/F
Build	F/F**
2) Proposed MD 5/MD 205 Build	B/C
3) Ramp Merge: Proposed MD 5/US 301 N.B. Build	E/B
4) Ramp Diverge: US 301 S.B./Proposed MD 5 Build	A/B

* The no-build assumes that a mainline build alternate has been selected but no build interchange option was selected.

** All intersections along US 301 will have a LOS F due to the anticipated traffic along US 301. A fourth lane along US 301 (in each direction) is needed to provide an adequate level-of-service.

Note: This traffic analysis reflects the flexibility to expand to six-lanes when and if the need arises.

b. Accident Summary

The intersection of US 301/MD 5 with MD 205 and MD 5 with MD 205 are currently classified as "High Accident Intersections". This condition will only worsen with the No-Build Alternate as traffic congestion increases in length and volume. The Selected Build Alternate will increase capacity and provide exclusive turns lanes at these intersections. These improvements along with the addition of through lanes on US 301 (construction began in FY 1990) will help to reduce the accident rate at the US 301/MD 5 intersection with Proposed MD 5 Relocated. Improvements at the intersection of MD 5 with MD 205 also include increased capacity and exclusive turn lanes. The selected alternative includes a relocation to bypass the intersection of MD 5 and MD 205. This improvement will help reduce the accident rate at this intersection by diverting traffic.

The average accident rate for MD 205 is 308 accidents for every one hundred million vehicles miles of travel (accident/100 MVM). This included 351 accidents between 1984 and 1989. This accident rate is considerably higher than the statewide average rate of 278 accident/100 MVM for similarly designed highways.

The collision types that exceeded their respective statewide averages rates were angle, rear end, and left turn collisions. These types of accidents are generally indicative of intersection and driveway conflicts, slower moving traffic, and periods of congestion. While there are no "High Accident Sections", the majority of these accidents are occurring in the northern segment from just north of Sub-Station Road to US 301/MD 5. These accidents resulted in a monetary loss to the motoring and general public of \$2.2 million/100 MVM.

The Selected Build Alternate would reduce the accident rate to 144 accidents/100 MVM. The accident cost resulting from the selected build alternate would be approximately \$1.5 million/100 MVM, a substantial reduction when compared to the existing conditions. The additional capacity will help reduce the angle and rear end collisions, while the use of protected left turn bays at median openings will help reduce left turn and rear end collisions.

c. Design Characteristics of the Selected Alternate

Median

The typical section for Segment I, Ultimate (Alternate 6); Segment II, Alternate 5/6 Modified; Segment III, Alternate 5/6; and Interchange Option A includes a 20' curbed median. The 20' curbed median is in accordance with AASHTO but is a design exception from SHA Highway Development Manual which specifies a 30' curbed median. The 20' curbed median was selected to minimize right-of-way and wetland impacts. Traffic operations do not require a double left turn in areas of the 20' curbed median. This exception to the SHA Highway Development Manual has been implemented at several other areas within the state. Review with the Access Studies Division has revealed no apparent accident experience at these locations.

Segment I, Interim

The existing shoulder will be upgraded to allow it to be used as a through traffic lane. The box culvert for the tributary to Jordan Swamp will not be impacted. The lanes widths over the box culvert will be reduced to 11'. Left turns will be prohibited except at Poplar Hill-Beantown Road and MD 5. A free right turn lane will be added from St. Charles Parkway to southbound MD 5. The lane configuration of MD 205 southbound at the intersection of MD 5 will be upgraded. Currently there is a left turn, left turn and through lane, through lane, and right turn lane. This will be changed to two left turn lanes, two through lanes, and a right turn lane.

Segment I, Ultimate (Alternate 6)

Dual bridges will be provided over the tributary to Jordan Swamp and adjacent wetlands. The typical section will include a four lane, divided roadway with shoulders and an open median of 34' minimum from MD 5 to the bridges. North of the bridges, the typical section will be a four lane divided roadway with a 12' outside traffic bearing shoulder, a 20' curbed median and curbed outside. No median breaks will be provided except at the intersection with existing MD 205 and at Poplar Hill-Beantown Road.

Segment II, Alternate 5/6 Modified

The typical section will be a four lane roadway with a 12' outside traffic bearing shoulder, a 20' curbed median and curbed outside. A median opening will be provided at Trinity Memorial Gardens Cemetery. A second median opening will be provided for Charles County Sand and Gravel a minimum of 750' north of the first median opening. The exact placement of this opening will be coordinated with Charles County Sand and Gravel.

Segment III, Alternate 5/6

The typical section will be a four lane divided roadway with 12' outside traffic bearing shoulder from Segment II to Conrail Railroad. From Conrail Railroad to US301/MD 5 a four lane divided roadway will be provided. This short section will provide an adequate level of service to the year 2000. It is anticipated that Interchange Option A will be constructed prior to the US 301/MD 5 intersection reaching an unacceptable level of service.

Median openings will be provided at Idlewood Trailer Park, Council Oak Drive, Schlagle Road, Pinefield Road, Nike Road, Conrail Railroad, and at the southern entrance to Pinefield Shopping Center across from Dash-In.


The curb line in front of the Pinefield Community will be maintained it it's present location. All widening will be constructed away from the Pinefield Community.

The curbed median between the Pinefield Shopping Center and Pinefield South Shopping Center will be reduced to 4' with turn lane. The outside curb line adjacent to Pinefield South Shopping Center will be maintained to its' present location. All widening should be constructed to the other side. This recommendation is made so that no parking spaces are removed from either shopping center.

Interchange Option A


Two lane ramps will be provided with a 50 MPH design speed. An at-grade crossing of Conrail Railroad will be provided. The northbound ramp will bridge over Wetland 1 and Mattawoman Creek. The southbound ramp will bridge over Wetland 2A (including Mattawomen Creek) and US 301/MD 5. Minimum acceptable geometries will be used to minimize wetland impacts.

PROPOSED MD 5 RELOCATED TYPICAL SECTIONS




TYPICAL SECTION NO. 3

SEGMENT III : STA. 492+00 (CONRAIL RR) TO U.S. 301



TYPICAL SECTION NO. 2


SEGMENT I : STA. 342+40 TO 367+00
 SEGMENT II : STA. 367+00 TO 396+00
 SEGMENT III : STA. 396+00 TO 492+00 (CONRAIL)



TYPICAL SECTION NO. 1

SEGMENT I : MD. 5 TO STA. 342+40


NOTE: THE DIMENSIONS SHOWN ARE FOR THE PURPOSE OF DETERMINING COST ESTIMATES AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE DURING THE FINAL DESIGN PHASE.



III-29

48

7112.0



INTERCHANGE OPTION A

RAMPS

NOTE:
 THE DIMENSIONS SHOWN ARE FOR THE PURPOSE OF
 DETERMINING COST ESTIMATES AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS,
 AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE DURING THE FINAL DESIGN PHASE.

PROPOSED MD 5 RELOCATED

TYPICAL SECTIONS

FIGURE III-8B

4. Environmental Consequences of the Selected Alternate

An Environmental Assessment was approved by Federal Highway Administration on January 19, 1990 and distributed prior to the public hearing for this project.

a. Socio-Economic and Land Use

There are a total of eight residential displacements and four commercial displacements required for the Selected Build Alternate. The relocation of one church would also be required by the Selected Build Alternate.

Within Segment I, there would be no displacements under the Interim or Ultimate improvements. Segment II, Alternate 5/6 Modified would require two residential displacements and one commercial displacement (Longwood Nursery). Segment III, Alternate 5/6, would require two residential displacements, one non-profit displacement (The Waldorf Jaycees are a tenant and a non-profit displacement. The parcel is considered commercial.) and one church displacement (Messiah Lutheran). Interchange Option A would have four residential displacements and two commercial displacements (Cap City and Illusions Nite Club). There is one residential relocation which impacts a minority family within Segment III: Alternate 5/6. There are no known effects to the elderly or handicapped individuals.

To ascertain the availability of replacement housing in the Study Area, local realtors were contacted and listings in The Washington Post were surveyed. The study found sufficient housing to exist on the open market for the owner-occupants, but found the rental market to be somewhat restrictive, with limited numbers of dwellings and high monthly rentals. According to the right-of-way/relocation report completed for this project, relocation sites are available within the vicinity of the study area for the church and commercial establishments displaced.

Relocation of any individuals, families, or businesses displaced by this project would be accomplished in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 and amendments of 1987 (Public Law 91-646 and Public Law 100-17), and could be affected in a timely and humane fashion. In the event comparable replacement housing is not available for displaced persons or available replacement housing is beyond their financial means, replacement "housing as a last resort" will be utilized to accomplish the rehousing.

Title VI Statement

It is the policy of the Maryland State Highway Administration to ensure compliance with the provisions of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and related civil rights laws and regulations which prohibit discrimination on the grounds of race, color, sex, national origin, age, religion, physical or mental handicap in all State Highway Administration program projects funded in whole or in part by the Federal Highway Administration. The State Highway Administration will not discriminate in highway planning, highway design, highway construction, the acquisition of right-of-way, or the provision of relocation advisory

assistance. This policy has been incorporated into all levels of the highway planning process in order that proper consideration may be given to the social, economic, and environmental effects of all highway projects. Alleged discriminatory actions should be addressed to the Equal Opportunity Section of the Maryland State Highway Administration for investigation.

Since MD 205 is an existing facility that traverses between neighborhoods, the selection of the build alternate and interchange option will not cause any segmentation of communities, isolation of community facilities, produce any adverse changes in social interaction, or disrupt community cohesion.

The impact on access to existing facilities and services resulting from the Selected Build Alternate is a minor increase in travel distance, requiring patrons to execute "U" turns at median breaks which are generally provided every 750 to 1500 feet with the exception of the heavy commercial area at the US 301/MD 205 intersection. The Selected Build Alternate will not impede existing pedestrian mobility and the use of a median will provide a refuge for crossing pedestrians. Selected Interchange Option A would introduce a minor change in accessing services in the US 301/MD 205 intersection quadrants (See Figure III-6). The change involved is that of a signalized "T" intersection that would be created with existing MD 205 and the approach to the interchange ramps east of the Happy Faces Early Learning Center south of the Conrail tracks. Commuters travelling northbound on MD 205 would now have to make a left turn to remain on MD 205 to access the businesses in the US 301/MD 205 intersection area.

The selected build alternate will have a positive effect on local and regional business by improving the transportation network. The mainline level of service will improve, inducing commuters to remain on this roadway rather than changing their traffic patterns and commercial activity. The mainline selected build alternate will displace the Waldorf Jaycees and Longwood Nursery and Interchange Option A will displace Cap City and Illusions Nite Club. Relocation sites are available within the vicinity of the study area for the displacements.

The selected build alternate is consistent with the County's Comprehensive Land Use Plan (approved 1989) for the year 2010. This plan has designated the study area as a Metro Form development area mixing residential, commercial and industrial uses. Increased traffic capacity and safety will play a vital role in the future development plans for this area.

b. Natural Environment

Geology, Topography, Soils

The selected build alternate is not expected to result in any substantial adverse impact to the study area's geology, topography or soils. Due to the erosion potential of the area soils and the perched water table, sediment control structures will be used to minimize erosion and sedimentation.

Surface Water

The selected mainline build alternate will cross three unnamed streams and the interchange selected build alternate will cross one stream (Mattawoman Creek). Short term impacts for the stream crossings are expected to be minor, and to occur in the form of temporary increases in turbidity, specific conductance, sedimentation, and reduced water clarity from the disturbance of contiguous upland areas during construction of the roadway and hydraulic structures. Long term impacts are also expected to be minor and occur in the form of increased roadway runoff from the addition of new impervious surface (19 acres). The impacts will be reduced by compliance with regulations from the Department of Natural Resources' Stormwater Management Regulations. In accordance with the Maryland Stormwater Management Act, stormwater management practices will be investigated in the following order of preference:

- ◇ On-site infiltration
- ◇ Flow attenuation by open vegetated swales and natural depressions
- ◇ Stormwater retention structures
- ◇ Stormwater detention structures

A hydraulic/hydrologic analysis will need to be performed in the final design phase to determine the necessary structural specifications and guidelines for the installation of new structures. The proposed improvements will require waterway construction permits and include plans for strict conformance for grading, erosion and sediment control, and stormwater management as required by the Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Water Resources Administration and the Maryland Department of the Environment.

The long term water quality of the study area is not expected to be impacted by the addition of new impervious surface and an increase in roadway runoff. Because of the high water tables throughout the study area, and the numerous pockets of water seeps discovered during wetland delineation activities, the potential for minor contamination to shallow water sources from roadway runoff is high. However, given the high quality of the area's wetlands and their potential for pollutant removal/reduction, the impacts are expected to be minimal. No impacts to wells, groundwater, or area aquifers are expected.

Mattawoman Creek has wetlands with anadromous fish spawning areas, therefore construction within the stream and it's floodplain and accompanying wetlands is prohibited from March 1 through June 15.

Floodplains

The 100 year floodplains associated with Mattawoman Creek (1.5 acres) and the tributaries to the Jordon Swamp (1.0 acres) will be impacted. These floodplain encroachments were evaluated in accordance with the requirements of FHPM 6-7-3-2 and Executive Order 11988 to determine if there were significant encroachments. It has been determined that none of the 100 year floodplain crossings would constitute a substantial encroachment. Mattawoman Creek is a regulated FEMA Floodway.

Critical Area

This project is not within the Chesapeake Bay Critical Area. See P. V-178.

Woodlands

The selected build alternate will impact seven acres of woodlands. Replacement, either on-site or off-site will be completed during the final design phase in adherence with Natural Resources Article, Section 5-103.

Endangered or Threatened Species

There are no known Federally or Maryland listed endangered or threatened plant or wildlife species present within the study limits. The presence of rare birds (Maryland listed) has been recorded in the vicinity. DNR surveyed the project area and did not find the presence of the rare birds. See P. V-163 to V-165.

Farmland

There is 0.8 acres of Prime Farmlands Soils impacted and 1.0 acres of Statewide Importance Farmlands impacted by Interchange Option A. The required coordination with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service has been completed. See P. V-181.

Wetlands

Pursuant to Executive order 11990 (Protection of Wetlands) and Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, wetland areas potentially affected by the proposed project have been identified.

The selected build alternate will impact 3.25 acres of wetlands from eight (8) sites. Table III-2 provides a listing of the wetland impacts. A discussion of each of the wetland sites including all measures for avoidance and/or minimization is as follows:

Wetland Site 1 is located along the east side of US 301/MD 5, approximately 850 feet north of the intersection of MD 205 and US 301/MD 5. This wetland is approximately 3 acres in size and consists of a large open pond and a surrounding wooded area (PF00W1B). The primary functions of W-1 is habitat for wildlife and aquatic wildlife, flood desynchronization and sediment trapping and nutrient retention. The resultant impact is 0.36 acres.

AVOIDANCE:

-Examined an alignment shift to the east (behind Wetland W-1) for the NB ramp from MD 205 to US 301 and discovered the following:

1. Impacts to Pinefield residents and along Nike Road (impacts 10 properties with 6 residential displacements and 2 apartment buildings displaced).
2. Provides a severely skewed crossing (approximately 45°) at the Conrail tracks. This is very unsafe due to the long length that the roadway runs on top of the railroad tracks and for sight distance while crossing the tracks.
3. Would increase impacts to Wetland W-1A (approximately 1.5 acres of wooded wetland) as it widens out from existing US 301 to the crossing of the Conrail tracks.
4. Would create a tie-in point further to the north to US 301 nearing the Cedarville/McKendree Road intersection possibly providing an inadequate intersection as appropriate lane drops could not be accomplished within the available spacing.

MINIMIZATION:

1. Used minimum acceptable design criteria (for 50 MPH) to tie ramp into US 301 NB as soon as possible to reduce wetland encroachments.
2. Provide a structural (bridge) crossing of the wetland (approximately 350'), thereby reducing the total acreage impacted by 1.0 acres and maintaining site integrity. While the impacted acreage was measured as the total area under the bridge, in final design this could be reduced to the impacts from the piers.
3. Studies were completed for redesigning the design speed below 50 MPH for the northbound two-lane ramp. This will also affect Wetland Site 1A. A 50 MPH design speed is designated for this facility by AASHTO and MSHA Highway Development Manual as a safe and effecient speed. A design speed less than 50 MPH would pose operational and safety hazards. The options would have the following design speeds and wetland impacts: Option A1=50 MPH (minimum tangent length), 0.36 acres of wetland impact (reduced 0.12 acres); Option A2=45 MPH, 0.34 acres of wetland impact (reduced 0.14 acres); Option A3=40 MPH, 0.32 acres of wetland impact (reduced 0.16 acres); Option A4=30 MPH, 0.27 acres of impact (reduced 0.21 acres).
4. Investigated narrowing the median on US 301 to 10' shoulders and providing a concrete barrier (existing median is ±50') and 45 MPH design speed. This would reduce the wetland impacts by 0.35 acres but would require 2500' of US 301 to be shifted. The shifting of US 301 would create maintenance of traffic problems and increase the construction cost by approximately \$2 million.

Wetland Site 1A is located along the east side of US 301/MD 5 approximately 1150 feet north of the intersection of MD 205 and US 301/MD 5 and is adjacent to the north side of site W-1. The site consists of Mattawoman Creek and the marshy wooded area that surrounds the creek, and is approximately 5.4 acres in size. This site is classified as PF01R/R2SB2. The primary functions of the wetland is habitat for wildlife and aquatic wildlife, nutrient retention, food chain support, and groundwater recharge. The resultant impact is 0.09 acres.

AVOIDANCE:

- 1. Impacts to Mattawoman Creek are unavoidable as the creek bisects US 301 in a perpendicular fashion. Mattawoman Creek extends to the west to the Potomac River and to the east approximately 5 miles.

MINIMIZATION

- 1. Used minimum acceptable design criteria (for 50 MPH) to tie ramp into existing US 301 as soon as possible to reduce encroachment.
- 2. Provided a structural (bridge) crossing of the wetland (approximately 150') thereby reducing total acreage impacted by 0.3 acres and maintaining the integrity of the site. While the impact of acreage was measured as the total area under the bridge, in final design this could be reduced to the impacts from the piers.
- 3. Studies were completed for redesigning the design speed below 50 MPH for the northbound two-lane ramp. This will also affect Wetland Site 1. A 50 MPH design speed is designed for this facility by AASHTO and MSHA Highway Development Manual as a safe and efficient speed. A design speed less than 50 MPH would pose operational and safety hazards. The options would have the following design speeds and wetland impacts: Option A1=50 MPH (minimum tangent length), 0.09 acres of wetland impact (reduced 0.04 acres); Option A2=45 MPH, 0.06 acres of wetland impact (reduced 0.07 acres); Option A3=40 MPH, 0.04 acres of wetland impact (reduced 0.09 acres); Option A4=30 MPH, 0.03 acres of impact (reduced 0.10 acres).
- 4. Investigated narrowing the median on US 301 to 10' shoulders and providing a concrete barrier (existing median is ±250') and 45 mph design speed. This would reduce the wetland impacts by 0.35 acres but would require 2500' of US 301 to be shifted. The shifting of US 301 would create maintenance of traffic problems and increase the construction cost by approximately \$2 million.

Wetland Site 2A consists of Mattawoman Creek and the marshy wooded area that surrounds it. This site is the westward extension of site W-1A, and is a continuous wetland system with drainage to the west. This wetland is classified as PF01E/R2SB2. The primary functions of this wetland is habitat for wildlife and aquatic wildlife, nutrient retention, food chain support and groundwater recharge. The resultant impact is 0.33 acres.

AVOIDANCE:

- 1. Impacts to Mattawoman Creek are unavoidable as it bisects US 301 in a perpendicular fashion. Mattawoman Creek extends to the west to the Potomac River and to the east approximately 5 miles.

MINIMIZATION

- 1. In order to reduce the impacts to W-2A the geometric layout of the ramp was kept as close to existing US 301 as possible due to the expansion of the wetland to the west of existing US 301.
- 2. The ramp will be on structure (bridge) over Mattawoman Creek (approximately 300') thereby reducing wetland impacts by 0.6 acres. While the impacted acreage was measured as the total area under the bridge, in final design this could be reduced to the impacts from the piers. The ramp is over 30' above the wetland and will not affect the existing drainage. Due to the height, it is felt that the ramp will not isolate any wetlands.
- 3. Investigated reducing the design speed of the ramp from the 50 MPH desired to 40 MPH. This reduced the wetland impacts by 0.11 acres.

Wetland Site 4 is located on the south side of MD 205 and is in back of the Pinefield South Shopping Center and extends from the shopping center eastward in a parallel fashion to MD 205 approximately 2400 feet before turning north to intersect MD 205 for approximately 300 north of the intersection of MD 205 and Sub-Station Road. This wetland consists of a meandering, unnamed, intermittent stream which flows to the west, and a large ponded area just east of the Chaney Ball Fields and the surrounding marshy wooded area. This site is classified as PF01B. The primary functions of this wetland is habitat for wildlife and aquatic wildlife, nutrient retention, food chain support and groundwater recharge. The resultant impact is 0.14 acres.

AVOIDANCE:

- 1. An alignment shift to the east to avoid the wetland would cause the relocation of 7 residents from Mattawoman Estates.
- 2. An alignment shift to the west would not avoid the site as the site is continuous.

MINIMIZATION:

- 1. In an effort to minimize impacts the proposed improvement will maintain use of the existing northbound lanes of MD 205 thereby reducing acreage from additional widening to the south.
- 2. A closed typical section reduces the impacts versus an open section with safety grading by approximately 0.1 acres.
- 3. A 20' closed median is proposed. This is reduction from a 30' median that was also investigated. A total savings of 0.01 acres was achieved.

Wetland Site 5 is located along the north side and adjacent to MD 205, just south of the intersection of MD 205 and Schlagle Road. This site consists of a heavily wooded marsh-like area with numerous water seeps. W-5 is approximately 11.6 acres in size and is classified as PF01E. The primary functions of this wetland are habitat for wildlife and aquatic wildlife, nutrient retention, food chain support. The resultant impact is 1.16 acres.

AVOIDANCE:

1. An alignment shift to the west to avoid this site would increase impacts to site W-5A by 0.1 acres and produce 3 residential displacements.
2. An alignment shift to the east would not avoid site W-5 and would increase impacts to the site by approximately 0.3 acres.

MINIMIZATION:

1. In an effort to reduce wetland impacts and potential impacts to residents on the west side of existing MD 205, the roadway was designed to straddle between site W-5 and W-5A and avoid the residents on the west side of existing MD 205.
2. A closed typical section reduces the impacts versus an open section with safety grading by approximately 1.5 acres.
3. A 20' closed median is proposed. This is reduction from a 30' median that was also investigated. A total savings of 0.4 acres was achieved.

Wetland Site 5A is located on the west side of and perpendicular to MD 205. The site consists of a vegetated drainage channel which is approximately five feet wide and is approximately 0.8 acres in size. The site is classified as PEM1C and its primary functions are flood desynchronization, sediment trapping and nutrient retention (short term). The resultant impact is 0.02 acres.

AVOIDANCE:

1. An alignment shift to the east to avoid this site would result in increased impacts to site W-5 by approximately 1.8 acres.
2. An alignment shift to the west would not avoid this site and would cause the relocation of 3 residents.

MINIMIZATION:

1. In an effort to reduce wetland impacts and potential impacts to residents on the west side of existing MD 205, the roadway was designed to straddle between Site W-5 and W-5A and avoid the residents on the west side of existing MD 205.
2. A closed typical section reduces the impacts versus an open section with safety grading.
3. A 20' closed median is proposed. This is reduction from a 30' median that was also investigated. A total savings of 0.01 acres was achieved.

Wetland Site 6A is located on the west side of MD 205 approximately 1000 feet north of the intersection of MD 205 and Mill Road and lies directly opposite of site W-6. The site consists of a natural stream channel and a flat, contiguous wooded area that is approximately 130 feet wide. Similarly to Site W-6, it is classified as PF01B. The primary functions of this site are habitat for wildlife and aquatic wildlife, nutrient and groundwater recharge. The resultant impact is 0.21 acres.

AVOIDANCE:

1. An alignment shift to the east to avoid W-6A would produce increased impacts to site W-6 (approximately 0.4 ac.) and cause an additional 5 residential displacements.
2. An alignment shift further to the west would result in identical wetland impacts to the proposed alignment and potentially cause impacts to the Trinity Memorial Gardens Cemetery.

MINIMIZATION:

1. A closed typical section reduces the impacts versus an open section with safety grading by approximately 0.1 acres.
2. A 20' closed median is proposed. This is reduction from a 30' median that was also investigated. A total savings of 0.04 acres was achieved.

Wetland Site 8 is located on the east side of MD 205 and is the eastward extension of Site W-7. This wetland consists of a well defined meandering stream channel, an adjacent marshy scrub area on the north side of a surrounding area of woodland. The site is classified as PF01E/R2SB2 and its primary functions are habitat for wildlife and aquatic wildlife, nutrient retention, food chain support and groundwater recharge. The resultant impact is 1.03 acres.

AVOIDANCE:

1. This site is unavoidable as it is positioned parallel to the east side of MD 205 in this part of the study area. Furthermore a portion of the wetland transverses to the north to form a "T" and bisect MD 5.

MINIMIZATION:

1. In an attempt to minimize impacts the roadway alignment was shifted to the east to a point where the wetland limits were narrower without compromising design standards.
2. A dual structural crossing (approximately 270') of the tributaries to the Jordan Swamp is planned for the northbound and southbound lanes of this alternate thereby reducing impacts to the sites. While the impacted acreage was measured as the total acres under the bridge, in final design this could be reduced to the impacts from the piers.
3. A continuation of the structural crossing of the tributaries to the Jordan Swamp over the entire wetland site will reduce the wetland impacts by 0.74 acres. The lengthened bridge (approximately 450') increases the total cost by approximately \$3,800,000.

4. Additional alignments to the east were investigated to determine if the wetland site narrowed. It was found that the wetland site does not narrow in width as additional stream convergencies are located downstream.
5. Eleven modified alignments and design speeds were investigated to help reduce the wetland impact. All eleven modified alignments have a design speed less then 50 MPH. A 50 MPH design speed is designated for the facility of AASHTO and MSHA Highway Development Manual as a safe and efficient speed. The modified alternates would reduced the wetland impacts by a maximum of 0.5 acres but would have increased the potential accident rate and reduced the operational integrity of the roadway.

Wetland Mitigation

Pursuant to Executive Order 11990, efforts were made to avoid and minimize harm to wetland in the project corridor. As previously discussed, there are not practible alternatives to the proposed construction and take of wetland areas. A Section 404 Permit (COE), Non-tidal Wetland Permit (DNR) will be required to fill wetlands in the project area. A suitable wetland mitigation plan will be developed during the project's final design phase and will be coordinated with appropriate permitting and resource agencies. Conceptual wetland mitigation sites have been located. These potential mitigation sites have been reviewed by SHA Lanscape Architecture Division, field checked and are satisfactory for potential mitigation sites. Mitigation sites are not available within SHA right-of-way. A total of 3.29 acres of wetlands will be impacted. This includes 0.87 acres within the Mattawoman Creek watershed and 2.42 acres within the Jordan Swamp watershed. There are three possible mitigation sites within the Mattawoman Creek watershed:

	SITE 1	SITE 2	SITE 3	TOTAL
AVAILABLE AREA (AC)	9.5	6.0	4.7	20.2
(WITHIN 100 YEAR FLOODPLAIN)	(2.8)	(2.3)	(2.4)	(7.5)


Mitigation Site 4 is within the Jordan Swamp watershed. Site 4A has been classified a wetland by soil borings. This area is currently a cultivated field but does not include any wetland vegetation. Site 4A may be upgraded with wetland vegetation and/or Site 4B may be used.

	SITE 4A	SITE 4B	TOTAL
AVAILABLE AREA (AC)	3.4	2.1	5.5










Figures III-8 and III-9 depict the potential mitigation sites.

TABLE III-2
WETLAND IMPACTS

SITE	DESCRIPTION OF IMPROVEMENT	CLASSIFICATION	IMPACTED ACREAGE
1	INT. OPTION A	PF00W1B	0.36
1A	INT. OPTION A	PF01R/R2SB2	0.09
2A	INT. OPTION A	PF01E/R2SB2	0.33
4	SEG.III/ALT. 5/6	PF013/R2SB2	0.05
5	SEG.III/ALT. 5/6	PFO1E/R2SB2	1.16
5A	SEG.III/ALT. 5/6	PEM1C	0.02
6A	SEG.III/ALT. 5/6	PF01B	0.21
8	SEG.I/ALT. 6	PF01E/R2SB2	<u>1.03</u>
		TOTAL	3.25 ACRES



LEGEND










-  PROPOSED ROADWAY
-  EXISTING ROADWAY
-  EXISTING RIGHT-OF-WAY
-  PROPOSED RIGHT-OF-WAY
-  R-11 AIR/NOISE RECEPTOR SITES
-  DIS. 7 DISPLACEMENT
-  WETLANDS (W-1)
-  FLOOD PLAINS
-  PROPOSED U.S. 301 WIDENING


PROPOSED MD 5 RELOCATED
CONCEPTUAL
WETLAND MITIGATION

SCALE: 1"=400' FIGURE III-9A

62

LEGEND

-  PROPOSED ROADWAY
-  EXISTING ROADWAY
-  EXISTING RIGHT-OF-WAY
-  PROPOSED RIGHT-OF-WAY
-  R-11 AIR/NOISE RECEPTOR SITES
-  DIS. 7 DISPLACEMENT
-  WETLANDS (W-1)
-  FLOOD PLAINS
-  PROPOSED U.S. 301 WIDENING



PROPOSED MD 5 RELOCATED.
CONCEPTUAL WETLAND MITIGATION
 SCALE: 1" = 400' **FIGURE II.9B**

c. Cultural Resources

The Maryland Historic Trust (MHT) has indicated that there are no historic sites of National Register or National Register Eligible quality in the study area. Consequently, there are no impacts to historic sites. See P. V-150.

A Phase I archeological survey was conducted for this project. The results of the survey found that there were no significant archeological resources in the project area. See P. V-151 to V-154

d. Parks and Recreation

The selected build alternate will not impact any publicly owned public park or recreation area.

e. Air Quality

The objective of this analysis is to compare the carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations estimated to result from the traffic volumes and roadway configurations of each alternate with the State and National Ambient Air Quality Standards (S/NAAQS). The NAAGS and SAAQS are identical for CO; 35 parts per million (PPM) for the maximum 1-hour period (40 mg/m³) and 9 PPM for an average one hour period within the maximum consecutive 8-hour period (10 mg/m³).

A microscale CO dispersion analysis for 1-hour and 8-hour CO concentrations resulting from automobile emissions was conducted. All calculations were performed for 1995 (year of completion) and 2015 (design year). The emission factors were calculated using the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) third generation Mobile Source Emissions Model (MOBILE 3) computer program with credit for a vehicle inspection and maintenance program. Line source CO dispersion estimates were calculated using the third generation California Line Source Dispersion Model (CALINE 3).

The selected build alternate will not result in violations of the 1 Hr or 8 Hr S/NAAQS for 1995 or 2015. See Table III-3 for results.

64

TABLE III-3

BACKGROUND CARBON MONOXIDE (CO) PPM

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>1 HR.</u>	<u>8 HR.</u>
1995	9.9	3.0
2015	10.0	3.1

MAXIMUM 1 AND 8 HOUR PREDICTED CO CONCENTRATIONS (PPM)*

SEGMENT I: ALTERNATE 6

REC.	1995				2015			
	NO-BUILD		BUILD		NO-BUILD		BUILD	
	1 HR.	8 HR.	1 HR.	8 HR.	1 HR.	8 HR.	1 HR.	8 HR.
1	12.9	3.4	10.9	3.5	12.4	3.4	11.5	3.5
2	12.4	3.4	10.8	3.5	12.6	3.4	11.5	3.5

SEGMENT II: ALTERNATE 5/6 MODIFIED

REC.	1995				2015			
	NO-BUILD		BUILD		NO-BUILD		BUILD	
	1 HR.	8 HR.	1 HR.	8 HR.	1 HR.	8 HR.	1 HR.	8 HR.
3	14.8	3.5	10.9	3.6	12.5	3.4	11.7	3.6
4	18.7	3.9	11.7	4.0	14.5	3.7	13.0	4.1
5	13.8	4.1	11.4	4.0	13.7	3.6	12.5	3.9

* Includes Background Concentrations

The S/NAAQS for CO: 1-HR maximum 35 PPM
8-HR maximum 9 PPM

65

MAXIMUM 1 AND 8 HOUR PREDICTED CO. CONCENTRATIONS (PPM*)

SEGMENT III: ALTERNATE 5/6

REC.	1995				2015			
	NO - BUILD		BUILD		NO - BUILD		BUILD	
	1 HR.	8 HR.	1 HR.	8 HR.	1 HR.	8 HR.	1 HR.	8 HR.
6	13.4	3.7	11.0	4.0	14.5	3.6	12.8	3.9
7	11.7	3.4	10.5	3.5	12.3	3.3	11.5	3.5
8	13.7	3.9	11.1	4.2	14.9	3.7	13.1	4.0
9	16.9	4.0	12.7	4.1	15.6	3.7	13.6	4.2
10	18.6	4.2	13.0	4.4	17.0	3.9	14.7	4.5
11	19.9	4.5	13.1	4.7	18.6	4.1	15.0	4.7
12	19.6	4.5	13.0	4.6	18.7	4.1	14.9	4.7
13	16.7	4.1	12.1	4.2	16.5	3.8	13.5	4.2
14	15.1	3.8	11.7	3.9	15.1	3.6	12.6	3.8

* Includes Background Concentrations

The S/NAAQS for CO: 1-HR maximum 35 PPM
8-HR maximum 9 PPM

66

The construction phase of the proposed project has the potential of impacting the ambient air quality through fugitive dust from grading operations and materials handling. The State Highway Administration has addressed this possibility by establishing Standard Specifications for Construction for Materials, which specifies procedures to be followed by contractors involved in state work.

The Maryland Air Management Administration was consulted to determine the adequacy of the Specifications in terms of satisfying the requirement of the Regulations Governing the Control Air Pollution in the State of Maryland. The Administration found that the specifications are consistent with the requirements of these regulations. Therefore, during the construction period, all appropriate measures (Code of Maryland Regulations 26.11.06.03 D) will be taken to minimize construction impacts on the air quality of the area.

A conformity analysis was completed and adopted by the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments in September, 1991. The Federal Highway Administration made a determination of conformity between the TIP and the SIP for attaining air quality standards in November, 1991.

f. Noise Quality

This noise analysis was completed in accordance with the FHWA Noise Abatement Criteria and 23 CFR, Part 772. The factors that were considered in identifying noise impacts are:

- ◇ Identification of existing land use;
- ◇ Existing noise levels;
- ◇ Prediction of future design year noise levels; and
- ◇ Potential traffic increases.
- ◇ Alternative noise abatement measures.

The noise impacts of the project were based upon the relationship of the projected noise levels to the FHWA Noise Abatement Criteria (shown in the following table) and to the ambient noise levels. Noise impacts occur when the Federal Highway Administration noise abatement criteria are approached or exceeded or when the predicted traffic noise levels substantially exceed the ambient noise levels. Maryland State Highway Administration uses a 10 dBA increase to define a substantial increase. Noise abatement measures or mitigation will be considered when a noise impact is identified.

The factors that were considered when determining whether mitigation is reasonable and feasible are:

- ◇ Whether a feasible method is available to reduce the noise;
- ◇ Whether the noise mitigation is cost-effective for those receptors that are impacted - approximately \$40,000 per impacted residence;
- ◇ Whether the mitigation is acceptable to a majority of the affected property owners.

An effective barrier should, in general, extend in both directions to four times the distance between receiver and roadway (source). In addition, an effective barrier should provide a 7-10 dBA reduction in the noise level as a preliminary design goal. However, any impacted noise receptor which will receive a 5 dBA reduction is considered when determining the cost-effectiveness of a barrier.

68

TABLE III-4
NOISE ABATEMENT CRITERIA
SPECIFIED IN 23 CFR 772

<u>Activity Category</u>	<u>Leq (h)</u>	<u>Description of Activity Category</u>
A	57 (Exterior)	Lands on which serenity and quiet are of extraordinary significance and serve an important public need and where the preservation of those qualities is essential if the area is to continue to serve its intended purpose.
B	67 (Exterior)	Picnic areas, recreation areas, playgrounds, active sport areas, parks, residences, motels, hotels, schools, churches, libraries, and hospitals.
C	72 (Exterior)	Developed lands, properties, or activities not included in Categories A or B above.
D	-	Undeveloped lands.
E	52 (Interior)	Residences, motels, hotels, public meeting rooms, schools, churches, libraries, hospitals, and auditorium.

Cost-effectiveness is determined by dividing the total number of impacted sensitive sites in a specified noise sensitive area, that will receive at least a 5 dBA reduction of noise levels, into the total cost of noise mitigation. For the purpose of comparison, a total of \$16 per square foot is assumed for estimated total barrier cost. This cost figure is based upon current costs experienced by the Maryland State Highway Administration and includes the cost of panels, footing, drainage, landscaping, and overhead. The State Highway Administration has established approximately \$40,000 per residence protected as being the maximum cost for a barrier to be considered reasonable.

Consideration is based on the size of the impacted area (number of structures, spatial distribution of structures, etc.) and the predominant activities carried on within the area.

The following is a site by site discussion of NSA's that will experience noise level impacts as projected from the 2015 (design year) Build Alternate. Table III-5 provides a summary of barrier attenuation, estimated costs, heights and lengths of the barriers analyzed, as well as the cost per resident protected.

NSA 4 (within Segment II) has a projected noise level which equals the noise abatement criteria of 67 dBA. Therefore, abatement measures were considered. This NSA will have frontage access onto the proposed alternate and is impacted by an alignment shift towards the NSA. This residence will be located 50 feet from the slope limits associated with Alternate 5/6 Modified thereby making the placement of an earth berm for noise attenuation unfeasible. A barrier at this location as would an earth berm would have to be segmented to maintain the property's access to the proposed roadway. The barrier examined had a total length of 360 feet and was 16 feet tall resulting in a cost of \$92,000. This barrier would reduce projected noise levels 4 dBA at the first floor and provide protection for only one home. This barrier is not considered reasonable due to the excessive cost per residence.

NSA 5 (within Segment II) has a projected noise level of 69 dBA which is 2 dBA above the noise abatement criteria of 67 dBA, therefore noise abatement measures were considered. This NSA will have frontage access onto the proposed alternates. The possibility of an earth berm was examined and was deemed unfeasible due to space restrictions for the required grading for an earth berm. A noise barrier and an earth berm would have to be segmented to maintain the property's access to the proposed roadway. The barrier considered was segmented and had a total length of 380 feet and was 16 feet tall resulting in a cost of \$97,000. This barrier would reduce the projected noise levels by 4 dBA at the first floor and provide protection for only one residence. This barrier is not considered reasonable due to the excessive cost per residence.

NSA 6 (within Segment III) has a projected noise level which equals the noise abatement criteria of 67 dBA, therefore noise mitigation was examined. This NSA will have frontage access onto the proposed alternate, but is not impacted by an alignment shift towards the NSA. The proposed alignment will actually be widened to the east side of existing MD 205 away from the NSA. The possibility of an earth berm for

noise abatement was considered and deemed unfeasible due to space restrictions for the required grading of the berm. A noise barrier and an earth berm would have to be segmented to maintain the property's access to the proposed roadway. The barrier examined was segmented and had a total length of 340 feet and was 14 feet tall resulting in a cost of \$76,000. This barrier would reduce the project noise levels by 8 dBA at the first flood and provide protection for only one residence. This barrier is not considered reasonable due to the excessive cost per residence.

NSA 8 (within Segment III) has a projected 2015 Leg. noise levels of 68 dBA which would exceed the noise abatement criteria 67 dBA; therefore, noise mitigation was considered. This NSA will have frontage access onto the proposed alternate. The proposed roadway by this NSA will be shifted to the opposite side (east side) of the NSA thereby helping to minimize noise impacts. An earth berm for noise mitigation at this NSA was considered and deemed unfeasible due to space restrictions for the required grading for an earth berm. A noise barrier and an earth berm at this NSA would have to be segmented to maintain the property's access to the proposed roadway. A continuous barrier could potentially affect 3 points of access; 2 private residential, 1 public residential (Council Oak Drive). The barrier examined at this NSA was segmented and had a total length of 385 feet and was 14 feet tall resulting in a total cost of \$85,000. This barrier would reduce the projected noise levels by 7 dBA at the first floor and provide protection for two residences for a cost per resident of \$43,000. This barrier will receive further consideration during final design.

This NSA 9 (within Segment III) has a projected 2015 Leq. noise level of 70 dBA which exceeds the noise abatement criteria of 67 dBA; therefore noise mitigation was considered. This NSA which is known as the Mattawoman Estates subdivision would have access to the proposed roadway via Indian Lane. The proposed roadway by this NSA would be shifted to the opposite side of the NSA (west side of MD 205) thereby helping to minimize noise impacts. An earth berm at this NSA was considered and deemed unfeasible due to space restrictions required for the grading of the berm. A noise barrier and an earth berm at this NSA would have to be segmented at Indian Lane to maintain the subdivisions access onto the proposed roadway. The barrier considered at this NSA was segmented and had a total length of 760 feet and was 12 feet tall resulting in a total amount of \$146,000. One residence has a projected 2015 noise level that will exceed 67 dBA, and six residences have 2015 projected noise levels which approach 67 dBA for a total of one impacted residence. The one impacted residence plus five of the six residences which approach 67 dBA will receive a reduction of 5 dBA or more in projected noise levels. This barrier is considered to be physically effective as it would produce the minimum 5 dBA reduction in projected noise levels, with a cost per residence of \$24,000. This barrier will receive further considerations during final design.

NSA 10 (within Segment III) has a projected 2015 Leq. noise level of 70 dBA which exceeds the noise abatement criteria of 67 dBA; therefore noise abatement measures were considered. This NSA is a group of MD 205 frontage homes adjacent to the Pinefield sub-division south of Pinefield Road. The proposed roadway by this NSA would be shifted to the opposite side (west side of MD 205) thereby helping to minimize noise impacts. An earth berm at this NSA was considered and deemed unfeasible due to space restrictions required for the grading of the berm. A noise barrier as would an earth berm would have to be segmented several times at the residences driveways in order to maintain the properties access onto the proposed roadway. The barrier examined at this NSA was segmented and had a total length of 480 feet and was 14 feet tall resulting in a total cost of \$108,000. Six residences have projected 2015 noise levels that will exceed 67 dBA. Of the six impacted residences all six will receive the minimum 5 dBA reduction in projected noise levels from the above described barrier. Therefore; a barrier at this NSA is considered to be physically effective. This barrier will receive further consideration during final design.

NSA 11 (within Segment III) has a projected 2015 Leq. noise level of 68 dBA which exceeds the noise abatement criteria of 67 dBA; therefore noise mitigation was considered. This NSA will have frontage access onto the proposed road and is adjacent to the Pinefield subdivision. Also, the proposed roadway by this NSA is shifted to the opposite side (west of MD 205) thereby helping to reduce the noise impacts. An earth berm at this NSA was considered and deemed unfeasible due to space restrictions for grading and the proximity of the NSA residences to the proposed roadway. A noise barrier as would an earth berm at this location would have to be segmented several times at the residences driveways in order to maintain the properties access onto the proposed roadway. The barrier considered at this NSA was segmented and had a total length of 635 feet and was 14 feet tall resulting in a total cost of \$142,000. Six residences have projected 2015 noise levels that will exceed 67 dBA. Of the six impacted residences all six will receive the minimum 5 dBA reduction in projected noise levels from the above described barrier. Therefore; a barrier at this NSA is considered to be physically effective. This barrier would result in a cost of \$24,000 per residence. This barrier will receive further consideration during final design.

NSA 12 (within Segment III) has a projected 2015 Leq. noise level of 70 dBA which exceeds the noise abatement criteria of 67 dBA; therefore noise mitigation was considered. This NSA is the Happy Faces Learning Center, a preschool. This NSA also will have frontage access onto the proposed roadway; and will experience a noise level impact from the proposed roadway being shifted towards it (west side of MD 205). An earth berm was considered at this site and deemed unfeasible due to space restrictions for grading and the proximity of the NSA to the proposed road. A noise barrier as would an earth berm at this location would have to be segmented at this NSA's entrance to maintain the property's access onto the proposed roadway. The barrier examined at this NSA was segmented and had a total length of 230 feet and was 16 feet tall resulting in a cost of \$59,000. This barrier would enable the preschool to receive the minimum 5 dBA reduction in projected noise levels. Therefore this barrier is considered to be physically effective. In addition, this barrier is considered to be feasible as it would provide the necessary attenuation for the preschool which is the equivalent of 10 residences. This would result in a cost per residence of \$6,000. This barrier will receive further consideration during final design.

As with any major construction project, areas around the construction site are likely to experience varied periods and degrees of noise impacts. This type of project would probably employ the following pieces of equipment that would likely be sources of construction noise:

- ◇ Bulldozers
- ◇ Graders
- ◇ Front End Loaders
- ◇ Dump and Other Diesel Trucks
- ◇ Compressors

Construction activities are anticipated to occur during normal working hours on weekdays. Therefore, noise intrusion related to construction should not occur during critical sleep or outdoor recreation periods.

Measures which will be considered to help minimize increased noise levels during construction include the following:

- ◇ Equip internal combustion engines used for any purpose on or related to the job with properly operating mufflers;
- ◇ Conduct truck loadings, unloading, and hauling so that noise is kept to a minimum;
- ◇ Route construction equipment and vehicles in areas that will cause the least disturbance to nearby receptors where possible; and
- ◇ When feasible, place continuously operated diesel-powered equipment, such as compressors or generators, in areas far from or shielded from noise sensitive areas.

Noise mitigation measures other than noise barriers and earth berms were considered for this project. These measures included the possibility for traffic management (ie. truck restrictions), the alteration of the horizontal and vertical geometry of the proposed road and the acquisition of property or buffer zones.

Placing truck restrictions on the proposed roadway would be detrimental to the mining operations of Charles County Sand and Gravel. This company has mining and shipping activities on both the east and west sides of MD 205 in the vicinity of Mill Road. MD 205 is this company's only outlet to other major transportation arteries. Also forcing truck traffic through the heart of Waldorf via MD 5/US 301 would exacerbate traffic congestion on those roads. Therefore, placing truck restrictions on the proposed roadway is considered unfeasible.

Alterations to the horizontal and vertical geometry of the proposed roadway were also considered. As mentioned in the site by site discussions of the impacted NSA's the horizontal geometry was shifted away from the noise sensitive areas to help minimize possible impacts. Alterations to the vertical geometry was considered and deemed unfeasible due to the potential extreme costs involved with potential residential relocations. In addition, public opposition to such an action is expected to be high.

TABLE III - 5
NOISE ANALYSIS

2015

Segment	NSA Description	Measured Ambient Leq	Predicted Ambient Leq	No Build	Build	Leq w/ Barrier	Barrier Length Height (ft)	Barrier Cost(\$x1,000)	Residences Protected	Cost Per Residence (\$x1,000)
I	1 Residence	61	--	--	62	--	--	--	--	--
I	2 Residence	59	--	--	62	--	--	--	--	--
II	3 Residence	60	--	--	63	--	--	--	--	--
II	4 Residence	63	--	--	67	63	360/16	92	1	92
II	5 Residence	68	--	--	69	65	380/16	97	1	97
III	6 Residence	67	66	63	67	59	340/14	76	1	76
III	7 Church	60	62	60	60	--	--	--	--	--
III	8 Residence	72	73	71	68	61	385/14	86	2	43
III	9 Residence	70	68	67	70	62	760/12	146	6	24
III	10 Residence	68	69	68	70	65	480/14	108	6	18
III	11 Residence	69	68	66	68	63	635/14	142	6	24
III	12 Residence	67	65	65	70	65	230/16	59	1(=10 Res.)	6
III	13 Residence	63	61	61	64	--	--	--	--	--

74

C. TEAM RECOMMENDATIONS

The Selected Build Alternate was recommended by the Project Planning Team. An access control management strategy will be developed in conjunction with Charles County for all undeveloped properties along MD 205.

The Selected Build Alternate is supported by Charles County.

The Selected Build Alternate is supported by the Maryland Statewide Commuter Assistance Study.

IV. PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

IV. PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

A Combined Location/Design Public Hearing for Proposed MD 5 Relocated was held on Monday, February 26, 1990 at Thomas Stone High School in Charles County, Maryland. The purpose of the hearing was to present the results of the engineering and environmental studies, and to receive public comments on the project.

A total of 18 people testified at the Public Hearing. A summary of responses is as follows:

- 8 people testified that they did not want to see the graves disturbed at Trinity Memorial Gardens Cemetery.
- 6 people testified that it makes no sense narrowing the roadway from 6 lanes to 4 lanes prior to the intersection with US 301/MD 5.
- 6 people testified that they were concerned with the safety of placing a 6 lane roadway through a residential area. They were concerned with driveway conflicts, U-turns, and pedestrian/bicyclists. Suggested alternateve alignments, possibly behind the Pinefield Community.
- 5 people testified that they felt additional coordination with mass transit/car pools should be considered.
- 4 people testified that they felt that the interchange at US 301/MD 5 should be built priot to the mainline improvements.
- 4 people testified that they were concerned with the noise impacts associated with the proposed improvements.

1. Commissioner Nancy Sefton, Charles County Commissioners

Comment/Question:

The improvement will provide badly needed additional capacity. The Charles County Commissioners prefer the build alternate and would like to suggest an access management program. The access management program would be used to consolidate access points onto MD 205 for proposed development.

SHA Response:

The Selected Build Alternate provides two additional lanes for capacity. An access management program will also be employed for proposed development.

2. Russell A. Burch, Jr.

Comment/Question:

Mr. Burch did not know if it is beneficial for the people of Waldorf to take the traffic out of Waldorf. He felt they might have a better economic impact if they were using U.S. 301. Requested the State to look at an alternate route other than MD 205.

SHA Response:

U.S. 301 is anticipated to be operating beyond capacity of the roadway. Diverting traffic from MD 205 to U.S. 301 would increase the congestion and delays. The heavy congestion and delays would negatively effect economic development along U.S. 301. Alternate routes to upgrading existing MD 205 were investigated and not selected. These were not selected due to increased wetland impacts, right-of-way impacts and costs.

3. Henry Rieffel, Jr. 2005 Mattawoman-Beantown Road, Waldorf, MD 20601

Comment/Question:

Owners of property adjacent to MD 205 will lose \$20,000-\$30,000 in real estate value unless service roads are put in to service them. State should buy these affected houses. There should have been noise tests done at the Jaycees Building. Vibration from trucks on improved roads will damage residential structures.

SHA Response:

The Selected Build Alternate does not provide service roads for existing properties. It is anticipated that traffic operations and safety will be adequate through the design year 2015 without service roads. The Jaycees Building will be displaced when the roadway is widened to four-lanes with shoulder and therefore will not require possible noise attenuation. Noise analyses have been completed for this project and are documented in this report. Several areas appear reasonable and will be evaluated in final design.

