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The FHWA has determined that this project will not have any significant impact on the environment. This finding of no significant impact is based on the Environmental Assessment and the attached information, which summarizes the assessment and documents the selection of Alternate 3 , consisting of a 5-lane section from Maryland Route 100 to Long Point Road and a 3-lane section east of Long Point Road to Pinehurst Road. The Environmental Assessment has been independently evaluated by the FHWA and determined to adequately discuss the environmental issues and impacts of the proposed project. It provides sufficient evidence and analysis for determining that an Environmental Impact Statement is not required.
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## Concurrence with Prior Action

The State Highway Administration is preparing a Final Envirormental Document - Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the project listed below. Location approval will be requested from the Ioderal Highway Administiration for Altermate 3 - a five lane urban street section.

1. State Contract No. AA-396-101-57L - Md. Rte. 177, from Md. Rte. 100 to Pinehurst Road.

The decision to proceed in this manner was made by the Administrator at a Staff Meeting held on May 15, 1986.

```
Copy: Mr. J. A. Agro, Jr.
    Mr. W. R. Clingan
    Mr. E. W. Loskot
    Mr. L. Ege, Jr.
    Mr. G.Straub
    Ms. Cymthia Simpoon
    Mr. F. DeSantis
    Contract AA-396-101-571
```


# Maryland Department of Transportation 

William K. Hellman Secretary

June 12, 1986

Hal Kassoff
Administrator

MEMORANDUM
TO: Mr. William I. Slacum, Secretary
State Roads Commission
FROM: Neil J. Pedersen, Director oneal yedesew Preliminary Engineering

SUBJECT: Contract No. AA 396-101-571 Maryland Route 177 (Mountain Road) From Maryland Route 100 to Pinehurst Road PDMS No. 023061

The Project Development Division is preparing a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the subject project. It is anticipated that the document will be submitted to the Federal Highway Administration with Location Approval being received in July, 1986.

The decision was made to proceed with the FONSI recommending Alternate 3 , the 5 lane urban street section, and Option $I$ for the Maryland Route l00/l77 intersection. The selection was made by Administrator Hal Kassoff at a team meeting on May 15, 1986. A summary of the meeting and the Project Development Team Summary and Recommendation are enclosed.

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.



Date

NJP:bh
Enclosures
cc: Mr. John Agro
Mr. Wayne Clingan
Mr. Edward Loskot
Mr. Louis Eye, Jr.
Mr. Gene Straub
Ms. Cynthia Simpson

My telephone number is 659-1110

# Maryland Department of Transportation 

State Highway Administration

June 3, 1986

WIlliam K. Hellman Secretary
Hal Kassoft Administrator

## MEMORANDUM

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

FROM:
Louis H. Ege, Jr., Deputy Project Development Division

SUBJECT: Contract No. AA 396-101-571
Maryland Route 177 (Mountain Road) From Maryland Route 100 to Pinehurst Road PDMS No. 023061

RE: ADMINISTRATOR'S SELECTION MEETING

On May 15, 1986, the Administrator selected Alternate 3, the five lane urban street section for the subject Maryland Route 177 project study. A complete project summary and team recommendation report has previously been provided to you. No significant revision to the report are required.

The following persons were present at the May lith meeting:

Hal Kissoff
Wayne Clingan
Neil Pedersen
Louis Eke
Robert Houst
Cynthia Simpson
James Dooley
Frank DeSantis
Edward Maras
Robert Lambkin
John Bruck
Ferdinand Doerfler
Earl Schaefer
Susan Bauer
Roland Davis
Robert Bond
John Wintering

Administrator
Acting Chief Engineer
Director, Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering
Deputy Director, Project Development
Division
Project Development Division
"
" " "
" " "
" " "
" " "
Bureau of Highway Planning and
Program Development
Bureau of Highway Design
District 5 Right-of-Way
Planner, Anne Arundel County Wilson T. Ballard

Mr. Neil J. Pedersen
June 3, 1986
Page 2

Frank DeSantis provided a presentation of the various alternates considered during the project study. The selected Alternate 3 (five lane) was described in detail.

The impacts of the project on the environmentally sensitive and critical area known as Fresh Pond/Angels Bog were reviewed. It is located adjacent to the north of Mountain Road between Maryland Avenue and Forest Glen Drive. It was pointed out that we have studied two alignment options. One "avoidance alignment" would entirely miss the Bog, but would impact commercially zoned property on the south side of Mountain Road. Contained within the commercial area is a residence (zoned Commercial) which would be totally taken. Total estimated right-of-way cost to avoid the Bog is approximately $\$ 315,000$. It was decided to avoid all impacts to the Bog.

There was considerable discussion regarding the typical section with respect to means of reducing lane widths to assure that the selected five lane section would not be overdesigned. It was pointed out that the proposed typical section is in accordance with standards for a 50 miles per hour design speed and is bicycle compatible. However, reduction of the pavement width may be considered further during final design, but would probably require a design waiver.

A discussion of the Intersection Option 1 for the Maryland Route 100/177 intersection verified that Option 1 offers significant advantages over the original intersection proposal. Accordingly, Option 1 was selected for final design.

This memorandum is provided to verify the Administrator's selections and is an addendum to the previously submitted summary and team recommendation.

The Final Environmental Document will be prepared for submission and approval by the Federal Highway Administration. Location/Design Approval is scheduled for July, 1986. Final design will be performed by in-house staff.


LHE: FDS: bh
cc: Attendees
Mr. Paul Wettlaufer



## III. <br> SUMMARY OF ACTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

## III. `SUMMARY OF ACTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

## A. Background

1. The Problem and Purpose of the Project

Existing Maryland Route 177 is located in northeastern Anne Arundel County, Maryland (see Figure 1), and connects Maryland Route 2 to Gibson Island. This highway functions as an intermediate arterial providing the sole highway access to the Magothy Peninsula east of Maryland Route 100 (see Figure 2).

The purpose of this project is to improve the existing traffic levels of service and safety conditions on Maryland Route 177 between Maryland Route 100 and Pinehurst Road. The project is considered by Anne Arundel County elected officials as one of their highest transportation priorities.

The existing roadway width is insufficient to accommodate the large volume of existing and projected traffic. The narrow roadway width combined with the location of utilities adjacent to the roadway results in serious service and safety deficiencies. During peak hours, delays and congestion are caused by left turning vehicles at the numerous intersections. Narrow roadway width at intersections preclude continuous traffic flow at these locations. Vehicles attempting to enter Maryland Route 177 from the crossroads are also experiencing increasing delays. The conditions and restrictions prevalent along Maryland Route 177 indicate that the existing two lane facility cannot adequately move the large volume of traffic and is insufficient to accommodate projected traffic demands.

## 2. Project History

In the 1960 's, studies were conducted which proposed the relocation of Maryland Route 177 (extension of Maryland Route 100) north of the existing road. As a result of severe socio-economic impacts and public opposition, the project was deleted from the plans and programs of the County and the Department of Transportation.

In 1978, Project Planning evaluated three (3) alternates to alleviate traffic congestion on Maryland Route 177. Alternate 1 was the No-Build Alternate. Alternate 2 would have provided minor improvements at intersections by the inclusion of left turn storage lanes. However, between these intersections, Maryland Route 177 would have remained a two lane roadway. This would have alleviated some of the congestion, but would not have substantially addressed increased traffic problems. A proposal designated as Alternate 3 consisted of the widening of Maryland Route 177 to a multi-lane facility. This alternte would have handled the increase of traffic in the corridor at an acceptable level of service.

Another proposal Alternate 4 provided an extension of Maryland Route 100 as a relief for traffic congestion along the Maryland Route 177 corridor. Both northern and southern relocation options were considered with this alternate. This alignment was located farther north than that originally proposed in the 1960 's. Traffic analyses indicate that Alternate 4 would not have provided the necessary traffic diversion from the existing Maryland Route 177, whether it be located north or south of Maryland Route 177.



The project is listed in the current 1985 Highway Needs Inventory and the Secondary Development and Evaluation Program of the Maryland Department of Transportation's Consolidated Transportation Program (CTP) for 1986-1991, although construction is not scheduled. The project conforms to the Regional Planning Council's General Development Plan, 1982 and Anne Arundel County's General Development Plan, 1978.
B. Alternates

1. Description
a. Interim Improvement

During the Spring of 1986 , a 2.1 mile section of existing Maryland Route 177 will be widened from Maryland Route 100 to Maryland Avenue. It will be upgraded to a 3 lane roadway comprised of one travel lane in each direction with a continuous two-way left turn center lane. The construction generally will be contained within the state owned $40^{\prime} \pm$ of right-of-way.

This improvement will satisfy immediate and interim traffic demands but will not satisfy future long term traffic requirements.
b. Alternates Studied but Dropped

Alternate 2 was presented at the Alternates Public Meeting but was dropped prior to the Location/Design Hearing because it does not provide adequate and safe left turn storage.

Alternate 2 consisted of a 4 lane undivided roadway with 2 travel lanes in each direction for the portion of Maryland Route 177 between Maryland Route 100 and the Long Point Road intersection where it would have transitioned to a 3 lane roadway.

The 4 lane section would have been 52 feet wide between curbs. The 3 lane section would have been 41 feet wide with a continuous left turn lane for the numerous driveway connections and intersecting streets in the area. A minimum $7^{\prime}$ of backing beyond the curbing for the entire project length and sidewalks would be provided on each side of the roadway.

The construction would generally followed the existing roadway centerline and included improvements to both vertical and horizontal alignments of the existing roadway to conform to a design speed of 50 mph .
c. Alternates Presented at the Combined Location/Design Pubiic Hearing

Alternate 1 (No-Build)
The No-Build Alternate would not provide significant improvements to existing Maryland Route 177 , other than the currently planned widening to three lanes between Maryland Route 100 and Maryland Avenue. It would provide no significant improvements to traffic operations or capacity. As traffic growth occurs, the congestion and delays on the existing road will worsen.

Alternate 2A (4 Lane Curbed Roadway with Left Turn Lanes at Major Intersections

Alternate 2 A would provide a four lane undivided roadway with 2 lanes in each direction with left turn storage lanes at ten major intersections. The 4 lane section would begin at Maryland Route 100 and transition to three lanes at Long Point Road. The three lane roadway would continue for the remainder of the project. The four lane section would be $52^{\prime}$ wide with the
exception that the roadway would widen to $65^{\prime}$ where left turn storage is provided. A strip of right-of-way would be required on both sides of the roadway where the 4 lanes and left turn storage is required.

## Alternate 3 (5 Lane Curbed Roadway)

Alternate 3 provides for a 5 lane roadway comprised of 2 travel lanes in each direction with a continuous two-way left turn center lane.

The 5 lane section would be provided from Maryland Route 100 to Long Point Road. The 5 lane section would transition to a 3 lane section east of Long Point Road as described for Alternate 2 A .

As under Alternate 2A, Alternate 3 would generally follow the existing roadway centerline. This would require improvements to the horizontal and vertical alignment of the existing roadway to conform to a design speed of 50 mph . A strip of new right of way would be required along both sides of the roadway (see Figures 4-9).

## Alternates 2A \& 3 Avoidance Alternates

These al ignments are identical to the Alternate 2 A and 3 alignments except in the vicinity of Fresh Pond/Angel Bog, where for each alternate, the alignment is shifted approximately 50 feet to the south. This avoids construction within Angel Bog. The avoidance alignments conform to the 50 mph design speed.

Optional Maryland Route 100/177 Intersection Proposal
As a result of citizen concerns expressed at the Alternates Public Meeting and subsequent correspondence, two (2) Maryland Route $100 / 177$ intersection configurations were presented at the Public Hearing. These were our original proposal and improvement
(1) The original intersection as presented in the Environmental Assessment attempted to maximize the use of the existing roadway ramp from eastbound Maryland Route 100 to southbound Maryland Route 177. In doing so, it compromised the use of an existing section of Maryland Route 177 as a two-way service road (Service Road 'A'). This service road would accommodate private and commercial driveways denied direct access to the mainline roadway. Schmidts Lane, as part of the Service Road "A" plan, would be relocated approximately 850' northwest of Loblolly Road. This design would force circuitous travel for several properties, and would allow the entrance to two properties only to the rear and would create less that desirable entrances to the mainline for two other properties. The relocation of Schmidts Lane also severed two residential properties.
(2) Shown at the Public Hearing, the mainline intersection was pulled farther west, allowing greater utilization of existing Maryland Route 177 as a two-way Service Road. However the relocation of Schmidts Lane was still required and circuitous travel was not alleviated. Further, it continued to bisect residential properties.
(3) Option 1 (Selected) also displayed at the Hearing, shifted the intersection farther to the west, but
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continued to utilize the existing paving of Maryland Route 100 and 177. This allowed for the maximum use of an existing section of Maryland Route 177 as a two-way service drive. This eliminated any relocation of Schmidts Lane and would avoid circuitous travel imposed on citizens and commercial establishments. Option 1 offers significant advantages in that it requires minimal right-of-way, utilizes Maryland Route 177 as a service drive, provides suitable access to development and does not sever residential properties. Affected citizens have expressed a preference for Option 1. d. Selected Alternate

The Selected Alternate consists of Alternate 3 with the avoidance alignment at Angel Bog/Fresh Pond and the Option 1 Maryland Route $100 /$ Maryland Route 177 intersection. The plans for the intersections of Maryland Route 177 with Lake Shore Drive and Pinehurst Road have been refined from those shown in the Environmental Assessment. These intersections were designed to accommodate traffic volumes greater than subsequent detailed traffic analyses predicted for the design year. By using the alignment of the existing intersection at Lake Shore Drive and modifying the geometry of the intersection at Pinehurst Road it is possible to both accommodate projected traffic volumes and reduce the right of way requirements and cost of the project. By not relocating the Lake Shore Drive intersection, the number of residential relocation is reduced by three (3) and the front entrance and parking lot of the group of small stores at the intersection will not have to be relocated to Lake Shore Drive.

## 2. Service Characteristics

## a. Existing and Projected Traffic Conditions

The roadway segment from Woods Road to Bussenius Road has a maximum average daily traffic volume (ADT) of 20,100 vehicles. Traffic demand in this area is projected to increase to 30,000 vehicles per day by 2015. Existing and projected truck usage comprises 4\% of ADT.

The ADT's for all alternates are shown in Figures 10 and 11.
Quality of traffic flow along a highway is measured in terms of level of service (LOS). This measure is dependent upon highway geometry and traffic characteristics and ranges from LOS "A" (Best) to LOS "C" (Minimum Desirable), to LOS "E" (Capacity), and LOS "F" (Horst or Forced Flow).

