


# FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

For

## **U.S. Route 29**

Patuxent River Bridge to U.S. Route 40  
Howard County, Maryland

Contract Number HO 606-101-770



prepared by:

U.S. Department of Transportation  
Federal Highway Administration  
and  
Maryland Department of Transportation  
State Highway Administration

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION  
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

FOR THE WIDENING AND INTERCHANGES ON

US ROUTE 29  
FROM PATUXENT RIVER BRIDGE TO US 40

HOWARD COUNTY, MARYLAND

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 the following improvements:

Old Columbia Road  
Alternate C-1

Gales Lane  
Alternate C-2 Modified

Hammond - Hillcrest  
Alternate C-3

Old Columbia Road  
Alternate C-2 Modified

Hopkins - Gorman  
The Developer's Proposal  
Alternate C-2

Pepple - Diamondback  
Alternate C-3

Rivers Edge Road  
Alternate C-4

Spring Valley Road  
Closure of US 29 access.

Seneca Drive  
Alternate C-5 Modified

Addition of Fifth and Sixth  
Lanes Throughout

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.

12/2/87

Date

Emil E. Dunsky

Division Administrator

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Record of Decision	I-1
II. Comparison of Alternates	II-1
III. Summary of Actions and Recommendations	
A. Background	III-1
1. Project Location	III-1
2. Project Purpose	III-1
3. Project History	III-1
B. Alternates	
1. Description	III-7
a. Alternates Not Considered in Final Selection	III-7
b. No-Build Alternate	III-9
c. Alternates Considered	III-9
2. Service Characteristics	III-19
a. Traffic Conditions	III-19
b. Accidents Summary	III-23
C. Environmental Consequences of Recommended Alternate	
1. Socioeconomic Impacts	III-25
a. Land Use and Planning	III-25
b. Displacements and Relocations	III-25
c. Neighborhoods	III-26
d. Community Facilities and Services	III-27
e. Historic and Archeological Resources	III-28
f. Economic Impacts	III-29
2. Natural Environment Impacts	III-29
a. Surface Water	III-29
b. Wetlands	III-30
c. Floodplains	III-33
d. Natural Habitat and Wildlife	III-34
e. Prime Farmland	III-35
3. Air Quality	III-35
4. Noise	III-37
D. Summary of Public Involvement	
1. Alternates Public Workshop	III-37
2. Positions Taken	III-37
E. Recommendations	III-39
IV. Public Hearing Comments	IV-1
V. Correspondence	
A. Written Comments Received Subsequent to the Location/Design Public Hearing and Responses	V-1
B. Agency Correspondence	V-55
C. Agency Comments on Environmental Assessment	V-90
VI. Summaries of Wetlands Field Views	VI-1

## LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table Number</u>	<u>Table Title</u>	<u>Page Number</u>
1	Comparison of Alternates	II-1
2	Comparison of Alternates B and C by Number of Noise Impacted Dwellings	II-3
3	1985 Traffic Data	III-20
4	Design Year 2015 Traffic Data	III-20
5	Howard County Intersection Level of Service	III-21
6	Accident Rates by Accident Severity 1983-1985	III-24
7	High Accident Locations - Highway Sections, 1983-1985	III-24
8	Selected Alternate Concepts - Effects on Neighborhoods	III-26
9	Affected Wetlands	III-31
10	Projected Worst - Case Carbon Monoxide Concentrations (PPM)	III-36
11	Noise Abatement Analysis Summary	III-38

Section I  
**Record of Decision**

6

MEMORANDUM OF ACTION OF STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATOR HAL KASSOFF  
FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 1987

CONCURRENCE WITH PRIOR ACTION

A final Environmental Document (Finding of No Significant Impact) is being prepared, on the project listed below. Location/Design approval will be requested, from the Federal Highway Administration, for alternates B and C.

1. State Contract No. HO-606-101-770 US Rte. 29 - Patuxent River to US Rte. 40 PDMS No. 132046

Alternates B and C, with full control of access with the addition of a fifth and sixth lane within the existing median.

The decision to proceed in this manner was made by the Administrator, at a staff meeting, held May 13, 1987.

cc: Mr. John A. Agro, Jr.  
Mr. Bob B. Myers  
Mr. Edward M. Loskot  
Mr. Earle S. Freedman  
Mr. Anthony M. Capizzi  
Mr. Wayne R. Clingan  
Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.  
Mr. Edward A. Terry  
Mr. R. Wayne Willey  
Mr. Jack F. Ross  
Mr. John D. Bruck  
Ms. Cynthia D. Simpson  
Mr. Charles G. Walsh  
Mr. Randy Aldrich



**Maryland Department of Transportation  
State Highway Administration**

7  
Richard H. Trainor  
Secretary  
Hal Kassoff  
Administrator

November 6, 1987

MEMORANDUM

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

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

SUBJECT: Contract No. HO 606-101-770  
U.S. Route 29  
Patuxent River to U.S. Route 40  
PDMS No. 132046

The Project Development Division is preparing a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the subject project. It is anticipated that this document will be ready to submit to the Federal Highway Administration during the month of November, 1987. The decision to proceed with the FONSI recommending Alternates B and C, full control of access with the addition of a fifth and sixth lane within the existing median, was made by the Administrator at a meeting on May 13, 1987. Location/Design approval will be requested for this alternate.

A summary of the May 13, 1987 meeting and the Team Recommendation Report is attached.

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

I concur with the above information:

11/6/87  
Date

*Hal Kassoff*  
Hal Kassoff  
Administrator

NJP/ih  
Attachment

- |                           |                        |
|---------------------------|------------------------|
| cc: Mr. John A. Agro, Jr. | Mr. Edward A. Terry    |
| Mr. Bob B. Myers          | Mr. R. Wayne Willey    |
| Mr. Edward M. Loskot      | Mr. Jack F. Ross       |
| Mr. Earle S. Freedman     | Mr. John D. Bruck      |
| Mr. Anthony M. Capizzi    | Ms. Cynthia D. Simpson |
| Mr. Wayne R. Clingan      | Mr. Charles G. Walsh   |
| Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.     | Mr. Randy Aldrich      |

My telephone number is (301) \_\_\_\_\_

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



Maryland Department of Transportation

State Highway Administration

June 5, 1987

William K. Hellmann Secretary
Hal Kassoff Administrator

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr. Deputy Director Project Development Division
FROM: Randy Aldrich Project Manager (with signature)
SUBJECT: Contract No. Ho 606-101-770 U.S. Route 29 Patuxent River to U.S. Route 40 P.D.M.S. No. 132046
RE: Administrator's Concurrence Meeting

On Wednesday, May 13, 1987, a meeting was held at State Highway Administration Headquarters in Baltimore in order to obtain the approval of the Administrator for the recommended alternatives for U.S. Route 29 in Howard County. The following representatives attended the meeting:

- List of attendees and their roles: Hal Kassoff (MD SHA - Administrator), Neil J. Pedersen (MD SHA - OPPE - Director), Louis H. Ege, Jr. (MD SHA - OPPE - Deputy Director), Charles G. Walsh (MD SHA - PDD Chief, Project Management), Wayne R. Clingan (MD SHA - District 7 - District Engineer), Randy Aldrich (MD SHA - Project Development- Project Manager), James E. Dooley, Jr. (MD SHA - Planning and Program Development), Cynthia D. Simpson (MD SHA - PDD Chief, Environmental Management), Sharon Preller (MD SHA - Project Development - Environmental), Barbara Ostrom (MD SHA - PDD Chief, Traffic Forecasting), Bob Lambdin (MD SHA - Project Development - Traffic Forecasting), Mona Dave (MD SHA - Project Development), John A. Logan, Sr. (MD SHA - Bridge Development), Ralph P. Manna (MD SHA - Bridge Development), John Jordan (MD SHA - Highway Development), Gregory J. Doyle (FHWA), Elizabeth Calia (Howard County - DPW)

My telephone number is 333-1139

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



Paula O'Conner	Howard County - OPZ
Carl Balser	Howard County - OPZ
Richard Schindel	MD SHA - District 7 - Office of Real Estate
William Miley	MD SHA - District 7 - Office of Real Estate
Jeffrey Randall	Bureau of Traffic Projects
R. Wayne Willey	Gannett Fleming - Project Manager
Jeffrey F. Lawrence	Gannett Fleming - Traffic Engineer

The following selections were made and concurred upon by the Administrator:

A. Old Columbia Road

1. Alternate C-1 was approved conditionally upon modifying the southbound off ramp with a 150 foot radius forming a T-intersection with Old Columbia Road; the southbound on ramp to use the existing roadway; the northbound off ramp to use a 150 foot radius; and, the northbound on ramp to follow the existing roadway. Compound curves or spirals should be examined to minimize required right-of-way. It was recommended to include this in the Maryland Route 216 Interchange Project.
2. Alternate C-4 was approved but should not be a part of MD SHA proposed improvements because it should be a county project.

B. Hammond - Hillcrest

1. Alternate C-3 was approved closing both Hammond and Hillcrest with the extension of Crest Road and the construction of the driveway. This was also recommended for inclusion in the Maryland Route 216 Interchange Project.

C. Hopkins - Gorman

1. The developer's proposal - Alternate C-2- is approved contingent upon previously discussed modifications.
2. The county is requiring the developer to present his proposal to the Planning Board again.

D. Rivers Edge Road

1. Alternate C-4 is approved.
2. Since the community on the west side favored Alternate C-3, the alternate travel routes that traffic would use through their neighborhood to access the east side from southbound U.S. Route 29 should be presented.

E. Seneca Drive

1. Alternate C-5 modified with the 150 foot loop ramp in the northwest quadrant, a 350 foot radius curve at the connection of extended Seneca Drive to existing Seneca Drive and 150 foot radius curves on the northbound right-in, right-out ramps was approved.
2. State Highway will present this modified alternate to the Seventh Day Adventist, Chesapeake Conference.
3. Howard County requested copies of the modification before issuing their position on the alternative.
4. If possible, this project should be constructed concurrent with the Brokenland Parkway project.

F. Gales Lane - Alternate C-2 modified was approved. The originally proposed Cul-De-Sac was deleted.

G. Old Columbia Road

1. Alternate C-2 modified was approved.
2. This alternate must be reviewed by the Maryland Historic Trust.

H. Pepple - Diamondback - Alternative C-3 was approved.

I. Spring Valley Road - No action required by the team since the right-out movement will be closed by construction of the MD Route 103 interchange.

J. In response to Howard County's question regarding the U.S. Route 40 traffic study, they were informed that the study will soon begin and will be treated as a special project.

A component of all of these access control concepts is the addition of a fifth and sixth lane for the corridor between Maryland Route 216 and the southern limit of the Maryland Route 100 Interchange Project. The added lanes would be constructed in the median of the existing roadway. Also included is a northbound only climbing lane between the north end of the Patuxent River Bridge and Old Columbia Road. The lane would also be constructed in the median.

RCA:ss

cc: Attendees  
Mr. Edward M. Loskot  
Mr. Anthony M. Capizzi  
Mr. James K. Gatley  
Mr. Thomas Hicks

//

Section II

**Comparison of Alternates**

TABLE 1  
COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES  
U.S. ROUTE 29  
HOWARD COUNTY, MARYLAND

	SEGMENT VI ALTERNATES										SEGMENT VII ALTERNATES			SEGMENT VIII ALTERNATES							SEGMENT IX ALTERNATES						
	B&C*	Old Columbia Road Overpass C Concepts				Hammond-Hillcrest C Concepts			Hopkins-Gorman Overpass C Concepts		B&C*	Rivers Edge Road C Concepts		B&C*	Seneca Drive C Concepts					Gales Lane C Concepts		B&C*	Old Columbia Rd/Wandering Way C Concepts		Pepple/Diamond Back C Concepts		
		1	2	3	4	1	2	3	1	2		3	4		3	4	5A	5B	5A-Mod	1	2		1	2	1	3	
SELECTED ALTERNATES	X (C only)	X			X			X		X	X (C only)	X	X (C only)			X			X	X (C only)		X		X			
Cost (in millions)	\$2.651	\$0.534	\$1.891	\$1.022	\$0.028	\$0.356	\$0.503	\$0.102	\$7.710	\$9.226	\$2.262	\$2.523	\$2.669	\$2.293	\$5.654	\$5.997	\$4.337	\$4.143	\$4.244	\$0.293	\$0.253	\$2.584	\$0.141	\$0.323	\$0.280	\$0.210	
<b>NATURAL ENVIRONMENT IMPACTS</b>																											
Loss of Natural Habitat (acres) (Does not include man-dominated or agricultural land)	0	0	1.0	3.0	0.3	0	0.5	0.4	8.1	4.7	0	1.2	1.5	0	1.5	0.8	0.8	0.9	0.8	0	0.4	0	0	0.8	0.3	0.3	
Threatened or Endangered Species	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	
Stream Crossings	0	0	2	3	0	0	2	0	4	5	1	3	3	0	1	2	2	3	2	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	
Wetland Areas Affected (acres)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	0	0	0	.006	0.2	0.2	0	0.2	0.22	0.22	0.42	0.22	0	0.1	0	0	0.03	0.1	0.1	
100-Year Floodplain Affected(acs)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.8	0	0	0	.006	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.4	0.8	0	0	0		
Prime Farmland (acres)	0	0	4.5	2.0	0	0	0	0	0.9	0.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Air Quality Impacts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>SOCIO-ECONOMIC IMPACTS</b>																											
Number of Families Relocated	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	1	0	1	2	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Business Displacements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Required Right-of-Way	0	.002	.117	.158	.005	.007	.018	.027	1.617	1.617	0	.050	.213	0	.187	.647	.511	.747	.553	0	.121	0	0	.068	0	0	
Historic Sites Affected(acres)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Consistent With Land Use Plans	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	

\*Impacts in this column are for lane widening of Alternate B and C, and therefore are in addition to those listed separately for the concepts.

\*\*No additional cost over that for lane widening.

TABLE 2

COMPARISON OF ALTERNATES B AND C  
BY NUMBER OF NOISE IMPACTED DWELLINGS  
U.S. ROUTE 29  
HOWARD COUNTY, MARYLAND

Noise Sensitive Area	Noise Impacts* by Alternate	
	B	C
A	1	1
B	5	11
C	2	6
D	2	4
E	3	7
F	13	28
G	10	13
H	1	8
I	0	0
TOTAL	37	78

\* All impacts represent an exceedence of the FHWA Noise Abatement criteria of 67 dBA. Leq.

Section III

**Summary of Actions  
And Recommendations**

III. SUMMARY OF ACTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Background

1. Project Location

This portion of existing U.S. Route 29 extends from the Patuxent River bridge at the Howard County line to the U.S. Route 40 interchange (Figure 1). The roadway lies in a north-south direction and intersects the following state roadways in the project area: Maryland Route 216, Maryland Route 32, Maryland Route 175, Maryland Route 108, and Maryland Route 103 (Figure 2). In addition to Columbia, numerous major residential, commercial, and industrial developments are located along the 4-lane and 6-lane divided highway.

2. Project Purpose

The purpose of the U.S. Route 29 study is to develop alternates that will ensure that sufficient, safe roadway capacity will be provided to accommodate existing and projected traffic growth. The consequences of the no-build alternate were also developed.


The U.S. Route 29 corridor is a vital part of the transportation network serving Howard County. This corridor has undergone extensive industrial-commercial development, and in the next 20 years is expected to experience continued growth in planned commercial, industrial, and residential development.

The existing roadway network in the study area is unable to properly handle current and projected traffic. The roadway operates above capacity during morning and evening peak traffic hours. Existing signals along the U.S. Route 29 corridor were installed to handle the crossing and turning movements at the more heavily congested areas. As a result of the influx in traffic and the future projected growth, these areas are at capacity and can no longer efficiently handle the traffic. The study of these areas has reflected the need for grade separated interchanges that can handle higher capacities.

In developing the proposal for fully controlled access, the existing road network on each side of U.S. Route 29 was examined to ensure that safe and efficient local traffic circulation is maintained. Parts of the existing local network must be upgraded, and new two-lane service roads were included as an element of this study.

3. Project History

In the early 1950's, the State Roads Commission planned and began construction of a new dual highway along the Old Columbia Pike Corridor. In Howard County, only one-half of this new roadway was constructed. By 1954, the new bridge over the Patuxent River was completed, thus opening the facility for through traffic. In 1968, the connection north of St. John's Lane to I-70 was completed. Development of the new town of Columbia necessitated the construction of dual lanes on the New Columbia Pike. The new construction was completed in 1970. Although not fully achieved, access to and from the New Columbia Pike was controlled so that the facility could one day evolve into a freeway.



**FIGURE 1**  
**Project Location Map**


Scale: 1" = 6 miles



FIGURE 2  
Study Area

1 of 2

SCALE: 1" = 2000'



MD. ROUTE 216  
INTERCHANGE STUDY

BROKEN LAND PARKWAY  
INTERCHANGE STUDY


SEGMENT VI

SEGMENT VII

SEGMENT VIII

LEGEND

▨ AREAS NOT INCLUDED  
IN THIS STUDY



**BROKEN LAND PARKWAY  
INTERCHANGE STUDY**

**MD. ROUTE 108  
INTERCHANGE STUDY**


**MD. ROUTE 103  
INTERCHANGE STUDY**

**SEGMENT VIII**

**SEGMENT IX**

**SEGMENT X**

**SEGMENT XI**

**LEGEND**  
 **AREAS NOT INCLUDED  
IN THIS STUDY**

**FIGURE 2  
Study Area**

2 of 2

SCALE: 1" = 2000'

Since completing the original dual highway, the State Highway Administration has refined the corridor in many locations to provide additional capacity. An interchange and an extension of Maryland Route 175 have replaced the original north entrance to Columbia at Oakland Mills Road. The Patuxent Freeway has replaced old Maryland Route 32. In 1982, the Howard County Office of Planning and Zoning developed transportation goals that recommend the upgrading of U.S. Route 29 to a controlled access highway with four or more travel lanes. Interchanges were recommended at Maryland Route 216, Hopkins/Gorman Road, Maryland Route 32, Little Patuxent Parkway, Maryland Route 108, Maryland Route 103, and Broken Land Parkway. Construction activities have begun for an interchange at Maryland Route 108. Final design activities are underway for new interchanges at Maryland Route 216, the proposed Maryland Route 103 at St. John's Lane, Broken Land Parkway, which includes Owen Brown Road and Columbia's South Entrance. North of St. John's Lane, the roadway has been widened to six lanes.

On February 8, 1986, an Alternates Workshop was held to present the State Highway Administration's preliminary alternate proposals for the reconstruction of U.S. Route 29. Those alternates were refined and presented at a combined location/design public hearing on February 17, 1987.

**B. Alternates**

**1. Description**

At the Alternates Public Workshop held February 8, 1986, at the Hammond High School, three alternates were presented for each segment within this project. The alternates were:

Alternate A -- No Build Alternate consisting of the maintenance of the existing highway design.

Alternate B -- Roadway widening within the median and no-access control.

Alternate C -- Roadway widening within the median with access control.

Alternates A and B were presented for each segment. In addition, numerous concepts were developed under Alternate C in each segment. A total of 22 Alternate C concepts were presented at the workshop.

**a. Alternates Not Considered in Final Selection**

Six of the Alternate C concepts were dropped from further consideration. The concepts and the reasons they were deleted from further study are presented as follows:

**At Rivers Edge Road (Segment VII)**

**VII-C-1: Right-on; Right-off Only**

Rivers Edge Road would have remained intact with the exception of the median crossover. This would have allowed only the right-on, right-off movements from U.S. Route 29. Crossover movements would have been achieved at adjacent interchanges.

This concept was dropped after the Alternates Public Workshop because the concept included a right-on, right-off movement at Old Columbia Road on the east side of U.S. Route 29. The acceleration lane for the right-on movement would have extended onto the bridge over the Middle Patuxent River. The required widening of the bridge was not considered to be cost effective.

VII-C-2: Underpass

Rivers Edge Road would have been reconstructed as an underpass to U.S. Route 29, connecting with Old Columbia Road on the east side of U.S. Route 29. Access ramps to and from southbound U.S. Route 29 would have served Rivers Edge Road. Northbound U.S. Route 29 would have had access to ramps along Old Columbia Road. The ramp configuration was a weaving lane connecting a tight on ramp with a tight off ramp. All existing access points and median crossovers to U.S. Route 29 would have been severed along this segment.

This concept was dropped after the Alternates Public Workshop because the weaving lane was carried on the bridge over the Middle Patuxent River. As with Concept VII-C-1, the required bridge widening was not considered to be cost effective.

At Seneca Drive (Segment VIII)

VIII-C-1: Right-on, Right-off Only

Seneca Drive would have remained intact with access to and from northbound U.S. Route 29. The median crossover would have been eliminated and all crossover movements would have been achieved at adjacent interchanges.

This concept was dropped after the Alternates Public Workshop because no access was provided for the developing properties on the west side of U.S. Route 29.

VIII-C-2: Overpass

This concept would close Seneca Drive to U.S. Route 29 as it exists today and constructing a structure over U.S. Route 29 utilizing the Seneca Drive alignment and grade. This would have allowed access for traffic westbound. Seneca Drive to southbound U.S. Route 29 traffic heading north on U.S. Route 29 could have made the eastbound movement onto Seneca Drive via a proposed ramp.

All crossover movements would have been made at adjacent interchanges. A service road would have been built to provide access to the parcels in the northeast quadrant of the Seneca Drive/U.S. Route 29 intersection.

This concept was dropped after the Alternates Public Workshop because no access was provided for the developing properties on the west side of U.S. Route 29, and the Seneca Drive to northbound U.S. Route 29 movement was not provided.

21

At Pepple Drive and Diamondback Drive (Segment IX)  
IX-C-2: No Access at Pepple or Diamondback

This concept proposed closing all access points to U.S. Route 29 at Pepple Drive and Diamondback Drive. All crossover movements would have been made at adjacent interchanges.

This concept was dropped after the Alternates Public Workshop because it was felt that the ramp at Maryland Route 175 should be improved (see Concept IX-C-3).

At Spring Valley Road (Segment X)  
X-C-1: Right-on Only

This concept would close the median crossover to U.S. Route 29 allowing only a right-on movement. Crossover traffic would use the proposed Maryland Route 103 interchange.

This concept was dropped after the Alternates Public Workshop because the movement is considered part of the proposed Maryland Route 103 interchange.

b. No Build Alternate

Alternate A is the No Build option consisting of the maintenance of the existing highway design. All existing at-grade intersections would remain. Key points of the No Build Alternate are:

1. The capacity of U.S. Route 29 would not be increased.
2. Existing traffic conditions and congestion would worsen as demand and traffic volumes increase.
3. No additional right-of-way would be required.
4. Motorist safety would remain a problem.
5. Costs associated with this Alternate are limited to those incurred for the normal activities for roadway maintenance.

c. Build Alternates Considered

In addition to the No Build Alternate, the Build Alternates, Alternates B and C, were considered in each segment. Two Alternate C concepts in Segment VI were modified and three developed since the Alternates Public Workshop. In Segment VII, one Alternate C concept was developed since the workshop. Two concepts were modified and three developed for Alternate C in Segment VIII, and one C concept in Segment IX was modified since the workshop. Mapping of the Alternates follows this section.

Alternate B

Alternate B is roadway-widening within the median with no control of access, consisting of widening the corridor from 4 to 6 lanes and leaving all existing at-grade intersections and other access points intact except those planned for future development. Mapping for this alternate is represented as widening only on the Detailed Alternates Mapping. Key points of Alternate B include:

VI-C-2: Extending Hammond Parkway

All access to U.S. Route 29 would be severed at Hillcrest Drive and Hammond Drive. Hammond Parkway would be extended to connect with Hammond Drive to accommodate all traffic to U.S. Route 29 via the proposed Hopkins/Gorman Road interchange. Key points are:

- 1. Required right-of-way would be 1.08 acres.
- 2. Capacity and safety along U.S. Route 29 would be increased.
- 3. Local circulation would be enhanced.
- 4. Estimated cost is \$503,000 (0.503 million)

VI-C-3: Extending Crest Road to Hammond Hills (Selected)

All access to U.S. Route 29 at Hillcrest Drive and Hammond Drive will be severed. A proposed extension of Crest Road to the Hammond Hills development will divert all U.S. Route 29 bound traffic to Maryland Route 216. A driveway will be provided to Hammond Parkway for the property northeast of Hammond Branch. Key points are:

- 1. Required right-of-way will be 1.62 acres.
- 2. Capacity and safety along U.S. Route 29 will be increased.
- 3. Local circulation will be enhanced.
- 4. Possible traffic impact on Hammond Hills development.
- 5. Estimated cost is \$102,000 (0.102 million)

At Hopkins/Gorman Road:

(See Detailed Alternates Mapping, Sheet 2 of 9)

VI-C-1: Overpass

Alternate VI-C-1 was developed since the Alternates Public Workshop and after detailed environmental analysis. The existing signalized intersection at Johns Hopkins/Gorman Road and U.S. Route 29 would be closed. An overpass would be constructed approximately 200 feet north of the existing intersection. Diamond type ramps would be provided for the southbound movements. A loop ramp and an outer ramp would be provided for the northbound movements. The relocated Hopkins/Gorman Road would tie into the existing roadway approximately 1400 feet west of U.S. Route 29. The new roadway would form a T-intersection with the existing roadway approximately 300 feet east of the existing intersection of Hammond Parkway at Gorman Road. An access road would be provided from Gorman Road to Old Columbia Road near the Middle Patuxent River. Key points are:

- 1. Required right-of-way would be 12.36 acres.
- 2. Full access is provided to all properties on both sides of U.S. Route 29.

- 3. Capacity and safety on U.S. Route 29 is increased.
- 4. Estimated cost is \$7.710 million.

VI-C-2: Overpass (Selected)  
 (See Detailed Alternates Mapping, Sheet 3 of 9)

Alternate VI-C-2 is the concept presented by the developer. The existing signalized intersection at Johns Hopkins/Gorman Road and U.S. Route 29 would be closed. An overpass will be constructed approximately 200 feet north of the existing intersection, and Relocated Hopkins-Gorman Road will tie into existing Hopkins-Gorman approximately 700 feet east of Hammond Parkway. Access to southbound U.S. Route 29 would be via a diamond type ramp from relocated Hopkins-Gorman Road and via a ramp from the development roadway. Access to northbound U.S. Route 29 will be via a overpass ramp from the development roadway. Access from northbound U.S. Route 29 will be via a loop ramp in the northeast quadrant of the interchange. Access from southbound U.S. Route 29 will be via a ramp connecting to the developed roadway. This concept features five intersections: Relocated Hopkins-Gorman Road/access road, Relocated Hopkins-Gorman Road/Extended Hammond Parkway/Northbound exit ramp, Relocated Hopkins-Gorman Road/Southbound entrance ramp, Relocated Hopkins-Gorman/Old Columbia Road/the development roadway and an intersection in the development. Environmental impacts associated with this alternate were assessed after the Environmental Assessment. No impacts have been determined to be significant. See Table 1 for impacts. Key points are:

- 1. Required right-of-way will be 12.36 acres.
- 2. Full access is provided to all properties on both sides of U.S. Route 29.
- 3. Southbound traffic exiting U.S. Route 29 and northbound traffic entering U.S. Route 29 must travel through a signalized intersection in the development.
- 4. Capacity and safety on U.S. Route 29 is increased.
- 5. Estimated cost is \$9.226 million, part of which is being funded by the developer.