4. Craig Scott

Comment/Question:

Asked when doing accident projections, were roads being used as informal bypasses studied for accident rates, or just roads in general? Requested SHA to consider an alignment along MD 382 and east of current development. Supports No-Build Option.

SHA Response:

Accident rates are developed for similar type roads. An alignment near MD 382 and east of the current development was investigated and not selected. This was not selected due to increased wetland impacts, right-of-way impacts, and cost.

5. Ms. Virginia Richardson

Comment/Question:

Ms. Richardson does not want Trinity Memorial Gardens disturbed. She owns lots there and was never notified. Stated she found out about this hearing by word of mouth.

SHA Response:

The Selected Build Alternate will not disturb any graves at Trinity Memorial Gardens Cemetery. The public hearing was advertised in the Washington Post, MD Independent, Times-Crescent, the Enterprise (St. Mary's), and the Maryland Register. Brochures were mailed to all people on the mailing list including all residents along MD 205.

6. Mr. Stephen Frye

Comment/Question:

Mr. Frye did not know about the hearing either. Objects to disturbing cemeteries.

SHA Response:

See SHA Response #5.

7. Ms. Sylvelva Landman

Comment/Question:

Ms. Landman objects to disturbing cemeteries. Objects to poor publicity of hearing.

SHA Response:

See SHA Response #5.

8. Mr. Richard Centner

Comment/Question:

Mr. Centner felt the merge from 6 lanes to 4 lanes at Pinefield Shopping Center will create a bottleneck. Objects to poor publicity of hearing. Supports No-Build alternate.

SHA Response:

The Selected Build Alternate includes a four-lane roadway throughout the project. Therefore no reduction of lanes at Pinefield Shopping Center is necessary. The Public Hearing was advertised in the Washington Post, MD Independent, Times Crescent, the Enterprise (St. Mary's), and the Maryland Register. Brochures were mailed to all people on the mailing list including all residents along MD 205.

80

9. Ms. Linda Smith 900 Truro Lane, Waldorf, MD 20601

Comment/Question:

Children walk and bike between Pinefield and the commercial area. She is concerned for their safety.

SHA Response:

The Selected Build Alternate includes a 12' outside shoulder and 20' curbed median that could provide safety for pedestrians and bicyclists.

10. Stanley Jamison Sub-Station Road, Waldorf, MD 20601

Comment/Question:

Mr. Jamison questioned, Why six lanes? Opposes disturbing the cemetery. To avoid displacements, relocate Schlagle to meet Sub-Station Road instead of relocating Sub-Station Road.

SHA Response:

The Selected Build Alternate includes a four-lane roadway. No graves will be disturbed at Trinity Memorial Gardens Cemetery. The no-build alternate was selected at Sub-Station Road avoiding any displacements.

11. Don Pheulpin Pinefield

Comment/Question:

Mr. Pheulpin was concerned with the noise factor. Has SHA considered 40 year plans as opposed to 20 year plans? Asked how does the proposed DC Bypass affect this?

SHA Response:

Noise attenuation was evaluated within this project and several areas were found to be reasonable. These areas will be evaluated again in final design. The Washington Bypass Study is not to the point where a selected alternate, if any, has been chosen. The Washington Bypass Study has included the selected alternate of the project in its' evaluation.

12. Naz Ortenzi St. Charles

Comment/Question:

Mr. Ortenzi felt that intermodal transportation in Waldorf is a joke due to no rail and poor bus service. Objects to disturbing cemeteries.

SHA Response:

The SHA supports intermodel transportation. The Selected Build Alternate will not affect any graves at Trinity Memorial Gardens Cemetery.

- 13. Harvey Berlin Tri-County Council of Southern Maryland

Comment/Question:

Liked Park and Ride slated to be at southern end of project. Commuter bus and vanpool service will be improved soon.

SHA Response:

A park-n-ride location is being evaluated and will be considered further in final design.

- 14. Kim Law Mattawoman-Beantown Road, Waldorf, MD 20601

Comment/Question:

Ms. Law questioned, Why 6 lanes? Would support adding a center turn lane to the existing roadway.

SHA Response:

The Selected Build Alternate includes a four-lane roadway. A five-lane roadway, which included a center turn lane was evaluated and not selected because it did not provide for adequate future traffic needs and the accident rate was anticipated to increase.

- 15. Mike Fallon 907 Truro Lane, Waldorf, MD 20601

Comment/Question:

Mr. Fallon felt a six lane highway in a residential area doesn't make sense. He was concerned for the safety of children in the area. He was concerned with access to residential communities. Believed 6 lanes feeding into four is a problem.

SHA Response:

See SHA Response #3, 8 and 9.

- 16. Bob Wells 1405 College Circle

Comment/Question:

Mr. Wells felt noise is getting worse and project will make it more so. MD 301/205 intersection should be the first part of the project. Objects to the 6 lane to 4 lane narrowing as it is a bottleneck.

SHA Response:

Noise attenuation was evaluated within this project and several areas were found to be reasonable. These areas will be evaluated again in final design. The Selected Build Alternate includes a four-lane roadway, therefore no reduction of lanes is necessary.

82

17. Chuck Delancey 5120 Alford Drive

Comment/Question:

Mr. Delancey was concerned with the noise, child safety. He was also concerned with 6-lane to 4-lane bottleneck and traffic from side streets making lefts across three lanes of traffic.

SHA Response:

See SHA Response #9 and 16.

18. Mark Watson

Comment/Question:

Representing mother who lives at 245 Nike Drive. He supports the No-Build. Asked if we are representing the residents of the area or our neighbors to the South?

SHA Response:

The No-Build Alternate was not selected because it does not address the required traffic operations or safety of the roadway.

A complete transcript of the hearing is available for review in the Project Development Division Offices, State Highway Administration, 707 N. Calvert Street, Baltimore Maryland 21202. Written comments received subsequent to the public hearing are discussed in the correspondence section of this document.

V. CORRESPONDENCE

V. CORRESPONDENCE

The following presents the written comments received during or subsequent to the Combined Location/Design Public Hearing (held February 26, 1990). Originals of these correspondence are available for review in the Project Development Division Offices, State Highway Administration, 707 North Calvert Street, Baltimore Maryland 21202. Oral comments received during the Hearing are presented in Section IV of this document.

- A. Written Comments Received Subsequent to the Combined Location/Design Public Hearing
- B. Elected Officials
- C. Agency Coordination

V. CORRESPONDENCE

A. WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED

SUBSEQUENT TO THE COMBINED

LOCATION / DESIGN PUBLIC HEARING AND RESPONSES

V. CORRESPONDENCE

A. Written Comments received Subsequent to the Combined Location/Design Public Hearing and Responses

A total of 127 written responses were received from the Public Hearing. This included two petitions of 7 people and 69 people. A summary of responses is as follows:

- 88 people (69%) responded that they did not want to see the graves disturbed at Trinity Memorial Gardens Cemetery.
- 26 people responded that they were concerned with the noise impacts associated with the proposed improvements.
- 26 people responded that they were concerned with the safety of making turns.
- 25 people responded that they were concerned with a 6-lane roadway through a residential area. They felt that a no-build option should be recommended or an alternative alignment, possibly behind the Pinefield Community.
- 9 people responded that the interchange at US 301/Md 5 should be built prior to the mainline improvements.
- 5 people responded that it made no sense narrowing the roadway from 6-lanes to 4-lanes prior to the intersection with US 301/MD 5.
- 5 people responded that they were in favor of Segment I, Alternate 6 to adequately handle future transportation needs
- 3 people responded that they were concerned with the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists with a 6-lane roadway.

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT DIVISION



Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

Richard H. Trainor
Secretary
Hal Kassoff
Administrator

STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS

2 03 PM '90

Contract No. CH 586-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman/Beantown Road
Existing MD 5 to US 301
Location/Design Public Hearing
Monday, February 26, 1990 @ 7:30 p.m.

April 11, 1990

Re: Contract No. CH566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman-Beantown Road
PDMS No.082039

Ms. Nora L. Willett
Route 1 Box 14 W
Bryans Road, Maryland 20616

Dear Ms. Willett:

Thank you for your recent letter opposing impacts to the Trinity Memorial Gardens Cemetery as the result of improvement studies for MD 205.

It is unfortunate that there is a misunderstanding about our intentions regarding the cemetery. We are charged with developing alternate solutions to transportation problems and documenting the impacts that would result. One of the build alternates presented at the February 26th public hearing, Segment II - Alternate 5/6, does impact cemetery graves. The other alternate presented that night, Segment II - Alternate 5/6 Modified, does not impact any graves. We have not reached any decisions regarding the desirability of either alternate.

Your opposition to disturbing any graves has been noted and will be considered in the development of our team recommendation. Thank you again for identifying your position.

Your name(s) has been added to or verified to be on the project mailing list, so that you will be kept informed of any decisions reached on the MD 205 study.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Deputy Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

by: Victor Janata
Victor F. Janata
Project Manager
Project Planning Division

LHE:VFJ:kw
cc: Mr. Edward H. Meehan

My telephone number is (301) 333-1105

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
383-7555 Baltimore Metro - 585-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5002 Statewide Toll Free

NAME NORA L. Willett DATE 3-9-90
PLEASE PRINT ADDRESS Rt. 1 Box 14 W
CITY/TOWN BRYANS ROAD STATE MD. ZIP CODE 20616

I/We wish to comment or inquire about the following aspects of this project:

We bought burial plots in good faith at Trinity Mem. Gardens, & now have 4 members buried there, which is located near the road. I hope and pray that their graves will not have to be moved because of a road.

I am very unhappy about this proposal.
Sincerely,
Nora L. Willett

Mr. Victor Janata Room 506
707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, MO. 21203

Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List.*
 Please delete my/our name(s) from the Mailing List.

*Persons who have received a copy of this brochure through the mail are already on the project Mailing List.

1. The Selected Build Alternate does not displace any graves at Trinity Memorial Cemetery.

87



Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

Richard H. Trainor
Secretary
Hal Kessoff
Administrator

STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS

Contract No. CH 568-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman/Beantown Road
Existing MD 5 to US 301
Location/Design Public Hearing
Monday, February 26, 1990 @ 7:30 p.m.

April 11, 1990

Re: Contract No. CH566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman-Beantown Road
PDMS No.082039

NAME Mr. and Mrs. Joseph C. Hill III DATE 3-12-90

PLEASE PRINT ADDRESS Rt. 1 Box 155W

CITY/TOWN Indian Head STATE MD ZIP CODE 20640

I/We wish to comment or inquire about the following aspects of this project:

We have a family member buried there and to have
other family member to be buried there as well.
We do not wish to have any of our family members
remains disturbed.

Mr. & Mrs. Joseph C. Hill, III
Route 1 Box 155 W
Indian Head, Maryland 20640

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Hill:

Thank you for your recent letter opposing impacts to the Trinity Memorial Gardens Cemetery as the result of improvement studies for MD 205.

It is unfortunate that there is a misunderstanding about our intentions regarding the cemetery. We are charged with developing alternate solutions to transportation problems and documenting the impacts that would result. One of the build alternates presented at the February 26th public hearing, Segment II - Alternate 5/6, does impact cemetery graves. The other alternate presented that night, Segment II - Alternate 5/6 Modified, does not impact any graves. We have not reached any decisions regarding the desirability of either alternate.

Your opposition to disturbing any graves has been noted and will be considered in the development of our team recommendation. Thank you again for identifying your position.

Your name(s) has been added to or verified to be on the project mailing list, so that you will be kept informed of any decisions reached on the MD 205 study.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Deputy Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

by:

Victor F. Janata
Victor F. Janata
Project Manager
Project Planning Division

LHE:VFJ:kw
cc: Mr. Edward H. Meehan

My telephone number is (301) 733-1105

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
363-7555 Baltimore Metro - 585-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5082 Statewide Toll Free
707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

Mr. Victor Janata Room 506
707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, MO. 21203

Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List.*

Please delete my/our name(s) from the Mailing List.

*Persons who have received a copy of this brochure through the mail are already on the project Mailing List.

1. See response p. V-3.

SP

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT CENTER



Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration

Richard H. Trainor Secretary Hal Kassoff Administrator

STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS

Contract No. CH 588-151-571 Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205) Mattawoman/Beantown Road Existing MD 5 to US 301 Location/Design Public Hearing Monday, February 28, 1990 @ 7:30 p.m.

April 11, 1990

Re: Contract No. CH566-151-571 Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205) Mattawoman-Beantown Road PDMS No.082039

Mr. Henry D. Vance Route 2 Box 608-F White Plains, Maryland 20695

Dear Mr. Vance:

Thank you for your recent letter opposing impacts to the Trinity Memorial Gardens Cemetery as the result of improvement studies for MD 205.

It is unfortunate that there is a misunderstanding about our intentions regarding the cemetery. We are charged with developing alternate solutions to transportation problems and documenting the impacts that would result. One of the build alternates presented at the February 26th public hearing, Segment II - Alternate 5/6, does impact cemetery graves. The other alternate presented that night, Segment II - Alternate 5/6 Modified, does not impact any graves. We have not reached any decisions regarding the desirability of either alternate.

Your opposition to disturbing any graves has been noted and will be considered in the development of our team recommendation. Thank you again for identifying your position.

Your name(s) has been added to or verified to be on the project mailing list, so that you will be kept informed of any decisions reached on the MD 205 study.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr. Deputy Director Office of Planning and Preliminary Engineering

by: Victor Janata Victor F. Janata Project Manager Project Planning Division

LHE:VFJ:kw cc: Mr. Edward H. Meehan

My telephone number is (301) 333-1105

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech 383-7555 Baltimore Metro - 585-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-482-5082 Statewide Toll Free 707 North Calvert St. Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

NAME HARRY D. VANCE DATE March 12, 90 ADDRESS Rt 2 Box 608-F CITY/TOWN White Plains STATE Maryland ZIP CODE 20695

I/We wish to comment or inquire about the following aspects of this project:

I/we wish to cast 16 NO votes concerning moving the grave sites at Trinity Memorial Gardens.

We are very displeased about this there is plenty of land near by without moving a cemetery.

These grave sites were bought some 30 years ago, & they are all in the family, these may be more.

Steve Johnson 2 Harry Vance 4 Jack Johnson 5 My mother, father, & daughter & mother John Fowler 3 in the already

Mr. Victor Janata Room 506 707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, MD, 21203 occupy graves We don't want them

Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List.*

Please delete my/our name(s) from the Mailing List.

*Persons who have received a copy of this brochure through the mail are already on the project mailing list.

1. See citizen response p. V-3

89

**STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS**

Contract No. CH 566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman/Beantown Road
Existing MD 5 to US 301
Location/Design Public Hearing
Monday, February 26, 1990 @ 7:30 p.m.



Maryland Department of Transportation
The Secretary's Office

PROJECT
DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION

Mar 29 3 24 PM '90

William Donald Schaefer
Governor
Richard H. Trainor
Secretary
Stephen G. Zentz
Deputy Secretary

March 26, 1990

Mr. and Mrs. Wolfgang Gaida
108 Indian Lane
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Gaida:

Thank you for your March 7th letter which raises a number of issues about the ongoing planning study for improvements to MD 205 (Mattawoman-Beantown Road) in Waldorf. I am responding on behalf of Messrs. Kassoff, Pedersen, Meehan and Janata.

No final decisions have yet been made concerning improvements to MD 205. The purpose of the study is to develop alternative solutions to address the transportation problem, and document the comparative impacts that result. Your input is welcomed as valuable factors in the project planning process.

As described at the February 26th public hearing, commuter traffic will continue to grow on MD 205. A six-lane divided highway improvement represents an ultimate solution that is needed by the year 2015. Interim improvements with fewer lanes may be feasible. The improvements proposed would accommodate the increasing commuter traffic, as well as turning movements into and out of the residentially zoned land adjacent to the road. In effect, the third lane in each direction would serve as a turning lane.

The existing US 301/MD 205 intersection is identified as a high-accident location. As stated at the recent public hearing the ultimate solution to the intersection is an interchange that would replace the existing intersection. Four interchange options were presented at the hearing.

Existing MD 205 has a higher accident rate than the statewide average for similar type roads. The proposed improvement would significantly reduce that rate. The proposed median would act as a safety zone for any pedestrians or vehicles crossing or turning left on the highway, and gaps in the highway traffic would be more likely to occur with more lanes.

NAME Wolfgang & Deborah Gaida DATE March 7, 1990

PLEASE PRINT ADDRESS 108 Indian Lane

CITY/TOWN Waldorf STATE MD ZIP CODE 20601

I/We wish to comment or inquire about the following aspects of this project:

See Attached pages for comments.

Please do not detach -

1. See P. V-9 for comments.

Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List.*

Please delete my/our name(s) from the Mailing List.

*Persons who have received a copy of this brochure through the mail are already on the project Mailing List.

My telephone number is (301) 859-7397

TTY For the Deaf: (301) 684-6919

Post Office Box 3765, Baltimore/Washington International Airport, Maryland 21240-0755

V-9

90

Mr. and Mrs. Wolfgang Gaida
Page Two

Safety was the reason no median opening at Indian Lane was recommended. An alternative to U-turns that we are still considering is connecting Indian Lane to Schlagle Road. Determining whether a traffic signal is warranted at Indian Lane will be done when the project nears the construction phase. The ultimate highway improvements are envisioned as a boulevard with a number of traffic signals at existing and future public street intersections.

A number of steps have been taken to reduce residential impacts, such as alignment shifts and reducing the median width.

Thank you for sharing your concerns. For additional information, please feel free to contact Mr. Neil Pedersen, Director of the Office of Planning and Preliminary Engineering for the State Highway Administration. Mr. Pedersen's telephone number is (301) 333-1110.

Sincerely,



Richard H. Trainor
Secretary

RHT:as

cc: Mr. Hal Kassoff
Mr. Neil J. Pedersen
Mr. Edward H. Meehan
Mr. Vic Janata

1. This project has been developed in coordination with Charles County.
2. Access to Indian Lane will be provided by a right in/right out to northbound MD 205. Southbound vehicles will require a 'U' turn. It is not anticipated that the 'U' turn will create extensive delays or a safety hazard.

1. The Selected Build Alternate provides a four-lane divided roadway with a 20' curbed median and 12' outside shoulder. This will not create a bottleneck at the Pinefield Shopping Centers.
2. The Selected Build Alternate includes Interchange Option A. This will improve traffic operation and safety at the intersection of U.S. 301/MD 5.
3. The Selected Build Alternate includes a 12' outside shoulder and 20' curbed median to provide a refuge to non-motorists.

91

V-7

bcc: Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Mr. John D. Bruck
Mr. John M. Contestabile

V-8

27

RECEIVED

MAR 9 1990

SECRETARY OF
TRANSPORTATION

PROJECT
DEV 008 Indian Lane
Waldorf, Maryland 20601
March 7, 1990
MAR 13 3 43 PM '90

Honorable Richard H. Trainor
Secretary
Department of Transportation
Post Office Box 8755
BWI Airport
Baltimore, Maryland 21240

Dear Secretary Trainor:

We are requesting your assistance in the matter of the expansion of Mattavoman-Beantown Road, Maryland Route 205. Contract Number: CH 566-151-571,

After attending a meeting held February 26, 1990, at Thomas Stone High School by the State Highway Commission, we were left with the impression that this highway was being built regardless of what the community thought about it or what impact such a major highway would have on the people living in the area. It leaves us to wonder what this task force was looking at when they drew up the plans for this road system.

The need for better and safer roads in the Charles County area is needed, no doubt about that. Anyone driving down 301 at rush hour knows exactly what a nightmare our road system is. However, the need for a 6-lane highway through a residential area at Maryland Route 205 is not an answer to this problem.

It appears that the State Highway Commission has taken over this project and it is not an issue that Charles County has any control over any longer; that the people who live in this area really do not have a choice. We disagree. The people who live in this area - must live with whatever havoc the State puts on us and that gives us the right to choose and voice our objections.

Although a 4-lane highway was mentioned, the 6-lane highway was presented as the only option justified as "think big - don't build small so that in 20 years we need to rebuild." That is all well and good but how can you justify not changing the intersection at Route 301 and Maryland Route 205, and how can you justify taking 6 lanes and narrowing it down to 4 lanes "creating a bottleneck of traffic" because you do not want to affect the shopping center? What about the people who live on the road - why is the "consideration" not of the people but of the shopping center?

The fact that the point of the intersection at Maryland Route 205 and 301 is one of the highest accident points in the State of Maryland may be true, but if this is true why is this high accident intersection remaining unchanged? The accident rate has increased in this particular area mainly after a shopping center

23

Honorable Richard H. Trainor

2

was built on the corner. The same corner that is not going to be changed with the construction of the new road. Now tell us this - taking the scenario of the existing 2-lane road and making it 6-lanes, narrowing down to the existing 4-lanes at the same high accident intersection and not changing anything about the high accident intersection, wouldn't logic dictate that the rate of accidents is only going to increase, not decrease. Wouldn't a better plan be one of which dealt with the intersection first - then in later studies see what would be needed and beneficial to the community.

The "safety" issue has not been mentioned. How safe will it be to live in a house directly on this 6-lane highway? What of the small children which live in these housing developments? How will this affect children getting on and off the school bus? How will their lives be affected by the increased volume of traffic? How is the increase in speeding vehicles going to be controlled?

Next, as a resident of Mattawoman Estates, Indian Lane, we feel that the magnitude of losing the right of way into our housing development needs to be looked into further. Without direct access into our subdivision, our only option is one of making a U-turn at Schlagle Road across three lanes of traffic which is suicide. Or as an alternative putting in an access road in the cul-de-sac which still leaves you making a left turn across three lanes of traffic without the aid of a traffic signal.

Finally, it has come to our attention that the primary purpose for rebuilding and extending Maryland Route 205 may not even be for the average citizens, but rather for those wealthy influential developers and landowners who want to develop property along the new highway.

We feel that a stronger study needs to be done and that other options need to be taken into consideration. Preferably one that does not interfere with a residential area. Until further studies are performed and other options presented we feel that at this time a "No-build" situation exists.

Thank you in advance for your consideration in this matter. We would hope to hear from you at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

Mr. & Mrs. Wolfgang Gaida
Mr. & Mrs. Wolfgang Gaida

94

Honorable Richard H. Trainor

3

Identical letter sent to:

Commissioner Murray D. Levy
Commissioner Nancy J. Stefton
Commissioner Thomas Mac Middleton
Honorable Barbara A. Mikulski
Honorable James C. Simpson
Honorable John R. Wood, Jr.
Honorable Michael J. Sprague
Honorable Paul S. Sarbanes
Honorable Roy Dyson
Honorable Samuel C. Linton
Honorable Thomas V. "Mike" Miller, Jr.
Mr. Edward Meehan
Mr. Hal Kassoff
Mr. Michael Rothenheber
Mr. Neil J. Pedersen
Mr. Victor Janata

This sheet intentionally left blank.

V-12

q/r



This sheet intentionally left blank.

This sheet intentionally left blank.

This sheet intentionally left blank.

This sheet intentionally left blank.

V-16

10/20



This sheet intentionally left blank.

V-17

101

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT DIVISION
10 01 AM '90



Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

Richard H. Trainor
Secretary
Hal Kassoff
Administrator

STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS

Contract No. CH 566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman/Beantown Road
Existing MD 5 to US 301
Location/Design Public Hearing
Monday, February 26, 1990 @ 7:30 p.m.

March 28, 1990

Re: Contract No. CH566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman-Beantown Road
PDMS NO. 082039

NAME DON HARRIMAN DATE 2/26/90
PLEASE PRINT ADDRESS RT 1 BOX 13
CITY/TOWN CHARLOTTE HALL STATE MD ZIP CODE 20622

Mr. Don H. Harriman
Route 1 Box 13
Charlotte Hall, Maryland 20622

Dear Mr. Harriman:

I/We wish to comment or inquire about the following aspects of this project:

SEGMENT I ALTERNATE 6
SEGMENT II ALTERNATE 5/6 MODIFIED
SEGMENT III SUBSTATION ROAD OPTION 1
INTERCHANGE OPTION B.

Thank you for your recent submittal on the MD 205 project planning study. Your recommendations will be taken into consideration in the development of team recommendations for the study.

You will be kept informed of future decisions reached on the MD 205 study through the project mailing list. Thank you for your interest in and input to the project planning process.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ego, Jr.
Deputy Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

I RECOMMEND THE ABOVE PLANS.

by: Victor P. Janata
Victor P. Janata
Project Manager
Project Planning Division

LHS:VPJ:as
cc: Mr. Edward H. Neehan

- Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List.*
- Please delete my/our name(s) from the Mailing List.

My telephone number is (301) 333-1105

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
383-7555 Baltimore Metro - 595-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-482-5082 Statewide Toll Free
707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

*Persons who have received a copy of this brochure through the mail are already on the project Mailing List.

1. The Selected Build Alternate includes Segment I, Alternate 6, Segment II, Alternate 5/6, and Segment III, Alternate 5/6. This will provide a four-lane divided roadway with 12' outside shoulder.
2. The No-Build option was selected for Sub-Station Road due to wetland impacts or displacements. This connection was not required for adequate traffic operations.
3. Interchange Option A was selected instead of Option B. This provides the same traffic operations but was a

102



STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS Mar 14 1 10 PM '90

Contract No. CH 566-151-571 Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205) Mattawoman/Beantown Road Existing MD 5 to US 301 Location/Design Public Hearing Monday, February 26, 1990 @ 7:30 p.m.

Re: Contract No. CH566-151-571 Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205) Mattawoman-Beantown Road PDHS No. 082039

NAME JAMES AND PAT HEBERT DATE 8 MARCH 90

PLEASE PRINT ADDRESS 120 INDIAN CT. CITY/TOWN WALDORF STATE MD ZIP CODE 20601

I/We wish to comment or inquire about the following aspects of this project:

Individually and in conjunction with the support of my neighborhood, Mattawoman-Estates, we wish to register our opinions concerning this Route 205 project. We adamantly OPPOSE any "Build Alternatives" of Rt. 205 as a bypass through what is predominately a residential area. The State's proposal for a 6-lane bypass would create a dangerous highway environment in a residential area, which is totally unacceptable. In addition to more cars, more trucks of all sizes, as well as buses resulting from a planned commuter park & ride at the corner of Rts. 205 and 5 will be traveling this bypass; consequently the noise pollution will ultimately increase to unacceptable levels. The safety factor is at a very high risk level as well. Asking citizens to enter onto 3-6 lanes of what undoubtedly will be a high-speed bypass, no matter what the posted speed limit is, for left or right turns and U-turns promotes a very substantial safety hazard.

We do recognize the need for a bypass and do support a bypass to the north and east of Rt. 205 which would have a tremendously reduced impact on residential homes and neighborhoods.

Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List. Please delete my/our name(s) from the Mailing List.

*Persons who have received a copy of this brochure through the mail are already on the project Mailing List.

- 1. The Selected Build Alternate provides for a four-lane divided roadway with 12' outside shoulders.
2. These improvements will provide a safer roadway than currently exists providing additional capacity and turn lanes.
3. Noise barriers and/or berms will be investigated again in final design for areas that exceed or approach the Federal Noise Abatement Criteria. See p. III-46 to III-54.

Mr. & Mrs. James Hebert 120 Indian Court Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Hebert:

Thank you for your recent letter supporting the No-Build Alternate for the MD 205 project planning study.

As described at the February 26th public hearing, commuter traffic will continue to grow on MD 205, even with the No-Build Alternate. Noise mitigation sites remain under consideration in the Mattawoman-Estates area. The Federal Highway Administration noise abatement criteria is estimated to be marginally exceeded at these locations in the design year (2015). A decision will be made as to whether noise mitigation should be considered at this area in the design phase of this project.

Existing MD 205 has a higher accident rate than the state-wide average for similar type roads. The proposed improvement would significantly reduce that rate. This is because the median would act as a safety zone for any pedestrians or vehicles crossing or turning left on the highway. Additionally, gaps in the highway traffic (which would allow turning movements) would be more likely to occur with more lanes.

The improvements proposed, four through lanes with outside shoulders, would accommodate the increasing commuter traffic as well as right turns into and out of the residentially zoned land adjacent to the road. The shoulder would serve as a combination turning and breakdown lane. The ultimate highway improvements are envisioned as a boulevard with a number of traffic signals at existing and future public street intersections. The existing 40 mph speed limit would remain. This road has and will continue to have at-grade intersections and entrances. This type design should not be confused with a "beltway".

My telephone number is (301) 333-1105

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech 383-7555 Baltimore Metro - 585-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5082 Statewide Toll Free 707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

Mr. and Mrs. James Hebert
Page Two.

MD 205 skirts the Mattawoman-Estates community on its western edge. Your suggestion for an alternate around your community would then pass close to the eastern edge of Pinefield in order to avoid the state parkland. Our initial study has shown that this alternate would require additional stream crossings (including Mattawoman Creek), impact appreciably greater amounts of wetland, and still lie adjacent to a number of residential areas. This "bypass" would be almost twice as long (and expensive) to construct, with the likelihood that motorists would continue to take Mattawoman-Beantown Road as the shorter route. For these reasons, we are proposing alternatives that make use of the existing highway corridor.


Recognizing your support for the no-build, if a build solution is selected, which option would you prefer: turning movements requiring U-turns on MD 205, or the construction of a connection between the Indian Lane cul-de-sac and Schlager Road? Please call me toll free in Maryland at 1-800-548-5026 with your thoughts on this element of the project.

Thank you for sharing your concerns. Your support for the No-Build Alternate has been noted and will be considered in the selection of alternates for this project. Your name has been added or been verified to be on the project mailing list, so you will be kept informed of any future decisions made on this project.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Deputy Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

by:


Victor Janata
Project Manager
Project Planning Division

LHE:VJ:as
cc: Mr. Edward H. Meehan

109

V-20



STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS

April 11, 1990

Contract No. CH 566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman/Beantown Road
Existing MD 5 to US 301
Location/Design Public Hearing
Monday, February 26, 1990 @ 7:30 p.m.

Re: Contract No. CH566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman-Beantown Road
PDMS No. 082039

NAME Patricia B. Ivie DATE 2-26-90

PLEASE PRINT ADDRESS 1012 State Hwy 6, West
CITY/TOWN La Plata STATE Md. ZIP CODE 20646

I/We wish to comment or inquire about the following aspects of this project:

*I am totally opposed to
any plan that would disturb
any part of the Trinity Cemetery.*

*These 125 families who have
loved and that would have to
be moved would have to go through
the grief process all over again.*

*Please let the dead "rest in
peace." We buried our loved ones
there in the good faith that
they would be there forever.*

*Thank you for considering
this comment.*

Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List.*

Please delete my/our name(s) from the Mailing List.

*Persons who have received a copy of this brochure through the mail are already on the project Mailing List.

Ms. Patricia B. Ivie
1012 State Highway 6, West
La Plata, Maryland 20646

Dear Ms. Ivie:

Thank you for your recent letter opposing impacts to the Trinity Memorial Gardens Cemetery as the result of improvement studies for MD 205.

It is unfortunate that there is a misunderstanding about our intentions regarding the cemetery. We are charged with developing alternate solutions to transportation problems and documenting the impacts that would result. One of the build alternates presented at the February 26th public hearing, Segment II - Alternate 5/6, does impact cemetery graves. The other alternate presented that night, Segment II - Alternate 5/6 Modified, does not impact any graves. We have not reached any decisions regarding the desirability of either alternate.

Your opposition to disturbing any graves has been noted and will be considered in the development of team recommendations. Thank you again for identifying your position.

Your name has been added to the project mailing list, so you will be kept informed of any future decisions made on this project.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Deputy Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

by: Victor F. Janaya
Victor F. Janaya
Project Manager
Project Planning Division

LHE:VFJ:kw

cc: Mr. Edward H. Meehan

My telephone number is (301) 333-1105

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
383-7555 Baltimore Metro - 565-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5062 Statewide Toll Free

PROJECT
DEVELOPMENT
REVISION
Mar 1 10 53 AM '90

107 Adams La.

Hallway, Md. 20601

3/2/90

Ms. Anne Marie McGonigal
Page Two

Your opposition to the widening of existing MD 205 has been noted and will be considered in the development of team recommendations. Thank you again for identifying your position.

Mr. Edward Meehan
District Engineer, District #5
State Highway Admin.
138 Defense Highway
Annapolis, Md. 21401

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Deputy Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

by: Victor F. Janata
Victor F. Janata
Project Manager
Project Planning Division

Dear Mr. Meehan,

I, an interested citizen, of the State of Maryland, and a resident of Charles County, attended the "Public Hearing Meeting" in Hallway at Stone High School, on Feb. 26, 1990.

After reflecting on the concerns stressed there, and also upon the presentations made by the people representing the State of Md., I would like to add my input.

LHE:VFJ:kw

cc: Mr. Edward H. Meehan

107

First and foremost, we have, as citizens, a duty to take full responsibility of ourselves and our families.

As the saying goes, "Charity begins at home." As you well know, the family is the basic unit of society.

Uprooting people and areas could change a great deal in the way the people of Hildorf are and act.

Not only is this project a social concern, but it should be viewed upon as a matter of "social justice".

I strongly believe, that the people on Fair Lane should not be disrupted, just to convene other countries.

Another option to be concerned about is the U turn when a person has to cut across three lanes to enter Indian Lane

Members of the panel spoke about appraisers coming in and settling justly. I have already looked at properties similar to mine and they are in the 250,000 neighborhood.

I am a single person who works for the Whitehouse of D.C. I have spent my life working for people at a very minimum salary. To be uprooted is tragic to say the least.

Four years ago, when I was evaluating
parochial schools, for Middle States,
I spent a great deal of time
in St. Mary's County. I was
told, at that time, to return
to F. G. Co. by way of Matthews
Beantown Rd, because it was
a short cut.

Four years ago, I moved
to Charles Co and was assured
by a reliable real estate
agent, that my property
would never be disturbed.

I happen to be one of the ones
involved, if another road
is cut through in the
Cul-de-sac.

I also feel very saddened by the fact that ^{the} state would even consider disrupting a cemetery. Most probably, the people voicing that choice, never experienced a death to a close one.

Mr. Burch spoke eloquently when he proposed his new idea. I also purpose looking at a rural undeveloped area which would in no way threaten a well established and maintained community. Hopefully, this recommendation will be given some consideration.

I would also suggest

strongly that priority of
opinion be given to individual
residents - not - businesses.

I would hope the State and
County would not side with
businesses - as "Money talks".

I do not agree with the
presentation on sound, noise etc.

All noise can be heard on
Indian Lane from both 205 and
301.

In regard to mailing,
I received the mail, but
many of my neighbors
did not.

As far as advertising in the
daily newspapers, I do not get
the paper. I really afford
it. I have to listen to the news
on T.V. and I have yet to hear
it being discussed on T.V.
Thank you, Mr. Muehlen.

Sincerely,
Anne Marie McGuire
107 Indian Ln.
Hollywood, Md. 20631

1. The Selected build alternate is a four-lane divided roadway with 12' outside shoulders. The 12' outside shoulder will provide a merge area for motorists leaving Indian Lane and a turn lane for people entering Indian Lane. It is anticipated that the selected build alternate will provide safe access to Indian Lane.
2. The selected build alternate does not impact any graves at Trinity Memorial Gardens Cemetery.
3. An alignment on relocation was investigated and not selected due to increased wetland impacts, right-of-way impacts and cost.
4. Noise Analysis were completed for this project (see p. III-46 to III-54). Several areas will be evaluated further in final design.
5. The Public Meeting was advertised in the Washington Post, MD Independent, Times-Crescent, The Enterprise (St. Mary's) and the Maryland Register. Brochures were provided to all people on the mailing list including all residents along MD 205.

PROJECT
DEVELOPMENT
CIVIL



Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

Richard H. Treinor
Secretary
Hel Kessoff
Administrator

STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS

Contract No. CH 566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman/Beantown Road
Existing MD 5 to US 301
Location/Design Public Hearing
Monday, February 26, 1990 @ 7:30 p.m.

April 11, 1990

Re: Contract No. CH566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman-Beantown Road
PDMS No.082039

NAME Joan L. Bowling DATE 3/3/90

Ms. Joan L. Bowling
Stella Maris Drive
Rock Point, Maryland 20682

Dear Ms. Bowling:

Thank you for your recent letter requesting that we make every effort to protect Zekiah Swamp and any associated wetlands in the development of improvements to MD 205. A number of federal and state agencies are very concerned about impacts to any wetlands, and particularly Zekiah Swamp. We must document to their satisfaction our efforts to avoid, minimize or mitigate any effects to wetlands.

Your support for the protection of the swamp and associated wetlands from any highway improvements has been noted and will be considered in the development of team recommendations. Thank you for identifying your position.

Your name has been added to the project mailing list, so you will be kept informed of any future decisions made on this project.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Deputy Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

by: Victor F. Janata
Victor F. Janata
Project Manager
Project Planning Division

LHE:VFJ:kw

cc: Mr. Edward H. Meehan

My telephone number is (301) 333-1105

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
303-7555 Baltimore Metro - 565-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5082 Statewide Toll Free
707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21202-0717

PLEASE
PRINT

ADDRESS STELLA MARIS DRIVE

CITY/TOWN Rock Point STATE MD ZIP CODE 20682

I/We wish to comment or inquire about the following aspects of this project:

WHILE ACKNOWLEDGING THE TRANSPORTATION
PROBLEMS OF THIS AREA, I REQUEST THAT
MAXIMUM PROTECTION BE AFFORDED
THE ZEKIAH SWAMP, ITS FEEDER STREAMS,
BOG AREAS AND HABITATS DURING THE
DESIGN, CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE
AND USE OF THE ROADWAY

Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List.*

Please delete my/our name(s) from the Mailing List.

*Persons who have received a copy of this brochure through the mail are already on the project Mailing List.

1. All efforts have been made to avoid and/or minimize impacts to wetlands and streams. Erosion and Sediment Control and Stormwater Management techniques will be employed to protect these resources.

114

DEVELOPMENT
NOV 30 10 42 AM '90



STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS

June 28, 1990

Contract No. CH 566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman/Beantown Road
Existing MD 5 to US 301
Location/Design Public Hearing
Monday, February 26, 1990 @ 7:30 p.m.

Re: Contract No. 566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman-Beantown Road
PDMS No. 082039

NAME William F. Cooke DATE 3-5-90

PLEASE PRINT

ADDRESS P.O. Box 1,

CITY/TOWN WALDORF STATE MD ZIP CODE 20604-0001

I/We wish to comment or inquire about the following aspects of this project:

I believe the general opinion of the 2/28/90 meeting is against placing this 6 lane Super highway in an existing residential area - I agree

I believe there is merit to this objection, and makes no sense to opening up a 6 lane highway from a 4 lane highway and then going back to only 4 lanes.

It should be much less expensive and much more practical to move further East on Route 5 and placing this highway in the forest, unoccupied rural area between Rt 5 and C. Daniels Road.

I urge that you reconsider the present proposals and make the proposed "Bypass" East of Rt 205 out of the residential areas to take the 5000+ veh/day commuter traffic away from Waldorf.

Mr. William F. Cooke
P.O. Box 1
Waldorf, Maryland 20604-0001

Dear Mr. Cooke:

Thank you for your letter regarding the MD 205 project planning study. Your opposition to widening Mattawoman-Beantown Road and support for a new road to the east has been noted and will be considered in the decision-making process.

MD 205 skirts the Pinefield community on its western edge. Your suggestion for an alternate to the east would then pass close to the eastern edge of Pinefield in order to avoid the state parkland. Our initial stream study has shown that this alternate would require additional stream crossings (including Mattawoman Creek), likely impact greater amounts of wetland, and still lie adjacent to a number of residential areas. This "bypass" would be almost twice as long (and expensive) to construct, with the likelihood that motorists would continue to take Mattawoman-Beantown Road as the shorter route. For these reasons, we are proposing alternatives that make use of the existing highway corridor.

The improvements we have proposed for Mattawoman-Beantown Road (four through lanes with outside shoulders) would accommodate the increasing commuter traffic as well as right turns into and out of the residentially zoned land adjacent to the road. The shoulder would serve as a combination turning and breakdown lane. The ultimate highway improvement is envisioned as a boulevard with a number of traffic signals at existing and future public street intersections. The existing 40 mph speed limit would remain. This road has, and will continue to have, at-grade intersections and entrances. This type design should not be confused with a "super highway".

Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List.*

Please delete my/our name(s) from the Mailing List.

*Persons who have received a copy of this brochure through the mail are already on the project Mailing List.

My telephone number is (301) 333-1105

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
383-7555 Baltimore Metro - 585-0451 O.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5062 Statewide Toll Free
707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

1. The Selected Build Alternate provides a four-lane divided roadway with 12' outside shoulder.
2. A bypass east of MD 205 was investigated and not selected due to increased wetland impacts, right-of-way impacts, and cost.


Mr. William F. Cooke
Page Two

Thank you again for identifying your position on this study.
We appreciate your participation in the project planning
process.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Deputy Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

by:



Victor F. Janava
Project Manager
Project Planning Division

LHE:VFJ:as
cc: Mr. Edward H. Neehan

V-32

1/12



STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS

April 11, 1990

Contract No. CH 566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman/Beantown Road
Existing MD 5 to US 301
Location/Design Public Hearing
Monday, February 26, 1990 @ 7:30 p.m.

Mr. James L. Hebert
120 Indian Court
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dear Mr. Hebert:

NAME JAMES L. HeBERT DATE 26 Feb 90.
PLEASE PRINT ADDRESS 120 INDIAN CT
CITY/TOWN WALDORF STATE MD ZIP CODE 20601

I/We wish to comment or inquire about the following aspects of this project:

The interchange must be built before the widening of 205 for the following reasons:
The chokepoint on 205 north and south is at the light at 205 and 301/5. Six lanes to four at this intersection would make it worst.
Build the interchange AND then evaluate traffic flow on 205; widening to four lanes may be more than enough. Six lanes may not be necessary during the next 25 years.
The interchange should recognize that traffic from the western Parkway onto 301/5 north may cause a situation worse than the current situation with 205. by the year 2000. Option C.
Taking 6 lanes (widened road) to four lanes at 301/5 and 205 will increase traffic flow on 205. To later reroute traffic to build an interchange later will cause more accidents than if you had left the road completely alone. In summary, it would be safer to build the interchange first at 205 and 301/5 and then widen 205 to traffic flow patterns once the interchange is complete. Then decide if 2, 4 or 6 lanes is required.

Thank you for your recent letter regarding the MD 205 project planning study. Your support for building the interchange at US 301 and MD 205 first, and the reasons why, has been noted and will be considered in the development of our recommendation to the Administrator.

The engineering phase would involve the detailed design of a roadway alternate and an interchange option. Our goal would be to construct an interchange at US 301/MD 205 before the improved intersection (with four lanes) reaches capacity. A six-lane divided highway improvement represents an ultimate solution that is needed by the year 2015. Interim improvements with fewer lanes may be feasible.

Your name has been added to the project mailing list, so you will be kept informed of any future decisions made on this project. Thank you again for your suggestions on this study.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Deputy Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

by: Victor F. Janata
Victor F. Janata
Project Manager
Project Planning Division

LHE:VFJ:kw

cc: Mr. Edward H. Meehan

My telephone number is (301) 333-1105

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
383-7555 Baltimore Metro - 565-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5062 Statewide Toll Free

Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List.*

Please delete my/our name(s) from the Mailing List.

*Persons who have received a copy of this brochure through the mail are already on the project Mailing List.

1. The Selected Build Alternate provides a four-lane divided roadway with 12' outside shoulder.
2. Interchange Option A was selected to improve the intersection with U.S. 301/MD 5. Due to funding constraints, staging of the improvements will occur.

117

PROJECT
DEVELOPMENT
MAY 14 1 33 PM '90

STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS

Contract No. CH 566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman/Beantown Road
Existing MD 5 to US 301
Location/Design Public Hearing
Monday, February 26, 1990 @ 7:30 p.m.



Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

Richard H. Trainor
Secretary
Hal Kassoff
Administrator

May 22, 1990

Re: Contract No. CH566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman-Beantown Road
PDMS No. 082039

NAME Mike + Sheila Klotz DATE 9 Mar 90

PLEASE PRINT ADDRESS 111 Indian Lane

CITY/TOWN Waldorf STATE Md. ZIP CODE 20601

I/We wish to comment or inquire about the following aspects of this project:

Individually and in conjunction with the support of my neighborhood, Mattawoman-Estates, we wish to register our opinions concerning this Route 205 project. We adamantly OPPOSE any "Build Alternatives" of Rt. 205 as a bypass through what is predominantly a residential area. The State's proposal for a 6-lane bypass would create a dangerous Beltway environment in a residential area, which is totally unacceptable. In addition to more cars, more trucks of all sizes, as well as buses resulting from a planned commuter park & ride at the corner of Rts. 205 and 5 will be traveling this bypass; consequently the noise pollution will ultimately increase to unacceptable levels. The safety factor is at a very high risk level as well. Asking citizens to enter onto 3-6 lanes of what undoubtedly will be a high-speed bypass, no matter what the posted speed limit is, for left or right turns and U-turns promotes a very substantial safety hazard.

We do recognize the need for a bypass and do support a bypass to the north and east of Rt. 205 which would have a tremendously reduced impact on residential homes and neighborhoods.

Mr. & Mrs. Mike Klotz
111 Indian Lane
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Klotz:

Thank you for your recent letter supporting the No-Build Alternate for the MD 205 project planning study.

As described at the February 26th public hearing, commuter traffic will continue to grow on MD 205, even with the No-Build Alternate. Noise mitigation sites remain under consideration in the Mattawoman-Estates area. The Federal Highway Administration noise abatement criteria is estimated to be marginally exceeded at these locations in the design year (2015). A preliminary decision will be made as to whether noise mitigation should be considered at this area in the final environmental document.

Existing MD 205 has a higher accident rate than the state-wide average for similar type roads. The proposed improvement would significantly reduce that rate. This is because the median would act as a safety zone for any pedestrians or vehicles crossing or turning left on the highway. Additionally, gaps in the highway traffic (which would allow turning movements) would be more likely to occur with more lanes.

The proposed improvements would accommodate the increasing commuter traffic, as well as right turns into and out of the residentially zoned land adjacent to the road. In effect, the third outer-most lane in each direction would serve as a turning lane. The ultimate highway improvements are envisioned as a boulevard with a number of traffic signals at existing and future public street intersections. The existing 40 mph speed limit would remain. This road has and will continue to have at-grade intersections and entrances. This type design should not be confused with a "beltway".

MD 205 skirts the Mattawoman-Estates community on its western edge. Your suggestion for an alternate around your community would then pass close to the eastern edge of Pinefield in order to avoid the state parkland. Our initial study has shown that this alternate would require additional stream

Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List.*

Please delete my/our name(s) from the Mailing List.

*Persons who have received a copy of this brochure through the mail are already on the project Mailing List.

My telephone number is (301) 333-1105

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
363-7555 Baltimore Metro - 365-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-482-5062 Statewide Toll Free

1. See response p. V-19.

118

STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS 1 13 11 '90

Contract No. CH 566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman/Beantown Road
Existing MD 5 to US 301
Location/Design Public Hearing
Monday, February 26, 1990 @ 7:30 p.m.

NAME ROD & MARSHA NEWMAN DATE MARCH 8, 1992

PLEASE PRINT ADDRESS 118 INDIAN COURT
CITY/TOWN WALDORF STATE MD ZIP CODE 20601

I/We wish to comment or inquire about the following aspects of this project:

Individually and in conjunction with the support of my neighborhood, Mattawoman-Estates, we wish to register our opinions concerning this Route 205 project. We adamantly OPPOSE any "Build Alternatives" of Rt. 205 as a bypass through what is predominately a residential area. The State's proposal for a 6-lane bypass would create a dangerous Beltway environment in a residential area, which is totally unacceptable. In addition to more cars, more trucks of all sizes, as well as buses resulting from a planned commuter park & ride at the corner of Rts. 205 and 5 will be traveling this bypass; consequently the noise pollution will ultimately increase to unacceptable levels. The safety factor is at a very high risk level as well. Asking citizens to enter onto 3-6 lanes of what undoubtedly will be a high-speed bypass, no matter what the posted speed limit is, for left or right turns and U-turns promotes a very substantial safety hazard.

We do recognize the need for a bypass and do support a bypass to the north and east of Rt. 205 which would have a tremendously reduced impact on residential homes and neighborhoods.

Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List.*
 Please delete my/our name(s) from the Mailing List.

*Persons who have received a copy of this brochure through the mail are already on the project Mailing List.

1. See response p. V-19.

crossings (including Mattawoman Creek), likely impact greater amounts of wetland, and still lie adjacent to a number of residential areas. This "bypass" would be almost twice as long (and expensive) to construct; with the likelihood that motorists would continue to take Mattawoman-Beantown Road as the shorter route. For these reasons, we are proposing alternatives that make use of the existing highway corridor.

Acknowledging your support for the no-build, if a build solution is selected, which option would you prefer: turning movements requiring U-turns on MD 205, or the construction of a connection between the Indian Lane cul-de-sac and Schlagel Road? Please call me toll free in Maryland at 1-800-548-5026 with your thoughts on this element of the project.

Thank you for sharing your concerns. Your support for the No-Build Alternate has been noted and will be considered in the selection of alternates for this project. Your name has been added or been verified to be on the project mailing list; so you will be kept informed of any future decisions made on this project.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Deputy Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

by: Victor Janata
Victor Janata
Project Manager
Project Planning Division

LHE:VJ:kw
cc: Mr. Edward H. Meehan

119

PROJECT
DEVELOPMENT

FEB 15 4 11 PM '90

STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS

Contract No. CH 566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman/Beantown Road
Existing MD 5 to US 301
Location/Design Public Hearing
Monday, February 26, 1990 @ 7:30 p.m.

NAME Scott & Cathy Ferguson DATE 3/9/90

PLEASE PRINT ADDRESS 104 INDIAN LANE

CITY/TOWN Waldorf STATE MD ZIP CODE 20601

I/We wish to comment or inquire about the following aspects of this project:

Individually and in conjunction with the support of my neighborhood, Mattawoman-Estatea, we wish to register our opinions concerning this Route 205 project. We adamantly OPPOSE any "Build Alternativea" of Rt. 205 as a bypass through what is predominately a residential area. The State's proposal for a 6-lane bypass would create a dangerous Beltway environment in a residential area, which is totally unacceptable. In addition to more cars, more trucks of all sizes, as well as buses resulting from a planned commuter park & ride at the corner of Rts. 205 and 5 will be traveling this bypass; consequently the noise pollution will ultimately increase to unacceptable levels. The safety factor is at a very high risk level as well. Asking citizens to enter onto 3-6 lanes of what undoubtedly will be a high-speed bypass, no matter what the posted speed limit is, for left or right turns and U-turns promotes a very substantial safety hazard.

We do recognize the need for a bypass and do support a bypass to the north and east of Rt. 205 which would have a tremendously reduced impact on residential homes and neighborhoods.

Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List.*

Please delete my/our name(s) from the Mailing List.

*Persons who have received a copy of this brochure through the mail are already on the project Mailing List.