Below are the 1985 and projected 2015 Levels of Service at selected intersections within the project limits during A.M. and P.M. peaks:

|  | 1985 LOS |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Intersections | No Build | 2015 LOS <br> Alt. | Alt. 3 |  |
| Woods Road Road | F/F | F/F | B/C | A/C |
| Lake Shore Drive | F/F | F/F | A/B | A/B |
| North Shore Drive | F/F | F/F | A/B | A/B |
| South Carolina Avenue | F/F | F/F | A/A | A/A |
| Hickory Point Road | F/F | F/F | A/A | A/A |
| Long Point Road | E/E | F/F | A/A | A/A |
| Ventnor Road | D/D | E/E | A/A | A/A |
| Pinehurst Road | C/C | D/D | A/A | A/A |

b. Existing and Projected Safety Conditions

Existing Maryland Route 177, from Maryland Route 100 to

Pinehurst Road experienced a total of 253 accidents for the three year period of 1982 through 1984, with an average accident rate of 414 accidents per 100 million vehicle miles of travel (accident s/100 mum). This rate is significantly higher than the statewide average rate of 329 accidents $/ 100$ mum for highways of similar design. These accidents resulted in an estimated accident cost of $\$ 3.4 \mathrm{million} / 100 \mathrm{mvm}$. Listed below are the accidents indicating year and severity.

| Severity | 1982 | 1983 | 1984 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fatal Accidents | 0 |  |  |  |
| Injury Accidents | 40 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Property Damage Only | 34 | 37 | 47 | 134 |
| Total Accidents | 74 | 84 | 48 | 117 |
|  |  | 95 | 253 |  |

As indicated above, there were two fatal accidents. One of the fatal accidents, an angle collision, occured at the intersecLion of Maryland Route 177 and Forest Glen Drive, the other was a fixed object accident and occured just east of Vent nor Road.

Congestion and geometric deficiencies (sharp curves) are the major contributing factors to the accident experience. This is indicated by the fact that the rate of angle, rear end and fixed object accidents are significantly higher than the statewide average rates. These rates are listed below.

| Manner of Collision | Existing Rate | Statewide Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| Angle | $70.41^{*}$ | 53.62 |
| Rear End | $101.52^{*}$ | 75.38 |
| Fixed Object | $137.55 *$ | 48.59 |
| Opp. Direction | 16.38 | 21.99 |
| Sideswipe | 22.93 | 32.01 |
| Left Turn | 21.29 | 10.51 |
| Pedestrian | 9.83 | 16.81 |
| Parked | 3.28 |  |
| *Significantly higher than statewide average |  |  |
| There were three sections of roadway meeting the criteria as |  |  |

a High Accident Location (HAL) during the study period. These sections are listed below indicating year qualified and number of accidents experienced.

From . 06 mile east of Alvin Road to .01 mile west of Forest Drive (1982-17 acc.)

From . 17 mile west of Woodland Road to .02 mile west of Park Drive (1984-29 acc.)

From .02 mile west of Park Drive to .06 mile east of Alvin Road (1984-23 acc.)

It is expected that, along the new five-lane portion of the selected alternate, the rate of angle accidents will decrease by approximately 81 percent, rear end accidents by 54 percent and left turn accidents by 27 percent.

The three-lane portion of the selected alternate would experience reductions in the rate of angle accidents by 61 percent, rear end accidents by 8 percent, and left turn accidents by 27 percent. These reductions are determined when compared to the two-lane roadway now present. The selected Alternate is expected to experience an overall rate of 300 accidents $/ 100 \mathrm{mvm}$ with a cost savings of $\$ 2.6$ million $/ 100$ mem when compared to the cost of the existing roadway's accident experience.
3. Design Characteristics
a. Three (3) Lane Curbed Section (Selected)

The typical section for the three (3) lane curbed section from Long Point Road to Pinehurst Road will consist of one (1) outside lane of $14^{\prime}$ in each direction and a continuous two-way left turn center lane of $1^{\prime}$ '. This three (3) lane section will be contained within a 55 foot minimum right-of-way.
b. Four (4) Lane Curbed Section

The typical section for the four (4) lane curbed section
will consist of two (2) outside lanes of 14 feet in each diraclion and two (2) inside lanes of 12 feet in each direction. The roadway will be contained within a 66' minimum right-of-way.
c. Five (5) Lane Curbed Section (Selected)

The typical section for the five (5) lane curbed section will consist of two (2) outside lanes of 14 feet in each direction, two (2) inside lanes of $12^{\prime}$ in each direction and a continuous two-way left turn center lane of 13 feet. The roadway will be contained within a $79^{\prime}$ minimum right-of-way.
4. Environmental Consequences
a. Social and Economic

Relocation
The Selected Alternate would require the acquisition of four (4) residences, three (3) of which are tenant occupied. Income levels of those displaced appear to be in the low to middle range.

The Selected Alternate would displace three (3) businesses. Two of the busineses, near Lake Shore Drive, appear to be tenant occupied; the third is a small vacant office building which was recently renovated. Up to ten (10) employees would be affected.

No elderly or handicapped individuals would be affected by the Selected Alternate. Several minority group members are employed by two of the displaced businesses.

All families and businesses would be relocated in accordance with the requirements of the "Uniform Relocation Assistance and Land Acquisition Policies Act of 1970." A summary of the State's relocation assistance program is located in the Appendix. All the required relocation are expected to be accomplished without
any undue hardship to those affected. All relocations would be completed in a 12-18 month period and in a timely, orderly, and humane manner. The tenant occupied residential properties would require Housing of Last Resort to provide decent, safe, and sanitary replacement housing.

A survey of the local real estate market reveals there to be sufficient and suitable replacement housing in the Mountain Road area for those affected. However, replacement business sites are limited in the area. A greater number of replacement sites are available closer to and along Ritchie Highway (Maryland Route 2). No other Federal, State or local projects are foreseen which would affect the supply and availability of area replacement housing.

In addition to the relocations, strip right-of-way would be required from properties adjacent with Maryland Route 177 to accommodate the proposed widening. The Selected Alternate would require 34.98 acres of right-of-way.

## 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 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.

The Selected Alternate would improve access and reduce congestion allowing better traffic movement throughout the
peninsula. Side streets and adjacent development would be more readily accessible. Emergency vehicle response time would be reduced as a result of increased capacity and accessibility. The project would not interfere with the continued operation of the Lake Shore Volunteer Fire Company.

The proposed reconstruction of the $\mathrm{Y}-\mathrm{split}$ intersections at Maryland Routes $100 / 177$ and Maryland Route 177 /Pinehurst Road and the Maryland Route 177 /Schmidt Lane and Maryland Route 177 /Lake Shore Drive intersections would improve service and safety. The widening would reduce the potential for side friction with pedestrians and other non-vehicular traffic.

The proposed action also would improve access to Downs Memorial Park and coastal recreation areas along the peninsula.

Patterns of social interaction and community cohesion would not be affected by the Selected Alternate.

In general, the planned widening would improve access and travel to area businesses by improving congestion and ease of movement. Parking would be maintained at each business and on slope easement areas.
b. Land Use

The proposed project is consistent with the Anne Arundel County General Development Plan (1978) which indicates that future improvements to Maryland Route 177 would better accommodate existing and proposed development in the area. This project would not spur growth incompatible with that now planned.
c. Historic and Archeological

No historic or archeological sites on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places exist in the project area, therefore no impacts are anticipated.
d. Natural Environmental Impacts

Prime Farmland Soils
The Selected Alternate would affect approximately 8.5 acres of Prime Farmland Soils currently zoned for commercial and low density residential uses. According to land use plans none of the Prime Farmland Soils affected are planned for agricultural use.

There is no indication that any unique farmland soils are present within the study area.

This project has been coordinated with the Soil Conservation Service in accordance with the National Farmland Protection Policy Act.

Floodplains
Limits of the 100 year floodplain for surface waters within the study area are based on Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) floodplain mapping for the area. The Selected Alternate will not entail any floodplain encroachments.

The use of standard hydraulic design techniques for all waterway openings which limit upstream flood level increases and approximate existing downstream flow rates will be utilized where feasible.

Use of state-of-the-art sediment and erosion control techniques and stormwater management controls will ensure that the Selected Alternate will not result in risks or impacts to the beneficial floodplain values or provide direft or indirect support to further development within the floodplain.

Surface Water
No major stream crossings would be required for construction
of the Selected Alternate. Pipe and culvert extensions would be required at several locations to provide adequate roadway drainage.

Final design for the proposed improvements will include plans for grading, erosion and sediment control, and stormwater management, in accordance with State and Federal laws and regulations. They will require review and approval by the Maryland Department of Natural Resources-Water Resources Administration (WRA) and the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene-Office of Environmental Programs (OEP).

The Fresh Pond impoundment/Angel Bog and surrounding wetlands are listed in the Maryland Critical areas study. This site abuts the existing Maryland Route 177 roadway for approximately 2000 feet. During construction, equipment will not be placed in a manner to impact the water quality and hydrology of this area. Strict application of stormwater management and sediment and erosion control measures will also be used to minimize impacts to this area and to Cooks Pond. There will be no encroachment on Fresh Pond/Angel Bog.

## Terrestrial Habitat

The Selected Alternate will require 12.8 acres of woodland habitat. The loss of habitat is generally accompanied by a proportional loss in animal populations inhabiting the study area. Since existing land use in the study area is predominantly residential and commercial this loss of habitat is not considered significant.

Coordination with DNR, Wildlife Administration, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service indicates that there are no known
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populations of threatened or endangered plant or animal species in the study area.

Aquatic Habitat
No tidal wetlands are located in the project area.
Non-tidal wetlands are located at Cooks Pond and Fresh Pond. The Selected Alternate does not encroach on wetlands at either location.
e. Air Quality

The results of the calculations of carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations at each of the sensitive receptor sites for the NoBuild and the Selected Alternate are shown on Table 2. A comparison of the values in Table 2 with the State and National Ambient Air Quality Standards (S/NAAQS) shows that no violations will occur for the No-Build or Selected Alternate in 1995 or 2015 for the 1 hour or 8 hour concentrations of $C O$.
f. Noise

All thirteen (13) noise sensitive areas (NSA's) are associated with the No-Build Alternate and the Selected Alternate. The predicted Leq noise levels for the Selected Alternate increase 2 to 24 dBA over present noise levels and vary 0 to +6 dBA from the Leq noise levels predicted for the No-Build Alternate (see Table 3).

TABLE 3
Projected Noise Levels
Maryland Route 177

| NSA | Description | Ambient Leq | Design Year 2015 Leq <br> No Build | 5-lanes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Residential | 63 | 67 | 69 |
| 2 | Residential | 62 | 66 | 68 |


| 3 | Residential | 66 | 64 | 68 |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 4 | Residential | 65 | 67 | 69 |
| 5 | Residential | 63 | 65 | 69 |
| 6 | Residential | 65 | 66 | 69 |
| 7 | Church | 61 | 64 | 66 |
| 8 | Church | 60 | 62 | 64 |
| 9 | Residential | 62 | 64 | 64 |
| 10 | Church | 52 | 61 | 63 |
| 11 | Residential | 52 | 60 | 68 |
| 12 | Residential | 46 | 63 | 66 |
| 13 | Residential | 42 | 66 |  |

Under the Selected Alternate, there are (7) NSA's that will exceed FHWA noise abatement criteria (NSA 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 11). There are four (4) NSA's that will experience a 10 dBA increase or more over ambient noise levels (NSA $10,11,12$, and 13) •

Noise abatement measures were considered for the 10 sites affected by this project. At each of these sites, however, private drives, commercial entrances and cross streets would introduce gaps and segmentation to the barrier system. These gaps would limit the potential noise reductions significantly (to 1 to 2 dBA ). For these reasons, noise barriers are not feasible for this project.

Three of the sites (NSA 7, 8, and 10) are churches and one of them (NSA 10) is not air conditioned. The walls of the air conditioned churches will provide 20-30 dBA of attenuation of road noise while those of the church without air conditioning will provide 10 - 15 dBA of atten uation (windows assumed opened).

None of the churches will exceed interior noise abatement criteria, therefore noise insulation is not recommended.

The use of landscaping and plantings may be feasible for these sites and will be studied in further detail during the design phase of the project.
5. Implementation Costs

The estimated construction cost of the Build Alternates in terms of thousands of 1985 dollars are shown in Table 1 on page II-1.
C. Positions Taken

1. Elected Officials and Community Associations

At the Public Hearing, the preferences of the elected officials and community associations were as follows:

Senator Phillip Jimeno
Alternate 3
Delegate John Leopold
Al ternate 3
Delegate Kolodziejski
Alternate 3
County Councilman Ahern Any Build Alternate
Greater Pasadena Council Alternate 3
Milberg Community Board of Directors
Alternate 2A
North Shore Community Association No-Build
Long Point Community Association Alternate 3
2. Citizens
a. Alternates Public Meeting - January 14, 1986

Approximately 173 citizens attended. At the Alternates
Public Meeting the No-Build and three (3) build alternates were presented. The build alternates discussed were:
a) Alternate 2 (4-lane Curbed Roadway without Left Turn Storage Lanes at Major Intersection)
b) Alternate 2A (4-1ane Curbed Roadway with Left Turn Storage Lanes at Major Intersections)
c) Alternate 3 (5-lane Curbed Roadway)

All of the build alternates began at Maryland Route 100 and continued to Long Point Road. At Long Point Road a three (3) lane roadway with a continuous two-way center left turn lane was introduced to Pinehurst Road. As a result of the Alternates Public Meeting and further studies, Alternate 2 was dropped. The basis being that a four-lane roadway without left turn storage at major intersections is unacceptable for a high volume facility.
b. A Combined Location/Design Public - March 26, 1986

Approximately 166 citizens attended. Of those citizens who spoke, preferences were as follows:
$\frac{\text { No-Build }}{6} \quad \frac{\text { Alternate 2A }}{1} \quad \frac{\text { Alternate 3 }}{6}$

During the time that the transcript was open for comments, 14 letters were received. The written preferences were:
$\frac{\text { No-Build }}{5} \quad \frac{\text { Alternate 2A }}{2} \quad \frac{\text { Alternate 3 }}{7}$

## D. Recommendation

Coordination with elected officials and interested citizens has continued to the present time. The State Highway Administration Project Development Division supports the recommendation of Alternate 3 Avoidance, the 5-lane roadway along with Option 1 for the Maryland Route $100 / 177$ intersection. This is based on the following :

1. Continuous two-way left turn lane is essential to service not only the ten major intersections, but numerous private and commercial driveways. (65 private30 commercial)
2. Identical number of properties affected and displaced as Alternate 2A.
3. Any future secondary road tie-in would be easily accommodated by the $5-1$ ane roadway.
4. The desirable aspects of a continuous 5-lane roadway when viewed from a traffic safety standpoint.