Segment VII -- Alternate C concepts are being considered at one location in Segment VII--at Rivers Edge Road.

VII-C-3: Underpass

This alternate is similar to Concept VII-C-2, which was dropped from further study, all aspects except that the location of the northbound ramps between U.S. Route 29 and Old Columbia Road would be changed. The ramps would not be located on the bridge and a higher design speed on the ramps would be provided. Key points of this alternate are:

- 1. Required right-of-way would be 2.94 acres.
- 2. Full access would be provided to Rivers Edge Road and

- Old Columbia Road.
- 3. Extensive earthwork would be required for the proposed ramps to Old Columbia Road.
- 4. Estimated cost is \$2.523 million.

VII-C-4: Underpass (Selected)

Concept VII-C-4 is a concept developed since the Alternates Public Workshop. This alternate is similar to Concept VII-C-3 in all aspects except that the location of the southbound ramps between U.S. Route 29 and Rivers Edge Road will be changed. Instead of tying in at the existing Rivers Edge Road/Longview Road intersections as in Concept VII-C-3, a new intersection will be formed on Rivers Edge Road between U.S. Route 29 and Longview Road. Key points are:

- 1. Required right-of-way will be 3.51 acres.
- 2. Full access will be provided to Rivers Edge Road and more direct access will be provided to Old Columbia Road traffic headed southbound on U.S. Route 29.
- 3. Extensive earthwork will be required for the proposed ramps to Old Columbia Road.
- 4. Estimated cost is \$2.669 million.

Segment VIII -- Alternate C concepts are being considered at two locations in Segment VIII--at Seneca Drive and at Gales Lane.

At Seneca Drive:

VIII-C-3: Overpass, Partial Diamond

This concept would close Seneca Drive as it exists today and construct a structure over U.S. Route 29 utilizing the Seneca Drive alignment and grades. A diamond ramp for access to and from southbound U.S. Route 29 from the overpass would be provided. Ramps to and from northbound U.S. Route 29 are also provided.

The overpass at Seneca Drive would extend west to Martin Road at Windsor Court. This would provide more direct access to U.S. Route 29 for Clemens Crossing. A service road would be provided to connect Allview Drive with Seneca Drive to provide access to the parcels in the northeast quadrant of the Seneca Drive/U.S. Route 29 intersection.

The alignment of Seneca Drive Extended was revised slightly from the alignment shown at the Alternates Public Workshop. The revision was made to minimize the impacts to the Dike Property and the natural water path on the Dike Property.

The southbound entrance ramp was relocated to provide access to traffic from the east side of U.S. Route 29. Key points of this alternate are:



1. Capacity and safety along U.S. Route 29 would be increased.
2. Required right-of-way would be 4.08 acres.
3. Full access would be provided to developments and properties on both sides of U.S. Route 29.
4. Local circulation would be improved with the connection to Martin Road.
5. Estimated cost is \$5.654 million.

VIII-C-4: Relocation of Seneca Drive-Overpass

This concept would relocate Seneca Drive approximately 500 feet to the south of its present location. This relocation would allow the proper grades and alignment for the proposed overpass. This Seneca Drive overpass would allow the southbound U.S. Route 29 movements to occur via diamond ramps. Along with this partial diamond, the proposed Seneca Drive overpass would make a direct connection to Martin Road at Windsor Court.

This concept would leave the existing Seneca Drive open for right-on, right-off movements only, and would provide a service road for the parcels located in the northeast quadrant of Seneca Drive and U.S. Route 29.

As with Concept VIII-C-3, the alignment of Seneca Drive Extended was revised slightly from the alignment shown at the Alternates Public Workshop in order to minimize the impacts to the Dike Property. Key points for this alternate are:

1. Required right-of-way would be 3.26 acres.
2. Capacity and safety along U.S. Route 29 would be increased.
3. Full access would be provided to developments and properties on both sides of U.S. Route 29.
4. Local circulation would be improved with the connection to Martin Road.
5. Disruption of the existing traffic movement during construction would be minimized by the relocation of Seneca Drive.
6. Estimated cost is \$5.997 million.

VIII-C-5A: Relocation of Seneca Drive-Overpass

Concept VIII-C-5A is a concept developed since the Alternates Public Workshop. This alternate would relocate Seneca Drive approximately 350 feet to the south of its present location. This location would allow the proper grades and alignment for the proposed overpass. This Seneca Drive overpass would allow the southbound U.S. Route 29 movements to occur via diamond ramps. Along with this partial diamond, the proposed Seneca Drive Extension would make a direct connection to Martin Road at Windsor Court. As described, this alternate would be similar to Concept

26

VIII-C-4 on the west side of U.S. Route 29. The differences are on the east side of the mainline. With a large radius on the connection of relocated Seneca Drive to existing Seneca Drive satisfying a 40 mph design speed, one additional residential displacement would be necessary.

The northbound right-on, right-off movements would take place approximately 50 feet north of the existing Seneca Drive. Old Columbia Road on the west side of Seneca Drive would form an at-grade intersection with Relocated Seneca Drive and the extension of the Service Road from Allview Drive. Key points are:

1. Required right-of-way would be 6.34 acres.
2. Capacity and safety along U.S. Route 29 would be increased.
3. Full access would be provided to developments and properties on both sides of U.S. Route 29.
4. Local circulation would be improved with the connection to Martin Road.
5. Estimated cost is \$4.337 million.

#### VIII-C-5B: Relocation of Seneca Drive - Overpass

Alternate VIII-C-5B was developed since the Alternates Public Workshop. The only difference between Concepts VIII-C-5A and VIII-C-5B is that the radius on the curve on the connection of Relocated Seneca Drive to Existing Seneca Drive was decreased, meeting a 30 mph design speed. Though the design speed is slightly reduced through this area, the tie-in is achieved without the additional property displacement. Key points are:

1. Required right-of-way will be 6.07 acres.
2. Capacity and safety along U.S. Route 29 will be increased.
3. Full access will be provided to development and properties on both sides of U.S. Route 29.
4. Local circulation will be improved with the connection to Martin Road.
5. Estimated cost is \$4.143 million.

#### VIII-C-5A-Modified: Relocation of Seneca Drive - Overpass (Selected)

Alternate VIII-C-5A-Modified was developed since the Public Hearing. This concept modifies the same radius that Alternate VIII-C-5B does. An improved design speed is obtained without the additional property displacement. Another key change with this concept lies west of Route 29. The southbound movements are achieved via loop ramps instead of diamond ramps. Both ramps are located in the northwest quadrant of the intersection. This alternate was developed after the environmental assessment and is

not included in the report. Impacts of the alternate have been studied and the change of radius and addition of loop ramps do not result in significant environmental impacts. Impacts have been summarized in Table 1 for this report. Key points are:

1. Required right-of-way would be 8.28 acres.
2. Capacity and safety along U.S. Route 29 would be increased.
3. Full access would be provided to development and properties on both sides of U.S. Route 29.
4. Local circulation would be improved with the connection to Martin Road.
5. Estimated cost is \$4.244 million.

At Gales Lane:

VIII-C-1: Right-on, Right-off

Gales Lane would remain open as it is today, with the right-on, right-off traffic movements only. Key points are:

1. No additional right-of-way required.
2. Crossover traffic would use adjacent interchanges.
3. Estimated cost is \$293,000 (0.293 million).

VIII-C-2: Service Road Connection (Selected)

Gales Lane access to U.S. Route 29 will be severed. Access will be provided by extending Gales Lane south to Gales Lane in the River Meadows Subdivision. Key points are:

1. Required right-of-way will be 0.89 acres.
2. Local circulation will be improved.
3. Estimated cost is \$253,000 (0.253 million).
4. Safety of U.S. Route 29 will be increased.

Segment IX -- Alternate C concepts are being considered at two locations--at Old Columbia Road and at Pepple Drive and Diamondback Drive.

At Old Columbia Road:

IX-C-1: Right-on, Right-off

Right-on, right-off traffic movement between northbound U.S. Route 29 and Old Columbia Road would be maintained. The median crossover would be closed. Key points are:

1. No additional right-of-way would be required.
2. Crossover traffic would use adjacent interchanges.
3. Estimated cost is \$141,000 (0.141 million).

IX-C-2: Roadway to Twin Knolls Road (Selected)

All access from Old Columbia Road onto U.S. Route 29 will be severed. To maintain access, a roadway that extends from Old Columbia Road to Twin Knolls Road will be constructed. This proposed roadway will allow the properties affected by the access control to gain access to U.S. Route 29 via Maryland Route 175. The location of the roadway was changed slightly from the Concept IX-C-2 which was shown in the Environmental Assessment. This change was made because the Maryland Historical Trust opposed the originally proposed location because of possible proximity impacts to the Felicity historic site. The selected alternate will allow the retention of more vegetation in the vicinity of the site and will avoid impacts to the west and north sides of Felicity. The current alternate saves more trees near the historic site. Key points are:

1. Required right-of-way will be 0.50 acres.
2. Local circulation will be improved.
3. Estimated cost is \$323,000 (0.323 million).

At Pepple Drive and Diamondback Drive:IX-C-1: Right-on, Right-off

Access to U.S. Route 29 at Pepple Drive would be severed. Diamondback Drive would remain open for the right-on, right-off traffic movement only. The curve on the entrance ramp from westbound Maryland Route 175 to northbound U.S. Route 29 would be flattened and lengthened to improve the design speed. These ramp improvements have been added to Alternate IX-C-1 since the Alternates Public Workshop. Key points are:

1. No additional right-of-way would be required.
2. Crossover traffic would use adjacent interchanges.
3. Improvements would be provided to the Maryland Route 175 on-ramp in the form of a continuous weaving lane and the flattening of the radius.
4. Estimated cost is \$280,000 (0.280 million).

IX-C-3: Improvements to Maryland Route 175 Ramp (Selected)

All access points to U.S. Route 29 at Pepple Drive and Diamondback Drive will be severed. The curve on the entrance ramp from westbound Maryland Route 175 to northbound U.S. Route 29 will be flattened and lengthened to improve the design speed. Key points are:

1. No additional right-of-way is required.
2. Capacity and safety of U.S. Route 29 will be improved.
3. Crossover traffic movements will be made at adjacent interchanges.
4. Improvements will be provided to the U.S. Route 175 ramp

- ramp by flattening the radius.
5. Estimated cost is \$210,000 (0.210 million).
  6. Access to U.S. Route 29 would be via Maryland Routes 108 and 175.

Segment X -- An Alternate C concept is being considered at Spring Valley Road.

X-C-2: No Access (Selected)

This concept will sever all access to U.S. Route 29 at Spring Valley Road. Key points are;

1. No additional right-of-way will be required.
2. Capacity and safety of U.S. Route 29 will be increased.
3. Possible adverse impacts to local circulation will occur.
4. No additional cost over that for lane widening.
5. Spring Valley Road has been closed due to Maryland Route 103 interchange construction. Howard County will provide access at this location.

Segment XI -- This segment of the U.S. Route 29 corridor exists today as a controlled access highway. No additional improvements are proposed.

2. Service Characteristics

a. Traffic Conditions

U.S. Route 29 is among the more important primary highways in Howard County and is the only one serving Columbia's town center. The growth in traffic volumes over the past thirty-five years along U.S. Route 29 has generally paralleled the growth in households and employment.

Current daily traffic volumes (vehicles per day) and hourly traffic volumes (vehicles per hour) are tabulated in Table 3 for the six segments of U.S. Route 29 studied in Howard County. The peak hour directional distribution is 62 percent A.M. southbound and 63 percent P.M. northbound. The A.M. and P.M. peak hours are 5.24 percent and 5.49 percent, respectively, of the average daily traffic.

TABLE 3  
1985 TRAFFIC DATA

<u>SEGMENT</u>	<u>LOCATION ALONG U.S. ROUTE 29</u>	<u>AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC VOLUME</u>	<u>PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC VOLUME</u>
VI	Howard County Line to North of Hopkins/Gorman Road	27,800	2,380
VII	North of Hopkins/Gorman Road to North of Maryland Route 32	31,400	2,985
VIII	North of Maryland Route 32 to Columbia's South Entrance	38,500	3,675
IX	Columbia's South Entrance to Maryland Route 108	47,900	4,380
X	Maryland Route 108 to North of Maryland Route 103	54,100	5,225
XI	North of Maryland Route 103 to U.S. Route 40	55,400	5,555

In accordance with the projected increases in land use in the study area, year 2015 traffic volumes are anticipated to significantly increase in comparison to today's volumes. Year 2015 daily and peak-hour traffic volumes for each study segment in Howard County are shown on Table 4.

TABLE 4  
DESIGN YEAR 2015 TRAFFIC DATA

<u>SEGMENT</u>	<u>LOCATION ALONG U.S. ROUTE 29</u>	<u>AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC VOLUME</u>	<u>PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC VOLUME</u>
VI	Howard County Line to North of Hopkins/Gorman Road	50,100	4,995
VII	North of Hopkins/Gorman Road to North of Maryland Route 32	51,800	4,955
VIII	North of Maryland Route 32 to Columbia's South Entrance	78,500	6,675
IX	Columbia's South Entrance to Maryland Route 108	92,100	6,835
X	Maryland Route 108 to North of Maryland Route 103	104,400	9,005
XI	North of Maryland Route 103 to U.S. Route 40	119,700	9,120

The existing truck usage comprises 5 percent of the average daily traffic (ADT) and A.M. and P.M. peak-hour traffic and will remain the same percentage for the design year of 2015.

In Table 5 are detailed results of the level of service analysis for the existing condition and for Alternate A and Alternate B for 2015 for each intersection on U.S. Route 29 in Howard County. When a LOS F is shown, the theoretical volume-to-capacity ratio (v/c) is also listed to indicate the severity of the intersection breakdown. For example, if v/c=1.25, capacity is exceeded theoretically by 25 percent. Results of the traffic analysis indicate extremely congested conditions (LOS F) at many intersections by year 2015 with Alternates A or B. These alternates would not meet future transportation demand for the corridor.

TABLE 5  
HOWARD COUNTY INTERSECTION LEVEL OF SERVICE

INTERSECTION	LEVEL OF SERVICE (A.M./P.M. PEAK HOURS)		
	-----1985-----		
	EXISTING CONDITION	ALTERNATE A	ALTERNATE B
U.S. 29 at Old Columbia Road (Sta. 657+)	A/A	D/F (1.06)	B/C
U.S. 29 at Hillcrest Drive	A/A	C/E	A/C
U.S. 29 at Hammond Drive	A/A	D/E	A/C
U.S. 29 at Johns Hopkins Road	C/D	F (1.25)/ F (1.38)	F(1.17)/ F(1.17)
U.S. 29 at Old Columbia Road (Sta. 656+)	A/B	B/F (1.06)	B/C
U.S. 29 at Rivers Edge Road	B/A	F (1.14)/D	D/D
U.S. 29 at Seneca Drive	A/C	C/F (1.44)	A/F (1.06)
U.S. 29 at South Entrance	C/E	*	*
U.S. 29 at Gales Lane	A/A	F (1.11)/ F (1.12)	C/D
U.S. 29 at Pepple Drive	C/D	F (1.21)/ F (1.29)	D/E
U.S. 29 at Diamondback Drive	C/C	F (1.17)/ F (1.23)	D/E

Notes: Alternate A = No Build  
 Alternate B = Lane Widening  
 Level of Service Determination Based on 1985 MD SHA Critical Lane Analysis  
 \*Closed except for special events

The level of service for freeway segments, ramps, intersections and weaves were calculated for the year 2015 for the Alternate C concepts. The traffic studies included an analysis of number of lanes required to meet future traffic demand within the corridor. Results clearly indicate a need for at least three lanes (in each direction). Levels of service F were projected in the study area for two lanes on the mainline at the following locations:

1. Northbound U.S. Route 29 south of Seneca Drive in Segment VIII, Concepts 3, 4, 5, 5a, and 5b.
2. Southbound U.S. Route 29 north of Seneca Drive in Segment VIII, Concepts 3, 4, 5, 5a, and 5b.
3. Northbound U.S. Route 29 south of Diamondback Drive in Segment IX, Concepts 1 and 3.
4. Northbound and Southbound U.S. Route 29 at Spring Valley Road in Segment X, Concept 2.

Widening to three lanes alleviates this breakdown condition, and Alternate C presently includes this widening.

Results of the capacity analysis indicate Alternate C would result in acceptable traffic flow conditions for future projected traffic volumes. At all but two locations, the freeway mainline would operate at LOS C or better conditions. LOS D would exist on the northbound lanes in Segment VIII south of Seneca Drive during the P.M. peak period for Concepts 3, 4, 5, 5a, and 5b. In Segment X, where projected traffic volumes are highest, LOS D is projected on both the northbound and southbound lanes at Spring Valley Road during the P.M. peak period for Concept 2. LOS E is projected at this location on the southbound lanes during the A.M. peak period.

At Old Columbia Road, concept segment VI, ramp LOS are as follows:

	A.M. PEAK			P.M. PEAK		
	Merge	Diverge	Ramp Proper	Merge	Diverge	Ramp Proper
Northbound U.S. 29 Exit Ramp	-	A	E	-	B	E
Northbound U.S. 29 Entrance Ramp (Standard Acceleration Lane)	A	-	C	B	-	C
(Auxiliary Lane)	A	-	C	A	-	C
Southbound U.S. 29 Exit Ramp (Standard Deceleration Lane)	-	B	E	-	A	E
(Auxiliary Lane)	-	A	E	-	A	E
Southbound U.S. 29 Entrance Ramp	A	-	C	A	-	C



At Seneca Drive, concept C-5A modified, ramp LOS are as follows:

	A.M. PEAK			P.M. PEAK		
	Merge	Diverge	Ramp Proper	Merge	Diverge	Ramp Proper
Northbound U.S. 29 Exit Ramp	-	A	E	-	A	E
Northbound U.S. 29 Entrance Ramp	A	-	E	A	-	E
Southbound U.S. 29 Exit Ramp	-	A	D	-	A	D
Southbound U.S. 29 Entrance Ramp	A	-	D	A	-	D

b. Accident Summary

U.S. Route 29, from the Patuxent River Bridge to U.S. Route 40 in Howard County, experienced 471 accidents during the three-year period of 1983 to 1985. This number resulted in an average accident rate of 106 accidents per 100 million vehicles miles of travel (acc/100MVM), which is lower than the weighted statewide average accident rate of 149acc/100MVM. The corresponding accident cost to the motoring and general public as a result of these accidents is approximately \$756,000/100MVM.

As indicated in Table 6 the three-year accident rates by accident severity and collision type are consistent with the corresponding statewide average rates for this type of roadway.

As shown, this segment of highway experienced two fatal accidents:

- o A pedestrian was struck while walking in the right-turn lane of northbound U.S. Route 29 at Maryland 216.
- o A driver, who had been drinking, drove his vehicle southbound in the northbound lane and struck a northbound vehicle.

There were two sections and five intersections that met the criteria for High Accident Locations (HAL) from 1983 to 1985. These locations are listed in Table 7.

At-grade intersections are experiencing the greatest number of conflicts and accidents. Of 471 accidents, 265 (or 56%) were intersection-related accidents. As traffic volumes increase, at-grade intersections will experience an increase in congestion, delay, and number of accidents.

The roadway widening and removal of at-grade intersections, such as by interchange construction, proposed by recommended Alternate C concepts will reduce congestion and delays. It also is projected to reduce the accident rate by 33% to 71 acc/100 MVM.

TABLE 6  
ACCIDENT RATES BY ACCIDENT SEVERITY,  
1983-1985

<u>SEVERITY</u>	<u>NUMBER OF ACCIDENTS</u>	<u>RATE/100MVM</u>	<u>STATEWIDE AVERAGE RATE</u>
Fatal Accidents	2	0.5	1.6
Injury Accidents	273	61.2	83.8
Property Damage Only	196	44.0	64.0
Total Accidents	471	105.6	149.0

ACCIDENT RATES BY COLLISION TYPE,  
1983-1985

<u>COLLISION TYPE</u>	<u>NUMBER OF ACCIDENTS</u>	<u>RATE/100MVM</u>	<u>STATEWIDE AVERAGE RATE</u>
Opposite Direction	7	1.6	2.1
Rear End	205	46.0	48.1
Left Turn	40	9.0	17.1
Sideswipe	32	7.2	12.7
Angle	70	15.7	24.7
Pedestrian	5	1.1	2.5
Fixed Object	42	6.4	19.1
Parked Vehicle	4	0.9	2.3
Other Collisions	66	14.8	20.2

TABLE 7  
HIGH ACCIDENT LOCATIONS-HIGHWAY SECTIONS,  
1983-1985

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>YEAR LISTED</u>
.12 mile south of Vista Road to .18 mile north of Maryland 32	1985
.23 mile south of Owen Brown Road to .27 mile north of Owen Brown Road	1983

HIGH ACCIDENT LOCATIONS-INTERSECTIONS  
1983-1985

<u>INTERSECTION</u>	<u>YEARS LISTED</u>
U.S. Route 29 at Johns Hopkins/Gorman Road	1983, 1985 <sup>1</sup>
U.S. Route 29 at Maryland 32	1984, 1985 <sup>2</sup>
U.S. Route 29 at Owen Brown Road	1983, 1984, 1985 <sup>1</sup>
U.S. Route 29 at Maryland 108	1983, 1984, 1985 <sup>3</sup>
U.S. Route 29 at Spur to Maryland Route 103	1983, 1984, 1985 <sup>1</sup>

- 1 - Interchange Proposed
- 2 - Interchange Constructed
- 3 - Interchange Under Construction

C. Environmental Consequences of Recommended Alternate

A detailed Environmental Analysis of the study area and the alternates under consideration was performed to determine the potential environmental consequences of the proposed project. The following summarizes the environmental impacts of the Selected Alternate.

1. Socioeconomic Impacts

Socioeconomic impacts associated with the Selected Alternate and Alternate Concepts are described for the following impact areas: (1) land use and planning, (2) displacements and relocations, (3) neighborhoods, (4) community facilities and services, (5) historic and archeological resources, and (6) the economy.

a. Land Use and Planning

The Selected Alternate is consistent with land use and development planning for the corridor. It will provide both the safest and most efficient response to future travel demand, thus improving serviceability of U.S. Route 29. The improved serviceability will further increase the desirability of the corridor for additional development.

b. Displacements and Relocations

The Selected Alternate will require the displacement of six residences and one business. Three of the residences are located at Hopkins Gorman in Segment VI, two residences are located at Seneca Drive in Segment VIII and one at Rivers Edge Road in Segment VII. Additionally, no minorities, elderly, or handicapped persons will be affected. Sufficient comparable and affordable replacement housing is available in the project area. A roofing business would be displaced at Hopkins/Gorman Road. The business should be able to relocate in the area. In accordance, with the "Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970," the State Highway Administration shall not proceed with any phase of a project causing relocation of any persons until it has furnished assurance that all displaced persons will be relocated satisfactorily to comparable, decent, safe, and sanitary housing. A lead time of 12 to 15 months is required to complete all relocations.

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 law and regulations which prohibit discrimination on the grounds of race, color, sex, national origin, age, religion, physical or mental handicap in all State Highway Administration program projects funded in whole or in part by the Federal Highway Administration. The State Highway Administration will not discriminate in highway planning, highway design, highway construction, the acquisition of right-of-way, or the provision of relocation advisory assistance. This policy has been incorporated into all levels of the highway planning process in order that proper consideration may be given to the social, economic, and environmental effects of all highway projects. Alleged

discriminatory actions should be addressed to the Equal Opportunity Section of the Maryland State Highway Administration for investigation.

c. Neighborhoods

Alternate C will change the accessibility to and from some adjacent neighborhoods. Table 8 shows the effect of the Selected Alternate concepts on the neighborhood.

TABLE 8  
SELECTED ALTERNATE CONCEPTS - EFFECTS ON NEIGHBORHOODS

<u>CONCEPT</u>	<u>AFFECTED NEIGHBORHOOD</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION OF POTENTIAL EFFECT</u>
Segment VI - Concept 3 Extending Crest Road from Hammond Hills	Hillcrest Heights Hammond Hills (proposed)	Encourages development Adds Traffic
Segment VIII - Concept 5a Seneca Drive to Martin Road	Clemens Crossing	Adds traffic to neighborhood streets
Segment VIII - Concept 2 Gales Lane	Talbot Springs Stevens Forest	Adds traffic to neighborhood streets
Segment IX - Concept 3 Pepple Drive/Diamondback Drive	Guilford Downs	Reduces traffic to neighborhood streets

Alternate C will reduce traffic congestion on Maryland Route 29, thus encouraging use of intersecting routes. As a result, the Selected Alternate will enhance the growth potential of existing neighborhoods (Hillcrest Heights, northwest of Maryland Route 108 in the Village of Dorsey Search, and south of Ellicott City) and will encourage development adjacent to Maryland Routes 216, 108, and 103, and U.S. Route 40.

The Selected Alternate will not bisect any existing or proposed residential neighborhoods nor present any barriers to neighborhood interaction. The Alternate will not impact community cohesion. Neither will it impact any social groups, such as, the elderly and physically handicapped who may be dependent upon public transportation.

d. Community Facilities and Services

Community facilities and services include emergency services, transportation, health care, education, religious, and recreation facilities. The Selected Alternate will provide the following beneficial impacts for each facility or service:

- o Transportation - will meet all identified transportation goals and would meet projected transportation demand. In addition, the Selected Alternate will provide faster transit trips and quicker access to park-and-ride lots.
- o Emergency Services - will provide faster response time over current conditions to most areas.
- o Health Care - will lessen travel time to facilities.
- o Educational - will improve safety to Clemen's Crossing Elementary, Clarksville Middle and Atholton High Schools from Rivers Edge Road, and to Clarksville Middle and Oakland Mills High Schools from Seneca Drive and Gales Lane, and to Hammond Elementary and Middle School and Atholton High Schools from Hopkins/Gorman Road.
- o Religious - will improve access to Locust United Methodist, Christ Memorial Presbyterian and Atholton Seventh Day Adventist Churches from Seneca Drive.