Mr. & Mrs. Mike Klotz
111 Indian Lane
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Klotz:

Mr. & Mrs. Su Yen Yang
102 Indian Lane
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Yang:

Mr. & Mrs. Ernie Heimpel
112 Indian Lane
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Heimpel:

Mr. & Mrs. Tomas Pagan
106 Indian Lane
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Pagan:

Mr. & Mrs. Richard Satterfield
122 Indian Court
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Satterfield:

Mr. Dan Cosgrove
121 Indian Court
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dear Mr. Cosgrove:

Mr. & Mrs. Steve Moyer
105 Indian Lane
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Moyer:

Mr. & Mrs. Gregg Rzechula
125 Indian Court
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Rzechula:

Mr. & Mrs. Robert J. Hawkins
113 Indian Lane
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Hawkins:

1. See response p. V-19.

182

STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS

Mar 14 1 10 PM '90

Contract No. CH 566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman/Beantown Road
Existing MD 5 to US 301
Location/Design Public Hearing
Monday, February 26, 1990 @ 7:30 p.m.

NAME JAMES & CYNTHIA VARMECKY DATE 8 MAR 90

PLEASE PRINT ADDRESS 116 INDIAN LANE

CITY/TOWN WALDORF STATE MD ZIP CODE 20601

I/We wish to comment or inquire about the following aspects of this project:

Individually and in conjunction with the support of my neighborhood, Mattavoman-Estates, we wish to register our opinions concerning this Route 205 project. We adamantly **OPPOSE** any "Build Alternatives" of Rt. 205 as a bypass through what is predominately a residential area. The State's proposal for a 6-lane bypass would create a dangerous beltway environment in a residential area, which is totally unacceptable. In addition to more cars, more trucks of all sizes, as well as buses resulting from a planned commuter park & ride at the corner of Rts. 205 and 5 will be traveling this bypass; consequently the noise pollution will ultimately increase to unacceptable levels. The safety factor is at a very high risk level as well. Asking citizens to enter onto 3-6 lanes of what undoubtedly will be a high-speed bypass, no matter what the posted speed limit is, for left or right turns and U-turns promotes a **very substantial** safety hazard.

We do recognize the need for a bypass and do support a bypass to the north and east of Rt. 205 which would have a tremendously reduced impact on residential homes and neighborhoods.

James Varnecky

Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List.*

Please delete my/our name(s) from the Mailing List.

*Persons who have received a copy of this brochure through the mail are already on the project Mailing List.

1. See response p. V-19.

Mr. S. D. Sauer
114 Indian Lane
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Sauerbry:

Mr. & Mrs. James Varnecky
116 Indian Lane
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Varnecky:

Mr. & Mrs. Scott Ferguson
104 Indian Lane
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Ferguson:

Mr. & Mrs. Rod Newman
118 Indian Court
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Newman:

PROJECT
DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION

STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS

MAR 14 1 10 PM '90

Contract No. CH 566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman/Beantown Road
Existing MD 5 to US 301
Location/Design Public Hearing
Monday, February 26, 1990 @ 7:30 p.m.

NAME DAVID + VIRGINIA SAUERBRY DATE 9 MAR 90

PLEASE PRINT ADDRESS 114 INDIAN LANE

CITY/TOWN WALDORE STATE MD ZIP CODE 20601

I/We wish to comment or inquire about the following aspects of this project:

Individually and in conjunction with the support of my neighborhood, Mettewomen-Estates, we wish to register our opinions concerning this Route 205 project. We adamantly **OPPOSE** any "Build Alternatives" of Rt. 205 as a bypass through what is predominately a residential area. The State's proposal for a 6-lane bypass would create a dangerous Beltway environment in a residential area, which is totally unacceptable. In addition to more cars, more trucks of all sizes, as well as buses resulting from a planned commuter park & ride at the corner of Rts. 205 and 5 will be traveling this bypass; consequently the noise pollution will ultimately increase to unacceptable levels. The safety factor is at a very high risk level as well. Asking citizens to enter onto 3-6 lanes of what undoubtedly will be a high-speed bypass, no matter what the posted speed limit is, for left or right turns and U-turns promotes a **very substantial** safety hazard.

We do recognize the need for a bypass and do support a bypass to the north and east of Rt. 205 which would have a tremendously reduced impact on residential homes and neighborhoods.

David Sauerbry
Virginia J. Sauerbry

Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List.

Please delete my/our name(s) from the Mailing List.

*Persons who have received a copy of this brochure through the mail are already on the project Mailing List.

1. See response p. V-19

102

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS

Mar 14 1 23 PM '90

Contract No. CH 566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman/Beantown Road
Existing MD 5 to US 301
Location/Design Public Hearing
Monday, February 26, 1990 @ 7:30 p.m.

NAME Robert J. and Cathleen Hawkins DATE 3/10/90

PLEASE PRINT ADDRESS 113 Indian Lane

CITY/TOWN Waldorf STATE MD ZIP CODE 20601

I wish to comment or inquire about the following aspects of this project:

Individually and in conjunction with the support of my neighborhood, Mattawoman-Estates, we wish to register our opinions concerning this Route 205 project. We adamantly **OPPOSE** any "Build Alternatives" of Rt. 205 as a bypass through what is predominately a residential area. The State's proposal for a 6-lane bypass would create a dangerous Beltway environment in a residential area, which is totally unacceptable. In addition to more cars, more trucks of all sizes, as well as buses resulting from a planned commuter park & ride at the corner of Rts. 205 and 5 will be traveling this bypass; consequently the noise pollution will ultimately increase to unacceptable levels. The safety factor is at a very high risk level as well. Asking citizens to enter onto 3-6 lanes of what undoubtedly will be a high-speed bypass, no matter what the posted speed limit is, for left or right turns and U-turns promotes a very substantial safety hazard.

We do recognize the need for a bypass and do support a bypass to the north and east of Rt. 205 which would have a tremendously reduced impact on residential homes and neighborhoods.

Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List.*
 Please delete my/our name(s) from the Mailing List.

*Persons who have received a copy of this brochure through the mail are already on the project Mailing List.

1. See response p. V-19.

193

STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS

Contract No. CH 566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman/Beantown Road
Existing MD 5 to US 301
Location/Design Public Hearing
Monday, February 26, 1990 @ 7:30 p.m.

NAME KZECHULN DATE 2-8-90

PLEASE PRINT ADDRESS 125 Indian Court

CITY/TOWN WALDORF STATE MD ZIP CODE 20604

I/We wish to comment or inquire about the following aspects of this project:

Individually and in conjunction with the support of my neighborhood, Mattawoman-Estatee, we wish to register our opinion concerning this Route 205 project. We adamantly **OPPOSE** any "Build Alternatives" of Rt. 205 as a bypass through what is predominately a residential area. The State's proposal for a 6-lane bypass would create a dangerous Beltway environment in a residential area, which is totally unacceptable. In addition to more cars, more trucks of all sizes, as well as buses resulting from a planned commuter park & ride at the corner of Rts. 205 and 5 will be traveling this bypass; consequently the noise pollution will ultimately increase to unacceptable levels. The safety factor is at a very high risk level as well. Asking citizens to enter onto 3-6 lanes of what undoubtedly will be a high-speed bypass, no matter what the posted speed limit is, for left or right turns and U-turns promotes a **very substantial** safety hazard.

We do recognize the need for a bypass and do support a bypass to the north and east of Rt. 205 which would have a tremendously reduced impact on residential homes and neighborhoods.

Gregg + Eleanor Kzechul

Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List.*

Please delete my/our name(s) from the Mailing List.

*Persons who have received a copy of this brochurs through the mail are already on the project Mailing List.

1. See response p. V-19.

124

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT DIVISION
10 01 11 '90

STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS

Contract No. CH 566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman/Beantown Road
Existing MD 5 to US 301
Location/Design Public Hearing
Monday, February 26, 1990 @ 7:30 p.m.

NAME Steve and Donna Moyer DATE 3/9/90

PLEASE PRINT ADDRESS 105 Indian Lane

CITY/TOWN Waldorf STATE MD ZIP CODE 20601

I/We wish to comment or inquire about the following aspects of this project:

Individually and in conjunction with the support of my neighborhood, Mattawoman-Estates, we wish to register our opinions concerning this Route 205 project. We adamantly **OPPOSE** any "Build Alternatives" of Rt. 205 as a bypass through what is predominately a residential area. The State's proposal for a 6-lane bypass would create a dangerous Baltway environment in a residential area, which is totally unacceptable. In addition to more cars, more trucks of all sizes, as well as buses resulting from a planned commuter park & ride at the corner of Rts. 205 and 5 will be traveling this bypass; consequently the noise pollution will ultimately increase to unacceptable levels. The safety factor is at a very high risk level as well. Asking citizens to enter onto 3-6 lanes of what undoubtedly will be a high-speed bypass, no matter what the posted speed limit is, for left or right turns and U-turns promotes a **very substantial** safety hazard.

We do recognize the need for a bypass and do support a bypass to the north and east of Rt. 205 which would have a tremendously reduced impact on residential homes and neighborhoods.

- Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List.*
- Please delete my/our name(s) from the Mailing List.

*Persons who have received a copy of this brochure through the mail are already on the project Mailing List.

135

PROJECT
DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION

STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS

1 10 PM '90

Contract No. CH 566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman/Beantown Road
Existing MD 5 to US 301
Location/Design Public Hearing
Monday, February 26, 1990 @ 7:30 p.m.

NAME DAN COSGROVE DATE 8 MAR 90
PLEASE PRINT ADDRESS 121 INDIAN CT
CITY/TOWN WALDOCF STATE MD ZIP CODE 20601

I/We wish to comment or inquire about the following aspects of this project:

Individually and in conjunction with the support of my neighborhood, Mattawoman-Etetes, we wish to register our opinions concerning this Route 205 project. We adamantly ~~OPPOSE~~ any "Build Alternatives" of Rt. 205 as a bypass through what is predominately a residential area. The State's proposal for a 6-lane bypass would create a dangerous Beltway environment in a residential area, which is totally unacceptable. In addition to more cars, more trucks of all sizes, as well as buses resulting from a planned commuter park & ride at the corner of Rts. 205 and 5 will be traveling this bypass; consequently the noise pollution will ultimately increase to unacceptable levels. The safety factor is at a very high risk level as well. Asking citizens to enter onto 3-6 lanes of what undoubtedly will be a high-speed bypass, no matter what the posted speed limit is, for left or right turns and U-turns promotes a very substantial safety hazard.

We do recognize the need for a bypass and do support a bypass to the north and east of Rt. 205 which would have a tremendously reduced impact on residential homes and neighborhoods.

Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List.*

Please delete my/our name(s) from the Mailing List.

*Persons who have received a copy of this brochurs through the mail are already on the project Mailing List.

12/5

STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT
MARCH 14 1990

Contract No. CH 566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman/Beantown Road
Existing MD 5 to US 301
Location/Design Public Hearing
Monday, February 26, 1990 @ 7:30 p.m.

NAME Richard & Linda Satterfield DATE March 9, 1990

PLEASE PRINT ADDRESS 122 Indian Court
CITY/TOWN Waldorf STATE MD ZIP CODE 20601

//We wish to comment or inquire about the following aspects of this project:

Individually and in conjunction with the support of my neighborhood, Mattavoman-Estates, we wish to register our opinions concerning this Route 205 project. We adamantly OPPOSE any "Build Alternatives" of Rt. 205 as a bypass through what is predominately a residential area. The State's proposal for a 6-lane bypass would create a dangerous Beltway environment in a residential area, which is totally unacceptable. In addition to more cars, more trucks of all sizes, as well as buses resulting from a planned commuter park & ride at the corner of Rts. 205 and 5 will be traveling this bypass; consequently the noise pollution will ultimately increase to unacceptable levels. The safety factor is at a very high risk level as well. Asking citizens to enter onto 3-6 lanes of what undoubtedly will be a high-speed bypass, no matter what the posted speed limit is, for left or right turns and U-turns promotes a very substantial safety hazard.

We do recognize the need for a bypass and do support a bypass to the north and east of Rt. 205 which would have a tremendously reduced impact on residential homes and neighborhoods.

Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List.
 Please delete my/our name(s) from the Mailing List.

*Persons who have received a copy of this brochurs through the mail are already on the project Mailing List.

1. See response p. V-19.

127

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS

Contract No. CH 566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman/Beantown Road
Existing MD 5 to US 301
Location/Design Public Hearing
Monday, February 28, 1990 @ 7:30 p.m.

NAME Tomas & Rosa Pagan DATE March 9, 1990.

PLEASE PRINT ADDRESS 106 Indian Lane

CITY/TOWN Waldorf STATE MD ZIP CODE 20601

I/We wish to comment or inquire about the following aspects of this project:

Individually and in conjunction with the support of my neighborhood, Mattawoman-Estates, we wish to register our opinions concerning this Route 205 project. We adamantly **OPPOSE** any "Build Alternatives" of Rt. 205 as a bypass through what is predominately a residential area. The State's proposal for a 6-lane bypass would create a dangerous Beltway environment in a residential area, which is totally unacceptable. In addition to more cars, more trucks of all sizes, as well as buses resulting from a planned commuter park & ride at the corner of Rts. 205 and 5 will be traveling this bypass; consequently the noise pollution will ultimately increase to unacceptable levels. The safety factor is at a very high risk level as well. Asking citizens to enter onto 3-6 lanes of what undoubtedly will be a high-speed bypass, no matter what the posted speed limit is, for left or right turns and U-turns promotes a **very substantial** safety hazard.

We do recognise the need for a bypass and do support a bypass to the north and east of Rt. 205 which would have a tremendously reduced impact on residential homes and neighborhoods.

Rosa Pagan
Tomas A. Pagan

Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List.*

Please delete my/our name(s) from the Mailing List.

*Persons who have received a copy of this brochure through the mail are already on the project Mailing List.

1. See response p. V-19.

128

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS: 1 19 90

Contract No. CH 566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman/Beantown Road
Existing MD 5 to US 301
Location/Design Public Hearing
Monday, February 26, 1990 @ 7:30 p.m.

NAME ERNE & LINDA HEIMPEL DATE 3-10-90

PLEASE PRINT ADDRESS 112 INDIAN LANE

CITY/TOWN WALDORF STATE MD ZIP CODE 20601

I/We wish to comment ~~on~~ about the following aspects of this project:

Individually and in conjunction with the support of my neighborhood, Mattawoman-Estates, we wish to register our opinions concerning this Rota 205 project. We adamantly **OPPOSE** any "Build Alternatives" of Rt. 205 as a bypass through what is predominately a residential area. The State's proposal for a 6-lane bypass would create a dangerous Beltway environment in a residential area, which is totally unacceptable. In addition to more cars, more trucks of all sizes, as well as buses resulting from a planned commuter park & ride at the corner of Rts. 205 and 5 will be traveling this bypass; consequently the noise pollution will ultimately increase to unacceptable levels. The safety factor is at a very high risk level as well. Asking citizens to enter onto 3-6 lanes of what undoubtedly will be a high-speed bypass, no matter what the posted speed limit is, for left or right turns and U-turns promotas a **very substantial** safety hazard.

We do recognise the need for a bypass and do support a bypass to the north and east of Rt. 205 which would have a tremendously raduced impact on rasidential homas and neighborhoods.

Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List.*
 Please delete my/our nams(s) from the Mailing List.

*Persons who have received a copy of this brochure through the mail are already on the project Mailing List.

1. See response p. V-19.

129

STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS U.S. MAIL PERMIT NO. 1097 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20541

Contract No. CH 566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman/Beantown Road
Existing MD 5 to US 301
Location/Design Public Hearing
Monday, February 26, 1990 @ 7:30 p.m.

NAME SUYEN YANG & SUSUE YANG DATE MAR. 9 '90

PLEASE PRINT ADDRESS 102 INDIAN LANE

CITY/TOWN WALDORF STATE MD ZIP CODE 20601

I wish to comment or inquire about the following aspects of this project:

94-V-1
Individually and in conjunction with the support of my neighborhood, Mattawoman-Etetas, we wish to register our opinions concerning this Route 205 project. We adamantly **OPPOSE** any "Build Alternatives" of Rt. 205 as a bypass through what is predominately a residential area. The State's proposal for a 6-lane bypass would create a dangerous Beltway environment in a residential area, which is totally unacceptable. In addition to more cars, more trucks of all sizes, as well as buses resulting from a planned commuter park & ride at the corner of Rts. 205 and 5 will be traveling this bypass; consequently the noise pollution will ultimately increase to unacceptable levels. The safety factor is at a very high risk level as well. Asking citizens to enter onto 3-6 lanes of what undoubtedly will be a high-speed bypass, no matter what the posted speed limit is, for left or right turns and U-turns promotes a **very substantial** safety hazard.

We do recognize the need for a bypass and do support a bypass to the north and east of Rt. 205 which would have a tremendously reduced impact on residential homes and neighborhoods.

Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List.*

Please delete my/our name(s) from the Mailing List.

*Persons who have received a copy of this brochure through the mail are already on the project Mailing List.

1. See response page V-19.

130

individually and in conjunction with the support of my neighborhood, Mattawomeo-Estates, we wish to register our opinions concerning this Route 205 project. We adamantly **OPPOSE** any "Build Alternatives" of Rt. 205 as a bypass through what is predominantly a residential area. The State's proposal for a 6-lane bypass would create a dangerous beltway environment in a residential area, which is totally unacceptable. In addition to more cars, more trucks of all sizes, as well as buses resulting from this planned commuter park & ride at the corner of Rts. 205 and 5 will be traveling this bypass; consequently the noise pollution will ultimately increase to unacceptable levels. The safety factor is at a very high risk level as well. Asking citizens to enter onto 3-6 lanes of what undoubtedly will be a high-speed bypass, no matter what the posted speed limit is, for left or right turns and U-turns promotes a very substantial safety hazard.

We do recognize the need for a bypass and do support a bypass to the north end east of Rt. 205 which would have a tremendously reduced impact on residential homes and neighborhoods.

101 Indian Lane
Waldorf, MD 20601
Richard E. Honaker, III

CITY/TOWN Waldorf STATE MD ZIP CODE 20601

I/We wish to comment or inquire about the following aspects of this project:

I whole heartily agree with the above state ment.

My house faces the road # 205, and the noise is already unacceptable. There has already been a great change since I purchased this property.

I believe a 6 lane highway in front of my house will damage it so badly that the state should buy the total property if it comes to that.

My #1 proposal and hope is to scrap the proposal and build a park by pass north and east of Pine Field.

I agree with the need, but disagree that so many residential areas must be ruined in the process; and it sounds to me as if the state planners, considered this to be no damage to me.

Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List.*

Please delete my/our name(s) from the Mailing List.

*Persons who have received a copy of this brochure through the mail are already on the project Mailing List.



Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

Richard H. Trainor
Hal Kassoff
Administrator

||| 2 1000

Re: Contract No. CH566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman-Beantown Road
PDMS No. 082039

Richard E. Honaker, M.D.
101 Indian Lane
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dear Dr. Honaker:

Thank you for your recent letter supporting the No-Build Alternate for the MD 205 project planning study.

As described at the February 26th public hearing, commuter traffic will continue to grow on MD 205, even with the No-Build Alternate. Noise mitigation sites remain under consideration in the Mattawoman-Estates area. The Federal Highway Administration noise abatement criteria is estimated to be marginally exceeded at these locations in the design year (2015). A decision will be made as to whether noise mitigation should be considered at this area in the design phase of this project.

Existing MD 205 has a higher accident rate than the state-wide average for similar type roads. The proposed improvement would significantly reduce that rate. This is because the median would act as a safety zone for any pedestrians or vehicles crossing or turning left on the highway. Additionally, gaps in the highway traffic (which would allow turning movements) would be more likely to occur with more lanes.

The improvements proposed, four through lanes with outside shoulders, would accommodate the increasing commuter traffic as well as right turns into and out of the residentially zoned land adjacent to the road. The shoulder would serve as a combination turning and breakdown lane. The ultimate highway improvement is envisioned as a boulevard with a number of traffic signals at existing and future public street intersections. The existing 40 mph speed limit would remain. This road has and will continue to have at-grade intersections and entrances. This type design should not be confused with a "beltway".

MD 205 skirts the Mattawoman-Estates community on its western edge. Your suggestion for an alternate around your community would then pass close to the eastern edge of Pinefield in order to avoid the state parkland. Our initial study has shown that this alternate would require additional stream crossings (including Mattawoman Creek), likely impact greater

My telephone number is (301) 333-1105

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
383-7555 Baltimore Metro - 565-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5082 Statewide Toll Free
707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

131

Richard E. Honaker, M.D.
Page Two

amounts of wetland, and still lie adjacent to a number of residential areas. This "bypass" would be almost twice as long (and expensive) to construct, with the likelihood that motorists would continue to take Mattawoman-Beantown Road as the shorter route. For these reasons, we are proposing alternatives that make use of the existing highway corridor.

Recognizing your support for the no-build, if a build solution is selected, which option would you prefer: turning movements requiring U-turns on MD 205, or the construction of a connection between the Indian Lane cul-de-sac and Schlagel Road? Please call me toll free in Maryland at 1-800-548-5026 with your thoughts on this element of the project.

Thank you for sharing your concerns. Your support for the No-Build Alternate has been noted and will be considered in the selection of alternates for this project. Your name has been verified as being on the project mailing list, so you will be kept informed of any future decisions made on this project.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Deputy Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

by:

Victor Janata

Victor Janata
Project Manager
Project Planning Division

LHE:VJ:as
cc: Mr. Edward H. Meehan

12/27

individually end in conjunction with the support of my neighborhood, Mattawomen-Estetes, we wish to register our opininns concerning this Route 205 project. We edamantly OPPOSE any "Build Alternatives" of Rt. 205 es e bypass through what is predominately e residential area. The State's proposal for a 6-lane bypass would create e dangerous Beltway environment in e residential aree, which is totally unaccepteable. In addition to more cers, more trucks nf ell sizes, es well es buses resulting from e planned commuter perk f ride at the corner of Rts. 205 and 5 will be traveling this bypass; consequently the noise pollution will ultimately increase to unaccepteable levels. The safety factor is et a very high risk level es well. Asking citizens to enter onto 3-6 lanes of what undoubtedly will be e high-speed bypass, no metter what the posted speed limit is, for left or right turns end U-turne promotes a very substantial safety hezard.

We do recognize the need for a bypass end do support a bypass to the north end east of Rt. 205 which would have a tremendously reduced impact on residential homes end neighborhoode.



Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

Richard H. Trainor
Secretary
Hal Kassoff
Administrator

JUL 3 1989

Re. Contract No.CH566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman-Beantown Road
PDMS No.082039

Mr. and Mrs. Michael Ritchlin
126 Indian Court
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Ritchlin:

Thank you for your recent letter supporting the No-Build Alternete for the MD 205 project planning study.

As described at the February 26th public hearing, both local and through commuter traffic will continue to grow on MD 205, even with the No-Build Alternete. Noise mitigation sites remain under consideration in the Mattawoman Estates area. The Federal Highway Administration noise abatement criteria is estimated to be marginally exceeded at these locations in the design year (2015). A decision will be made as to whether noise mitigation should be considered at this area in the detail design phase. A detailed air quality analysis was completed for this project. It indicated that no violations of state or national ambient air quality standards for carbon monoxide (CO) would occur as the result of the project; even by the design year.

Existing MD 205 has a higher accident rate than the state-wide average for similar type roads. The proposed improvement would significantly reduce that rate. This is because the median would act as a safety zone for any pedestrians or vehicles crossing or turning left on the highway. Additionally, gaps in the highway traffic (which would allow turning movements) would be more likely to occur with more lanes.

The improvements proposed, four through lanes with outside shoulders, would accommodate the increasing commuter traffic as well as right turns into and out of the residentially zoned land adjacent to the road. The shoulder would serve as a combination turning and breakdown lane. Bus stops and bicycle travel could also be accommodated by the outside shoulder. Pedestrians would be able to walk safely along a graded area behind the curb. The ultimate highway improvement is envisioned as a boulevard with a number of traffic signals at existing and future public street intersections. The existing 40 mph speed limit would remain. This road has, and will continue to have, at-grade intersections and entrances.. This type design should not be confused with a "beltway".

My telephone number is (301) 333-1105

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
303-7555 Baltimore Metro - 565-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5082 Statewide Toll Free
707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

NAME Deborah + Michael Ritchlin DATE Mar 9, 1990
PLEASE PRINT ADDRESS 126 Indian Ct. (Mattawoman Estates)
CITY/TOWN Waldorf STATE Maryland ZIP CODE 20601

I/We wish to comment or inquire about the following aspects of this project:

I oppose any build alternatives on Rt. 205 which is a highly residential area. Mattawoman Estates would be badly affected by noise pollution and ^{polluted} air from vehicles. My back yard faces Rt. 205; and I don't want to have to worry about my three small children playing in back. My small neighborhood is very nice and has many small children who are safe when playing outside because there is no thru traffic from other neighborhoods. There are so many children who live along Rt. 205; and a lot of them also ride bicycles to other neighborhoods and to the baseball field on Substation Rd. There are many school buses that travel Rt. 205 since there are many children. Any having any build alternatives would be very dangerous to pedestrians and drivers as well. The traffic on Rt. 205 is very low during normal hours. The ^{the noise is worse than that of a school} noise is worse than that of a school bus. ^{at the} improved intersection since people have to yield out to get on Rt. 201. Rt. 201 is where the congestion really begins. The car accidents ^{what} mainly happen occur on Rt. 205 when people turn into the Pinfield shopping ctr. since you're concerned about accidents block ^{with a road behind the} the entrances of Pinfield shopping ctr. or just tear it down, or there's no stores of great importance in there to alot of people. The ^{with a road behind the} certainty is more important than the Pinfield shopping ctr. I support the Eastern Bypass

- Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List. ^{which will relieve the traffic of St. Paul's}
- Please delete my/our name(s) from the Mailing List. ^{County traffic and other communities}

*Persons who have received a copy of this brochure through the mail are already on the project Mailing List. ^{permanently with an build alternative. The EASTERN BYPASS would help save the Rt. 205 301 congestion in Waldorf going northward?}

133

Mr. and Mrs. Michael Ritchlin
Page Two

MD 205 skirts the Mattawoman-Estates community on its western edge. Your suggestion for an alternate around your community would then pass close to the eastern edge of Pinefield in order to avoid the state parkland. Our initial study has shown that this alternate would require additional stream crossings (including Mattawoman Creek), likely impact greater amounts of wetland, and still lie adjacent to a number of residential areas. This "bypass" would be almost twice as long (and expensive) to construct, with the likelihood that motorists would continue to take Mattawoman-Beantown Road as the shorter route. For these reasons, we are proposing alternatives that make use of the existing highway corridor. The Eastern Bypass study has one preliminary alternate that would pass between Pinefield and the state parkland. Other preliminary alternates are west of US 301 and do not address the MD 5 corridor problems.

We are looking at restricting the number of shopping center access points from MD 205 in conjunction with each of the four interchange options. The cemetery is not impacted by any of our proposals, and Trinity Memorial Gardens to the south is only affected by one of the two build alternates at that location.


Acknowledging your support for the no-build, if a build solution is selected, which option would you prefer: turning movements requiring U-turns on MD 205, or the construction of a connection between the Indian Lane cul-de-sac and Schlagel Road? Please call me toll free in Maryland at 1-800-548-5026 with your thoughts on this element of the project.

Thank you for sharing your concerns. Your support for the No-Build Alternate has been noted and will be considered in the selection of alternates for this project. Your name has been added or been verified to be on the project mailing list, so you will be kept informed of any future decisions made on this project.

Very truly yours.

Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Deputy Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

by:


Victor Janata
Project Manager
Project Planning Division

LHE:VJ:as
cc: Mr. Edward H. Meehan

1
VJ

V-50



March 9, 1990

Mr. Neil J. Pedersen, Director
Office of Planning & Preliminary Engineering
State Highway Administration
P. O. Box 717
Baltimore, MD 21203-0717

April 3, 1990

Dear Mr. Pedersen:

Re: Contract No.: CH566-151-571
Project Name: Proposed MD5 Relocated(MD205)
Mattavoman/Beantown Road
Existing MD 5 to US 301

Our firm has developed plans to operate a "Gas and Go" on our parcel located on the northeast corner of MD 205 and MD 5. We appreciated the opportunity to review the project alternatives that were discussed for this intersection at the February 26 public hearing. We wish to go on record as opposing Alternate No. 6 as presented at the public hearing. We would support Alternate No. 5. The reason for our oppositions are as follows:

- Alternate No. 6 relocated would split from existing MD 5 approximately 2400' south of the existing MD 5/MD 205 intersection and tie into the basic alignment of MD 205 by the end of Segment I. Redirecting existing traffic would negatively impact the success of our retail outlet.
- The new location alternate requires a new traffic signal be installed at the split within 2400' of the existing signal at MD 205/MD 5 which would remain. Traffic wishing to continue north on existing MD 5 would be further burdened with the additional traffic signal.
- The alternate which we support would minimize properties affected, right-of-way required, cost and environmental impacts compared to Alternate No. 6. The proposed 6-lane, divided roadway would more than adequately handle future traffic needs at the intersection of MD 205 and MD 5.

We support the State Highway Administration's efforts to construct MD 5 Relocated and would ask consideration be given in minimizing right-of-way acquisition of existing property owners. Clearly, Alternate No. 5 would address the needs of MD 205 by incorporating additional roadway/traffic capacity, and would ask that these comments be made a part of the permanent record on this subject.

Mr. Harry Mentzer
Real Estate Representative
The Wills Group
Box E
La Plata, Maryland 20646

Dear Mr. Mentzer:

Thank you for your March 9th letter regarding the MD 205 project planning study. Your support for an improved MD 205 and specific preference for Alternate 5 has been noted and will be considered in the selection process.

The operation of the Segment I - Alternate 5 intersection between existing MD 5 and MD 205 will fail well before the design year. With the amount of existing and approved commercial development in close proximity to the MD 5/MD 205 intersection, the desirable solution of an interchange would create extensive displacement impacts. That is the major reason for developing and presenting Segment I - Alternate 6. We are currently investigating the specific magnitude of impacts of replacing the MD 5/MD 205 intersection with an interchange.

Thank you for identifying your position on the MD 205 project. The Wills Group is already enrolled on the project mailing list so you will be kept informed of any future decisions made on this project.

Very truly yours,

Neil J. Pedersen

Neil J. Pedersen, Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

NJP:as

cc: Mr. Edward H. Meehan
Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.

My telephone number is (301) 333-1110

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
363-7555 Baltimore Metro - 565-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5082 Statewide Toll Free
707 North Calvert St. Baltimore, Maryland 21202

BOX E, LA PLATA, MARYLAND 20646
301/934-8101 202/870-3015

1. Within Segment I, the Selected Build Alternate includes an interim improve to upgrade the existing roadway to a four-lane undivided roadway. When the intersection with MD 5 becomes unmanageable, Alternate 6 will be constructed.

135

Mr. Neil J. Pedersen
Page 2
Merch 9, 1990

Your consideration of the above is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
Harry Mentzer
Harry Mentzer
Real Estate Representative

HM/jp

PC: Harry Brown
Lock Wills

1/3/90

V-52

PROJECT
DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION

Mar 14 1 00 PM '90

MAR 10, 1990



Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

Richard H. Trainor
Secretary
Hal Kassoff
Administrator

Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration
Project Planning Division
Post Office Box 717
Baltimore, MD 21203

Dear Sir or Madams:

On February 26, 1990, we attended the public hearing on contract number CH 566-151-571, Proposed MD 5 Relocated, Mattawoman-Beantown Road. We did not make written comments at that time but now wish to do so. After reading the project brochure, we do not support any of the build alternatives. Our reasons and concerns follow.

Item 1. The future development plan for Charles County designates this region as primarily residential. Contrary to what your brochure says on page 13 in the socio-economic environment section, a six-lane major highway is inconsistent with the character of this region.

Item 2. All the build options will disturb or displace existing churches, private family dwellings, and family burial plots. There is no evidence that the State considered other less disruptive routes.

Item 3. While the majority of the proposed expanded road is to be six lanes wide, the section from the railroad track to the MD 301 intersection is to remain only four lanes. It is inconceivable that the State would spend \$39-\$51 million and leave a major bottleneck in the road.

The rationale for not upgrading this section to the full six lanes is that the State wants to avoid right-of-way impacts at the shopping centers. The State is willing to displace private citizens, churches, and even burial plots but is reluctant to disturb commercial property.

This section of MD 205 is dangerous because there are two shopping centers with multiple uncontrolled entrances and exits. The Charles County Zoning Board allowed this to occur and has never corrected their poor decision.

Item 4. Median openings are to be provided at all crossroads except at Indian Head Lane. This would deny the twenty-five families living along this road and the adjacent court the ability to make left turns onto MD 205. Rather, a convoluted bypass for Sub-Station Road is to be built at a cost of \$500-\$700,000. A far better, and less expensive, solution is to simply provide a median opening at this crossroad.

Item 5. A six-lane major highway through our residential area

July 3, 1990

Re: Contract No. CH566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman-Beantown Road
PDMS No. 082039

Richard and Regina Dubicki
4603 Harwich Drive
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Dubicki:

Thank you for your recent letter supporting the No-Build Alternate for the MD 205 project planning study.

Because of environmental and economic constraints, we are seeking solutions to transportation problems that maximize the use of existing highway corridors and rights-of-way. MD 205 is being used by an increasing number of commuters who are avoiding the US 301/MD 5/MD 228 intersection. Despite improvements that are planned for this intersection, we are still projecting that a considerable amount of traffic will continue to use MD 205 as a shortcut.

Existing MD 205 has a higher accident rate than the state-wide average for similar type roads. The proposed improvement would significantly reduce that rate. This is because the median would act as a safety zone for any pedestrians or vehicles crossing or turning left on the highway. Additionally, gaps in the highway traffic (which would allow turning movements) would be more likely to occur with more lanes.

The improvements proposed, four through lanes with outside shoulders, would accommodate the increasing commuter traffic as well as right turns into and out of the residentially zoned land adjacent to the road. The shoulder would serve as a combination turning and breakdown lane. Bus stops and bicycle travel could also be accommodated by the outside shoulder. Pedestrians would be able to walk safely along a graded area behind the curb. The ultimate highway improvements are envisioned as a boulevard with a number of traffic signals at existing and future public street intersections. The existing 40 mph speed limit would remain.

Under the proposed improvements there would be displacements of people and businesses depending on the alternates and options selected. The Messiah Lutheran Church would have to be displaced by any build alternate. A number of steps have been taken to reduce residential impacts, such as alignment shifts and reducing

My telephone number is (301) 333-1105

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
383-7555 Baltimore Metro - 565-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5062 Statewide Toll Free
300 North Calvert St. Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

137

Richard and Regina Dubicki
Page Two

raises concerns about future highway safety. Such a road will certainly become a high-speed thoroughfare for heavy truck traffic which will have significant negative impact on our rural environment.


Currently, MD 205 is the major route for all school bus traffic to Thomas Stone High School, John Hanson Middle School, and J. P. Ryon Elementary School from the Pinefield and White Oak communities and the Idlewood Trailer Park. These buses travel MD 205 from 7:00 to 9:00 AM and from 2:00 to 4:00 PM. We believe that our children should not have to compete with high speed dangerous truck traffic.

Finally, please place us on the project mailing list. Our address is as follows:

Richard and Regina Dubicki
4603 Harwich Drive
Waldorf, MD 20601

Sincerely;


Richard F. Dubicki


Regina L. Dubicki

the median width. One of the build alternates presented at the February 26th public hearing. Segment II - Alternate 5/6, does impact cemetery graves at the Trinity Memorial Gardens Cemetery. The other alternate presented that night, Segment II - Alternate 5/6 Modified, does not impact any graves. We have not yet reached any decisions regarding our alternate selection.

We believe that through the study process, we have developed alternates that will relieve the transportation problems along Mattawoman-Beantown Road. The alternates include the reconstruction of the MD 205 roadway to a curbed, four-lane divided highway with outside shoulders, as well as construction of an interchange to replace or augment the US 301/MD 205 intersection. Only four lanes were proposed for MD 205 between US 301 and the railroad tracks because the solution is an interchange, not a larger intersection. That segment of roadway would be adequate with Interchange Options A or B, and would be replaced by an overpass with Interchange Options C or D. We are looking at restricting the number of shopping center access points from MD 205 in conjunction with each of the four interchange options.

Safety was the reason no median opening at Indian Lane was recommended. Sub-station Road, Indian Lane and Schlagle Road all intersect with MD 205 within 400 feet. Queuing left-turn traffic, waiting to enter Schlagle Road, would conflict with a median opening at Indian Lane. An alternative to U-turns that we are still considering is connecting Indian Lane to Schlagle Road.

Your name has been added to the project mailing list, so you will be kept informed of any future decisions made on this project. Thank you again for identifying your position on the study. We appreciate your participation in the project planning process.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Deputy Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

by:


Victor F. Pinata
Project Manager
Project Planning Division

LHE:VFJ:as

cc: Mr. Edward H. Meehan

1. See response p. V-7 and V-31.
2. The access points to the shopping centers will be consolidated to one opening providing a safer condition.
3. The roadway is designed with a 50 mph design speed (and will be posted a little lower). A high-speed thoroughfare is not proposed.

138

PROJECT
DEVELOPMENT
PROGRAM



Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

Richard H. Trainor
Secretary
Hal Kassoff
Administrator

STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS

Contract No. CH 566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman/Beantown Road
Existing MD 5 to US 301
Location/Design Public Hearing
Monday, February 26, 1990 @ 7:30 p.m.

June 27, 1990

Re: Contract No. CH566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman-Beantown Road
PDMS No. 082039

NAME JOANN BRODERICK DATE 3/12/90

PLEASE PRINT ADDRESS 239 BAR OAK DR.

CITY/TOWN WALDORF STATE MD ZIP CODE 20601

I/We wish to comment or inquire about the following aspects of this project:

Intersection 205 + MD 5 has been changed in the past year with the widening + addition of left turn lanes straight + left turn straight + right turn. There is no longer a problem at this intersection. The problem has been corrected. Alternative 5 for Segment I is fine. Alternative 6 is a waste of money! Alternative 5/6 modified for Seg II is fine. Seg III has me totally confused! The options 2 or 3 for the relocation of Sub-station road is preferred.
The interchange options are what confuse me. I don't really understand Right of Way. Option A + B seem fine why develop C + D. Option C will cause more congestion + unsafe driving conditions. The light at Pinefield will have to be larger for Sub station road connection is made. Then the cars that just went over the ramp will be stopped + the ramp will back up. There will be more accidents at Wash. Avenue. + traffic going onto 301-5 at that section. A light would probably have to be added. The people in White Oak Village currently have enough trouble getting out of the development. Option Interchange 'C' will make this problem worse.

Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List.*

Please delete my/our name(s) from the Mailing List.

*Persons who have received a copy of this brochure through the mail are already on the project Mailing List.

Ms. Joann Broderick
239 Bar Oak Drive
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dear Ms. Broderick:

Thank you for your letter regarding the MD 205 project planning study. Your support for Alternate 5 in Segment I, Alternate 5/6 Modified in Segment II, Substation Options 2 or 3, and Interchange Option A or B have been noted and will be considered in the decision-making process.

While the MD 5/MD 205 intersection operates at an adequate level, the future traffic growth will overload it. An interchange will be needed. Because of the extent of impacts it would have on adjacent existing or approved development, Alternate 6 was presented.

Alternate 5/6 is the one build alternate in Segment III. It follows the existing MD 205 corridor, with alignment shifts from side to side to minimize impacts to existing homes.

Interchange Options C and D were presented as conventional interchange configuration solutions. These designs would handle all the movements that the intersection now serves. Interchange Options A and B only accommodate the major traffic movements; the signalized intersection would remain, but would have to handle much less traffic.

My telephone number is (301) 333-1105

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
383-7555 Baltimore Metro - 585-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5082 Statewide Toll Free
707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

1. Segment I, Alternate 6 was selected instead of Alternate 5. While the recent improvements at the intersection of MD 205 with MD 5 provide initial relief, they will not provide adequate future traffic needs.
2. Segment II, Alternate 5/6 Modified and Segment III, Alternate 5/6 have been selected.
3. The no-build has been selected for Sub-Station Road. This will avoid wetland impacts or displacements.
4. Interchange Option A was selected.
5. The selected improvements will improve the safety + provide additional capacity and protected turn pockets.

139

Ms. Joann Broderick
Page Two

Your name has been added to the project mailing list, so you will be kept informed of any future decisions made on this project. Thank you again for identifying your recommendations. We appreciate your participation in the project planning process.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Deputy Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

by:

Victor F. Janata

Victor F. Janata
Project Manager
Project Planning Division

LHE:VFJ:as
cc: Mr. Edward H. Meehan

147

DEVELOP

MAR 17 10 33 AM '90

STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS

Contract No. CH 566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman/Beantown Road
Existing MD 5 to US 301
Location/Design Public Hearing
Monday, February 26, 1990 @ 7:30 p.m.

NAME: Randall A. & Deborah Simmons DATE: March 7, 1990
ADDRESS: 109 Indian Lane
CITY/TOWN Waldorf STATE: Maryland ZIP CODE 20601

We wish to comment or inquire about the following aspects of this project:

After attending your meeting held February 26, 1990, at Thomas Stone High School, we were left with the impression that this highway was being built regardless of what the community thought about it or what impact such a major highway would have on the people living in the area. It leaves us to wonder what this task force was looking at when they drew up the plans for this road system.

The need for better and safer roads in the Charles County area is needed, no doubt about that. Anyone driving down 301 at rush hour knows exactly what a nightmare our road system is. However, the need for a 6-lane highway through a residential area at Maryland Route 205 is not an answer to this problem.

It appears that the State Highway Commission has taken over this project and it is not an issue that Charles County has any control over any longer; that the people who live in this area really do not have a choice. We disagree. The people who live in this area - must live with whatever havoc the State puts on us and that gives us the right to choose and voice our objections.

Although a 4-lane highway was mentioned, the 6-lane highway was presented as the only option justified as "think big - don't build small so that in 20 years we need to rebuild." That is all well and good but how can you justify not changing the intersection at Route 301 and Maryland Route 205, and how can you justify taking 6 lanes and narrowing it down to 4 lanes "creating a bottleneck of traffic" because you do not want to affect the shopping center? What about the people who live on the road - why is the "consideration" not of the people but of the shopping center?

The fact that the point of the intersection at Maryland Route 205 and 301 is one of the highest accident points in the State of Maryland may be true, but if this is true why is this high accident intersection remaining unchanged? The accident rate has increased in this particular area mainly after a shopping center



Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

d H.
Secretary
Hal Kassoif
Administrator

June 27, 1990

Re: Contract No. CH566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman-Beantown Road
PDMS No. 082039

Mr. R. A. Simmons
109 Indian Lane
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dear Mr. Simmons:

Thank you for your recent letter supporting the No-Build Alternate for the MD 205 project planning study.

As described at the February 26th public hearing, commuter traffic will continue to grow on MD 205, even with the No-Build Alternate. Noise mitigation sites remain under consideration in the Mattawoman-Estates area. The Federal Highway Administration noise abatement criteria is estimated to be marginally exceeded at these locations in the design year (2015). A decision will be made as to whether noise mitigation should be considered at this area in the design phase of this project.

Existing MD 205 has a higher accident rate than the state-wide average for similar type roads. The proposed improvement would significantly reduce that rate. This is because the median would act as a safety zone for any pedestrians or vehicles crossing or turning left on the highway. Additionally, gaps in the highway traffic (which would allow turning movements) would be more likely to occur with more lanes.

The improvements proposed, four through lanes with outside shoulders, would accommodate the increasing commuter traffic, as well as right turns into and out of the residentially zoned land adjacent to the road. The shoulder would serve as a combination turning and breakdown lane. The ultimate highway improvements are envisioned as a boulevard with a number of traffic signals at existing and future public street intersections. The existing 40 mph speed limit would remain. This road has and will continue to have at-grade intersections and entrances. This type design should not be confused with a "beltway".

My telephone number is (301) 333-1105

14

was built on the corner. The same corner that is not going to be changed with the construction of the new road. Now tell us this - taking the scenario of the existing 2-lane road and making it 6-lanes, narrowing down to the existing 4-lanes at the same high accident intersection and not changing anything about the high accident intersection, wouldn't logic dictate that the rate of accidents is only going to increase, not decrease. Wouldn't a better plan be one of which dealt with the intersection first - then in later studies see what would be needed and beneficial to the community.

The "safety" issue has not been mentioned. How safe will it be to live in a house directly on this 6-lane highway? What of the small children which live in these housing developments? How will this affect children getting on and off the school bus? How will their lives be affected by the increased volume of traffic? How is the increase in speeding vehicles going to be controlled?

Next, as a resident of Mattawoman Estates, Indian Lane, we feel that the magnitude of losing the right of way into our housing development needs to be looked into further. Without direct access into our subdivision, our only option is one of making a U-turn at Schlagle Road across three lanes of traffic which is suicide. Or as an alternate putting in an access road in the cul-de-sac which still leaves you making a left turn across three lanes of traffic without the aid of a traffic signal.

Finally, it has come to our attention that the primary purpose for rebuilding and extending Maryland Route 205 may not even be for the average citizens, but rather for those wealthy influential developers and landowners who want to develop property along the new highway.

We feel that a stronger study needs to be done and that other options need to be taken into consideration. Preferably one that does not interfere with a residential area. Until further studies are performed and other options presented we feel that at this time a "No-build" situation exists.

Thank you in advance for your consideration in this matter. We would hope to hear from you at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

Mr. & Mrs. Randall A. Simmons

Mr. & Mrs. Randall A. Simmons

Mr. R.A. Simmons
Page Two

MD 205 skirts the Mattawoman-Estates community on its western edge. Your suggestion for an alternate around your community would then pass close to the eastern edge of Pinefield in order to avoid the state parkland. Our initial study has shown that this alternate would require additional stream crossings (including Mattawoman Creek), likely impact greater amounts of wetland, and still lie adjacent to a number of residential areas. This "bypass" would be almost twice as long (and expensive) to construct, with the likelihood that motorists would continue to take Mattawoman-Beantown Road as the shorter route. For these reasons, we are proposing alternatives that make use of the existing highway corridor.

Recognizing your support for the no-build, if a build solution is selected, which option would you prefer: turning movements requiring U-turns on MD 205, or the construction of a connection between the Indian Lane cul-de-sac and Schlagle Road? Please call me toll free in Maryland at 1-800-548-5026 with your thoughts on this element of the project.

Thank you for sharing your concerns. Your support for the No-Build Alternate has been noted and will be considered in the selection of alternates for this project. Your name has been added or been verified to be on the project mailing list, so you will be kept informed of any future decisions made on this project.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Deputy Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

by:

Victor Janata
Victor Janata
Project Manager
Project Planning Division

LHE:VJ:as
cc: Mr. Edward H. Meehan

1. See response p. V-7

2/1

This page intentionally left blank.

This page intentionally left blank

144

This page intentionally left blank.



Maryland Department of Transportation

The Secretary's Office

William Donald Schaefer
Governor
Richard H. Trainor
Secretary
Stephen G. Zantz
Deputy Secretary

RECEIVED

MAR 9 1990

PROJECT 109
DEVELOP Indian Lane
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

SECRETARY OF
TRANSPORTATION

March 7, 1990

Honorable Richard H. Trainor
Secretary
Department of Transportation
Post Office Box 8755
BWI Airport
Baltimore, Maryland 21240

March 26, 1990

Mr. and Mrs. Randall A. Simmons
109 Indian Lane
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Simmons:

Thank you for your March 7th letter which raises a number of issues about the ongoing planning study for improvements to MD 205 (Mattawoman-Beantown Road) in Waldorf. I am responding on behalf of Messrs. Kassoff, Pedersen, Meehan and Janata.

No final decisions have yet been made concerning improvements to MD 205. The purpose of the study is to develop alternative solutions to address the transportation problem, and document the comparative impacts that result. Your input is welcomed as valuable factors in the project planning process.

As described at the February 26th public hearing, commuter traffic will continue to grow on MD 205. A six-lane divided highway improvement represents an ultimate solution that is needed by the year 2015. Interim improvements with fewer lanes may be feasible. The improvements proposed would accommodate the increasing commuter traffic, as well as turning movements into and out of the residentially zoned land adjacent to the road. In effect, the third lane in each direction would serve as a turning lane.

The existing US 301/MD 205 intersection is identified as a high-accident location. As stated at the recent public hearing the ultimate solution to the intersection is an interchange that would replace the existing intersection. Four interchange options were presented at the hearing.

Existing MD 205 has a higher accident rate than the statewide average for similar type roads. The proposed improvement would significantly reduce that rate. The proposed median would act as a safety zone for any pedestrians or vehicles crossing or turning left on the highway, and gaps in the highway traffic would be more likely to occur with more lanes.

Dear Secretary Trainor:

We are requesting your assistance in the matter of the expansion of Mattawoman-Beantown Road, Maryland Route 205. Contract Number: CH 566-151-571.

After attending a meeting held February 26, 1990, at Thomas Stone High School by the State Highway Commission, we were left with the impression that this highway was being built regardless of what the community thought about it or what impact such a major highway would have on the people living in the area. It leaves us to wonder what this task force was looking at when they drew up the plans for this road system.

The need for better and safer roads in the Charles County area is needed, no doubt about that. Anyone driving down 301 at rush hour knows exactly what a nightmare our road system is. However, the need for a 6-lane highway through a residential area at Maryland Route 205 is not an answer to this problem.

It appears that the State Highway Commission has taken over this project and it is not an issue that Charles County has any control over any longer; that the people who live in this area really do not have a choice. We disagree. The people who live in this area - must live with whatever havoc the State puts on us and that gives us the right to choose and voice our objections.

Although a 4-lane highway was mentioned, the 6-lane highway was presented as the only option justified as "think big - don't build small so that in 20 years we need to rebuild." That is all well and good but how can you justify not changing the intersection at Route 301 and Maryland Route 205, and how can you justify taking 6 lanes and narrowing it down to 4 lanes "creating a bottleneck of traffic" because you do not want to affect the shopping center? What about the people who live on the road - why is the "consideration" not of the people but of the shopping center?

The fact that the point of the intersection at Maryland Route 205 and 301 is one of the highest accident points in the State of Maryland may be true, but if this is true why is this high accident intersection remaining unchanged? The accident rate has increased in this particular area mainly after a shopping center

My telephone number is (301) 859-7397

TTY For the Deaf: (301) 684-6919

Post Office Box 8755 Baltimore/Washington International Airport, Maryland 21240-0755

1990


Mr. and Mrs. Randall A. Simmons
Page Two

Safety was the reason no median opening at Indian Lane was recommended. An alternative to U-turns that we are still considering is connecting Indian Lane to Schlagle Road. Determining whether a traffic signal is warranted at Indian Lane will be done when the project nears the construction phase. The ultimate highway improvements are envisioned as a boulevard with a number of traffic signals at existing and future public street intersections.

A number of steps have been taken to reduce residential impacts, such as alignment shifts and reducing the median width.

Thank you for sharing your concerns. For additional information, please feel free to contact Mr. Neil Pedersen, Director of the Office of Planning and Preliminary Engineering for the State Highway Administration. Mr. Pedersen's telephone number is (301) 333-1110.