Option 1 Maryland Route 100/177 Intersection

1. Existing Route 177 is utilized to the utmost as a two-way service drive.
2. Improved and convenient access to residences and businesses.
3. Eliminates circuitous access and inconvenient access for several properties.
4. Does not sever residential properties, rendering severed parcels useless to owners.
5. Preferred by citizens at Public Hearing.


## IV. PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

The Combined Location/Design Public Hearing was held on March 26, 1986 at 7:30 pom. in the Chesapeake Bay Middle School in Pasadena, Maryland. The purpose of the Hearing was to present the results of the engineering and environmental analyses and to receive public comments on the project. Alternate 1 (No-Build), Alternate 2A (4-lane with Left Turn Lanes), and Alternate 3 (5-lane) were presented. Approximately 166 persons attended the Hearing and thirty (30) individuals made statements following the formal State Highway Administration presentation.

The following is a summary of the statements made and the responses given by the State Highway Administration. A complete transcript of all comments made at the Hearing is available for review at the Project Development Division, State Highway Administration, 707 North Calvert Steet, Baltimore, Maryland 21202. Written comments received subsequent to the Hearing are in the Correspondence Section.

1. Delegate John Leopold: Supports Alternate 3 and opposes land development. SHA Response: Alternate 3 is the Selected Alternate. It is consistent with area land use plans.
2. Senator Phillip Jimeno: Improvements to Mountain Road are needed to meet the needs of existing residents and solve traffic congestion.

SHA Response: Alternate 3 will solve the existing traffic congestion on Mountain Road and is the Selected Al ternate.
3. Delegate Charles Kolodziejski: Committed to Alternate 3 but wants a gauge of public opinion. SHA Response: Alternate 3 is the Selected Alternate.
4. County Councilman Edward Ahearn: Will support majority opinion. Wants shoulder on interim improvement. SHA Response: Interin improvement will have four foot shoulders on both sides.
5. Juanita Ruth Malinowski, 25 Lake Shore Drive:

Concerned that relocation of Lake Shore Drive will require her house.

SHA Response: The Selected Alternate does not include the relocation of Lake Shore Drive.
6. Donald Lennox: Supports Alternate 3. SHA Response: Alternate 3 is the Selected Alternate.
7. Robert Fishbach, Milbern Community Association:

Supports Alternate 2A.
SHA Response: Alternate 3 is the Selected Alternate.
Alternate 2 A was not selected because of safety and service considerations.
8. Charles Kral, Sillery Bay: Supports four lane or five lane Alternate.

SHA Response: Alternate 3 is the Selected Alternate.
9. Mike Gabriel, Maryland Route 100 Mountain Road:

Opposed to any widening of Mountain Road, but if he had to choose, prefers the five lane Alternate with Option \#1.

SHA Response: Alternate 3 with Option \#1 is the IV -2
selected Alternate.
10. Tren Ward, President of the North Shore Community Association: Wants to know cause of existing congestion, thought it might be the light at Lake Shore Road, and is concerned about communities on the southern side of Mountain Road making left turns onto Mountain Road.

SHA Response: Congestion is a result of an insufficient number of through lanes and increased development in the area. Congestion will increase. However, traffic lights may be warranted in the future at major intersections on Mountain Road.
11. June Downey, Mountain Road: Asked why there are utility poles on only one side of the road between Carroll Road and Maryland Route 100. Wanted to know which leg would have the right-of-way at the Mountain Road/Pinehurst Road intersection. Asked if she will have to move.

SHA Response: The utility companies were able to use a common set of poles in that area. Pinehurst Road will have right-of-way at the Mountain Road/Pinehurst Road intersection. Acquisition of Ms. Downey's house for this project is not anticipated.
12. Ed Bordner, Lake Shore Volunteer Fire Company: Wants to know when definite answers will be available as to the effect of the project on the firehouse.

SHA Response: Alternate 3 will require a strip
approximately twenty (20) feet of right-of-way across
the front of the firehouse property. Approximately 55 feet of apron will remain in front of the firehouse, which is adequate for the operation of the firehouse.
13. Paul DiPietro, Long Point Improvement Association: The Association supports Alternate 3.

SHA Response: Alternate 3 is the Selected Alternate.
14. Susan Morrison, Gibson Island: Prefers Alternate 1. Believes Build Alternate would be similar to Ritchie Highway.

SHA Response: Alternate 3, the Selected Alternate, is consistent with the Master Plans for the area and will not introduce growth that is not already planned.
15. Elmer Daubert, Mountain Road: Expressed dissatisfaction with safety and traffic conditions on the existing roadway. Concerned that interim improvements will increase flooding of his store. Didn't receive notification of interim improvements.

SHA Response: The Selected Alternate will correct the deficiencies of the existing roadway. Appropriate procedures will be used to avoid additional runoff flow.
16. Senator Phillip Jimeno: Interim improvements were demanded by affected communities at community meetings. Supports interim improvement for short term and Alternate 3 for long term.

SHA Response: Alternate 3 is the Selected Alternate. Construction of the interim improvements will begin in mid-June and should be completed in the Fall.
17. Elmer Daubert, Mountain Road: Opposes interim improvement.

SHA Response: The interim improvements are needed to immediately relieve the existing congestion and safety problems. The interim improvements will be adequate until the ultimate (Selected Alternate) is constructed.
18. Dave Williams, Greater Pasadena Council: Supports interim improvements and Alternate 3.

SHA Response: See response to \#16.
19. Sherry Morgan, 181 Low's Way: Expressed concerns about left turns onto Mountain Road and children crossing Mountain Road. Questioned traffic projections.

SHA Response: The increased capacity provided by the Selected Alternate will introduce larger breaks in traffic. Pedestrian crosswalks will be provided when needed. The methodology used in the Baltimore Metropolitan area for forecasting traffic demands is called the $3-C$ process. This process, the Continuing Comprehensive and Cooperative Urban Transportation Planning Process, is the process mandated by Federal Law to be used in all major urban areas.
20. Daniel Morrissey: Supports interim improvement and Alternate 3.

SHA Response: See response to \#16.
21. Harold Kohcheski, 145 South Carolina Avenue: Concerned that speeds will increase with Alternate 3.

SHA Response: An increase in speed is not anticipated. The posted speed limit will remain at 40 miles per hour.
22. Chris Riley, 275 Beach Road: Supports road widening and traffic lights.

SHA Response: Alternate 3 consists of widening of existing Maryland Route 177 to five lanes. Traffic lights may be warranted in the future at major intersections on Mountain Road.
23. Jack Feehley, 444 Park Creek Road: Expressed concern about left turns onto Mountain Road and supports traffic lights.

SHA Response: See response to \#19 and \#22.
24. Lee Antonetti, 4524 Mountain Road: Supports extension of Maryland Route 100.

SHA Response: Extension of Maryland Route 100 is not under consideration. See Page III-2.
25. Juanita Ruth Malinowski, 25 Lake Shore Drive:

Expressed concern for the future of the fire station. SHA Response: The fire station will remain intact and will be able to operate as it currently does.
26. Rick Goldberg, 4540 Mountain Road: Concerned that speeds will increase under Alternate 3. SHA Response: The posted speed limit will be 40 mph as currently exists.
27. Robert Tull, 4542 Mountain Road: Wants to know if zoning will change with Alternate 3. SHA Response: Alternate 3, the Selected Alternate is consistent with area land use plans. The State Highway Administration does not control zoning. Zoning is a local governmental function.
28. Leon Malinowski, 25 Lake Shore Drive: Expressed dissatisfaction with unavailability of final design details in the vicinity of the fire station. SHA Response: Details will become available during Final Design, and may be obtained by contacting the Project Eng ineer.
29. Phyllis Mays, 4627 Mountain Road: Concerned that Alternate 3 will lead to development. SHA Response: Alternate 3 is consistent with area land use plans.
30. John Greiner, Leathery Plain: Supports the interim improvements and trial period prior to selecting an alternate.

SHA Response: Alternate 3 will be needed to meet the needs of longer term traffic volumes.



March 27. 1986
$\left.H^{2} \cdot A\right|^{0}$

William Hellmann, Secretary
fiMaryland Department of Transportation
P.O. Box 8755
P.O.
BWI

Diltimore, Maryland 21240
Dear Mr. Hellmann:
Enclosed ia $s$ copy of our letter to hai Kasaoff regarding our concern over the potentisi impact of the proposed up-grading of Ma. Rt. 177 in Anne Arundel county upon Angeli'a Bog and Freah Pond.

We bring this to your attention becsuae wo are aware of your concern for the nstursi resources in maryland and your comintment to minimizing adverse impscts upon them. We urge you to review the project with our concerns in
mind and do everything you can to protect these special areaa.

We feel very fortunate to have $s$ person of your censitivity in the leaderahip of mpor. Thank you for your consideration of this metter.

> Sincerely, Cydy Castmex Ajax Esstman. Past President

RECEIVED
APR 11906 of sumitaly

Maryland Department of Transportation The Secratary's Office

## Harry Hughes

 GovenorWhlliam K. Hellmann
Re: Contriact No. AA 396-101-571
Maryland Route 177 from
Maryland Route 177 fro
Maryland Route 100 to
Pineburst Road
P.D.M.S. No. 023061

```
Ms. Ajax Eastman, Past President
Maryland Conservation Council
112 kast Lake Avenue
```

Dear Ms. Eastman:
Thank you for your letter of March 27, 1986 expressing your concerna for the potential impacts of the Maryland Route 177 profect on Fresh Pond/Angel Bog. The Maryland Department of State Planning designated Fresh Pond/Angel Bog as an Area of Critical State Concern in January, 1980 . Beasasured that the Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration, in accordance with State and Federal regulations, has during planning activities for the Maryland Route 1$\rangle 7$ project.

An Environmental Document for the Maryland Route 177 project consistent with applicsble State and Federal regulations has been prepared. Compliance with State and Federal regulations ensures that full considerstion will be given to the potential impacts of the Maryland Route 177 project to Fresh Pond/Angel Bog and that every feasible and reasonable effort will be made to minimize o

Thank you again for your interest and input in the Maryland Route 177 project.
Sincerely,
Ts/ mllliam K. hellmann
William K. Hellmann

WKH:ih
cc: Mr. Hal Rasboff
Mr . Neil J. Pedersen
Mr. Edward Meehan

bce: - Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr. Ms. Cynthia D. Simpson $\sqrt{\mathrm{Ms} \text {. Cynthia D. Simp }}$

4 M Malepheno wimber 10 (301) 859-7397
raleotion TTY For The Doer ;3011 158 . 7227
....


MARYLAND CONSERVATION COUNCIL
March 27. 1986

Mr. Hal Kassoff, Administretor
State H1ghyey Administration
Maryland Deparitment 'of Transportation
P:O. Box 8755 International Airport
Baitimore, Maryiand 21240

## Dear Mr. Kasioff

The Maryland Conservation Council was unable to attend the hearing on the State Highwey Administration's proposed improvements to Maryland Ronte 177 in Anne Ar and we are. writing to expreprot could have on Anged's Bog and devastating
Fresh Pond.

He ere distreased that documents prepared by MDOT concerning
He ere distressed that documenta prepared by the bog and this project make no mention of: the importence or thos probably pond; the edverse inpects that this project its completion; and mitigating measures to minimize the predictable impacts.

The value of Angel's Bog is well documented in the cataloque of Natural Arees by Maryland Dopartment or er et least three plants and is particulariy importent ab. in danger of extinetion in werylandín represents the nothernmost and pipewort. range of southern species of as sundewa, pitcher plante, cranberries, and leerher leaf.

These apeciel neturel ereas and their surrounding buffer zones re rapidly diseppearing from our harylend heritage. order thet reas need to be protected $f 0 r$ future generetions in ol feetures they. mey better understand Maryland's historic nataral foetus.

Development which disturbs the buffers or drainage pate. of these speciel areas will result in their ultimete dem:. Angel's Therefore, we request that MDOT produce of the roed project on Bogrand Fresh Pond a foring drainage syatems, roed runoff. those arees ceused by ald also request plans for avoiding destruction clearing, etc. We would impacts.

Please add the Meryland Conservation Councildurtestimony to the record and forward any informetion on the project to me et the following address:

```
112 E. Lake Avenue
Biltimore, Maryland 21212
```

sincerely.
Cini Cetmax
Ajax Eastman.
past President

This is in response to the letter on the preceding page.

Maryand Department of Transportatoon
Suate Highway Administration

## APR 23 安

 Hal Kessofl Hal KasselfContract No. AA 396-101-571 Maryland Route 177 from Maryland Route 100 to
P.D.M.S. No. 023061

Me. Ajax Eastman, Pret Preeident Maryland Coneervation Council 112 E. Lake Avenue

- Baltimore, Maryland 21212
$\ddagger$ Dear Me. Baetman:
Thank you for your letter of March 27, 1986 expreesing . The concerns of the Karyland Coneervation Council for the potential impacte of the Maryland Route 177 project on Preeh Pond and Angel Bog.

An Bavironmental Aeeeeement for the Maryland Route 177 project hae heen prepared in compliance with applicable state and
Pederal regulations.

The Maryland Route 177 project will include piane for eediment and eroelon control and etormwater management which will he ment of Heal the Department of Natural Reeourcee and the Depar ment or feal th and Mental Rygiene. Theee plans Fill include ogy of Freeh Pond and Angel Bog are minimized.

Alignmente which aroid right-of-way aquieition from Pree Pond and Angel bog have been developed for each Build Alternate A decieion on the feaelbility of the aroidance alignment and the eelection of an alternate for conetruction ie expected thie eummer.

Thank you again for your intereet in this project
Sincerely,

## OREENL Sigsedgy <br> Hal Kaeeoff

Adminietrator
EX/ih
cc: Mr. Neil J. Pedereen Mr. Bdward Meehan

My talaphone numbar is_ 659-1111
Toietypewniter for impalrad Hearing or Speech
383.7555 Ballimore Meiro - $585-0451$ O.C. Msiro $-1800-492.5082$ stotowide Tall Free P.O. Box 717 I 707 North Calven St., Baltimore, Morytand 21203 . 0797


See SHA response on the following page.