Adverse community service and facility impacts will be minimal. Impacts include the following:

- o Transportation - will limit pedestrian and bicycle crossing U.S. Route 29 to major interchanges; however, sidewalks will be provided on all bridge crossings, making access safer than current conditions. During construction there will be slowing as traffic patterns are changed; two lanes north and south will be opened at all times.
- o Emergency Services - response times will increase to facilities in certain neighborhoods in Segment VI at Old Columbia Road, Segment IX at Pepple Drive, Segment VIII at Gales Lane, Segment IX at Old Columbia Road, and Segment X at Spring Valley Road.
- o Educational - school bus travel times will be increased in segment VI for Hammond Elementary Clarksville Elementary, Hammond Middle and Clarksville Middle Schools at Old Columbia Road, in Segment IX for Oakland Mills Middle and Howard High Schools at Pepple Drive and Diamondback Drive, and in Segment X for Northfield Elementary, Dunloggin Middle, and Centennial High School at Spring Valley Road.

e. Historic and Archeological Resources

No property will be required from the historic sites identified as on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places by Alternate C.

Scaggs Place is located in the southwest quadrant of the U.S. Route 29 and Johns Hopkins/Gorman Road intersection where two additional lanes will be constructed within the median as part of Alternate VI-C-2. The existing signalized intersection at Johns Hopkins/Gorman Road and U.S. Route 29 would be closed. An overpass will be constructed approximately 200 feet north of the existing intersection, and relocated Hopkins-Gorman Road will tie into existing Hopkins-Gorman approximately 700 feet east of Hammond Parkway. Access to southbound U.S. Route 29 would be via a diamond type ramp from relocated Hopkins-Gorman Road within the same quadrant as the historic site. None the less, the take-off point of the ramp will be approximately 400 feet north of Scaggs Place. The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) has indicated that Scaggs Place may be affected, but not adversely (See letter in Correspondence Section dated March 4, 1987).

Athol is located near the U.S. Route 29/Seneca Drive intersection in the vicinity of Alternate VIII C-5A-Modified. This alternate will relocate Seneca Drive approximately 350 feet south of its present location. This location will allow the proper grades and alignment for the overpass. Seneca Drive will be extended to connect to Martin Drive at Windsor Court, northwest of Athol. The southbound movement ramps are located north of Athol and the proposed Seneca Drive Extension. The SHPO has indicated that the site will be affected, but not adversely (See letter in Correspondence Section dated July 10, 1987).

Kelly's Store House, the Gales-Gaither House and Felicity are located on Old Columbia Pike halfway between the U.S. Route 29/Maryland Route 108 intersection and the proposed U.S. Route 29/Broken Land Parkway intersection. All three are currently reached via a segment of the Old Columbia Pike which is parallel to and east of U.S. Route 29.

U.S. Route 29 will be widened by 2 lanes within the median of the existing roadway as part of Alternate IX-C-2. All access from Old Columbia Road onto U.S. Route 29 will be severed. To maintain access, a roadway that extends from Old Columbia Road to Twin Knolls Road will be constructed. This proposed roadway will allow the properties affected by the access control to gain access to U.S. Route 29 via Maryland Route 175.

The proposed access road will be located between the Gales-Gaither House and Felicity. The roadway, located in an area of heavy vegetation, will be largely unseen from both sites.

This alternate will affect all three of these sites, but not adversely. The SHPO agrees with this assessment in his July 10, 1987 letter which is included in the Correspondence Section.

The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation in their letter dated November 3, 1987, supported the no adverse effect determination of this project upon Scagg's Place, Athol, Kelly's Store House, Gales-Gaither House, and Felicity. This letter is included in the Correspondence Section.

The Maryland Geological Survey, Division of Archeology, stated that an archeological survey was not required as the proposed improvements occur in existing medians or along road berms. The SHPO agrees with this finding (See letter in Correspondence Section).

f. Economic Impacts

By increasing the highway capacity to meet future travel demand, the Selected Alternate will benefit the economic development of the project area. The construction of the Hopkins/Gorman interchange will enhance the development of the planned employment center northwest of the new interchange. By reducing hazardous conditions and alleviating traffic congestion, land values might be expected to increase adjacent to U.S. Route 29.

2. Natural Environment Impacts

a. Surface Water

One stream relocation will be required by the Selected Alternate in the vicinity of Hopkins/Gorman Road (Sheet 3 of Alternate Mapping). Construction of the service road between Hopkins/Gorman Road and Old Columbia Road will require rechannelization of approximately 610 feet of an intermittent tributary of the Middle Patuxent River. The stream length of the relocated section will be maintained; and to the extent possible the existing slope and grade will be maintained. Because there will be no loss in stream length and because a natural stream channel will be used, no significant scouring is expected. After stabilization of the new channel, no long-term impacts will occur.

In addition to the one stream relocation, the Selected Alternate will involve construction at 14 stream locations; 10 will be new crossings and 4 will be extensions of culverts or bridges. The 10 new crossings will be as follows: 4 crossings of an intermittent tributary of the Middle Patuxent River at Hopkins/Gorman Road (Sheet 3), 3 crossings at a small tributary of the Middle Patuxent River at Rives Edge Road (Sheet 4), 1 new crossing of an intermittent tributary of Beaver Run at Seneca Drive (Sheet 5), 1 new crossing of a tributary of the Little Patuxent River at Gales Lane (Sheet 6), and 1 new crossing of a tributary of the Little Patuxent River at Twin Knolls Road (Sheet 7). All of the 10 new stream crossings will be accomplished by using culverts. The 4 extensions of existing culverts or bridges will be as follows: extending the existing northbound piers at the main branch of the Middle Patuxent River to provide for bridge widening (Sheet 3), two extensions of the culvert at Beaver Run (east and west of U.S. Route 29) (Sheet 5), and extending the culvert at Maryland Route 175 for a tributary of the Little Patuxent River (Sheets 7 and 8).

Erosion and sediment control procedures developed during final design will be used to mitigate the impact of stream sedimentation. This will include "Standard Erosion and Sediment Control Procedures" as specified by Maryland SHA as well as MD DNR - Water Resources Administration's (WRA's) standards and specifications. In compliance with the "1983 Maryland Standards and Specifications for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control," an erosion and sediment

control plan will be followed. A Waterway Construction Permit may be required during final design for each stream crossing.

Stormwater runoff will be managed under DNR's Stormwater Management Regulations and will be in compliance with COMAR 05.08.05.05. Approval as per Section 8-11-05 and 8-11A-05 of the Natural Resources Article, Annotated Code of Maryland relative to sediment and erosion control and stormwater management will be obtained. All efforts will be made to comply with the objectives of the Patuxent River Policy Plan, regarding non-point pollution and integrity of streamside environment.

b. Wetlands

Pursuant to Executive Order 11990, Protection of Wetlands, wetland areas within the project area were identified. National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) maps were initially reviewed to identify wetlands. Additionally, a field view was conducted in October, 1986 with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and various divisions within the Maryland Department of Natural Resources and September 15, 1987 with the U.S. Corps of Engineers, to verify the location and classification of wetlands. Minutes of this meeting are in Section VI. A total of 20 wetlands were identified in the area; these were then classified in accordance with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service system (FWS/OBS-79/31). The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has been asked to review the wetlands study and conduct a Field view if necessary. No tidal wetlands are located within the study area.

Efforts were made to minimize impacts to the non-tidal wetlands. However, due to construction of grade separations and service roads necessary to provide control of access along U.S. Route 29, avoidance of all wetlands was not feasible. Seven of the 20 area wetlands will be impacted by the Selected Alternate. The affected wetlands, their location, classification, dominant vegetation, approximate total size and area affected is given on Table 9. A total of approximately 0.756 acres of wetlands will be required by the Selected Alternate.

No encroachments on Wetlands #1, #2, #3, #4, #7, #8, #9, #10, #14, #15, #16, #17, or #20 will occur with the Selected Alternate. The impacts on Wetlands #5, #6, #11, #12, #13, #18, and #19 are discussed below.

Wetlands #5 is a palustrine scrub/shrub wetland associated with the 100-year floodplain of the Middle Patuxent River (See sheet 4 of Alternates mapping). In addition to scrub/shrub wetlands adjacent to the river, palustrine forested wetlands are also associated with this large wetland. The scrub/shrub area of this wetland that will be impacted is located under the existing U.S. Route 29 bridge. Vegetation in this area includes sycamore, willow, slippery elm and ash. Deer tongue, poison ivy, jewelweed and grasses are also found along the banks of the river. The wetland area impacted function, mainly as shoreline anchoring. The Selected Alternate will require approximately 240 square feet (.006 acres) of this wetland to widen the bridge (extension of existing piers) over the Middle Patuxent River. Because Wetland #5 is a linear wetland that is perpendicular to the U.S. Route 29, it cannot be avoided by the proposed widening. Traffic characteristics render it infeasible to widen U.S. Route 29 without widening this bridge.



TABLE 9

## AFFECTED WETLANDS

WETLAND #	LOCATION	USFWS CLASSIFICATION	DOMINANT VEGETATION	APPROX. TOTAL SIZE IN ACRES	AREA AFFECTED BY RECOMMENDED ALTERNATE (ACR)
#5	Main crossing of Middle Patuxent River Station 795	Palustrine, Scrub/Shrub, Broad-leaved Deciduous; temporary flooding	sycamore, willow, slippery elm, ash, grasses, deer tongue, poison ivy, jewelweed	300+	0.006
#6	Tributary to Middle Patuxent River near Rivers Edge Road Station 815	Palustrine, Scrub/Shrub, Broad-leaved Deciduous; temporary flooding	alder, willow, button-bush, red maple	0.5	0.2
#11	Beaver Run near Seneca Drive Station 880	Palustrine, Scrub/Shrub, Broad-leaved Deciduous; temporary flooding	alder, willow, bristly locust, honeysuckle	10+ (total of #11 & #12)	0.02
#12	Beaver Run near Seneca Drive Station 880	Palustrine, Forested, Broad-leaved Deciduous; temporary flooding	red maple, blackwillow, river birch, black locust, boxelder, silver maple; understory: honeysuckle, foxglove, dewberry, sweet cicely	10+ (total of #11 & #12)	0.22
#13	Tributary to Little Patuxent River near Gales Lane Station 965	Palustrine, Forested, Broad-leaved Deciduous; temporary flooding	tulip poplar, black willow, river birch, black locust, boxelder, gray birch	2+	0.1
#18	Tributary to Little Patuxent River near Twin Knolls Road Station 1015	Palustrine, Scrub/Shrub, Broad-leaved Deciduous; temporary flooding/ Palustrine, Emergent, Narrow-leaved Persistent; temporary flooding	black willow trees and shrubs, red maple, boxelder, swamp rose, bristly locust, sedges, rushes, sweetflag	2+	0.03
#19	Tributary to Little Patuxent River near MD 175 ramp Station 1035	Palustrine, Scrub/Shrub, Broad-leaved Deciduous; temporary flooding/ Palustrine, Emergent, Narrow-leaved Persistent	willows (trees and shrubs), box elder, bristly locust, wild garlic, sedges, rushes	2+	0.1

42

Wetland #6 is a palustrine, scrub/shrub wetland associated with a tributary to the Middle Patuxent River near Rivers Edge Road (See Sheet 4 of Alternates mapping). This wetland is dominated by alder, willow, buttonbush and red maple. This wetland functions mainly for sediment trapping. The Selected Alternate will require approximately 0.2 acre from this wetland for placement of a new culvert to provide for a ramp from southbound U.S. Route 29 to the Rivers Edge underpass. A shift in the Rivers Edge underpass would avoid this wetland but would impact stormwater management facilities and approximately three residences in the southwest quadrant of this area. A shift to the north would impact a minimum of five residences in the northwest quadrant.

Wetland #11 is a palustrine, scrub/shrub wetland associated with Beaver Run on the east side of U.S. Route 29 (See Sheet 5). This wetland area is dominated by alder, willow, bristly locust and honeysuckle, although little vegetation exists in the area that would be impacted. This wetland functions as fish habitat and sediment trapping. Approximately 0.02 acres of this wetland will be required by the Selected Alternate to extend the existing culvert to the east of U.S. Route 29. This culvert extension is required by concepts 4, 5a, 5b, and 5a-Modified in this location to provide access along Shaker Drive (Old Columbia Road). Concept 3 would not have impacted the wetland but was not selected because it did not allow for the proper grades and alignment for the proposed overpass.

Wetland #12 is a palustrine, forested wetland associated with Beaver Run on the west side of U.S. Route 29 (See Sheet 5). The dominant vegetation in this area include red maple, black willow, river birch, black locust and silver maple. The understory includes honeysuckle, fox grape, dewberry, and sweet cicely. Functions of this wetland are wildlife habitat, nutrient cycling, and sediment trapping. The Selected Alternate will require approximately 0.22 acres from this wetland to extend the existing culvert on the west side of U.S. Route 29, to provide for relocated Seneca Drive and the southbound exit and entrance ramps for U.S. Route 29. The southbound entrance ramp crosses wetland #12 twice. The design of this concept was required due to safety criteria. A shift to the north would impact at least one building and much of the developable land associated with the 7th Day Adventist facilities.

Wetland #13 is a mature palustrine, forested wetland associated with a tributary to the Little Patuxent River near Gales Lane (See Sheet 6). The primary function of this wetland is nutrient cycling. Other functions include wildlife habitat, sediment trapping, and food chain support. Vegetation at this wetland includes tulip poplar, black willow, river birch, black locust, boxelder, and gray birch. Approximately 0.01 acres of this wetland will be required by the Selected Alternate to extend Gales Lane. Because access along U.S. Route 29 would be severed for those residences north of Gales Lane, a connection with Gales Lane is required. The Recommended Alternate is the only concept that meets the designated safety criteria of minimizing entrance on U.S. Route 29.

Wetland #18 is a combination of palustrine scrub/shrub and palustrine emergent wetlands (See Sheet 7). This wetland is associated with a tributary of the Little Patuxent River in the vicinity of Twin Knolls Road. Dominant vegetation at this wetland includes black willow trees and shrubs, red maple,

and box elder, swamp rose, bristley locust, sedges, rushes and sweet flag are also present. This wetland functions as wildlife habitat and sediment trapping. The Selected Alternate will require approximately 0.03 acres from this wetland to provide for the roadway connection to Twin Knolls Road. If access to U.S. Route 29 from Old Columbia Road were provided in this location, the roadway to Twin Knolls would not be needed; however this would not meet the criteria of minimizing entrance onto the highway. A previous concept (old C-2) that was evaluated at this location would impact a larger area of this wetland (0.1 acres) and would also take some of the trees that act as a buffer to Felicity, a historic resource. This concept was revised based on comments from Maryland Historical Trust and shifted southward to minimize impacts to Felicity.

Wetland #19 is also a combination of palustrine scrub/shrub and palustrine emergent wetlands (See Sheets 7 and 8). This wetland is associated with a tributary to the Little Patuxent River near the Maryland Route 175 westbound ramp to U.S. Route 29 northbound. Vegetation at this area includes willow trees and shrubs, box elder, bristly locust, wild garlic, sedges and rushes. The affected wetland functions as a fishery and wildlife habitat, and for sediment trapping. Approximately 0.1 acre of this wetland would be required by the Selected Alternate to straighten and lengthen the Maryland Route 175 ramp. This ramp is being relocated because the present ramp does not meet the safety design criteria. Because the ramp is perpendicular to this wetland, it cannot be avoided.

The 0.756 acres of wetlands cited represents a maximum area of wetland that could be impacted. All possible mitigation measures will be incorporated into project design to minimize wetland impacts, including erosion and sediment control procedures, minimizing the amount of fill by using slopes of 1½:1, and replacement of wetlands.

The State Highway Administration will replace impacted wetlands on a 1:1 basis where necessary, as determined by the Corps of Engineers. Replacement options on-site and off-site are being considered.

Wetland Finding

The Selected Alternate includes all practicable measures to minimize harm to wetlands. Suitable mitigation for wetlands taken will be developed during final design. Because the wetlands affected by the Selected Alternate are a relatively small part of the wetland resources (See Table 9) in the Middle Patuxent River and Little Patuxent River watersheds and wetlands will be replaced, no long-term adverse impacts are expected to result.

c. Floodplains

The Selected Alternate will require 1.206 acres from the 100-year floodplain: .006 acres from the 100-year floodplain of the Middle Patuxent River, and 1.2 acres from the 100-year floodplain of the Little Patuxent River. Of the total 1.206 acres impacted, roadway widening will place fill in approximately 0.806 acres of the floodplain. The remaining 0.4 acres of floodplain will be filled for placement of a culvert to extend Gales Lane.

In accordance with Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management, and FHPM 6-7-3-2 each floodplain encroachment was evaluated to determine its' significance. Where practicable, longitudinal and significant encroachments in the 100-year floodplain should be avoided. Roadway widening within the median is considered a longitudinal encroachment. Because the existing roadway is within the floodplain, roadway widening cannot avoid impact in the floodplain. The transverse encroachment at Gales Lane is considered insignificant because it does not: (1) interrupt or terminate a community's only evacuation route, (2) significantly affect the natural and beneficial floodplain values, or (3) produce an increased risk associated with flooding such as property loss or hazard to life. Also the proposed encroachments will not support further development within the floodplain.

The use of standard hydraulic design techniques for all waterway openings will incorporate structures to limit upstream flood level increases and approximate existing downstream flow rates. Use of state-of-the-art sediment and erosion control techniques and stormwater management controls will minimize risks and impacts to the beneficial floodplain values.

Floodplain Finding

Because the Selected Alternate will produce a longitudinal encroachment into the 100-year floodplain this floodplain finding is required. Roadway widening within the median of U.S. Route 29 is considered a longitudinal encroachment since it is more or less parallel to and within the floodplain. Widening U.S. Route 29 will encroach on the 100-year floodplains of the Middle Patuxent River and the Little Patuxent River. Approximately 0.006 acres within the Middle Patuxent River floodplain, and 0.8 acres within the Little Patuxent will be filled.

Because the existing roadway is within the 100-year floodplain, roadway widening cannot avoid impacting the floodplain. This is the only location in which the roadway can be widened, and therefore is the only practicable alternative that meets the needs of expanding and upgrading the present facility. Roadway widening is considered insignificant if it does not: 1) interrupt or terminate a community's only evacuation routes, 2) significantly affect the natural and beneficial floodplain values in the area, or 3) produce an increased risk associated with flooding such as property loss or hazard to life. Based on preliminary hydrology and hydrogeology studies conducted, the project would meet these criteria and thus would not be considered significant.

Construction in the floodplain will be designed to conform with applicable state and local floodplain protection standards. During final design, additional hydrology and hydrogeology studies will be done in order to evaluate any significant encroachments.

d. Natural Habitat and Wildlife

The Selected Alternate will require approximately 9.3 acres of natural habitat (abandoned field shrub and woodland). Coordination with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has indicated that there are no federally listed or proposed threatened or endangered plant or animal species known to exist in the

area. Coordination with the Department of Natural Resources also revealed no threatened or endangered wildlife species.

The glassy darter (Etheostoma vitreum), a fish species designated as rare by the Maryland Natural Heritage Program, is found in the Middle Patuxent River at the U.S. Route 29 crossing. Widening of the Middle Patuxent will disturb approximately a 240-square-foot area on the banks of the river. Erosion and sediment control procedures will mitigate potential impacts at this location. The nearest construction activities to the two rare amphipods (Stygobromus potomacus and Stygobromus pizzini) will be over two miles from where they are found near U.S. Route 40.

e. Prime Farmland

The Selected Alternate will require acquisition of approximately 0.7 acres of prime farmland at Hopkins/Gorman Road. In accordance with the Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981, a Farmland Conversion Impact Rating Form (Form A-1006) was initially completed and processed for the project in coordination with the Soil Conservation Service. (See Appendix B) However, the only selected concept that will impact prime farmland was developed subsequent to this coordination with the SCS. Using the Howard County LESA system, the actual site assessment for this concept is 56 out of 160 points. Assuming the maximum 100 points for the relative value of the farmland (would most likely be less), the total score would be 156 points. Because the total score is less than 160 points, the impact on prime farmland is not considered significant as per the SCS process.

3. Air Quality

An air quality analysis was performed to determine the air quality impacts of the proposed alternates in relationship to ambient air quality standards. Future air quality impacts for the project area were determined for the years 1995 and 2015 for each Alternate in Segments VI through X. Table 10 presents the worst-case impacts among the various modeling sites for the Alternates A, B, and C. The analysis indicated that in all cases Alternate C would result in the least air quality impacts. Roadway widening will increase traffic speeds on U.S. Route 29, which will decrease CO emission rates. The access control improvements of Alternate C will further increase average speeds over Alternate B, and subsequently reduce emission rates and air quality impacts. There are no substantial difference in air quality impacts among the various Alternate C concepts within each segment. Therefore the Selected Alternate C concepts will not result in a violation of Air Quality Impacts.

TABLE 10  
PROJECTED WORST-CASE CARBON MONOXIDE CONCENTRATIONS (PPM)

AIR QUALITY SENSITIVE AREA	YEAR	1-HOUR CO IMPACT (ppm)			8-HOUR CO IMPACT (ppm)		
		ALT A	ALT B	ALT C	ALT A	ALT B	ALT C
A	1995	3.8	3.7	3.7	2.1	2.1	2.1
	2015	10.2	5.6	3.6	4.0	2.6	2.0
B	1995	3.9	3.7	3.8	2.1	2.1	2.1
	2015	14.2	7.4	3.6	5.2	3.1	2.0
C	1995	10.2	8.9	3.7	6.1	5.6	2.1
	2015	13.6	13.4	4.2	7.9	8.0	2.4
D	1995	4.2	3.9	4.9*	2.3	2.2	3.2*
	2015	14.2	12.2	5.3*	6.5	5.6	3.3*
E	1995	7.8	7.1	3.7	4.1	3.7	2.1
	2015	10.1	10.2	3.6	5.1	5.1	2.0
F	1995	8.5	5.8	3.7	4.0	2.9	2.1
	2015	12.7	11.0	3.6	5.6	5.0	2.0
G	1995	10.1	6.6	3.7	4.6	3.2	2.1
	2015	16.0	14.2	3.7	6.2	5.4	2.0
H	1995	12.2	3.7	3.7	6.5	2.1	2.1
	2015	18.3	3.6	3.6	10.1	2.0	2.0

NOTE: The one-hour NAAQS is 30 ppm; the eight-hour NAAQS is 9 ppm.

\*The Alternate C concept which yielded the value was not modeled, but based on a similarly modeled concept, the impacts were estimated.

Selected Alternate is in BOLD TYPE.

4. Noise

A noise impact analysis was conducted within the study area. Nine noise sensitive areas (NSA) were identified within the project area and a representative noise measurement was taken for each noise sensitive area. The predicted future noise levels will increase a maximum of 6 dBA, Leq, over present noise levels. None of the NSA's would experience an increase of 10 dBA over present conditions, however, the FHWA Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC) of 67 dBA, Leq, would be exceeded at 78 sites for the Build Alternate. A summary of existing noise levels, future noise levels and abatement analysis of impacts is presented in Table 11.

D. Summary of Public Involvement

1. Alternates Public Workshop

The Alternates Public Workshop was held on February 8, 1986. This served as the first formal contact with the public. The purpose of the public workshop was to: acquaint interested persons with the project planning process, present findings of the engineering, environmental, and socioeconomic studies, and provide an opportunity for public involvement in the project planning process. The workshop offered a large number of individuals and groups the opportunity to express their opinions and concerns. Photogrammetric mapping depicting the various alternates were on display, with representatives available to answer questions and record comments. A brochure which highlighted key information and provided brief descriptions, maps, and typical sections of the alternates was distributed at the workshop. The public was encouraged to participate in the workshop to ensure their input in the decision-making process.

A debriefing meeting was then held on April 3, 1986, to determine which of the study alternates should be carried forward to further study based on the results of the workshop.

2. Positions Taken

The preferences of the community associations at the Location/Design Hearing were as follows:

<u>Community Associations</u>	<u>Alternate Preference</u>
Holiday Hills Riverside Estates	VII-C-3 Rivers Edge Road
Hickory Ridge Village	VIII-C-5b Seneca Drive
Hammond Village Citizens Associations	VI-C-3 Hopkins Gorman Overpass VI-C-2 Hammond-Hillcrest
Seabring Civic Association	VIII-C-5 and 5b Seneca Drive
Atholton Manor Civic Association	No preference stated

TABLE 11  
NOISE ABATEMENT ANALYSIS SUMMARY  
U.S. ROUTE 29  
HOWARD COUNTY, MARYLAND

Noise Sensitive Area	# of Homes w/Greater than 5 dBA Reduction & Greater Than 67 dBA	Noise Modeling Site	Description of Modeling Site	Noise Levels Range (Leq)					Barriers			Cost Per Residence (\$ x 1000)
				Existing		No Build (Design Year)	Build (Design Year)	Build w/ Barrier (Design Year)	Length (ft.)	Height (ft.)	Cost (1) (\$ mil.)	
				Ambient (2)	Calibrs. (Modeled)							
A	1	A-1	Scaggs House, historical residence	60	62	66	71	60	+1000	16	0.241	214.0
B	11	B-1	Residence south of Hillcrest Heights			61-69	67-75	60-65	+2600	16-21	1.430	130.0
		B-2	Residence south of Hillcrest Heights									
		B-3	Residence, Hillcrest Heights at Hammond Drive									
		B-4	Hammond Village, west of Irae Court, residence	57	58							
		B-5	Hillcrest Heights at Hillcrest Drive, residence	67	67							
C	15	C-1	Church of God State Headquarters, office			60-67	65-72	58-64	+3900	16	1.991	133.0
		C-2	Riverside Estates, south of Rivers Edge Road, residence									
		C-3	Riverside Estates at Longview Road, residence									
		C-4	Riverside Estates at Vista Road, residence									
		C-5	Riverside Estates at Rivers Edge Road, residence	63	64							
		C-6	Riverside Estates at Rivers Edge Road, residence									
D	13	D-1	Arrowhead at Flapjack Court, residence	66	65	61-66	65-70	57-61	+1500	16	0.648	50.0
		D-2	Arrowhead, north of Maryland Route 32, residence									
E	7	E-1	River Meadows, south of River Meadows Drive, residence			60-69	65-73	62-65	+2000	21	1.372	196.0
		E-2	River Meadows at Offshore Green, residence	68	67							
		E-3	River Meadows at Rosineta Road, residence									
		E-4	Residence at Galas Lane									
F	37	F-1	Tor Apartments, north of Galas Lane	62	60	60-68	65-73	55-63	+4800	16-26	2.830	76.5
		F-2	Tor Apartments									
		F-3	Autumn Crest Apartments									
		F-4	Autumn Crest Apartments, north of Tor Apartments	60	61							
		F-5	Oakland Mills, on Wandering Way, residence									
		F-6	Oakland Mills, on Wandering Way, residence									
		F-7	Oakland Mills, on Wandering Way, residence									
		F-8	Kelly's Store House, historical/residence	65	65							
		F-9	Felicity, historical/residence									
		F-10	Autumn Crest Apartments									
G	26	G-1	Guilford Downs at Pepple Road, residence	64	64	63-69	67-73	64-72	+3700	16-21	2.329	90.0
		G-2	Guilford Downs on West Penafield Road, residence									
		G-3	Guilford Downs at Diamondback Road, residence									
		G-4	Delton on Dalton, residence									
H	14	H-1	Columbia Hills at West Hills Road, residence	65	66	59-67	64-72	62-65	+1870	16-21	0.802	57.0
		H-2	Columbia Hills at Spring Valley Road, residence									
		H-3	Columbia Hills at Spring Valley Road, residence									
		H-4	Columbia Hills on Sybert Drive, residence									
I	--	I-1	Village of Dorsey's Search, residence	57	57	59	63	-	-	-	-	
TOTAL	124								21370		11.643	

(1) Based on \$27.00/sf  
(2) Based on "..."