Sincerely,



Richard H. Trainor
Secretary

RHT:as

cc: Mr. Hal Kassoff
Mr. Neil J. Pedersen
Mr. Edward H. Meehan
Mr. Vic Janata

Honorable Richard H. Trainor

2

was built on the corner. The same corner that is not going to be changed with the construction of the new road. Now tell us this - taking the scenario of the existing 2-lane road and making it 6-lanes, narrowing down to the existing 4-lanes at the same high accident intersection and not changing anything about the high accident intersection, wouldn't logic dictate that the rate of accidents is only going to increase, not decrease. Wouldn't a better plan be one of which dealt with the intersection first - then in later studies see what would be needed and beneficial to the community.

The "safety" issue has not been mentioned. How safe will it be to live in a house directly on this 6-lane highway? What of the small children which live in these housing developments? How will this affect children getting on and off the school bus? How will their lives be affected by the increased volume of traffic? How is the increase in speeding vehicles going to be controlled?


Next, as a resident of Mattawoman Estates, Indian Lane, we feel that the magnitude of losing the right of way into our housing development needs to be looked into further. Without direct access into our subdivision, our only option is one of making a U-turn at Schlagle Road across three lanes of traffic which is suicide. Or as an alternate putting in an access road in the cul-de-sac which still leaves you making a left turn across three lanes of traffic without the aid of a traffic signal.

Finally, it has come to our attention that the primary purpose for rebuilding and extending Maryland Route 205 may not even be for the average citizens, but rather for those wealthy influential developers and landowners who want to develop property along the new highway.

We feel that a stronger study needs to be done and that other options need to be taken into consideration. Preferably one that does not interfere with a residential area. Until further studies are performed and other options presented we feel that at this time a "No-build" situation exists.

Thank you in advance for your consideration in this matter. We would hope to hear from you at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,



Mr. & Mrs. Randall A. Simmons

1. See response p. V-7

147

bcc: Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Mr. John D. Bruck
Mr. John M. Contestabile

Honorable Richard H. Trainor

3

Identical letter sent to:

Commissioner Murray D. Levy
Commissioner Nancy J. Stefton
Commissioner Thomas Mac Middleton
Honorable Barbara A. Mikulski
Honorable James C. Simpson
Honorable John R. Wood, Jr.
Honorable Michael J. Sprague
Honorable Paul S. Sarbanes
Honorable Roy Dyson
Honorable Samuel C. Linton
Honorable Thomas V. "Mike" Miller, Jr.
Mr. Edward Meehan
Mr. Hal Kassoff
Mr. Michael Rothenheber
Mr. Neil J. Pedersen
Mr. Victor Janata

148

V-64

PROJECT
DEVELOPMENT
DIV.

MDCT
PG



Maryland Department of Transportation

The Secretary's Office

William Donald Schaefer
Governor
Richard H. Trainor
Secretary
Stephen G. Zentz
Deputy Secretary

APR 5 9 03 AM '90
109 Indian Lane
Waldorf, Maryland 20601
March 20, 1990

Honorable William D. Schaefer
Governor of Maryland
State House
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

April 17, 1990

Dear Governor Schaefer:

We are requesting your assistance in the matter of the expansion of Mattawoman-Beantown Road, Maryland Route 205. Contract Number: CH 566-151-571.

After attending a meeting held February 26, 1990, at Thomas Stone High School by the State Highway Commission, we were left with the impression that this highway was being built regardless of what the community thought about it or what impact such a major highway would have on the people living in the area. It leaves us to wonder what this task force was looking at when they drew up the plans for this road system.

The need for better and safer roads in the Charles County area is needed, no doubt about that. Anyone driving down 301 at rush hour knows exactly what a nightmare our road system is. However, the need for a 6-lane highway through a residential area at Maryland Route 205 is not an answer to this problem.

It appears that the State Highway Commission has taken over this project and it is not an issue that Charles County has any control over any longer; that the people who live in this area really do not have a choice. We disagree. The people who live in this area - must live with whatever havoc the State puts on us and that gives us the right to choose and voice our objections.

Although a 4-lane highway was mentioned, the 6-lane highway was presented as the only option justified as "think big - don't build small so that in 20 years we need to rebuild." That is all well and good but how can you justify not changing the intersection at Route 301 and Maryland Route 205, and how can you justify taking 6 lanes and narrowing it down to 4 lanes "creating a bottleneck of traffic" because you do not want to affect the shopping center? What about the people who live on the road - why is the "consideration" not of the people but of the shopping center?

The fact that the point of the intersection at Maryland Route 205 and 301 is one of the highest accident points in the State of Maryland may be true, but if this is true why is this high accident intersection remaining unchanged? The accident rate has increased in this particular area mainly after a shopping center was built on the corner. The same corner that is not going to be changed with the construction of the new road. Now tell us this

Mr. and Mrs. Randall A. Simmons
109 Indian Lane
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Simmons:

Governor William Donald Schaefer asked me to thank you for your recent letter regarding the ongoing planning study for improvements to MD 205 (Mattawoman-Beantown Road) in Waldorf. The Governor also asked me to respond to you directly.

It appears your letter to the Governor and my response to your earlier letter crossed in the mail. I hope my March 26th letter to you adequately addressed your concerns. If you have any questions please don't hesitate to contact Mr. Neil Pedersen, Director of Planning and Preliminary Engineering. Mr. Pedersen may be reached at 333-1110.

Thank you for sharing your concerns.

Sincerely,

Richard H. Trainor
Secretary

RHT/1

cc: The Honorable William Donald Schaefer
Mr. Hal Kassoff

My telephone number is (301) 859-7197
TTY For the Deaf: (301) 684-6919

Post Office Box 8755, Baltimore/Washington International Airport, Maryland 21240-0755

149

- taking the scenario of the existing 2-lane road and making it 6-lanes, narrowing down to the existing 4-lanes at the same high accident intersection and not changing anything about the high accident intersection, wouldn't logic dictate that the rate of accidents is only going to increase, not decrease. Wouldn't a better plan be one of which dealt with the intersection first - then in later studies see what would be needed and beneficial to the community.

The "safety" issue has not been mentioned. How safe will it be to live in a house directly on this 6-lane highway? What of the small children which live in these housing developments? How will this affect children getting on and off the school bus? How will their lives be affected by the increased volume of traffic? How is the increase in speeding vehicles going to be controlled?

Next, as a resident of Mattawoman Estates, Indian Lane, we feel that the magnitude of losing the right of way into our housing development needs to be looked into further. Without direct access into our subdivision, our only option is one of making a U-turn at Schlagle Road across three lanes of traffic which is suicide. Or as an alternate putting in an access road in the cul-de-sac which still leaves you making a left turn across three lanes of traffic without the aid of a traffic signal.

Finally, it has come to our attention that the primary purpose for rebuilding and extending Maryland Route 205 may not even be for the average citizens, but rather for those wealthy influential developers and landowners who want to develop property along the new highway.

We feel that a stronger study needs to be done and that other options need to be taken into consideration. Preferably one that does not interfere with a residential area. Until further studies are performed and other options presented we feel that at this time a "No-build" situation exists.

Thank you in advance for your consideration in this matter. We would hope to hear from you at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

Mr. & Mrs. Randall A. Simmons

Mr. & Mrs. Randall A. Simmons

150

PROCESSED
DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION



Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

Richard H. Trainor
Secretary
Hal Kassoff
Administrator

STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS

Contract No. CH 566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman/Beantown Road
Existing MD 5 to US 301
Location/Design Public Hearing
Monday, February 26, 1990 @ 7:30 p.m.

May 18, 1990

Re: Contract No. 566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman-Beantown Road
PDXS No. 082039

NAME MR. AND MRS. JAMES E. ROCHE DATE 3/15/90

PLEASE PRINT ADDRESS Rt. 205, Box 201

CITY/TOWN Waldorf STATE MD ZIP CODE 20601

I/We wish to comment or inquire about the following aspects of this project:

WE are very much OPPOSED to a large highway especially a 6-lane. We have resided on Rt. 205 (4 houses N of Longwood on one acre) for 20 yrs.; we are retired and on fixed income. We FEAR relocation! We are very much concerned the State will not pay enough to relocate our home or lot equal to present. I have worked my whole life for my present home! If not relocated, the road most certainly will come closer to us. The NOISE factor is another consideration. The heavy truck traffic is too much now! SPEED will be another worry. Traffic goes 50 mph now in a 40 mph zone. Faster speeds for larger highways equals more accidents and deaths. Although there is backup, it does move continually and traffic clears. Why widen a road to 6 lanes only 2 miles long that takes 3 minutes to travel just so there is congestion at either end (Hurry Up And Wait is not the answer)! Big road and small exits make no sense! Neither does spending \$12 million more for 2 additional lanes. Gov. Shafer says we are spending too much now--why throw money away? ALSO, east-siders must be able to cross over to go south (80% of time, we turn left out of our driveway.) If a 4-lane is constructed, we DO NOT WANT a grassy median. Residents do not want U-turns. It is not fair to take more land than needed to have a median that seldom gets mowed and create headaches for residents. We are TAXPAYERS too. Make a middle turn lane but absolutely no median strip!!! SUGGESTION: Why not just construct road on open land east of Rt. 205 (behind residences) and over wetlands?

Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List.*

Please delete my/our name(s) from the Mailing List.

*Persons who have received a copy of this brochure through the mail are already on the project Mailing List.

Mr. and Mrs. James E. Roche
Route 205, Box 201
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Roche:

Thank you for your recent letter opposing proposed improvements to MD 205 that are currently under study.

Based on a review of the study alternatives in front of your home, we would only have to acquire some frontage from your property. You would not be relocated.

The proposed improvements would accommodate the increasing commuter traffic, as well as turning movements into and out of the residentially zoned land adjacent to the road. In effect, the third lane in each direction would serve as a turning lane. The ultimate highway improvements are envisioned as a boulevard with a number of traffic signals at existing and future public street intersections. The existing 40 mph speed limit would remain.

If the outcome of our study is a build solution, the engineering phase would involve the detailed design of a roadway alternate, including improvement of intersection movements at MD 5, and an interchange option at US 301. While the MD 205 project is not programmed for construction, the widening of US 301 to six through lanes is scheduled to begin this year.

A five-lane curbed roadway with a continuous center left-turn lane was studied and presented in the initial study stage (Alternate 2). It was dropped from further consideration because of the high accident rate associated with this type roadway. Existing MD 205 has a higher accident rate than the statewide average for similar type roads. The proposed improvement would significantly reduce that rate. The median would act as a safety zone for any pedestrians or vehicles at median openings. Crossing or turning left on the highway. Gaps in the highway traffic would be more likely to occur with more lanes.

My telephone number is (301) 333-1105

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
383-7555 Baltimore Metro - 565-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5062 Statewide Toll Free
707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

Mr. and Mrs. James E. Roche
Page Two

Your suggestion to relocate MD 205 to the east would result in many new stream and wetland crossings, and impact many more acres of wetland. For these reasons, we are proposing alternatives that make use of the existing highway corridor.

Your opposition to any of the roadway build alternates has been noted and will be considered in the determination of an alternate. Your name has been added to the project mailing list, so you will be kept informed of any future decisions made on this project. Thank you again for identifying your position.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Deputy Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

By: Victor Janata
Victor Janata, Project Manager
Project Planning Division

LHS:VJ:as

cc: Mr. Edward H. Meehan

159

89-A

STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS

Contract No. CH 566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman/Beantown Road
Existing MD 5 to US 301
Location/Design Public Hearing
Monday, February 26, 1990 @ 7:30 p.m.



Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

Richard H. Trainor
Secretary
Hal Kassoff
Administrator

April 11, 1990

Re: Contract No. CH566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman-Beantown Road
PDMS No.082039

NAME Louise E. Flesher DATE Mar. 17, 1990

PLEASE PRINT ADDRESS 14103 S. Springfield Road

CITY/TOWN Brandywine STATE Maryland ZIP CODE 20613

I/We wish to comment or inquire about the following aspects of this project:

I have received in the mail your proposed
MD 5 Relocation and I have no objection to your
building your Route 205. What I do object to is
your proposal to disturb the graves of people that are
buried there. I have owned cemetery lots at Trinity
for 30 years 12 years ago November 1977 I buried my
husband in the very section of the cemetery you want
to relocate I think that it is a disgrace when you
have alternatives such as alternate 5/6 modified which
would cost the taxpayers less money. My family has
8 graves in the very section you want to disturb.
It seems that now there is no place sacred to the
government. You have to bury or cremate your loved
ones but then the highway admin can come in a dig
them up and move them to a gravel pit what
would you feel if it was your loved ones.

Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List.*

Please delete my/our name(s) from the Mailing List.

*Persons who have received a copy of this brochure through the mail are already on the project Mailing List.

Ms. Louise E. Flesher
14103 S. Springfield Road
Brandywine, Maryland 20613

Dear Ms. Flesher:

Thank you for your recent letter opposing impacts to the Trinity Memorial Gardens Cemetery as the result of improvement studies for MD 205.

It is unfortunate that there is a misunderstanding about our intentions regarding the cemetery. We are charged with developing alternate solutions to transportation problems and documenting the impacts that would result. One of the build alternates presented at the February 26th public hearing, Segment II - Alternate 5/6, does impact cemetery graves. The other alternate presented that night, Segment II - Alternate 5/6 Modified, does not impact any graves. We have not reached any decisions regarding the desirability of either alternate.

Your opposition to disturbing any graves has been noted and will be considered in the development of our team recommendation. Thank you again for identifying your position.

Your name(s) has been added to or verified to be on the project mailing list, so that you will be kept informed of any decisions reached on the MD 205 study.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Deputy Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

by:

Victor F. Janata
Victor F. Janata
Project Manager
Project Planning Division

LHE:VFJ:kw

cc: Mr. Edward H. Meehan

My telephone number is (301) 333-1105

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
383-7555 Baltimore Metro - 565-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5082 Statewide Toll Free
707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT DIVISION



Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration

Richard H. Trainor Secretary Hal Kassoff Administrator

STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS

Mar 21 2 21 PM '90

April 11, 1990

Contract No. CH 588-151-571 Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205) Mattawoman/Beantown Road Existing MD 5 to US 301 Location/Design Public Hearing Monday, February 26, 1990 @ 7:30 p.m.

Re: Contract No. CH566-151-571 Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205) Mattawoman-Beantown Road PDMS No.082039

Ms. Patricia Mae Strader Route 2 Box 179Y Indian Head, Maryland 20640

Dear Ms. Strader:

Thank you for your recent letter opposing impacts to the Trinity Memorial Gardens Cemetery as the result of improvement studies for MD 205.

It is unfortunate that there is a misunderstanding about our intentions regarding the cemetery. We are charged with developing alternate solutions to transportation problems and documenting the impacts that would result. One of the build alternates presented at the February 26th public hearing, Segment II - Alternate 5/6, does impact cemetery graves. The other alternate presented that night, Segment II - Alternate 5/6 Modified, does not impact any graves. We have not reached any decisions regarding the desirability of either alternate.

Your opposition to disturbing any graves has been noted and will be considered in the development of our team recommendation. Thank you again for identifying your position.

Your name(s) has been added to or verified to be on the project mailing list, so that you will be kept informed of any decisions reached on the MD 205 study.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr. Deputy Director Office of Planning and Preliminary Engineering

by: Victor F. Janata Project Manager Project Planning Division

LHE:VFJ:kw cc: Mr. Edward H. Meehan

My telephone number is (301) 333-1105

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech 363-7555 Baltimore Metro - 565-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5082 Statewide Toll Free

PLEASE PRINT

NAME Patricia Mae Strader DATE Mar. 23, 1990

ADDRESS Rt 2 Box 179Y

CITY/TOWN Ind. Head STATE Md. ZIP CODE 20640

I/We wish to comment or inquire about the following aspects of this project:

I really don't think my children nor myself could handle going thru their dad's (my husband) their brothers their Granddads and the aunt's and Uncles Graves being disturbed. It's unkind to even think about it - when all you have to do is move a few houses on the other side of the road -

Mr. Victor Janata Room 506 707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, MD. 21203

Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List.

Please delete my/our name(s) from the Mailing List.

*Persons who have received a copy of this brochure through the mail are already on the project Mailing List.

1. See response p. V-3

154

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT DIVISION



Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration

Richard H. Trainor Secretary Hal Kassoff Administrator

STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS

Feb 28 9 37 AM '90

Contract No. CH 566-151-571 Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205) Mattawoman/Beantown Road Existing MD 5 to US 301 Location/Design Public Hearing Monday, February 28, 1990 @ 7:30 p.m.

April 11, 1990 Re: Contract No. CH566-151-571 Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205) Mattawoman-Beantown Road PDMS No.082039

Mr. Charles F. Mathews P.O. Box 36 Bryans Road, Maryland 20616

Dear Mr. Mathews:

Thank you for your recent letter opposing impacts to the Trinity Memorial Gardens Cemetery as the result of improvement studies for MD 205.

It is unfortunate that there is a misunderstanding about our intentions regarding the cemetery. We are charged with developing alternate solutions to transportation problems and documenting the impacts that would result. One of the build alternates presented at the February 26th public hearing, Segment II - Alternate 5/6, does impact cemetery graves. The other alternate presented that night, Segment II - Alternate 5/6 Modified, does not impact any graves. We have not reached any decisions regarding the desirability of either alternate.

Your opposition to disturbing any graves has been noted and will be considered in the development of our team recommendation. Thank you again for identifying your position.

Your name(s) has been added to or verified to be on the project mailing list, so that you will be kept informed of any decisions reached on the MD 205 study.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr. Deputy Director Office of Planning and Preliminary Engineering

by: Victor F. Janata Victor F. Janata Project Manager Project Planning Division

LHE:VFJ:kw cc: Mr. Edward H. Meehan

My telephone number is (301) 333-1105

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech 363-7555 Baltimore Metro - 565-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5082 Statewide Toll Free 707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

NAME CHARLES F. MATHEWS DATE 3-25-90

PLEASE PRINT ADDRESS P.O. Box 36

CITY/TOWN BRYANS Rd STATE Md ZIP CODE 20616

I/We wish to comment or inquire about the following aspects of this project:

I think it's a shame when the State can't plan for roads and housing better and far enough in advance so country's don't have to be disturbed. Leave the Country alone but those people take a little longer to travel between pt #5 and 3.1.

Mr. Victor Janata Room 506

707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, MD. 21203

Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List.*

Please delete my/our name(s) from the Mailing List.

*Persons who have received a copy of this brochure through the mail are already on the project Mailing List.

1. See response p. V-3

155

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT



Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

Richard H. Trainor
Secretary
Hal Kassoff
Administrator

STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS

April 11, 1990

Contract No. CH 586-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman/Beantown Road
Existing MD 5 to US 301
Location/Design Public Hearing
Monday, February 26, 1990 @ 7:30 p.m.

Re: Contract No. CH566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman-Beantown Road
PDMS No.082039

Mr. & Mrs. Earl Mathews
Box 4 N. Mathews Road
Bryans Road, Maryland 20616

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Mathews:

Thank you for your recent letter opposing impacts to the Trinity Memorial Gardens Cemetery as the result of improvement studies for MD 205.

It is unfortunate that there is a misunderstanding about our intentions regarding the cemetery. We are charged with developing alternate solutions to transportation problems and documenting the impacts that would result. One of the build alternates presented at the February 26th public hearing, Segment II - Alternate 5/6, does impact cemetery graves. The other alternate presented that night, Segment II - Alternate 5/6 Modified, does not impact any graves. We have not reached any decisions regarding the desirability of either alternate.

Your opposition to disturbing any graves has been noted and will be considered in the development of our team recommendation. Thank you again for identifying your position.

Your name(s) has been added to or verified to be on the project mailing list, so that you will be kept informed of any decisions reached on the MD 205 study.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Deputy Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

by: Victor Janata
Victor F. Janata
Project Manager
Project Planning Division

LHE:VFJ:kw
cc: Mr. Edward H. Meehan

My telephone number is (301) 333-1105

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
383-7555 Baltimore Metro - 585-0451 O.C. Metro - 1-800-482-5082 Statewide Toll Free
707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

PLEASE PRINT

NAME Mr. & Mrs. Earl Mathews DATE 3/2/90
ADDRESS BOX 4 N. MATHEWS RD.
CITY/TOWN BRYANS RD. STATE VMD. ZIP CODE 20616

If we wish to comment or inquire about the following aspects of this project:

MY HUSBAND + I ARE VERY UPSET ABOUT THIS HIGHWAY THAT IS SUPPOSED TO GO THROUGH TRINITY GARDENS CEMENTARY. WE HAVE ONE BOY BURIED THERE. WE WENT THROUGH A VERY GRIEVING TIME WHEN HE DIED. WE STILL GET VERY UPSET AT TIMES. THIS WHAT YOU ARE GOING TO DO WOULD TEAR US UP. WE DO NOT WANT OUR SON'S GRAVE TAKEN UP. IT WOULD BE LIKE LIVING THIS TRAGEDY ALL OVER AGAIN. I THINK THAT IT IS WRONG TO TAKE UP THESE GRAVES AND I KNOW OTHER PEOPLE FEEL THE SAME WAY. IT'S A BEAUTIFUL CEMENTARY & A BEAUTIFUL PLACE TO BUIRE OUR LOVED ONES. HIS MY HUSBAND MUM, DAD, BROTHERS & NEPHEW ARE BURIED THERE. PLEASE CONSIDER PEOPLES FEELINGS & HURTES.

Mr. Victor Janata Room 506
707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, MD. 21203
 Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List.*
 Please delete my/our name(s) from the Mailing List.

*Persons who have received a copy of this brochure through the mail are already on the project mailing list.

1. See response p. V-3

156

V-72

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT DIV.

APR 21 3 34 PM '90

STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS

Contract No. CH 566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman/Beantown Road
Existing MD 5 to US 301
Location/Design Public Hearing
Monday, February 28, 1990 @ 7:30 p.m.

Re: Contract No. CH566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman-Beantown Road
PDMS No.082039



Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

Richard H. Trainor
Secretary
Hal Kassoff
Administrator

April 11, 1990

NAME BARRY & Patricia Hill DATE 3/3/90

PLEASE PRINT ADDRESS 5 N. Mathews Rd

CITY/TOWN Bryans Road STATE M.D. ZIP CODE 20616

I/We wish to comment or inquire about the following aspects of this project:

I do not feel it right to build a highway right through a cemetery. It is totally unnecessary and other alternatives should be done to avoid disrupting the grave sites. This will cause much pain to the families concerned. All of my family members are buried at Trinity and most importantly, my son is buried there, and I will do everything in my power to stop this highway from going through the cemetery. Please understand, it was hard enough to have to bury our son the first time. I don't know if I could take having to do it twice.

Sincerely,

Patricia Hill

Mr. Victor Janata Room 506
707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, MD. 21203

Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List.*

Please delete my/our name(s) from the Mailing List.

*Persons who have received a copy of this brochure through the mail are already on the project Mailing List.

Mr. & Mrs. Barry Hill
5 N. Mathews Road
Bryans Road, Maryland 20616

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Hill:

Thank you for your recent letter opposing impacts to the Trinity Memorial Gardens Cemetery as the result of improvement studies for MD 205.

It is unfortunate that there is a misunderstanding about our intentions regarding the cemetery. We are charged with developing alternate solutions to transportation problems and documenting the impacts that would result. One of the build alternates presented at the February 26th public hearing, Segment II - Alternate 5/6, does impact cemetery graves. The other alternate presented that night, Segment II - Alternate 5/6 Modified, does not impact any graves. We have not reached any decisions regarding the desirability of either alternate.

Your opposition to disturbing any graves has been noted and will be considered in the development of our team recommendation. Thank you again for identifying your position.

Your name(s) has been added to or verified to be on the project mailing list, so that you will be kept informed of any decisions reached on the MD 205 study.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Deputy Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

by: Victor Janata
Victor F. Janata
Project Manager
Project Planning Division

LHE:VFJ:kw
cc: Mr. Edward H. Meehan

My telephone number is (301) 333-1105

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
383-7555 Baltimore Metro - 565-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5062 Statewide Toll Free



Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

Richard H. Trainor
Secretary
Hal Kassoff
Administrator

STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS

Contract No. CH 566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman/Beantown Road
Existing MD 5 to US 301
Location/Design Public Hearing
Monday, February 26, 1990 @ 7:30 p.m.

April 11, 1990

Re: Contract No. CH566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman-Beantown Road
PDMS No.082039

PLEASE PRINT NAME Betty L. Flesher DATE 3/16/90
ADDRESS 29 Moran Drive
CITY/TOWN Waldorf STATE MD ZIP CODE 20601

I/We wish to comment or inquire about the following aspects of this project:

Taking the cemetery sites.
Based on the information I read in your booklet
it would seem the most feasible alternative for
both now and the future would be for Segment
I Alternate 6 and Segment II Alternate 5/6 Modified
Using Segment I Alternate 6 would help
the future to eliminate construction at MD205/
MD5 intersection. With the businesses located
at and near this intersection plus the extreme
way to St. Charles this area is already
congested during rush hours. Future building in
this area will only make things worse.
Using Segment II Alternate 5/6 modified will
not interfere with the cemetery. As someone who
has a family member buried in this area, I feel
that taking the cemetery would be a traumatic
experience for everyone concerned. The right side of
the cemetery is mainly babies. It is hard enough
to lose a child but then to have the state

Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List.* (Out'd)
 Please delete my/our name(s) from the Mailing List.

*Persons who have received a copy of this brochure through the mail are already on the project Mailing List.

Ms. Betty L. Flesher
29 Moran Drive
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dear Ms. Flesher:

Thank you for your recent letter in favor of Segment I, Alternate 6 and Segment II, Alternate 5/6 Modified for the project planning study of MD 205. Giving your preferences and the reasoning behind those choices are appreciated. They will be considered in the development of team recommendations.

Thank you also for the petition against impacts to the Trinity Memorial Gardens Cemetery. Most of the names were decipherable and have been added to the project mailing list. Everyone will be kept informed of any decisions reached on the MD 205 study.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Deputy Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

by: Victor F. Janata
Victor F. Janata
Project Manager
Project Planning Division

LHE:VFJ:kw

cc: Mr. Edward H. Meehan

My telephone number is (301) 333-1105

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
383-7555 Baltimore Metro - 585-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-482-5092 Statewide Toll Free
707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

158

come in and disinter these sites plus the other sites would only add to continued grief of all those concerned.

I trust you will take this letter into consideration and put yourself in the place of those concerned.

Thank you
Betty A. Hlesker

March 18, 1990

Maryland Dept. of Transportation
State Highway Administration
Office of Planning &
Preliminary Engineering
Box 717
Baltimore, MD 21203

Subject: Proposed MD Route 5 Relocated (MD 205)

We, the below undersigned, protest the proposed widening for Route 205 (Mattawoman - Beantown Road) which would involve displacing 1,500 grave sites.

With one hundred twenty five people already buried in this historical site, we feel that other measures could be taken to assure that the rights and wishes of the deceased and their families could be granted, and that the Trinity Memorial Gardens would remain unmarred.

Name	Address	Phone Number
Betty Fleck	29 Maan Dr. Waldorf Md. 20601	9-32-8720 ✓
Tam Ryncey	P.O. Box 537, Charlotte Hall, Md 20622	884-0392 * ✓
Wanda Burns	P.O. Box 475, Charlotte Hall, MD 20622	884-880 ✓ ✓
David A. Duma	3321-C1 Hunting Sq Dr. Temple Hills MD	20748 630-1149 * ✓
(relative) Mary Jensen	350 Cedar Hill Courthouse Rd 21032	301-923-3562 ✓
Jan Brown	12428 Mellin L. Brown, Md 20715 (301) 262-6312	* ✓
Francis J. Kellum	301 Arlington Dr. La Plata, Md. 20646	✓
Margaret Kays	82 Copkey Ave. Ws. Hvt Md 20622	✓
Robert E. Fisher	14035 Springfield Rd. Brandywine, Md. 20613	782-725 ✓
George Wayne Schultz	P.O. Box 2303 La Plata Md.	✓
Sally Keatt	P.O. Box 601 Mecha. Md. 20659	✓
Maria Madourelasiu	P.O. Box 601 Mecha. Md. 20659	✓
Jeff Kanner	La Plata, MD.	* ✓

* = unable to understand name or incomplete address

160

Name

Address

Phone Number

Mary P. A. Corbett * LAPIATA, Md. *
 David W. Woolford LAPIATA MD 932-6553 *
 Francis Mento 2922000 Dr. W. W. of Md. 415-5011 *
 Lester T. Felt Pataky, Chile, Poland 902-6692 *
 Mary Nellie 96 Acres Wood Dr 843-7531 *
 Edward J. Murphy RT 2 BOX 589 9358774 *
 Linda Quirk 14. Shepton Ave. 843-3808 ✓
 Sandy Payne 1392 Redwood C. R. LAPIATA MD 934-8576 ✓
 David Stafford 803 Belfort Rd 843-3893 ✓
 Samuel Humber 3613 OSBORN CT. 843-9839 *
 Charles D. DeHaven Waldorf Md. 645-2271 *
 Charles D. Sweeney RT-2 Box 495 White Plains 934-8037. ✓
 John R. Kern 881 OXFORD CT. WALDORF 645-5137 ✓
 Robert Palko P.O. Box 632 White Plains MD. 645-5137 *
 Joseph W. Sullivan RT1 BOX 15A BILLINGSLEY RD WHITE PLAINS MD 20695.
 Eucra P. Sullivan RT1 BOX 15A BILLINGSLEY RD WHITE PLAINS MD 843-1895 ✓
 Sergio E. Sullivan RT1 Box 15A BILLINGSLEY RD WHITE PLAINS MD 843-1895 ✓
 Frances E. Long 25 Jorgens Rd. Beltsville Md. 753-6710 ✓
 Hilda Farrell 3916 Park Ct Temple Hills Md. ✓
 Ina Anderson 2076 Claring Cross Ct. Waldorf 645-3014 ✓
 DAVID C. Torpless 2076 Claring Cross Ct. Waldorf 645-3014 ✓
 Donna Nolan Rt. 2 Box 537, White Plains, Md. 932-0308 ✓
 Stephen Nolan Rt. 2 Box 537, White Plains, Md. 932-0308 ✓
 Nazim A. Khan RFL Box 123 Charlotte Hall Md
 Karen Fulkell RT1 BOX 63 White Plains, MD 843689

* = unable to understand name or incomplete address

March 17, 1990

Maryland Dept. of Transportation
State Highway Administration
Office of Planning &
Preliminary Engineering
Box 717
Baltimore, MD 21203

Subject: Proposed MD Route 5 Relocated (MD 205)

We, the below undersigned, protest the proposed widening for Route 205 (Mattawoman - Beantown Road) which would involve displacing 1,500 grave sites.

With one hundred twenty five people already buried in this historical site, we feel that other measures could be taken to assure that the rights and wishes of the deceased and their families could be granted, and that the Trinity Memorial Gardens would remain unmarred.

<u>Name</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Phone Number</u>
Richard T. Flasher	1410 1/2 South Spring Hill Rd. Grandywine Md 20813	372-6606 ✓
Christopher J. Hayes	6111 Topic Pl. Waldorf Md.	20103 645-2142
Bethesda Hall	2708 Riverwood Dr Waldorf Md	645-7841 ✓
William R. McHugh	2708 Riverwood Dr Waldorf	645-7841 ✓
Theresa A. Casner	55 Ell Lane Waldorf	645-9524 ✓
Elizabeth Baarsger	2405 Pinfield Rd Waldorf	843-6229 ✓
Elizabeth Gallagher	2708 Riverwood Waldorf	645-7841 ✓
Paul F. Gallagher	2708 Riverwood Waldorf	645-7841 ✓
Richard W. King	1113 Harvest Rd Waldorf	932-3742 ✓
Don Tyler	2362 Turkey Hill Rd LaVista	932-1756 ✓
Mark Flasher	of PO Box 92 Mechanicsville, MD 20659	504-8402 ✓
Esther & Ruby Dudley	19000 Meadows Dr. Indian Hill Md.	375-9057 ✓
Stannis C. Flasher	3813 Oak St. Old Bay Md.	20714 455-7326 ✓

* = unable to understand name or incomplete address

199

Name	Address	Phone Number
Barbara Anderson	Rt. 1 Box	843-6809 ✓
Bob Anderson	same	" " ✓
George Long	25 Jonquil Pl. Indian Head Md	753-6780 ✓
Mark C Stewart	Rt 2 Box 252 Pomfret	206-46 832-1092 ✓
Edw. L Stewart	" " "	" " ✓
Dorothy Shaver	Rt 4 Box 4344 La Plata Md	" " ✓
Ely Hall Nally	Rt. I Box 6A White Plains Md	" " ✓
Robert Nally	Rt. Box 6A White Plains Md	" " ✓
William F. McEwen	1010 FLOYD DR. WALDORF, MD 20602	" " ✓
J. L. Payne	Rt. I Box 728 WANTED MEX MD 20662	" " ✓
Richard Trapp	707 Brandon Cir - Waldorf Md 20601	" " ✓
Greg [unclear]	151 U. FFA Dr. DEER NEWBURY Md *	" " ✓
Arnell Anderson	151 Clifton Pl. Newbury Md 20647	" " ✓
Terry [unclear]	2621 Annapolis Ln. Laurel Md 2715 *	" " ✓
Jim [unclear]	1205 GARDEN AVE. CHARLOTTE MD 20733 *	" " ✓

* - unable to understand name or incomplete address

Name

Address

Phone Number

Name	Address	Phone Number
Dolores Hogan	204 Bucknell Rd Bryans Rd Md	375-7125 ✓
Ellen A. Hill	14103 Springfield Rk Prandyune Md	372-6606 *
Alison Alister	3813 Parkhurst N Baltimore Md	855-7396

V-80

1. See reponse p. V-3

1669

Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration



PROJECT
DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION

MAR 15 2 53 PM '90

April 4, 1990



Chaney
Enterprises

March 12, 1990

Mr. Neil J. Pedersen
Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering
State Highway Administration
P.O. Box 717
Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

Dear Mr. Pedersen:

With respect to the proposed Maryland Route 5 relocated (MD 205) project I would like to make the following comments as the corporate representative of Waldorf Restaurant, Inc.

Segment I: Alternate 6 we feel would be preferable because of the ever increasing through traffic to St. Mary's County. This alternate presents the opportunity to solve the through traffic problem for the long-term. Alternate 5 will result in continued and worsening stacking along Route 5.

Segment II: We have no preferred alternate but do need the continuation of a crossover for the existing truck traffic. We would like to keep the crossover to the Charles County Concrete property at its present location because of cost consideration but would certainly be willing to work with you in achieving the most desirable ultimate location.

Segment III: ^{SUB-STATION, ROVAL OPTION} Alternate 2 or 3 is preferred of the ones described at the presentation. We would also like to suggest a 4th alternative as per the attached sketch. We feel each of these, particularly the new proposal creates the best traffic flow for the neighboring Pinefield community. Given the likelihood of the nearby overpass to the existing community entrance and the increased commercial nature of the area we feel the creation of an additional traffic flow option would best service the community.

Mr. Francis H. Chaney, II
Vice President/General Manager
Chaney Enterprises
Post Office Box 548
Waldorf, Maryland 20604

Dear Mr. Chaney:

Thank you for your March 12th letter concerning the project planning study for MD 205.

Your preferences for some alternates/options and opposition to others are noted and will be considered in the development of the project planning team recommendation. Your suggestions for new or revised alternates are being evaluated, and the project manager, Victor Janata, will contact you to discuss them. He will also address crossover locations along MD 205 for entrances to the Charles County Concrete properties.

I am forwarding your suggestions for Western Parkway connection alignments adjacent to Interchange Option B to the Charles County Department of Planning and Growth Management for their review and comment.

Thank you again for your proposals for new alternates for the MD 205 project planning study. Your suggestions are appreciated.

Very truly yours,

Neil J. Pedersen

Neil J. Pedersen, Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

NJP:kw

cc: Mr. Roy E. Hancock
Mr. Edward H. Meehan
Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Mr. Anthony M. Capizzi
Mr. John D. Bruck
Mr. John Contestabile

My telephone number is (301) 333-1110

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
383-7555 Baltimore Metro - 565-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5082 Statewide Toll Free
707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

105


Mr. Neil J. Pedersen
March 12, 1990
Page 2

Interchange: Option B is our preference, followed by Option A. We are strongly opposed to Option C and D. We have also attached for your consideration a variation of Option B which we feel would be a viable alternative to the existing B Proposal. (Sketch Attached)

These comments are as brief as possible. They are made with objective of looking at traffic patterns for the entire area. If you would like to discuss any of these comments in more detail please feel free to call.

Sincerely,

CHANEY ENTERPRISES



Francis H. Chaney, II
Vice President/General Manager

P.S. I gave a copy of a Western Parkway Plan III Proposal to Victor Janata at the February 28 hearing on Maryland Route 5.

cc: Victor Janata

FCH,II:djm
Enclosures

(301) 645-5555

Waldorf MOTEL

20 UNITS

ON ROUTES 5 & 301

WALDORF, MARYLAND 20601



Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

Richard H. Trainor
Secretary
Hal Kassoff
Administrator

February 26, 1990

March 22, 1990

Neil J. Pedersen, Director
Office of Planning &
Preliminary Engineering
State Highway Administration
P.O. Box 717
Baltimore, MD 21203-0717

PROJECT
DEVELOPMENT
FEB 26 4 02 PM '90

Dear Sir:

We have been reviewing both the improvements proposed by the Maryland State Highway Administration and the Charles County Department of Public Works for the alignment of the Western Parkway. We feel that some of the alternatives that are proposed are damaging to property values, not only for the properties which we represent, but also to some of the other properties in the Waldorf area.

We are proposing for your consideration an alternative alignment. We, along with Lou Grasso, would be willing to donate the right of way for the alignment as shown.

Very truly yours,

WALDORF RESTAURANT, INC.

RECEIVED

FEB 28 1990

Francis H. Chaney, II

FHC, II:cmj

WALDORF, OFFICE OF
PLANNING & PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

Mr. Francis H. Chaney, II
Waldorf Restaurant, Inc.
Routes 5 and 301
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dear Mr. Chaney:

Thank you for your February 26th letter and mapping suggesting revisions to the proposed Western Parkway. While the State Highway Administration is reviewing plans being developed for the Western Parkway, I should clarify that this is a Charles County proposal and would not be a state highway. Our interest is primarily in its effect on US 301 at intersection points.

I understand that the Phase III segment is not finalized and the initial impacts to wetlands in the study area are generating additional roadway alignments. I have taken the liberty of forwarding a copy of your letter and alignment suggestions to the Charles County Department of Planning and Growth Management for their review and comment.

We will continue to coordinate with Charles County on the Western Parkway issue and revise our interchange options accordingly for the US 301/MD 205 intersection study. Thank you again for your initiative in generating a new study alignment for the Western Parkway.

Very truly yours,

Neil J. Pedersen

Neil J. Pedersen, Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

NJP/ih

cc: Mr. Roy E. Hancock
Mr. Edward H. Meehan
Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Mr. Anthony M. Capizzi
Mr. John D. Bruck

My telephone number is (301) 333-1110

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
383-7555 Baltimore Metro - 565-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-482-5082 Statewide Toll Free
707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

1. See response p. V-18

167



Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

Richard H. Trainor
Secretary
Hal Kassoff
Administrator

PROJECT
DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION

STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS

March 28, 1990

Re: Contract No. CH566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman-Beantown Road
PDMS No.082039

Contract No. CH 566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman/Beantown Road
Existing MD 5 to US 301
Location/Design Public Hearing
Monday, February 26, 1990 @ 7:30 p.m.

Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Scott
Route 2 Box 179Z
Indian Head, Maryland 20640

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Scott:

Thank you for your recent letter opposing impacts to the Trinity Memorial Gardens Cemetery as the result of improvement studies for MD 205.

It is unfortunate that there is a misunderstanding about our intentions regarding the cemetery. We are charged with developing alternate solutions to transportation problems and documenting the impacts that would result. One of the build alternates presented at the February 26th public hearing, Segment II - Alternate 5/6, does impact cemetery graves. The other alternate presented that night, Segment II - Alternate 5/6 Modified, does not impact any graves. We have not reached any decisions regarding the desirability of either alternate.

Your opposition to disturbing any graves has been noted and will be considered in the development of team recommendations. Thank you again for identifying your position.

Your names have been added to the project mailing list, so that you will be kept informed of any decisions reached on the MD 205 study.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Deputy Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

by: Victor F. Janata
Victor F. Janata
Project Manager
Project Planning Division

LHE:VFJ:as
cc: Mr. Edward H. Heehan

My telephone number is (301) 333-1105

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
383-7555 Baltimore Metro - 585-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5082 Statewide Toll Free
707 North Calvert St. Baltimore, Maryland 21202-0717

NAME Mr and Mrs Arthur Scott DATE Mar 1 / 90
PLEASE PRINT ADDRESS Rt 2 Box 179Z
CITY/TOWN Indian Hd STATE Md ZIP CODE 20640

I/We wish to comment or inquire about the following aspects of this project:

This is the most cruel thing I ever heard of it sounds like you would rather move the dead than move the nursery across the road

This would really be a most distressing thing to put on members of families

We are just starting to get ourselves together from putting our daughter there to say go there it again.

I travelled her another way to go to let his people rest in peace

A Concern mother & father and sister & brother

Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List.*

Please delete my/our name(s) from the Mailing List.

*Persons who have received a copy of this brochure through the mail are already on the project Mailing List.

1. See response p. V-3

108



Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

Secretary
Hal Kessoff
Administrator

June 27, 1990

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT
MAY 11 5 35 AM '90
May 9, 1990
Mrs. D. L. Shall
6217-Douglas Circle
Waldorf, Md. 20601

Mrs. Audrey L. Shall
6217 Douglas Circle
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dear Mrs. Shall:

Mr. Neil Pedersen asked me to thank you for your recent letter regarding the project planning study for MD 205. Mr. Pedersen also asked me to respond to you directly. Your support for the no-build alternate along MD 205 and Interchange Option D at US 301 will be taken into consideration in the decision-making process.

While I can sympathize with your apprehensions about increasing traffic along Mattawoman-Beantown Road (MD 205), this is a preferred route for much of the MD 5 through traffic. Volumes will continue to grow on this highway, with or without the improvements presented in our project planning study.

The resulting transportation problems will be congestion and accidents; not just at the existing US 301/MD 205 intersection, but all along the MD 205 corridor. We believe that through the study process, we have developed alternates that will relieve those problems. These include the reconstruction of the MD 205 roadway to a four-lane divided highway, as well as construction of an interchange to replace or augment the US 301/MD 205 intersection. The interchange would be justified in conjunction with additional capacity being provided along MD 205.

Your name has been added to the project mailing list so you will be kept informed of any future decisions made on this project. Thank you again for identifying your position on this study. We appreciate your participation in the project planning process.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Deputy Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

by:

Victor Janata
Victor Janata
Project Manager

LHE:VJ:kw

cc: Mr. Neil J. Pedersen
Mr. Edward H. Meehan

333-1105 or 1-800-548-5026
My telephone number is (301) _____

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
383-7555 Baltimore Metro - 545-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5082 Statewide Toll Free
707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

Mr. Neil J. Pedersen
Director, Office of Planning
& Preliminary Engineering
State Highway Administration
P.O. Box 517
Baltimore, Md. 21203-0717

Re: Proposal Md. 5 Relocated (Md. 205)

Dear Sir:

I support a no-build alternative regarding the widening of Rte. 205 (segments I, II and III). Widening the road will not alleviate congestion and will destroy the quality of life for the residents of Pinefield and the people living along Route 205.

I support the high quality inter-

169

II

change, Option D, to alleviate congestion at the intersection of U.S. Route 301 and Md. Route 205.

A high quality interchange is the most cost-effective solution to the developing congestion problem, and will preserve the quality of life in our community.

Sincerely
Mrs. Audrey L. Hall

THIS LETTER ALSO SENT TO THE FOLLOWING
WHO SUBMITTED THE IDENTICAL LETTER:

Marge and Robert Bouvier
2001 Mattawoman-Beantown Road
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Mr. Willis W. Travis
1706 Temi Drive
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Mr. George T. Swanson
4005 Brewster Lane
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Ms. Kathleen Swanson
4005 Brewster Lane
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dale G. and Jeanette B. Albright
1324 Harwich Drive
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Mr. Phillip E. Wallace
806 Truro Court
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Ms. Barbara J. Wise
6010 Suzanne Road
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Mr. Thomas E. Mc Conell
2902 Sandwich Drive
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Ms. Brenda H. Colegrove
4624 Harwich Drive
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

John M. and Karen L. Carrier
3438 Williamsburg Drive
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Timothy F. and Cheryl A. Poole
3712 Onset Lane
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Mr. Lloyd P. Janssen
2528 Lisa Drive
Waldorf, Maryland 20601-3368

Everett L. and Julia A. Kline
5305 Doris Drive
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Maj. and Mrs. Philip W. Budenbender
5308 Doris Drive
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Charles M. and Jeanne R. Zell
4212 Sandwich Circle
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Ms. Patricia Zalesak
5309 Doris Drive
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Benton and Velma Royer
4203 Sandwich Circle
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Thelma M. and Francis C. Eagen
5702 Lynn Circle
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Mr. Michael J. Phelan
907 Truro Lane
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Mr. Robert T. Wells
1405 Harwich Circle
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Mr. Herbert G. Laucks
2511 Lisa Drive
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Ms. Linda Nowak
5910 Michael Road
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Ms. Lydia A. McConnell
902 Truro Lane
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Frazier C. White and Carol Mona
4623 Harwich Drive
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Joe and Lois Sovey
2104 Dennis Road
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Mr. Sam R. Steiner
4207 Sandwich Circle
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Thomas and Sarah J. Gibson
4403 Cotuit Circle
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

172

88-A

Mike and Barbara Giannini
5918 Michael Road
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Ms. Catherine W. Snyder
5018 Nicholas Road
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Mrs. Sandy Ball
1409 Harwich Circle
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Mr. Jim Starnes
1901 Michael Road
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Mr. Hubert W. Lafleur, Jr.
4614 Harwich Drive
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Mr. Joseph M. Proctor
3501 Lisa Lane
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Mr. and Mrs. Robert C. Sohl
3806 Brewster Circle
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

James and Shirley Long
5102 Alfred Drive
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Mr. Terry Hays
1734 Temi Drive
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Ms. Pamela Henry
2109 Dennis Road
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Mr. and Mrs. Robert Oberti
1034 Country Lane
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

W. B. and Cynthia Sigafoose
4514 Orleans Lane
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Ms. Elisabeth Hunsaker
4615 Harwich Drive
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Mrs. Philip W. Wade
1714 Temi Drive
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Ms. Joan C. Hartzfeld
6205 Douglas Court
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Mrs. Randall Sapp
2225 Pinefield Way
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Ms. Molly Ward
3203 Pinefield Circle
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Ms. Suzanne R. Denton
3213 Pinefield Circle
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Mr. and Mrs. B. C. Dorsey
3209 Pinefield Circle
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Mr. Brian C. Dorsey, Jr.
3209 Pinefield Circle
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Mr. John A. Ward
3203 Pinefield Circle
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Ms. Genevieve R. Gallagher
6317 Josephine Road
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Ms. Sharon K. Shew
P.O. Box 462
White Plains, Maryland 20695

Jill and John Norris
3403 Lisa Circle
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Edward M. and Mary Jane Frohlich
4407 Cotuit Circle
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Milton and Vivian Truxon
2664 Pinewood Drive
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Ms. Candice M. Lundin
4629 Harwich Drive
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Ms. Liza A. Barrier
4301 Sandwich Court
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

06-A

124

Mr. and Mrs. William F. Cupp
2210 Pinefield Road
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Mr. and Mrs. William Deavers
221 Bell Tree Lane
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Mrs. Mary E. Freitag
2215 Pinefield Way
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Mr. Matthew S. Kruk
3306 Pinefield Lane
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Mr. and Mrs. Brian K. Larson
2223 Pinefield Way
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Ms. Janice Leopard
2215 Pinefield Way
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Mr. and Mrs. Robert L. Martin
2219 Pinefield Way
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Ms. Barbara McGlynn
2231 Pinefield Road
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Mr. and Mrs. Robert F. Webb
3305 Pinefield Lane
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Ms. Tamara L. Webb
3305 Pinefield Lane
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Ms. Elizabeth L. Winegar
5500 Jefry Circle
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

George B. Tannehill
1045 Country Lane
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Chantal A. Anderson
1031 Country Lane
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Janet E. Milloff
1046 Country Lane
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Milt and Maxine Parker
1041 Country Lane
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Helene Brawner
1035 Country Lane
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Michael A. Knight
1043 Country Lane
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Mr. and Mrs. Lonnie G. Medlin
1905 Mattawoman-Beantown Road
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

176

V-92



Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

Richard H. Trainor
Secretary
Hal Kassoff
Administrator

STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS

Contract No. CH 566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman/Beantown Road
Existing MD 5 to US 301
Location/Design Public Hearing
Monday, February 28, 1990 @ 7:30 p.m.

Re: Contract No. 566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman-Beantown Road
PDMS No. 082039

NAME RAYMOND F. DETIG DATE 2/28/90

PLEASE PRINT ADDRESS 2420 PEAR TREE CT

CITY/TOWN WALDORF STATE MD ZIP CODE 20602

I/We wish to comment or inquire about the following aspects of this project:

I recommend the following alternatives

Segment I - Alternate 6

Segment II - Alternate 5/6 modified

Segment III Alternate 5/6, option 3

Seg

Interchange option: 'A'

HSC - EXTEND THE STUDY AREA TO INCORPORATE THE
RT 301 - CEDARVILLE RD INTERSECTION. IT IS
POINTLESS TO PROPOSE SOLUTIONS OF THIS MAGNITUDE
AND EXPENSE AND TO IGNORE THE CONSTRAINTS
PRESENTED BY THE 301 - CEDARVILLE RD INTERSECTION.

CONSIDER CLOSING THE MEDIAN @ CEDARVILLE RD AND
PROVIDE ADEQUATE MEDIAN WIDTHS & 'U' TURN
CAPABILITY TO ALLOW CEDARVILLE RD ACCESS.

Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List.*

Please delete my/our name(s) from the Mailing List.

*Persons who have received a copy of this brochure through the mail are already on the project Mailing List.

Mr. Raymond F. Detig
2420 Pear Tree Court
Waldorf, Maryland 20602

Dear Mr. Detig:

Thank you for your letter regarding the MD 205 project planning study. Your recommendations for Alternate 6 in Segment I, Alternate 5/6 Modified in Segment II, Alternate 5/6 in Segment III, Substation Road Option 2, and Interchange Option A will be considered in the decision-making process.

The US 301/Cedarville Road intersection was considered in the development of interchange options. It has been signalized, and intersection improvements are included in a US 301 widening project scheduled to begin this year. The State Highway Administration believes that with the recent signalization and with the use of the shoulder lane during peak hours, the intersection is functioning satisfactorily. For these reasons we are not proposing any further improvements as part of this study.