## APR 28 Kis

Be: Contract Mo. AA 388-101-871 Maryland zoute 177 from Haryland Eonte 100 to pinehurst Road P.D.N.S. No. 023081

## Mr. Buasn R. Younge B4: Churoh Road 04:Cnuroh zoad 2101 Arnold, Yarylend 21010

-•Doar Mre. Younge:
Fhank you for yonr letter of April 6, 1986 expreacing your concerne regarding the potential impacte of the Margland Ronte 177 project on Freeh Pond/Angel Bog. The Maryland Departant of Btate Pianning deeignated Preeb Pond/Angel Bog ae an Area of Critical 8tate Concern in January, 1980. State Bighway adminietration in accordance with Btate and Pederal regulatione, has tion in accordance with state and an environmental concern duriag planning activities for the larylend Route 177 project.

An Environmental Lesesment for the Maryland Route 177 project bas been prepared in compliance oith applicable state and Federal regulationa.

The Maryland Route $\mathbf{2 7 7}$ projact will include plane for aediand erosion control and etormater management fich will be revieved by the Department of Natural Resourcen and the Depertreviewod by the Department or miene. Theoe plans fili inciude ment of Health and Mental fygiene, the water quality and hydrology of Fresh Pond and Angel Bog are minimized.

Alignment which evoid right-of-wey quisition from Fresh pond and Angel gog have heen developed for aach Build Alternate.

Compliance with Btate and Pederal repulations ensures that full consideration will be given to the potential 1mpacts of the

Mre. Thand E. Toune Pago 2
reatible and resconable efiort will be ande to alnimize or avoid impanat to this desifnated Critionl Area.

Thank you again for yonr intereet in the Maryland Route 177 .
project.

## gincerely HAL KASSOFF

## Idminiotrator

日K/4b
eo: Mr. Weli-s. pedormen Mr. Edvard Meohan
bec: Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Mr. Louis B. Ege, Jr.
Ms. Cynthia D. Bimpson Ms. Prank DeSantis


Mr Killiam K Hellmann

## Secrotary

PO Box 8755 tment of Transportation
altimore-Washington
International Airport

Dear Mr Hellmann
We are concerned that Angel's Bog [half a mile west of Hickory may inadvertantly bet Glen Drive on Route 177 (Mountain Road). Bog is one of the very faroy Every offort should be made to preserve thie fragil ecological into account all measures needed to protect Angel please take road-building chemicals and debris

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Thet C C.amud } \\
& \text { cthw ir inamel } \\
& \text { Ellen w Caswell }
\end{aligned}
$$


 faryland Route 177 from Pipehurst Road P.D.M.s. No. 023061

WIH: 1h
cc: Mr. Hal Tassofi
: Mr. Botrard $\mathbf{H}$. Meehan M. Loure A. Bge, Jr.



## Maryland Department of Transportation

State Highway Adminierration 28 unce

ARR 28 ROB

## Hal Kasesf

Re: Contract No. AA 396-101-571. Maryland Houte 177 from Maryland Route 100 to Pinehuret Road
P.D.M.S. No. 023081

## Mr. Robert L. Caswell

Ms. E11en 1182 35th place
11826 3Sth place
, .
Administrator
State Highway Administration
707 Nand Department of Transportation Baltimore Maryland 21202

## Dear Mr. man. Castell:

Thank you for your letter expreesing your concerns for potential impacts of the Maryland Route 177 project on Preeh
and Angel Bog.

An Environmental Aseeesment for the Maryland Houte 177 project has been prepared in compliance with appilcable state and
Federal regulations.

The Maryland Route 177 project will include plane for eedi ment and erosion control and etormater management which will be revieved by the Department of Natural Beeources and the Department of Health and Hental Hygiene. Theee plane will include measures to ensure that impacta to the Fater quality and hydrology of Presh Pond and Angel Bog are minimized.

Alignments mich avoid right-of-way aquisition from Freeh Pond and Angel Bog have been developed for each Build Alternate $t$ and the selection of an alternate for construction 1e expected this

Thank you again for your interest in thie project.
Ellens it Coscure
Ellen w Caswell
Sincerely yours
thent CCamell
Robert L Caswell

HK/1h
cc: Mr. Nell J. Pedereen
Mr. Edward Yeehan
Kir. Loule H. Ege, Jr.

> Sincerely, ORGIML SGNED By: HAL KASSO Hal Kaseoff Administrator

Point Road and forest Glen Drive on Route 177 (Mountain Road) may inadvertantiy be destroyed by road improvements. Angel's Bog is one of the very few remaining natural bogs in Maryland. Every effort should be made to preserve this fragile ecological

In preparing your Environmental Impact Assessment please take nto account all measures needed to protect Angel's Bog from road-building chemicals and debris.
Mh
Mr. Nell J. Pedereen
Mr. Edward Meehan
Mr. Loule H. Ege, Jr.

My tolephona number is 659-1111

P.O. Bax 717 I 707 North Calvert SL. Battimore, Maryiand 21203 - 0717

state hit adu
31 แR $862: 59$
iir. Hel Kassorf, Aonidistrstor Stots ii she ky idministration Hi. Dopt. of Tranaportation
Baltimoro. 21202
Door ir. Raszoff:
Ploose oonsidor this pryt or your inkRING rocord Botaniats used to oome from many itotes to
tudy Suitland Bog. It has been "1mproved" out of oxistance. 4 bog is a fragile a.eid wotland that has suoh nor.thorn plants os sphagrum, sundows and pitcher plants.
Angol': Bog ( Z nile west of Hiokory Pt. Rd. and Forsest Glon Drivo on Rt 177 (Hountein Road) The 60 nore bog is now burfored by o surrounding woods and Frosh Pond.
Such rond buildine ohomioels os ooncrote loundn into tho surroundings would destroy the unusual hobitot.
Your Bnvironmantal Inneot Assosmant should reeognito the full thrort

Mo vory boat possible oontrols will bo nocessery during and after 00

Your plans should recognize the weter onurces for tho pond and jog and make sure theso soureos aro not impoired.
$A$ boE is mall, but it can not oxist without bufforine lend.
sineeroly,


## RECEIVED

## 7902 Brooklyn Bridfo Fd

 curel, ii:. 20707spintary

Mr. William L. Eellmamn, Soorotery

delt, -ifuah. Int. Airport, Belt. 21240
Dear Lly. Dellmanas
Botanists fram many atstos usod to study Sulthand Bos. It has boen "juprovod out of axistanoo. A bot is a fragilo oeid ephagnum, sunderre, and pitohor plants.
Angol's Bo5 (ie milo west of tickory Pt. Rd. and Forost fion privo on Kt 177 (Hountain Rood) is about the list corstal plain bog in Maryland. woods and Prosi Pond.

Such road building chomioals on oonoroto loaching into surroundings vould dostroy the unusual bebitat.

Your burironaontol inpsot dssossment should reoogaizo tio full tireet.
Tno vory best possiblo oontrols will be needed during and after oonstruotion

Your plans should reeognize tho wiator souroos for tho pond and onf and wntro sure these not lapairod
4 bog is smell, but it cen not oxist without burforing land.

## Hun.rnly.

FlenxezC- Potiteo


Manland Department of Transportation
State Nighwary Administration

## cyothea <br> Whluan X. Hefienm <br> Hal Kassam Mal Kassint

nr
Ms. Elernor C. Robbine Page 2
fanable and reasonable effort will he made to minimize or avoid impaote to thie deeignated Critical Area.

Thank you again for your interest in the Margiand Route 177 project.

Me. Eleanor C. Robbins 7902 Brooklyn Bridge Road Laurel, Maryland 20707

## Dear Me. Robbine:

Thank you for your lettere of March 24, 1986 and March 1986 to secretary Hilimann and me exprsising your concesrns regarding the potential impacte of the Maryland Route 177 prfiectin rogarding the potential 1mpacte of the Maryland Route 177 prifect ${ }^{2}$ planning deeignated Frssh Pond/Angel Bog as an Area of Criticki Btate Concern in January, 1980. Bs aseured that the Maryland Department of Treneportation - 8tats Highway Adminietration in accordance witb State and Pederal regulatione, hae'identified Presh Pond/Angel Bog ae an environmental concern during plenning
activitiee for the Kargland Routs 177 projsct.

An Environmental Aseeesment for ths Maryland Route 177 project bas been preparsd in compliance vith applicable State and Pederal regulations.

The Marylend Route 177 project will include plans for ssdiment and sroeion control and etorawatsr management whicb will h reviewsd by the Departaent of Natural Rssourcee and the Depart msnt of Hsalth and Mental Hygiens. Thess plane will include measuree to ensure that mpacts to the water quality and hydrollogy of Frseb Pond and Angsl Bog are minimizsd.

Alignmente which avoid right-of-way acquieition from Frssh ond and Angel Bog have been developsd for eacb Build Altarnate.

Compliance rith State and Fedsral regulations ensuree that Ull coneideration will he given to the potential 1 mpacts of the
Uargland Route 177 projact on Presh Pond/Angsi Bog and that svery


## HE/ih

co: Mr. Nell J. Pedereen

## $J^{M r}$. Edmard Meehan

$J_{\mathrm{Mr} \text {. }}^{\mathrm{Mr}}$ Louie H. Ege, Jr


## Mandand Department of Tansportation

Stato Highway Administration

Re: Contract No. AA 396-101-571
Maryland Route 177 from
Maryland Route 177 fro Pinehurst Road P.D.M.S. No. 023061

Ms. Elizabeth K. Hartline, Chairman
Maryland Wildlands Committee
5430 Patterson Road
Hydes, Maryland 21082
Dear Ms. Hartline:
Thank you for your letter of March 21, 1986 expressing the concerns of the Maryland Wildlands Committee for the potential impacts of Maryland Route 177 project on Fres Pond and Angel Bog.

An Environmental Assessment for the Maryland Route 177 project has been prepared in compliance with applicable project has been prepared in cond

The Maryland Route 177 project will include plans for sediment and erosion control and stormwater management which will be reviewed by the Department of Natural Resources and the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene These plans will include measures to ensure that impacts to the water quality and hydrology of Fresh Pond and Angel Bog

Alignments which avoid right-of-way aquisition from
Fresh Pond and Angel Bog have been developed for each Build

## Ls. Elizabeth R. Hartline

Page 2 JPR 11960

Alternate. A decision on the feasibility of the avoidance alignment and the selection of an alternate for construcalignment and the selection of
tion is expected this summer.

Thank you for your interest in this project.
Sincerely,

HR:ih
cc: Mr. Neil Pedersen Mr. Edward Meehan Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.
bce: Ms. Cynthia D. Simpson JMr. Prank DeSantis

## MARYLAND WILDLANDS COMMITTEE <br> 

20 Maren 1986
Secretary Wiiliam Hellaan
Department of Transportation
P. O. Box 8755

Baitimore-Washington International Airport
baitimore, Maryiand 21240
Dear Mr. Helimann:
The Marylsid Wildianos Committee is especially concerned about the road widening and other improvements to Maryland Routed about east-southeast of Jacobsvilite in Angel's $80 g$ and Fresh Pono ( 3 niles

Since the LocationdDesign Public Hearing
the location of bog or pond and since its text states that not iabei
popuiations of eny threatened or endenger exist in the project aresm, State Rosos planners or animal species the significance of the Angel's Bog/fresh Pond area or the degree of endangerment it will be exposed to by road improvea or the degree of watershed. The bog's plant community is relatively rare: it includes at least one species, the leatherleaf (Chamaedaphnae caliculata) in danger of extinction in Maryiand.Furthermore, bog, pond sind the best of holly in the understory aiongluding the oak/hickory/tulio popiar with offer a marveious ecologicai and RTE. 177)taken as an integrai unit, of Maryisno - provided we don't edocationai opportunity to the state

Please do
 to preserve this to provide the essential insights and precautions sdequate improvement of MD RTE. 177.

We think we nom have Maryiands
Transportation. I hope the nandiing of anizghtened Department of sincercly.

Elizabeth K. Hartline, Chairman

Mayland Departmentoftransportatoon
 Maryland Route 177 frox Maryiand Route 100 to Pinehurat Road
P.D.M.S. No. 023061

## Ma. Elizabeth R. Hartline, Chairman

Maryland Wildianda Comaittee
5430 Patterson Road
Hydea. Marylend $21082 \rightarrow$

## Dear Ms. Bartline:

Thank you for your letter of March 20, 1986 expressing your 177 project on Presh Pond/Angel Lapacta of the Maryland Route State Planning designated Freah Pond/Anges Bog as an Areant of Gritical State Concern in January, 1980. Be aasured that the Maryland Department of Transportation - State Highway Administration, in accordance with State and Federal regulations, has identified Fresh Pond/Angel Bog as an environmental concern during planning activities for the Maryland Route 177 project.

An Environmental Document for the Maryland Route 177 project consiatent with the appiicable State and Federai reguiations has enaurea that full consideration will be given to the potions impacta of the Maryland Route 177 project on Fresh Pond/Angel and that every feaaible and reasonable effort wili be made to Bog minimize or avoid impacta to thia deaignated Criticai Area.

Thank you again for your interest in the Maryland Route 177 project.

Sincerely.
/S/ william k. hellmank
Wiiliam R. Helimann
Secretary
WKH:Ih
c: Mr. Hai Rassoff
Mr. Neil J. Pederaen
bcc: Mr. Edward H. Meehan Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr Mr. Frsnk DeSantis

4701 Mountain Road
Preadsna，Maryland 21122
March 18， 1986

Mr．Neil J．Podersen，Dirsstor
Office of Planning a Preliminary Engineering State Highway Adminietration
707 M．Calvert Street
Beitimors Maryland 21202

## Dear Yr Pedersens

I attended the hearing at Chseapeake High Bohol for this alternate plane to widen Mountain Road．This proposed five lane highway with arfewarif docerinot．seen in anyway to be a fair and equable solution to the traprio problis．

Tie ie a rural area and wo residents want to resp it that way． A five lane highway with sidewalks would nertainly dsetroy the rural ${ }^{\circ}$

W Hs，who live in the area ares much aware of the traffic plow but are wiling to deal with sone or it to maintain the ssei－pastoral eocene．I can understand a four lane highway from Route 100 to Maryland Arenas and a throes lane from Maryland to Pinehurst，being the original right a mare．Three hans would gives the additional maneuverability needed in osee of anoldents，traffic flow，first，sta． In reality，the main traffic problea ie at tho site of the firehouse wats of taxpayer money．

My wife and $I$ want to go on record as opposing the five lams plan．


Mänjand Department of Transportation
sulat＇o＇Honway administration
May 1， 1986

## William K．Hellman <br> secistay

 Hal KissoffAdmedatration

RE：Contract No．AA 396－101－471
Maryland Route 177
From Maryland Route 100 to Pinehurst Rosa

Dear Mr．jórgan
Thank you for your March 18， 1986 letters addressed to Mr． Meehan and me opposing Alternate 3 ，the five lane plan

We decided to carry the four or five lane study section to Long Point Road because this is where．there is a significant drop in traficic volumes．Also，we have eliminated sidewalk construe－ lion fromithe study，but are proposing to retain the right－of－way needed if．the County wishes to construct sidewalks in the future．

Thank you for your interest in this study．Your wife＇s and your opposition to the five lane plan will be noted in our decision mating process．

Very truly yours，
Nil $g$ tederen
Nell J．Pedersen，Director
Office of Planning and
Preliminary Engineering
JP：${ }_{\text {cc }}{ }_{\mathbf{M r}}$
Mr．
n：



Mr. Eaward H. Meehan
Dietriot Engineer-Dietriot 5 State Highway Adninietration
138 Defenee Highway
Annapolie. Marjland
21401
Dear Mr. Meehan

I attended the hearing at Chesapeake High Sohool for the alternate plane to widon Mountain Boad. The proposed five Iano highway with sidewaiks does not eees in anyway to be a fair and equablo ocipelon to the traptio problom.