87



## E. Recommendations

After a detailed advisement of engineering features, environmental consequences, agency remarks, public coordination and testimony, and public officials comments the following alternates were recommended by the Project Team.

### Segment VI - Patuxent River to North of Hopkins-Gorman Road

#### Widening

Adding a fifth and sixth lane beginning at Maryland Route 216 is recommended. Also included is a truck climbing lane from the Patuxent River to Old Columbia Road. All of these lanes are to be constructed in the median of the existing roadway. None of this widening would be initiated until operating difficulties are experienced with traffic flow on the exiting four lane roadway. Widening will increase highway capacity and produce a limited reduction in the number of accidents.

### Access Control - Alternate C

#### Old Columbia Road

Concept 1 and Concept 4 were chosen. The first selection closes the median crossover and modifies the disjointed intersection with right-on, right-off ramps. These ramps will have a minimum radius of 150 feet and proper length acceleration and deceleration lanes. The second selection will extend Cherry Tree Lane approximately 200 feet to intersect Harding Road. Cherry Tree Lane is identified on the 1982 General Plan and is currently being constructed as part of Winchester Homes' Cherry Tree Farms Development. Funding for the first selection will be the responsibility of the State Highway Administration. The second selection will be the responsibility of Howard County and is being coordinated with the subdivision process for the area.

#### Hammond Drive - Hillcrest Drive

Concept 3 was chosen. This concept closes the median crossover at Hammond Drive at northbound U.S. Route 29, provides a driveway to Hammond Parkway for the property northeast of Hammond Branch, and extends Crest Road to a section of Crest Road being constructed by developers. Hillcrest Drive and Hammond Drive will be closed at U.S. Route 29 and cul-de-sacs will be constructed at these locations.

#### Johns Hopkins Road - Gorman Road

Concept 2 was selected. This is the concept proposed by the Brantly Development Corporation which has dual bridges over U.S. Route 29. This concept is contingent upon the developer's participation in the construction of the interchange and fulfillment of the commitment to modify the proposal with only a three leg intersection on Montpelier Parkway, relocation of the intersection of the service road in the northeast quadrant to extension of

50

the service road to provide access to properties on the east side of U.S. Route 29.

Segment VII - North of Hopkins - Gorman Road to Maryland Route 32

Widening

Adding a fifth and sixth lane extending through the limits of this segment is recommended. These lanes will be constructed within the median of the existing roadway. None of this widening will be initiated until operating difficulties are experienced with traffic flow on the existing four lane roadway. Widening will increase highway capacity and produce a limited reduction in the number of accidents.

Access Control - Alternate C

River Edge Road

Concept 4 was chosen. This concept proposes extending Rivers Edge Road under U.S. Route 29 to Old Columbia Road, diamond type ramps on the west side of U.S. Route 29, on and off ramps to Old Columbia Road on the east side of U.S. Route 29, and reconstruction of Old Columbia Road on the east side of U.S. Route 29, between the ramp terminus and the underpass. Due to the proximity of Maryland Route 32, there will be continuous acceleration-deceleration lanes between the two interchanges. The underpass concept will accommodate pedestrian movement under safer conditions.

Segment VIII - Maryland Route 32 to Columbia's South Entrance

Widening

Adding a fifth and sixth lane extending through the limits of this segment is recommended. These lanes will be constructed within the median of the existing roadway. None of this widening will be initiated until operating deficiencies are experienced with traffic flow on the existing four-lane roadway. Widening will increase highway capacity and produce a limited reduction in the number of accidents.

Access Control - Alternate C

Seneca Drive

Concept 5A-Modified was chosen. This concept proposes extending Seneca Drive over U.S. Route 29 and intersecting with Martin Road. In the northwest quadrant of the proposed interchange, there will be a loop ramp to southbound U.S. Route 29, and an off ramp from southbound U.S. Route 29. Right-on, right-off ramps to an extension of Old Columbia Road - Shaker Drive will be provided on the east side of U.S. Route 29. The classification of Old Columbia Road - Shaker Drive extended will be downgraded from a major collector to minor collector. The Seneca Drive overpass will have sidewalks making pedestrian crossing easier and safer.

Gales Lane

Concept 2 was selected. This concept closes Gales Lane at northbound U.S. Route 29 and provides a connection from the Gales Lane which intersects with River Meadows Drive to Gales Lane. The previously proposed cul-de-sac from the existing Gales Lane has been deleted. This concept will add traffic to neighborhood streets at Talbott Springs and Stevens Forest.

Segment IX - Columbia's South Entrance to Maryland Route 175

Widening

Adding a fifth and sixth lane extending through the limits of this segment is recommended. These lanes will be constructed within the median of the existing roadway. None of this widening will be initiated until operating difficulties are experienced with traffic flow on the existing four lane roadway. Widening will increase highway capacity and produce a limited reduction in the number of accidents.

Access Control - Alternate C

Old Columbia Road

Concept 2 was chosen. This concept proposed closing the median crossover and the intersection between Old Columbia Road and U.S. Route 29. Access will be provided by the extension of a roadway from Twin Knolls Road to Old Columbia Road. The roadway will be in an area of available land between the Felicity House and Gales Gaither House in order to avoid an adverse impact on Felicity House.

Pepple Drive - Diamondback Drive

Concept 3 was selected. This concepts closes the median crossover at Pepple Drive and the intersection between both Pepple Drive and Diamondback Drive with northbound U.S. Route 29. In addition, the poor horizontal alignment of the ramp from westbound Maryland Route 175 to northbound U.S. Route 29 will be improved. Concept 3 will reduce traffic to streets in Guilford Downs.

Segment X - Maryland Route 175 to north of Maryland Route 108

Widening

Adding a fifth and sixth lane extending through the limits of this segment. These lanes will be constructed within the median of the existing roadway. None of this widening will be initiated until operating difficulties are experienced with traffic flow on the existing four lane roadway. Widening will increase highway capacity and produce a limited reduction in the number of accidents.

Access Control - Alternate C

Spring Valley Road

No action is needed at this location. Upon completion of the ramp from northbound U.S. Route 29 to eastbound U.S. Route 100, all access to U.S. Route 29 at Spring Valley Road will be closed .

Segment XI - North of Maryland Route 108 to U.S. Route 40




Widening

No action is needed for this segment. The construction of the proposed interchange at Maryland Route 100 will provide the fifth and sixth lanes in this segment where they do not currently exist.

Access Control


There are no access control issues in this segment.

# U.S. ROUTE 29 SEGMENT VI HOWARD COUNTY LINE TO NORTH OF HOPKINS / GORMAN ROAD



ALTERNATE "C" - CONCEPT 2  
OLD COLUMBIA ROAD

ALTERNATE "C" - CONCEPT 3  
OLD COLUMBIA ROAD




**LEGEND**

- HISTORIC SITES/PROPERTIES
- DISPLACEMENTS
- PAVEMENT TO BE REMOVED
- STREAMS
- INTERMITTENT STREAMS
- WETLANDS
- WETLANDS IDENTIFICATION NUMBER
- 100-YEAR FLOODPLAIN BOUNDARIES
- LANE WIDENING

MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION  
U.S. ROUTE 29  
PROJECT 83-09  
SHEET 1 OF 9

SCALE IN FEET


TO  
1-70



TO  
WASHINGTON

54

# U.S. ROUTE 29 SEGMENT VI HOWARD COUNTY LINE TO NORTH OF HOPKINS / GORMAN ROAD



ALTERNATE "C" - CONCEPT 2  
HAMMOND-HILLCREST DRIVE

TO  
WASHINGTON

TO  
I-70

NOTE: FOR FLOODPLAIN BOUNDARIES, WETLANDS, ETC.  
SEE ALTERNATE "C" - CONCEPT 1  
HAMMOND-HILLCREST DRIVE

**LEGEND**

- NOISE MODELING SITES
- \* NOISE MONITORING SITES


ALTERNATE "C" - CONCEPT 2  
HOPKINS-GORMAN ROAD  
INTERCHANGE  
(SELECTED)

MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION  
U.S. ROUTE 29  
PROJECT 63-09  
SHEET 3 OF 9

SCALE IN FEET  
0 100 200

DATE OF PHOTOGRAPHY: MARCH 15, 1983

### U.S. ROUTE 29 SEGMENT VII NORTH OF HOPKINS / GORMAN ROAD TO NORTH OF MARYLAND ROUTE 32



ALTERNATE "C" - CONCEPT 3  
RIVERS EDGE ROAD

ALTERNATE "C" - CONCEPT 4  
RIVERS EDGE ROAD  
(SELECTED)

#### LEGEND






- NOISE MODELING SITES
- NOISE MONITORING SITES
- HISTORIC SITES/PROPERTIES
- DISPLACEMENTS
- PAVEMENT TO BE REMOVED
- STREAMS
- INTERMITTENT STREAMS
- WETLANDS
- WETLANDS IDENTIFICATION NUMBER
- 100-YEAR FLOODPLAIN BOUNDARIES
- LANE WIDENING

TO  
1-70

MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION  
U.S. ROUTE 29  
PROJECT 83-09  
SHEET 4 OF 9  
SCALE: 1" = 40'





# U.S. ROUTE 29 SEGMENT VIII NORTH OF MD. ROUTE 32 TO SOUTH ENTRANCE TO COLUMBIA



- LEGEND**
- HISTORIC SITES/PROPERTIES
  - DISPLACEMENTS
  - PAVEMENT TO BE REMOVED
  - STREAMS
  - INTERMITTENT STREAMS
  - WETLANDS
  - ① WETLANDS IDENTIFICATION NUMBER
  - 100-YEAR FLOODPLAIN BOUNDARIES
  - LANE WIDENING
  - NOISE MONITORING SITES
  - NOISE MODELING SITES


VERMONT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
STATE HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION  
U.S. ROUTE 29  
PROJECT 85-09  
SHEET 5 OF 9  
SCALE IN FEET

# U.S. ROUTE 29 SEGMENT VIII NORTH OF MD. ROUTE 32 TO SOUTH ENTRANCE TO COLUMBIA



- LEGEND**
- NOISE MODELING SITES
  - \* NOISE MONITORING SITES
  - HISTORIC SITES/PROPERTIES
  - ▭ DISPLACEMENTS
  - ▨ PAVEMENT TO BE REMOVED
  - STREAMS
  - - - INTERMITTENT STREAMS
  - ▨ WETLANDS
  - ① WETLANDS IDENTIFICATION NUMBER
  - 100-YEAR FLOODPLAIN BOUNDARIES
  - LANE WIDENING
- MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION  
U.S. ROUTE 29  
PROJECT 83-09  
SHEET 6 OF 9
- SCALE IN FEET

# U.S. ROUTE 29 SEGMENT IX SOUTH ENTRANCE TO COLUMBIA TO MARYLAND ROUTE 108




- LEGEND**
- HISTORIC SITES/PROPERTIES
  - DISPLACEMENTS
  - PAVEMENT TO BE REMOVED
  - STREAMS
  - INTERMITTENT STREAMS
  - WETLANDS
  - WETLANDS IDENTIFICATION NUMBER
  - 100-YEAR FLOODPLAIN BOUNDARIES
  - LANE WIDENING

**LEGEND**

- NOISE MODELING SITES
- NOISE MONITORING SITES

MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION  
U.S. ROUTE 29  
PROJECT 83-09  
SHEET 7 OF 9  
SCALE 1" = 100'



TO WASHINGTON

TO I-70

**U.S. ROUTE 29 SEGMENT X**  
**MARYLAND ROUTE 108 TO NORTH OF MARYLAND ROUTE 103**



SEGMENT XI NOT SHOWN. NO WORK TO BE DONE IN THIS SEGMENT.

- LEGEND**
- HISTORIC SITES/PROPERTIES
  - DISPLACEMENTS
  - PAVEMENT TO BE REMOVED
  - STREAMS
  - INTERMITTENT STREAMS
  - WETLANDS
  - WETLANDS IDENTIFICATION NUMBER
  - 100-YEAR FLOODPLAIN BOUNDARIES
  - LANE WIDENING

MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
 STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION  
**U.S. ROUTE 29**  
 PROJECT 83-09  
 SHEET 9 OF 9

0 100 200  
 SCALE IN FEET

# U.S. ROUTE 29 SEGMENT X MARYLAND ROUTE 108 TO NORTH OF MARYLAND ROUTE 103




ALTERNATE "C" - CONCEPT 3  
PEPPE DRIVE AND DIAMONDBACK DRIVE  
(SELECTED)

ALTERNATE "C" - CONCEPT 2  
SPRING VALLEY ROAD  
(SELECTED)

- LEGEND
- [Symbol] HISTORIC SITES/PROPERTIES
  - [Symbol] DISPLACEMENTS
  - [Symbol] MOVEMENT TO BE REMOVED
  - [Symbol] STREAMS
  - [Symbol] INTERMITTENT STREAMS
  - [Symbol] WETLANDS
  - [Symbol] WETLANDS IDENTIFICATION NUMBER
  - [Symbol] 50-YEAR FLOODPLAIN BOUNDARIES
  - [Symbol] LANE WIDENING
  - [Symbol] CRASH MONITORING SITES
  - [Symbol] CRASH MODELING SITES

MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION  
U.S. ROUTE 29  
PROJECT 83-09  
SHEET 8 OF 9


SCALE IN FEET  
DATE OF PHOTOGRAPHY MAR 15, 1985



**MINOR COLLECTOR STREET**

**CLOSED SECTION**

RIVERS EDGE RD. VII-C-3 AND 4  
SPRINGVALLEY RD. IX-C-2




**MINOR COLLECTOR STREET**

**OPEN SECTION**

OLD COLUMBIA RD. VI-C-2 AND 3  
HAMMOND-HILLCREST DR. VI-C-2 AND 3  
RIVERS EDGE RD. (OLD COLUMBIA RD.) VII-C-3 AND 4


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

**TYPICAL SECTIONS**



**MAJOR COLLECTOR STREET  
CLOSED SECTION**

SENECA DR. VIII-C-3,4 AND 5  
SENECA DR. (SHAKER DR.) VIII-C-3,4 AND 5




**LOCAL STREET  
OPEN SECTION**

GALES LANE VIII-C-2  
OLD COLUMBIA RD. IX-C-2

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

**TYPICAL SECTIONS**



**NORMAL SECTION**  
**6 LANE DIVIDED HIGHWAY**  
**INSIDE WIDENING**


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

TYPICAL SECTIONS


of



65




RAMPS - TANGENT SECTION



RAMPS - CURVE SECTION  
RADIUS LESS THAN 400 FT.

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



RAMP ACCELERATION & DECELERATION LANES

TYPICAL SECTIONS

Section IV

**Public Hearing Comments**

IV. SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

The Combined Location/Design Hearing was held on February 7, 1987, at 7:00 p.m. at Hammond High School in Columbia, Maryland. The purpose of the Public Hearing was to present the results of the Project Planning Study and to receive public comments on the project. Twenty-one individuals made statements following the formal State Highway Administration presentation.

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

1. Steve Weber (7037 Longview Road, Representing Holiday Hills Riverside C/Concept 3 underpass. Additional concerns include: a traffic light at the intersection of Old Columbia and Rivers Edge Roads, lighting and adequate drainage in the underpass, a walkway for pedestrians and bicyclists, a small underpass to deter heavy truck usage, and adequate buffer for residents adjacent Route 29.

SHA Response - An intersection analysis at the Rivers Edge Road - Old Columbia Road intersection shows level of service A with stop control. A traffic signal is not warranted at this location.

2. Mr. Iager (8564 Old Columbia Road)

Supports Alternate C, Concept 1 in Segment VI because it has the least impact on the land he presently farms. He only retains 75 of the original 131 acres due to condemnation by various State agencies. Specific questions by Mr. Iager:

- a. If an overhead bridge is to replace all access at Old Columbia Road and Route 29 why does the roadway need to be realigned?

SHA Response - To establish a better grade onto the bridge.

- b. How can a right-on, right-off be any more detrimental to a safety factor than a grade separation?

SHA Response - The right-on, right-off concept was selected. The only reason an overpass concept would have been considered safer is that it would not have provided any entrance onto U.S. Route 29.

3. Mr. Armiger (Ellicott City)

He is a developer and his partnership owns a piece of land in Segment VII which may be impacted by an interchange. They have plans for a \$5 million, fifty thousand square foot building on the land. Would like plans revised.

SHA Response - Ramps were revised to incorporate a shift and leave as large a plot of developable land as possible.

4. James Lesch (6052 Sunny Spring, Columbia; Representing Hickory Ridge Village Board)

The Village Board supports Alternate 5-B in Segment VIII. Feel this alternate will relieve congestion, will provide efficient access to the adjacent residential neighborhood, and has the least residential displacements. Also feel it is critical to have interim southbound access from Clemen's Crossing at the Seneca Drive Location. Appropriate pedestrian access should be provided in coordination with the County.

SHA Response - The selected alternative, 5A-Modified is almost identical to 5B east of U.S. Route 29. West of U.S. Route 29 the design has loop ramps instead of diamond ramps. Traffic patterns will remain as they exit today until completion of the Seneca Drive Overpass. The pedestrian issue mentioned is not within the scope of this job.

5. Bruce Woodford (10613 John Hopkins Road, Laurel; Representing Hammond Village Citizens Association)

The completion of Maryland 216 Interchange is an essential step toward decreasing traffic in Hammond Village. HVCA supports Concept 2 for the Hopkins-Gorman Road Interchange. Regarding access to the Hillcrest area the HVCA supports Concept 3, the extension of Crest Drive. HVCA recommends the following: (1) Rivers Corporate Park and new Industrial Park should have adequate access to U.S. 29 north and MD 32 south, (2) frontage road should have only the capacity to service homes along it, (3) shift intersection of the frontage road further west away from curve on Gorman/Johns Hopkins Road.

SHA Response - 1) Existing access to these areas will remain unchanged within the scope of this work, 2) The frontage road will have only the capacity to service homes along it, 3) The selected alternate, revised Concept 2, responds to this concern.

6. James Cody (6085 Covington Road; Representing Seabring Civic Association)

The Association supports all five concepts under Alternate C in Segment VIII because of their connection of Martin Road to Route 29 and the provision of ramps from southbound 29 to the Seneca Drive Extension and then from this extension back onto southbound 29. Specifically support Concept 5 or 5-B. Their most important need is alleviating the existing traffic at the west side of Owen Brown Road and Route 29.

SHA Response - Minor modification at Cedar Lane is proposed for Spring 1988. This will provide some relief as an interim solution.

7. Andy Brooks (9486 Wandering Way)

SHA should consider paving all the lanes with "popcorn aggregate" which on Interstate Route 495 it was reported to have reduced the noise impact by 10 dBA. Concerned about lack of noise and air studies in Segment IX along the "driveway" from the Hilton to Rt. 175.

SHA Response - The recommendation for pavement design is a final design element and the comment will be considered at that time. In the modeling process representative areas are used to model the area. It is felt the locations chosen have adequately represented the area.

8. Grace Roenger (4434 Columbia Road)

Owens a home in Segment X between Rt. 29 and Columbia Road. Feels the residents on Columbia Road are entitled to some barriers to reduce the impact.

SHA Response - A noise analysis has been done for the area and those locations warranting barriers have been presented.

9. Ms. Dyke (15554 Prince Frederick Way, Silver Spring)

Against the road and bridge at Seneca Drive because it is a discrimination against that piece of land. Feels it would be cheaper to reopen the road from Maryland Route 32 to Shaker Lane for the people on the east side and reopen Freetown Road extension for the west side people.

SHA Response - These alternates are not feasible because: 1) Shaker Lane already has access to Route 32 east of U.S. Route 29, 2) Freetown Road would be tying into a ramp which is unsafe. These alternates connect the developments east and west of U.S. Route 29 to Maryland Route 32. The Seneca Drive Overpass connects these developments to U.S. Route 29.

10. Kenneth Milbaugh (8449 Old Columbia Road)

Opposed to Concepts 3 and 4 in Segment VI because of the additional heavy traffic placed on Harding Road. Concept 3 will split their farm in half and take the barn.

SHA Response - Concept 1 was selected.

11. Arnold Bruckner (9491 Crisscross Court)

a. Located in Segment IX, he is concerned about noise levels and that not enough houses have been targeted as being impacted by barriers thereby raising the cost per house to an unacceptable level.

SHA Response - Only those houses which would experience a 5 to 7 decibel reduction in noise by the building of a barrier are considered.

b. Why were the tests made after the morning rush hours and nothing indicated takes into account the ambient noise at the time the tests are made.

SHA Response - Tests were conducted in accordance with SHA policy. The time selected for monitoring was judged to be the noisiest time of day, which occurs with LOS C traffic conditions.

12. Richard Ely (9221 Winding Way, Columbia)

Would like to propose that 3 percent of all funds for highway construction be set aside for noise abatement and landscaping and to propose also the participation of representatives of affected communities in the spending of the funds.

SHA Response - Comment noted.

13. Richard Rant (9146 Wandering Way, Columbia Hills)

In favor of the proposed project. Hopes the planners involved in the U.S. Rt. 29, Route 103/29 and Route 100 projects coordinate with the County as not to inadvertently preclude the construction of a second entrance into the Columbia Hills/Meadowbrook Farms community.

SHA Response - The second access is being considered in conjunction with the Route 100 project studies.

14. James Tordella (10353 Maypole Way, Hickory Ridge Village; Representing Howard County Bicycle Club)

Suggests that bridges be compatible with MD's State Highway Administration's current guidelines which allows bicycles and cars to share a roadway. Alternate C would close the only bicycle route in the County which runs southwest to northeast. No mention of this could be found in the EA. As a resident, he favors Alternate 5-B at Seneca Drive. The State should consider the maximum extent possible of noise barriers because all people are affected.

SHA Response - Noise barriers are considered during the design phases. There are places where noise reduction benefits decrease greatly as you move further away from them. The bridge will be compatible with Maryland State Highway Administration's current guidelines which allow bicycles and cars to share a roadway.

15. Allen Hobby (4256 Columbia Road, Ellicott City)

Concerned that noise impact studies should have been coordinated with the studies from the Route 103 Interchange and the Route 100 extension projects. In addition, have the elevations of his home and the proposed ramp been considered?

SHA Response - Air and noise evaluation for the proposed Route 103 and Route 100 traffic was done under a separate study and coordinated with the Route 29 study. In evaluation of the noise impacts to adjacent homes the new elevations of the ramps and elevations of the homes were used.

16. Robert Braxton (7051 Longview Road)

Supports Segment VII, Alternate C, Concept 3.

SHA Response - Comment noted.

17. Jerome Svec (10522 Vista Road in Holiday Hills)

Suggest that traffic hazards in the weave area of the cloverleafs be alleviated by the addition of deceleration lanes and acceleration lanes for the weave areas.

SHA Response - All ramps will be provided with sufficient acceleration or deceleration lanes. No existing cloverleaf interchange will be affected by this project with the exception of the Maryland Route 175 interchange. The ramp from westbound Route 175 to northbound U.S. Route 29 will be modified to improve acceleration onto U.S. Route 29. Also, a continuous acceleration/deceleration lane will be provided between the Maryland Route 32 and the Rivers Edge Road interchanges due to their proximity.

18. John Murphy

a. Is SHA going to escrow funds if the noise models prove inaccurate and supplementary noise abatement is necessary? Does the level of noise abatement change with the amount of federal funding or the project's location? If so, it should be uniform.

SHA Response - There are two types of noise wall programs: (1) noise wall consideration with an existing highway, and (2) noise wall consideration with new construction. The 67 dBA range applies to both. SHA will look at areas a second during detailed design studies.

b. If the noise model is incorrect, would funds for the enhanced abatement be considered as part of the new construction funds or as part of a retrofit.

SHA Response - If subsequent noise studies determine that the proposed construction would result in an impact, and a noise abatement is considered to be reasonable and feasible, the funding of the abatement measure will be eligible at the time of construction of the road improvements.

19. Ms. Mortimer (10222 Westwood Drive; Representing Atholton Manor Civic Association)

a. Could Seneca Drive go between the Dyke property and the Seventh Day Adventists Church and through the rental areas of Shady Grove or Walnut instead of its current location?

SHA Response - The Seneca Drive Overpass was selected to tie-in across from Windsor Court to minimize impacts to the Seventh Day Adventist Church and to a proposed development at the Dyke Property.

b. Concerned about the noise impact on residences along Shell Drive.

SHA Response - In the analysis of the impacts to this area, consideration was given to the homes along Chell Drive, and it was determined that no barriers were warranted.

c. Would like to see sidewalks on both sides of Martin Road.

SHA Response - This is the responsibility of Howard County or Columbia Association.

20. Jane Lankos (6110 Covington Road; Representing Hickory Village Board)

Would like to see access to Route 29 from Martin Road. Could the road be moved over a street from Windsor Court?

SHA Response - The Seneca Drive Overpass was selected to tie-in across from Windsor Court to minimize impacts to the Seventh Day Adventist Church and to a proposed development at the Dyke Property.

21. Marty Pavloski (6602 Seneca Drive)

Quickly determine the best alternative and concept of Seneca Drive and promptly inform the people whose homes are affected.

SHA Response - When an alternate has been chosen at Seneca Drive and final design begins, affected property owners will be contacted by the State Highway Administration concerning necessary property acquisitions.