Thank you again for your recommendations and suggestions. We appreciate your participation in the project planning process.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Deputy Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

by: Victor F. Japata
Victor F. Japata
Project Manager
Project Planning Division

LHE:VFJ:as

cc: Mr. Edward H. Meehan

My telephone number is (301) 333-1105

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
363-7555 Baltimore Metro - 585-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5062 Statewide Toll Free
707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

Mr. Neil J. Pedersen, Director
Office of Planning and Preliminary Engineering
State Highway Administration
PO Box 717
Baltimore, MD. 21203-0717

March 7, 1990

Dear Mr. Pedersen:

We support a no build option on the proposed MD 5 relocation. The idea of encouraging everyone to use this road as a commuting bypass is not in Waldorf's best interest. With the amount of growth going on in this area, including the new mall, what we need is for an eastern bypass to be addressed and remove the traffic from our neighborhood streets. It is very shortsighted of the State Highway Administration to think that this road will benefit anyone. By the time construction is completed, it will already be obsolete.

The amount of traffic coming north on 301 from La Plata area increases daily and already makes merging onto 301 from 205 impossible. By encouraging the increase of traffic on 205 you will make this problem even worse and not only affect commuters on 205, but make it unbearable for those coming north on 301. It already is not unusual for commuters on 301 to take up to one hour to get through Waldorf and the problems that will occur at 205 and 301 interchange will only cause more headaches for all concerned.

The plan, as we understand it, is that the road if built will be completed before work even starts on the interchange. This is like putting the cart before the horse. If an interchange is built that is effective, you should move traffic on 205 enough to never need to add any lanes to the road. By putting the road in first, you will encourage everyone to use 205 as a bypass and then start construction on the interchange, leaving all these commuters with no place to go.

On a more personal level for those of us living along route 205, it is our understanding from speaking with your representatives at your meeting on Feb. 26, 1990 that the environmental studies for noise levels exceeded the maximums allowed. This area is definitely a residential area with numerous children. Our neighborhood of 26 houses is serviced by 4 school buses on a daily basis. We believe the welfare and safety of these children has not been given sufficient consideration. We live in a quiet neighborhood of just two dead-end cul-de-sacs and our quality of living and of those living along the proposed road will be changed drastically. The number of people having to make u-turns to come and go from their homes will be a serious traffic hazard. The fact that a light at White Oak has not been given consideration is a real oversight. This is a large,



Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

Richard H. Trainor
Secretary
Hal Kassoff
Administrator

April 4, 1990

Mr. Rod Newman
118 Indian Court
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dear Mr. Newman:

Thank you for the March 7th letter you and your neighbors submitted opposing any improvements to MD 205 under consideration by the ongoing project planning study.

Because of environmental and economic constraints, we are seeking solutions to transportation problems that maximize the use of existing highway corridors and rights-of-way. MD 205 is being used by an increasing number of commuters who are avoiding the US 301/MD 5/MD 228 intersection.

This project is not currently in the construction program, so I cannot estimate when construction might take place if a build alternate is selected. Whether or not the roadway improvement would occur before the building of an interchange at US 301/MD 205 would depend on funding availability. The engineering phase would involve the detailed design of a roadway alternate and an interchange option. Our goal would be to construct an interchange at US 301/MD 205 before the improved intersection reaches capacity.

While I can sympathize with your apprehensions about increasing traffic along Mattawomen-Beantown Road, this is a preferred route for much of the MD 5 through traffic. We will consider your suggestion of a connection between Indian Lane and Schlagle Road which would give access to the MD 205/Schlagle Road intersection. A decision for a signalized intersection is not made during this phase of the study; however, it will be considered in the detailed design phase.

Existing MD 205 has a higher accident rate than the state-wide average for similar type roads. The proposed improvement would significantly reduce that rate. The proposed median would act as a safety zone for any pedestrians or vehicles crossing or turning left on the highway, and gaps in the highway traffic would be more likely to occur with more lanes. Safety was the reason no median opening at Indian Lane was recommended.

My telephone number is (301) 333-1110

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
383-7555 Baltimore Metro - 585-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5062 Statewide Toll Free
707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

178

growing neighborhood and many of the residents will have to come out of their neighborhood and make a left to leave for work in the morning. How can they be expected to cross 3 lanes of traffic and enter into 3 lanes of rapidly moving traffic?

In closing, while we can see the need for improved commuting routes for the area, we feel that this is not the way to go. An Eastern Bypass would do much more for a larger number of people. Once the traffic from St. Mary's County and Eastern and Southern Charles have an alternate route to use, the existing routes 205 and 301 will sufficiently service those of us living in Waldorf.

Concerned residents of Mattawomen Estates;

Rod Newman 118 INDIAN CT. WALDORF MD. 20601
Doreen Deane 119 Indian Ct Waldorf Md. 20601
Margaret Y. Scott 119 Indian Ct Waldorf, Md 20601
James Z. Albert 120 Indian Ct. Waldorf, Md 20601
Mary T. Hebert 120 Indian Ct Waldorf, MD 20601
Christopher Jeffrey 120 Indian Ct. Waldorf, MD 20601
Marsha L. Newman 118 Indian Ct. Waldorf Md. 20601

Mr. Rod Newman
Page Two

Traffic forecasts for this study assumed the ultimate construction of an Eastern Bypass. These forecasts will again be reviewed at the conclusion of project planning studies for the Eastern Bypass. Our position is, however, that improvements to MD 205 are needed, even with the construction of the Eastern Bypass.

Thank you again for your input into the project planning process. Your name, as well as your neighbors' names, will be added to or confirmed on the project mailing list to keep you informed of any decisions reached on the MD 205 study.

Very truly yours,

Neil J. Pedersen

Neil J. Pedersen, Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

NJP:as

cc: Mr. Edward H. Meehan
Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Mr. John D. Bruck
Mr. John M. Contestabile



Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

Richard H. Trainor
Secretary
Hal Kassoff
Administrator

STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS

Contract No. CH 566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman/Beantown Road
Existing MD 5 to US 301
Location/Design Public Hearing
Monday, February 26, 1990 @ 7:30 p.m.

April 11, 1990

Re: Contract No. CH566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman-Beantown Road
PDMS No.082039

NAME THOMAS W. GALISH DATE 16 MAR 90
ADDRESS 4632 HARWICH DRIVE
CITY/TOWN WALDORF STATE MD ZIP CODE 20601

Mr. Thomas W. Galish
4632 Harwich Drive
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dear Mr. Galish:

Thank you for your recent letter identifying the No-Build Alternate as your choice for the MD 205 project planning study.

It is unfortunate that there is a misunderstanding about our intentions regarding the cemetery. We are charged with developing alternate solutions to transportation problems and documenting the impacts that would result. One of the build alternates presented at the February 26th public hearing, Segment II - Alternate 5/6, does impact cemetery graves. The other alternate presented that night, Segment II - Alternate 5/6 Modified, does not impact any graves. We have not reached any decisions regarding the desirability of either alternate.

MD 205 skirts the Pinefield community on its western edge. Your suggestion for an alternate around Pinefield would pass close to the eastern edge of the community to avoid the state parkland, require additional stream crossings, including Mattawoman Creek, likely impact greater amounts of wetland, and still lie adjacent to a number of residential areas. This "bypass" would be almost twice as long (and expensive) to construct with the likelihood that motorists would continue to take Mattawoman-Beantown Road. For these reasons, we are proposing alternatives that make use of the existing highway corridor.

Your support for the No-Build Alternate has been noted and will be considered in the development of team recommendations. Thank you again for identifying your position.

I/We wish to comment or inquire about the following aspects of this project:

I RECOMMEND THAT THE NO-BUILD ALTERNATE OPTION BE EXERCISED IN REGARD TO THIS PROJECT AT THE CURRENT TIME. I BASE THIS RECOMMENDATION ON THE DISTURPTION THIS PROJECT WILL CAUSE TO THE RESIDENTS ALONG 205 AND QUESTIONABLE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT FINDINGS. ALSO THE POTENTIAL PSYCHIC AND SPIRITUAL PROBLEMS WHICH MAY RESULT FROM THE RELOCATION OF GRAVE SITES IN SEGMENT II. I THINK THAT ALTERNATE ROUTING BE REVIEWED OR REREVIEWED WITH THE OBJECTIVE OF FINDING LESS DISTURPTIVE ROUTING NORTH EAST OF 205, PERHAPS A ROUTE THAT WOULD UTILIZE SEGMENT I ALTERNATE 6 WHICH WOULD THEN FOLLOW PURAN HILL RD WHICH WOULD GO NORTH EAST OF THE PINEFIELD COMMUNITY AND LINKING UP WITH 301 OR OR ABOVE CENNERVILLE RD.

Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List.*

Please delete my/our name(s) from the Mailing List.

My telephone number is (301) 333-1105

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
383-7555 Baltimore Metro - 585-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5062 Statewide Toll Free
707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

*Persons who have received a copy of this brochure through the mail are already on the project Mailing List.

1. See response p. V-3 and V-31

180

96-A

Mr. and Mrs. Dale G. Albright
1324 Harwich Drive
Waldorf, Md. 20601

May 1, 1990

Mr. Neil J. Pedersen
Director, Office of Planning & Preliminary
Engineering
State Highway Administration
P.O. Box 717
Baltimore, Md. 21203-0717

Dear Mr. Pedersen:

I am concerned about your current plans to widen MD 205 Mattawoman-Beantown Road (in your MD 5 Relocated Project). Using any of your current options will make it hazardous for my family, friends and me to use the main entrance to the Pinefield neighborhood.

Already, with only two lanes, it is dangerous for the kids of Pinefield to go to the local stores or to visit friends when they must walk along or cross MD 205. By adding additional lanes of traffic, I believe the situation will become so dangerous that the main entrance to Pinefield will become unsafe.

Since I never planned to have a six-lane highway at my doorstep when I bought my home, I request you to develop another alternative as part of the MD 5 Relocated project, to make the Pinefield entrance safer (not more hazardous). I have reviewed the "Pinefield Option" and disagree with it. To help me keep close track on the direction this project is taking, please place me on your mailing list for this project. Reply requested.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Dale G. Albright

Mrs. Dale G. Albright
1324 Harwich Drive
Waldorf, Md. 20601



Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

May 23, 1990

Richard H. Trainor
Secretary
Hal Kassoff
Administrator

Mr. and Mrs. Dale G. Albright
1324 Harwich Drive
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Albright:

Thank you for your May 1st letter commenting on the project planning study for MD 205, specifically, your opposition to additional lanes on Mattawoman-Beantown Road, and your concern that improvements to the road would make the existing signalized MD 205/Pinefield Road intersection more dangerous.

While I can sympathize with your apprehensions about increasing traffic along Mattawoman-Beantown Road, this is a preferred route for much of the MD 5 through traffic. Volumes will continue to grow on this highway, with or without the improvements presented in our project planning study.

Existing MD 205 has a higher accident rate than the state-wide average for similar type roads. The proposed improvement would significantly reduce that rate. The proposed median would act as a safety zone for any pedestrians or vehicles crossing or turning left on the highway. They would only have to look in one direction at a time, and gaps in the highway traffic would be more likely to occur with more lanes. Graded areas behind the outside curbs would provide a safer location for persons walking along the highway.

We believe that, with proper design, a roadway can be constructed that will be safe for Pinefield residents and for through travelers on Mattawoman-Beantown Road. The proposed closed section roadway, together with protected turn lanes and signals, will afford a safe design.

Your opposition to additional roadway lanes on MD 205 near Pinefield Road has been noted and will be considered in the selection of an alternate. Your name has been added to the project mailing list so you will be kept informed of any future decisions made on this project.

Very truly yours,

Neil J. Pedersen

Neil J. Pedersen, Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

NJP:as

cc: Mr. Edward H. Meehan
Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.

My telephone number is (301) 333-1110

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
333-7555 Baltimore Metro - 565-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5062 Statewide Toll Free
707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717



Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

III 3 1990

Richard H. Trainor
Secretary
Hal Kassoff
Administrator

Re: Contract No. CH566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman-Beantown Road
PDMS No. 082039

STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS

Contract No. CH 566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman/Beantown Road
Existing MD 5 to US 301
Location/Design Public Hearing
Monday, February 26, 1990 @ 7:30 p.m.

Ms. Linda Awramik
286 Pin Oak Drive
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dear Ms. Awramik:

Thank you for your recent letter regarding the MD 205 project planning study. Your comments will be considered in the decision-making process.

While I can sympathize with your apprehensions about improvements to Mattawoman-Beantown Road (MD 205), this is a preferred route for much of the MD 5 through traffic. Volumes will continue to grow on this highway, with or without the improvements presented in our project planning study. This will occur even with the widening of US 301/MD 5 in Waldorf, with construction scheduled to begin this year. The greater volumes of traffic will continue to be along US 301/MD 5, not MD 205.

Our investigations have identified that the transportation problems will be congestion and accidents, not just at the existing US 301/MD 205 intersection, but all along the MD 205 corridor. We believe that through the study process, we have developed alternates that will relieve those problems. These include the reconstruction of the MD 205 roadway to a four-lane divided curbed highway with outside shoulders, as well as construction of an interchange to replace or augment the US 301/MD 205 intersection. The interchange would be justified in conjunction with additional capacity being provided along MD 205.

We had previously studied and presented Alternate 2, which was a five-lane curbed street with a continuous left-turn center lane. This was dropped from further consideration because of the accident rate associated with this type roadway and because it would not adequately handle the future traffic needs.

Your suggestion for a bypass to the east would have to pass close to the eastern edge of Pinefield in order to avoid the state parkland. Our initial study has shown that this alternate would require additional stream crossings (including Mattawoman Creek), likely impact greater amounts of wetland, and still lie adjacent to a number of residential areas. It would be almost twice as long (and expensive) to construct, with the likelihood that motorists would continue to take Mattawoman-Beantown Road as the shorter route. For these reasons, we are proposing alternatives that make use of the existing highway corridor.

My telephone number is (301) 333-1105

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
383-7555 Baltimore Metro - 585-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5082 Statewide Toll Free
707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

MAY 22 10 52 AM '90

NAME Linda Awramik DATE 5/13/90

PLEASE PRINT ADDRESS 286 PIN OAK DR

CITY/TOWN Waldorf STATE MD ZIP CODE 20601

I/We wish to comment or inquire about the following aspects of this project:

1. A 6-lane road to relieve 4-lane traffic; yet will feed back into a 6-lane busy rd. Money ill-spent. THE INTERSECTIONS ARE THE PROBLEM.
2. Rt 205 is a residential road. The main thorough-way is 301-5. Expired and upgrade 301 and 5 to handle the increased traffic. How do those businesses feel about shifting the main flow of traffic away from their business?
3. If any improvement is made to Rt 205 AT A MAXIMUM, THE PROPOSED increase in lanes should be 4 (two lanes in either direction) with a merge lane in the middle; however, I am not convinced an upgrade is necessary.
4. My preference would be to locate an upgraded road to serve as a by-pass in an area less populated (i.e. towards Cedarville Rd.)

Thank you for this opportunity to be heard.

Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List.*

Please delete my/our name(s) from the Mailing List.

*Persons who have received a copy of this brochure through the mail are already on the project Mailing List.

1. See response V-31

197

Ms. Linda Awramik
Page Two

Your name is on our project mailing list, so you will be kept informed of any future decisions made on this project. Thank you again for providing us with your comments on this study. We appreciate your participation in the project planning process.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Deputy Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

by: Victor F. Janata
Victor F. Janata
Project Manager
Project Planning Division

LHE:VFJ:as
cc: Mr. Edward H. Meehan

183

V-99

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT
MAY 3 10 47 AM '90

Date: 6 May 90
Name: Barbara Auman
Address: 1722 Temi Dr
Waldorf, Md
20601



Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

Richard H. Trainor
Secretary
Hal Kassoff
Administrator

JUL 6 1990

Mr. Neil J. Pedersen
Director,
Office of Planning & Preliminary Engineering
State Highway Administration
P.O. Box 717
Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

Re: Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)

Dear Sir:

I support a no-build alternative regarding the widening of Route 205 (segments I, II and III). Widening the road will not alleviate congestion and will destroy the quality of life for the residents of Pinefield and the people living along Route 205.

I support the high quality interchange, Option D, to alleviate congestion at the intersection of U.S. Route 301 and MD Route 205.

A high quality interchange is the most cost effective solution to the developing congestion problem and will preserve the quality of life in our community.

Sincerely,
Barbara Auman

P.S. I am also concerned about the environment and feel we do not need anymore concrete in Charles Co.

Ms. Barbara Auman
1722 Temi Drive
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dear Ms. Auman:

Mr. Neil Pedersen asked me to thank you for your recent letter regarding the project planning study for MD 205. Mr. Pedersen also asked me to respond to you directly. Your support for the no-build alternate along MD 205 and Interchange Option D at US 301 will be taken into consideration in the decision-making process.

While I can sympathize with your apprehensions about increasing traffic along Mattawoman-Beantown Road (MD 205), this is a preferred route for much of the MD 5 through traffic. Volumes will continue to grow on this highway, with or without the improvements presented in our project planning study. We are responding to ongoing and planned development in the Southern Maryland region.

The resulting transportation problems will be congestion and accidents; not just at the existing US 301/MD 205 intersection, but all along the MD 205 corridor. We believe that through the study process, we have developed alternates that will relieve those problems. These include the reconstruction of the MD 205 roadway to a four-lane divided highway, as well as construction of an interchange to replace or augment the US 301/MD 205 intersection. The interchange would be justified in conjunction with additional capacity being provided along MD 205.

Your name has been added to the project mailing list so you will be kept informed of any future decisions made on this project. Thank you again for identifying your position on this study. We appreciate your participation in the project planning process.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Deputy Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

LHE:VFJ:as
cc: Mr. Neil J. Pedersen
Mr. Edward H. Meehan

by: *Victor Janata*
Victor Janata, Project Manager
Project Planning Division

My telephone number is (301) 333-1105

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
383-7555 Baltimore Metro - 565-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5062 Statewide Toll Free
707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

18



Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

Richard H. Train
Secretary
Hal Kassoff
Administrator

June 22, 1990

SALVATORE CURTO
3710 Onset Lane
Waldorf, MD 20601

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT
(301) 843-9043

May 30, 1990

Mr. Neil J. Pederson
Director
Office of Planning & Preliminary Engineering
State Highway Administration
P.O. Box 717
Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

RECEIVED

JUN 4 1990

#049

DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF
PLANNING & PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

Re: Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)

Dear Mr. Pederson,

Seventeen years ago I became a homeowner and resident of Pinefield, a quiet and stable community located in Charles County. In that time my family and I have thoroughly enjoyed the peaceful and natural quality of our neighborhood and surroundings. Although we supported careful growth, we were in constant hope that it would not come to the very doorstep of Pinefield. It has come, unfortunately, in the form of the proposed widening of Route 205 (segments I, II, and III). As a result, I am in full favor of a no-build alternative. I vigorously oppose the planned change as it undermines the very reasons we left Northern Virginia; reasons we hold in common with neighbors and friends--safety, a wholesome environment, and a secure future.

Along with many in this family community, I prefer the high quality interchange, Option D, to alleviate congestion at the intersection of U.S. Route 301 and MD Route 205. After listening to many discussions involving possible options, I am convinced that a high quality interchange is the best means of solving traffic congestion and preserving the quality of life we have worked hard to maintain in Pinefield. The widening of Route 205 will not only physically transform our community, but will significantly and measureably increase the risk of personal injury for those who live here. Neither is necessary.

I sincerely hope this letter is not too late in urging another course of action by your department.

Sincerely,

Salvatore Curto
Salvatore Curto

Mr. Salvatore Curto
3710 Onset Lane
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dear Mr. Curto:

Thank you for your May 30th letter regarding the MD 205 project planning study. Your support for Interchange Option D and opposition to any widening of MD 205 will be taken into consideration in the decision-making process.

While I can sympathize with your apprehensions about increasing traffic along Mattawoman-Beantown Road (MD 205), this is a preferred route for much of the MD 5 through traffic. Volumes will continue to grow on this highway, with or without the improvements presented in our project planning study.

The traffic congestion problem you refer to will not be just at the US 301/MD 205 intersection, but all along MD 205, from MD 5 to US 301. The problems are not just congestion, caused by overloading the capacity of the roadway, but also accident problems related to the type of road and the capacity restrictions.

We believe that through the study process, we have developed alternates that will relieve the transportation problems in the MD 205 corridor. These include the reconstruction of the MD 205 roadway to a four-lane divided highway, as well as construction of an interchange to replace or augment the intersection at US 301/MD 205. The interchange is justified in conjunction with additional capacity being provided along MD 205. It would be difficult for us to justify expending \$20-30 million for an interchange at US 301 if it does not tie into a widened MD 205.

Your name has been added to the project mailing list so you will be kept informed of any future decisions made on this project. Thank you again for identifying your position and we appreciate your participation in the project planning process.

Very truly yours,

Neil J. Pedersen

Neil J. Pedersen, Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

NJP:eh

cc: Mr. Edward H. Meehan
Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.

My telephone number is (301) 333-1110

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
383-7555 Baltimore Metro - 565-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5062 Statewide Toll Free
707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717



Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

Richard H. Trainor
Secretary
Hal Kassoff
Administrator

July 6, 1990

Ms. Margaret A. Fields,
11000 Beantown Road
Baltimore, Maryland 20601

Dear Ms. Fields:

Mr. Neil Pedersen asked me to thank you for your recent letter regarding the project planning study for MD 205. Mr. Pedersen also asked me to respond to you directly. Your support for the no-build alternate along MD 205 and Interchange Option D at US 301 will be taken into consideration in the decision-making process.

While I can sympathize with your apprehensions about increasing traffic along Mattawoman-Beantown Road (MD 205), this is a preferred route for much of the MD 5 through traffic. Volumes will continue to grow on this highway, with or without the improvements presented in our project planning study.

The resulting transportation problems will be congestion and accidents; not just at the existing US 301/MD 205 intersection, but all along the MD 205 corridor. We believe that through the study process, we have developed alternates that will relieve those problems. These include the reconstruction of the MD 205 roadway to a four-lane divided highway, as well as construction of an interchange to replace or augment the US 301/MD 205 intersection. The interchange would be justified in conjunction with additional capacity being provided along MD 205.

Your name has been added to the project mailing list so you will be kept informed of any future decisions made on this project. Thank you again for identifying your position on this study. We appreciate your participation in the project planning process.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Deputy Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

by: Victor Janate
Victor Janate
Project Manager
Project Planning Division

LHE:VJ:as

cc: Mr. Neil J. Pedersen
Mr. Edward H. Meehan

333-1105 or 1-800-548-5026

My telephone number is (301)

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
383-7555 Baltimore Metro - 585-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5082 Statewide Toll Free
707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

May 18, 90

Pinefield Resident

Dear Sirs,

We have lived in Pinefield for the past 12 years, we have been in Charles County for 23 years. We have always felt that though the area continued to grow & expand, the roads were never updated to go along with the growth.

What is being proposed now is most useless & a disadvantage to us in the Pinefield, Sub Station & 205 area.

Our elected officials have short changed us, & actually have been very dishonest with us in our community. We find it necessary to take a firm stand on this issue, as it not only affects us but will be devastating for our children & their children. Or do humans enter into your picture at all. Sincerely
Margaret A. Fields

1890

V-102

PINEFIELD NEWS-EXTRA

SIX LANES IN FRONT OF PINEFIELD!

At the April 26, 1990 meeting of the Pinefield Civic Association (PCA), the State Highway Administration's proposal to widen Route 205 was discussed. It was the consensus of the PCA members in attendance that a "No-build" option on the widening of Rte 205 and interchange re-building Option D be encouraged. Your neighbors in the PCA ask you to review the proposals reproduced in the April Pinefield Newsletter and, if you agree, to forward the following letter to the SHA. An individual letter will carry even more weight than a form letter, but either way, please write and let the State know your position.

Date: *May 18, 90*
Name: *Maureen A. Fields*
Address: *6011 Suzanne Rd*
Waldorf, Md
21151

Mr. Neil J. Pedersen
Director,
Office of Planning & Preliminary Engineering
State Highway Administration
P.O. Box 717
Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

Re: Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)

Dear Sir:

I support a no-build alternative regarding the widening of Route 205 (segments I, II and III). Widening the road will not alleviate congestion and will destroy the quality of life for the residents of Pinefield and the people living along Route 205.

I support the high quality interchange, Option D, to alleviate congestion at the intersection of U.S. Route 301 and MD Route 205.

A high quality interchange is the most cost effective solution to the developing congestion problem and will preserve the quality of life in our community.

Sincerely,

Maureen A. Fields



Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

Richard H. Trelnor
Secretary
Hel Kassoff
Administrator

STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS

PROC
DEVELOP
DATE
Mar 6 3 57 PM

April 4, 1990

Re: Contract No. CH566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman-Beantown Road
PDMS No.082039

Contract No. CH 566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman/Beantown Road
Existing MD 5 to US 301
Location/Design Public Hearing
Monday, February 26, 1990 @ 7:30 p.m.

Ms. Georgieanna Hamilton
Route 1 Box 106
Charlotte Hall, Md. 20622

Dear Ms. Hamilton:

Thank you for your recent letter opposing impacts to the Trinity Memorial Garden Cemetery as the result of improvement studies for MD 205.

It is unfortunate that there is a misunderstanding about our intentions regarding the cemetery. We are charged with developing alternate solutions to transportation problems and documenting the impacts that would result. One of the build alternates presented at the February 26th public hearing, Segment II - Alternate 5/6, does impact cemetery graves. The other alternate presented that night, Segment II - Alternate 5/6 Modified, does not impact any graves. We have not reached any decisions regarding the desirability of either alternate.

Your opposition to disturbing any graves has been noted and will be considered in the development of project planning team recommendations. Thank you again for identifying your position.

Your name has been added to the project mailing list, so you will be kept informed of future decisions reached on the MD 205 study.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Deputy Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

by: Victor F. Janafa
Victor F. Janafa
Project Manager
Project Planning Division

LHE:VFJ:as
cc: Mr. Edward H. Meehan

My telephone number is (301) 333-1105

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
383-7555 Baltimore Metro - 585-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5082 Statewide Toll Free
707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21205-0717

PLEASE
PRINT

NAME Georgieanna Hamilton DATE 3/1/90
ADDRESS Box 106
CITY/TOWN Charlotte Hall STATE Md ZIP CODE 20622

I/We wish to comment or inquire about the following aspects of this project:

I am not in favor of building this highway to rush money for such a small obstacle. I would prefer to help the dead. My husband and my little girl are there to rest. I can't go through this again. I don't touch Trinity Memorial Garden Cemetery for any reason.

Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List.*
 Please delete my/our name(s) from the Mailing List.
*Persons who have received a copy of this brochure through the mail are already on the project Mailing List.

1. See response V-3 and V-18

V-104

188

Date: 5/9/90
Name: Donna H. Keys
Address: 6019 Suzanne L.
Waldorf, MD 20601



Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

Richard H. Trainor
Secretary
Hal Kassoff
Administrator

July 3, 1990

Mr. Neil J. Pedersen
Director,
Office of Planning & Preliminary Engineering
State Highway Administration
P.O. Box 717
Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

Ms. Donna H. Keys
6019 Suzanne Road
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Re: Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)

Dear Ms. Keys:

Dear Sir:

I support a no-build alternative regarding the widening of Route 205 (segments I, II and III). Widening the road will not alleviate congestion and will destroy the quality of life for the residents of Pinefield and the people living along Route 205.

Mr. Neil Pedersen asked me to thank you for your recent letter regarding the project planning study for MD 205. Mr. Pedersen also asked me to respond to you directly. Your support for the no-build alternate along MD 205 and Interchange Option D at US 301 will be taken into consideration in the decision-making process.

I support the high quality interchange, Option D, to alleviate congestion at the intersection of U.S. Route 301 and MD Route 205.

While I can sympathize with your apprehensions about increasing traffic along Mattawoman-Beantown Road (MD 205), this is a preferred route for much of the MD 5 through traffic. Volumes will continue to grow on this highway, with or without the improvements presented in our project planning study.

A high quality interchange is the most cost effective solution to the developing congestion problem and will preserve the quality of life in our community.

The resulting transportation problems will be congestion and accidents; not just at the existing US 301/MD 205 intersection, but all along the MD 205 corridor. We believe that through the study process, we have developed alternates that will relieve those problems. These include the reconstruction of the MD 205 roadway to a four-lane divided highway, as well as construction of an interchange to replace or augment the US 301/MD 205 intersection. The interchange would be justified in conjunction with additional capacity being provided along MD 205.

Sincerely,

Donna H. Keys

This project is in a major commuter travel corridor which is currently under study as part of the Maryland Department of Transportation's "Statewide Commuter Assistance Study." Anticipated to be completed this summer, this multi-modal transportation planning study is examining transit alternatives such as park-and-ride, express bus, busway, commuter rail, light rail and heavy rail service, as well as additional highway improvements. The specific improvement alternatives under study for a particular area will reflect the unique travel needs and opportunities along the corridor as a whole.

As a real estate appraiser, I am well aware of the trend in growth in the southeastern portion of Southern MD; however, I see very little logical need for a super-highway on Route 205. Perhaps a more reasonable idea would be to upgrade the interchange and upgrade Route 205 to accommodate the most realistic traffic expectations of today and the near future. No more than 4 lanes are needed, total. The wanton destruction of people's

homes to make way for more cars defeats the push for area mass-transportation. Put your (our) money to a wiser use and listen to the people. The cycle is vicious and by the year 2010, Waldorf will be a parking lot.

Donna H. Keys

My telephone number is (301) 333-1105

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
303-7555 Baltimore Metro - 565-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5082 Statewide Toll Free
707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

1. See response p. V-18

189


Ms. Donna H. Keys
Page Two

Your name has been added to the project mailing list so you will be kept informed of any future decisions made on this project. Thank you again for identifying your position on this study. We appreciate your participation in the project planning process.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Deputy Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

by:


Victor Jankata
Project Manager

LHE:VJ:as

cc: Mr. Neil J. Pedersen
Mr. Edward H. Meehan

333-1105 or 1-800-548-5026

199

V-106



Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

June 1, 1990

Richard H. Trainor
Secretary
Hal Kassoff
Administrator

May 14, 1990

James F. McConnell
902 Truro Lane
Waldorf, MD 20601

RECEIVED

MAY 17 1990
4877
DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF
PLANNING & PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

Mr. Neil J. Pedersen
Director, Office of Planning & Preliminary Engineering
State Highway Administration
P.O. Box 717
Baltimore, MD 21203-0717

Mr. James F. McConnell
902 Truro Lane
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dear Mr. McConnell:

Thank you for your May 14th letter commenting on the project planning study for MD 205; specifically, your opposition to additional lanes on Mattawoman-Beantown Road and your concern that improvements to the road would make the MD 205/Nike Drive intersection more dangerous.

While I can sympathize with your apprehensions about increasing traffic along Mattawoman-Beantown Road, this is a preferred route for much of the MD 5 through traffic. Volumes will continue to grow on this highway, with or without the improvements presented in our project planning study.

Existing MD 205 has a higher accident rate than the state-wide average for similar type roads. The proposed improvement would significantly reduce that rate. The proposed median would act as a safety zone for any pedestrians or vehicles crossing or turning left on the highway. They would only have to look in one direction at a time, and gaps in the highway traffic would be more likely to occur with more lanes. A graded area behind the outside curb would provide a safer location for persons walking along the highway.

We believe that with proper design, a roadway can be constructed that will be safe for Pinefield residents and for through travelers on Mattawoman-Beantown Road. The proposed closed section roadway, together with protected turn lanes and signals, will afford a safe design.

This project is in a major commuter travel corridor which is currently under study as part of the Maryland Department of Transportation's Statewide Commuter Assistance Study. Anticipated to be completed this summer, this multi-modal transportation planning study is examining transit alternatives such as park-and-ride, express bus, busway, commuter rail, light rail and heavy rail service, as well as additional highway improvements. The specific improvement alternatives under study for a particular area will reflect the unique travel needs and opportunities along the corridor as a whole.

Dear Mr. Pedersen:

I am concerned about your current plans to widen MD 205 Mattawoman-Beantown Rd (in your MD 5 Relocated Project). Using any of your current options will make it hazardous for my family, friends and me to use the Nike Drive entrance to the Pinefield neighborhood.

Already, with only two lanes, it is dangerous for the children of Pinefield to go to the local stores or to visit friends when they must walk along or cross MD 205. By adding additional lanes of traffic, I believe the situation will become so dangerous that the Nike Drive entrance to Pinefield will become unsafe. I believe it would be accurate to say that the main entrance to Pinefield would become equally hazardous.

Since I never planned to have a six lane highway at my doorstep when I bought my house, I request you to develop another alternative as part of the MD 5 Relocated Project, to make the Pinefield entrance safer (not more hazardous).

Also, I am convinced that money spent for building highways could be better spent for mass transit or commuter rail options for Charles County. Building new roads has not relieved traffic congestion anywhere in the Washington area, and in fact, has caused increased congestion. Those who do not learn from history are condemned to repeat it. I believe that the complete MD 5 Relocated Project is ill-advised.

To help us keep close track on the direction this project is taking, please place me on your mailing list for this project.

Respectfully,
Resnly Requested.

Sincerely,

James F. McConnell

My telephone number is (301) 333-1110

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
363-7555 Baltimore Metro - 565-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5062 Statewide Toll Free
707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

191

Mr. James F. McConnell
Page Two

Your opposition to additional roadway lanes on MD 205 near Nike Drive has been noted and will be considered in the decision making process. Your name has been added to the project mailing list so you will be kept informed of any future decisions made on this project. Thank you again for your input.

Very truly yours,

Neil J. Pedersen

Neil J. Pedersen, Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

NJP:eh

cc: Mr. Edward H. Meehan
Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.

801-A

10/2



PINEFIELD CIVIC ASSOCIATION, INC.

WALDORF, MARYLAND 20601
5602 Daniel Circle
DEVELOPMENT

31 MAR 9 03 AM '90



*Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration*

Richard H. Trainor
Secretary
Hal Kassoff
Administrator

May 3, 1990

Mr Neil J. Pedersen
Director, Office of Planning & Preliminary Engineering
State Highway Administration
P.O. Box 717
Baltimore, MD 21203-0717

Mr. Johnny A. Martin, President
Pinefield Civic Association, Inc.
5602 Daniel Circle
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

RE: MD 5 Relocated Project (Widening MD 205)

Dear Mr. Martin:

Dear Mr Pedersen:

Thank you for your recent letter presenting the "Pinefield Option" for consideration as an alternate in the MD 205 project planning study.

We applaud your efforts to prepare for the future growth which MD 205 Mattawoman-Beantown Rd must support. In our view, your current proposals and options to widen MD 205 (MD 5 Relocated), provide suitable alternatives to make MD 205 capable of supporting increased traffic volumes, but falls short of being a safe proposal for us.

Although your proposal is intriguing and would have some advantages from a traffic operational standpoint, it would be cost prohibitive to consider for Mattawoman-Beantown Road. The cost to build the structure to support the type of roadway you have proposed is usually in the range of ten times or more expensive than at-grade roadway construction.

We are concerned about the increased safety hazard Pinefield, our neighboring communities, and the Pinefield Shopping Center businesses will face once MD 205 is widened. Separating this community from its neighbors and supporting businesses by a six lane divided highway can only make our day to day lives more dangerous.

We believe that with proper design, a roadway can be constructed that will be safe for Pinefield residents and for through travellers on Mattawoman-Beantown Road. The proposed closed section roadway, together with protected turn lanes and signals, will afford a safe design.

We understand that the Pinefield RD/MD 205 light will remain; however, this will not provide enough safety for us. By implementing any one of your proposed alternatives without further modification, you will create a significant safety hazard for this community.

Thank you for your interest. We appreciate hearing from citizens concerned about the safety of their communities.

Request you develop another alternative or option to relieve the safety hazard your current proposal will create. We have developed an option we want you to consider. This option will probably increase the noise and air pollution for our neighborhood and be an eyesore; however, we believe safety is more important.

Very truly yours,

Neil J. Pedersen

Neil J. Pedersen, Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

NJP:as

cc: Mr. Edward H. Meehan
Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.

My telephone number is (301) 333-1110

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
383-7555 Baltimore Metro - 565-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5062 Statewide Toll Free
707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

193

601-A



PINEFIELD CIVIC ASSOCIATION, INC.

WALDORF, MARYLAND 20601

5602 Daniel Circle

I can be reached at (301) 859-4877 during working hours and 645-2140 after 5:00 PM. I will arrange a meeting with the PCA Board to discuss this problem if the need arises.

Sincerely

Johnny A. Martin
Johnny A. Martin
President

1 Atch
Pinefield Option

cc: Charles County Commissioners
Mr Janata
Mr Meehan
Pinefield Newsletter

Mr. Johnny A. Martin, President
Pinefield Civic Association, Inc.
5602 Daniel Circle
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dear Mr. Martin:

Thank you for your recent letter presenting the "Pinefield Option" for consideration as an alternate in the MD 205 project planning study.

An analysis is underway to quantify the impacts and costs of this alternate. We will be able to get back to you with the results in mid-May. Feel free to contact the project manager, Vic Janata, in the interim with any questions. His toll-free number is 1-800-548-5026.

Thank you for your interest. It is a pleasure to hear from citizens concerned about the safety of their communities.

Very truly yours,
PEDERSEN
VJ
cc: Meehan

194

PINEFIELD OPTION

FOR

MD 5, RELOCATED
(MD 205)

BY
THE PINEFIELD CIVIC ASSOCIATION
MARCH 31, 1990

195

V-1111

OBJECTIVE:

To provide a direct (through path) lane of travel for north and southbound MD 5 and ST Charles Pkwy traffic, without increasing the safety hazard to the Pinefield communities or businesses.

OPTION SUMMARY:

Build a raised dual-lane (one lane each direction) roadway above existing MD 205, extending from the proposed MD 5/US 301 overpass to a distance pass Substation Rd.

RATIONAL:

The elevated roadway will service north and southbound MD 205 traffic from MD 5/US 301 to MD 5 and St Charles Pkwy. The elevated traffic will flow without stop (no stop signs or lights) from the Prince Georges county line to MD 5 and St Charles Pkwy allowing the two lanes to handle increase volume (in both directions).

The existing roadway will continue to handle "local traffic" from the light at MD 5/US 301 and Mattawoman-Beantown Rd to Substation Rd where it will merge with the elevated roadway at ground level and be constructed per current options for MD 5 Relocated.

CONCLUSIONS:

This option allows the existing Pinefield area communities to have continued safe access to local businesses and residences by keeping the high volume of traffic away from their entrances on MD 205, Mattawoman-Beantown Rd.

ADVANTAGES:

- High speed travel (no stop lights or stop signs) from Charles County Line on MD 5/US 301 to intersection of MD 205 and MD 5 at St Charles Pkwy.
- US 301 type roadway at all intersections between Substation Rd and Popular Hill-Beantown Rd.
- One lane, each way, of "through" traffic via overpasses
- One lane, each way, of "local" traffic via the existing roadbed

DISADVANTAGES:

- Overpass from MD 5/US 301 to Substation Rd
- Increased noise and air pollution from overpass on surrounding communities
- Increased cost of additional overpass structures

V-112

1990



Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

Richard H. Trainor
Secretary
Hal Kassoff
Administrator

May 29, 1990

1 31 1990

Mr. Neil J. Pederson
Director,
Office of Planning & Preliminary Engineering
State Highway Administration
P.O. Box 717
Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

May 9, 1990

Re: Proposed Maryland 5 Relocation (MD 205)

Dear Sir:

As a homeowner and resident of Pinefield, I am deeply concerned about the proposed relocation of Maryland 5 (MD 205). I can understand wanting to shift the flow of route 5 traffic around Waldorf to ease congestion, but it appears we are putting the cart before the horse. Widening MD 205 without first building an interchange at U.S. 301 will not alleviate existing problems. It will only increase congestion, the potential for accidents and destroy the quality of life for the residents of Pinefield and those living along MD 205.

I do support the proposed interchange, Option D. This would help to alleviate the traffic congestion at the U.S. Route 301 and MD 205 intersection and stabilize a growing traffic safety problem around the Pinefield shopping areas. The safety problems in this area are increasing as more Pinefield residents, especially children, are walking and biking to these shopping areas.

A high quality interchange is the most cost effective solution to the developing congestion. Basic physics states that increasing the capacity of the pipe without increasing the capacity of the faucet to handle the flow will only increase pressure. Pinefield doesn't need that. Your serious consideration of these proposals will be greatly appreciated by the residents of Pinefield.

Stephen R. Stoker
4513 Orleans Lane
(Pinefield)
Waldorf, MD 20601-3232

RECEIVED

MAY 11 1990
859
DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF
PLANNING & PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

Mr. Stephen R. Stoker
4513 Orleans Lane
Waldorf, Maryland 20601-3232

Dear Mr. Stoker:

Thank you for your May 9th letter opposing major improvements to MD 205 and supporting the construction of Interchange Option D at US 301.

While I can sympathize with your apprehensions about increasing traffic along Mattawoman-Baantown Road (MD 205), this is a preferred route for much of the MD 5 through traffic. Volumes will continue to grow on this highway, with or without the improvements presented in our project planning study.

We are in agreement with you that an interchange is necessary to augment or replace the US 301/MD 205 intersection. If the outcome of our study is a build solution, the engineering phase would involve the detailed design of a roadway alternate and an interchange option at US 301. No segment of the project is in the current construction program. Should the roadway be reconstructed first, our goal remains to construct an interchange at US 301/MD 205 before the improved intersection reaches capacity.

Existing MD 205 has a higher accident rate than the state-wide average for similar type roads. The proposed improvement would significantly reduce that rate. The proposed median would act as a safety zone for any pedestrians or vehicles crossing or turning left on the highway. They would only have to look in one direction at a time, and gaps in the highway traffic would be more likely to occur with more lanes. Gradual areas behind the outside curbs would provide a safer location for persons walking along the highway.

We believe that with proper design, a roadway can be constructed that will be safe for Pinefield residents and for through travelers on Mattawoman-Baantown Road. The proposed closed section roadway, together with protected turn lanes and signals, will afford a safe design.

My telephone number is (301) 333-1110

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
383-7555 Baltimore Metro - 565-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5062 Statewide Toll Free
707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

V-113

Mr. Stephen R. Stoker
Page Two

Thank you again for your input into the project planning process. Your support for constructing Interchange Option D first, before widening MD 205, has been noted and will be considered in the selection of alternates for this study. I have added your name to the project mailing list, so you will be kept informed of any future decisions made on this project.

Very truly yours,

Neil J. Pedersen

Neil J. Pedersen, Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

NJP:as

cc: Mr. Edward H. Meehan
Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.

V-114

198

2918 Sandwich Drive
Waldorf, MD 20601

April 27, 1990

Mr. Neil J. Pedersen
Director, Office of Planning & Preliminary Engineering
State Highway Administration
P.O. Box 717
Baltimore, MD 21203-0717

RE: MD 5 Relocated Project (Widening MD 205)

Dear Mr. Pedersen:

I am writing to you to oppose any thing in this project other than the "no build" option. My opposition is based on two items: (1) as a taxpayer of the state of Maryland, I object to spending any funds on this project until the full effects of the Washington Bypass, the widening of U.S. 301, and the results of the 1990 Decennial Census are known; and (2) as a resident of the Pinefield neighborhood, widening of the current MD 205 would wreak havoc to our neighborhood.

As to the first item, it is just plain premature to plan for this project given the uncertainties mentioned above. A Washington Bypass may obviate the traffic projections for continued growth in those portions of the Tri-County area south and east of Waldorf. The fact that Waldorf now acts as a bottleneck for north-south traffic on U.S. 301 and MD 5 is not all bad; continued highway "improvements" will lull future residents into attempting longer and longer commutes to and from the Washington metropolitan area with detrimental impacts on the nation's energy supplies and the regional quality of life.

As to the second item, I foresee very serious disadvantages to our Pinefield neighborhood if this project goes forward with any of the alternatives identified so far. We didn't bargain for a state highway on the doorstep to our neighborhood when we purchased our home 11 years ago, and we certainly didn't bargain for a 6-lane, divided roadway at that. Although safety is a primary concern, the environmental damage of such a highway is sufficient enough reason to halt further planning. More than a third of Pinefield homes lie within a half mile of the current MD 205! The noise factor alone is sufficient to justify not going ahead with this project unless noise barriers are an integral part of the project. Even though the nation continues to decrease pollution output per vehicle, more roadway means more vehicles and therefore more pollution. As to safety, the local traffic patterns i.e., Pinefield traffic heading south onto U.S. 301, have been neglected in favor of the through traffic. Additionally, the phasing of the overall project (thoroughfare widening first, interchanges later), would make this a long and costly (in terms of accidents and "neck down" disruptions) to all those who would have to travel this route during construction.

To ensure that I am kept abreast of your thinking on this project, please place me on your mailing list for this project.

Very truly yours,

Thomas D. Wanner
THOMAS D. WANNER

cc: Charles County Commissioners



Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

Richard H. Trainor
Secretary
Hal Kessoff
Administrator

May 22, 1990

Mr. Thomas D. Wanner
2918 Sandwich Drive
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dear Mr. Wanner:

Thank you for your April 27th letter supporting the No-Build Alternate for the MD 205 project planning study.

Our traffic volume forecasts reflect the relationship of MD 205 and the surrounding highway network. A number of related highway improvements are included in this network, such as the widening of US 301/MD 5 through Waldorf to six through lanes. Despite these area roadway improvements, we still project a need to widen MD 205, as it is still a preferred route for many MD 5 travelers. Traffic demand on MD 205 will be reassessed as future decisions are reached on other highway improvements (such as the Washington Bypass).

Regarding the noise impacts of our proposal, four mitigation sites remain under consideration, all in the Pinefield area. The federal noise abatement criteria is estimated to be marginally exceeded at these locations in the design year (2015). A preliminary determination on the reasonableness and feasibility of noise mitigation will be made during the preparation of the final environmental document.

No decisions have been reached on the potential construction staging of these improvements because of current funding limitations. No segment of the project is in the current construction program. If a build solution is selected, the engineering phase would involve the detailed design of a roadway alternate and an interchange option. Should the roadway be reconstructed first, our goal remains to construct an interchange at US 301/MD 205 before the improved intersection reaches capacity.

The Pinefield Road intersection with MD 205 is already signalized. The Option A and B intersection with MD 205, which would line up with Nike Drive, can also be expected to be controlled by traffic signals. Interchange Option C proposes a connection between MD 205 opposite Pinefield Road and Substation Road, and from there to US 301. Interchange Option D provides a direct ramp access between MD 205 and southbound US 301. Pinefield residents would have safe access to southbound US 301 under any of the build options under consideration. Selection of an interchange option has not yet been made.

My telephone number is (301) _____


Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
303-7555 Baltimore Metro - 565-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5082 Statewide Toll Free
707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

199

Mr. Thomas D. Wenner
Page Two

Thank you for shering your concerns. Your support for the No-Build Alternate has been noted and will be considered in the decision-making process. Your name has been edded to the project mailing list, so you will be kept informed of any future decisions made on this project.

Very truly yours,



Neil J. Pedersen, Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

NJP:es

cc: Mr. Edward H. Meehan,
Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.

Mr. Thomas D. Wannner
Page Two

Thank you for sharing your concerns. Your support for the No-Build Alternate has been noted and will be considered in the decision-making process. Your name has been edded to the project mailing list, so you will be kept informed of any future decisions made on this project.

Very truly yours,




Neil J. Pedersen, Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

NJP:as

cc: Mr. Edward H. Meehan
Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.

Prepared by: Victor Janate, Proj. Plan. Div., 333-1105, 5-15-90

911-V





STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS

Contract No. CH 566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman/Beantown Road
Existing MD 5 to US 301
Location/Design Public Hearing
Monday, February 26, 1990 @ 7:30 p.m.

April 11, 1990

Re: Contract No. CH566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman-Beantown Road
PDMS 082039

NAME Helen C White DATE 2-26-90

PLEASE PRINT ADDRESS C-10 Idlewood Trailer Park

CITY/TOWN Waldorf, STATE Maryland ZIP CODE 20601

I/We wish to comment or inquire about the following aspects of this project:

I wish to register my opinion about the displacement
of 1500 gravesites at Trinity Memorial Gardens. My father,
is buried there, my mother, will be there + my husband
my self + 1 of my children is to be buried there near the existing
road.
I think the alternate 5/6 modified should be the
only consideration.

Ms. Helen C. White
C-10 Idlewood Trailer Park
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dear Ms. White:

Thank you for your recent letter opposing impacts to the Trinity Memorial Gardens Cemetery as the result of improvement studies for MD 205.

Your support for Segment II, Alternate 5/6 Modified has been noted and will be considered in the development of our team recommendation. Thank you again for identifying your position.

Your name is on the project mailing list, so you will be kept informed of any future decisions made on this project.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Deputy Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

by: Victor F. Janata
Victor F. Janata
Project Manager
Project Planning Division

LHE:VFJ:kw

cc: Mr. Edward H. Meehan

Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List.*

Please delete my/our name(s) from the Mailing List.

*Persons who have received a copy of this brochure through the mail are already on the project Mailing List.

My telephone number is (301) 333-1105

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
383-7555 Baltimore Metro - 585-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5082 Statewide Toll Free
307 North Calvert St. Baltimore, Maryland 21202



Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

Richard H. Trainor
Secretary
Hal Kessoff
Administrator

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT
0111
11 10 11 '90

STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS

Contract No. CH 566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman/Beantown Road
Existing MD 5 to US 301
Location/Design Public Hearing
Monday, February 26, 1990 @ 7:30 p.m.

Re: Contract No. 566-151-571
Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)
Mattawoman-Beantown Road
PDMS No. 082039

NAME JAMES WOODWARD DATE 4-16-90

PLEASE PRINT ADDRESS C 22 Idlewood Pk.

CITY/TOWN Waldorf STATE Md ZIP CODE 20601

I/We wish to comment or inquire about the following aspects of this project:

I do NOT BELIEVE this will work.
Did you think about all the school buses
on this road all the children walking
on the side of the road.

I do NOT think the GRAVE SITES
AT TRINITY MEMORIAL GARDENS SHOULD
be moved.

I think the EASTERN BYPASS WILL
WORK BETTER

Mr. James Woodward
C 22 Idlewood Park
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dear Mr. Woodward:

Thank you for your recent letter regarding the MD 205 project planning study. Your opposition to the widening of existing Mattawoman-Beantown Road and the moving of grave sites at the Trinity Memorial Gardens Cemetery is noted and will be considered in the decision-making process.

Existing MD 205 has little or no shoulders. The improvements proposed, four through lanes with outside shoulders, would accommodate the increasing commuter traffic as well as right turns into and out of the residentially zoned land adjacent to the road. The shoulder would serve as a combination turning and breakdown lane. Bus stops and bicycle travel could also be accommodated by the outside shoulder. Pedestrians would be able to walk safely along a graded area behind the curb. The ultimate highway improvement is envisioned as a boulevard with a number of traffic signals at existing and future public street intersections. The existing 40 mph speed limit would remain.

From your opposition to disturbing any graves at the Trinity Memorial Gardens Cemetery, I surmise that you would support Alternate 5/6 Modified in Segment II. That alternate does not impact any graves and was presented at the February 26th public hearing.