Thie is a rural area and we reeldente want to reep it that way. A five lane highway with oldewaike would oertainly deetroy the rural aepect. I mored to thie area about twenty montha ago mowing the traffio problei but wanting an area which wae not overly oomerioalized.

We, who live in the area are wuoh aware of the traffic plow but
$\angle$ are willing to deal with oome or it to maintain the cemi-paetoral
scene. I can understand a four lane highmay from Route 100 to Maryland Arenue and a three lane from Maryland to Pinehuret. Meing the origipal Fight n waya. Three lanee would give the additional maneaverability needed in caee or aooidente, trarfio flow firee ireto. in ineantion slewaiks are ouperfinoue. oompletely unneceseary and a waete of tarpayer nones.

My wife and I want to go on reoord ae oppoeing the five lane plan.


RECEIVFN
contact LEE/SHA
I believe this is his


Burean Chier
Traffio Enginearing Divieion
Anne Arundel Counts
Truman Parkway
${ }_{21401}$ Anapolla. Maryland
$\checkmark$
Dear Sir:
I attended the hearing at Cheeapeake High School regarding the propoeed plane for Mountein Road. We were told your department could give ne information on a peraonal level.

I live at 4701 Hotantain Road. I have ilved her eince June, 1984. at the time of purchace, I wae inforved there wae no plan for extensive widening of Mountain Road. Please inform me how the preeent propoeale

The proposed five lane highway with oidewalks doee not eeen in anyMay to be a fair and equable solution to the traffic problem. I oan three lane fros Maryland to Pinehuret, psing the orgingl right a wars. Three lanee would gire the additional maneuverability needed. In raility the main eraffio problem ie at the eite of the firehouee. any plan, eldewalta are euperfiuoue and a waete of taxpajer monej.

I would appreoiate your giving me information ae to how my pereonal property would be affeoted by eaoh or the propesale.

miAR 271986
TRAFFIC ENGIMEERING BUREAU OF ENGINEERING

## Mayland Department of Transportation

Stata Highwey Aaministration

## willan K. Hellmano

 cecimy Hal KazseffApril 29, 1986

## RE: Contract No. AA 396-101-571 Maryland Route 177 Karyland Route 100 to <br> Pinehurst Road P.D.M.S. No. 023061

Mr. John M. Morgan
4701 Mountain Road
pasadena, Maryland 21122
Dear Mr. Morgan
Thank you for your March 18, 1986 letter concerning the Mountain Road study. Anne Arundel County felt it would be
$<\quad$ more appropriate that our District 5 office in Annapolis it to my office. please excuse the delay in response.

The lane requirements specified under this study are the result of careful traffic analyses of current and projected useage of Mountain Road. It is felt that the continuous twoway left turn center lane (5 lane section) is a requirement numerous private and commercial driveways. Your concern about sidewalks has been expressed by other
citizens. In that regard, we have eliminated sidewalk construction from our study proposals. However, we will acquire the necessary right-of-way from back of curbing (approximately 7 future.

If you would send us a copy of your property plat, we would way.

We appreciate your interest in the study and thank you for taking the time to write and express your views. They will

Mr: Morgan
April 29, 1986
Page 2
be considered in our study process
Very truly gours,
Louis H. Ege, Jr., Deputy Director Project Development Division


## LHE/FDS/e1w

cc: Mr. Lawrence Elliott $\mathbf{M r}$. Robert Sword Mr. Robert Sword


# - O. DOX 5057 - LaXE EHONE. MANYLAND 21122 

 ausunes mona ses.eAOI
## if Silliam K. Hellman, Secretary.

Department of Transportetior.
The Soard of Directors of the Lake Shore Volunteer Fire Company Inc. Would like to know how much footage of our property that boarders Hountain Road. You are planning on taking, when you widen the hi-day the need a mindmum of 45 feet for mantalng our equipent. ? we would like ehis information as soon as possible.

So tha: we can conduct oureelf's aceerdingly.


See SHA response on the following page.
fertur"

## RECEIVED

FEB 271906
gacfitany
Of THANEPARTMTH

## Mandand Department of Transportation <br> State highway Administration

## Wribian X. Hellman Hal Kassel

MAR 18198

RE: Contract No. AA 396-101-571 Maryland Route 177 to From Maryland Rout inehurst Road PDMS No. 023061

## Mr. Howard O. Odin, Jr

Secretary
Lake Shore Volunteer Fire Company
P.O. Box 1057

Lake Shore, Maryland 21122

## BUREAU Of Project planning Mar 19331 PM '86

Dear Mr. Oden:
Your inquiry to Secretary William $K$. Hellman relative to the proposed property acquisition in front of the Lake Shore Volunteer Fire House has been forwarded to

The north curb line of the preferred five-lane alternate (Alternate 3) would be approximately 55 feet from the front wall of the fire house. There would be a

Due to the proximity of homes on the south side of the road it is not practical to consider a significant alignment shift in that direction.

Since the project is essentially a roadway widening, the proposed vertical road grade would remain generally the same. However, some minor adjustments to the existing concrete apron would be required.

We are proposing to relocate Lake Shore Drive eastward to Garland Road in order to eliminate the offset intersection. If this is done, there would be approximately 130 feet between the less traffic congestion and more freedom of movement during emergencies.

Mr? Howard O. Oden, Jr.
Page 2
Mi s 18 M

Enclosed is a tentative plan for your review. A Public Hearing is scheduled for March 26,1986 at $7: 30 \mathrm{p}$. m . at the Chesapeake Bay Middle School. I trust that the information provided herein is satisfactory for your needs. If there are any concerns, do not hesitate to contact the Project Manager, Frank DeSantia, at 659-1109 prior to the Hearing.

Thank you for your interest in the project study.
Sincerely,
ORIGINAL SASNOFF
HAL KASSOFF
Administrator

## HR :d

Enclosure
cc: Mr Neil J. Pedersen Mr. Louis H. Eke, Jr. Mr. Edward Meehan
Mr. Jack Cladding
Mr. Ferdinand Doerfler
Mr. Robert Bond

THE MIL-BUR CLUB, INC.

#  

$\qquad$

```
March 25, 1986
: Project No. M-396-101-571 P.D.M.S. Ref. Mo. 023061
```

Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration
Office of Planning and Preliainary Engineering
Baltimore, MD 21203
Attn: Mr. Neil J. Pedersen, Director

Dear Mr. Pedersen:

At its last regular meeting, the Board of Directors of the Wil-aur Clot. Inc. voted on its preference for al ternative solutions to the club is the duly constituted of Mountain Road (Route 177). The Mil-Bur M1)-Bur on The Magothy. representing fifty-eight (58) of the sixty-seven (67) homes in the community.

The Board supports Alternative 2A (4-Lane Curbed Roadway with Left The Board supports Alternative 2A (4-Lane Curbed Roadway
Turn Lanes at Major Intersections) for the following reasons:

1. Alternative 1 ( $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ - Build) is inherently unsatisfactory today. and will be so in the future. Residents of the peninsula are subject to predictable cocruting traffic congestion as well as
unpredictable blockages due to accidents.
2. The level of traffic to be expected for the forseeable future on Route 177 does not warrant the handiing capacity of SHA's preferred Al ternative 3 ( 5 Lanes) in the absence of dense residential development on the Mountain Road peninsula. The expansion of the roadway to 5 lanes invites such development
by (a) changing the presently linadequate, subcs by (a) changing the presently inadequate, sub-standard roadway substantially greater right-of-way for future water and sewer substantialy greater right-af-way for future water and s extensive development. Inviting such development is not in concert with the growing environsental concern over the fragility of the Chesapeake Bay's shoreline. It is counterproductive to the effort to making the road adequate
for existing traffic.

This is in response to the letter on the preceding page.

Mr. Robert E. Fishback, president
The Mil-Bur Club, Inc.
保 Circle 21122
pasadena. Maryland 21122
Dear Mr. Fishback:
Thank you for your letter of March 25, 1986 supporting Thank you for your letter of March 25 , 1986 supporting
Alternative $2 A$, the $4-1 a n e$ curbed roadway with left turn lanes at Alternative $2 A$, the
major intersections.

Your Board's preference will become part of the project record and will be considered in our decision making process record and will be considered in our decision making prional capabilities, Alternative 3 continues at this time to be the preferred alternate.

Currently, there are only sufficient funds in the Special program to widen Mountain Road from Route 100 to Maryland Avenue. lt is felt that widening to Maryland Avenue will be sufficient daress immediate traffic congestion. The widening is expected to be under construction in several weeks.

Thank you for taking the time to write and to express your views.

Very truly yours,

Neil J. Pedersen, Director Office of planning and Preliminary Engine aring

NJP: ds
cc: Mr. Hal Kassoff
Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Mr. Edward Meehan
Senator P.C. Jimeno
Delegate J. R. Leopold
Delegate C. W. Kolodziejski
Delegate W. Turc
County Councilman E. C. Ahern


## whilem K. Kelman

 HAE Kossed! Hay KassedMarch 5, 1986
RE: Contract No. AA 396-101-571 Maryland Route 177 From Maryland Route 100 to Pinehurst Ro. 023061

Ms. Sylvia S. Rashbaum 5001 Collins Avenue Apt. 2J Miami Beach, Florida 33140

Dear Ms. Rashbaum:
Thank gou for your letter of February 26 to $\mathbf{M r}$. Neil J. Pedersen. You will be routinely informed of important project developments through our project mailing list. For your advanced developments through our project mailing list. For your advan information, a Location/Design Public Kearing will be held on 4804 Mountain Road, Pasadena, Maryland. You will receive a brochure in the near future providing you with additional information.

Thank you for your interest in the project study.
Very truly yours,
Louis H. Ege, Jr. Deputy Director
Project Development Division


LHE: FDS:slc
Mr.1Frank J. DeSantis
Mr.1Frank J. DeSantis
State nighway Administration
State nighway Administration
707 N. Calvert Street
707 N. Calvert Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201
Baltimore, Maryland 21201
Dear Mr. DeSantis:
The Anne Arundel County Department of Pubiic Horks.has reviewed the proposed alternates for MD 177 and supports Alternate 3. Oue to the number Road, we beling streets, driveways, and conmercial entrances alono the best traffic operations. However, we would suggest that the cross-section could safely be reduced to less than the proposed 65 foot width. While a 60 foot width would be desirable, we believe that a 56 font (12', $11{ }^{\prime}$, $1 D^{\prime}, 11$ ', 12 $\operatorname{section~would~be~sufficient.~Either~a~} 56$ or 60 foot section would
reduce the impact on abutting properties. Similarly, the three lane section could be reduced to 36 feet.
These reduced cross-sections could provide the needed extra capacity while lessening the impact and possible citizen opposition to the project. We appreciate your consideration of this matter. If we can orovide further information, please do not hesitate to contact us

nGB/JDS/ckd
cc: Darryl T. Hockstra

Mardand Department of Transportation
Slate Highway Administration

## Wullam K. Hollimam Hat Kaasoff

RE: Contract No. AA 396-101-571
Maryland Route 177
Maryland Route 100 to
Pinehurst Road
P.D.M.S.No. 023061

Mr. Danny G. Boyd, Director
Department of Public Works Anne Arundel County
1 Harry S. Truman Parkway
Annapolis, Maryland 21401
Dear Mr. Boyd:
Thank you for your letter of March 31, 1986 to Mr. DeSantis expressing your support for Alternate 3.

Your suggestion to reduce the proposed 65 foot street width to 56 foot would not be in conformance with desirable lane widths for this type of facility utilizing a 50 mph design speed. The relative benefits to the community of saving 4.5 feet of strip right-of-way on each side of Route 177 do not seem warranted when weighed against compromises to engineering design and safety requirements.

You may recall that as a result of citizen requests, we have eliminated the 5 foot sidewalk construction which will result in benefits to adjacent properties.

We appreciate your interest in and support for the project. Thank you for taking time to express your support.

> Very truly yours,

> Neil J. Pedersen, Directór
> Office of Planning and Preliminary Engineering

NJP/elw
cc: Mr. Edward Meehan
Mr . Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Mr. Fred Doerfler

My : illephone number is 6E9-1110

$383-7555$ Baltimore Netro - $565-0451$ O.C. Metro - 1800492.5082 Statewide Toll Fiee P.O. Box 717 / 707 North Cavert St., Ballumore, Maryiand 21203-0717

itr:. James toorrizon

:Zarel. 10, 1936
Office of Flannine and preliminary mogineerine State Highway Administration 707 N. Calvert St.
Bal timore, Ki 21202
Dear Mr. Pedersen,
Finclosed is a statement on the roposed widening of i.ountain Ra. ?e would like assurance from you that you will continue to support the zi..i!. uveatoriun on the lountain Rd. Corridor.

We feel that the current repositioning of the telerhone poles should continue, allowinf: for wider shoulders (simultaneously facijitatine jeft hand turns). This should be given a trial period before the building of a third lane, since wider shoulders would accomplish the same end at less cost.