Section V  
**Correspondence**

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



County Council of Howard County

GEORGE HOWARD BUILDING  
3430 COURT HOUSE DRIVE  
ELLCOTT CITY, MARYLAND 21043-4392  
992-2001

COUNCILMEMBERS

- C. Vernon Gray, Chairperson  
District 3
- Shane Pendergrass, Vice Chairperson  
District 1
- Angela Beltram  
District 2
- Charles C. Feag  
District 5
- Ruth Karon  
District 4

Jeanne E. Stephens  
Administrative Assistant  
Ronald S. Weinstein  
County Auditor

February 19, 1987

Mr. Neil Pederson, Director  
State Highway Administration  
Maryland Department of Transportation  
P.O. Box 717  
707 N. Calvert Street  
Baltimore, Maryland 21202

Dear Mr. Pederson:

I received the attached letter concerning improvements to US 29. I would appreciate your staff reviewing the comments, as they relate to the proposed improvements in the area of Hammond Village.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

C. Vernon Gray  
Chairperson

CVG:gt/jc-3376c

Attachment

cc: Scott Dixon

RECEIVED

FEB 23 1987

PLANNING

DEAF TDD NUMBER - 992-2323

75



**Maryland Department of Transportation**

State Highway Administration

William K. Hollmann  
Secretary  
Hal Kassoff  
Administrator

MAR 27 1987

The Honorable C. Vernon Gray

Page Two

MAR 27 1987

Re: Contract No. HO 606-101-770  
U.S. Route 29  
Patuxent River to  
U.S. Route 40  
PDMS No. 132046

The Honorable C. Vernon Gray  
Chairperson, Howard County Council  
George Howard Building  
3430 Courthouse Drive  
Ellicott City, Maryland 21043

Dear Councilmen Gray:

Thank you for your recent letter conveying the concerns of Mr. Scott Dixon about our project planning study on U.S. Route 29. My staff has reviewed his interchange proposal for Hopkins-Gormen Road. While we appreciate his thoughts and creative effort, there are a few problems associated with design characteristics of the proposal. An interchange with diamond type ramps on the east side of U.S. Route 29 and cloverleaf type ramps on the west would not adequately accommodate the projected turning movements at this location. In addition, his proposal would cost approximately \$500,000 more to construct. Finally, the weaving maneuver between the successive loop ramps creates an undesirable traffic operating situation.

As I am sure you are aware, the Brently Development Corporation has agreed to participate in the funding of an interchange at this location. Their plans for the Montpelier Research Park necessitate the interchange to accommodate traffic generated by the development. The Administration has worked closely with Howard County staff, representatives from Brantly, as well as representatives from neighboring community associations in the design of an interchange which best meets the needs of all concerned parties. I feel that our interchange designs at this location, and in particular Concept No. 2, meet the traffic needs at this location in the most cost-effective manner.

I hope this provides you with information to address Mr. Dixon's proposal. Please feel free to contact me if additional information is needed.

Sincerely,

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY:  
Hal Kassoff  
Hal Kassoff  
Administrator

HK:cn

cc: Mr. Neil J. Pedersen  
Mr. Weyne R. Clingan  
Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.

My telephone number is 333-1111

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech  
383-7555 Baltimore Metro - 545-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5082 Statewide Toll Free  
P.O. Box 717 / 707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203 - 0717

76

RECEIVED  
 FEB 12 1987  
 CVG/ha

Scott Dixon  
 8018 Alsdin Drive  
 Laurel, MD 20707  
 Feb. 9, 1987

Mr. C. Vernon Gray  
 Chairman, Howard Cty. Council  
 County Building  
 Ellicott City, MD 21043


Dear Mr. Gray:

I am writing in response to the proposed interchange at Route 29 and Johns Hopkins Road and the closing of Hillcrest Drive and Hammond Drive at U.S. 29. I have been following articles in the Howard County Times and the Hammond Village Voice newsletter.


It appears that the new design might reduce the traffic coming through the Gorman Road residential area. This relief is badly needed. During much of the day it is almost impossible to safely make a left turn onto Gorman Rd. from the streets in Hammond Village because of the volume and speed of traffic coupled with several intersections being obscured by shrubbery and curves. In order to catch a bus to Hammond High School in the morning, it often takes 5 minutes to cross Gorman Rd. I'm sure the students going to Hammond Middle School face the same problem. Things are so bad that the elementary students residing in Warfield Range (3 to 4 blocks from Hammond Elementary) ride a bus to school because of the traffic. Isn't this a waste of tax money when you have to bus students who live only 4 blocks from school?

With the volume of traffic coming from west of U.S. 29 on Johns Hopkins Rd., I am still concerned about all the left turns that need to be made, especially by school buses. If these areas are not to be controlled by traffic lights, I think we are asking for a rise in the accident rate in this area. Looking to the future, I think it would be more advantageous to make this a complete cloverleaf now while the property is available, or at least eliminate some of the left turns on the west side of U.S. 29 (where most of the traffic is coming from) according to the following diagram:

Now Proposed




My Proposal



With the proposed closing of Hillcrest Dr. and Hammond Dr. at U.S. 29 Hillcrest, a longtime part of the Hammond Village area needs to have access to the village via Hammond Pkwy extension. This means more traffic from the east side of U.S. 29 needing good access to high-speed 29. A high-speed road needs controlled access to make it safer. I agree that closing these 2 roads is necessary, but I urge you to re-evaluate the design of the proposed interchange in light of this and the upgrading of U.S. 29 to six lanes.

Sincerely,  
*Scott Dixon*  
 Scott Dixon

77



# County Council of Howard County

GEORGE HOWARD BUILDING  
3430 COURT HOUSE DRIVE  
ELLCOTT CITY, MARYLAND 21043-4392  
992 2001

### COUNCILMEMBERS

- C. Vernon Gray, Chairperson  
District 3
- Shane Pendergrass, Vice Chairperson  
District 1
- Angela Beltram  
District 2
- Charles C. Feaga  
District 4
- Ruth Keston  
District 5

Jeanne E. Stephens  
Administrative Assistant  
Ronald S. Weinstein  
County Auditor

February 23, 1987

Mr. Neil Padaraen, Director  
Office of Planning & Preliminary Engineering  
State Highway Administration  
707 North Calvert Street  
Baltimore, Maryland 21202

Dear Mr. Padaraen:

I received a copy of the attached February 15 letter to you from Mrs. Michel P. Gladhill of the Warfield's Range Community Association.

Would you please send me a copy of your response to these comments. Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

*C. Vernon Gray*  
C. Vernon Gray  
Chairperson

CVG:ng/jc-3384c

attachment

RECEIVED

MAR 2 1987

DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF:  
PLANNING & PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

78



**Maryland Department of Transportation**

State Highway Administration

William K. Hollmann  
Secretary

Hal Kassoff  
Administrator

MAR 30 1987

The Honorable Vernon Gray

Page Two MAR 30 1987

The Honorable C. Vernon Gray  
Chairperson, Howard County Council  
George Howard Building  
3430 Courthouse Drive  
Ellicott City, Maryland 21043

Dear Councilman Gray:

Thank you for your letter of February 23, conveying concerns of your constituents, Mrs. Michel P. Gledhill and the residents of Warfield's Range Community Association. Mrs. Gledhill's letter addressed the level of traffic on Gorman Road between U.S. Route 29 and Leishear Road, as well as the impact that locating an interchange on U.S. Route 29 at Hopkins-Gorman Road might have on this traffic level.

We feel that both single-structure interchange proposals, so-called concept 1 and concept 1A, as well as the dual structure proposal, or concept 2, will limit the future volume of traffic on Gorman Road. We also feel that concept 2 provides more direct access between the proposed Montpelier Research Park and U.S. Route 29. For these reasons, the State Highway Administration, the County, and the developer prefer this alternative.

The Warfield's Range Community Association is also concerned about the proposed frontage road on the east side of U.S. Route 29, between Gorman Road and the Old Columbia Road, crossing of the Middle Patuxent River. Since concept 2 at Hopkins-Gorman Road has been selected as a preferred alternative, we will look into relocating the intersection opposite Hammond Parkway. The frontage road would be classified as a minor collector, the same classification as Gorman Road. We do not envision this becoming a major thoroughfare.

If the proposed interchange at Rivers Edge Road were to be constructed, it would provide convenient access between U.S. Route 29 and the developing industrial area adjacent to the Middle Patuxent River, through Old Columbia Road. The proposed road going through the Middle Patuxent River floodplain will, by itself, limit the volume of traffic on the frontage road. Our study anticipates no changes to this proposed structure.

I have asked Mr. Louis Ege, Jr., Deputy Director of the Project Development division, to get back to you when a decision is made about relocating the intersection. He advises me that we have not received the original letter from Mrs. Gledhill, but we will forward a copy of this letter to her for her information. If there are any other questions or we may be of further assistance, please don't hesitate to call me, or Mr. Ege at 333-1130.

Sincerely,

Hal Kassoff  
Administrator

HK/tld

cc: Mr. Neil J. Pedersen  
Mr. Wayne R. Clingan  
Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.  
Mrs. Michel P. Gledhill

My telephone number is \_\_\_\_\_

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech  
383-7555 Baltimore Metro — 565-0451 D.C. Metro — 1-800-492-5062 Statewide Toll Free  
P.O. Box 717 / 707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203 0717

79



HOUSE OF DELEGATES

ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND 21401-1991

February 24, 1987

SUSAN R. BUSWELL  
LEGISLATIVE DISTRICT 13B  
HOWARD-PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTIES

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

SUBCOMMITTEE  
EDUCATION AND HUMAN RESOURCES

218 LOWE OFFICE BUILDING  
BALTIMORE AREA 841-3208  
WASHINGTON AREA 858-3208

DISTRICT TELEPHONE  
798-8368 OR 723-0788

RECEIVED  
OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
HOUSE OF DELEGATES  
ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND

February 18, 1987

Mrs. Michel P. Gledhill  
10525 Patuxent Ridge Way  
Laurel, Maryland 20707

(301) 792-9429

The Honorable Susan R. Buswell  
Member - Maryland House of Delegates  
T. H. Lowe House Office Building  
6 Governor Bladen Boulevard  
Annapolis, Maryland 21401-1991

Dear Delegate Buswell,

I would like to take this opportunity to introduce myself. My name is Michel Gledhill and I am President of the Warfield's Range Community Association. I represent a community of fifty-five homes which will be increased to ninety-nine homeowners within the next year.

Although we are a relatively new community, we have become actively involved in several issues that have had an effect on our immediate neighborhood.

Enclosed is a letter that has been sent to Mr. Neil Pedersen, Director of the Office of Planning and Preliminary Planning/State Highway Administration. This letter deals with three road projects that are of vital concern to our community. The letter states our position on these projects and we would appreciate any support that you can give us.

Please feel free to contact me if I can provide any additional information you may require.

Sincerely,

Michel P. Gledhill  
President

Ms. Michel P. Gledhill  
President, Warfield's Range Community  
Association  
10525 Patuxent Ridge Way  
Laurel, Maryland 20707

Dear Ms. Gledhill:

Thank you for communicating with me on the road development planned near Warfield's Range.

I will be happy to work with your Association to get full consideration by the State Highway Administration of your concerns.

I assume you are also keeping close contact with the Howard County Government since I believe some of these roads will require County approval and participation.

Again, thank you for sharing your concerns. Please keep me informed of your response from Mr. Pedersen. If you or your members have any questions, please don't hesitate to call me in Annapolis.

Sincerely,

  
Susan R. Buswell

cc: County Executive Bobo  
Mr. Hal Kassoff, Administrator, State Highway  
Administration

ENC.

52



February 15, 1987

Mrs. Michel P. Gladhill, President  
Warfield's Range Community Association  
10525 Patuxent Ridge Way  
Laurel, Maryland 20707

Mr. Neil J. Pedersen, Director  
Office of Planning & Preliminary Engineering  
State Highway Administration  
707 North Calvert Street  
Baltimore, Maryland 21202

Re: Issues To Be Addressed At The February 17, 1987 Meeting  
at Hammond High School

Dear Mr. Pederson:

Warfield's Range is a new residential area that has, just in the past three years, become home to fifty-five families. Within the next twelve months, approximately forty-four homes will be built to complete our community.

The residents of Warfield's Range needs and wishes are no different than many others. We wish to have adequate access to the local roads to complete our daily tasks. Along with these desires, we must keep sight of the ramifications that these conveniences bring us. We do not want to jeopardize the safety of our children walking across Gorman Road to school; nor do we want the noise and congestion that would be generated by the traffic, particularly at rush hour. Our goal is to find a solution that would satisfy all parties.

The completion of Maryland Route 216 from U.S. Route 29 to east of Leishear Road, as well as the interchange, is an essential step in the reduction of traffic from the Warfield's Range/Hammond Village corridor. With the possibility of another Planned Employment Community at Interstate 95 and Route 216, the potential for future difficulties is easily recognized.

At a meeting held in our community November 20, 1986 we had the opportunity to view the three proposals for the Johns Hopkins/Gorman Road intersection. To our understanding, these options were: a single lane bridge, straight through interchange; a single bridge T interchange; and "Concept C"-Alternate II of Hopkins/Gorman Road Interchange proposed by the Brantly Development Corporation. It is in the community's best interest to support the dual bridge proposal. Although it will make access to Route 29 somewhat more difficult, the benefits that this plan will provide for us certainly over-shadows any difficulties it may cause.

Another area of concern is the frontage road connecting Gorman Road and Old Columbia Pike near the Middle Patuxent River. This road has the potential of becoming a major route between the Rivers Corporate Park and the future Planned Employment Center at Interstate 95 and Route 216. We fully support the Hammond Village Citizens Association Roads Committee in their recommendation to:

(1) Shift the intersection of the frontage road (Old Columbia Pike) west away from the curve as shown in the proposed "Concept C", Alternate II of Hopkins-Gorman Road Interchange.

(2) To ensure that the industrial Park traffic has adequate access to U.S. Route 29, North and South and State Maryland Route 32.

(3) Ensure that the the frontage road (Old Columbia Pike) has only the capacity needed to service the homes along the Old Columbia Pike.

Although the Warfield's Range Community Association is a young one, I have found that we are comprised of people who care a great deal about their neighborhood and their community. We hope that our support of the aforementioned proposals will be considered in the final determination of the future of our community.

Sincerely,

*Michel P. Gladhill*

Michel P. Gladhill  
President

(This letter was re-typed by SHA in order to be legible after printing.)

February 3, 1987

To: Mr. Neil J. Pederson, Director  
Office of Planning and Preliminary Engineering  
State Highway Administration  
Post Office Box 717  
Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

The U.S. Route 29 (Columbia Pike) project from the Montgomery County Line at the Patuxent River to U.S. Route 40 directly impacts my farming operation with the acquisition of approximately 4.5 acres of our prime farm land. This land right of way is indicated on your impact study as Segment VI Alternate "C" Concept 1 - 2 - 3 and 4 Old Columbia Road. We would at this time request a complete copy of your impact study. I reviewed the one at our Howard County Library and found it too extensive to copy.

We of the Iager Brothers Farm have been impacted by the Maryland State Highway Administration in the past years since 1950 at least three (3) different occasions condemning land of our farm in the name of progress for the State of Maryland. We feel it is time to draw a halt at this time. The only concept plan we would even consider without taking legal action would be VI-C-1, taken from your January 18, 1987 Draft on Environmental Assessment Study.

The statement on page IV - 23 of the Environmental Study Paragraph I is incorrect concerning 4.5 acres acquisition. This is only a small amount of the total land the State Highway Administration has acquired from the Iager Brothers' farm over a period of years thus rendering the impact study useless concerning Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981, using a so called Point system. You can make a pencil do anything you wish to show or prove a point.

We could possibly keep on farming with the implementation of VI-C-1 alternative. Any other of your proposed plans would be totally unacceptable to us.

The right-on and right-off concept would give the same safe effect as a cloverleaf would on Route 29 with the medium strip crossovers removed.

We would appreciate an explanation of the State's position on acquiring more land for your proposed VI-C-2 Overpass bridge. This 100 Feet of additional right of way would heavily impact our farm residence with the road passing within 25 feet of our front door. Please explain to us what you mean by the "proper grade" could be obtained by moving the original road over 100 feet to the south. This does not make any logic since the Old Columbia Rd. now in use is a direct straight crossover and the new proposed road would cross Route 29 at a very sharp angle. The cost to the state in acquisition between plan VI-C-1 estimated per your figure \$492,000 compared to VI-C-2 overpass concept at \$1.731 million for construction alone. We ask you; Is it worth the difference in cost to achieve the same safe traffic pattern?

We reserve the right to speak at your February 17, 1987 Public Hearing 7 p.m. at Hammond High School.

In conclusion we feel the State of Maryland has worn out it's welcome for acquiring land from the Iager Brothers Farm in the name of progress and should only consider the plan concept VI-C-1. Speaking for two families that have given enough.

Sincerely,

Original was signed by

Howard L. Iager  
8564 Old Columbia Rd.  
Laurel, MO 20707

82



**Maryland Department of Transportation**

State Highway Administration

March 18, 1987

William K. Hoffmann  
Secretary

Hal Kasheff  
Administrator

Re: Contract No. HO 606-101-770  
U.S. Route 29 - Patuxent  
River to U.S. Route 40  
PDMS No. 132046

Mr. Howard L. Iager  
8564 Old Columbia Road  
Laurel, Maryland 20707

Dear Mr. Iager:

This letter is in response to your correspondence of February 3, 1987 regarding our Project Planning study underway on the U.S. Route 29 corridor in Howard County.

Attached with this letter is a copy of the Environmental Assessment you requested which was compiled for this project. It discusses in detail the impacts for your property adjacent to Old Columbia Road near the Patuxent River. These impacts are associated with this project only.

The overpass proposed in Alternate VI-C-2 was located south of the existing alignment of Old Columbia Road because this location's existing terrain was more suitable. Also, this location allows the existing roadway to remain open during the construction phase. Upon completion, the old roadway will provide access to the golf driving range facility. The widening and realignment of the old roadway adjacent to your home is necessary to provide desirable horizontal and vertical geometric design for the overpass.

I want to thank you for your interest in the highway development process as it relates to this project and, in particular, your endorsement of Alternate VI-C-1. Your concerns will be taken into account during the decision making process for this study. Please feel free to contact me or the Project Manager, Mr. Randy Aldrich, telephone number 333-1139, if we can provide further assistance.

Very truly yours,

*Neil J. Pedersen*

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

NJP:tn  
Attachment

cc: Mr. Wayne R. Clingan  
Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.

My telephone number is 333-1110

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech  
383-7555 Baltimore Metro - 565 0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5062 Statewide Toll Free  
P.O. Box 717 / 707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203 0717

83

(This form was typed by SHA in order to be legible after printing).

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

Contract No. HO 606-101-770  
PDMS No. 132046  
Location - Design Public Hearing  
U.S. Route 29  
Patuxent River to U.S. Route 40  
Tuesday February 17, 1987  
Hammond High School

Original Signed by  
David B. Haytowitz

NAME \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_

PLEASE PRINT ADDRESS 2958 Schubert Drive

CITY/TOWN Silver Spring STATE MD ZIP CODE 20904

I/We wish to comment or inquire about the following aspects of this project:  
At this time Route 29 is one of the more attractive highways around, primarily  
because of one large median strip. Do not widen the highway in the median and  
use one so called "Jersey" Barriers. They are best left in Jew Jersey, where  
they fit in with the rest of the state. Don't put them in Maryland - They're  
ugly!



**Maryland Department of Transportation**

State Highway Administration

William K. Hoffmann  
Secretary  
Hal Kasseff  
Administrator

March 10, 1987

RE: Contract No. HO 606-101-770  
U.S. Route 29 - Patuxent  
River to U.S. Route 40  
PDMS No. 132046

Mr. David B. Haytowitz  
2968 Schubert Drive  
Silver Spring, Maryland 20904

Dear Mr. Haytowitz:

This letter is in response to your correspondence of February 25, 1987 and pertains to our Project Planning study underway on the U.S. Route 29 corridor in Howard County.

The widening of the roadway, as proposed in Alternatives B and C between Maryland Route 216 and U.S. Route 40, would be made within the existing median of the roadway. The median is just wide enough for the lanes to be added without erecting a double face "Jersey Type" barrier. Upon completion, a strip of grass will remain in the median.

I want to thank you for your interest in the highway development process as it relates to this study. Contact me if you have additional questions.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr.  
Deputy Director  
Project Development Division

by: Randy C. Aldrich  
Randy Aldrich  
Project Manager

LHE:RCA:bh

cc: Mr. Wayne R. Clingan

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

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

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

My telephone number is 333-1139  
Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech  
383-7555 Baltimore Metro - 565-0451 O.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5082 Statewide Toll Free  
P.O. Box 717 / 707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

h8



Oakland Mills Community Association, Inc.

March 3, 1987

State Highway Administration  
Office of Preliminary Planning and Engineering  
Box 717  
Baltimore MD 21203

Dear Sirs,

The Village of Oakland Mills will be greatly impacted by the widening of Route 29. Portions of Segments VIII and X, as well as all of segment IX are on the western border of Oakland Mills. We have specific concerns which we feel must be addressed before any final decisions are made.

Our most significant concern is the major increase in road noise which will be a result of the widening and increased traffic on Route 29. Many of our residents already are subject to dba levels which exceed noise quality maximums. Your five noise monitor stations (E,F,G) verify that real silencing efforts must be made so that our villagers will not be forced to move.

Please address the following:

1. Popcorn surfacing should be used in our sound-sensitive areas if indeed not in the entire road.
2. The \$30,000 per home that is used as a guide for the building of sound blockers must include all impacted homes. If all affected homes at the 29/175 intersection are used as a base multiplier, innovative efforts could eliminate the excessive noise in that area.
3. Have you sound monitored the many new townhouses that now exist on the old Allview Golfcourse?

In addition to the noise concerns we have, there are three road outlets to Route 29 whose closings will have some effect on Oakland Mills. We recommend that Gales Lane be closed (SEG VIII, ALT. C, OPT 2). We recommend the closing of Old Columbia Road 300 feet south of Route 175 Interchange (SEG IX, ALT. C, OPT 2). We do question why the cul-de-sac must be placed at the end of this extended road. Signs indicating that private property was being crossed should prevent unwanted visitors. However, we do recommend that Diamondback Drive as a right-in and right-out be left open. Our residents have told us that they wish this Route 29 access to stay (SEG X, ALT C, OPT 2).

We look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

*R. F. Berlett*  
Robert A. Berlett, Sr.  
Chair, Oakland Mills Village Board

RECEIVED

MAR 5 1987

DIRECTOR'S OFFICE OF  
PLANNING & PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

cc: Delegate V. Thomas

85



**Maryland Department of Transportation**

State Highway Administration

William K. Hollmann  
Secretary

Hal Kassoff  
Administrator

April 3, 1987

Re: Contract No. HO 606-101-770  
U.S. Route 29  
Patuxent River to U.S. Route 40  
P.D.M.S. No. 132046

Mr. Robert A. Berlett, Sr., Chairman  
Oakland Mills Village Board  
The Other Barn  
Oakland Mills Village Center  
5851 Robert Oliver Place  
Columbia, Maryland 21045

Dear Mr. Berlett:

This letter is in response to your correspondence of March 3, 1987 and pertains to our Project Planning Study underway on the U.S. Route 29 Corridor in Howard County. I can appreciate the concerns the Village of Oakland Mills may have regarding future noise levels being generated by traffic on U.S. Route 29. In addressing your three points, I offer the following:

1. We anticipate that upon addition of the extra lanes, the remaining lanes will be resurfaced. At this time, it is our policy to include a popcorn surface on all roadways in our primary system, as is the case with U.S. Route 29. As you are no doubt aware of, popcorn surface provides a small reduction in noise levels.
2. The cost effectiveness of the modeled noise barrier in Noise Sensitive Area F, which lies within the southeast quadrant of the U.S. Route 29 - Maryland Route 175 interchange, only includes residential structures that lie immediately adjacent to U.S. Route 29 and those which would receive at least a 5 decibel reduction in noise levels if the wall were to be built. The calculations on Area F are based on a 4800 foot barrier costing approximately \$2.7 million providing benefit for 18 residential structures. This equates to a cost per residence of \$143,000. We are currently verifying this count as it appears some of these structures are multi-family dwellings in which we count first level units. This refined information will be available in the final environmental document.

Mr. Robert A. Berlett  
Page 2

3. The townhouses which are under construction on the old Allview Golf Course are not included in the noise analysis. When our noise analysis was performed, we were unaware of the exact plans that Howard Research and Development had for the parcel. Analysis at this location will be included in the Final Environmental Document.

Regarding the effects of roadway closures with U.S. Route 29 in the Oakland Mills area, I appreciate your endorsement of Concept C-2 at Gales Lane, Concept C-2 at Old Columbia Road, and Concept C-1 at Pepple/Diamondback Drives. The cul-de-sac at the end of the extension of Twin Knolls Road to Old Columbia Road is a Howard County requirement.

I want to thank you for your interest in the highway development process as it relates to this study. If I can provide further assistance, contact me, or the Project Manager, Mr. Randy Aldrich, telephone no. (301) 333-1139.

Very truly yours,

*Neil J. Pedersen*

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

NJP/1h

cc: Mr. Wayne R. Clingan  
Mr. Charles B. Adams  
Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.

My telephone number is 333-1110

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech

383-7555 Baltimore Metro - 565-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5062 Statewide Toll Free

P.O. Box 717 / 707 North Calvert St. Baltimore, Maryland 21203 - 0717

56



**Maryland Department of Transportation**

State Highway Administration

William K. Hoffmann  
Secretary

Neil Kasloff  
Administrator

April 8, 1987

RE: Contract No. HO 606-101-770  
U.S. Route 29 - Patuxent  
River to U.S. Route 40  
PDMS No. 132046

(This letter was re-typed by SHA in order to be legible after printing.)

6085 Covington Road  
Columbia, Maryland 21044  
March 20, 1987

Mr. James Cody, President  
Sebring Civic Association  
6085 Covington Road  
Columbia, Maryland 21044

Maryland Dept. of Transportation  
State Highway Authority  
Office of Planning and Preliminary  
Engineering  
Baltimore, MD 21203

Dear Mr. Cody:

Dear Sirs:

This letter is in response to your correspondence of March 20, 1987 regarding our Project Planning study underway on the U.S. Route 29 corridor in Howard County. I appreciate your endorsement of Concept C-5B at Seneca Drive. We have identified a connection between southbound U.S. Route 29 and Martin Road that would provide alternative access to and from the Village of Hickory Ridge. At this time, we are investigating the practicality of stage constructing Concept C-5 (A or B) to provide this interim connection. As you suggested, this could possibly be completed as a Special Project administered by our District Office in Frederick. When a decision has been made, we will be providing the community with details of the project and an anticipated schedule of completion.

On February 17, 1987 I spoke at the public hearing on the US Rt. 29 Location/Design held at Hammond High School. As the President of the Sebring Civic Association (Sebring is a community of 71 families in Columbia, located off Owen Brown Road west of Rt. 29), I spoke in favor of Alternative C-Concept 5 or 5B at the Seneca Rd. Location on Rt. 29. A main point of my statement was the existing congestion during the AM and PM rush hours at the Sebring Rd.-Owen Brown intersection. We attribute this undue congestion to the lack of an alternative access/exit from the Hickory Ridge area-a problem that could be alleviated by providing access to and from Rt. 29 via Martin Road. While we realize that a Rt.29-Martin Road connection will be provided in some fashion once the work is completed in the Seneca Drive area, the purpose of this letter is to request that this access be provided for within a more immediate time frame. It is our understanding that just such a connection could be provided for under the auspices of a Special Projects funding request and could be accomplished without the need for a public hearing.

I appreciate your interest in the highway development process as it relates to this project. If I can provide further assistance, contact me or the Project Manager, Mr. Randy Aldrich, telephone no. 333-1139.

Very truly yours,

*Neil J. Pedersen*

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

I would appreciate your written reply as to the feasibility of such a project and/or what it will take to initiate action towards such a proposal. To this end, I look forward to opening up a cooperative dialogue with your office.