The Eastern Bypass study has one preliminary alternate that would pass between Pinefield and the state parkland. Other preliminary alternates are west of US 301 and do not address the MD 5 corridor problems. Of course, we will continue to coordinate the potential implementation of MD 205 with decisions reached on the Eastern Bypass study.

My telephone number is (301) 333-1105

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
383-7555 Baltimore Metro - 565-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5052 Statewide Toll Free
707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List.*

Please delete my/our name(s) from the Mailing List.

*Persons who have received a copy of this brochure through the mail are already on the project Mailing List.

1. See response p. V-3 and V-7.

811-A

202

Mr. James Woodward
Page Two

Thank you again for identifying your position. Your name has been added to the project mailing list, so you will be kept informed of any future decisions made on this project.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Deputy Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

by:



Victor F. Ignata
Project Manager
Project Planning Division

LHE:VPJ:as

cc: Mr. Edward H. Meehan

203

10 13: 15
MAY 17 1990

5309 Doris Drive
Waldorf, Maryland 20601
May 19, 1990



Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

Richard H. Trainor
Secretary
Hal Kassoff
Administrator

June 12, 1990

Mr. Hal Kassoff
Administrator
State Highway Administration
707 North Calvert Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

Re: Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)

Dear Sir:

Problem Statement

The State Highway Administration (SHA) has proposed to solve a projected congestion problem at the intersection of Route 205 and Route 301 for design year 2015.

Discussion

To solve this problem your Office of Planning and Preliminary Engineering has proposed that Route 205 be widened and that a new interchange be built at the intersection of Route 205 and Route 301. If fully implemented, this proposal could cost as much as \$51 M depending upon the alternatives and options within the proposal.

The Pinefield Civic Association which represents the community of approximately 1400 homes adjacent to Route 205 has proposed building a high quality interchange only (Interchange Option D of the SHA proposal). This proposal would cost \$26 M. This proposal would represent a cost avoidance of \$20 M to \$25 M by eliminating the widening options contained in the SHA proposal.

Mr. Neil Pedersen and Mr. Victor Janata of your planning office and Mr. Thomas Mac Middleton, President of the Charles County Commissioners, attended the last Pinefield Civic Association meeting held on May 17th. None of these gentlemen could provide technical justification for widening the road. It appears that they all assumed that widening Route 205 was part of a cost effective measure to solving the congestion problem. It may not be.

The projected congestion problem will result from the inability of traffic to efficiently merge onto Route 301 from Route 205. Widening Route 205 will not solve the congestion problem. It will only bring the bottleneck closer to the intersection.

RECEIVED
DORIS E-139
MAY 24 1990
944
DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF
PLANNING & PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

Mr. Phillip F. Zalesak
Chairman, Route 205 Committee
Pinefield Civic Association
5309 Doris Drive
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dear Mr. Zalesak:

Thank you for your May 19th letter, which contained the recommendations of your association regarding the MD 205 project planning study. Your support for Interchange Option D and opposition to any widening of MD 205 will be taken into consideration in the decision-making process. I would like to clarify several points in your letter.

The "forecasted congestion problem" is not just at the US 301/MD 205 intersection, but all along MD 205, from MD 5 to US 301. The problems are not just congestion, caused by over-loading the capacity of the facility, but also accident problems related to the type of road and the capacity restrictions.

We believe that through the study process, we have developed alternates that will relieve the transportation problems in the MD 205 corridor. These include the reconstruction of the MD 205 roadway to a four-lane divided highway, as well as construction of an interchange to replace or augment the intersection at US 301/MD 205. The interchange is justified in conjunction with additional capacity being provided along MD 205. It would be difficult for us to justify expending \$20-30 million for an interchange at US 301 if it does not tie into a widened MD 205.

The need for the proposed improvements is presented in the Environmental Assessment prepared for the project. As traffic volumes continue to grow in the area, congestion will worsen and the accident rate on MD 205 will increase. Your association has been provided with a copy of that document, which contains an explanation of the existing and projected levels of service on MD 205 and summarizes the results of the technical analyses. Traffic growth in the corridor will outstrip the ability of the existing two-lane roadway to serve the capacity needs.

My telephone number is (301) 333-1111

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
363-7555 Baltimore Metro - 565-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5062 Statewide Toll Free
707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

205

V-120

What will solve the congestion problem is to build a high quality interchange which will move traffic efficiently and safely onto and off of Route 301. Option D of your proposal meets these criteria. This would be the logical first step in construction. It may also be the only one necessary. It is probably sufficient to meet the stated objective "to alleviate existing congestion and provide for continued safe and efficient operation in the future."

Recommendation

I recommend the following actions:

(1) Proceed with planning, programming and budgeting of the SHA Option D interchange.

(2) Cease any further planning and consideration of widening Route 205 until sufficient technical justification can be developed. Neither SHA or Charles County seems to have this data. If they do, they have not presented it to the people who would be impacted by this action.

Summary

Implementing the above recommendations will allow the stated objective to be met and provide an opportunity to revisit the option of widening Route 205 at a later date.

Sincerely,



Phil Zalesak
Chairman,
Route 205 Committee
Pinefield Civic Association


Copy to:

Congressman Roy Dyson
Richard H. Trainor (Secretary, Maryland Department of Transportation)
State Senator James C. Simpson
State Delegate John F. Wood
Charles County Commissioners
Maryland Independent
Times Crescent
Pinefield Newsletter

Mr. Philip F. Zalesak
Page Two

If you have any further questions, please feel free to call Mr. Neil Pedersen, our planning director, for a fuller discussion of the issues. Mr. Pedersen can be reached at (301) 333-1110.

Sincerely,



Hal Kassoff
Administrator

HKA

cc: Mr. Edward H. Meehan
Mr. Neil J. Pedersen
Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.

V-121

205

PROJECT 5309 Doris Drive
DEVELOPER Waldorf, Maryland 20601
June 25, 1990



Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

Richard H. Trainor
Secretary
Hal Kassoff
Administrator

Mr. Hal Kassoff
Administrator
State Highway Administration
707 North Calvert Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

JUN 25 1990

RECEIVED

JUN 28 1990 F-148

193

DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF

PLANNING & TRANSPORTATION

August 2, 1990

Mr. Phil Zalesak
President (Elect)
Pinefield Civic Association
5309 Doris Drive
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Re: Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)

Dear Sir:

Thank you for your letter of June 12, 1990. I have reviewed the contents of the environmental assessment (contract no. 566-151-571) and have discussed its contents with Mr. Victor Janata of your office.

I have studied Table 12, Effects on Traffic Operations (pages IV-6 to IV-9), and have come to the following conclusions:

First, widening MD 205 will not significantly improve the congestion and safety problems projected at the intersections of US 301-MD 5/MD 205 and MD 5/MD 205, high accident intersections identified in section 11 of the assessment. The US 301-MD 5/MD 205 intersection would still be at level of service (LOS) F (force or breakdown flow) after widening had been completed (page IV-8). The MDS/MD 205 intersection would be at LOS E and F, respectively, during morning and evening peak hours for alternative 5 (page IV-7). The MDS/MD 205 intersection would be at LOS D for both morning and evening peak hours for alternative 6 (page IV-7). I would call these gains marginal at best for the amount of resources dedicated to this portion of the project.

Second, only interchange option D provides any significant relief in congestion (and presumably safety) at the US 301-MDS/MD 205 intersection and allows easy access to southbound US 301 from Pinefield. Options A and B would provide no relief in congestion (LOS F morning and evening) even with the mainline alternative built (page IV-9). Significant is the note at the bottom of the page that reads "all intersections along 301 will have a LOS F due to the anticipated traffic along US 301. A fourth lane along US 301 (in each direction) is needed to provide an adequate level-of-service." I understand that US 301 will only be widened to three lanes in each direction in the near future. Option C would not provide easy access to southbound US 301 from Pinefield. Option D would provide easy access to southbound US 301 and have minimal impact in our community.

Dear Mr. Zalesak:

Thank you for your June 25th letter regarding the MD 205 project planning study. I would like to clarify several points in your letter.

Interchange options have been studied at US 301 because an interchange is the only long term solution for the MD 205 intersection with US 301/MD 5; however, this is in conjunction with the widening of MD 205. Without implementing the build improvements to MD 205, the northern segment of it will be operating at level of service (LOS) F in this decade, with traffic operating at a stop and go condition. The remainder of the highway will be at LOS F before the design year (2015).

The MD 5/MD 205 intersection fails by the design year, even with the Alternate 5 improvements to MD 205, because the intersection does not adequately handle the transportation needs. An interchange is required there, but because of the magnitude of residential and commercial displacements for existing and approved development and wetland impacts, it was not presented. With the Alternate 6 improvements to MD 205, no interchange is needed at MD 5, and the existing MD 5/MD 205 intersection, with no improvements, operates significantly better and meets the transportation needs for the design year.

All of the interchange options at US 301/MD 5 result in significant improvements to congestion and safety levels. The misunderstanding results from the comparison between intersection and ramp LOS. With Interchange Options A and B, the existing intersection would remain, but with considerably less traffic along existing MD 205. However the intersection LOS designations are derived from the total volume of traffic through the intersection, and the US 301 volumes overwhelm the calculations. Interchange Options C and D replace the intersection. Once traffic is on US 301, regardless of which interchange option might be built, traffic will operate at LOS F in the design year because of the volume of traffic on US 301 for the lanes provided. It should be noted that the US 301 traffic volumes do not reflect implementation of an eastern Washington Bypass solution.

My telephone number is (301) 333-1111

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
303-7555 Baltimore Metro - 565-0461 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5082 Statewide Toll Free
707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

2009

V-122

In summary, the data contained in your report documents a projected congestion and safety problem at the two primary intersections of MD 205. Your data indicate that only marginal improvement can be obtained by widening MD 205. Your data indicate that interchange option D provides significant relief in congestion (and presumably safety) and further provides easy access to southbound US 301 from Pinefield.

I strongly recommend that interchange option D be considered the first step in solving the congestion and safety problem documented in your assessment. I also recommend that an analysis be conducted to determine the impact of just implementing interchange option D. This additional data would allow you to determine the cost effectiveness of widening MD 205.

Sincerely,



Phil Zalesak
President (Elect),
Pinefield Civic Association

Mr. Phil Zalesak
Page Two


PROJECT
DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION

AUG 2 3 55 PM '90

Selection of an interchange option will be based on a number of factors, including maintenance of traffic impacts, wetland impacts, disruptions to commercial access, and costs. We continue to believe that Pinefield residents will have safe access to southbound US 301 with any of the interchange options. The widening of MD 205 is supported by our published data that identifies the operational deficiencies of the existing road and the improved LOS and reduced accident rate for the build alternates in the design year.

If you have any further questions, please feel free to call Mr. Neil Pedersen, our planning director, for a fuller discussion of the issues. Mr. Pedersen can be reached at (301) 333-1110.

Sincerely,



Hal Kassoff
Administrator

HK/ih

cc: Mr. Edward H. Meehan
Mr. Neil J. Pedersen
Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.

5309 Doris Drive
Waldorf, Maryland 20601
April 28, 1990

PROJECT
DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION

MAY 2 4 15 PM '90



Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

Richard H. Trainor
Secretary
Hal Kassoff
Administrator

Mr. Neil J. Pedersen, Director
Office of Planning and Preliminary Engineering
State Highway Administration
P.O. Box 717
Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

May 22, 1990

Re: Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)

The Pinefield Civic Association (PCA) met last Thursday, April 26, 1990 to discuss the subject proposal. I passed out copies of the diagrams contained in your location/design public hearing brochure and read from sections of the brochure to acquaint the attendees with the proposal. After much discussion, the following determinations were made:

(1) First, Mr. Johnny Martin's letter to you dated March 31, 1990 was not formulated in accordance with the by-laws that govern the PCA and, therefore, does not represent the position of the Pinefield community. In fact, Mr. Martin admitted that this was his proposal. Mr. Martin is a hard working PCA president, however, he erred in presenting his proposal as the consensus view of the Pinefield community. Virtually no one at the meeting spoke in favor for a build option regarding the widening of Route 205 except for Mr. Martin.

(2) Second, to Mr. Martin's credit he tasked me to formulate a position that would represent a consensus view of our community. Based on the discussions at the meeting, the following position is formulated and will be reviewed in accordance with the PCA by-laws:

a. The PCA supports a no-build alternative regarding the widening of Route 205 (segments I, II and III). Widening the road will not alleviate congestion and will destroy the quality of life for the residents of Pinefield and the people living along Route 205.

b. The PCA supports the high quality interchange, option D, to alleviate congestion at the intersection of Route 301 and 205.

c. The PCA believes that this proposal is the most cost effective solution to the developing congestion problem and will preserve the quality of life in our community.

Sincerely

Philip F. Zalesak

cc: Mr. Hal Kassoff (SHA)
County Commissioners

RECEIVED

MAY 2 1990

DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF
PLANNING & PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

Mr. Philip F. Zalesak
5309 Doris Drive
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dear Mr. Zalesak:

Thank you for your April 28th letter identifying the preliminary position of the Pinefield Civic Association towards improvements being studied for MD 205 (Mattawoman-Beantown Road). I also appreciated the opportunity to meet with representatives of the association on May 17th.

The Pinefield Civic Association's position against a build alternate along MD 205 and favoring Interchange Option D to replace the US 301/MD 205 intersection is noted and will be considered in the selection of alternates for this project. Thank you for submitting your recommendations.

Very truly yours,

Neil J. Pedersen, Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

NJP:as

cc: Mr. Edward H. Meehan
Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Mr. John M. Contestabile

My telephone number is (301) _____

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
363-7555 Baltimore Metro - 565-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5062 Statewide Toll Free
707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

1. See response p. V-18

208

PROJECT
DEVELOPMENT

5309 Doris Drive
Waldorf, Maryland 20601
April 23, 1990



Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

Richard H. Trainor
Secretary
Hal Kassoff
Administrator

May 22, 1990

Mr. Neil J. Pedersen, Director
Office of Planning and Preliminary Engineering
State Highway Administration
P.O. Box 717
Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

Re: Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)

Dear Sir:

I have reviewed the subject proposal and have discussed this matter with Mr. Victor Janata of your office. After careful consideration, I have come to the following conclusions:

First, six lanes of traffic at the entrance of Pinefield will permanently destroy the quality of life for the residents of Pinefield, a community of approximately 1400 homes. If completed, this construction would add pollution, noise and safety hazards to a quiet, established neighborhood and disrupt the efficient flow of traffic from Pinefield to Route 301 going south.

Second, if the proposal is seriously considered, a number of flaws need to be addressed. I understand that the project would be completed in stages with Route 205 being widened first (segments I, II and III) and an interchange to be built later. If this is the plan to be executed, the tax payers will have spent a minimum of \$19.1 M and achieved nothing as far as relieving congestion. I also understand that if an interchange is to be built concurrent with the widening of Route 205, options A and B are preferred. These options actually impede traffic feeding from the Pinefield community trying to access Route 301 going south. Residents would have to cross six lanes of traffic to access the Route 205 and 301 intersection.

I recommend the following:

First, take no action on this proposal. Improvements are already underway to improve the flow of traffic through Waldorf by widening Route 301 and Route 5. This work will be completed by 1992. The Washington Bypass determination will be made later this year. Both of these projects may preclude the requirement for making any changes to Route 205.

Mr. Philip F. Zeleseck
5309 Doris Drive
Weldorf, Meryland 20601

Deer Mr. Zeleseck:

Thank you for your April 23rd letter recommending no action regarding improvements to MD 205 end supporting the construction of Interchange Option C or D first, if e build solution is selected.

While I cen sympathize with your apprehensions about increasing treffic along Mettawomen-Beentown Roed (MD 205), this is e preferred route for much of the MD 5 through traffic. Volumes will continue to grow on this highway, with or without the improvements presented in our project planning study.

No decisions have been reached on the steging of improvements. If a build solution is selected, the engineering phase would involve the detailed design of e roedway elternate end en interchange option. No segment of the project is in the current construction program. Should the roadway be reconstructed first, our goel remains to construct en interchange at US 301/MD 205 before the improved intersection reeches capacity.

The Pinefield Roed intersection with MD 205 is elready signalized, and the Interchange Options A end B intersection with MD 205, which will line up with Nike Drive, will likely be controlled by a traffic signal. Pinefield residents will heve safe access to southbound US 301; therefore, Options A end B cannot be eliminated. Selection of en interchange option hes not yet been mede.

Our traffic forecasts reflect the relationship of MD 205 end the surrounding highway network. A number of releted highway improvements are included, such as the widening of US 301/MD 5 through Weldorf to six through lenes. There is the possibility thet decisions reeched on the Washington Bypass could affect the treffic forecasts for MD 205. The future treffic volumes and

My telephona number is (301) 333-1110

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
383-7555 Baltimore Metro - 565-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5082 Statewide Toll Free
707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

209

Second, if you decide to proceed with the proposed project, build either interchange options C or D first before widening Route 205. If the interchange alone alleviates congestion, you will have saved the taxpayers \$19.1 M and preclude destroying an established neighborhood.

Sincerely,


Philip F. Zalesak


Mr. Philip F. Zalesak
Page Two

resulting magnitude of highway improvements needed for MD 205 can be reassessed as decisions on other highway improvements or changes in the highway network are made. No decisions are final, particularly when events result in less damaging and less expensive solutions.

Your recommendation to build the interchange at US 301 first and your preference for Interchange Options C and D have been noted and will be considered in the selection of alternates for this project.

Thank you for your time and effort in submitting recommendations. Your contribution to the project planning process is appreciated.

Very truly yours,


Neil J. Pedersen, Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

NJP/ih

cc: Mr. Edward H. Meehan
Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Mr. John M. Contestabile

210

THE HONORABLE THOMAS MAC MIDDLETON,
MURRAY D. LEVY
NANCY J. SEPTON

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT
MAR 5 12 47 PM '90



MELVIN S. BRIDGETT
COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

MAR 13 1990

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT
MAR 14 12 34 PM '90

County Commissioners
of Charles County

P. O. BOX B
LA PLATA, MARYLAND 20648
(301) 845-0550 OR D.C. 870-3000

RECEIVED

MAR 2 1990

DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF
PLANNING & PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

February 26, 1990

Mr. Hal Kassoff, Administrator
Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration
707 N. Calvert Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

Dear Mr. Kassoff:

We would like to thank the State Highway Administration for their cooperation and support in the development of the Route 205 improvement project. We would also like to express our support for the proposals that have been presented by the State Highway Administration staff, and although we do not wish to indicate a preference among the alternates at this time, we would encourage the State to proceed with a build alternate.

The existing intersections of U.S. Route 301 with Maryland Route 205, and with Maryland Routes 228 and 5, currently operate at unacceptable levels of service. The improvement of Maryland Route 205 to a relocated Maryland Route 5, with an interchange at U.S. Route 301, will provide badly needed additional capacity and will allow these roads to function properly.

The Route 205 study has been modified by the State to create a six lane divided highway for most of this roadway. We understand that this was done in response to projected traffic volumes. We would like to suggest the development of an access control or access management program for the improved roadway. This will maintain the facility's ability to carry high volumes of traffic. We also feel that it is important to include the construction of an interchange at the U. S. 301 intersection.

The Honorable Thomas Mac Middleton
President, Charles County Commissioners
Post Office Box B
La Plata, Maryland 20648

Dear Commissioner Middleton:

Thank you for your February 26th letter and Commissioner Septon's presentation at the MD 205 (Mattawoman-Beantown Road) Location/Design Public Hearing. We appreciate your support of a build solution to alleviate congestion problems in the Waldorf area.

Consistent with the level of access controls for MD 5 to the south and recognizing the resulting impacts to the large number of existing residential access points along MD 205, we did not propose formal access controls along the anticipated highway improvements. We hope to work closely with Charles County through our Access Control Committee to minimize any additional entrance points, encouraging developers to access from intersecting public roads. Based on the support indicated by Charles County elected officials, we are proceeding with design for the widening of MD 205.

Thank you again for letting us know the Commissioners' position regarding this project.

Sincerely,

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY:
HAL KASSOFF

Hal Kassoff
Administrator

HK/t

cc: Mr. Neil J. Pedersen
Mr. Edward H. Meehan

bcc: Mr. John D. Bruck
Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.

SAY NO TO DRUGS
EQUAL OPPORTUNITY COUNTY

211

V-127

Mr. Hal Kassoff
February 26, 1990
Page -2-

We feel that this is an important project that we would like to see proceed to construction as quickly as possible, while assuring that any negative impacts that may result from this project are minimized.

Again, thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Very truly,

COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF
CHARLES COUNTY, MARYLAND

Thomas Mac Middleton
Thomas Mac Middleton, President

Murray D. Levy
Murray D. Levy

Nancy J. Sefton
Nancy J. Sefton

1b

1. See response p. V-18.
2. An access control management strategy will be developed in conjunction with Charles County for proposed developments.

2/27

V-128

ADDITION COMMENTS RECEIVED

V-129

2/3

Date: 5-15-90

Name: STANLEY DIXIE
KUCZEWSKIAddress: 1029 COUNTRY LANE
WALDORF, MD. 20601Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway AdministrationRichard H. Train
Secretary
Hal Kassoff
Administrator

July 17, 1990

Mr. Neil J. Pedersen
Director, Office of Planning & Preliminary Engineering
State Highway Administration
P.O. Box 717
Baltimore, MD 21203-0717

RE: MD 5 Relocated Project (Widening MD 205)

Dear Mr. Pedersen,

I am concerned about your current plans to widen MD 205 Mattawoman-Beantown Rd. (in your MD 5 Relocated Project). Using any of your current options will make it hazardous for my family, friends, and me to use the main entrance to the Pinefield neighborhood.

Already, with only two lanes, it is dangerous for the kids of Pinefield to go to the local stores or to visit friends when they must walk along or cross MD 205. By adding additional lanes of traffic, I believe the situation will become so dangerous that the main entrance to Pinefield will become unsafe.

Since I never planned to have a six lane highway at my doorstep when I bought my home, I request you to develop another alternative as part of the MD 5 Relocated project, to make the Pinefield entrance safer (not more hazardous). I have reviewed the "Pinefield Option" and agree/disagree (circle one) with it. To help me keep close track on the direction this project is taking, please place me on your mailing list for this project.

Reply Requested.

Signed,

Mr. and Mrs. Stanley Kuczewski
1029 Country Lane
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Kuczewski:

Thank you for your recent letter regarding the project planning study for MD 205. We have noted your opposition to additional lanes on Mattawoman-Beantown Road, and your concern that improvements to the road would make the existing signalized MD 205/Pinefield Road intersection more dangerous.

While I can sympathize with your apprehensions about increasing traffic along Mattawoman-Beantown Road, this is a preferred route for much of the MD 5 through traffic. Volumes will continue to grow on this highway, with or without the improvements presented in our project planning study.

Existing MD 205 has a higher accident rate than the state-wide average for similar type roads. The proposed improvement, a curbed four-lane divided highway with outside shoulders, would significantly reduce that rate. The proposed median would act as a safety zone for any pedestrians or vehicles crossing or turning left on the highway. They would only have to look in one direction at a time, and caps in the highway traffic would be more likely to occur with more lanes. The shoulder would serve as a combination turning and breakdown lane. Graded areas behind the outside curbs would provide a safer location for persons walking along the highway.

We believe that, with proper design, a roadway can be constructed that will be safe for Pinefield residents and for through travelers on Mattawoman-Beantown Road. The proposed closed section roadway, together with protected turn lanes and signals, will afford a safe design.

My telephone number is (301) 333-1110

Mr. and Mrs. Stanley Kuczewski
Page Two

Your opposition to additional roadway lanes on MD 205 near Pinefield Road has been noted and will be considered in the selection of an alternate. Your name has been added to the project mailing list so you will be kept informed of any future decisions made on this project.

Very truly yours,

Neil J. Pedersen

Neil J. Pedersen, Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

NJP:ee

cc: Mr. Edward H. Meehan
Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.

JUNE 26, 1990

MR. NEIL J. PEDERSEN - DIRECTOR
OFFICE OF PLANNING & PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING
STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
P. O. BOX 717
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND 21203-0717

DEAR MR. PEDERSEN:

WE ARE THE MEDLIN FAMILY AND WE HAVE LIVED IN OUR HOME AT 1905 MATTAWOMAN-BEANTOWN ROAD FOR 8 YEARS. IN THAT TIME WE HAVE SEEN MANY, MANY ACCIDENTS ON OUR ROAD, ESPECIALLY IN FRONT OF OUR HOME. WE HAVE HAD CARS JUMP OUR CURB AND TEAR DOWN OUR MAILBOX QUITE A FEW TIMES, WE EVEN HAVE HAD A CAR ROLL STRAIGHT THROUGH OUR YARD ACROSS OUR DRIVEWAY AND FINALLY IT CAME TO REST ON ONE OF OUR BIG TREES. IN THIS ACCIDENT A BOY WAS HURT VERY BADLY. THANK GOD WE WERE NOT HOME, BUT WE CAME HOME TO CAR PARTS AND GAUSE, TUBES AND BLOOD ALL OVER OUR DRIVEWAY.

OUR HOME SITS PRETTY CLOSE TO THE ROAD ALREADY AND IT'S ALWAYS BEEN A NIGHTMARE TRYING TO GET IN AND OUT OF OUR DRIVEWAY. WE HAVE BEEN VERY LUCKY SO FAR. WE HAVE ALMOST BEEN HIT HEAD-ON AND REAR-ENDED BY PEOPLE NOT ACKNOWLEDGING THE YELLOW SAFETY AREA IN FRONT OF OUR HOME. WE HAVE ALWAYS BEEN VERY CAUTIOUS AND FEARFUL FOR OUR FAMILY. EVEN GETTING OUR MAIL OR PUTTING OUR TRASH OUT WE HAVE TO BE CAREFUL BECAUSE OF THE CARS GOING TOO FAST AND COMING DANGEROUSLY CLOSE TO OUR CURB. WE CANNOT IMAGINE 6 LANES OF TRAFFIC IN FRONT OF OUR HOME, DUE TO THE FACT WE WILL LOOSE SOME OF OUR FRONT YARD SPACE WHICH WILL PUT OUR HOME EVEN CLOSER TO THE ROAD - NOT TO MENTION THE NOISE TYHT WILL ALSO BE CREATED BY THIS

THERE HAVE BEEN SO MANY ACCIDENTS BETWEEN THE PINEFIELD LIGHT AND NIKE DRIVE. WITH THE NEW ROAD TAKING PART OF OUR FRONT YARD AND PUTTING OUR HOME EVEN CLOSER TO THE ROAD IS A TERRIFYING THOUGHT. WE ARE REALLY AFRAID FOR OUR FAMILY AND THE OTHER FAMILY'S AROUND US. THIS IS WHY WE WOULD LIKE THE NO-BUILD OPTION ON THE WIDENING OF ROUTE 205 AND THE INTER-CHANGE RE-BUILDING OPTION D BE ENCOURAGED.

WE SINCERELY HOPE SOMEONE WILL GIVE SOME THOUGHT TO US, OUR HOMES, AND OUR SAFETY BEFORE THERE IS A REAL TRAGEDY.

THANKING YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND ATTENTION IN THIS MATTER, WE REMAIN,

RESPECTIFULLY YOURS,

Neil & Jodie E. Medlin



Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

Richard H. Tr
Secretary
Hel Kassoff
Administrator

July 18, 1990

Mr. and Mrs. Lonnie G. Madlin
1905 Mettewomen-Beentown Road
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Madlin:

Thank you for your letter of June 26th regarding the MD 205 project planning study. Your support for the no-build alternate along MD 205 and Interchange Option D at US 301 will be taken into consideration in the decision-making process.

Mattawoman-Beantown Road (MD 205) remains a preferred route for much of the MD 5 through traffic. Volume will continue to grow on this highway, with or without the improvements presented in our project planning study.

Existing MD 205 has a higher accident rate than the statewide average for similar type roads. The proposed improvement would significantly reduce that rate. This is because the median would act as a safety zone for any pedestrian or vehicle crossing or turning left on the highway. Additionally, gaps in the highway traffic (which would allow turning movements) would be more likely to occur with more lanes.

The improvements proposed for MD 205, reconstruction to four through lanes with outside shoulders, would accommodate the increasing commuter traffic as well as right turns into and out of the residentially zoned land adjacent to the road. The shoulder would serve as a combination turning and breakdown lane. The interchange would be justified only in conjunction with additional capacity being provided along MD 205.

The improvements would involve the replacement of the existing curb along MD 205 in virtually the same location. The new shoulder would be located inside the curb, and then the two northbound lanes, so the new roadway would actually be farther away from your home. The strip of your frontage needed for the highway improvement would accommodate a graded grassy area outside the curb for pedestrian use plus any slopes to meet the existing ground.

My telephone number is (301) 333-1110

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
303-7555 Baltimore Metro - 565-0431 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5082 Statewide Toll Free
707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

210

V-132

Mr. and Mrs. Lonnie G. Medlin
Page Two

Thank you for sharing your concerns. Your name has been verified as being on the project mailing list, so you will be kept informed of any future decisions made on this project.

Very truly yours,

Neil J. Padarsen

Neil J. Padarsen, Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

NJP:as

cc: Mr. Edward H. Meahan
Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT DIVISION
SEP 4 11 58 AM '90

5309 Doris Drive
Waldorf, Maryland 20601
August 27, 1990

Mr. Hal Kassoff
Administrator
State Highway Administration
P.O. Box 717
Baltimore, Maryland 21203 - 0717

Re: Proposed MD 5 Relocated (MD 205)

1. Thank you for your letter of August 2, 1990. I have no further questions regarding the State Highway Administration's (SHA) position on the subject project. As you ponder the merits of this project, please consider the following points in your deliberations:

2. The SHA's goal for this project is to "alleviate existing congestion and provide for continued safe and efficient operation in the future." The SHA position on this project is as follows:

a. To alleviate existing congestion, SHA is willing to spend upwards of \$31M to improve a feeder road which will merge with a major highway projected to be at forced or breakdown flow in the design year. Widening the feeder road and building a interchange at the intersection of the feeder road and the major highway will significantly improve the traffic flow from the feeder road onto the major highway which is operating at forced or breakdown flow. (I would like to see this calculation.)

b. The selection of interchange options will be based on:

- (1) maintenance of traffic impacts
- (2) wetland impacts
- (3) disruption to commercial access and
- (4) costs.

c. Any of the interchange options will provide safe access to southbound US 301.

3. In reviewing the position contained in paragraph 2.a. above, consider the following:

a. This new improved feeder road is going nowhere. Your letter of August 2, 1990 states clearly that "once traffic is on US 301, regardless of which interchange option might be built, traffic will operate at LOS F in the design year because of the volume of traffic



Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration
PROJECT DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

SEP 17 9 05 AM '90
September 14, 1990

Richard H. Trainor
Secretary
Hal Kassoff
Administrator

Mr. Philip F. Zalesak
President (Elect)
Pinefield Civic Association
5309 Doris Drive
Waldorf, Maryland 20601

Dear Mr. Zalesak:


Thank you for your August 27th letter regarding the MD 205 project planning study. We appreciate the time and thoughtful analysis you have put into this issue. Your points will be considered as we deliberate what course of action to pursue.

While our analyses show that US 301 to the north of the proposed US 301/MD 205 interchange would operate at Level of Service F conditions in the design year, the interchange will substantially improve conditions over what they would be under the no-build alternative.

The case for the need for an interchange at US 301 and MD 205 exists regardless of whether a Washington Bypass is constructed. I can assure you that impacts to people who live along MD 205, as well as safety considerations, will be major considerations in any decision which is ultimately made regarding MD 205.

Again, thank you for your thoughtful letter. If you have any additional questions, please feel free to contact me or Neil Pedersen, Director of the Office of Planning and Preliminary Engineering. Mr. Pedersen can be reached at (301) 333-1110.

Sincerely,


Hal Kassoff
Administrator

HK:tn

cc: Mr. Neil J. Pedersen
Mr. Edward H. Meehan
Mr. Louis H. Ega, Jr.

My telephone number is (301) _____

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
303-7555 Baltimore Metro - 565-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5062 Statewide Toll Free
707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

218

on US 301 for the lanes provided." Is this project really going to alleviate congestion? How many more cars per minute will really transition onto Route 301 given the SHA projection?

b. Your letter also implies that the success of this project is dependent on implementation of the eastern Washington Bypass. Given the current political environment (two of the three Charles County commissioners openly oppose the eastern Washington Bypass), a decision on the MD 205 may be premature.

4. In reviewing the position contained in paragraph 2.b. above, consider the following:

a. Nowhere on your priority list is the impact to the people who live along and adjacent to MD 205. Pinefield alone is approximately 1400 homes. Aren't we your customers also? Shouldn't consideration be given to the efficient flow of traffic from northbound MD 205 to southbound US 301? This access is critical to the people of Pinefield. This is our primary access to businesses and shopping in Waldorf. We can't just pick up and move. Businesses turnover in the Pinefield shopping centers every year, yet disruption to commercial access is on your priority list. Cost also made your priority list. SHA seems willing to spend up to \$25 M for the mainline options but not willing to spend sufficient funds to build a high quality interchange which serves the needs of our community.

Interchange options A and B are inconvenient and inconsistent with the SHA goal to provide efficient operations. How efficient is it to force people to engage another intersection before they can access southbound US 301? Also, interchange option C would require another light at the intersection of US 301 and Pinefield Road extended to provide comparable service to what we have now. US 301 already has too many lights which cause inefficient traffic flow through Waldorf.

b. Where is safety on your list? This whole project is presumably based on "continued safe and efficient operation in the future."

5. Regarding safety, point 2.c. above, consider the following:

a. Which is safer, to cross two intersections or one intersection to access southbound US 301 from northbound MD 205? I think the answer is obvious without making a calculation. Interchange options A and B create a safety hazard which currently does not exist. These options force people to cross southbound MD 205 traffic before they can access the US 301/MD 205 intersection.

219


V-136

b. How safe is option C? Is it safer to make a right hand turn at a light or cross through an intersection? I think the answer is obvious. Option C would create a hazard which currently does not exist.

6. In summary, given the SHA projection of traffic along US 301, this whole project seems dubious at best. This project, as currently conceived, will not "alleviate existing congestion and provide for continued safe and efficient operation in the future." However, if SHA insists on going forward with this project for other reasons, I strongly recommend that interchange option D be considered as part of the plan. Option D is the safest, most efficient and least disruptive of all the options in moving traffic onto and off of US 301.

7. Please keep me informed regarding the status of this project.

Sincerely,


Philip Jalesak
President (Elect)
Pinefield Civic Association

V-137

1. The Selected Build Alternate includes Interchange Option A. This will provide adequate traffic operation and safety in the future.

DDP
6/26/00

10-11-11

V. CORRESPONDENCE

B. ELECTED OFFICIALS

222

B. Elected Officials

The following is a statement given at the Combined Location/Design Public Hearing held on Monday, February 26, 1990 at Thomas Stone High School.

4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

I'd like to start by recognizing Commissioner Nancy Sefton who is here on behalf of the County Commissioners, and who has a statement she would like to read into the record. Ms. Sefton?

COMMISSIONER SEFTON:

Thank you, Mr. Meehan. Although this is not a County project, the County tries to coordinate our local road projects with those that the State are doing, so on behalf of my fellow County Commissioners, Murray Levy and Mack Middleton, who are at other functions this evening, I would like to read our statement.

"We would like to thank the State Highway Administration for their cooperation and support in the development of the Route 205 improvement project. We would also like to express our support for the proposals that have been presented by State Highway Administrative staff, and although we do not wish to indicate a preference among the alternates at this time, we would encourage the State to proceed with the build alternate.

1 "The existing intersections of Routes U.S. 301 and
 2 Maryland Route 205 and Maryland Route 228 and 5 currently
 3 operate at unacceptable levels of service. The improvement
 4 of Maryland Route 205 to a relocated Maryland Route 5 with
 5 an interchange at 301 will provide badly needed additional
 6 capacity and will allow these roads to function properly.
 7 The Route 205 study has been modified by the State to create
 8 a six (6)-lane divided highway for most of this roadway.
 9 We understand that this was done in response to projected
 10 traffic volume. We would like to suggest the development of
 11 an access control or access management program for the
 12 improved roadway. This will maintain the facility's
 13 ability to carry high volumes of traffic. We feel that it
 14 is important to include the construction of the interchange
 15 at the U.S. 301 intersection.

16 "We feel this is an important project and we would
 17 like to see it proceed to construction as quickly as possible
 18 while assuring that any negative impacts that may result from
 19 this project are minimized. We thank you for this cooperation
 20 in the matter." And it is signed by the County Commissioners.

21 MR. MEEHAN:

22 Thank you, Commissioner Sefton.

23 Tonight is the night the legislators work late in

1 Annapolis, so I don't think we have any State delegates or
2 the State senator with us tonight. However, I wanted to check
3 and make sure. Are there any State delegates, or is Senator
4 Simpson here? They're all working in Annapolis tonight.

5 Okay, are there any Federal officials who would
6 like to give testimony, from any Federal agencies? Any State
7 agencies represented here tonight? The County has already
8 spoken, so we will get into the mailing list.

THOMAS MAC MIDDLETON, PRESIDENT
MURRAY D. LEVY
NANCY J. SEFTON



MELVIN S. BRIDGETT
COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

④
225

County Commissioners
of Charles County

P. O. BOX B
LA PLATA, MARYLAND 20646
(301) 645-0550 OR D.C. 870-3000

RECEIVED

MAR 2 1990

DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF
PLANNING & PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

February 26, 1990

Mr. Hal Kassoff, Administrator
Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration
707 N. Calvert Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

Dear Mr. Kassoff:

We would like to thank the State Highway Administration for their cooperation and support in the development of the Route 205 improvement project. We would also like to express our support for the proposals that have been presented by the State Highway Administration staff, and although we do not wish to indicate a preference among the alternates at this time, we would encourage the State to proceed with a build alternate.

The existing intersections of U.S. Route 301 with Maryland Route 205, and with Maryland Routes 228 and 5, currently operate at unacceptable levels of service. The improvement of Maryland Route 205 to a relocated Maryland Route 5, with an interchange at U.S. Route 301, will provide badly needed additional capacity and will allow these roads to function properly.

The Route 205 study has been modified by the State to create a six lane divided highway for most of this roadway. We understand that this was done in response to projected traffic volumes. We would like to suggest the development of an access control or access management program for the improved roadway. This will maintain the facility's ability to carry high volumes of traffic. We also feel that it is important to include the construction of an interchange at the U. S. 301 intersection.

SAY NO TO DRUGS

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY COUNTY

226

Mr. Hal Kassoff
February 26, 1990
Page -2-

We feel that this is an important project that we would like to see proceed to construction as quickly as possible, while assuring that any negative impacts that may result from this project are minimized.


Again, thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Very truly,


COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF
CHARLES COUNTY, MARYLAND



Thomas Mac Middleton, President



Murray D. Levy



Nancy J. Sefton

1b

V. CORRESPONDENCE

C. AGENCY COORDINATION

V. CORRESPONDENCE

C. Agency Coordination

<u>DATE</u>	<u>COORDINATION</u>
8-23-89	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
9-14-89	
6-30-88	Maryland Historical Trust
7-28-89	
4-89	Phase I Archeological Investigation
2-03-89	Waldorf Restaurant, Inc.
2-29-88	Maryland Department of Natural Resources
2-08-89	Tidewater Administration
3-09-89	
3-04-88	Maryland Department of Natural Resources
3-13-89	Forest, Park and Wildlife Service
6-13-89	
8-03-89	
3-16-90	Maryland Department of Natural Resources
4-05-90	Water Resources Administration
7-11-90	Maryland Department of Natural Resources
	Capital Programs Administration
2-23-88	U.S. Department of Interior
3-26-90	Fish and Wildlife Service
11-28-90	
8-31-89	Chesapeake Bay Critical Areas Commission
2-15-89	U.S. Department of Agriculture
4-20-89	

229

2-21-90	Maryland Department of Environment
3-12-90	
10-19-90	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
3-18-90	U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
4-18-90	Charles County Government Planning and Growth Management
8-30-89	Prince George's County Government Department of Environmental Resources
1-14-90	Waldorf Volunteer Fire Department, Inc.
11-1-91	Conrail
01-18-89	Interagency Meetings
10-18-89	
08-15-90	
07-17-91	



Johnson, Mirmiran and Thompson, P.A.
PLANNERS ENGINEERS LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS SURVEYORS

MEMORANDUM

TO: The File
FROM: Chuck Butler
DATE: August 23, 1989
SUBJECT: Corps of Engineers Wetland Field Review for MD 5 Relocated.

On Tuesday August 22, 1989, a field review of the delineated wetlands was held with the following persons in attendance:

Victor Janata	SHA, Project Planning
David Coyne	SHA, Project Planning
Barbara Allera-Bohlen	SHA, Environmental Management
Susan Jacobs	SHA, Highway Design
David Pelton	SHA, Highway Design
Fred Doerfler	SHA, Highway Design
Paul Wettlougher	US Army Corps of Engineers
Michael J. Rothenheber	Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson, P.A.
William Fletcher	Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson, P.A.
Joyce Kimble	Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson, P.A.
Charles Butler	Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson, P.A.

1. No SHA response required.

1. All persons in attendance were given an information handout for the field review which included a summary of impacts chart and 100 scale photogrammetric mapping of worst case impacts by the proposed mainline alternates and interchange options at each wetland site. All adjustments and concurrences made by the C.O.E. to the site delineation were referenced to this mapping.
2. This project contains twelve (12) individual wetland sites that are potentially impacted by four (4) interchange options and seven (7) mainline alternates. Of the 12 sites, eleven (11) were actually inspected by the C.O.E. The C.O.E. review of the wetland sites was limited to areas of proposed impact. The total boundary of each wetland delineated was not reviewed. The inspection resulted in the C.O.E. concurring with JMT's delineation for the following sites: 1, 1A, 2, 2A, 3, 4, 5A, 6 and 6A.
3. The C.O.E. reduced the northern delineation boundary of Site 2A. The original delineation encompassed a portion of the pasture adjacent to the northern bank of Mattawoman Creek. The C.O.E.'s delineation confined the wetlands to basically the streambank. The C.O.E. concurred with the delineation on the southern side of Site 2A.

230

4. The C.O.E. was undecided about the delineation at Site 5, and stated that an additional trip would be made to review the site again.
5. The C.O.E. reduced the northern delineation boundary at Site 8 to follow just west of two utility poles on the southern side of MD 205 to a point near the intersection of two small tributaries and the second pole. The revised delineation will now continue from this point eastward along the 150 contour line as shown on the photogrammetric mapping used for the Alternates. The southern delineation boundary was acceptable to the C.O.E.
6. JMT raised a question with the C.O.E. about Corps jurisdiction and the potential roadway impacts at Site 8, due to the fact that the current land use is agricultural and therefore is not under their jurisdiction. The C.O.E. stated that if the current land use is changed for construction of the proposed roadway then the Corps would have jurisdiction over the portion of wetland that would be affected by the right-of-way required for the proposed roadway.
7. The C.O.E. did not review Site 7 due to time constraints, but stated that an additional trip would be made to review the delineation on the same day that Site 5 is reinvestigated.
8. On September 1, 1989 the C.O.E. inspected the delineation at Site 7, and reinvestigated the delineation at Site 5 by themselves. As a result, the C.O.E. contacted Barbara Allera-Bohlen of SHA's Environmental Management Section with their concurrence on JMT's delineations at both sites.

cc: All Attendees
Daniel T. Cheng
Matt Wolniak

V-147



Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

Richard H. Traino
Secretary-
Hal Kassoff
Administrator

September 14, 1989

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Deputy Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

FROM: Cynthia D. Simpson *cds*
Assistant Division Chief
Project Planning Division

SUBJECT: Contract No. CH 566-151-571
MD 5 Relocated, US 301 to MD 5
PDMS No. 082039
Wetland Field Review

An agency field review was held on August 22, 1989 to seek the Corp's concurrence with wetland boundaries and to discuss alternatives developed and impacts.

The following people were in attendance:

Paul Wettlaufer	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Victor Janata	SHA Project Planning
David Coyne	" " "
Barbara Allera-Bohlen	" " "
Fred Doerfler	SHA Highway Design
Susan Jacobs	" " "
David Pelton	" " "
Michael Rothenheber	Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson
William Fletcher	" " "
Joyce Kimble	" " "
Charles Butler	" " "

Representatives of the Department of Natural Resources, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Environmental Protection Agency were invited but did not attend the meeting.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers concurred with delineations of the following sites: 1, 1A, 2, 3, 4, 5A, 6 and 6A.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers reduced the northern delineation boundaries of sites 2A and 8.

1. No. SHA response required.

V-2
My telephone number is (301) 333-1177

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
383-7555 Baltimore Metro - 565-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5082 Statewide Toll Free
707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

237

Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.
September 14, 1989
Page 2

On September 1, 1989 the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers inspected the delineation of site 7 and reinvestigated the delineation of site 5. They contacted Berbere Allera-Bohlen of the Environmental Evaluation Section and indicated concurrence with the existing delineations of these sites.

Attached are the minutes of the field meeting.

CDS:BA:cd

Attachments

cc: Attendees

Mr. Hermen Rodrigo
Mr. Quesin Teherien
Mr. Micheel Slettery
Mr. Pete Stokley
Mr. John Nichols
Mr. Bill Schultz
Mr. Elder Ghigierelli
Mr. Charles Adams
Mr. Steve Silva
Mr. Ed Stein



PROJECT DEVELOPMENT DIVISION
William Donald Schafer
Governor
JUL 6 12 37 PM '88
Jacqueline H. Rogers
Secretary, DHCD

June 30, 1988

Ms. Cynthia Simpson, Chief
Environmental Management
Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration
707 North Calvert Street
P.O. Box 717
Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

Re: Contract CH 556-151-571
Mattawoman-Beantown Road
Charles County, Maryland
PDMS 082039

Dear Ms. Simpson:

Thank you for your letter concerning the subject project. Our office concurs that neither the Pickerell House (#1) nor the Grove Tenant Farm (#2) appear eligible for inclusion on the National Register.

Sincerely,

George J. Andrev

George J. Andrev
Project Review and Compliance Administrator
Office of Preservation Services

GJA/AT/lm

cc: Ms. Rita Suffness
Mr. Paul Wettleufer
Dr. Ralph Eshelman
Mr. George Dyson

1. No SHA response required.

Maryland
Department of Housing and Community Development
State House, 21 State Circle, Annapolis, Maryland 21401 (301) 974-4450, 757-9000
Temporary Address: Arnold Village Professional Center, 1517 Ritchie Highway, Arnold, Maryland 21012

234



PROG
DEVELO
AUG 2 2 53 PM '89

William Donald Schaefer
Governor

Jacqueline H. Rogers
Secretary, DHCD

July 28, 1989

RECEIVED

AUG 7 1989

JOHNSON, MIRMIRAN & THOMPSON

Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Deputy Director
Office of Planning and Preliminary Engineering
State Highway Administration
707 North Calvert Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

Re: Contract No. CH 566-201-571
MD 5 Relocated (Mattawoman-Beantown Road)
from U.S. 301 to MD 5
PDMS No. 082039
Charles and Prince George's Counties, MD

Dear Mr. Ege:

Thank you for sending us a copy of the report on the Phase I archeological survey conducted for the above-referenced project. The report was prepared by Berger Burkavage, Inc.

The report presents the necessary documentation on the survey's goals, methodology and results. The level of investigations and resulting report are consistent with state and federal standards for archeological work. Based on the information in the report, we concur that construction of the proposed project will have no effect upon significant archeological resources. Further archeological investigations are not warranted for this project.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth J. Cole
Administrator
Archeological Services
Office of Preservation Services

EJC/lm

cc: Ms. Rita Suffness
Dr. Ira Beckerman
Berger Burkavage, Inc.
Dr. Ralph E. Eshelman
Mr. George Dyson
Ms. Shirley Baltz
Mr. Joseph McNamara
Department of Housing and Community Development
One House, 21 State Circle, Annapolis, Maryland 21401 (301) 974-5000

1. No SHA response required.

735

MANAGEMENT SUMMARY
PHASE I ARCHAEOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS
OF MARYLAND ROUTE 5 RELOCATED
MATTAWOMAN - BEANTOWN ROAD,
FROM U.S. ROUTE 301 TO MARYLAND ROUTE 5
CHARLES AND PRINCE GEORGES COUNTIES, MARYLAND

STATEWIDE ARCHAEOLOGICAL SERVICES
CONTRACT NO. W 818-101-671(n)
PDMS NO. 032119

PREPARED FOR:
MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

PREPARED BY:
THE CULTURAL RESOURCE GROUP
BERGER BURKAVAGE, INC.

APRIL 1989

This document summarizes the results of the Phase I archaeological survey of the proposed alternatives for Maryland Route 5 relocated Mattawoman-Beantown Road, from U.S. Route 301 to Maryland Route 5, Charles and Prince Georges Counties, Maryland. Included in the survey were Alternative 2,3,4 and 4-Modified, as well as Interchange Options A, B, C and D. Altogether the proposed improvements involve approximately three miles of roadway alignments. The Cultural Resource Group of Berger Burkavage, Inc. conducted this study for the Maryland Department of Transportation, State Highway Administration, under Contract Number W 818-101-671(N) PDMS No. 032119. A more detailed report covering these archaeological investigations will be completed by May 5, 1989, and will comply with the guidelines established by the Maryland Historical Trust and the Maryland Geological Survey's Division of Archaeology.

The Phase I investigative process was begun with archival research focusing on both prehistoric and historic resources. An examination of historical documents and maps, as well as, archaeological reports, was conducted at the Maryland Historical Trust, Annapolis; and the Maryland Geological Survey's Division of Archaeology, the Maryland Historical Society, and the Enoch Pratt Free Library, Baltimore. The purpose of this background effort was to determine if documented archaeological and historical sites were in the project boundaries, and furthermore, to help gain a preliminary perspective as to the distribution of known sites in the region from which to create a context for the interpretation of newly discovered site areas.

Based on the historic and prehistoric background studies the project area was divided into high, moderate and low probability segments with respect to the expected occurrence of archaeological sites. The areas of highest probability were seen as the crossing of the two streams located on both the northern and southern ends of the project corridor. In addition the pedestrian survey of the area revealed the presence of a series of small swamps and bogs in the flat, poorly drained divide between the two stream systems. The higher better drained sections around the swamp were also tested as the background research indicated that prehistoric sites are known to occur in these types of topographic setting. Shovel test transects were also placed across moderate to low probability areas. A total of 104 shovel tests units were distributed at seven areas along the project alignment.

The archaeological investigations for the project did not identify any prehistoric archaeological sites within the project corridor. Several twentieth century properties were tested - one was a recently burned down farmstead - but no buried archaeological remains were recovered. No historic archaeological resources, besides modern roadside trash deposits, were encountered within the confines of the project boundaries.

Based on the results of the background research and field investigations it appears as if the potential for archaeological resources is extremely low. No further fieldwork is recommended for this project.