As tacnayern we feel we should be more conservative in spendine hichway dollars and realistic about what a hishcernea tret Alternates? ? ${ }^{\text {a }}$ and 3, as prono:sed by the State cerned trot Alternates ?, SA and 3, as proposied wy the Stat and that if implemented woulu lift the fuildine moratorimm This moulc make the winened road not only a safety hazard, a divisive concrete strip throuch the community, buta a tiaffic concestod corricor similay to other areas where the so called improved road hes only led to more traffic and hodrepodge development. Rit=hie Hichway is no exception. We have no faith that Enne Arundel County planning :nd Zoning our a so called improved road

品e hope we can count on your support.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Sincerely, B Cacel } \\
& \text { Qatew B Cacel } \\
& \text { :rs. James forrison }
\end{aligned}
$$

## RECEIVED <br> MAR $\begin{aligned} & =514 \\ & \text { : } 1986\end{aligned}$

The Puhlic Beariag on the proposed videaine of Mountain Ioad was held on

## Litemate 1 (Mo Euild)

Under tha No-suild Alternate there would be no aignificant improvemente to tha aistiagharyland 177 other than the currently planaed videniag to threa lanes恠 100 and thryland Aranue.
ALTBRMys 2 (Pour-Lane Curbed Roadvay)
Long Point Road were it would roadway betwean the terninus of hD Rte 100 and
Altimate 21 (Four-Lave Curhed Roadway with laft turn lanes at major intarsections)
Altrantri 3 (Five-Lene Curbed Roadvar)

- This would provde five-lane roadvay compriad of two travel lanas in each directioo and one contiauous left ters lame in the middla of the roadway batwean the terminus of RD Rte 100 and Long Point Road.

Wa feel you hould think carefully about these proposals and their future ranificstions. Mone of the above sives anyona an alternate routa off the panisula in case of emergency. (An altarnate route ia why most paopla ara diasatiafied with

1. Continuous thrae lane highways are notoriously dangerous. Oncoming haadights ara hlinding. It is difficult to diacern who has tha right to use the centar lane in some instances. In no way will a third lane aid morning and evaning traffic congestion during the ruah hours unless the third lane is clearly limited to Wast hound traffic in the A.M. and Eant bound traffic in the P.M. Tha $\begin{gathered}\text { Eighuay Depertment }\end{gathered}$ raquire costly over


If tha axisting talephone poles were either buried or moved considerahly fartha sway from the road and the shouldar widened to facilitata passing, wa would achieve the same and as the proposad three-lane road at far less cost.
2. The use of either Alternata 2 or 3 would change the whole character of the Mountain Rond corridor. Tha road would ba physically aimilar to Ritchie gighue pedeatrian median strip. (Median atripe serve as e afety buffer and facilitate of concrete.) Magy pore for the havy watar run-off from such would be added. No planning has been made thare is no propoall for sound barriers treveled four lane roads in Maryland and Virginia. now being eracted on havily
Our County Councilman, Mr. Ahern, admitted that tha widening of Mountain Rond to four or five lanes will force the County to lift the moratorium on high danity zoning,

The Stata Highway officials are planning the thrae lane conatruction to begin this Spring with plana for either four or fiva lanes in the next five yeare.

The Slata of Maryland ia not planning to build a four or fiva lane highway merely co enahla those of us already reaiding on Mountain Road Routa 177 corridor to craval up and down the road mbre quickly. Rather, the State is planning increased davalopment in thia araa and the road would be quickly fillad co capacity as new
homes ara built.

## Mandand Department of Tansportaton

State Highway Aoministration
March 26, 1986

## Wrision K. Hotheram seatemy Hal Kasent

RE: Contract No. AA 396-101-571 Maryland Route 177 From Maryland Route 100 to Pinehurst Road
PDMS No. 02306

This is in response to the letter on the preceding page.

## Mrs. Arthur B. Cecil

1 Mrs. James Morrison
Box 214
Gibson Island, Maryland 21056
Dear Mrs. Cecil and Mrs. Morrison:
Thank gou for gour March 10, 1986 letter with attached statement expressing your opposition to our study proposals.

Improvements are being studied in response to priorities established by Anne Arundel County elected officials who feel that traffic capacity improvements are needed to support existing traffic as well as traffic generated by planned growth.

We cannot put wide enough shoulders within our right-of-way to facilitate the bypassing of left turning vehicles. We are continuing to evaluate the possibility of providing reversible lanes westbound in the morning peak hours. This will be method it may be utilized, we intend to proceed with whatever of the three lane roadway this spring, which we feel is much needed to alleviate existing traffic demands.

We appreciate your taking the time to write. Thank you for your interest in the project study.

## Very truly yours <br> Thie of Pedasw

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

## NJP: ds <br> cc: Mr. Edward Meehan <br> Mr. Lawrence Elliott

My toliephene number t _ (301) 659-1110 Telatypewnter for imperred Heering or Spemen
 P.O. Box 717 / 707 Nortn Cement St., Banumorr, Marymad 21203 - 0717



Mrs. Arthur B. Cecil
Mrs. James Morrison
Box 214
Gibson Island, Maryland 21056
Dear Mrs. Cecil and Mra. Morrison:
Thank you for your letter of March 10,1986 relative to the Maryland Route 177 study.

The continuation of the building moratorium ia a local land use matter. Decisions regarding the moratorium will be made by local Anne Arundel County officiala.

The State Highway Administration's proposals to widen Mountain Road are in conformance with County development plans and are a result of coordination with elected officials.

Existing traffic congestion requires that the three-lane improvement from Maryland Route 100 to Maryland Avenue be underway this spring. The State Highway Administration's proposals for the long term, either four or five lanes, are being considered in an effort to address projected traffic demands. I assure you every effort will be made by the Administration to reach the most reasonable solution to the problem.

Thank you for taking the time to write and we appreciate your interest. Your views will be considered in the planning process. Sincerely,


Maryand Department of Transpontaton
Slate Highway Aammustration
p.D.M.S. No. 023061

Mr. R. L. Caplinger 8224 Bayside Drive Pasadena, Maryland

Dear Mr. Caplinger
Thank you for gour April 4, 1986 comments opposing the proposals to widen Mountain Road

Your views will be considered in our decision making process. The State Highway Administration will attempt to reach the most reasonable decision for this project. At this time, however, the 5 lane proposal is the alternate which will address the long term transportation needs of the community.

We appreciate your taking the time to write to us

project Development Division

LhE/FDS/elw

My tetaphens number is
 P.O. Box 717 / 707 Norn Cavant St., Baltumorr, Maryiand 21203 - 0717

Location/Design Public Hearing

I/ we wan to comment or Inquire about the following aspect of thea project:

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
PI am currently on the Mailing Lat.

Maryland Department of Transportation
state Highway Administration

## William X. Holman  

April 15, 1986
RE: Contract No. AA 396-101-571 Maryland Route 177
From Maryland Route 100 to Pinehurst Road PDUS No! 023061

Cusimano \& Sons, Inc. 601 Revel Highway \& Route 50 Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Dear Mr. Cusimano:
Thank you for your March 19, 1986 inquiry concerning the effects of our proposals to your Long point Mall Shopping Center.

Enclosed for your information is a plan and cross-sectional view of the tentative impacts of our preferred 5-1ane roadway. Depicted in tentative shading is the existing roadway and shown in Depicted in yellow shaditional paving. Also shown is the proposed new right-of-way requirement.

You will see that, although theiisland is required for the roadway widening, you should not lose any of your existing roadway widening, you should anility would remain unchanged.

The effects may be subject to some revision during the final design phase of the contract.
please contact Mr. Frank DeSantis of my office if there ar any questions. Thank you for your interest.

Very truly yours,
Louis H. Age, Jr.
Deputy•Director
Project Development Division


Lne:psure
cc: Mr.N. J. Pedersen
Mr. E. Behan
 Telatypewitro tor impaired Hearing act
383 -7555 Baltimore Marco - $565-0451$ D.C. Metro - $1-800-192.5082$ Statewide Tor: Froe
P.O. Boas 717 / TO 7 North Calvert St. Baltimore. Maryland 21203 - 0717


## walton K. Hetman <br> fermi Hal basin

## March 31, 1986

RE: Contract No. AA 396-101-571 Maryland Route 177 from Maryland Route 100 to inehurst Road
PDMS No. 023061

## Mr. Paul Dipietro, Chairman

Long Point Improvement Association
142 Circle Road
Pasadena, Maryland 21122
Dear Mr. Dipietro:
Thank you for your March 13,1986 letter indicating the Long Point Community Association's support for Alternate 3 for the pro ciated and will he considered in our decision making process

Thank you for taking the time to write to us.
Very truly yours,
Louis H. Eke, Jr
Deputy Director
Project Development Division
by: $\frac{\substack{\text { Frank DeSantis } \\ \text { Project Manager }}}{}$
LHE: FDS: bb
cc: Mr. Edward Meehan

[^0]Location/Design Public Hearing
Contract No. AA 396-101-571
From Maryland Route 100 to Pinehurst Road March 26, 1986 anteres ON

name Warren Magruder onte 27 Muchr 6
 cityitown PASADENA state Mo ZIP CODE $2 / 172$ I/We wlah to comment or Inquire ebout the following espects of this project:


 dote. The slate ohold counter the numerouz


Major General Warren Magruder
8148 Riverside Drive
Pasadena, Maryland 21122
Dear General Magruder:
Thank you for gour March 27, 1986 comments supporting the project and the conduct of State Highway Administration staf at the Puhlic Hearing.

The points gou have made in gour letter are well taken It is ohvious that you are knowlegeable in traffic management matters and we appreciate your support for the preferred 5 lane alternate.

Your views will he given consideration in our decision making process.

Thank you for your interest in the study.
Very truly yours,
Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Deputy Director
Project Development Division


LHE/FDS/elw
cc: Mr. Edward Meehan
April 18, 1986
RE: Contract No. AA 396-101-571
Maryland Route 177
Maryland Route 100 to
Pinehurst Road
P.D.M.S. No. 023061

William K. Helliman
William
secrany
.
Hat Kassolt
Marland Department of Fransporiation

| Ha! Kassoll |
| :---: |
| nembukray |

hank you for your interest in the study


My telephone number is 659-1109

555 Baltumore Metro - $565-0451$ D.C. Metro - $1.600-192-5062$ Starewide
P.O. Box 7171707 North Calvert St., Batumore, Maryiana 21203 - 0717
Location/Design Public Hearing Contract No. AA 396-101-571

Gregg and Route 100 to pinehurst Road March 26, 1986
nnes Sherei Morgan

```
arvolio Vay y \(218 \operatorname{coos} 21122\)
```

UWo wion to commont or inguro about the tollowing aspocte of thie protioct: I I am conerened about the problem of mating a leff tuen from the south side of mountarn RD, in preticularly ferm 0 de Mt. RD. I wes for that this would not be a pedbem. Please peovile the data on which gul bese youre essumptisns.
is Please pesvid data and assumptivus which red gou to
is Please pesvid data and assumptivus which red gou to
$\therefore$ belive that MA RD would hande ay, 00 ceresblay \&y 2000 .
3. The comment was moode that left turns off MI Ab is
the aruse of the pesblems. peovide dato on which you
bared youe eosumptions.
The want this opea to pemain pupal lle di not want another Ritchic tigheway. If fire ape NoF gring to "build upt like the ritchre tighway area.
Puhyds we need a koed with compoceabectaves?.
 hepe isi don't make deeisions that affect $\delta$ uh daily lives blindly.
Wiam currently on the Malling List.
$\square$ Plose add mylour name(e) to the Malling List.

See SHA response on the following page.


Kay 13, 1986
Maryland Department of Transportation

No. AA 396-101-571 Maryland Route 177 Maryland Route 100 to PDMS No. 023061

Mr. and Mrs. Gregg Morgan 181 Lewes Way
pasadena, Maryland 21122
Dear Mr. and Mrs. Morgan:
Thank you for your letter, dated April 1, 1986, expressing your views on the Maryland Route 177 study. please excuse the delay in responding

Responses to your specific items are as follows:

1. Problem making left turn south side of Maryland Route 177, particularly Old Mountain Road.
The improved level of service provided by the additional traffic lanes will allow more and larger breaks in through traffic, thereby' allowing perpendicular traffic sufficieg time to negotiate turning movements onto the highway.
2. Provide data and assumption for 29,000 vehicles per day by year 2015.

Traffic assumptions involve calculations based on copula lion trends, proposed development, and the 3-C process. A copy pent, and a copy of the mes closed.

At present, the average daily traffic (ADT), is 20,000. It is projected, using those assumptions of population growth proposed development and the 3-C process, that the average daily traffic would be 30,000 vehicles per day by 2015
3. Left turns off Maryland Route 177 is the cause $o_{i}$ the problem.

Not only is traffic impeded by left turns at major intersections, of which there are 10 from Maryland Route 100 to Long point hoad, but there are 65 private driveways and 30 commercial driveways which are also causing traffic to queue.

## My telephone number is 659-1109

 23.7555 Baillmore Testy $-565-0451$ D P.O. Box 7171707 North Calvert St, Eallimore. Marciano 21203 - 0717

Mr. and Mrs. Morgan May 13, 1986
page 2

This has become a serious problem during peak hours. In this regard, the 5 lane section will satisfy needs for both left regard, the turning traffic and through volumes.

If there are further questions regarding traffic, please contact Kr . Robert Lambdin at 659-1325.

Your opposition to the project will be considered in our decision making process. Thank you for taking the time to express your views.

Very truly yours,
Louis H. Eke, Jr.
project Development Division

project Manager

## LAESFDS: cd

## Enclosures

cc: Mr. Robert Lambdin

Mandand Department offransportation

Fron Maryland Route 100 to PDuS No. 023061

This is in response to Hearing testimony.

Mr. Howard O. Oden, Jr.
Secretary
Lake Shore Volunteer Fire Company
P.O. Box 1057

Lake Shore, Maryland $21122^{-1 \text {.. }}$

## Dear Mr. Oden:

As a follow-up to concerns expressed in testimony given at the March 26, 1986 Public Hearing, enclosed is a more detailed plan Shore Pire Company.

As we stated in our letter of March 18, 1986 from Mr. Kassoff, there would be approximately 55 feet remaining from the front wall to the curb line. This information was also reiterated at the Hearing. In your letter to Secretary William K. Hellmann you gtated that minimum of 45 feet would be required for maintaining
equipment.

Subsequent to your receipt of our March 18, 1986 response, a project development team review meeting was held. It was decided at that time that the cost and community impacts caused by relocating Lake Shore Drive eastward to Garland Road could not he justified. Therefore, the relocation was dropped from the study and was not shown at the Hearing.

If you have additional questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me or the the Project Manager, Frank DeSantis, 659-1109 for further coordination. Thank you for your cooperation.