Sincerely,

Original was signed by

James Cody  
President, Sebring Civic Association

NJP:bh

cc: Mr. Wayne R. Clingan  
Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.  
Mr. Jerry L. White

My telephone number is 333-1110

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech  
383 7555 Baltimore Metro - 565-0451 OC Metro - 1 800-492-5062 Statewide Toll Free  
P.O. Box 717 / 707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203 - 0717

87

NAME Wayne and Sylvia New

Date March 4, 1987

ADDRESS 6421 Chell Road

City Columbia

State Maryland Zip Code 21044

Comment:

As twenty year residents --taxpayers at this address, we strongly urge the State Highway Administration to consider minimal personal property loss and the addition of noise barriers for those, like us, whose property is adjacent to Route 29. The growth of Howard County, we realize, makes such a highway expansion inevitable. It is only fair that the needs of all County residents be considered, including ours. We also ask that the type of noise barrier be earthen. Thank you in advance for assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

*Wayne R. New*  
*Sylvia J. New*

RECEIVED

MAR 11 1987

DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF  
PLANNING & PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING



Maryland Department of Transportation

State Highway Administration

April 8, 1987

Re: Contract No. HO 606-101-770  
U.S. Route 29 - Patuxent  
River to U.S. Route 40  
P.D.M.S. No. 132046

William K. Hoffmann  
Secretary  
Hal Kasloff  
Administrator

Mr. and Mrs. Wayne New  
6421 Chell Road  
Columbia, Maryland 21044

Dear Mr. and Mrs. New:

This letter is in response to your correspondence of March 4, 1987, regarding our Project Planning study underway on the U.S. Route 29 corridor in Howard County. Studies to determine the impact associated with existing and future noise levels have been performed for the Chell Road portion of the corridor.

We have determined that a twelve foot high barrier spanning a length of 2,300 feet would reduce noise levels adjacent to your home. Unfortunately, this proposed barrier does not benefit enough dwellings to fall within our cost effectiveness threshold. If a proposed barrier costs approximately \$40,000 for every dwelling to which it provides benefit, we consider it cost effective. In the Chell Road area, the proposed wall is costing approximately \$58,000 for every dwelling it benefits. Dwellings which derive a benefit are those which lie immediately adjacent to the roadway.

If I can provide further assistance, contact me or the Project Manager, Mr. Randy Aldrich, telephone no. 333-1139.

Very truly yours,

*Neil J. Pedersen*

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

NJP/ib

cc: Mr. Wayne R. Clingan  
Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.  
Mr. Charles B. Adams

My telephone number is 333-1110

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech  
303 7555 Baltimore Metro - 565 0451 D.C. Metro - 1 800-492 5082 Statewide Toll Free  
P.O. Box 717 / 707 North Calvert St. Baltimore, Maryland 21203 0717

88



(This letter was typed by SHA in order to be legible after printing).

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

Contract No. HO 606-101-770  
PDMS No. 132046  
Location - Design Public Hearing  
U.S. Route 29  
Patuxent River to U.S. Route 40  
Tuesday February 17, 1987  
Hammond High School  
Original Signed by  
Chris Workman

NAME \_\_\_\_\_ DATE 2/22/87

PLEASE PRINT ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_

CITY/TOWN Columbia STATE MD ZIP CODE 21044

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

The environmental assessment produced for the Owen Brown/Highway 29 study indicated that noise levels in my area are expected to double. I understand that noise abatement for my area will be studied further. I wish to state my concern that noise levels remain under federal standards and, if that requires abatement measures, that such construction be included in the project.



**Maryland Department of Transportation**

State Highway Administration

William K. Hoffmann  
Secretary  
Hal Kassoff  
Administrator

April 10, 1987

Re: Contract No. HO 606-101-770  
U.S. Route 29  
Patuxent River to U.S. Route 40  
P.D.M.S. No. 132046

Mr. Chris Workman  
6413 Chell Road  
Columbia, Maryland 21044

Dear Mr. Workman:

This letter is in response to your correspondence of February 22, 1987 pertaining to our Project Planning study on the U.S. Route 29 corridor in Howard County.

The noise analysis for the area where you live was performed and addressed within the Environmental Assessment for the proposed Brokenland Parkway Interchange. This analysis shows that future noise levels will exceed Federal Highway Administration Noise Abatement Criteria. It also shows that if a barrier were to be erected, it would cost approximately \$58,000 for every dwelling for which it provides a benefit. Those dwellings which receive a benefit are all those adjacent to the roadway. If a proposed barrier costs about \$40,000 for every dwelling that it benefits, we proceed with further analysis of the barrier. In your particular case, since the costs do not meet our threshold, no further analysis of the barrier will be performed.

I want to thank you for your interest in the highway development process as it relates to this study. Please contact us again if you have additional questions.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr.  
Deputy Director  
Project Development Division

by: \_\_\_\_\_  
Randy Aldrich  
Project Manager

LHE/RCA/ih

cc: Mr. Wayne R. Clingan  
Mr. Charles B. Adams

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

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

69



**Maryland Department of Transportation**

State Highway Administration

William K. Hedmann

Secretary

Hal Kasloff

Administrator

(This letter was typed by SHA in order to be legible after printing).

Thomas M. Coleman  
5668 Stevens Forest Road  
Columbia, MD 21045

February 22, 1987

Planning & Preliminary Engineering  
State Highway Administration  
Post Office Box 717  
Baltimore, MD 21203-0717

Gentlemen:

Please place my name on the project mailing list for the Route 29 (between the Patuxent River and U.S. Route 40) widening project.

Also please sent to me a copy of the Draft Environmental Assessment.

Sincerely

Original signed by

Thomas M. Coleman  
5668 Stevens Forest Road  
Columbia, MD 21045

March 5, 1987

RE: Contract No. HO 606-101-770  
US Route 29  
Patuxent River to  
US Route 10  
PDMS No. 123046

Mr. Thomas M. Coleman  
5668 Stevens Forest Road  
Columbia, MD 21045

Dear Mr. Coleman:

This letter is in response to your correspondence of February 22, 1987 and pertains to our Project Planning study underway on the US Route 29 corridor in Howard County. As you have requested, your name has been added to our mailing list for this project. Also, attached with this letter, I have provided you a copy of the Environmental Assessment prepared for the project.

I would like to thank you for your interest in the highway development process as it relates to the project. Contact me again if you have additional questions.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr.  
Deputy Director  
Project Development Division

by: Randy Aldrich  
Randy Aldrich  
Project Manager

LHE:RCA:eg  
Attachment  
cc: Wayne R. Clingan

My telephone number is 333-1139

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech  
383 7555 Baltimore Metro - 565 0451 D.C. Metro - 1 800 492 5082 Statewide Toll Free  
P.O. Box 117 707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203 0717

pb

(This letter was typed by SHA in order to be legible after printing).

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

Contract No. HO 606-101-770  
PDMS No. 132046  
Location - Design Public Hearing  
U.S. Route 29  
Patuxent River to U.S. Route 40  
Tuesday February 17, 1987  
Hammond High School  
Original Signed by  
Burt & Jackie Heinrich

NAME \_\_\_\_\_ DATE 3-3-87

PLEASE  
PRINT

ADDRESS 6542 Beechwood Dr.

CITY/TOWN Columbia STATE MD ZIP CODE 21646

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

~~We wish to voice strong opposition to Alternative C, Concept 3 Seneca Dr.,  
Segment VIII. Specifically we oppose the manner in which Shaker Dr. would be  
extended. To extend this road as proposed would not only vertically destroy the  
yards of those homes immediately adjacent to the road but would, on our opinion,  
do serious harm to the aesthetic and monetary value of all properties along  
Beechwood Dr. and Amherst Dr. between Seneca Dr. and the church. In addition we  
think that there is already a safety problem with the "closeness" of the two  
intersections Beechwood/Seneca and Shaker/Seneca.  
We also oppose Concept 4 as the partial utility drive (and incomplete Shaker Dr.)  
would force all arrowhead traffic into the development and turn a peaceful  
neighborhood where children play into a high-traffic area.  
We therefore support concept 5 in same form not only for safety reasons but to  
preserve the quality of our homes and neighborhood by keeping traffic at/on Rt  
29 - where it was when we bought this home.~~

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

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

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



**Maryland Department of Transportation**

State Highway Administration

**William K. Holloman**  
Secretary  
**Hal Kassoff**  
Administrator

April 10, 1987

Re: Contract No. HO 606-101-770  
U.S. Route 29 - Patuxent  
River to U.S. Route 40  
P.D.M.S. No. 132046

Mr. and Mrs. Heinrich  
6542 Beechwood Drive  
Columbia, Maryland 21046

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Heinrich:

This letter is in response to your correspondence of March 3, 1987 pertaining to our Project Planning study on the U.S. Route 29 corridor in Howard County. I appreciate your comments pertaining to the three grade separation concepts for Seneca Drive, and your endorsement for Concept No. 5. We will use this information in our decision on a preferred concept at this location.

I want to thank you for your interest in the highway development process as it relates to this project. If we can provide further assistance, please contact us again.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr.  
Deputy Director  
Project Development Division

by: Randy Aldrich  
Randy Aldrich  
Project Manager

LHE/RCA/ih

cc: Mr. Wayne R. Clingan

My telephone number is 333-1139

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech  
J83 7555 Baltimore Metro - 565-0451 O.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5082 Statewide Toll Free  
P.O. Box 717 / 707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203 0717

16

RECEIVED

#204  
FEB 18 1987

DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF  
PLANNING & PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

Mr. Frank M. Fugate  
10927 Hillcrest Drive  
Laurel, Md. 20707  
Phone No. (301) 792-4770

Maryland Department of Transportation  
State Highway Administration  
Office of Planning and Preliminary Engineering  
Box 717  
Baltimore, Md. 21202

Re: Contract No.: MD 606-101-770, PDMS No. 132046

To whom It May Concern:

I am writing this letter in the hopes that I will be able to get the Department of Transportation, Highway Administration to buy my property when US RT 29 Section VI is improved. I live on the northeast corner of RT 29 and Hillcrest Drive, at 10927 Hillcrest Drive.

I ask you to consider buying my property and making it a buffer area for our development. I make this request for many reasons.

The first, I am concerned about excessive noise. I believe that the increase traffic load on Rt 29 would increase noise dramatically. This in turn would have adverse effects on my family. I would be glad to part in a noise environmental impact study of people living along US RT 29.


Second, I also believe that my home will not withstand the excessive vibrations that would be put on it by the increased vehicular traffic, especially heavy truck traffic. I can already see some damage caused by vibrations that have taken place over the past years as the amount of traffic has increased. In your report you mention a hydrology report, does it take into account the effect of vibrations on structures? Please send me a copy of this hydrology report.

Third, I believe that if you buy land now it would be cheaper in the long run if there is future expansion of Rt 29. For example, on the north east side of Rt 29 between Rocky Gorge and new Rt 32, a distance of 6.5 miles, there are only 5 homes. Now would be the time to buy for future expansion not wait for explosive development after Rt 29 is improved.

Please add my name to the group of speakers at the meeting on 17 February 1987.

I am looking forward to hearing from you at the earliest possible time.

Frank M. Fugate



92



**Maryland Department of Transportation**

State Highway Administration

William K. Holloman

Secretary

Hal Kassoff

Administrator

March 13, 1987

RE: Contract No. HO 606-101-770  
U.S. Route 29  
Patuxent River to U.S. Route 40  
PDMS No. 132046

Mr. Frank M. Fugate  
10927 Hillcrest Drive  
Laurel, Maryland 20707

Dear Mr. Fugate:

This letter is in response to your correspondence received on February 18, 1987 and pertains to our Project Planning study underway on the U.S. Route 29 corridor in Howard County. Your property situated on the northeast corner of U.S. Route 29 and Hillcrest Drive lies outside of our existing right-of-way line and is not needed for any improvements proposed for this area of the corridor. We do not purchase property unless required for an improvement. Thus, purchase of your home is not possible.

We have performed noise measurements adjacent to your home and have used this information to predict future noise levels associated with projected increases in traffic. Our models indicate that the noise levels generated by traffic on U.S. Route 29 within the next 30 years will exceed the Federal Highway Administration Noise Abatement Criteria. Since the levels in the vicinity of your home will exceed 67 decibels, we have performed preliminary studies of methods to mitigate the impact. A decision on the reasonableness and feasibility of the barrier will be made during the development of the final engineering design.

The hydrology report mentioned in the environmental document refers to rainfall characteristics and its dispersment. This has no relation to the effect of roadway vibrations on your home. A study has been made of the soil characteristics of the area and has determined they are adequate to allow widening of the roadway within the existing median. We anticipate any future roadway vibrations will not have an adverse impact on your home.

Mr. Frank M. Fugate  
March 13, 1987  
Page 2

The design year of our study, 30 years into the future, is 2015. Our traffic forecasts show that by 2015, the traffic increases in the corridor south of Maryland Route 32 can be adequately accommodated by a six lane roadway. At this time, we cannot justify the additional expense associated with purchasing right-of-way for a future seventh and eight lanes.

I would like to thank you for your interest in the highway development process as it relates to this project. If we can be of further assistance, please contact me or the Project Manager, Mr. Randy Aldrich, telephone number (301) 333-1139.

Very truly yours,

*Neil J. Pedersen*

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

NJP:ds

cc: Mr. Wayne R. Clingan  
Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.  
Ms. Cynthia Simpson

My telephone number is (301) 333-1110

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech

383-7555 Baltimore Metro — 565-0451 D.C. Metro — 1-800-492-5062 Statewide Toll Free

P.O. Box 717 / 707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203 0717

93

(This letter was typed by SHA in order to be legible after printing).

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

Contract No. HO 606-101-770  
PDMS No. 132046  
Location - Design Public Hearing  
U.S. Route 29  
Patuxent River to U.S. Route 40  
Tuesday February 17, 1987  
Hammond High School  
Original Signed by  
S. Femrite

NAME \_\_\_\_\_ DATE 2/5/87  
ADDRESS 4673 Stallion St.(Columbia Hills - Meadowbroke Farms)  
CITY/TOWN Elliott City STATE MD ZIP CODE 21043

PLEASE PRINT  
I/We wish to comment or inquire about the following aspects of this project:  
~~Obviously, with the increased traffic, roads must be improved, widened, built,~~  
etc. Our concern is the noise, pollution, etc. which results. We hope the  
Highway Administration will take all possible steps to alleviate these  
situations, one possible solution would be to begin NOW an extensive evergreen  
tree planting program on all right-of-ways to help buffer the noise, etc. If  
the trees are planted now, by the time the highway is completed, a buffer would  
be in place and make our living near these super highways more tolerable

Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List.\*  
 Please delete my/our name(s) from the Mailing List.  
\*Persons who have received a copy of this brochure through the mail are already  
on the project Mailing List.



**Maryland Department of Transportation**

State Highway Administration

William K. Holmann  
Secretary  
Hal Kasloff  
Administrator

March 16, 1987

Re: Contract No. HO 606-101-770  
U.S. Route 29  
Patuxent River to U.S. Route 40  
P.D.M.S. No. 132046

Mr. S. Femrite  
4673 Stallion Court  
Ellicott City, Maryland 21043

Dear Mr. Femrite:

This letter is in response to your correspondence of February 5, 1987 and pertains to our Project Planning Study underway on the U.S. Route 29 corridor in Howard County. I want to thank you for your suggestion of planting a dense coverage of evergreen trees to mitigate future noise levels along this roadway. Unfortunately, in many of the areas along the corridor, there is insufficient width to accommodate a wide enough grove of these trees to provide effective mitigation. Nor can we be assured the trees will grow high enough to provide effective mitigation for the surrounding terrain.

A preliminary noise analysis has been performed and the results are available for review in the Environmental Assessment on display at the Howard County Library. When the project moves into the final design phase, a more detailed analysis of noise and noise mitigation will be undertaken.

I want to thank you for your interest in the highway development process as it relates to this project. Contact me if you have additional comments or questions.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr.  
Deputy Director  
Project Development Division

by: \_\_\_\_\_  
Randy Aldrich  
Project Manager

LHE/RCA/ih  
cc: Mr. Wayne R. Clingan  
Mr. Charles Adams

66

(This letter was typed by SHA in order to be legible after printing).



Maryland Department of Transportation

State Highway Administration

William K. Hoffmann
Secretary
Hal Kassoff
Administrator

March 13, 1987

RE: Contract No. HO 606-101-770
U.S. Route 29 - Patuxent
River to U.S. Route 40
PDMS No. 132046

STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS

Contract No. HO 606-101-770
PDMS No. 132046
Location - Design Public Hearing
U.S. Route 29
Patuxent River to U.S. Route 40
Tuesday February 17, 1987
Hammond High School
Original Signed by
Mr. James F. Donnelly

NAME DATE 2/18/87

PLEASE PRINT ADDRESS 10200 Westwood Drive
CITY/TOWN Columbia STATE MD ZIP CODE 21044

I/We wish to comment or inquire about the following aspects of this project:
We as a neighbor on Chell road, parallel to Rt 29 are very concerned about the
noise level generated now and the possible increase, due to the traffic as a
result of Rt 29 future development. It's been suggested by some to add a berm
or a barrier along the Chell road property line to control the noise factor.
During peak traffic we can feel the road vibration as the heavy traffic (trucks
etc) proceed on Rt 29. This even vibrates our front window.
Then when the wind of EW its just wonderful
We all know this will increase and become unbearable as work progresses.
So please consider plans to add either a berm or barrier adjacent to our proper-
ties before it drives us to the happy (Flak) farm.
Thank you
James F. Donnelly

Mr. James F. Donnelly
10200 Westwood Drive
Columbia, Maryland 21044

Dear Mr. Donnelly:

This letter is in response to your correspondence of February 18,
1987 regarding our Project Planning study underway on the U.S. Route 29
corridor in Howard County.

Preliminary studies have been made of existing and projected
noise levels in the segment of the corridor adjacent to Chell Road.
Those studies indicate that the Noise Abatement Criteria standards
established by the Federal Highway Administration will be exceeded
in the vicinity of Chell Road. When this project proceeds into the
final design phase, further analysis on noise mitigation measures
will be performed.

At this time we have not made any commitment to erect noise
barriers. A determination will be made as to whether noise barriers
are reasonable or feasible.

I would like to thank you for your interest in the highway
development process as it relates to this study. Contact me if
you have additional questions.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr.
Deputy Director
Project Development Division

by: Randy Aldrich
Project Manager

LHE:RCA:bh
cc: Mr. Wayne R. Clingan
Mr. Charles B. Adams

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

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

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

My telephone number is 333-1119
Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech
383 7555 Baltimore Metro - 565 0451 DC Metro - 1 800 492 5062 Statewide Toll Free
P.O. Box 717 / 707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203 0717

Handwritten number 95

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

Contract No. HO 606-101-770  
PDMS No. 132046  
Location - Design Public Hearing  
U.S. Route 29  
Patuxent River to U.S. Route 40  
Tuesday February 17, 1987  
Hammond High School

NAME Kathleen and William Docheray DATE March 4, 1987

PLEASE PRINT ADDRESS 6425 Chell Road

CITY/TOWN Columbia STATE Maryland ZIP CODE 21044

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

As fifteen year residents and taxpayers at this address, we strongly

urge the highway administration to consider minimal personal property

loss and the addition of noise barriers for those, like us, whose

property is adjacent to Route 29. The growth of Howard County, we realize,

makes such a highway expansion inevitable. It is only fair that

the needs of all County residents be considered including ours.

Thank you in advance for your assistance in this matter..

We also request that the type of noise barrier be earthen.

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

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

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



**Maryland Department of Transportation**

State Highway Administration

William K. Holman  
Secretary  
Hal Kassoff  
Administrator

April 10, 1987

Re: Contract No. HO 606-101-770  
U.S. Route 29  
Patuxent River to  
U.S. Route 29  
P.D.M.S. No. 132046

Mr. and Mrs. William Docheray  
6425 Chell Road  
Columbia, Maryland 21044

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Docheray:

This letter is in response to your correspondence of March 4, 1987 pertaining to our Project Planning study on the U.S. Route 29 corridor in Howard County.

The noise analysis for the area where you live was performed and addressed within the Environmental Assessment for the proposed Brokenland Parkway Interchange. This analysis shows that future noise levels will exceed Federal Highway Administration Noise Abatement Criteria. It also showed that if a barrier were to be erected, it would cost approximately \$58,000 for every dwelling for which it provides a benefit. Due to limited right-of-way availability at this location, our analysis investigated structural barriers only. Earthen berms were not studied. Those dwellings which receive a benefit are all those adjacent to the roadway. If a proposed barrier costs about \$40,000 for every dwelling that it benefits, we proceed with further analysis of the barrier. In your particular case, since the costs do not meet our threshold, no further analysis of the barrier will be performed.

I want to thank you for your interest in the highway development as it relates to this study. Please contact us again if you have additional questions.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr.  
Deputy Director  
Project Development Division

by: Randy Aldrich  
Randy Aldrich  
Project Manager

LHE/RCA/lh

cc: Mr. Wayne R. Clingan  
Mr. Charles B. Adams

My telephone number is 333-1139

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech  
383 7555 Baltimore Metro - 565-0451 O.C. Metro - 1 800-492-5062 Statewide Toll Free  
P.O. Box 717 / 707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203 0717

96



(This letter was typed by SHA in order to be legible after printing).

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

Contract No. HO 606-101-770  
PDMS No. 132046  
Location - Design Public Hearing  
U.S. Route 29  
Patuxent River to U.S. Route 40  
Tuesday February 17, 1987  
Hammond High School  
Original Signed by  
John G. Brandenburg

DATE 2/5/87

NAME \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_

PLEASE  
PRINT

ADDRESS 5243 W. Running Brook 301

CITY/TOWN Columbia STATE MD ZIP CODE 21044

~~I/We wish to comment or inquire about the following aspects of this project:  
The project is needed and should proceed ASAP, following Alternative "C". My~~

~~wife commutes daily on 29 toward Silver Spring. In the past year, traffic  
congestion has increased MARKEDLY during rush hour, and signals seem to hold  
things up greatly. Alt "C" should solve things for a long time to come.  
You should seriously examine noise attenuation for existing residents along 29  
and major feeder routes. We live on 175 at Running Brook Road for 3 1/2 years.  
Noise levels have increased markedly as traffic levels have increased. This  
problem will further increase, affecting negatively both quality of life and  
property values.~~

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

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

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



**Maryland Department of Transportation**

State Highway Administration

William K. Hoffmann  
Secretary  
Hal Kassoff  
Administrator

March 11, 1987

RE: Contract No. HO 606-101-770  
U.S. Route 29 - Patuxent  
River to U.S. Route 40  
PDMS No. 132046

Mr. John G. Brandenburg  
5243 West Running Brook  
Unit 301  
Columbia, Maryland 21044

Dear Mr. Brandenburg:

This letter is in response to your correspondence of February 5, 1987 regarding our Project Planning study underway on the U.S. Route 29 corridor in Howard County. Your endorsement of Alternative C is appreciated.

With regards to noise attenuation, preliminary studies have been made of existing and projected noise levels in the corridor. The Noise Abatement Criteria Standards established by the Federal Highway Administration are exceeded in several areas. As the study continues, a decision will be made whether barriers are reasonable and feasible. The decision will be made known in the final environmental document being prepared.

I want to thank you for your interest in the highway development process as it relates to this study. Contact me if you have additional questions.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr.  
Deputy Director  
Project Development Division

by: Alice Ellen White, Jr.  
Randy Aldrich  
Project Manager

LHE:RCA:bh  
cc: Mr. Wayne R. Clingan  
Mr. Charles B. Adams

My telephone number is 333-1139

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech  
383 7555 Baltimore Metro - 565-0451 O.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5082 Statewide Toll Free  
P.O. Box 717 / 707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203 0717

97

COMMISSIONERS

Alexander Williams, Jr.  
Chairman  
Lounard H. Tuttlebaum  
Vice Chairman  
Ada Kuoncu Blumhardt  
Jean L. Maury  
Robert M. Potter  
Robert P. Will  
Richard G. Hoover  
General Manager

Washington Suburban  
Sanitary Commission

4017 Hamilton Street • Hyattsville, MD 20781 • 301 699-4000  
TTY: 277-2314

January 26, 1987

PROJECT  
DEVELOPMENT  
DIVISION  
Feb 2 10 47 AM '87

Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.  
Deputy Director  
Project Development Division  
State Highway Administration  
Md. Dept. of Transportation  
P.O. Box 717  
707 North Calvert Street  
Baltimore, Md. 21203-0717

Dear Mr. Ege:

We have had the opportunity to review the Draft Environmental Assessment entitled: "U.S. Rt. 29 Patuxent River Bridge to U.S Rt. 40" Howard County, Maryland and would like to provide the following comments:

1. Please see our previous comments dated 2/10/86 and 2/26/86 concerning: emergency vehicle access to fire roads on WSSC watershed property, direct and indirect effects of construction on watershed property and reservoir water quality, access to emergency rescue boat launch ramp, traffic rerouting to Scotts Cove Recreation Area, and water quality effects of roadway runoff. These issues appear not to have been addresses in the Draft E.A.
2. Page 1-31 #44. Reference to WSSC property as "park" property may be misleading or inaccurate. This is forested watershed buffer protection property. Within your study area Segment V1, the only recreational access is limited to fishing by boat only (no shoreline fishing) on the T.H. Duckett (Rocky Gorge) Reservoir.
3. Page IV-8 Item 6 "Parks". WSSC watershed property is not developed "park" property in the usual definition or sense. We cannot agree with the statement "No impacts on area parks would occur with the implementation of any of the project alternatives." Significant direct and indirect impacts on WSSC watershed property include: runoff from construction at Old Columbia Pike intersection with Rt. 29, emergency vehicle access limitations to watershed fire access roads, emergency vehicle access limitations to watershed/reservoir boat launch ramps, and traffic rerouting to the Scotts Cove Recreation area.
4. Page V-4 Statement "(Asked for more specific information on park boundaries and uses. No response received as of January, 1987.)" is simply not true! We have had several telephone conversations with Ms. Sharon Preller (301-659-1184 or 5) and have sent maps and other information. We understood that maps and

Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.  
January 26, 1987  
Page 2

plans would be sent to us to comment on, then we would send a letter stating our agreement or disagreement with stated impacts on our property. We have received nothing from the Maryland SHA as of 1/26/87. Our maps and additional information are again enclosed here.

Sincerely,

Michael J. Gear  
Watershed Manager

MJG:ssa  
Enclosures

98



Maryland Department of Transportation

State Highway Administration

William K. Hedmann
Secretary
Mai Kassoff
Administrator

Mr. Michael T. Grear
March 11, 1987
Page Two

March 11, 1987

RE: Contract No. M 425-101-370 N
U.S. Route 29 Widening
Howard County Line to U.S. Route 40

Mr. Michael T. Grear
Watershed Manager
Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission
4017 Hamilton Street
Hyattsville, Maryland 20781

Dear Mr. Grear:

Thank you for your January 26, 1987 letter regarding the Environmental Assessment for U.S. Route 29 from the Patuxent River Bridge to U.S. Route 40 in Howard County.