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT DIVISION
WALDORF RESTAURANT, INC.
P.O. Box 548
Waldorf, MD 20604

FEB 9 2 43 PM '89

February 3, 1989

RECEIVED

*Chuck B.
M. J. E.*

JUN 30 1989

CENTRAL RECORDS & TRANSPORT

Maryland Dept. of Transportation
State Highway Administration
707 North Calvert Street
Baltimore, MD 21203-0717

Attention: Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Deputy Director
Project Development Division

Re: Contract No. CH 566-101-571
MD 205 (MD 5 Relocated)
Charles County

Dear Sir:

In reply to your letter of January 18, 1989, please be advised as follows:

1. This area is private property owned by Waldorf Restaurant, Inc.
2. The property is used seasonally by the Waldorf Youth League (spring through summer).
3. The approved use of the ballfields is temporary (through the summer of 1989).
4. There is no written agreement with the Charles County Parks and Recreation Department.
5. As far as we know, there are no governmental bodies which have a proprietary interest in the land.

If you have additional questions, please advise.

Very truly yours,

WALDORF RESTAURANT, INC.

Francis H. Chaney, II
Francis H. Chaney, II

FHC,II:cmj

1. No SHA response required.

939



Maryland Department of Natural Resources

Tidewater Administration
Tawes State Office Building
580 Taylor Avenue
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

William Donald Schaefer
Governor

PROJECT
DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION

MAR 2 10 58 AM '88

Torrey C. Brown, M.D.
Secretary

February 29, 1988

MEMORANDUM

To: Cynthia A. Simpson, SHA

From: Larry Lubbers, Fisheries Division

Subject: Contract NO. CH 552-101, Mattawoman Beantown Road between U.S. Route 301 and Maryland Route 5 including part of Maryland Route 382 in Charles County.

The attached letter to the Army Corps of Engineers reviews the information that we have already provided to both the Corps and SHA. As we pointed out in 1975 there are spawning runs of anadromous fish in the lower reaches of Zekiah Swamp.

LL/kb

1. No SHA response required.

Telephone: _____
DNR TTY for Deaf: 301-974-3683

dhc



Maryland Department of Natural Resources

FEB 11 1989

Tidewater Administration
Tawes State Office Building
580 Taylor Avenue
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

RECEIVED

William Donald Schaefer
Governor

Torrey C. Brown, M.D.
Secretary

February 8, 1989

Mr. Charles Butler
Johnson, Mirmiran and Thompson, PA
810 Gleneagles Court
Suite 200
Baltimore, MD 21204

Dear Mr. Butler:

I have reviewed the correspondence which you enclosed with your 27 December 1988 letter to Mr. Larry Lubbers. The fisheries information in that correspondence is current and accurate.

You may wish to contact the Maryland Heritage Program in the Forest, Park and Wildlife Service concerning the potential presence of rare or sensitive aquatic plants and animals in Jordan Swamp. This Program can be reached at 974-2870 or by writing to the following address:

Tawes State Office Building (B-2)
580 Taylor Avenue
Annapolis, Md. 21401

If you need any additional information, please contact me at 974-2784.

Sincerely,

Elder A. Ghigiarelli
Chief, Project Review

EAG:MED:swp

Telephone: (301) 974-2784
DNR TTY for Deaf: 301-974-3683

1. Forest, Park and Wildlife was contacted.
(See response on P. V-162)

2/11



PROJECT
Maryland Department of Natural Resources

Tidewater Administration
Tawes State Office Building
380 Taylor Avenue
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Mar 14 7 52 AM '89

Torrey C. Brown, M.D.
Secretary

William Donald Schaefer
Governor

March 9, 1989

RECEIVED

MAR 16 1989

DEPT. OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Ms. Cynthia Simpson, Chief
Environmental Management
Maryland State Highway Association
707 N. Calvert Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

RE: Wetlands at MD Rte 5/MD 382 Intersection just south
of Mattawoman-Beantown Road, Jordan Swamp Run
Drainage

Dear Ms. Simpson:

This is in response to a request made by staff of your office for a description of the functions and values of wetlands draining to Jordan Swamp Run, south of the terminus of Mattawoman-Beantown Road at MD 382. I visited the area on February 3, 1989. Please note that an area of wetland plantings exists adjacent to Jordan Swamp Run, to the south of the new MD 382.

Much of the area to the north and east of Jordan Swamp Run is currently agricultural field. To the south of Jordan Swamp Run and extending east from the agricultural field toward MD Rte 5, much of the land is forested. This area would best be described as a palustrine, forested, broad-leaved deciduous, temporarily to seasonally flooded (PF01A-C) wetland with scattered patches of scrub/shrub and emergent wetland. In these more open patches, vegetation indicates historic disturbance (probably pasture). Several seeps were also evident here. The area exhibits a diversity of species general indicative of high quality, healthy wetland habitat.

Jordan Swamp Run is an anadromous finfish spawning and nursery waterway. Resident and anadromous fish species that are known to inhabit this stream include: Creek Chub (Erimyzon

1. The wetlands within Segment I will be bridged rather than filled.

Telephone: _____
DNR TTY for Deaf: 301-974-3683

epb

V-158

oblongus), Fallfish (Semotilus corporalis), Rosyside Dace (Clinostomus funduloides), Largemouth Bass (Micropterus salmoides), Tesselated Darter (Etheostoma olmstedii), Yellow Perch (Perca flavescens), and White Perch (Morone americana). These species are generally indicative of good water quality and healthy stream habitat.

Jordan Swamp Run, its lower order streams and their associated floodplain/wetlands function in a water quality capacity by trapping sediments and toxics that might be bound to them, taking up excess nutrients that contribute to the eutrophication of higher order streams (and eventually the Bay), and moderating peak flows of water during storm events. The aforementioned seeps also serve a hydrologic recharge function and help to maintain appropriate stream temperatures. These wetlands are important habitat areas that are not quickly or easily replaced due to their lengthy maturation time. Lower order streams and drainage ways also serve as loci of energy and function in nutrient processing and cycling. They are production areas for large particles of allochthonous material that are processed by specialized consumers (mostly aquatic insects) that, in turn, provide food sources and nutrient inputs for organisms further downstream. So, these wetlands and streams are very important in terms of maintaining ecosystem function as a whole.

The entire watershed between topographical contours of 100 msl and 185 msl consist of Bibb silt loam and is nearly level. This soil unit is classified as a poorly drained hydric soil by the USDA. The water table is at or near the soil surface for long periods throughout the growing season, and undrained areas are seasonally ponded. These areas also flood when the streams overflow.

The pH of soils in this area is very strongly to extremely acidic, ranging from 5.0 to 4.5. Due to the acidic nature of these soils, grading activities could pose a substantial threat to stream water quality. Moreover, Bibb soil is poor substrate for roadway construction because of the high water table (0-1 foot) high potential frost action and flood hazard. These same constraints will affect the stability of box culverts since trenched and filled areas will be subject to slumping and low bearing strength.


Jordan Swamp Run drains directly into Zekiah Swamp Run and, subsequently, into Zekiah Swamp. The Zekiah Swamp is the largest hardwood swamp in Maryland. It has been designated as an

Area of Critical State Concern by the Maryland Department of State Planning and is described in the Designation Report as being prime habitat for beaver, mink, osprey, herons, wood duck, Maryland Diamondback Terrapin, and overwintering Wilson's snipe, and for such rare species as the bald eagle, and red cockaded woodpecker (now classified as extirpated). The Smithsonian Institute's 1974 survey of ecologically important plants, animals, biotic communities, and natural areas of the Chesapeake Bay region determined that the Zekiah Swamp was the highest rated natural area of 232 areas in the Chesapeake Bay Region and was determined to be one of the most important remaining ecological areas of its type on the eastern seaboard. It is a general objective of the Maryland Coastal Zone Management Program to protect coastal terrestrial areas of significant resource value (Coastal Zone Management Program for the State of Maryland, 1978 P.84 (5)). These are areas that have particular scenic, scientific, geologic, hydrologic, biological, or ecosystem maintenance importance. The Zekiah Swamp and its associated headwaters are a prime example of such areas.

It is my understanding that a full interchange is being contemplated in the subject area. Due to the importance of the wetlands in this area, I urge SHA to thoroughly explore alternatives to the placement of fill in the wetlands for the construction of an interchange. It is imperative that wetland impacts within the Zekiah watershed be minimized. Potential additional stress to this ecosystem must be viewed in the context of existing stresses due to mining operations, roadway construction, and commercial and residential development currently occurring in the watershed. When viewed in this context, the potential impact on the Zekiah Swamp ecosystem is clearly understood.

I hope that what I have provided is sufficient to address your immediate needs. If you require further assistance, please contact me at (301) 974-2784.

Sincerely,


Michael E. Slattery,
Environmental Biologist
Power Plant and Environmental
Review Division

MES/db

References

Klein, Richard D. 1981. The Department of Natural Resources
Compilation of Maryland's Fishery Resources. MD. Dept. Natural
Resources, Annapolis, MD.

Smithsonian Institution Center for Natural Areas, Ecology Program
1974. Natural Areas of the Chesapeake Bay Region: Ecological
Priorities. Washington, D.C.

United States Department of Commerce. 1978. Final Environmental
Impact Statement Proposed Coastal Management Program for the
State of Maryland. Office of Coastal Resource Management,
NOAA, Washington, D.C. 463 pp.



Maryland Department of Natural Resources
PROJECT DEVELOPMENT DIVISION
Forest, Park and Wildlife Service
Tawes State Office Building
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

MAR 14 10 26 AM '88

William Donald Schaefer
Governor

Torrey C. Brown, M.D.
Secretary

Donald E. MacLauchlan
Director

88-2-313

March 4, 1988

Cynthia D. Simpson, Chief
Environmental Management
Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration
707 North Calvert Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

RE: Contr. No. CH 552-101
Mattawoman Beantown Road between
U.S. Route 301 and Maryland Rt. 5
including part of Md. Rt. 382
Charles County


1. No SHA response required.

Dear Ms. Simpson:

This is in response to your request of February 10, 1988 for information regarding the above referenced project. There are no known Federal or State threatened or endangered plant or wildlife species present at this project site.

If you have any questions regarding this matter please feel free to call me.

Sincerely,


James Burtis, Jr.
Assistant Director

JB:epm

cc: Therres
Boone

Telephone: _____
DNR TTY for Deaf: 301-974-3683

V-12

2/16



Maryland Department of Natural Resources

Forest, Park and Wildlife Service
Tawes State Office Building
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

William Donald Schaefer
Governor

*Chuck
Patt*

Torrey C. Brown, M.D.
Secretary

Donald E. MacLaughlin
Director

March 13, 1989

Mr. Charles P. Butler
JOHNSON, MIRMIRAN AND THOMPSON, PA
810 Gleneagles Court
Suite 200
Baltimore, MD 21204

Re: Upgrading of Mattowman Beantown Rd. -
Charles Co. , MD

Dear Mr. Butler:

This is in response to your request for information regarding the above referenced project. There are no known federal or state threatened or endangered plant or wildlife species present at this project site.

If you have any questions regarding this matter please feel free to call me at (301) 974-3195.

Sincerely,

James Burtis, Jr.
James Burtis, Jr.
Assistant Director

JB:dec

cc: Robert Miller
Jonathan McKnight

89.02.060

1. No SHA response required.

Telephone: _____
DNR TTY for Deaf: 301-974-3683

247



Maryland Department of Natural Resources

Forest, Park and Wildlife Service
Tawes State Office Building
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

William Donald Schaefer
Governor

RECEIVED

Torrey C. Brown, M.D.
Secretary

Donald E. MacLaughlin
Assistant Secretary

June 13, 1989

JUN 16 1989
87112.03
JOHNSON, MIRMIRAN & THOMPSON
Chuck
Mike R.

Mr. Charles P. Butler
JOHNSON, MIRMIRAN AND THOMPSON, P.A.
810 Gleneagles Court, Suite 200
Baltimore, MD 21204

Re: MD 205 in Charles Co.
JMT Job No. 87112.03

Dear Mr. Thompson:

I spoke with Ann Rasberry about the two lists she generated for your response to this information request and the fact that several species on Heritage's list showed up on her computer printouts. The two lists she gave you represent two different types of information: the atlas data are known observations; the wildlife database data are only potential occurrences. Therefore, the rare birds on the atlas printout are much more significant than the rare species on the second list.

The rare birds on the atlas printout include least bittern (Ixobrychus exilis) which is State-listed as in need of conservation, common barn-owl (Tyto alba) which is on Heritage's watchlist, and loggerhead shrike (Lanius ludovicianus) which is State-listed as endangered and is a candidate for federal listing. These rare birds have been documented through the atlas project as being in the vicinity of the Mattawoman project site; however, it is unclear whether the project would directly impact these species since their exact locations are unknown. Unfortunately, we have not yet incorporated the atlas data into Heritage's database and had previously responded with a "no comment" on this project.

The possibility of loggerhead shrikes breeding on the project site are remote. However, since it is a State endangered species and a federal candidate, I feel it is important to determine its status in the area. I hope to survey the area within a week, both for this species and the others. I will send you a follow-up memo as soon as possible.

1. A survey of the area did not locate any endangered species. See August 3, 1989 letter.

Telephone: _____
DNR TTY for Deaf: 301-974-3683

219

Mr. Charles P. Butler
June 13, 1989
Page 2

If you have any questions regarding this please feel free to contact me at (301) 974-3195.

Sincerely,

James Burtis, Jr.

James Burtis, Jr.
Director

ENCLOSURE

249



Maryland Department of Natural Resources

Forest, Park and Wildlife Service
Tawes State Office Building
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

William Donald Schaefer
Governor

RECEIVED

Torrey C. Brown, M.D.
Secretary

Donald E. MacLauchlan
Director

August 3, 1989

AUG 31 1989

RECEIVED

Mr. Charles P. Butler
JOHNSON, MIRMIRAN AND THOMPSON, P.A.
810 Gleneagles Court
Suite 200
Baltimore, MD 21204

Re: Proposed MD 5 Relocated (Mattawoman - Beantown Md.
Follow-up James Burtis memo of June 13, 1989
Presence of Rare Species at Mattawoman Creek

1. No SHA response required.

Dear Mr. Butler:

On June 12, 1989 Lynn Davidson surveyed the Mattawoman Creek project site for the least bittern (*Ixobrychus exilis*) and loggerhead shrike (*Lanius ludovicianus*). She did not find either of these species, or any other rare birds in the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, although we have general concerns about the impact on wetlands in this area, we still have "no comment" in regard to the project's impact on Threatened or Endangered species.

If you have any further questions regarding this matter please feel free to contact Ms. Lynn Davidson, Natural Heritage Program at (301) 974-2870.

Sincerely,

James Burtis, Jr.
Director

JB:dec

Telephone: _____
DNR TTY for Deaf: 301-974-3683

250



PROJECT
DEVELOPMENT
MARCH 21 1990

William Donald Schaefer
Governor

Maryland Department of Natural Resources

Water Resources Administration
Tawes State Office Building
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Torrey C. Brown, M.D.
Secretary

Catherine P. Stevenson
Director

March 16, 1990

Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr., Deputy Director
Office of Planning and Preliminary Engineering
Room 506
State Highway Administration
707 North Calvert Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21202

Dear Mr. Ege:

This correspondence is in response to your request for comments on the environmental assessment for MD. 5 Relocated, U.S. 301 to MD. 301/5 (Contract CH 566-151-571). The Nontidal Wetlands Division has the following comments:

1. p. 1-22 Wetland #8 is described as being the mitigation site for MD. 382 wetland impacts. If the created wetlands are lost due to the proposed project, another mitigation site must be found. We strongly recommend that SHA locate its mitigation sites in areas that will be protected in perpetuity, as required in the Nontidal Wetlands Regulations.
2. The Division recommends Alternative 5 in segment 1 as the preferred design. If SHA believes that this is not acceptable due to the resulting LOS F intersection, the following information should be included in the final document for review:
 - a. Description of how Alt. 5 has caused a LOS intersection;
 - b. Attempts to accommodate and correct the constraints of the intersection.
3. p. III-2 The document states that Alt. 6, segment 1 would not require an interchange. Please clarify if this means that none of the options A/B/C/D would be necessary.

1. The created wetland mitigation site for MD 382 will not be impacted.
2. Segment I; Alternate 6 was selected. Interchange options with Alternate 5 were investigated and dropped due to right-of-way impacts, cost, and increased wetland impacts.
3. Interchange Option A was selected for the northern terminus.
4. The water quality treatment will be obtained by erosion and sediment control and stormwater management measures. See P. III-31 and III-32.
5. Interchange Option A has been selected. The anticipated wetland impacts have been reduced from 0.94 acres to 0.78 acres.
6. Conceptual wetland mitigation sites have been located. These potential mitigation sites have been reviewed by SHA Landscape Architecture Division, field checked and are satisfactory for potential mitigation sites.

Telephone: 974-3841
DNR TTY for the Deaf: 301-974-3683

251

4. p. IV-17 The document states that the potential for minor groundwater contamination is high as a result of this project, and that the impacts are expected to be minor due to the filtering ability of adjacent high quality wetlands. The Division is opposed to using nontidal wetlands as a sole source of water quality treatment. Other measures should be required. Also, we believe that the high quality value of the wetlands will be reduced due to the additional road work.
5. If an interchange is required, the Division recommends Option A as it has the lowest wetland impact (.64 acres).

6. The Division recommends that nontidal wetland losses be replaced by crating, restoring or enhancing nontidal wetlands at the following ratios:

- 1:1 • Emergent nontidal wetlands
- Farmed nontidal wetlands
- 2:1 • Scrub-shrub and forested nontidal wetlands
- 2:1 • Emergent nontidal wetlands of special state concern
- 3:1 • Scrub-shrub and forested nontidal wetlands of special state concern

In fulfilling the mitigation ratios the State Highway Administration should:

- Locate mitigation sites preferably onsite and connected to existing nontidal wetlands, waterways or 100-year flood plains.
- Select mitigation sites on upland sites which have undergone disturbance.
- Monitor the mitigation project for five years.
- Provide for the long-term protection of mitigation projects.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Denise Clearwater

Denise Clearwater
Natural Resources Planner
Nontidal Wetlands Division



RECEIVED
MAY 1 1990

William Donald Schaefer
Governor

Maryland Department of Natural Resources

Water Resources Administration
Tawes State Office Building
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Torrey C. Brown, M.D.
Secretary

Catherine P. Stevenson
Director

April 5, 1990

RECEIVED

APR 11 1990

JOHNSON, WIRMIAN & THOMPSON

Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Deputy Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering
707 North Calvert Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21202

Attention: Barbara Allera-Bohle

Re: WRA File No. 89-PP-0850
SHA No. CH566-151-571
Environmental Assessment: MD
Route 5 relocated (MD 205)- From MD
5 to U.S. 301/MD 5 and the
interchange at U.S. 301/MD 5, Charles
County

Dear Mr. Ege, Jr.:

The above referenced Environmental Assessment has received the necessary review. Activities proposed by the project include the upgrade of existing MD 205, thereby impacting wetland and floodplain areas associated with Mattawoman Creek and Zekiah Swamp.

Mattawoman Creek and Zekiah Swamp are under increasingly intense pressures from development activities and road construction in their corresponding watersheds. These activities have resulted in significant cumulative impacts to existing aquatic resources, largely through wetland fill activities. Because wetland areas typically provide unique habitat and a variety of water quality benefits to downstream areas, the protection of these resources is essential to the maintenance of the integrity of the aquatic system.

Zekiah Swamp is designated as a Non-tidal Wetland of Special State Concern in the adopted Non-tidal Wetlands Regulations.

The Mattawoman Creek has been designated as an area of critical state concern (see figure 2). This creek is "among the most important of the Potomac Basin spawning waters" and has "the largest concentration of nesting wood duck in Maryland...", according to the Areas of Critical State Concern Designation Report, Maryland Department of State Planning, January 1981, p. 1-68. Development and its associated sedimentation endangers the ecosystem of Mattawoman Creek (p. 1-70).

Jordan Swamp Run is part of the Wicomico Drainage Basin, therefore any anticipated impacts must be coordinated with the Maryland Wild and Scenic Rivers Program. That coordination can be

1. Segment I, Alternate 6 was selected. The wetlands will be bridge entirely to minimize impacts. Segment I, Alternate 5 did not provide adequate future traffic operations.
2. Interchange Option A was selected.
3. The No-Build Option was selected for Sub-Station Road.
4. The water quality treatment will be obtained by erosion and sediment control and stormwater management measures. See P. III-31 and III-32.
5. Construction within the wetlands and floodplains of Mattawoman Creek will be prohibited between March 1 and June 15.
6. Avoidance and/or minimization to wetland impacts are document on P. III-33 to III-40.

Telephone: _____
DNR TTY for the Deaf: 301-974-3683

2/5/90

conducted through this agency.

The proposed fill of wetlands and waterways and the disturbances to floodplain areas are likely to result in the loss of wildlife habitat and in the reduction of critical water quality benefits including sediment trapping, flood storage, nutrient uptake, and pollutant removal. In addition, sulfur-bearing subsurface soils which can promote low pH conditions when oxidized are believed to occur in the project area. Disturbance of these subsurface soils may be conducive to pH reductions in receiving waterways during storm runoff events. These impacts, combined with the increased pollutant loadings from the created impervious surfaces may significantly contribute to reductions in water quality and habitat in the Mattawoman Creek and Zekiah Swamp aquatic systems.

To assure that the impacts to existing aquatic resources are avoided, then minimized to the greatest extent possible, the following concerns and recommendations should be addressed in the design of this project:

1. The fill of wetlands and waterways and the disturbance of floodplain areas associated with Jordan Swamp Run required by Alternate 6 in Segment 1 appear to be excessive. Alternate 5 is preferred over Alternate 6 in Segment 1 because the impacts to Wetland #8 are significantly minimized. In addition, the impacts proposed by Alternate 5 are in close proximity to the existing alignment of Mattawoman Beantown Road. Therefore, overall potential impacts to the Zekiah Swamp aquatic system, Alternate 6 will be closely investigated by this Division if selected by the State Highway Administration.
2. Interchange options A and B are preferred because they would result in the least impact to wetlands, both within the 100 year floodplain and overall. The potential secondary impacts to wetland 2A caused by fragmentation of the riparian corridor should be further evaluated to determine which option is preferable.
3. Option 1 for the proposed Relocated Sub-station Road is undesirable because of the required wetland fill. The excessive impacts to existing upland forest areas required by this option is also likely to result in a greater disturbance to the soils in this area, which may promote the impacts from low pH.
4. Increased efforts should be directed at minimizing disturbances throughout the alignment to reduce the opportunities for sedimentation and acid runoff in the subject watershed. The potential for impacts from sulfur-bearing soils are not addressed in this environmental assessment and should be investigated. In areas where impacts to sulfur-bearing soils are unavoidable, methods to reduce the associated impacts should be investigated.
5. Mattawoman Creek has wetlands with anadromous fish spawning areas; therefore, construction within the stream and its floodplain and accompanying wetlands is prohibited from March 1 through June 15, inclusive, of any year.
6. In relation to all the wetlands, it is suggested that: temporary influences on non-tidal wetlands be remedied; post-construction elevations be the same as originally found; heavy equipment in wetlands be placed on mats or be suitably designed to prevent damage to wetlands; and construction material be removed to an upland disposal area.

254

Page 3
Mr. Ege, Jr.
April 5, 1990

7. Quality stormwater management must be implemented for all created impervious surfaces. If infiltration is not feasible, alternative strategies such as retention facilities should be investigated.

Enclosed for your use is a copy of the "Emergency Regulations for Nontidal Wetlands: Addendum to the Waterway Construction Permit Regulations".

If you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact me at (301) 974-2265.

Very truly yours,

Michele A. Huffman

Michele A. Huffman
Project Engineer
Waterway Permits Division

MAH

Enclosures

cc: Renata Steffey, Nontidal Wetlands Division
Sean Smith, PPER
Gene Cheers, CPA

255



PROJECT
DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION

JUL 13 1 42 PM '90

William Donald Schaefer
Governor

Maryland Department of Natural Resources

Capital Programs Administration
2012 Industrial Drive
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Torrey C. Brown, M.D.
Secretary

Michael J. Nelson
Assistant Secretary
for Capital Programs

July 11, 1990

RE: SHA No. CH566-151-571
MD 5 Relocated (Mattawoman
Beantown Road): US 301/MD 5
to MD 5
WRA File No. 89-PP-0850

Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Deputy Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering
707 North Calvert Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21202

Attention: Cynthia D. Simpson

Dear Mr. Edge:

The above referenced project has been reviewed by the Maryland Scenic and Wild Rivers Program. We strongly concur with the recommendations made to your office on April 5, 1990 by the Water Resources Administration.

Any additional comments will depend on the selection of a preferred alternate. Therefore, please inform our office when you make that determination. We look forward to continued cooperation between the State Highway Administration, the Water Resources Administration, and the Scenic and Wild Rivers Program.

Very truly yours,

Neal R. Welch
Scenic and Wild Rivers Program

NRW

Enclosure

cc: Michele A. Hoffman, WRA

1. See previous correspondence.
(See P. V-169).

Telephone: _____
DNR TTY for the Deaf: 301-974-3683

256



United States Department of the Interior - PROJECT
DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
DIVISION OF ECOLOGICAL SERVICES
1825 VIRGINIA STREET
ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND 21401

FEB 24 11 50 AM '88

February 23, 1988

Ms. Cynthia D. Simpson
Maryland Department of Transportation
707 North Calvert St.
Baltimore, MD 21203-0717

Dear Ms. Simpson:

This responds to your February 10, 1988 request for information on the presence of species which are Federally listed or proposed for listing as endangered or threatened within the area of Contract No. CH 552-101, Mattawoman Beantown Road widening, Charles County, Maryland. We have reviewed the information you enclosed and are providing comments in accordance with Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (87 Stat. 884, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

Except for occasional transient individuals, no Federally listed or proposed endangered or threatened species are known to exist in the project impact area. Therefore, no Biological Assessment or further Section 7 Consultation is required with the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS). Should project plans change, or if additional information on the distribution of listed or proposed species becomes available, this determination may be reconsidered.

This response relates only to endangered species under our jurisdiction. It does not address other FWS concerns under the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act or other legislation.

Thank you for your interest in endangered species. If you have any questions or need further assistance, please contact Judy Jacobs of our Endangered Species staff at (301) 269-5448.

Sincerely yours,

G. A. Kinser

Glenn Kinser
Supervisor
Annapolis Field Office

1. No SHA response required.



United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
DIVISION OF ECOLOGICAL SERVICES
1825 VIRGINIA STREET
ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND 21401

March 26, 1990

Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Deputy Director
Office of Planning and Preliminary Engineering
State Highway Administration
707 N. Calvert St.
Baltimore, MD 21202

RE: Maryland Route 5 relocated
(MD 205)

Dear Mr Ege:

This letter is in reference to your January 31, 1990, request that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) review the Environmental Assessment for proposed Maryland Route 5 relocated. The Service has reviewed the environmental assessment with respect to the potential impacts of the various highway improvement proposals upon fish and wildlife resources and their habitats. We have the following comments on the proposed alternatives and options.

The Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) proposes to increase the capacity and improve the safety of Route 5 relocated (presently identified as Maryland Route 205). SHA has separated the mainline portion of the road into three segments with a total of five alternatives. There are two build alternatives for Segment I, two for Segment II, and one for Segment III. There are also four interchange options (A, B, C, D) proposed for the northern intersection of Route 5 relocated and Route 301.

The Service objects to one of the proposed alternatives and two of the options. These include Segment I, Alternate 6 and interchange Options C and D. The Service opposes the alternate and two of the options because these proposals will maximize, rather than minimize, the impacts to several high quality wetlands. In addition to maximizing the filling of wetlands, Segment I, Alternate 6 will isolate 10-13 acres of wetlands within three major road corridors (Route 301, Route 5, Route 205). The Service is especially opposed to this alternate because of the resultant unnecessary fragmentation of wildlife habitat. The surrounding of wildlife habitat with roads will cause a significant increase in the mortality rate of terrestrial wildlife populations.

1. Segment I, Alternate 6 was selected rather than Alternate 5. Alternate 5 could not provide adequate future traffic operations. The wetland impacts with alternate 6 will be minimized by bridging the entire wetlands. This will reduce the wetland impacts from 2.01 acres to 1.03 acres and help to avoid isolating the wetlands. See P III-33 to III-40 for wetland avoidance and/or minimization. Additionally the bridging of the entire wetland should help avoid any fragmentation of wildlife habitat.
2. Interchange Option A was selected.
3. The replacement of wetlands will be finalized in the design process to determine the amount of palustrine forested wetlands.
4. Conceptual wetland mitigation sites have been located. These potential mitigation sites have been reviewed by SHA Landscape Architecture Division, field checked and are satisfactory for potential mitigation sites.

258

The Service recommends that all unavoidable wetland losses be replaced on a 2:1 basis for palustrine forested wetlands and on a 1:1 basis for all other wetland types. The 2:1 replacement ratio for forested wetlands will help compensate for the time lag of 40 to 50 years which is required for planted seedlings to reach maturity. This ratio will also help compensate for the risk associated with trying to create forested wetlands. The techniques for creating forested wetlands have not been fully developed.

Assuming certain conditions were met, the Service's most probable position on any Section 404 permits for this project would be no objection. This position would be contingent upon:

- e) Elimination of Segment I, Alternate 6, and interchange Options C and D from consideration.
- b) Submission of an acceptable mitigation plan.
- c) Identification of a viable mitigation site with the 404 application.

If you have any questions concerning these comments, please contact Bill Shultz of my staff at (301) 269-5448.

Sincerely yours,

Edgar A. Park
For John P. Wolfen
Supervisor
Annapolis Field Office

659



Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

Richard H. Trainor
Secretary
Hal Kassoff
Administrator

November 28, 1990

RE: Contract No. CH 566-151
MD 5 Relocated: US 301 to
MD 5/US 301
PDMS No. 082039

Mr. William Schultz
U.S. Department of the Interior
Fish and Wildlife Service
Delmarva Area Office
1825 B Virginia Street
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Dear Mr. Schultz:

In a phone conversation on November 19, 1990, Ms. Barbara Allera-Bohlan of my staff discussed with you wetland impacts associated with the referenced project. Ms. Allera-Bohlan explained that the State Highway Administration has further minimized the wetland impacts of wetland 1 and 1A on the northbound ramp for proposed Interchange Option A by using a minimum tangent length with design speed of 50 mph on the ramp. This reduces the total impacts from .94 to .78 acres. Additionally, the calculated impacts are the entire shedded area under the ramp. See attached map of Interchange Option A. She explained that the ramp will actually be elevated 30 feet above existing ground elevation and the actual permanent impacts will be from piers only, and not fill from the ramp.

Further, it was discussed that proposed Interchange Option B would require the areas under the relocated US 301 and the proposed ramp to be filled. Also, it would be difficult to maintain traffic under this option.

Therefore, because less wetlands would be filled, traffic operation issues and cost, the State Highway Administration still prefers proposed Interchange Option A. You stated that because of the reduction of wetland areas and new information brought to light, this was a better alternative.

In order to complete the coordination on this project, I am requesting your concurrence in the selection of Interchange Option A.

12/4/90 verbal
CONCURRENCE 1:15 PM
by BS.

1. Mr. William Schultz concurred with the Selection of Interchange Option A during a phone conversation on December 4, 1990.

My telephone number is (301) 333-1177

260

Mr. William Schultz
November 28, 1990
Page 2

Should you want further information, please contact Ms.
Barbara Allara-Bohlan at 333-6745.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Deputy Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

by: Cynthia D. Simpson
Cynthia D. Simpson
Assistant Division Chief
Project Planning Division

LHE:BA:cd
Attachments
cc: Mr. Neil J. Pedersen
Mr. Vic Janata

2/10/1



JOHN C. NORTH, II
CHAIRMAN

STATE OF MARYLAND
CHESAPEAKE BAY CRITICAL AREAS COMMISSION
WEST GARRETT PLACE, SUITE 320
275 WEST STREET
ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND 21401
974-2418 or 974-2426

SARAH J. TAYLOR, PhD
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

COMMISSIONERS

August 31, 1989

Thomas Osborn
Anne Arundel Co.
James E. Gutman
Anne Arundel Co.
Ronald Karasz
Baltimore City
Ronald Hickamell
Baltimore Co.
Albert W. Zahner
Calvert Co.
Thomas Jarvis
Caroline Co.
Kathryn O. Langner
Cecil Co.
Samuel Y. Bowling
Charles Co.
G. State Phillips
Dorchester Co.
Victor K. Butana
Harford Co.
Wanda D. Miller
Kent Co.
Perry Glandening
Prince George's Co.
Robert R. Price, Jr.
Queen Anne's Co.
J. Frank Riley, Jr.
St. Mary's Co.
Ronald D. Adkins
Somerset Co.
Shepard Kreech, Jr.
Talbot Co.
William Corkran, Jr.
Talbot Co.
William J. Bostian
Wicomico Co.
Russell Blaka
Worcester Co.

Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Deputy Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering
State Highway Administration
707 North Calvert Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21203

Dear Mr. Ege:

Thank you for sending us notification of the State Highway Administration projects listed below. We concur with the determination of the Environmental Evaluation Section that these projects are not in the Critical Area, and are therefore not subject to Critical Area Commission review. The above-referenced projects are:

Robert R. Price, Jr. Queen Anne's Co.	Contract No. AA 936-151-570	MD 3 Reconstruction
J. Frank Riley, Jr. St. Mary's Co.	" " B 813-101-471	US 1 Silver Spring Road
Ronald D. Adkins Somerset Co.	" " B 881-101-471	MD 45, MD 145
Shepard Kreech, Jr. Talbot Co.	" " CH 566-151-571	MD 5 Relocated
William Corkran, Jr. Talbot Co.	" " H 888-101-471	US 1 Business
William J. Bostian Wicomico Co.	" " H 899-101-471	MD 152, US 1
Russell Blaka Worcester Co.	" " H 873-101-470	US 1 Hickory/MD 23
	" " H 896-101-471	MD 161 Bridge Replacement
	" " H 887-101-471	MD 7, Steoney Road
	" " SM 752-251-271	MD 471, Bridge No. 18028
	" " S 365-101-171	MD 362 Extended

Again, we appreciate your consideration.

CABINET MEMBERS

Wayne A. Cawley, Jr.
Agriculture
Robert Schooplen
Employment and Economic Development
Robert Parciasepe
Environment
Ardath Cade
Housing and Community Development
Torrey C. Brown, M.D. CC
Natural Resources
Ronald Kretzner
Planning

AR:msl

Cynthia Simpson
Thomas Osborne
Eugene Lauer
William Carroll

David Flowers
Jackie Magness
Jon Grimm
Ron Adkins

Sincerely,

Abi Rome

Abi Rome
Natural Resources Planner

PROJ
DEVELOP
DIV
SEP 5 9 51 AM '89

1. No SHA response required.

2/27



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Soil
Conservation
Service

P.O. Box 269
La Plata, MD 20646

RECEIVED

February 15, 1989

FEB 18 1989

Mr. Charles Butler
Environmental Manager
Johnson, Mirmiran and Thompson, P.A.
810 Gleneagles Court
Suite 200
Baltimore, MD 21204

Dear Mr. Butler:

Enclosed you will find Charles County soil maps
for the area you designated in your letter of January 13,
1989.


This route contains the following soils:

AuD3	BrB2	SaE
BlA	EK	WoB2
BlB2	LE	
BlC2	RdB2	
BlC3	RyB2	
Bo	ShA	


The soil units named SHA (sassafras) and WoB2 (woodstown)
are listed as prime farmland soils for Charles County, Md.

The soil units named BlA (Beltsville), BlB2 (Beltsville),
BlC2 (Beltsville), BrB2 (Bourne), RdB2 (Rumford) and RyB2
(Rumford) are listed as soils of statewide importance for
Charles County, Md.

If I can be of any further assistance, please let me
know.


J.H. Kimmons

cc: R. Dills (w/o encl.)

 The Soil Conservation Service
is an agency of the
United States Department of Agriculture

50

V-26

2/16/89



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Soil
Conservation
Service

APR 25 1989

*Chuck
7/11/89*

April 20, 1989

Mr. Charles P. Butler
Environmental Manager
Johnson, Mirmiran and Thompson, P.A.
810 Gleneagles Court, Suite 200
Baltimore, MD 21204

Dear Mr. Butler:

Enclosed is the Farmland Conversion Impact Rating (AD-1006) for
MD 205 Farmland Impacts, JMT Job No. 87112.03.

Please note that an AD-1006, with Part I completed, is to be sent
to the Soil Conservation Service (SCS) along with the maps and
other information. I had an extra copy of the form and filled in
Part I for this project.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please
contact me.

Sincerely,

Larry S. Holmes

Larry S. Holmes
District Conservationist

LSH:hmd

Enc.

1. No SHA response required.

2/10/89

FARMLAND CONVERSION IMPACT RATING

PART I (To be completed by Federal Agency)

Date Of Land Evaluation Request: 3-22-89
 Federal Agency Involved: FHWA
 Name Of Project: MD 205 JME Job No. 87112.03
 County And State: Prince George's, Maryland
 Proposed Land Use: Highway
 Date Request Received By SCS: 3-27-89

PART II (To be completed by SCS)

Does the site contain prime, unique, statewide or local important farmland? Yes No
 (If no, the FPPA does not apply - do not complete additional parts of this form.)
 Acres Irrigated: None Average Farm Size: 98 acres
 Amount Of Farmland As Defined In FPPA: Acres: 111,985 % 35.9
 Major Crops: Corn, Soybeans, Tobacco, Small Grains
 Acres: 145621 % 46.7
 Name Of Local Site Assessment System: FPPA
 Date Land Evaluation Returned By SCS: 4-14-89

	Alternative Site Rating			
	Site A	Site B	Site C	Site D
PART III (To be completed by Federal Agency)				
A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly	2.44	2.9	1.85	1.53
B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly	2.44	2.9	1.85	1.53
C. Total Acres In Site				
PART IV (To be completed by SCS) Land Evaluation Information				
A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland	.84	.52	.38	.35
B. Total Acres Statewide And Local Important Farmland	1.6	2.38	1.47	1.18
C. Percentage Of Farmland In County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted	.001	.001	.001	.001
D. Percentage Of Farmland In Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative Value	54	55	54.5	54.5
PART V (To be completed by SCS) Land Evaluation Criterion				
Relative Value Of Farmland To Be Converted (Scale of 0 to 100 Points)	63	59	60	60
PART VI (To be completed by Federal Agency)				
Site Assessment Criteria (These criteria are explained in 7 CFR 658.51b)	Maximum Points			
1. Area In Nonurban Use				
2. Perimeter In Nonurban Use				
3. Percent Of Site Being Farmed				
4. Protection Provided By State And Local Government				
5. Distance From Urban Builtup Area				
6. Distance To Urban Support Services				
7. Size Of Present Farm Unit Compared To Average				
8. Creation Of Nonfarmable Farmland				
9. Availability Of Farm Support Services				
10. On-Farm Investments				
11. Effects Of Conversion On Farm Support Services				
12. Compatibility With Existing Agricultural Use				
TOTAL SITE ASSESSMENT POINTS	160			
PART VII (To be completed by Federal Agency)				
Relative Value Of Farmland (From Part VI)	100			
Total Site Assessment (From Part VI above or a local site assessment)	160			
TOTAL POINTS (Total of above 2 lines)	260			

Was A Local Site Assessment Used? Yes No

Site Selected: _____ Date Of Selection: _____

Reason For Selection: _____

Handwritten signature or initials.



1.5.0.1
900221

DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT

2500 Broening Highway, Baltimore, Maryland 21224
Area Code 301 • 631-3245

William Donald Schafer
Governor

Martin W. Walsh, Jr.
Secretary

February 21, 1990

Ms. Cynthia D. Simpson, Chief
Environmental Management
Project Development Division
707 North Calvert Street, Room 310
Baltimore, Maryland 21202

RE: Contract No. CH 566-151-571
MD 5 Relocated
US 301 to MD 5
FDMS No. 082039

1. No SHA response required.

Dear Ms. Simpson:

I have reviewed the air impact analysis performed for the proposed relocation of Maryland 5 (205) from Maryland Route 5 and US 301/MD 5 and the proposed interchange at US 301/MD 5.

The proposed project is consistent with the Air Management Administration's plans and objectives. Furthermore, adherence with the provisions of COMAR 26.11.06.03D will ensure that impact from the construction phase of this project will be minimal.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this analysis.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mario E. Jorquera".

Mario E. Jorquera, P.E.
Program Administrator
Air Management Administration

MEJ/sf

2/26/90



DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT

2500 Broening Highway, Baltimore, Maryland 21224
Area Code 301 • 631-

Willem Donald Schafer
Governor

Martin W. Walsh, Jr.
Secretary

March 12, 1990

Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr., Deputy Director
Office of Planning and Engineering
Maryland State Highway Administration
707 N. Calvert Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21202

RE: Environmental Assessment
Md. Rt. 5 relocation; U. S. 301 to Md. 301/5 in Charles County
Contract No. CH 566-151-571

Dear Mr. Ege:

We are in receipt of the above-referenced document and offer the following comments.

1. The impacted drainage areas, Mattawoman Creek, Zekiah Swamp Run, and Jordan Swamp Run are high quality wetland resources. Avoidance in segment III, alternate 5/6 should be further demonstrated. In addition, Segment I, alternate 6 should be avoided if possible.
2. Mitigation for unavoidable wetland impacts shall be provided by in-kind wetland re-creation at a minimum of 1:1. Stream and riparian habitat restoration may also be required.
3. Areas bound by access ramps should not be used as mitigation areas.
4. All work in State wetlands and waterways is prohibited from March 1 to June 15.

1. Wetland avoidance and/or minimization efforts are documented in this report. See P. III-33 to III-40.
2. Segment I, Alternate 6 was selected. The wetlands will be bridged entirely to minimize impacts.
3. Wetland mitigation will be provided by in-kind wetland recreation at a minimum of 1:1.
4. Conceptual wetland mitigation sites have been developed (See III-39 to III-42). These do not include any sites within ramps.
5. Construction will not be allowed within Mattawoman Creek's wetlands or floodplains during March 1 and June 15.
6. Stormwater management will be prepared in final design in coordination with the Department of the Environment.

2/6/90

V-183

5. All newly constructed impervious areas shall be subject to stormwater management of the first one half inch of runoff in uplands.
6. Naturally occurring State wetlands and waterways shall not be impounded for the purposes of stormwater control or mitigation enhancement.

We hope that this information is helpful and appreciate the opportunity to comment. If you have any questions please contact me at (301) 631-3609.

Sincerely,
Andrew T. Der JSW

Andrew T. Der
Natural Resources Biologist
Standards & Certifications

cc: Cheryl Smith
James Teitt

ATD:dmt

V-184

2/22/90



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION III
841 Chestnut Building
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107

PROJECT
DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION

OCT 26 9 49 AM '90

OCT 19 1990

Ms. Cynthia D. Simpson, Chief
Environmental Management
Project Development Division (Room 301)
Maryland State Highway Administration
707 North Calvert Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

Re: Maryland Route 5 Relocated

Dear Ms. Simpson:

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act, EPA has reviewed the Air Quality Technical Report for the above referenced project. The basic dispersion and emission models that were applied were acceptable. However, since major intersections were apparently not addressed with an appropriate intersection model, maximum Carbon monoxide (CO) concentration impacts may have been significantly underestimated. The analysis is unacceptable in that regard.

The MOBILE3 emission factor model is acceptable for this analysis. However, future analyses should utilize MOBILE4.

The CALINE4 dispersion model is acceptable for estimating concentrations due to line sources. To demonstrate compliance with the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for CO, a quantitative air quality assessment must be conducted for locations where significant traffic slowdowns or queuing are possible. The highest CO concentrations typically occur in the vicinity of major at-grade intersections. If the project involves many intersections, it suffices to conduct the assessment for the intersections where the greatest traffic volumes and the poorest levels of service occur. Major intersections must be addressed by application of an appropriate intersection model for predicting potential air quality impacts.

Thank you for allowing EPA the opportunity to comment on the above referenced project. If you have any questions concerning our comments, please contact Denise Rigney of my staff at (215) 597-7336.

Sincerely,

Thomas Stenkamp for
Diana Esher, Chief
Environmental Planning Section

1. No SHA response required



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT
PHILADELPHIA REGIONAL OFFICE
MAR 16 1990

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Philadelphia Regional Office, Region III
Liberty Square Building
105 South Seventh Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106-3392

MAR 16 1990

Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr
Deputy Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering
Room 506
State Highway Administration
707 North Calvert Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21202

Dear Mr. Ege:

We have received the environmental assessment on contract
No. CH 566-151-571, MD 5 Relocated, US 301 to MD 301/5. We have
no comments on this document.

Very sincerely yours,

Francis X. Healey
Harry W. Staller
Deputy Regional Administrator

for

1. No SHA response required.

2/20

981-V

CHARLES COUNTY GOVERNMENT
Planning and Growth Management

ROY E. HANCOCK, Deputy County Administrator

April 18, 1990

Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Room 506
State Highway Administration
707 North Calvert St.
Baltimore, MD 21202

RE: MD 5 Relocated Environmental Assessment

Dear Mr. Ege:

I have reviewed the subject assessment document and offer the following comments:

- o Effective sedimentation and erosion controls should be established during construction in order to prevent the degradation of water quality in Mattawoman and Jordan Creeks. This is especially important to consider because of the acidic nature of soils in the project area.
- o Highway stormwater management should incorporate BMPs to intercept and filter pollutants out of highway runoff before the runoff enters Mattawoman or Jordan Creeks.
- o Interchange options A and Segment I Alternate 6 are preferable options from an environmental standpoint because of lower tree clearing and/or wetlands impact acreages.
- o The assessment states that noise barriers are not feasible or cost effective for Noise Sensitive Areas # 4, 5, 6, and 8. Five homes are located in these areas. Perhaps the highway department could offer noise attenuation in the form of sound insulating windows to these residences as a substitute for barriers.
- o I suggest that the highway department include figures in future impact documents that show projected noise impact contours in addition to the tables which report the spot noise impact projections.

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

APR 23 3 50 AM '90

RECEIVED

APR 23 1990

HANCOCK, KIRKMAN & THOMPSON




271

Mr. Ege, SHA

Page 2

Please contact me at 645-0590 if you require further information
or clarification on the comments above.

Sincerely,



George J. Maurer
Senior Environmental Planner

8/2/88

V-188



THE PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY GOVERNMENT
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES



August 30, 1989


Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Deputy Director
Office of Planning and Preliminary Engineering
Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration
707 North Calvert Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

Dear Mr. Ege:

Prince George's County has reviewed the site location of the relocation of MD Route 5 (Mattawoman-Beantown Road). We concur with the State Highway Administration's (SHA) determination that the site is not located within the County's Chesapeake Bay Critical Area.

Thank you for providing the County an opportunity to review the project location. We are pleased that SHA is considering the Chesapeake Bay Critical Area when planning and designing State roads.

Sincerely,


Eugene T. Lauer
Director

1. No SHA response required.

213



Waldorf Volunteer Fire Dept., Inc.

RECEIVED

87112
APR 11 1990

Mike, Chuck
JOHNSON, MIRMIRAN & THOMPSON

P.O. BOX 392

Waldorf, Maryland

20601

January 14, 1990

Mr. Charles P. Butler
Environmental Manager
Johnson, Mirmiran and Thompson, P.A.
810 Glensgles Court
Suite 200
Baltimore, Maryland 21204

Dear Mr. Butler:

Thank you for your letter dated January 4, 1990 requesting concurrence or comments concerning the impact on emergency vehicle accessibility by the proposed modifications to Maryland Route 205.

The congested traffic conditions in the Waldorf area are a major problem for us as providers of fire protection and emergency medical service. Our response times have steadily increased in recent years and the addition of a 1.3 million square foot regional mall and several other large shopping and commercial centers is certain to slow our response time further in the future.

We are enthusiastic about any road improvement project that will relieve congestion and reduce, or stabilize, our response times. The proposed project in your letter is a major route taken by both our EMS and fire apparatus. We are cautiously optimistic about the potential of a 4 or 6 lane "bypass" for Waldorf.

The last sentence of the third paragraph of your letter is confusing and I assume you meant to say "...actually aid emergency vehicle accessibility." We would very much like to concur with your conclusion, but until we have the actual plans for the proposed new traffic patterns at both ends of the project it will be impossible for us to evaluate accessibility. Some of the interchanges we have observed can severely restrict access to certain areas or certain directions on major roads. We are extremely concerned that the proposed project not do either of these. Any increase in our response time into the Pinefield Subdivision would be unacceptable and would severely reduce the fire and EMS protection to the citizens in that area.

1. Additional mapping was forwarded. Several phone calls followed without receiving any comments. Coordination will continue through the design process.

Members:

NATIONAL FIRE PROTECTION ASSOCIATION
MARYLAND STATE FIREMEN'S ASSOCIATION
THE ILLUMINATED MARYLAND VOLUNTEER FIREMEN'S ASSOCIATION
COURTESY COUNTY VOLUNTEER FIREMEN'S ASSOCIATION

279

061-A

Page 2

Mr. Charles P. Butler

Please consider this a formal request for details of the proposed traffic flow for the entire project. We CAN NOT concur with the conclusion that the project will "aid accessibility" until we have had a chance to review the detailed plans. We also formally request an opportunity to suggest changes or modifications after we have reviewed the requested plans.

We look forward to hearing from you on this matter.

Sincerely,



Daniel J. Stevens
Chief

CC: Charles County Commissioners

V-191

275



Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

O. James Lighthizer
Secretary
Hal Kassoff
Administrator

November 1, 1991

Mr. Jim Christoff, Train Master
Conrail
225 33rd Street South
Washington, DC 20019

Dear Mr. Christoff:

Thank you for your recent telephone conversation with Mr. Monty Rahman of my staff regarding rail traffic passing through Waldorf, Maryland.

The information provided was:

- o The number of trains per day varies between four and eight trains depending on rate of coal production and season. (two to four trains each way).
- o No forecasted increase in the number of trains is anticipated.
- o The speed limit is 30 miles per hour
- o The number of cars per train is seventy-five.
- o Train length is approximately one mile.

1. No SHA response required

Please advise by letter if there is any discrepancy in the above information. Your cooperation in this matter is appreciated.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Deputy Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering

LHE:MAR:as

cc: Mr. Victor Janata
Mr. Edward Meehan
Mr. Neil J. Pedersen

333-1105

My telephone number is _____

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
383-7555 Baltimore Metro - 565-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5062 Statewide Toll Free
707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

2/18

INTERAGENCY MEETINGS

Four interagency meetings were held in which Proposed MD 5 Relocated was discussed. These meetings were held on January 18, 1989; October 18, 1989; August 15, 1990; and July 17, 1991. A complete attendance and transcript of the meetings is available at Maryland State Highway Administration, 707 North Calvert Street, Baltimore, Maryland. Included herein is an attendance of the meeting, summary of discussion, and comments/questions with responses.