Very truly yours,
onil of yedusem

```
NJP:ds
Enclosure
cc: Mr. Hal Kassoff
    Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.
    Mr. Louis H. Ege,
    Mr. Rohert Bond
    Mr. Charles Lee
```




Mardand Department of Transportation
Staie Highwey Administration

April 18, 1986
RE: Contract No. AA 396-101-571
Maryland Route 177
Maryland Route 100 to
P.D.M.S. No. 023061

Mr. George C. Pauley 4625 Mountain Road Pasadena, Maryland 21122

Dear Mr. Pauley:
Thank you for your comments supporting the No-Build Alternate for the Mountain Road study.

Your views will be considered in our process and we appreciate your taking the time to write to us. Thank you for your interest.

Very truly yours,
Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Deputy Director
Project Development Division
by:


LHE/FDS/elw

## My telephone number is 659-1109

 P.O. Box 717 / 707 North Catvert St., Batimore. Marytand 21203 - 0717


See SHA response on the following page.
$\therefore$
Mandand Department of Transportation
State Kighway Administration
Mr. W. Edward Piitt
April 18, 1986
Page 2

## April 18, 1986

## $\underset{\text { Sutham K. Hollmam }}{\text { Sation }}$ suctury <br> Hal Kassoff

RE: Contract No. AA 396-101-571 Maryland Route 177 from Karyland Route 100 t p.D. . . S. No. 023061

Mr. W. Edward Plitt 9 Gray Drive
Pasadena, Maryland 21122
Dear Mr. Plitt:
Thank you for your March 21, 1986 letter expressing your opposition to widening Mountain Road.

Traffic capacity per se is not an element of traffic flow hat will be significantiy helped with the three (3) lane improvement. Additional lanes will be required to handle longterm capacity demands

In October of 1984, the signal equipment at the Lake Shore Drive intersection was changed so that we could make further enhancements to the signal timing in an effort to address the high volume of encountered in the peak hours. At this 177 approaches from $6: 30 \mathrm{a} . \mathrm{m}$. to $9: 00 \mathrm{a} . \mathrm{m}$. and again from
3:00 p.m. to $6: 30 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. , Monday through Friday. At all other
times the green interval to Maryland Route 177 is a great deal less. A recent inspection conducted by the signal technicians indicates that the equipment is functioning properly and providing the timing element during the peak hours as noted

When one recognizes the volume of traffic that utilizes aryland Route 177 in this area, the disruption of the flow for any reason, i.e. someone stops to make a left turn, school will result. This is simply a matter of too many cars and a lack ill result. This is simply a matter of too many cars and a lack solution to this problem is the construction of additional travel lanes in order to provide a highway capacity that is
necessary to handle the existing and future traffic volumes in this corridor.

Very truly yours,
Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Deputy Director
Project Development Division


LHE/FDS/elw
cc: Kr. Lawrence Elilott

My telephane number is 659-1109
Teletypewriter for Impaired Haaring or Speech
3837555 Bailmore Metro - $565-0451$ D.C. Metro - $1800-192.5062$ Statewice Toll Freo
P.O. Bor 7171707 North Calvert St., Baltumore, Marviend 21203 . 0717

Location/Design Public Hearing
Contract No. AA 396-101-571
From Maryland Route loo mintan Road March 26,1986
name Alis. Mary Poling

adoress 92 Beacrane Road OATE
aitritown Pasadena
state $M d$.
ZIP CODE $2 / 1 / 22$
I/Ti wish to comment about the following aepecta of thisproject:

$$
\mathrm{v}-36
$$



Maryand Department of Transportation
Statas hiommar acminutration

April 18, 1986
RE: Contract No. AA 396-101-571
Maryland Route 177
Karyland Route 177
Karyland Route 100 to
Pinehurst Road
P.D.M.S. No. 023061

Mrs. Mary Poling
92 Beacrane Road
Pasadena, Maryland 21122
Dear Mrs. Poling:
Thank you for your Karch 28, 1986 comments supporting the S lane roadway for the Mountain' Road study. Your views will be given serious consideration

The 5 lane alternate continues to be the preferred solution
You will be advised of project developments through the mailing list and through local newspaper media.


LHE/FDS/elw

> Wy tolephone number is 659-1109
> 383.7555 aatimora Meltro - 5650431 ID.C. Meatro - Hearring or Speech
> P.O. Boy 717 / 707 North Cewivert St., Batitimore, Maryieno Stanewide Toll Free

## STATE HIGhWAY administration QUESTIONS ANDIOR COMMENTS

Location/Design Public Hearing Contract No. AA 396-101-571 From Maryland Route 1700 to Pinehurst Road March 26, 1986


I/We wish to commant or Inquire about the following aapects of this project: A/terante 3 ( 5 lane. Rdwy) is the only Thing That $T$ becocit roploced todir) BuT we've beew Thiough pll of Tiis Time a Trme Agningit, Tis The veters thot, ceunT und Nof The contridutione of businecs preple Ther the volecs of this pein of land in ancetion ofter ancoling dave Spotion, we do no $T$ wout our cememanities beeter up by a by pess, oud we wart mr Ro T be plornet
 have! do samething fer Thr geed af The aesertirsted of the
Gen.


SHA Response: Alternate 3 is the Selected Alternate.

```
=4 STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
                    QUESTIONS ANDIOR COMMENTS
Location／Design Public Hearing
Contract Ko．AA 396－101－571
From Maryland Route 177 Mountain＇Road
Nate 1.00 to Pinehurst Road
Nash 1986
name EDWARD I RoAch Sa：
\[
\text { DATE } 3-26-86
\]
```



```
PLEASE
```







towiond q iNcomplete dideneyetaute ampler


if thin outing Aid acesmplish anocthico ix anode
quite clear to del that que praphado to date are mort unpopular suits the part majority people If yob ever hove another melted near＇team＇ －howard do ito home work and el arne simple question lams the people capable of answering

 $\square 1$ am currehty on tho Mailing list $\square$ P．S Statements above are mend

文 Please add my／Our name fee）to the Mailing Leet．ret：

Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration

## Wrath K．Hellman <br> ceremony

He kasself

April 18， 1986
RE：Contract No．AA 396－101－571 Maryland Route 177 Maryland Route 100 to PDMS No． 023061

Mr．Edward J．Roach，Sr 00 Beach Road
P Pasadena，Maryland 21122

## Dear Mr．Roach

Thank you for your March 26， 1986 letter expressing your con－ cerns about the Maryland Route 177 project

While it is true that the project is controversial，we cannot agree that the overwhelming majority oppose it．We would suggest that you coordinate your views with Mr．David Williams，President of your council，who is on record as supporting the project and prior to the hearing

$$
\square
$$

We would be happy to discuss the project and provide you review．Please contact the project Manager if you wish you a further discussion．We have added your name to our mailing list．

Thank you for your interest
Very truly yours，
Louis H．Ege，Jr．，Deputy Director Project Development Division


Frank DeSantis
Project Manager

## LBE ：FDS：bb

cc：Mr．Neil J．Pederse
Mr．Edward Meehan
Mr．Lawrence Eliot


## state highway administration

Location/Desion Pubic Heating
Contract No. AA 396-101-571
$\stackrel{\text { Prom Maryland }}{ }$ Route 100 to pinehurst Road March 26, 1986

.
$\qquad$

Ea d am currently on the Mailing List.
$\square$ Please add my/our names) to the Mailing Lat.
$\because$,

Mandand Department of Transportation
sure Rignwiy Aominatration

## What K. Hellman

werner HAl Kerseill


IWo wan to comment or Inquire about the following aapecte of inf project:

atzle invirtime of to ide t ate in.
The ohm ancisiony bier a


 pefower afintion eserine to te taseide


with th urigety of enter high ene the pice fines.

1626 Southshore Park
1626 Southshore Parkway
Pasadena, Maryland 21122

## Dear Mr. Weber:

We have forwarded your inquiry relative to the Mountain Road study to our District 5 Utility Office in Annapolis, They will be providing you with a response.

Thank you for taking the time to write us.
Very truly yours,
Louis H. Ese, Jr., Deputy Director Project Development Division


LHE/FDS/elw
cc: Mr. Charles W. Carroll (w/incoming)

April 2, 1986
RR: Contract No. AA 396-101-571 Maryland Route 177
Maryland Route 100 to
Pinehurst Road
P.D.M.S. No. 023061
$\because=$


Maryland Department of Transportation
Whfiam K. Hettmam
seatemy State Highway Aoministration

RE: Contract No. AA 396-101-571
Maryland Route 177
Maryland Route 100 to
pinehurst Road

Mr. David C. Williams, President
Greater Dasadena Council
1208 Holvewood Drive
Pasadena, Maryiand 21122
Dear Mr. Williams:
Thank you for your comments received April 7, 1986 represent
ing the views of 28 community associations in the pasadena area
Your support for Alternate 3, the 5 lane proposal, will be considered in our decision making process. The State Highway Administration continues to take the view that a 5 lane roadway is the preferred solution to the transportation needs of the community

As requested; your name has been placed on our mailing list Thank you for taking the time to write to us.

cc: Mr. N. J. Dedersen
LHE/FDS/elw
Mr. E. Meehan

My talephone number is 659-1109
333.7555 Bathimore Teletypewriler for impairod Mearing or Speech

7555 Battimore Metro - $565-0451$ D.C. Merro - $1-800-492.5062$ Statewide Toll Free
P.O. Box 717 I 707 North Cilvern St., Batimore, Maryland 21203 - 07:7
$E \times h, b+I$


PUBLIC hearing
mD. RTE. if7 mountain road

March 2C, 1986
The matter before us tonight is not a new one. It is an issue that has generated great controversy and one that has no easy or simple solution. For this reason, the final solution to the traffic congestion on Mountain Road will not be popular with everyone. It is, however, an issue that can no longer be side-stepped or avoided; the time to deal with the traffic congestion is now. The citizens of the Peninsula have appropriately demanded that their government officials deal directly and immediately with this issue.

It is and always has been my position that improvements to Mountain Road are clearly needed. This is not based on my desire to accomnodate future development on the Peninsula, but to meet the needs of existing residents. I feel that were we to turn our backs on this fact, we would be acting irresponsibly. The safety and convenience of all residents of this area are at stake.

As you are aware, we, the elected officials of the 31st District and the 3rd Councilmanic District were successful in obtaining funds for the three lane widening of Mountain Road. The fruits of our efforts should be realized by years end with the completion of this project. Once this short-term widening is completed, I am committed to demanding that the state officials determine if any adjustments can be made to that project so that this shortterm measure becomes our long-term solution. We will request all options including, but not limited to, interchangeable lanes be evaluated.

In the meantime, if we are really serious about addressing the congestion problems on Mountain Road, we must endorse the state's plan for the five-lane widening. Failure to support this proposal at the present time could jeopardize our standing in the priorities of the state funding of highway projects. The demand for road projects continues to increase with less resources available to fund these projects.

In order for construction to begin on this alternative for Mountain Road, it will be necessary for the State Highway Administration to perform project planning studies, detailed design, and right-of-way acquisition activities prior to construction. From a project production standpoint, a mini num of four to five years would be required before construction could begin. Many of you here tonight will not be happy with what I am saying, but it is important that I give you the facts as they exist and not provide you with risieading or false information. As your elected officials, our responsibility is to seek the funding for this project. I am convinced that the State Highway Administration is committed to this project.

I am not pleased with the prospect of displacing the residents and businesses along Mountain Road, many of whom are longtime residents of the Peninsula. As I stated, there will be many years before construction begins. During this time, there will be a need for compromise and negotiation to solve our traffic congestion problem. It is my hope that we will maintain an open line of communication. It is only through an open, honest and frank exchange of ideas that we solve this long standing problem.

Louls E. Ege, Jr Deputy Director
Project Developaent Division (bM 310)
Sore higbway Adaiaiatration
Baltimore, HD 21202
Re: MD Rt 177; 86-06-119 Buviromental Assescment and Air quality Analyena

## Dear Mr. Ege:

In accordance with the proviaions of section 309 of tbe Clean Air Act end the National Eavironaental Policy Act (NEPA), BPA has revieved referenced project Aseesement (EA) and Air ant the wetlands avoid ance approact in the Freih Pond/Angel's Bog. sres, regardless of the alternate chosen. We whah to be kept apprised of fessibility of this approsch throughout the deaign phase of tbe profect. If circumenting this wetland area ie deterained to be impractical, a full discussion of the rationale behind tbat decision sbould be presented In addition, sitigetion for wethand lowsee, however minimal, should be coordinated with the proper agencies.

The following comants and observations refer to the kA and express our concerns regarding the enviroment al impacta that could be encountered We have no comments on the Air Quality Analyeis.
P.IV-7 Mention is made of the pipe and culvert extensions that would
(IV.D.3) be required by the higbway expanaion. The exact nuber of
(IV.D.3) these exteneions and tbeir locations ehould be clarified, slong with a statement regarding the bydraulic capacities of the lengthened etructuree in reletion to drainage areas.
p. IV-8 As design detells are developed, EPA wiebes to be advised ní As design deteils are developed, EPA wiebes to be advised ní
the epecifice pertaining to stormater manag enent and sedime:t and erosion control.


Thenk you for offering EPA tbe opportunity to review and coment on this EA. Please adrise us of the status of the project's design phaee with regard to wetlands avoidance, stormwater managenent and eedinentation/ erosion aesiatance, please call Jeffrey Alper at 215/597-7817.


Richard V. Pepino
Chief, NEPA Compliance Section

SHA Response to United States Environmental Protection Agency:

1. The Selected Alternate avoids Angel Bog.
2. This information will become available during final design. The Maryland Route 177 project will be discussed at the Quarterly Environmental Inter-Agency meetings held by the State Highway Administration. When the project reaches the appropriate stage of final design, the answers to these specific questions will be discussed at an Inter-Agencv meeting.
3. The noise impacts of Alternate 2 A would be identical to those of the Selected Alternate.
4. Construction and maintenance activities will generally occur during normal working hours on weekdays.


Mr. Louls 日. Ege, Jr.
deputy Director
Project Development Division
State Eighuay Administration
N. Calvert Street

Roon 310
altimore, MD 21202
Re: URA No. 79-PP-0108
SHA No. AA-396-101-571
aviroumental Asseeement for MD 177
froe MD 100 to Pinehurst Road in
Anne Arundel County

## Dear Mr. Ege:

The above referenced document hae received neceesary review by the Water Resourcee Adninistration and other agencies within the Department of Nataral provided by the Tidewater Adainistration's Cosstal Resources Division and Fisheries Division; Capital Programe, Forest; Park and Wildiffe Service and the Wetlands Division of WRA.