Inadvertently, your correspondence of February 2, 1987 (we have no record of the February 22, 1987 letter) was not included in the Environmental Assessment for the subject project. However, we wish to take this opportunity to address your concerns regarding the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC) watershed property relative to the proposed improvement of U.S. Route 29 by referring to your letter of January 26, 1987.

- 1. Emergency vehicle access to fire roads on the WSSC watershed property would be fully maintained since the widening of U.S. Route 29 in Howard County occurs north of Maryland Route 216 (Scaggsville Road) not south. Emergency vehicle access from U.S. Route 29 northbound to Old Columbia Road would be maintained by a locked gate. Access to the west side of U.S. Route 29/Old Columbia Road would be provided via Maryland Route 216 westbound.

Alternate C, Concepts 2, 3, and 4 would remove all access, exclusive of the emergency access described above, to U.S. Route 29 at Old Columbia Road. Access to Scotts Cove Recreation Area would be provided via Pineway Drive off of Scaggsville Road.

The only improvement at the U.S. Route 29/Old Columbin Road intersection is the proposed overpass and removal of the median crossover. These improvements would not significantly increase water runoff. However, Alternate C, Concepts 2, 3, and 4 would cross intermittent tributaries of the Patuxent River via service roads. Section IV, pages 13 and 14, of the Environmental Assessment addresses the mitigation of these impacts.

- 2. We regret our oversight in calling your property parkland. We will use the correct identification in the final environmental document. However, earlier telephone conversations with Ms. Sharon Preller were focused on uses of "the park property", and a request to forward "park property boundaries" to Gannett Fleming. These requests were formalized in a letter by Gannett Fleming to Mr. Franklin Jamerson, Acting Water Operation Division Head of WSSC, dated October 14, 1986. However, neither Ms. Preller nor Gannett Fleming received the information requested, nor were they alerted to the misnomer.
3. See #1 & 2. No right-of-way would be required from the WSSC property for the proposed improvements.
4. See #2.

We do thank you for the mapping and information received on February 2, 1987 regarding the WSSC watershed property. We hope all questions have been addressed and if there are further comments or questions, please contact me or the project manager, Mr. Randy Aldrich, at 333-1139.

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

By: Cynthia D. Simpson
Cynthia D. Simpson, Chief
Environmental Management

- LHE:CDS:tlh
cc: Mr. Neil J. Pedersen
Mr. Wayne Clingan
Mr. Mike Snyder
Mr. Wayne Willey
Mr. Randy Aldrich

69

8449 Old Columbia Road  
Laurel, Maryland 20707  
March 3, 1987

Mr. Randy Aldrich, Project Manager  
Maryland Department of Transportation  
State Highway Department  
Office of Planning & Preliminary Engineering  
Box 717  
Baltimore, Maryland 21203

Contract No. HO 606-101-770  
PDMS No. 132046

Dear Mr. Aldrich:

I attended the Design Public Hearing held at Hammond High School on February 17, 1987, relative to proposed alternatives for improving U.S. Route 29, and am especially interested in the portion identified as Segment VI from the Patuxent River to north of Hopkins-Gorman Road. I am co-owner and Secretary of the corporation which operates the Rocky Gorge Driving Range, Miniature Golf, and Baseball/Softball Batting facility located at the intersection of U.S. Route 29 and Old Columbia Road; owner of approximately 70 acres of land which borders on U.S. Route 29 and includes the above described recreational facility; and wife of Kenneth F. Novak, owner of 2 houses and a lot located at 8450 Old Columbia Road. This letter is being written on behalf of the corporation as well as myself and my husband.

We feel that improvements are needed on U.S. Route 29 so that the road will be able to handle the projected increase in traffic. In discussions with representatives of the State Highway Administration at the meeting, several issues were identified which are of concern to us. They are:

Alternate C, Concept 1 - This alternative would adversely affect the accessibility of the recreational facility because it eliminates access to vehicles going south on U.S. Route 29. More than 50 percent of our customers come from the Columbia, Laurel, Ellicott City, and Baltimore areas and unless better provisions are made for accessing our property, this concept is unacceptable to us.

Alternate C, Concept 2 - This concept has the least harmful impact for accessing our recreational facility and property; however, it would be more inconvenient than it is now. It would also take a portion of our property located at 8450 Old Columbia Road.

Alternate C, Concept 3 - This concept is totally unacceptable for a number of reasons. Construction of the service road would divide our farm into two parcels. We currently raise beef cattle and some provision would need to be made to move the cattle across or under the service road. Currently the streams on our property

flow continuously year round and our farm pond is always full because the streams and pond are fed by springs. Construction of the service road as proposed would close off at least 3 of these springs and alternative water supply sources would have to be provided. The field west of the service road would be without running water. The service road would cross the irrigation system for our recreational facility which was installed in 1986 at a cost of about \$80,000. The availability of water for the irrigation system would also be in jeopardy since the water comes from the farm pond. The irrigation system would need to be replaced. Furthermore, the elevation required for the service road, due to the existing topography would greatly diminish the value of the property for either agricultural or commercial purposes. This concept would also put all of the traffic going to our recreational facility on Harding Road, a narrow 2-lane road with a 90 degree turn at the intersection of Old Columbia Road and Harding Road. This road could not handle the more than 2,000 vehicles that travel to our facility almost daily during the peak months of May, June, July, and August. We were told that the traffic volume on Old Columbia Road is 400 vehicles daily, however, this is significantly lower than our data which is based on the volume of business we have. We also wish to point out that our largest volume days are on weekends and holidays.

Alternate C, Concept 4 - It is difficult to even comment on this proposal because we are unable to determine where Cherry Lane joins Harding Road because Cherry Lane is not constructed at present. It appears, however, that this concept is primarily a concession to the developer of Cherry Tree Farms Housing Development. This concept should be avoided because of the large volume of traffic that would be required to travel on Harding Road. This alternative is totally unacceptable.

All of the different concepts provided under Alternative C are significant to us since the ease by which our recreational facility is accessed is diminished or eliminated. We urge you to take our interests into consideration when determining final plans.

We appreciate having the opportunity to express our concerns on these alternatives and concepts. We trust that you will keep us informed as decisions are made and this project progresses.

Sincerely,

  
Frances E. Robinson

PROJ. FILE  
RECEIVED  
MAR 5 1987

101



**Maryland Department of Transportation**

State Highway Administration

William K. Hellmann  
Secretary  
Mal Kassoff  
Administrator

March 16, 1987

Re: Contract No. HO 606-101-770  
U.S. Route 29 - Patuxent  
River to U.S. Route 40  
P.D.M.S. No. 132046

Ms. Frances E. Robinson  
8449 Old Columbia Road  
Laurel, Maryland 20707

Dear Mrs. Robinson:

This letter is in response to your correspondence of March 3, 1987 regarding our Project Planning study underway on the U.S. Route 29 corridor in Howard County. I appreciate your support for making traffic capacity improvements in the corridor. The comments you have provided on the grade separation concepts at Old Columbia Road south of Maryland Route 216 are being taken into consideration as we make our recommendation to the Administrator on a preferred concept. We are aware that some of the concepts would seriously hamper access to your recreational facility and every reasonable effort will be taken to keep the potential impacts to a minimum.

I want to thank you for your interest in the highway development process as it relates to this project. If I can provide further assistance, please contact me.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr.  
Deputy Director  
Project Development Division

by:

  
Randy Aldrich  
Project Manager

LHE/RCA/ih

cc: Mr. Wayne R. Clingan

My telephone number is 333-1139

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech  
383-7555 Baltimore Metro - 565-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5062 Statewide Toll Free  
P.O. Box 717 / 707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203 0717

101



maryland association  
of bicycle organizations

reply to: James M. Tordella  
President, MABO  
10353 Maypole Way  
Columbia, MD 21046

RECEIVED  
MAR 5 1987  
PROJECT DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

3 March 1987

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

DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF  
PLANNING & PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

Dear Mr. Pedersen:

SHA should certainly be commended on the fine work and detailed engineering on the recent study of US29 in Howard County. This letter is in response to your request for comments on that plan.

As you know from our letter of 21 July 1985, MABO is concerned with maintaining bicycle access to US29, since there is no viable alternative for bicycling in a southwest-northeast direction in Howard County. We appreciate the time and effort taken by Mr. Richard Davis, Bicycle Affairs Coordinator, in sketching alternate routes to US29. Unfortunately, those routes do not meet any of the Federal Highway Administration guidelines for comparative safety of expressways and alternate routes for bicyclists. The guidelines are found in the FHA R&D handbook on bicycle mopping, in an appendix. Using US29 is better than using circuitous side roads full of traffic conflicts, according to those guidelines.

MABO realizes that it is illegal to bicycle on an expressway in Maryland. MABO is also in favor of excellent transportation facilities for Howard County and the state. MABO believes that providing full sidepoths is nowhere near as cost effective as allowing bicycle access to most expressways.

We propose that the SHA and MABO cooperate on a Maryland law change to provide access to US29 and other roads. We would prefer adherence to the federal guidelines in the bicycle mopping handbook. Another approach we could discuss would be a bicycle operator's license for use of roads which would be otherwise forbidden.

We also request that the design of bridges to be built over US29 as a part of this project be reviewed for bicycle compatibility. These bridges will be used by the large population living on both sides of US29, and they should all have curb lines which meet the SHA guidelines for shared use. For the speed and traffic load of these bridges in general, the curb lines should be about 14 feet for better bicycling

Bicycling is a cheap, highly efficient, and healthful method of recreation, exercise and commuting. Bicycle commuting could relieve a noticeable amount of automobile traffic from U.S. 29, if it were provided for. Bicycling over bridges should also be easy. Not every longer trip in Howard County should require a car. Bicycling contributes to that undefinable attribute called quality of life, which Howard County possesses in abundance. Our transportation system should maintain and enhance that quality of life.

Very truly yours,

James M. Tordella  
President, MABO

cc: Ms. Liz Bobo, Howard County Executive  
Mr. Robert Kittleman, House of Delegates

102

James M. Tordella  
Governmental Representative  
Howard County Bicycle Club  
10353 Maypole Way  
Columbia, MD 21044

3 March 1987

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

Dear Mr. Pedersen:

The Howard County Bicycle Club, a group of 40-50 bicyclists in Howard County, wishes to comment on the current US29 plan. We believe the overall plan is a good one, showing careful engineering design and considerations. We are particularly interested in two aspects: bicycle compatibility of interchanges and bridges, and access to US29.

We wish to emphasize that all bridges should be bicycle compatible. We request that all bridge curb lanes be 14' wide. This is particularly important in Columbia and south of Columbia. Seneca Drive is an example of two large groups of people (one group on each side of the road) who will use such bridges. The bridges should be built to our best design criteria. We believe sidewalks on both sides are also necessary on these bridges. We favor option 5B for Seneca Drive.

The second area is access to US29. We as a club believe that access to US29 is necessary for reasonable commuting and longer distance travel in Howard County. We would like to work with the SHA on possible laws to make access to expressways legal. The new US29 should not penalize current valid road users. We bicyclists have not sold our right of access, and we believe that our tax dollars should not be used to deprive us of access.

Very truly yours,



James M. Tordella  
Governmental Representative  
Howard County Bicycle Club

RECEIVED

MAR 5 1987

PLANNING & PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

103



**Maryland Department of Transportation**

State Highway Administration

William K. Hoffmann  
Secretary  
Hal Kassoff  
Administrator

MAR 30 1987

Mr. James E. Tordella  
10353 Maypole Way  
Columbia, Maryland 21044

Dear Mr. Tordella:

Thank you for your letters of March 3, 1987 presenting the positions of Maryland Association Bicycle Organizations and the Howard County Bicycling Club regarding our US 29 Corridor Study. Your views, as well as the rest of the public's comments, will be considered before a comprehensive recommendation is presented to the Administrator.

As you know, cycling will gradually become prohibited on US 29 within Howard County as the roadway is upgraded to a full control of access highway. Recognizing that some cyclists and many motorists will be inconvenienced to varying degrees by this necessary improvement to US 29, we are making an extensive effort to develop an integrated system of local service roads and grade separated cross-roads to minimize the amount of adverse travel. Also, you should be aware that the local service roads and many connections proposed within the US 29 corridor are being built for the County using their criteria, which in some cases may not be completely bicycle compatible.

With regard to your secondary issue, the State Highway Administration cannot condone the use of our freeways (expressways as defined by Maryland Law) for any purpose other than high speed motor vehicle travel. To do so would compromise the primary safety and operational advantage of these highways - limiting potential extraneous interferences. Only 2% of all the highway mileage in Maryland is prohibited to bicycle use. I feel it is not unreasonable to preclude a few cyclists from less than 560 miles of freeways for the general public welfare. In those few areas of the State where no public road alternatives exist, we will work with you to develop pragmatic service options.

Mr. James E. Tordella

Page Two

Please feel free to call me if I can be of any further assistance.

Very truly yours,  
NEIL J. PEDERSEN

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

NJP/jp

cc: Mr. Louis Ege  
Mr. Richard W. Davis

bcc: Mr. Jack F. Ross  
Mr. J. L. White  
Mr. J. E. Thompson  
Mr. J. D. Bruck  
Mr. Randy Alrich

My telephone number is 333-1110

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech  
183 7555 Baltimore Metro - 565 0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5082 Statewide Toll Free  
P.O. Box 717 / 707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

164



10721 Gorman Road  
Laurel, Md. 20707  
2 March 1987

PROJECT  
DEVELOPMENT  
DIVISION  
Mar 5 4 04 PM '87

Mr. Neil J. Pederson, Director  
Office of Planning and Preliminary Engineering  
State Highway Administration  
707 N. Calvert Street  
Baltimore, Maryland 21202

Dear Mr. Pederson:

I am writing to express my concern with regard to the Hopkins-Gorman Road interchange as depicted in Segment VI of the State Highway Administration's publication entitled, "Combined Location/Design Public Hearing U.S. Route 29", with references to the hearing of February 17, 1987 and identified as "Alternate C-Concept 1, Hopkins-Gorman Road Interchange."

This particular design puts a large intersection directly in our front yard and would be extremely undesirable and would have a direct adverse effect on the style and comfort of living which we have been accustomed to ever since moving into our house on Gorman Road in 1972. Also, we would surely suffer a substantial financial loss in the decreased value of our property as a result of the building of a 4-lane road that would intersect with the existing Gorman Road in such a manner that lights of vehicles would be shining directly into two bedrooms and the livingroom of our house, not more than 100 feet away, not to mention the noise and congestion of such an intersection.

In a recent telephone conversation with Mr. Randy Aldrich of the State Highway Administration, I learned that this particular concept was developed to accommodate the request of the Hammond Village Citizens Association (HVCA) to have a "T" intersection with stop signs to make Gorman Road a less desirable route for east-west traffic through the residential neighborhood of Hammond Village. I was, and still am, active on the HVCA Roads Committee which submitted the concept of the "T" intersection; however, our idea of where the intersection would best be located is not the way it was developed for this concept. Our original idea would have put the intersection at the existing intersection of Hammond Parkway and Gorman Road or with the access road "Old Columbe Pike". Please note that the HVCA does not support the acceptance of Concept 1. On the other hand, the HVCA does support the acceptance of Concept 2 for the Hopkins-Gorman Road interchange as expressed in writing and verbal testimony by Mr. Bruce Woodford, President of the HVCA, at the hearing held February 17, 1987 at Hammond High School.

I would appreciate hearing from you or any member of your staff any news or developments regarding the intersection as it would be a big relief to know that Concept 1 is not being considered a viable concept for this interchange. I can be reached during the day at my work number (202) 537-8900 or during evening hours at (301) 498-1215.

Your cooperation regarding this matter would be most appreciated.

Sincerely,

*Jerry A. Waggoner*  
Jerry A. Waggoner

cc: Mr. Randy Aldrich, Project Manager  
Project Development Division  
State Highway Administration  
707 N. Calvert Street  
Baltimore, Maryland 21202

RECEIVED

#347  
MAR 5 1987

PLANNING & PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

105



**Maryland Department of Transportation**

State Highway Administration

William K. Hoffman  
Secretary  
Neil Kessoff  
Administrator

March 24, 1987

Re: Contract No. HO 606-101-770  
U.S. Route 29  
Patuxent River to  
U.S. Route 40  
PDMS No. 132046

Mr. Jerry A. Waggoner  
10721 Gorman Road  
Laurel, Maryland 20707

Dear Mr. Waggoner:

This letter is in response to your correspondence of March 2, 1987 and pertains to our Project Planning study underway on the U.S. Route 29 corridor in Howard County. I understand your concerns regarding the impacts which Alternative VI-C-1 at Hopkins-Gorman Road may have on your home on Gorman Road. At this time, we are proceeding on agreement preparations with the Brantly Development Corporation for an interchange at this location. The agreement is based on the mutual selection of Concept No. 2.

I want to thank you for your interest in the highway development process as it relates to the study. If Randy Aldrich or I can provide further assistance, please feel free to contact either of us again.

Very truly yours,

*Neil J. Pedersen*

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


NJP:cn

cc: Mr. Wayne R. Clingan  
Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.  
Mr. John D. Bruck

My telephone number is (301) 333-1111

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech  
363-7555 Baltimore Metro — 565-0451 D.C. Metro — 1-800-492-5082 Statewide Toll Free  
P.O. Box 717 / 707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203 - 0717

106



February 24, 1987

Mr. Randy Aldrich  
Project Manager  
Project Development Division  
State Highway Administration  
707 North Calvert Street  
Baltimore, Maryland 21202

Dear Mr. Aldrich:

I was present at the February 17 hearing at Hammond High School, and although tempted, I chose not to speak. My feelings about the proposed changes at Route 29 and Old Columbia Road (section VI), while perhaps unorthodox, are quite strong, and I would like this letter to be added to the official record of community response.

The night of the hearing, at about 6:30 p.m., as I approached the top of my driveway, I noticed a car, engine running, with headlights beamed down the field that stands between my house and Harding Road. I didn't know what they were doing, but I headed down my drive anyway. And then I saw—six or seven deer illuminated by the headlights.

Ten minutes later I headed back up the drive on my way to the hearing. The deer were still there. They crossed the gravel path in front of my car and fled into the woods that surround the Rocky Gorge Reservoir.

I doubt I need to explain what a beautiful, lifting experience it is to see these animals. That's why I purchased the property (13 acres) two years ago, and why I built a log home that was just completed in December. The previous owner had badly abused the land, particularly by renting it to motorcycle gangs who found it a convenient site to strip automobiles. After many months of work, the land has been restored.

I live at the intersection of Harding and Old Columbia Roads. During the warmer months of the year, people often pull their cars off the road and, with kids in tow, peer into the lager's bog lot that's at the corner. Harding Road may be just off Route 29, but it's still a twisting, turning, sleepy country road. I'm often amazed that I can drive the length of Harding Road over to Route 216 and not encounter even one other vehicle.

As you may know, much of the property to the east of Route 29, including my land, is zoned for half-acre residential development. When my neighbors first met me, and had finished with the normal greetings, they all got around to the one question that filled them with trepidation: "Are you planning to subdivide?" Since they didn't know me, I'm not sure they truly believed me when I answered "no." They had no way of knowing that I looked at the land as a place to live and die, and not as a place for tract housing.

PROJECT  
DEVELOPMENT  
DIVISION  
Jan 2 11 13 AM '87

And that brings me to Howard and Claire Lager, and their son and daughter-in-law, Larry and Joyce Lager. Their land, at the intersection of Route 29 and Old Columbia Road, is a place where several generations of Lagers have lived out their lives. Howard was born there (he must be close to 70 now) and it was his grandfather who first settled the land sometime in the late 1800s. The Lager farm, zoned for half-acre development, is worth a small fortune, and the Lagers, while not poor, do not have much in the way of financial resources. The temptation to be wealthy would be too much for most Americans today, but Larry and Joyce, who now live in a trailer on the property, still hope they can hold onto the land. This last weekend, they had a site surveyed for a home.

You may recall that Larry testified at the recent hearing, and told how their 130-odd acres in 1953 had now been reduced to about 75. (Actually, based on a map Larry showed me, it looked to me that they started with 146 acres.) Not all was taken for roads; a substantial amount was taken by WSSC. Regardless of how you view it, from the Lager's perspective, it's been government, government, government taking their land, paying them very little for it, and now, unbelievably, ready to take another substantial bite. It scares them, and it scares me. It's unconscionable for the State, acting in what is supposed to be the public interest, to drive these people off their land. That is what will happen if this continues. Frankly, it is in the public interest for the Lagers to stay with the land; what the Lagers represent to their community is something so distinct, so unique, and so valuable that it cannot be quantified, and therefore will never be considered unless you, as project manager, can make it a part of your personal decision-making.

The Lagers are the center of the community. Larry helps elderly residents who can't help themselves by plowing their driveways when it snows, and Joyce and Claire run errands for them. I've seen Howard, who's certainly no spring chicken himself, mowing and doing other yard work for an elderly lady down the road. When drifting snow blocked Old Columbia after our first big storm, Larry, who had no trouble getting out with his 4-wheel drive vehicle, nevertheless plowed the road all the way to Route 29. When I was cleaning up my land and building my house, their help was constant. They would see me doing something difficult and next thing you know they'd be there with two tractors, some other tools, and willing, helping hands. Truly unbelievably wonderful people.

Last summer, Howard was telling me of the "old days," when the bridge over the Patuxent was wood planks, and when snow and ice prevented cars getting up the hill from the bridge. He and his dad would go down and haul cars out with their farm equipment. It never occurred to me to ask whether they charged the motorists for their help because knowing Howard and knowing Larry, there's no doubt in my mind that helping people has been an important tradition in the Lager family for generations.

The Lagers raise hogs and hay. The less land they have, the less hay they can grow, and the fewer hogs they can support. Larry has a regular job, but the entire family depends upon their income from farming to make ends meet. Larry showed me a piece of paper wherein someone has computed, based on a point system, that the Lager farmland is not very valuable. To whom? It's their livelihood, their very existence. Would you or I sit still to have our jobs eliminated because Big Brother decided, based on a point system, that they were not valuable? Land is to a farmer what a building is to an office worker. It's obvious that the State Highway Administration is avoiding taking buildings, but who makes the moral judgment that the building is more important than the land? Or is it simply the economic tail wagging the dog? Naturally, each time the state takes another chunk of Lager land, the economies of scale necessary to run a farm become skewed in a negative direction. If the SHA takes land this time, it's easy to see how the point system will make the Lager property look even less valuable when it's time for the next land grab.

107

One speaker at the Hammond High School forum stated curtly that his development group had a development project planned for a certain intersection and that the state would therefore have to alter its plans. The lagers have no development on the drawing board; instead, they have had a farm business at their intersection for about 100 years. A field of hay may not look like much, but last summer, during the drought, it was more important to a lot of farmers than a new office building. Somehow, somewhere, we have lost sight of the value of the land and the people who nurture it. The land is much more than a speculative site for a shopping center, office building or subdivision with vinyl siding.

(I do not intend to convey an anti-business attitude. As the founder and president of a 50-employee company, I think my feelings about the rights of Americans to make a lawful living should be self-evident.)

But let's get back to roads. Concept 2, with its overpass requiring the seizing of substantial lager property, including destruction of the hog lot at the corner of Old Columbia and Harding Roads, would be tragic for the many reasons I've already stated. More than anything else, Concept 2 seems to be a means to funnel traffic to the golf driving range. It would not serve Harding Road residents very well, since there are only a dozen or so houses on the western part of Harding that would choose to use that route, while those on the eastern side of Harding would probably go directly to 216 or take a short cut through Pineway Drive.

Concept 3 is a road going to nowhere. It destroys the Robinson barn and cuts their farm in half. It dumps additional, unwanted traffic onto Harding Road. Concept 4, which extends a road within Cherry Tree Farms, does the same damage to the area in terms of traffic on Harding Road. Harding curves and twists, and to straighten it, or even to smooth it out a bit and make it suitable for heavier traffic means taking even more land from the lagers and a lot of other people who now live on its edge. To what end? To serve the driving range? To provide for occupants of housing that has not even been built? Do you take someone's front yard or front porch to build a road to serve people who may never occupy housing that may never be built? Carving a road from 216 to Harding Road sends a message: Harding Road and its adjacent lands are now open for full-scale development because there is good transportation access.

Let's be honest. People who live along Harding Road don't want development, and certainly don't want the SHA making social policy by cutting new roads that have the effect of directly encouraging development. We have a significant handicap already because of the half-acre zoning. Some of us with the means to do something about it are doing our best to acquire land and keep it out of the hands of developers. The battle is tough enough without the odds being stacked to a greater degree. Of course I'm biased, but it makes sense to leave a small country road just as it is, and funnel traffic out to Route 216, with its future interchange and higher capacity.

I could say that by increasing access to Harding Road, one increases garbage, noise and pollution. That's an argument against any road that's ever been built since man invented the wheel. But I will legitimately argue that increased residential development along Harding Road, which would be encouraged by Concepts 3 or 4, will tend to cause contamination of the Rocky Gorge water supply, since the surrounding land is of much higher elevation than the reservoir itself. That in itself should be reason enough to limit access to Harding Road. Rocky Gorge is a unique resource. Can we spare the short piece of road that snakes around this beautiful land—spare it and the reservoir from the ravages that more people inevitably bring?

Obviously, I support Concept 1. Everyone in the neighborhood that I've talked to also supports this concept. And yet even if it's adopted, I fear for the future of the lager farm; despite plans to widen 29 by utilizing the median strip, I keep looking at the curve in the road from Old Columbia down to the Patuxent bridge, and wonder how long it will be before someone suggests straightening the road by snatching more lager land to the east of 29.

I know you must consider good transportation policy as your prime goal, and I realize that there are many competing interests wishing to be heard. There are always winners and losers. But the lagers have lost enough. If government has a conscience, it's time to call a halt to the Lager land-grab.

Almost everyone accepts the inevitability of Route 29 as a limited access highway, and we know that development is coming. But with Concept 1, the lagers, as the heart and soul of a community, can still remain. And if more roads are not connected to Harding Road, the deer, the woods, and the water can maintain themselves as a needed oasis in the midst of frenzied development.