278

JANUARY 18, 1989

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Cynthia Simpson	SHA - Project Development
Joe Kresslein	SHA - Project Development
Barbara Allera-Bohlen	SHA - Project Development
Donald Honeywell	SHA - Project Development
William Malone	SHA - Bridge Design
Charles O'Kehie	SHA - Bridge Design
Nadzy Mondanipour	SHA - Bridge Design
Tzyy Shan Lin	SHA - Bridge Design
Linda Kelbaugh	SHA - Highway Division
Fred Doerfler	SHA - Highway Division
Barb Solbert	SHA - Highway Division
Barbara Clouse	SHA - Wetlands
Mohammed Hashemi	SHA - Wetlands
Peter Stokely	U.S. E.P.A.
Bill Schultz	U.S.F.W.S.
Mike Slatterg	MD DNR - Tidewater
Arnold Norden	MD DNR - LPS
John Wolf	MD DNR - LPS
Carol Brunori	MD DNR - FPWS
Steve Harmen	U.S. Corps of Engineers
Herman Rodrigo	FHWA
Paul Wettlaufer	FHWA
John Nichols	National Marine Fisheries Services
Andrew Der	D.O.E.
Bob Harvey	National Park Service

Project Planning Studies began in January, 1988 and an Alternates Meeting was held on November 22, 1988. A description of the existing conditions along with alternates presented at the Alternates Meeting were presented. There were three mainline build alternates and four interchange options for the US 301/MD 5 intersection presented. The mainline build alternates included: Alternate 2, a five-lane curbed roadway; and Alternate 3 and 4, a four-lane divided roadway with a raised median and left turn lanes at selected locations. Alternate 3 provided service roads, at Pinefield and Council Oak, while Alternate 4 provided a more extensive service road network. The four interchange options would be Option A, B, C, and D.

The mainline build alternates would impact Trinity Memorial Gardens Cemetery. Alternate 2 would impact 15 grave sites, Alternate 3 would impact 48 grave sites, and Alternate 4 would impact 92 grave sites. An additional service road system to reduce the grave site impacts was presented. This would provide rear access to the residences across from the cemetery. Preliminary environmental impacts with the mainline alternates and interchange options were presented.

Most of the Comment/Questions from the attending agencies involved the wetlands and floodplain of Mattawoman Creek and whether they will be bridged or not. Wetland delineation had not been completed (NWI mapping was being used) and no decision had been made on the length of bridge over Mattawoman Creek.

279

January 18, 1989

Comment/Question

Comment/Question: Mike Slattery, DNR
Concerned about wetland impacts to Mattawoman Creek because of their significant recreational function. Are there 6 acres of impact or 1-3?

Response: Barbara Allera-Bohlen, SHA
Based on NWI mapping, the mainline options would involve approximately 1-3 acres. The interchange options will be addressed separately.

Comment/Question: Bill Schultz, USFWS
Will this be put together in a EIS or EA?

Response: Cynthia Simpson, SHA
This decision has not been made at this time.

Comment/Question: Bill Schultz, USFWS
Will there be bridge supports in the creek itself? (Mattawoman Creek) or will the whole floodplain be spanned? What is the present span length?

Response: Sue Ellen White, SHA
At this stage we don't know. We were assuming for cost estimating purposes, spanning the entire floodplain. I don't know what the current span length is.

Comment/Question: Pete Stokley, EPA
Stated that he would like to see the acreages of impacts of each of the options at Mattawoman Creek, when available. Also impacts to woodlands. Is there going to be impacts to the ballfields?

Response: Barbara Allera-Bohlen, SHA
Our understanding is that the area where the ballfields are located will be developed for residential use. There are plans from Charles County to extend Eastern Parkway and it will go through the Chaney Property which the Chaney's favor. Mr. Chaney expects the new ballfield in St. Charles to be completed by next year.

Comment/Question: Pete Stokley, EPA
Our major concern would also be to minimize impacts to the wetlands.

280

January 18, 1989

Comment/Question

Comment/Question: John Nichols, NMFS

Do you have descriptions of the streams? We do have a concern for the ecology and filling of the floodplain. I assume that you don't know whether you'll be spanning the interchange options over Mattawoman.

Response: Barbara Allera-Bohlen, SHA
It has not been decided yet.

Comment/Question: John Nichols, NMFS

If there is any crossing on the interchange as well as the mainline, we would like to see the information. I would also like to see the wetlands delineation once they are completed.

Response: Barbara Allera-Bohlen, SHA
O.K.

Comment/Question: Andrew Der, MDE

We were also like to see wetlands delineations as soon as possible and a mitigation plan and urge avoidance of wetlands. Once again we would encourage use of open section road design to reduce pollution flows into stormwater.

Comment/Question: Bob Harney, NPS

Is there any Charles County park land associated with this project?

Response: Barbara Allera-Bohlen, SHA
No.

Comment/Question:

Did you evaluate the floodplain land (acreage) yet?

Response: Barbara-Allera-Bohlen, SHA

Based on the floodplain mapping, we know there is a large floodplain associated with Mattawoman Creek but we have no acreages worked out yet.

281

OCTOBER 18, 1989

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Cynthia Simpson	SHA - Project Development
Mark Duvall	SHA - Project Development
Barbara Allera - Bohlen	SHA - Project Development
Sharon Preller	SHA - Project Development
Monty Rahman	SHA - Project Development
Sue Rajan	SHA - Project Development
Dennis Simpson	SHA - Project Development
Cathy Pecora	SHA - Project Development
James Yarsky	SHA - Project Development
Wesley Glass	SHA - Project Development
Leroy Carrigan	SHA - Project Development
Howard Johnson	SHA - Project Development
Frank DeSantis	SHA - Project Development
Don Sparklin	SHA - Project Development
Victor Janata	SHA - Project Development
Rita Suffness	SHA - Project Development
James L. Wynn	SHA - Project Development
William Baker	SHA - Highway Design
Jane Wagner	SHA - Highway Design
Edward C. Johnson	SHA - Highway Design
Bob Easter	SHA - Highway Design
Stephen Wanamaker	SHA - Bridge Design
Ali Chaharbaghi	SHA - Bridge Design
Bill Branch	SHA - Wetlands Group
Barbara Clouse	SHA - Wetlands Group
Mohammed Hashemi	SHA - Wetlands Group
Jack Hett	SHA - Landscape Architecture
M.Q. (Cas) Taherian	Maryland DNR - Water Resources Admin.
Andrew Der	Maryland Department of the Environment
Bill Schultz	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Carlo R. Brunori	Maryland DNR - Forest, Parks and Wildlife Service
Ted Foglietta	McCormick Taylor & Associates, Inc.
Jill O. Kulig	McCormick Taylor & Associates, Inc.

New mainline build alternates were presented, Alternate 5 and 6. The roadway was separated in three segments. Within the southern segment, Alternate 5 followed the existing alignment while Alternate 6 was on relocation. The typical section provided six-lane open roadway. Segment 2 and 3 proposed a six-lane, closed roadway with 20 foot raised median. From the railroad tracks to US 301/MD 5 the roadway would be reduced to a four-lane roadway. The previous mainline alternates were dropped because the four-lane roadway did not accommodate future traffic requirements.

Most of the Comments/Questions from the attending agencies involved wetland impacts. A wetland delineation was held on August 25, 1989 and impacts to the eight wetland sites for each alternate were presented. It was explained that with Segment 1, Alternate 6 was superior to Alternate 5 for traffic operations but had greater wetland impacts. It was

282

questioned if the alignment of Alternate 6 could be shifted to minimize the wetland impacts. It was also discussed that Segment II, Alternate 5 and 6 would require approximately 120 grave sites from Trinity Memorial Gardens Cemetery.

283

October 18, 1989

Comment/Question

Comment/Question: Carlo Brunori, DNR - FP&WS

Asked if Wetland 1 appears on the project wall maps.

Response: Barbara Allera-Bohlen, SHA

Responded that the wetlands do not appear on the project maps which are posted around the room.

Cynthia Simpson, SHA

Explained that Carlo does not have a map which shows the actual interchange options.

Response: Barbara Allera-Bohlen, SHA

Explained that she could get a map out of the Alternates Brochure that would show the interchange options, but she does not believe the wetlands are involved with the interchange options.

Vic Janata, SHA

Explained that the interchange options have been presented in the Alternates Brochure and he does not believe that it has changed.

Option B modifies the directional ramps in an attempt to reduce wetland impacts to the west side and calls for a left exit off the southbound roadway.

Barbara Allera-Bohlen, SHA

Stated that Option B will affect approximately .48 acre at Wetland 1.

Vic Janata, SHA

Explained Option C provides southbound Route 301 to southbound Mattawoman/Beantown Road access behind the Chamber Building, and crosses an existing signalized intersection.

There are retaining walls involved to separate the ramps from existing development and allow for access to a shopping center in the area.

289

October 18, 1989

Comment/Question

Barbara Allera-Bohlen, SHA

Added, there will be a service road behind the commercial area on both sides of the shopping center.

Comment/Question: Mark Duvall, SHA

Asked what the wetland impacts under Option C entailed.

Response: Barbara Allera-Bohlen, SHA

Responded that .55 acre of wetlands would be impacted under Option C, at Wetland 1. She explained that at the wetlands field review, the worst case scenario was anticipated.

Cynthia Simpson, SHA

Stated that the environmental document should show wetland impacts for each of the options that are being shown. She added that the environmental document has not yet been circulated.

Comment/Question: Cas Taherian, DNR-WRA

Asked if the environmental document was a draft.

Response: Cynthia Simpson, SHA

Yes.

Comment/Question: Bill Schultz, USF&WS

Asked when the wetlands were delineated.

Response: Barbara Allera-Bohlen, SHA

Responded that the wetlands were delineated August 25, 1989 with the Corps.

October 18, 1989

Comment/Question

Comment/Question: Cas Taherian, DNR-WRA

Asked how many stream crossings are associated with this project.

Response: Barbara Allera-Bohlen, SHA

Responded that there would be ~~seven~~^{SEVERAL} stream crossings.

Comment/Question: Cas Taherian, DNR-WRA

Suggested that SHA establish a close coordination with DNR.

Comment/Question: Vic Janata, SHA

Explained that Alternate 6 seems to be superior to Alternate 5 however, there are greater impacts to sensitive environmental areas under Alternate 6. He then asked how SHA would develop a close coordination with DNR.

Comment/Question: Cas Taherian, DNR-WRA

Commented that sometimes before the Environmental Impact Statement you establish coordination by sending letters to the different agencies.

Cynthia Simpson, SHA

Asked Barbara and Vic to send Cas a copy of the wetland package.

Comment/Question: Bill Schultz, USF&WS

Asked if the alignment could be shifted further south to avoid more wetlands.

Response: Barbara Allera-Bohlen, SHA

Said the further south you go, the closer you get to Jordan Swamp.

Comment/Question: Bill Schultz, USF&WS

Asked if the alignment could be shifted at all.

Response: Barbara Allera-Bohlen, SHA

Responded that approved development in Charles County makes it difficult to shift the alignment.

Response: Vic Janata, SHA

Stated that they looked for the minimum of crossings when designing the

286

AUGUST 15, 1990

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Cynthia Simpson	SHA - Environmental Management
Mark Duvall	SHA - Environmental Management
Barbara Allera - Bohlen	SHA - Environmental Management
Howard Johnson	SHA - Environmental Management
Wesley Glass	SHA - Environmental Management
Sharon Preller	SHA - Environmental Management
Don Sparklin	SHA - Environmental Management
Bob House	SHA - Project Planning Division
Victor Janata	SHA - Project Planning Division
Monty Rahman	SHA - Project Planning Division
Carl Bialecki	SHA - Project Planning Division
Karl Teitt	SHA - Project Planning Division
Mark Crampton	SHA - Project Planning Division
Ruth Mayenshein	SHA - Project Planning Division
George Walton	SHA - Project Planning Division
Leroy Tyree	SHA - Highway Design
Susan Jacobs	SHA - Highway Design
Kenneth McDonald	SHA - Highway Design
Dave Pelton	SHA - Hydraulics
Marva Randle	SHA - Hydraulics
Linda Kelbaugh	SHA - Office of Chief Engineer
Dan Guy	SHA - Office of Chief Engineer
Jack Hett	SHA - Landscape Architecture Division
Pat Gauss	SHA - Landscape Architecture Division
Stave Harmon	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Karen Craven	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Bill Schultz	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
John Nichols	National Marine Fisheries Service
Denise Rigney	EPA
Peter Stokely	EPA
Michelle Huffman	DNR-Water Resources Administration
M.Q. (Cas) Taherian	DNR - Water Resources Administration
Sean M. Smith	DNR - Tidewater Administration
Valarie Rychwalski	Maryland Department of the Environment
Elizabeth Hannold	Maryland Historical Trust
Herman Rodrigo	Federal Highway Administration
Kay Batey	Federal Highway Administration

The alternates were presented. These were the same as the previously presented. The typical section was presented as a four-lane, divided curbed roadway with outside shoulders and a 20' curbed median. The Comments/Questions from the attending agencies were discussed for each segment of the project. This started with Segment 1 to the south.

Within Segment 1, discussion centered on wetland impacts. It was stated that Alternate 5 did not provide adequate future traffic needs. The wetland impacts for both Alternate 5 and 6 were presented. It was stated that the typical section was revised to a 20' curbed

interchange options were investigated with Alternate 5 but dropped because of right-of-way impacts, cost, and increased wetland impacts. Concern was raised about the fragmentation of wetlands by Alternate 6. Mr. Bill Schultz, USFWS, stated that he preferred Alternate 5 due to wetland impacts.

Within Segment 2, discussion centered on impacts to grave sites. Alternate 5/6 impacts over 1500 grave sites, of which more than 100 grave sites are entombed. There was strong public opposition to the option. The preferred alignment is Alternate 5/6 Modified. This did not impact any grave sites but displaces a nursery and several homes.

Within Segment 3, there was no discussion.

With the interchange options, the discussion centered on wetland impacts. The proposed wetland impacts for the four options were presented. Interchange Option A was presented as the preferred option. Mr. Bill Schultz, USFWS, stated that he preferred Option B because from his field reviews he felt that Option A impacted higher quality wetlands. The SHA stated that Option B was not preferred because it proposed a left hand median exit which is unusual to drivers creating a hazard.

288

August 15, 1990

Comment/Question

Comment/Question: Herman Rodrigo, FHWA - Clarified that the figures for the impacts were for Wetland 7 only and not both 7 and 8. Also clarified that SHA changed their typical section from an open section to a closed section as well as reducing the median for the purpose of wetland impact reduction.

Response: Victor Janata, SHA - Concurred that what was previously presented at another hearing was an open section for alternates 5,6, and 7. An extension of the closed section was made to the intersection with MD 5 through the area where the wetlands are.

Response: Barbara Allera-Bohlen, SHA - Corrected her previous statement regarding the .24 acres of impacts. These impacts included both Wetlands 7 and 8.

Victor Janata, SHA - Stated that Segment 1, Alternate 6 was designed to be a more functional intersection with MD 5 than Alternate 5 because it is a more continuous MD 5, however, there are right-of-way problems as well as increased acreages of wetland impacts. The alternate was designed to cross the most narrow portion of the wetland it affects. Poplar-Hill Beantown Road would have to be relocated with this alternate. This alternate works without an interchange because there are three intersections, which provide an adequate level of service. However, Wetland 8 is impacted.

Barbara Allera-Bohlen, SHA - Stated that SHA was asked to look at shifting the road further east, however there were even more wetland impacts in this situation.

Victor Janata, SHA - Stated that, originally there was an open, 30' median with shoulders in a four-lane section, we extended the closed section, shown for the northern end, south over the wetlands, decreased the closed section median from 30' to 20' and there was enough room to transition to the open section of MD 5 for the intersection there.

Barbara Allera-Bohlen, SHA - Stated that the total wetland impact here was originally 2 acres, but by reducing the original typical section from 30' to 20', we reduced it by .24, so the total impact for this section is now 1.77 acres. Wetland 8 is now being used agriculturally.

289

August 15, 1990

Comment/Question

Comment/Question: Herman Rodrigo, FHWA - Asked if reduction of the median from open to closed for Alternative 6 could be kept closed all the way up to the intersection or if the roadway must be separated.

Response: Victor Janata, SHA - Responded that it should be separated because MD 5 is open section with shoulders also, the median must be split to provide enough storage for one movement.

Comment/Question: Cas Taherian, DNR, WRA - Asked if it was ever considered to use MD 205 as part of this alternate.

Response: Victor Janata, SHA - Stated that Alternate 5 uses MD 205, but Alternate 6 also uses existing MD 205 as part of the movement because this is a full intersection, some of the turning movements use this roadway.

Comment/Question: Herman Rodrigo, FHWA - Commented that both Alternate 5 and Alternate 6 would remain in the planning process.

Response: Victor Janata, SHA - Stated that major improvements would not have to be made because the existing roadway would be used to accomodate traffic coming from St. Charles Parkway and U.S. 301 for both Alternates 5 and 6.

Comment/Question: Bill Schultz, USFWS - Questioned why an interchange could not be used at MD 205.

Response: Victor Janata, SHA - Clarified that it is not an interchange but an at-grade intersection having free movements.

Comment/Question: Bill Schultz, USFWS - Clarified previous question to mean why a type of interchange could not be made at the intersection with MD 205.

Response: Victor Janata, SHA - Stated that this was investigated, however the impacts to existing and approved development, wetlands, and right-of-way would cost approximately \$15 million. There are additional wetland impacts with this approach also.

Comment/Question: Bill Schultz, USFWS - Expressed concern with the issue of fragmentation of wetlands. Where MD 5 and MD 205 meet is currently undeveloped land.

Response: Barbara Allera-Bohlen, SHA - Stated that this property has already been approved by Charles County for development.

Comment/Question: Steve Harmon, ACOE - Questioned if SHA had done any detailed studies on the wetland impacts and impacts to residents in the area to support the estimated cost of \$15 million. Stated that the specific information has not been given to ACOE for review.

290

August 15, 1990

Comment/Question

Response: Barbara Allera-Bohlen, SHA - Responded that the information is still being developed.

Response: Victor Janata, SHA - Stated that the problems and opposition to this alternate have been recognized as opposed to Alternate 5, and additional options are being studied that will be discussed in the future.

Comment/Question: Steve Harmon, ACOE - Questioned why the intersection was said to fail, if it was projected to fail in the future or if it fails at this time and if the reason for this was because of the St. Charles development.

Response: Victor Janata, SHA - Responded that the intersection fails with the improvements because of poor design and the traffic generated by the general development of the area, both existing and approved. The problem is not so much the volume of traffic, the intersection fails before the design.

Comment/Question: Bill Schultz, USFWS - Asked how long this project has been in planning.

Response: Victor Janata, SHA - Stated that the county has had this project proposed for a number of years. The County and the State made a trade in the responsibility of highways and the State took it over in 1988. An alternates meeting was held in November of 1988 and a public hearing February 26, 1990.

Comment/Question: Cas Taherian, DNR, WRA - Asked about recent improvements to MD 205.

Response: Victor Janata, SHA - Verified that improvements had recently been made to the intersection of MD 5 and Mattawoman-Beantown Road and spot improvements in various places also. Previously, this was a county route which tied into the State Route 5. However, because of traffic volume on Mattawoman-Beantown Road, the state acquired it and approved its inclusion in an improved alignment to be more consistent with the direction of the traffic flow of the area.

Comment/Question: Cas Taherian, DNR, WRA - Asked about the new structure that was constructed and if it was considered as an option for MD 5 at that time.

Response: Barbara Allera-Bohlen, SHA - Stated that the plans for improvements to this roadway were not being considered at the time of the bridge replacement. There were some realignments done to Poplar Hill-Beantown Road where the curve was taken out.

Response: Victor Janata, SHA - Stated that since the study had not been done at that time, a decision could not be made as to which alignment to take.

Comment/Question: Cas Taherian, DNR, WRA - Questioned if there was a preferred alternate chosen by SHA.

291

August 15, 1990

Comment/Question

Response: Victor Janata, SHA - Stated that there was no official decision, however SHA may lean toward Alternate 5, recognizing the additional wetland impacts in Alternate 6. However, a solution is being sought which solves both problems - function and environmental stability.

Comment/Question: Herman Rodrigo, FHWA - Asked for clarification regarding SHA's current position on Alternate 5, an at-grade intersection with MD 5. Wanted verification that SHA was looking at other options to try to improve the proposal to see if it will operate at a better level of service and that SHA was looking at an interchange as opposed to intersection.

Response: Victor Janata, SHA - Responded that SHA primarily looked at an interchange and discovered that the right-of-way impacts and wetland impacts were such that SHA did not want to pursue this option because of the existing development and approved development that would be impacted.

Response: Barbara Allera-Bohlen, SHA - Added that the information is still being developed. We do not wish to discuss it yet until we can find a better solution to both the wetlands and traffic issues.

Comment/Question: Herman Rodrigo, FHWA - Questioned where the flyover ramp structures will touch down.

Response: Victor Janata, SHA - Responded that the structures will touch down to the west of the railroad and the railroad will continue to be at-grade as well as the service roads.

292

August 15, 1990

Comment/Question

Response: Bob Houst, SHA - Stated that the structures will be at-grade by the time you get to the shopping center.

Barbara Allera-Bohlen, SHA - Stated that the wetland impacts resulting from Interchange Option D totalled 1.98 acres. This is not the preferred alternate.

Victor Janata, SHA - Stated that Interchange Option B would provide directional ramps between MD 205 and U.S. 301 to the north. SHA tried to reduce wetland impacts in this interchange by designing left exits off of southbound U.S. 301 to southbound MD 205. In that process, it was necessary to move southbound U.S. 301 to the west and the result was that no wetland acreages were saved. The existing at-grade signalized intersection at MD 205 and U.S. 301 would remain and there would be a connection to these ramps so traffic flowing between MD 205 and U.S. 301 to the south would remain with an at-grade intersection.

Comment/Question: Denise Rigney, EPA - Questioned how the Washington Bypass would affect any of this.

Response: Victor Janata, SHA - Stated that the Eastern Washington Bypass provides options west of here that tie into the U.S. 301 corridor in Prince Georges County.

Comment/Question: Denise Rigney, EPA - Clarified that the Washington Bypass would probably be up farther on U.S. 301 rather than following the existing corridor to the east of Mattawoman-Beantown Road.

Response: Barbara Allera-Bohlen, SHA - Stated that the proposed improvements would need to be done anyway; they probably could not be incorporated into the Washington Bypass Corridor.

Barbara Allera-Bohlen - Stated that Wetlands 1 and 1a on the east side of U.S. 301 would be impacted by Interchange Option B. Therefore, this is not a preferred option.

Comment/Question: Bill Schultz, USFWS - Asked what the impacts were for this option.

Response: Barbara Allera-Bohlen, SHA - Responded that the total impacts for this option are 1.12 acres.

Victor Janata, SHA - Stated that Interchange Option A has been designated as the preferred option. It provides directional ramps between the north leg of U.S. 301 and the south leg of MD 205. The southbound ramp is a normal right exit ramp which goes over U.S. 301 and is at-grade at the railroad tracks. The northbound is also at-grade at the railroad tracks. With this option, the existing MD 205 signalized intersection with U.S. 301 would remain operational to carry traffic between Mattawoman-Beantown Road and southbound U.S. 301.

293

August 15, 1990

Comment/Question

Barbara Allera-Bohlen, SHA - Stated that Wetland 1 is impacted but the total impacts with Option A are only .94 acres. Again, this is designated as the preferred Option due to the reduced wetland impacts.

Comment/Question: Herman Rodrigo, FHWA - Asked if the State was proposing a fill or a structure at the wetland crossing.

Response: Barbara Allera-Bohlen, SHA - Responded that the State proposes a structure.

Comment/Question: Herman Rodrigo, FHWA - Asked for clarification as to whether the figure for the wetland impacts included the structure in place.

Response: Barbara Allera-Bohlen, SHA - Concurred that this was the case.

Comment/Question: Bill Schultz, USFWS - Stated that he preferred Option B, even though there are more wetland impacts, he stated that he had visited the site and there was a difference in quality in the wetlands on the site. Wetland 2a is directly tied into the Mattawoman Creek system, it is not only a 100-year floodplain, but a 25-year or even less than that, and it is an integral part of the Mattawoman Creek situation. Wetland 1 is fairly well isolated from the floodplain, it is in the 100-year floodplain, but probably not in the 25- or 50-year floodplain. Therefore he prefers fewer impacts to Wetland 2a.

Comment/Question: Herman Rodrigo, FHWA - Asked if there were capacity problems or problems with the geometrics which make Option B undesirable.

Response: Victor Janata, SHA - Stated that the problem with Option B was that there is a left exit which is considered to be an unusual type of exit. It can be considered a hazard because people do not usually expect to exit from the left, a right exit is much more common. Therefore, drivers may miss the exit or slow down erratically to try to get over to the left lane, causing a dangerous situation.

Comment/Question: Herman Rodrigo, FHWA - Asked if appropriate signing could be utilized to avoid these problems.

Response: Victor Janata, SHA - Felt that any signing would not be adequate enough to prepare drivers for the unexpected. People are used to right exits, even though Maryland does use left ones occasionally.

Response: Bob Houst, SHA - Stated that studies are being done to see if there is quantifiable evidence that left exits are a problem. He stated that there is a "feeling" that left exits are not as desirable and therefore should be avoided if possible.

Comment/Question: Herman Rodrigo, FHWA - Asked if there was any difference, from a capacity standpoint, in what these two options provide.

204

August 15, 1990

Response: Barbara Allera-Bohlen, SHA - Stated that they provide for about the same capacity. The major difference is that Option A has a right exit and Option B has a left exit which is considered undesirable.

Comment/Question: Herman Rodrigo, FHWA - Interested in Bill Schultz's (USFWS) comment regarding his prognosis of the difference between Option A versus B. Asked Bill to clarify the reasoning of his preference of Option B even though this option has a greater acreage of wetlands impacted.

Response: Bill Schultz, USFWS - Responded that Wetland 1 is not as functionally a part of the Mattawoman Creek system as Wetland 2a. Therefore, Wetland 2a is a much more valuable wetland system.

Response: Barbara Allera-Bohlen, SHA - Stated that at this point, no evaluations of quality or value have been done on the wetlands in the study area.

Comment/Question: Bill Schultz, USFWS - Stated that since he had been in the field to see this particular site, his previous comment would be his opinion regarding the value of the wetland systems mentioned.

Asked if it would be possible to bridge the wetland and 100-year floodplain if Option A were to be chosen for construction.

Response: Barbara Allera-Bohlen, SHA - Responded that it could be investigated further as to what the cost would be.

Comment/Question: Bill Schultz, USFWS - Stated that it might be a good compromise to use Option A with a structure over the entire floodplain. This would allow for safety and still maintain water quality, and even though the area would not be as good for wildlife because of the effects of shading, the impacts to the floodplain would reduce.

Comment/Question: Sean Smith, DNR, TW - Asked if evaluation that was done between Options A and B for wetland acreages was based on actual acres of fill. Stated that Option B had more acres of fill but Option A was impacted in a greater way due to fragmentation. Also asked if effects of temporary impacts were investigated, and if heavy equipment would be entering the area that would be fragmented, and therefore compact areas of vegetation which would end up being lost.

Response: Linda Kelbaugh, SHA - Stated that as a general practice, during construction, SHA has special provisions included in all contract documents that state how construction impacts to wetlands are to be handled. She stated that SHA clears rather than grubs, and uses mats as temporary fill over it. Upon completion, all that is put down is removed. Temporary impacts are handled in this way as a standard procedure.

Comment/Question: John Nichols, NMFS - Asked if a bridge would result in less lateral impacts to the wetlands than fill. He also asked for verification of

295

August 15, 1990

Comment/Question

the indication that fill would include to the toe-of-slope and an additional 25' beyond this.

Response: Linda Kelbaugh, SHA - Verified that 25' is a "rule-of-thumb" but that type of analysis has to be done on a case-by-case basis to know what type of equipment will be needed and what type of area will be needed. Regarding the question as to whether the bridge would result in less lateral impacts to the wetlands than fill, she answered that this, also, should be determined on an individual basis.

Comment/Question: Sean Smith, DNR, TW - Commented that in this case SHA would probably heavily impact the wetlands between the ramp and the main highway by the construction equipment, the operation of the highway and possibly the stormwater management operation, depending on how it was constructed.

Response: Linda Kelbaugh, SHA - Stated that these issues would be resolved in the final design stage and that not enough information was available currently to discuss the topic further.

Comment/Question: Sean Smith, DNR, TW - Noted that this should be investigated because although Option A has less acres of wetland impacts due to fill, there are temporary impacts to the fragmented area that could be significant.

Response: Linda Kelbaugh, SHA - Stated that these issues will be addressed in final design in the detailed minimization report.

Comment/Question: Herman Rodrigo, FHWA - Asked Sean Smith (DNR, TW) why he thought the area between the ramp and roadway would be so heavily impacted that it should be included as part of the permanent impacts to the area.

Response: Sean Smith, DNR, TW - Clarified that his point was not that construction impacts should be counted as permanent impacts to the area but that they should be evaluated because construction activities will be occurring on both sides of the fragmented area, which is not very wide, and that sometimes up to 25' is used for an area where heavy equipment will be used. Also, the way in which the stormwater management facility is constructed may cause an impact to the wetlands, dependent upon what will be discharged into the facility.

Response: Victor Janata, SHA - Stated that there will not be any improvements on existing U.S. 301 in this area.

Response: Linda Kelbaugh, SHA - Stated that all of these issues will be part of the design detailed minimization report.

Response: Barbara Allera-Bohlen, SHA - Stated that no stormwater management plan has been developed as of yet.

296

August 15, 1990

Comment/Question: Bill Schultz, USFWS - Stated that after the area is bridged, the vegetation system will not be the same due to the effects of shading. This will lessen the value of the wetlands for wildlife habitat.

Response: Barbara Allera-Bohlen, SHA - Clarified Bill Schultz's (USFWS) position as preferring Option B unless the entire floodplain is bridged in Option A.

Response: Bill Schultz, USFWS - Concurred that this was his position and that his opinion was that Wetland 2a had the highest value of all the wetlands in the project.

Comment/Question: Herman Rodrigo, FHWA - Asked if it was possible to move the interchange further south to avoid these impacts.

Response: Victor Janata, SHA - Stated that more wetland impacts would occur by having to relocate MD 205 since the interchange could not be moved south without having to move MD 205 also.

Comment/Question: Peter Stokely, EPA - Asked about the possibility of a cloverleaf type of interchange.

Response: Victor Janata, SHA - Explained that a cloverleaf interchange is a four-legged interchange and there are only three legs now, therefore there is no need for this type of interchange.

Response: Linda Kelbaugh, SHA - A cloverleaf interchange is a larger interchange and therefore requires more right-of-way, wetland impacts, etc.

Comment/Question: Peter Stokely, EPA - Asked what the distance was between the ramp and existing U.S. 301 in Wetland 2a. Also asked if this information would be available before the final selection of the Interchange Option was made.

Response: Barbara Allera-Bohlen, SHA - Responded that she could investigate that and inform him at a later time but that the information would be part of the minimization report.

Comment/Question: Denise Rigney, EPA - Asked if the numbers given were final numbers for the wetland impacts and if the acreages could be estimated to the hundredth place at this level of detail or if they had to wait until final design. If the difference between the two interchanges in question is estimated at only .18 acres, perhaps by the time the project gets to final design, the impacts will be minimized to the point that there is even less or no difference in figures to use as a reason for selecting the one alternative over the other.

Response: Barbara Allera-Bohlen, SHA - Stated that these are "worst case" scenarios and that impacts will be minimized by the time the project is through final design. Also stated that the safety issue, as well as the fact that there were fewer wetland impacts, were the important factors in the selection of Interchange Option A over Interchange Option B as the preferred Option.

August 15, 1990

Comment/Question

Comment/Question: Denise Rigney, EPA - Asked if the Washington Bypass was considered in the traffic projections that were used for the project and if perhaps the figures were high if this was not considered.

Response: Victor Janata, SHA - Stated that the Bypass was not considered in the traffic figures, but that if the Bypass is built, he would anticipate that the U.S. 301 mainline will operate at a lesser level of service (los F) than is projected.

Comment/Question: Denise Rigney, EPA - Questioned if this would be serving mainly local traffic, would a left exit be considered as much of a safety hazard when serving commuter traffic.

Response: Victor Janata, SHA - Stated that this would serve commuter traffic because even if a "build" solution for an Eastern Washington Bypass is chosen, it would be to the west of U.S. 301 so that it would not have an impact on the MD 5 corridor traffic although it would help the situation on the U.S. 301 corridor.

Barbara Allera-Bohlen, SHA - Stated that Wetland 3 is behind the Chaney Building and is impacted by Options C and D only.

Comment/Question: Bill Schultz, USFWS - Commented that he preferred Alternate 5 in Segment 1.

Comment/Question: Cas Taherian, DNR, WRA - Commented that he preferred to see the interchange moved to the south.

Comment/Question: Peter Stokely, EPA - Commented that he felt a need for SHA to pursue the study of a combination of a cloverleaf and diamond interchange or an explanation as to why this would not be feasible.

Response: Barbara Allera-Bohlen - Stated that this subject will be addressed in the Avoidance/Minimization/Mitigation Report for this project.

Comment/Question: Bill Schultz, USFWS - Stated that there is a considerable amount of development at the existing intersection.

JULY 17, 1991

298

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Cynthia Simpson	SHA - Project Planning Division
Barbara Allera-Bohlen	SHA - Project Planning Division
Victor Janata	SHA - Project Planning Division
Bruce Grey	SHA - Project Planning Division
Lorraine Strow	SHA - Project Planning Division
Monty Rahman	SHA - Project Planning Division
Wes Glass	SHA - Project Planning Division
Anne Elrays	SHA - Project Planning Division
Heidi Farrell	SHA - Project Planning Division
Bob Schneider	SHA - Project Planning Division
Mark Duvall	SHA - Project Planning Division
Linda Kelbaugh	SHA - Environmental Permits
Dan Guy	SHA - Environmental Permits
Alex Soutar	SHA - Environmental Permits
Stanley Davis	SHA - Bridge Hydraulics
Glen Smith	SHA - Highway Design
Bruce Dombroski	SHA - Highway Design
John Leslie	SHA - Highway Design
Glen Helms	SHA - Highway Design
Mike Jager	SHA - Highway Design
Paul Matys	SHA - Bridge Design
Andy Kosicki	SHA - Bridge Design
Danelle Mucci	SHA - Bridge Design
Bill Branch	SHA - Wetlands
Michelle Huffman	DNR - WRA
Bob Cooper	DNR - Non-tidal Wetlands
Paul Wettlaufer	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Jeff Knoedlar	National Park Service
Jareene Barkdoll	FHWA
Andrew Der	MDE
Sean Smith	DNR - Tidewater
Larry Fogelson	OP - Clearinghouse
Amy Noji	WBC&M

It was stated that the SHA has selected Segment 2, Alternate 5/6 Modified. This avoided impacts to the grave sites. Segment 3, Alternate 5/6 was also selected. Interchange Option A was also selected.

Within Segment I, Alternate 6 was presented as preferred. Alternate 5 did not provide adequate traffic operation. Interchanges with Alternate 5 were investigated and dropped due to right-of-way impacts, cost, and additional wetland impacts. The wetland impacts were reduced from 2.01 acres to 1.03 acres by providing a dual bridge over the entire wetlands. Bridging the entire wetland increases the cost by approximately \$4 million. The bridge would be over 10 feet above the wetland.

PROBLEMS WITH THE TAPE MACHINE
MADE MINUTES FROM THIS MEETING
INAUDIBLE

299

PROJECT UPDATE: MD 5 RELOCATED

Mr JANATA: SHA held the recommendation meeting on administrative and we kept

Segment the decision of sentence two and three of the mainline of MD 5 Relocated as well as the interchange INAUDIBLE study INAUDIBLE interchange INAUDIBLE

mainline Segment 2 of Alternate 5-6 modified which voided the Segment 3 Alternate 5/6 was selected. INAUDIBLE grayeard and the INAUDIBLE ALSO, Interchange Option A was selected. SHA had not Segment 1 at

What we didn't resolve was the southern end. INAUDIBLE The public hearing INAUDIBLE was held Feb. 1990. At the hearing along the alignment was presented as an at grade existing INAUDIBLE to INAUDIBLE intersection INAUDIBLE to existing MD 5 at the south.

Alternate 6, which relocated the alignment to the south, is more consistent with the INAUDIBLE redesignation of alternate 5 of the redesignation. The object was INAUDIBLE that people would take this road to reach U.S. 301. INAUDIBLE

MS. ALLERA-BOHLEN:

The road would bypass to the congested area As a five INAUDIBLE

MR. JANATA:

INAUDIBLE

The problem with alternate 5 was INAUDIBLE she at grade that intersection with MD 5 which INAUDIBLE fails. We are looking at an interchange and it wasn't feasible because it costs for right of way there where we're looking at 15-20 million dollars INAUDIBLE

Because of the development INAUDIBLE that exists there and the approval INAUDIBLE development, other avenues to deal with. Also, an interchange had INAUDIBLE additional

wetland INAUDIBLE impacts. Alternate 6 is INAUDIBLE much superior operationally

1 superior operation for ~~the~~ primary highway consistency, ~~to~~
 2 safety and driver participation. ~~INAUDIBLE~~ *However, there are wetland*
 3 ~~Originally~~ was identified here 2.01 ~~...~~ *acres impacts. we reduced it*

4 MS. ALLERA-BOHLEN:

5 ~~Right.~~

6 MR. JANATA:

7 ~~We brought that down to~~ *1.77* through a constraining
 8 of the ~~INAUDIBLE~~ section to ~~reduce~~ that section. With a
 9 ~~20 foot curb~~ and a 20 foot median.

10 MS. ALLERA-BOHLEN:

11 The ~~wetland~~ *30...* median was reduced from
 12 ~~MR. JANATA:~~ *30 foot to 20 foot at wetlands*

13 ~~Yeah 30...~~

14 MS. ALLERA-BOHLEN:

15 ~~It was 30...~~

16 MR. JANATA:

17 ~~So~~ ~~INAUDIBLE~~ say well, is there
 18 something inbetween here. It really can't ~~INAUDIBLE~~

19 We recognize the opposition that's been ~~INAUDIBLE~~ to Alt. 6 + the
 20 ~~the wetland.~~ *5th* ~~was~~ *used to* developed a series of alternates and
 21 *Options* oppositions that would essentially ~~INAUDIBLE~~ avoid impacts and

22 ~~On Maryland... ~~INAUDIBLE~~~~

23 ~~just beyond there~~ ~~INAUDIBLE~~ *you run into*

1 a wetland ~~INAUDIBLE~~
 2 and curving around the existing lines and try to come up with
 3 something that would work better operationally, ~~well~~, There are *geomet*
 4 constraints ^{at MD5 and MC 205} are there geometrically. If we keep a 50 mile
 5 per hour design speed, ^{we would} the impact wetland ~~INAUDIBLE~~
 6 ~~INAUDIBLE~~ * ~~wetland number~~ 7.
 7 If we can keep it on an existing ~~alignment~~
 8 alignment not just widen the impacts at the existing crossing
 9 ~~INAUDIBLE~~ the stream then would constrain as a design
 10 speed.

11 ~~The problems~~ *We*'re looking at a primary highway
 12 that's running from Washington D.C. ~~down~~ to Point Lookout.
 13 ~~And~~ ^{SHA doesn't} we don't want to provide an improved system and then put
 14 some constraints ~~in~~ that are going to be unsafe. ~~And~~ *The* ~~for~~
 15 ~~they're~~ ^{are} not going to be recognized by the ~~INAUDIBLE~~ driver.
 16 ~~And, what we're coming back to is~~ ^{SHA is recommending} alternate 6.
 17 ~~And~~ *We* want to ~~say that we will span~~ ^{the} whatever wetlands *with a*
 18 ~~INAUDIBLE~~ *bridge.*

19 MS. ALLERA-BOHLEN: *SHA was*
 20 ~~Just as a sidetrack~~ ~~we were~~ originally proposing
 21 just spanning the stream itself ^{at convergence of} ~~and convert it to~~ the two
 22 streams. Now we're proposed to expand the whole wetland.

23 MR. JANATA:

1 ~~so~~ ^{Your} your handout does not reflect it. We're talking
 2 about approximately 4 million dollars ~~additional~~ ^{additional} ~~more~~
 3 ~~This is the INAUDIBLE~~

4 MR. DUVALL:

5 ~~It~~ do you have the length differences?

6 MR. JANATA:

7 ~~INAUDIBLE~~ ^{450' of additional length}

8 ~~MS. ALLERA-BOHLEN:~~

9 ~~Additional?~~

10 ~~MR. JANATA:~~

11 ~~Yeah~~

12 MS. ALLERA-BOHLEN:

13 ^{The impact includes the}
 14 ~~What it would come down to is actual shadowing of~~
 15 ^{which} a bridge ~~would be about an acre. And, I'm not sure of~~ The
 16 elevation of the bridge ~~but it...~~

16 ~~MR. JANATA:~~

17 ~~It's pretty low.~~

18 MS. ALLERA-BOHLEN:

19 ^{15'} ~~It would be~~ pretty low. So actual ~~INAUDIBLE~~ ^{impacts are}
 20 ^{the pier} ~~impact~~ ^{which} is less than an acre.

21 MR. SEAN SMITH:

22 ~~The...~~ ^{Acad of the original acre}
 23 ^{was 2 acres}

23 MR. JANATA:

^{Stated it was}

was brought down
2.01 which ~~breaks down~~ to 1.77 ~~INAUDIBLE~~ *by contracting*
the median.

MS. HUFFMAN:

~~So ~~the~~ ~~INAUDIBLE~~~~

MS. ~~ALBERTA~~ BOHLEN:

~~That's right. I have that shadowing ~~INAUDIBLE~~~~
~~it would be less than that ~~INAUDIBLE~~~~

MR. SEAN SMITH:

Asked if
~~You said that the intersection produces ~~INAUDIBLE~~~~ *fail*
~~is ~~that~~ under existing conditions or under proposed conditions~~
with ~~the~~ ~~development~~?
~~INAUDIBLE~~ *alternate?*

MR. JANATA:

judicial *it* *fail. However,*
~~Under the proposed conditions would be a ~~INAUDIBLE~~~~
~~it's close to failing now. The intersection, cause we can~~
~~walk a road and we would have if something like this would~~
~~widen the road on approaching. But, there's still so much~~
~~traffic ~~INAUDIBLE~~~~

MR. SEAN SMITH:

Asked if this project
Charles
~~Okay, does that take into consideration that the~~
~~INAUDIBLE~~ *Charles* County Bypass which is also proposed with
~~the ~~INAUDIBLE~~~~ *St Charles* development which is going to connect
~~several major highways in the ~~INAUDIBLE~~~~ *Charles County*
~~INAUDIBLE~~ *to do that intersection.*

MR. JANATA:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

~~There are a lot of people coming right from there right~~

~~into it. INAUDIBLE~~

~~MR. SEAN SMITH:~~

~~So then your evaluation did consider that?~~

MR. JANATA: *Said.*

~~Yeah.~~ *YES*

MR. SEAN SMITH:

Asked What level of service did you come up with ~~that~~ *Alter*
~~would be...~~ *5.*

MS. ALLERA-BOHLEN:

~~With five.~~

MR. JANATA:

Stated *alternate 5, its level*
> ~~With INAUDIBLE~~ *E in the morning...*

~~MS. ALLERA-BOHLEN:~~

~~E, P.~~

~~MR. JANATA:~~

and level F in the afternoon ~~INAUDIBLE~~ *with a volume/capac*
~~pass the INAUDIBLE~~ *ratio of* ~~with~~ 1.401.

MR. SEAN SMITH:

Asked if SHA
~~And you~~ looked at interchanges?

MR. JANATA:

~~Yeah.~~ *Said yes.*

~~MS. ALLERA-BOHLEN:~~

1 And we're going to ~~INAUDIBLE~~

2 ~~MR. DUVALL:~~

3 Anything else? Paul

4 MR. WETTLAUFER:

5 It sounds like it would be a good thing ~~INAUDIBLE~~ *merge of Napa and 40*

6 ~~MR. JANATA:~~

7 ~~INAUDIBLE~~

8 ~~MS. ALLERA BOHLEN:~~

9 Hopefully.

10 MR. JANATA:

11 *Said* ~~OK yeah~~, there was concern previously about ~~just using~~ *at the bridge over wetland 8*
12 ~~going to~~ a jersey barrier, but we do have problems with that. *because*
13 ~~at the~~ ~~INAUDIBLE~~ *right distance*. ~~Right now what we~~ *SHA is*
14 ~~had proposed~~ *is* a twenty foot curved median *on* One bridge, with ~~the~~
15 ~~duel~~ ~~INAUDIBLE~~ *bridges* ~~what was presented initially~~
16 ~~At~~ *SHA presented* the hearing, ~~was two separate bridges. One with shoulder,~~
17 ~~two lane curved bridges. That may be superior or better~~
18 ~~in terms of shadowing the impact~~ ~~INAUDIBLE~~

19 MS. ALLER-BOHLEN:

20 *Stated* ~~We~~ *SHA* would like to take your comments on that. *which of the*
21 *you prefer.*

22 MR. WETTLAUFER:

23 *Asked* ~~What are you~~ *is* ~~considering now,~~ *SHA* two bridge with what cross section?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

MR. JANATA:

Stated it ^{two}
~~They~~ would be twenty-four foot bridges. ~~Two~~

~~twenty four foot bridges.~~ What we presented in terms of wetland impacts would be one, dual curved ^b ~~twenty four foot wide or~~ twenty-eight foot with a twenty foot curved median. ~~and that~~ would be one big bridge. If you prefer that ~~would you prefer~~ *we could have a* the second bridge, ~~INAUDIBLE~~

~~MR. SEAN SMITH:~~

~~What you're saying is...~~

~~MR. JANATA:~~

The options are two ^{large} separate bridges or one ^{wetland} bridge. In terms of impacts and shadowing ~~INAUDIBLE~~ *they would be about the same.* ~~They would be close~~ by but ~~they would be separate.~~

MR. SEAN SMITH:

Asked What is the distance between the two bridges as it's proposed now?

MR. JANATA:

It would... *be 46' between the bridges but its variable*

~~MS. ALLERA-BOHLEN:~~

~~You know Vie?~~

MR. JANATA:

~~I'm not~~ ~~INAUDIBLE~~ ~~this presently shows~~ about fifty-eight feet

1 MR. SEAN SMITH:

2 Fifty-eight.

3 MR. JANATA:

4 ~~Thirty-four foot INAUDIBLE that's~~
5 ~~outside. The inside INAUDIBLE~~

6 MR. WETTLAUFER:

7 You said thirty-eight?

8 MR. JANATA:

9 ~~I'm saying INAUDIBLE~~

10 ~~But that varies INAUDIBLE various dimensions~~
11 ~~INAUDIBLE~~

12 MR. WETTLAUFER:

13 ~~There's one bridge you'd have twenty foot INAUDIBLE~~

14 MR. DUVALL:

15 ~~Anything else?~~

16 MR. WETTLAUFER:

17 *Said the Corps would*
~~I guess I INAUDIBLE~~ *prefer two bridges.*

18 MS. ALLERA-BOHLEN:

19 ~~INAUDIBLE~~

20 MR. SEAN SMITH:

21 *Said he was*
~~assuming~~ *that in your constructions you'd*
22 *be able to leave the existing trees INAUDIBLE between the two bri*

23 MR. JANATA:

Said he was hopeful, but he thinks that it's
~~Hopefully, I think that's all the farm in there~~

now.

~~MR. SEAN SMITH:~~

~~INAUDIBLE~~

~~MR. JANATA:~~

~~Well I know INAUDIBLE let me be sure.~~

~~Certainly we'll take that into account and it's been reported~~

~~INAUDIBLE~~ Certainly ^{JHA} would try to ~~INAUDIBLE~~ *save the trees.*

~~MR. DUVALL:~~

~~Anything else Sean?~~

~~MR. SEAN SMITH:~~

~~That's it.~~

~~MR. DUVALL:~~

~~Anything else Vic?~~

~~MR. JANATA:~~

One other point, ~~INAUDIBLE~~ *Seg 1 Alt's will be*
a long term solution, there will be an interim solution.
~~It's probably going to be a state INAUDIBLE~~
This is in the area between Seg 2 and Poplar R.
~~Further advanced. INAUDIBLE~~ *and if you're*
over rd. That section currently has no shoulders so would have to be widened
~~INAUDIBLE~~ *to accommodate 4 lanes,* ~~Now, back here down to the~~
~~intersection INAUDIBLE~~ ~~we have to~~
~~widen that two lane road to a four lane road INAUDIBLE~~
~~the shoulders if we can widen INAUDIBLE~~
from Poplar Beantown Rd
~~In this area down to route 5 the road was reconstructed~~

when the box culvert was replaced. Current conditions
and ~~INAUDIBLE~~ improved. ~~Right now we~~ have

sufficient shoulders ~~INAUDIBLE~~ to make the
improvement ~~it will cross~~ without any additional

impacts to the ~~INAUDIBLE~~ previous mitigation site or tributary
Jordan Swamp

MS. ALLERA-BOHLEN:

~~INAUDIBLE~~ additional impacts.

MR. SEAN SMITH:

Stated
~~You said~~ the bridge structures would be rather low

to the ground. ~~You're talking ten foot or...~~ *Asked if it was*
about 10 feet

MR. JANATA:

Said it about 10 feet or less
~~That's probably...~~

~~MR. SEAN SMITH:~~

~~Less than ten feet?~~

~~MR. JANATA:~~

~~I say ten foot or less. I'm not specifically~~

~~INAUDIBLE~~ it's pretty flat there because of

~~INAUDIBLE~~

MR. SEAN SMITH:

Said he
~~was~~ curious from the standpoint of ~~INAUDIBLE~~ *wildlife habitat*

and if ~~SHA~~ *was* truly minimizing the impact to the
wildlife in that area. *since* A very low bridge ~~would be~~, you

wouldn't be reducing ~~INAUDIBLE~~ *the fill*. The vegetation ~~INAUDIBLE~~ *would be able to*

Still the reduction would be ~~INAUDIBLE~~ *of the side slope up to the*
road

310

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

MS. KELBAUGH:

stated

SHA should be concern

^ This is an area where ~~INAUDIBLE~~

considering there's development all around it

MR. SEAN SMITH:

stated

forested flood

I would be concerned. I believe that the ~~INAUDIBLE~~

area *& riparian* ~~and~~ that he area is going to be developed

then those forced ~~INAUDIBLE~~ *through the riparian corridors*

is only creating ~~INAUDIBLE~~ *the only wildlife corridor*

that area.
~~proposed just down south of there, ~~INAUDIBLE~~~~

~~MR. JANATA:~~

~~There are two tributaries coming together~~

~~INAUDIBLE There's really a swimming area~~

~~down here and here. And there's a little bit along the~~

~~shore here but that's it. INAUDIBLE~~

~~INAUDIBLE~~

MR. DUVALL:

Asked when she ^{found} document
~~When is it due out?~~

MR. JANATA:

Asked Ms Allera-Bohlen

When would we have to get it in by ~~November?~~

MS. ALLERA-BOHLEN:

said Location.... design approval is December.

MR. JANATA:

stated

distributed

~~Can we get it in by November. I don't know we're~~

~~going to work on it.~~