In accordance with Section 8-803, Natural Resources Article, Annotated Code of Maryland, Watervay Construction Permit uill be obtained from this Adainistration ehould the selected alternative alter the course, current, or cross-aection of Angel's Bog Preeh Pond or the ascoctated floodplatne.

In addition, in accordance with Section 8-11-05 and Section 8-11A-05, Natural Reeources Article, hanotated Code of Karglad requiree neceseary review and approval for sediment control and stormater manasement requiremente by the Sedieent and Storwater Division of this Aduinistration. The Water Resourcee Adinaistration prefers the alternative which vould have the lesst impact on the watere of the State.

Please keep in mind that Angel's Bog has been designated ae an Area of Critical State Concern and has been found to support a highly diverse floral commity. In fact, it hss the higheet diversity index of all the Ame Arundel County bogs and represents one of the finest non-tidal vetland habitats in northern Anne Arundel County. Said habitat benefits uncomion nests, eerves as a repository for common species be displaced by fincreasing urhanization, and eupports the preeence of rare plants.

Mr. Louie B. Ege, Ji Cay 5, 1986

Given the aforementioned attributes of Angel's Bog, the Department atrongly recomenda that the avoidance option be puraned for any of the build alcernatives chosen, that stringent stormater management measures be incorporated into the project to reduce the iapact of increased runoff so as to maintain the existing hydrology of the contributiag drainage area and to ensur its integrity, diversity and productivity. Additionally, the potential impact increased poilutant-laden roaduay runoff on Presh Pond/Angel's Bog must be considered in the Final Enviromental document

## RLH:MQT:das

cc: Elder Ghigiarelil
Carlo Brunori
Ted Hogan
Earl Shaver
Arnold Norden
George Rrantz
Wanda D. C. Adans

SHA Responses to Water Resources Administration:

1. Sediment and erosion control and stormwater management will be incorporated in the project. Required plans will be filed and permits obtained.
2. The Selected Alternate avoids impacts to Angel Bog.
10 W. College Terrace

Room 230
Frederick, MD 21701

June 13, 1986

Ms. Cynthia D. Simpson<br>Chief, Environmental Management<br>Maryland Dept. of Transportation<br>State Highway Administration<br>P. 0. Box 717<br>707 North Calvert St. Baltimore, MD 21203-0717

Re: Farmland Protection Policy Act form AD-1006 for MD Rt. 177 from MD Rt. 100 to Pinehurst Road in Anne Arundel County

Dear Ms. Simpson:
I reviewed the information you sent relating to future land use and learned from Anne Arundel County Planning and Zoning that low density residential zoning can be defined as $1 / 2$ to 2 units per acre. Based on the FPPA regulations, land can be precluded from "prime" if the density exceeds one unit per 3/4 acre. Therefore, this low density zoning in Anne Arundel County may be viewed as marginal for precluding "prime" soils from consideration under FPPA. However, from a practical viewpoint it is difficult to visualize how the loss of 1 - 2 ac. of statewide important soils (RuN and RuB), that is yet to be built upon (zoned low density residential), will affect agriculture in such a rapidly urbanizing area.

If I can be of further assistance, please feel free to contact me at 394-6822.
Sincerely,


CARL E. ROBINETTE
Area Soil Scientist
Enclosure
cc:
James Wist, District Consvst., SCS, Annapolis, MD


OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND MENTAL HYGIENE

201 WEST PRESTON STREET • BALTIMORE, MARYLAND 21201 • AREA CODE 301 - 383-
TTY FOR DEAF: Balto. Area 383-7555
D.C. Metro 565-0451

Adele Wlizack, R.N., M.S., Secretary
William M. Eichbaum, Assistant Secretary

April 9, 1986

Ms. Cynthia D. Simpson, Acting Chief Environmental Management Bureau of Project Planning (Room 310) State Highway Administration 707 North Calvert Street Baltimore, MD 21202

$\begin{aligned} \text { Re: } & \text { Contract No. AA } 396-101-571 \\ & \text { Maryland Route } 177 \text { from } \\ & \text { Maryland Route } 100 \text { to } \\ & \text { Pinehurst Road } \\ & \text { P.D.M.S. No. } 023061\end{aligned}$

Dear Ms. Simpson:
We have reviewed the Draft Air Quality Analysis for the above subject project and have found that it is not inconsistent with the Administration's plans and objectives.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this analysis.
Sincerely,
TiMecard $<$ Cate
Edward L. Carter, Chief
Division of Air Quality Planning and Data Systems
Air Management Administration
ELC/cp

Maryland Historical Trust
June 26, 1985

Ms. Cynthia D. Simpson
Acting Chief, Environmental Management
State Highway Administration
P. O. Bóx 717

707 North Calvert Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717
RE: Maryland Route 177 Widening
Maryland Route 100 to
Pinehurst Road
Anne Arundel County

Dear Ms. Simpson:
Thank you for your letter regarding the above-referenced project.

We concur with your opinion that sites $1,2,3,4,5,6$ and 8 are not eligible for the National Register. We further concur that the Bodkin School may be National Registerellgible.


JRL/KEK/hec
cc: Mr. Anthony F. Christhilf
Ms. Linda Collins
Ms. Rita Suffness

Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr., Acting Chief
Bureau of Project Planning
State Highway Administration
Maryland Department of Transportation
P. O. Box 717

707 North Calvert Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717
Re: AA 396-101-571
MD Rt 177
(MD Rt. 100 to Pinehurst Rd.)
P.S.M.S. No. 023061

Anne Arundel County, Maryland
Dear Mr. Ege:
Thank you for your letter of December 20, 1985, regarding this project. We believe that Bodkin School is not eligible for the National Register, and we agree with SHA that a determination of effect is not needed.

Based upon the results of the Phase I archeological reconnaissance conducted of the project area, we concur that the above-referenced project will have no effect upon significant archeological resources. Therefore, additional archeological investigations are not warranted for this particular project.


JRL/GJA/pc
cc: Ms. Rita Suffness
Mr. Tyler Bastian
Mr. Anthony Christhilf
Mr. Michael Parker

JOHN R GRIFFIN
DEPUTY SECRETARY

STATE OF MARYLAND
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
MARYLAND GEOLOGICAL SURVEY
KENNETH N WEAVER oipector
marylano geological surver
EMERYT.CLEAVES DEPUTY DIRECTOR

## THE ROTUNDA

711 W. 40TH STREET, SUITE 440
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND 21211

Division of Archeology
$338-7236$
9 December 1985

Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr. Bureau of Project Planning State Highway Administration P.O. Box 717/707 North Calvert St. Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

RE: MD 177 (MD 100 to Pinehurst Dr.)
Dear Mr. Ege:
I recently completed a Phase $I$ archeological investigation of the proposed highway expansion of Maryland Route 177 from the juncture of Maryland Route 100 to Gibson Island. The area surveyed was confined to the 1 imits of the proposed right-of-way as well as the section of the John Downs Memorial Park, which will be impacted by the replacement of Pinehurst Road.

A total of eleven loci were surveyed in the fleld over the course of several days. Loci were selected on the basis of previous experience with site prediction models. Shovel test pits were placed at approximately 20-meter intervals over most of each loci unless evident disturbances or lack of topographic integrity made testing unnecessary. Soil from the shovel test pits was screened through one quarter inch hardware screen. A total of 78 test pits were dug and screened.

Two transects within the bounds of the Maryland Route 177 project area had been previously examined (with negative results) in 1980 by the Maryland Historical Trust through a contract for the Maryland Department of Transportation to inventory the architectural and archeological resources in the area. These transects were not resurveyed during the work done on this survey.

Prior to doing field work, historical background research was done to locate potentially significant archeological sites within the project limits. Search of the historical literature of the area, study of early maps, and discussions with local inhabitants during fieldwork revealed no historically important sites or buildings within the limits of the right-of-way.

The results of the fieldwork were also negative. No prehistoric cultural material was found in the 78 shovel test pits or on the surface. Some historic material was found, but is all of recent origin (post 1940).

No additional archeological field investigations are recommended in connection with this project as defined in the plans provided.

A more detailed report will be forthcoming. In the meantime if you have questions regarding this matter, please feel free to call me.

Sincerely,


Hettie L. Boyce Archeologist

HLB: lw
cc: Rita Suffness

## APPENDICES

Attachment for Environmental
Impact Documents
Revised: November 29, 1985
Bureau of Relocation Assistance

## "SUMMARY OF THE RELOCATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM OF THE

STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION OF MARYLAND"

All State Highway Administration projects must comply with the provisions of the "Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970" (Public Law 91-646) and/or the Annotated Code of Maryland, Real Property, Title 12, Subtitle 2, Sections 12-201 thru 12-212. The Maryland Department of Transportation, State Highway Administration, Bureau of Relocation Assistance, administers the Relocation Assistance Program in the State of Maryland.

The provisions of the Federal and State Law require the State Highway Administration to provide payments and services to persons displaced by a public project. The payments that are provided include replacement housing payments and/or moving costs. The maximum limits of the replacement housing payments are $\$ 15,000$ for owner-occupants and $\$ 4,000$ for tenantoccupants. Certain payments may also be made for increased mortgage interest costs and/or incidental expenses, provided that the total of all housing benefits does not exceed the above mentioned limits. In order to receive these payments, the displaced person must occupy decent, safe and sanitary replacement housing. In addition to the replacement housing payments described above, there are also moving cost payments to persons, businesses, farms and non-profit organizations. Actual moving costs for residences include actual moving costs up to 50 miles or a schedule moving cost payment, including a dislocation allowance, up to $\$ 500$.

The moving cost payments to businesses are broken down into several categories, which include actual moving expenses and payments"in lieu of" actual moving expenses. The owner of a displaced business is entitled to receive a payment for actual reasonable moving and related expenses in moving his business, or personal property; actual direct losses of tangible personal property; and actual reasonable expenses for searching for a replacement site.

The actual reasonable moving expenses may be paid for a move by a comercial mover or for a self-move. Generally, payments for the actual reasonable expenses are limited to a 50 mile radius. The expenses claimed for actual cost commercial moves must be supported by receipted bills. An inventory of the items to be moved must be prepared in all cases. In selfmoves, the State will negotiate an amount for payment, not to exceed the lowest acceptable bid obtained. The allowable expenses of a self-move may include amounts paid for equipment hired, the cost of using the business ${ }^{-}$own vehicles or equipment, wages paid to persons who physically participate in the move, the cost of actual supervision of the move, replacement insurance for the personal property moved, costs of licenses or permits required, and other related expenses.

In addition to the actual moving expenses mentioned above, the displaced business is entitled to receive a payment for the actual direct losses of tangible personal property that the business is entitled to relocate but elects not to move. These payments may only be made after an effort by the owner to sell the personal property involved. The costs of the sale are also reimbursable moving expenses. If the business is to be reestablished, and the personal property is not moved but is replaced at the new location, the payment would be the lesser of the replacement cost minus the net proceeds of sale (or trade-in value) or the estimated cost of moving the item. If the business is being discontinued or the item is not to be replaced in the reestablished business, the payment will be the lesser of the difference between the value of the item for continued use in place and the net proceeds of the sale or the estimated cost of moving the item. When personal property is abandoned without an effort by the owner to dispose of the property for sale, unless permitted by the State, the owner will not be entitled to moving expenses, or losses for the item involved.

The owner of a displaced business may be reimbursed for the actual reasonable expenses in searching for a replacement business up to $\$ 1,000$. All expenses must be supported by receipted bills. Time spent in the actual search may be reimbursed on an hourly basis, within the maximum limit.

In $11 e u$ of the payments described above, the business may elect to receive a payment equal to the average annual net earnings of the business. Such payment shall not be less than $\$ 2,500$ nor more than $\$ 10,000$. In order to be entitled to this payment, the State must determine that the business cannot be relocated without a substantial loss of its existing patronage, the business is not part of a commercial enterprise having at least one other establishment in the same or similar business that is not being acquired, and the business contributes materially to the income of a displaced owner during the two taxable years prior to displacement.

Considerations in the State's determination of loss of existing patronage are the type of business conducted by the displaced business and the nature of the clientele. The relative importance of the present and proposed locations to the displaced business, and the availability of suitable replacement sites are also factors.

In order to determine the amount of the "in lieu of" moving expenses payment, the average annual net earnings of the business is considered to be one-half of the net earnings, before taxes, during the two taxable years immediately preceding the taxable year in which the business is relocated. If the two taxable years are not representative, the State may use another two-year period that would be more representative. Average annual net earnings include any compensation paid by the business to the owner, his spouse, or his dependents during the period. Should a business be in operation less than two years, the owner of the business may still be eligible to receive the"in lieu of" payment. In all cases, the owner of the business must provide information to support its net earnings, such as income tax returns, for the tax years in question.

For displaced farms and non-profit organizations, the actual reasonable moving costs generally up to 50 miles, actual direct losses of tangible personal property, and searching costs are paid. The "in lieu of" actual moving cost payments provide that the State may determine that a displaced farm may be paid from a minimum of $\$ 2,500$ to a maximum of $\$ 10,000$, based upon the net income of the farm, provided that the farm has been discontinued or relocated. In some cases, payments "in lieu of" actual moving costs may be made to farm operations that are affected by a partial acquisition. A non-profit organization is eligible to receive "in lieu of" actual moving cost payments, in the amount of $\$ 2,500$.

[^1]
[^0]:    My trippteme number is 659-1109 Tue
    
    P.O. Box 7171707 North Calvert St., Bathmorm, Meryumid 21203.0717

[^1]:    A more detailed explanation of the benefits and payments available to displaced persons, businesses, farms, and nonprofit organizations is available in Relocation Brochures that will be distributed at the public hearings for this project and will also be given to displaced persons individually in the future along with required preliminary notice of possible displacment.

    In the event comparable replacement housing is not available to rehouse persons displaced by public projects or that available replacement housing is beyond their financial means, replacement "housing as a last resort" will be utilized to accomplish the rehousing. Detailed studies must be completed by the State Highway Administration before "housing as a last resort" can be utilized。

    The "Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of $1970^{\prime \prime}$ requires that the State Highway Administration shall not proceed with any phase of any project which will cause the relocation of any persons, or proceed with any construction project, until it has furnished satisfactory assurances that the above payments will be provided and that all displaced persons will be satisfactorily relocated to comparable decent, safe, and sanitary housing within their financial means or that such housing is in place and has been made available to the displaced person.