Sincerely,

  
Paul Panitz  
11497 Harding Road  
Laurel, Maryland 20707  
(301) 953-7485 H  
(202) 529-5655 O

cc: Mr. Neil J. Pederson  
Mr. Wayne R. Clingan



**Maryland Department of Transportation**

State Highway Administration

**William K. Hoffmann**  
Secretary  
**Hal Kaseoff**  
Administrator

March 23, 1987

Re: Contract No. HO 606-101-770  
U.S. Route 29  
Patuxent River to U.S. Route 40  
P.D.M.S. No. 132046

Mr. Paul Panitz  
11497 Harding Road  
Laurel, Maryland 20707

Dear Mr. Panitz:


This letter is in response to your correspondence of February 24, 1987 regarding our Project Planning study underway on U.S. Route 29 in Howard County. I appreciate your providing us with your thoughts pertaining to the grade separation proposals at Old Columbia Road. As you stated at the end of your comments, it is inevitable that some day in the future, U.S. Route 29 will become a controlled access highway. Your concerns, as well as those of your neighbors will be used in our selection process. Even after a selection is made of a preferred concept, we foresee no changes to the existing intersection until operational deficiencies have been identified.

I want to thank you for your interest in the highway development process as it relates to this study. Please contact us again if you have additional questions.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr.  
Deputy Director  
Project Development Division

by:

  
Randy Aldrich  
Project Manager

LHE/RCA/ih

cc: Mr. Wayne R. Clingan

109

RECEIVED

MAR 5 1987

DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF  
PLANNING & PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

State Highway Administration  
Office of Planning and Preliminary Engineering  
PO Box 717  
Baltimore Md 21203

REF: Contract No. 606-101-770  
PDMS No. 132046  
U.S. Route 29 - Patuxent River to U.S. 40

Sirs:

I did not make the meeting you apparently held recently on the referenced project, but I am looking at your proposals in the TRI-COUNTY FREE PRESS about the grade separation where Johns Hopkins Road/Gorman Road meets Columbia Pike, U.S. 29. All the proposals are puzzling to me.

I don't think I have ever seen a grade separation with so much busywork and so much confusion. Proposal C-2 even has an extra overpass. All this to avoid installing an ordinary cloverleaf.

I don't mean to sound cynical, I truly don't. However, all three proposals give the appearance of having been carefully drawn to avoid intruding on the property of Someone Or Other along the south side of Johns Hopkins/Gorman. Experience being what it is, the first name that comes to mind is that of the Columbia folks, HRD. The result, no matter what the reason, seems chaotic.

I don't ask much out of my highway taxes. I do ask that I be able to:

1. Leave my house and be able to travel north on U.S. 29.
2. Leave my house and be able to travel south on U.S. 29.
3. Leave my house and be able to get across U.S. 29 to go to Laurel.
4. Be able to come back from those three places.

And given that we are going to the expense, effort, and 2-year-long disruption of a grade separation project, I also ask that I be able to do these things, once the construction is complete, without having to put up with another traffic signal.

The proposed alternatives do not appear to give me a lot.

ALTERNATIVE C-1 would, if I read it correctly, require me to cross a ramp, make two left turns, and probably put up with at least one stop sign to accomplish maneuver (1); have a double merge to accomplish maneuver (2); cross a ramp and make a left turn to stay on my own street (maneuver [3]); and have a mix of right turns and ramp crossings to come back home.

ALTERNATIVE C-1a is a slight improvement, in that it would eliminate one left turn, I think.

ALTERNATIVE C-2 would finally let me travel north (maneuver [1]); with no other

7357 Hopkins Way  
Clarksville Md 21029  
2 March 1987


1101

-2-

really obvious improvements, but it introduces a new danger: the big entry scheme to the Liparini Development off the ramp. It would be only a matter of time before some chap got himself hit, turning left into that development, and the cries would begin for a \$546 traffic signal.

These designs were not intended to benefit the motorist! They may benefit Liparini and HRD, or maybe someone with a house near the southeast corner (I haven't looked carefully). But it seems to me, who travels that intersection twice daily and sometimes 10 times daily, that we could do this better.

We will refer to this, for want of a better term, as Alternative C-3.



I am neither a highway engineer or a graphic designer! Your people can do better than this. Thing is, they can also do better than the other alternatives. C-3 provides:

- full access all eight ways between Hopkins and U.S. 29;
- full access to Liparini from all four directions, plus escape;
- separation of the Liparini traffic from the APL traffic--something you will wish, down the line, that you had done at the beginning;
- two overpasses, same as C-2;
- making Gorman the stub street subject to the stop sign, rather than making through traffic subject to it;
- the possibility (----- line) of another access to Liparini direct from southbound U.S. 29 if the planners deem it wise;
- fewer linear feet of paved ramps than Alternatives 1, 1a, or 2, I swear;
- very little encroachment on the south side of Hopkins, no more than the SHA plans;

110

- markedly less confusion;
- only one set of left turns, that at the service drive for Liparini;
- through alignments for through traffic.

Folks, I'm not intending to be flippant, but the published alternatives make no sense at ALL. I am rejecting Alternatives A and B out of hand as being insufficient to meet the problem, as I am sure you recognize already. You are probably going to have to build Alternative B some day anyway, unless the various planners wake up to the fact that we don't need any more Rockville Pikes all over the state.

Thank you for your consideration, etc. You must be aware, by the way, that it will be vital to bring Md. 216 out to U.S. 29 to avoid drowning the poor folks east of U.S. 29 on Hopkins/Gorman with Liparini traffic.

And you must absolutely stop granting any more people access to U.S. 29, such as the half-access signalized setups near Md. 32.

Sincerely,



GEORGE L. HAMLIN

111



**Maryland Department of Transportation**

State Highway Administration

William K. Hedmann  
Secretary  
Hal Kassoff  
Administrator

April 1, 1987

Re: Contract No. HO 606-101-770  
U.S. Route 29  
Patuxent River to  
U.S. Route 40  
PDMS No. 132046

Mr. George L. Hamlin  
7357 Hopkins Way  
Clarksville, Maryland 21029

Dear Mr. Hamlin:

This letter is in response to your correspondence of March 2, 1987 regarding our Project Planning study underway on the U.S. Route 29 corridor in Howard County.

I appreciate your concerns regarding the proposed interchange concepts at Hopkins-Gorman Roads. These concepts have been carefully developed; not to avoid Howard Research and Development property; but to discourage the usage of Gorman and Leishear Roads by through traffic between Interstate Route 95 and the proposed Montpelier Research Park adjacent to U.S. Route 29. We feel that without a scheduled program to construct the proposed interchange between U.S. Route 29 and Maryland Route 216, the private construction of a standard interchange at Hopkins-Gorman Roads by Montpelier's developer, the Brantly Development Group, would encourage traffic to use these roads. Recently, Howard County downgraded the classification of Gorman Road so as to limit future traffic growth. All of these proposed interchange concepts proposed by Brantly are designed to discourage through traffic on Gorman and Leishear Roads.

Since this interchange involved private funding, the proposals were also developed to provide cost-effective adequate levels of future traffic service. For this reason, a full cloverleaf type interchange, as you have recommended, was not studied as an alternative solution. A full cloverleaf is expensive to build, expensive to maintain, requires more right-of-way, and has four undesirable weaving areas between successive loop ramps. At this location, it also provides excess capacity on some of the movements. Even if this interchange were to be entirely funded by the State, we would have ruled out consideration of a full cloverleaf for the same reasons.

My telephone number is 333-1110

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech  
383-7555 Baltimore Metro - 565-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5062 Statewide Toll Free  
P.O. Box 717, 707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

Mr. George L. Hamlin  
April 1, 1987  
Page Two

I want to thank you for your interest in the highway development process as it relates to this project. If we can provide further assistance, contact me or the Project Manager, Mr. Randy Aldrich, telephone number (301) 333-1139.

Very truly yours,

*Neil J. Pedersen*

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

NJP:tn

cc: Mr. Wayne R. Clingan  
Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.

112



Mr. John A. Marsch  
10928 Hillcrest Drive  
Laurel, Md. 20707  
Phone No. (301) 498-4175

Maryland Department of Transportation  
State Highway Administration  
Office of Planning and Preliminary Engineering  
Box 717  
Baltimore, Md. 21202

Re: Contract No.: HD 606-101-770, PDMS No. 132046

To whom It May Concern:

I am writing this letter in the hopes that I will be able to get the Department of Transportation, Highway Administration to buy my property when US RT 29 Section VI is improved. I live on the northeast corner of RT 29 and Hillcrest Drive, at 10928 Hillcrest Drive.

I ask you to consider buying my property and making it a buffer area for our development. I make this request for many reasons, medical being one of them.

First, I have a hearing loss which was caused by excessive noise exposure. This problem is aggravated by any noise above 82DBs. My hearing loss is on file with the US Labor Department and is due to noise exposure. I am not allowed to be exposed to any noise above 82DBs. By your own estimates if you widen US RT 29 there will be a ten-fold increase in the vehicular traffic next to my property. Some part of that traffic will cause noise above 82DB. This noise will cause more damage to my already poor hearing. In order for my hearing to remain intact, I can only see two options: one, the Highway Department build a noise barrier along my property fronting the highway that will protect my hearing; and the other, is buy my property and make it a buffer to our development. I believe it would be cheaper to buy my property.

If you need documentation concerning my hearing problems, I would be glad to provide you with it. I would also be glad to take part in a noise environmental impact study of people living along US RT 29.

Second, I also believe that my home will not withstand the excessive vibrations that would be put on it by the increased vehicular traffic, especially heavy truck traffic. I can already see damage caused by excessive vibrations that have taken place over the past years as the amount of traffic has increased. In your report you mention a hydrology report. I would like a copy of it.

Third, I believe that if you buy land now it would be cheaper in the long run for future expansion of Rt 29. For example, on the north east side of Rt 29 between Rocky Gorge and new Rt 32, a distance of 3.5 miles, there are only 5 homes. Now would be the time to buy for future expansion not wait for explosive development after Rt 29 is improved.

Please add my name to the group of speakers at the meeting on 17 February.

I am looking forward to hearing from you at the earliest possible time.

Mr. John A. Marsch  
10928 Hillcrest Drive  
Laurel, Md. 20707  
Phone No. (301) 498-4175  
March 03, 1987

Maryland Department of Transportation  
State Highway Administration  
Office of Planning and Preliminary Engineering  
Box 717  
Baltimore, Md. 21202

Re: Contract No.: HD 606-101-770, PDMS No. 132046

To whom It May Concern:

I am writing this letter to you after reviewing the environmental impact study you did for the US RT 29 expansion. As I pointed out to a DOT representative at the 17 February 1987 meeting, the study map clearly showed my home as a noise measurement station and the corner of my property as a pollution measurement station. I can assure you that in the past year there have not been any measuring devices on my property. The only devices that have been on my property in the past year were some road barrier saw horses but nothing attached to them. My wife who stays at home and my neighbors who work at night did not see anything or anybody doing measurements. I do not at this stage believe that you have a valid environmental impact statement. How many other areas have been missed? I am really concerned about your flawed noise measurements because of the hearing damage that I already have due to excessive noise exposure.

By your own estimates, which I question at this time, if you widen US RT 29 there will be a serious increase of noise due to the increase in vehicular traffic next to my property. A good part of that traffic will cause noise above my hearing damage threshold. This increase in noise will cause more damage to my already poor hearing. In order for my hearing to remain intact, I can only see two options: one, the Highway Department build a costly and unsightly noise barrier along my property fronting the highway that will protect my hearing; and the other, is buy my property and have it for future expansion of US 29. I believe it would be cheaper to buy my property.

I am looking forward to hearing from you at the earliest possible time.

*John A. Marsch*  
John A. Marsch

RECEIVED  
#355  
MAR 6 1987

DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF  
PLANNING & PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

*John A. Marsch*  
J. A. Marsch

113



**Maryland Department of Transportation**

State Highway Administration

March 26, 1987

William K. Heilmann  
Secretary  
Hal Kasaoff  
Administrator

Mr. John A. Marsch  
March 26, 1987  
Page Two

Re: Contract No. HO 606-101-770  
U.S. Route 29 - Patuxent  
River to U.S. Route 40  
PDMS No. 132046

Mr. John A. Marsch  
10928 Hillcrest Drive  
Laurel, Maryland 20707

Dear Mr. Marsch:

This letter is in response to your correspondence of March 3, 1987 regarding our project planning study underway on the U.S. Route 29 corridor in Howard County. Our consultant performing this study made existing ambient noise measurements in Noise Sensitive Area B on May 8, 1986. These measurements were made in the front yard area of the house in the northeast corner of the intersection at Hillcrest Drive and U.S. Route 29. The noonday period between 10:00 a.m. and 2:00 p.m. was chosen for the measurements. It is important for these ambient measurements to be made at a time of the day which permits maximum operating speeds. Vehicles operating at these speeds generate higher noise levels. It is unfortunate that your wife was not aware of our consultant's visit.

The existing ambient noise level at the monitored site on Hillcrest Drive is 71 decibels. This exceeds the Federal Highway Administration's Noise Abatement Criteria by 4 decibels. As you have pointed out, adding more lanes in the corridor will produce higher noise levels. Under these circumstances, we model the effectiveness of a noise barrier. In our modeling of the barrier, we determined there were not enough dwellings benefitting from its erection to make it cost effective. The maximum cost we can justify for a noise barrier is \$40,000 per dwelling or less. There is no provision in State or Federal law which allows us to purchase affected homes in lieu of erecting barriers.

I am sorry there is not more that we can do regarding your noise situation. Please feel free to contact me or the Project Manager, Mr. Randy Aldrich, telephone 333-1139, if you have further questions.

Very truly yours,

*Neil J. Pedersen*

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

NJP:cn

cc: Mr. Wayne R. Clingan  
Mr. Charles B. Adams  
Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.

My telephone number is 333-1110

114

(This letter was typed by SHA in order to be legible after printing.)

We live in Hillcrest Sub-division (8016 Crest Rd) and have for the past thirty (30) years and would request the following considerations in the Rt 29 plan.

1. That Hillcrest Road and Hammond Drive remain with right turn options for egress and ingress as is presently existing from and to Rt 29. In using Hammond Drive to transverse to 8016 Crest Road requires navigating up two (2) hills, one after another with a 30% grade on both and two (2) sharp turns in inclement weather as snow, ice and rain. By coming up, Hillcrest Road, we are up one hill to flat ground for 100 yards before making entrance to the second hill for better movement and safety, and this would apply to Hammond Parkway if built.

2. That Crest Road be extended to new Route 216 for egress and ingress (and no Hammond Parkway connection) to go south on Rt 216 to Route 29 to Burtonsville. Also that Rts 216 and 29 remain as a at grade crossing with traffic light which exists at present time.

3. If Hammond Parkway road system was initiated, it would be the most confusing interchange on Rt 29. Trying to make a left turn across traffic on John Hopkins Road to go south to Burtonsville on Rt 29 would be a severe and dangerous configuration where your life would be in constant danger. Coming south on Rt 29 from Columbia toward Hillcrest development would be very hard and confusing route for the residents of the community and as well as visitors.

Please simplify the problem, not compound it. Construct small full coverleafs intersections, people can slow down for safety's sake.

Thank you

Original was signed by

C. T. Diffendal  
Doris Diffendal  
8016 Crest Road  
Laurel MD 20707

115



**Maryland Department of Transportation**

State Highway Administration

William K. Hoffmann  
Secretary

Hai Kassoff  
Administrator

MAR 23 1987

RE: Contract No. HO 606-101-770  
U.S. Route 29  
Patuxent River to U.S. Route 40  
PDMS No. 132046

Mr. & Mrs. C. T. Diffendal

Page 2

I would like to thank you for your interest in the highway development process as it relates to this project. If I can provide further assistance, please contact me or the Project Manager, Mr. Randy Aldrich, telephone number 333-1139.

Mr. & Mrs. C. T. Diffendal  
8016 Crest Road  
Laurel, Maryland 20707

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Diffendal:

This letter is in response to your correspondence of February 18, 1987 and pertains to our Project Planning study underway on the U.S. Route 29 corridor in Howard County. I would like to comment on your numbered items:

Very truly yours,

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY:  
~~Neil J. Pedersen~~  
Neil J. Pedersen, Director  
Office of Planning and  
Preliminary Engineering

NJP:ds  
cc: Mr. Wayne R. Clingan  
Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.

- 1) Leaving both Hammond Drive and Hillcrest Drive with right-on, right-off access to northbound U.S. Route 29 will retain an undesirable weave section along northbound U.S. Route 29 between the two roadways. One of the roadways needs to be closed to correct this deficiency. The closure of Hillcrest Drive was selected due to the proximity of Hillcrest Drive to the end of the proposed ramp from Maryland Route 216 to northbound U.S. Route 29. At this time, we foresee no action on either closure until we identify operational problems associated with leaving them open.
- 2) Upon completion of the proposed interchange between U.S. Route 29 and Maryland Route 216, the existing intersection at that location will be closed. If Alternative C-3 is selected at Hammond-Hillcrest Drive, your access to and from U.S. Route 29 would be achieved via this interchange.
- 3) The purpose of Alternative C-2 is to provide access to your community so that Hammond Drive and Hillcrest Drive can be cul-de-saced at U.S. Route 29. Retaining local street access to an expressway type roadway is not a desirable alternative and is not consistent with effective land use planning. I realize that your access may be more circuitous with this proposal. As I stated in No. 1 above, we do not anticipate any changes at this location until we identify operational problems with retaining access to U.S. Route 29.

My telephone number is (301) 333-1110

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech  
383-7555 Baltimore Metro — 565-0451 D.C. Metro — 1-800-492-5062 Statewide Toll Free  
P O Box 717 / 707 North Calvert St. Baltimore, Maryland 21203 - 0717

111



Maryland Department of Transportation

State Highway Administration

William K. Hoffmann  
Secretary  
Hal Kassoff  
Administrator

February 23, 1987

RE: Contract No. HO 606-101-770  
U.S. Route 29  
Patuxent River to U.S. Route 40  
PDMS No. 132046

(This letter was typed by SHA in order to be legible after printing).

Rodney & Cecilia Fletcher  
9526 Pepple Drive  
Columbia, MD 21045  
(301) 730-0278

January 30, 1987

Mr. Neil J. Pederson, Director  
Office of Planning & Preliminary Engineering  
State Highway Administration  
707 North Calvert Street  
Baltimore, MD 21202

Reference: Alternatives Public Workshop  
Draft Environment Assessment  
US Route 29  
Contract No. HO 606-101-770

Dear Mr. Pederson:

I inspected a copy of the referenced report at our local library and its proposed Alternatives IX-C-1 (concept 1) and IX-C-3 (Concept 3) as to the impact on our property at 9526 Pepple Drive.

According to the accompanying maps of IX-C-1 & 3, they show an existing right-of-way through our home! Please say it ain't so! Please note on the enclosed copy of our property plot my marking in red ink as to what I think I saw as the right-of-way line shown by your map.

There is no such right-of-way as so shown. I know that by letter of March 18, 1971, we were advised of a proposed "taking of our property for the right of way sometime in the 20-year plan because of the closest Route 175 ramp. But, "no taking" nor acquisition of a right-of-way through our home has ever happened.

Otherwise, I shall be happy to see access to 29 from Pepple Drive cease. It is a most dangerous intersection.

Please advise regarding the map's (yours) depiction of a right-of-way through our home.

Yours truly

Original signed by

Rodney Fletcher

Encl: a/s

Mr. & Mrs. Rodney Fletcher  
9526 Pepple Drive  
Columbia, Maryland 21045

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Fletcher:

This letter is in response to your correspondence of January 30, 1987, and pertains to our Project Planning study underway on the U.S. Route 29 corridor in Howard County. The map you sent us of your property with a proposed right-of-way line through your home is identical to the map you saw in our Environmental Document on display at the Howard County Library. The right-of-way line through your home is an error and I regret any discomfort it may have caused you. The line is from a plat prepared for the ramp from Maryland Route 175 which was never constructed as originally proposed. This is an oversight on our part. At the Public Hearing held on February 17, 1987, our displays showed revised right-of-way lines. Because our study proposes the closure of Pepple Drive at U.S. Route 29 and the reconstruction of the ramp from Maryland Route 175, we will need approximately 0.06 acres of your property. The shaded area on the enclosed map shows the needed right-of-way.

I thank you for your interest in the highway development process as it relates to the project. If we can provide further assistance, please contact me or the Project Manager, Mr. Randy Aldrich, at 333-1139.

Very truly yours,

*Neil J. Pedersen*

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

NJP:sb  
Enclosure

cc: Mr. Wayne R. Clingan  
Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.  
Mr. Richard L. Schindel

My telephone number is 333-1110

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech  
383-7555 Baltimore Metro - 565-0451 O.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5082 Statewide Toll Free  
P.O. Box 717 / 707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203 - 0717

117

RECEIVED

MAR 2 1988

BRUCKNER & BRUCKNER, P.A.

6111 KENILWORTH AVENUE  
SUITE 104  
RIVERDALE, MARYLAND 20737

(301) 779-4700

ARNOLD D. BRUCKNER  
JOYCE ANN BRUCKNER  
DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF  
PLANNING & PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

W. TIMOTHY PARLETT

Also Attached to D.C.

February 26, 1987

Howard County Office

10320 Little Patuxent Parkway  
Suite 102 202  
Columbia, Maryland 21044  
(301) 798-9922

PROJECT  
DEVELOPMENT  
DIVISION  
FEB 29 PM '87

Mr. Neil J. Pederson  
Office of Planning and Preliminary Engineering  
Maryland State Highway Administration  
707 N. Calvert Street  
Baltimore, Maryland 21202

Re: Route 29 Expansion  
Report No. FHWA-MD-SA-87-01-D

Dear Mr. Pederson:

Today I spoke with Dave Willis of Genett Fleming in Herrishburg, Pennsylvania. I requested a list of the sixteen (Alternative B) or nineteen (Alternative C-1) receptors in Area F that would benefit from noise barriers per the study as listed in Table 27 on page IV-28 of the Environmental Assessment dated January 12, 1987. He indicated that he is not able to release information without authorization from the Highway Administration. Please provide him with that authorization, or in the alternative, provide the information to us directly.

In addition, we would propose that the cul-de-sac shown in Alternative C, Concept 2 be moved to either of the areas shown in green on the attached map, or in the alternative, be made smaller to be simply a turn-around as opposed to a cul-de-sac. Our concern is that we do not want this area opened to additional traffic as it immediately abuts our property and the building of the cul-de-sac in that area would destroy part of the natural barrier between our property and Route 29 as well as some of the Columbia open space. Please respond as to the feasibility of these alternative proposals.


I would appreciate the answers to these questions as soon as possible. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,  
Bruckner & Bruckner, P.A.

By: *Joyce Ann Bruckner*  
Joyce Ann Bruckner

JAB/cjw  
cc: Honorable Thomas N. Yeager  
Honorable Virginia Thomas  
Honorable Elizabeth Bobo  
C. Vernon Gray  
Oakland Mills Village Board

U.S. ROUTE 29 SEGMENT II  
SOUTH ENTRANCE TO COLUMBIA TO MARYLAND ROUTE 108



118

RECEIVED

FEB 27 1987

BRUCKNER & BRUCKNER, P.A.

111 KEN WORTH AVENUE  
SUITE 504  
RIVERDALE, MARYLAND 20717

(301) 779-4700

ARNOLD D. BRUCKNER  
ROYCE ANN BRUCKNER

W. TIMOTHY PARLETT

\*Also Addressed in D.C.

February 24, 1987

Howard County Office

10120 Little Patuxent Parkway  
Suite 142 202  
Columbia, Maryland 21044  
(301) 998-9999

of Counsel  
STEPHEN A. BECKER

Mr. Dave Willis  
Gennett Fleming  
P.O. 1963  
Harrisburg, P.A. 17106

Re: Route 29, Columbia, Maryland  
Environmental Assessment of  
January 12, 1987  
Report No. FHWA-MD-EA-87-01-D

Dear Mr. Willis:

In accord with our conversation of today I have enclosed figures fifteen with our house circled in green. I would appreciate your letting me know as soon as possible whether or not our house was included in the sixteen (Alternate B) or nineteen (Alternate C-1) receptors in Area F benefiting from noise barriers as listed in Table 27 on page IV-28. If our house was not included, please specify the reason therefor.

Also, as we discussed, I would appreciate whatever information you might have as to whether noise barriers would benefit us as our property is somewhat elevated and as to any measures other than noise barriers available to property owners. I very much appreciate your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

Bruckner & Bruckner, P.A.

By: *Royce Ann Bruckner*  
Royce Ann Bruckner

JAB/cjw  
Enclosure




FIGURE 15  
Noise and Air Quality  
Sensitive Area F

LEGEND  
● AIR MODELING SITES  
■ NOISE MODELING SITES  
★ NOISE MONITORING SITES

611



**Maryland Department of Transportation**

State Highway Administration

William K. Hellmann  
Secretary

Hal Kessoff  
Administrator

March 31, 1987

Re: Contract No. HO 606-101-770  
U.S. Route 29  
Patuxent River to  
U.S. Route 40  
P.D.M.S. No. 132046

Ms. Joyce Ann Bruckner  
c/o Bruckner and Bruckner, P.A.  
6811 Kenilworth Avenue  
Suite 504  
Riverdale, Maryland 20737

Dear Ms. Bruckner:

This letter is in response to your correspondence of February 26, 1987 and pertains to our Project Planning Study underway on the U.S. Route 29 corridor in Howard County. Attached is a map which indicates the dwellings which were counted as benefiting from the erection of a noise barrier in Noise Sensitive Area F. As our analysis in this area requires revision, this information will appear in the final environmental document.

Regarding the proposed cul-de-sac at the end of the extension from Twin Knolls Road in Concept C-2 at Old Columbia Road, Howard County requires a turn around as close as possible to the end of the road so that service vehicles don't have to back out of the area. We intend to turn this road over to Howard County upon completion. The proposed cul-de-sac was located on Columbia Association property to avoid environmental complications associated with locating it on any of the adjoining properties which are eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. It will not be possible to relocate the cul-de-sac as you have requested. We will investigate if a different design could be utilized to reduce impact to the trees on this parcel.

I would like to further add that the proposed concepts for Old Columbia Road constitute our long range plans. At this time, we foresee no immediate change to Old Columbia Road. In the event that operational problems develop at this location, we will consider pursuing changes as proposed in our study.

My telephone number is 333-1110

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech  
383-7555 Baltimore Metro - 565-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5062 Statewide Toll Free  
P.O. Box 717 / 707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

Ms. Joyce Ann Bruckner  
Page 2

I want to thank you for your interest in the highway development process as it relates to this study. If I can provide further assistance, contact me or the Project Manager, Mr. Randy Aldrich, Telephone No. 333-1139.

Very truly yours,

*Neil J. Pedersen*

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

NJP/ih


Attachment

cc: Mr. Wayne R. Clingan  
Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.  
Mr. Charles B. Adams

120



U.S. ROUTE 29  
SOUTH ENTRANCE TO COLUMBIA



TO  
WASHINGTON

Dwellings benefited by 20 ft. noise barrier within NIA F



Maryland Department of Transportation

State Highway Administration

William K. Hoffmann  
Secretary

Hal Kassoff  
Administrator

April 14, 1987

RE: Contract No. HO 606-101-770  
U.S. Route 29 - Patuxent River  
to U.S. Route 40  
PDMS No. 132046

Mr. and Mrs. Arnold D. Bruckner  
9491 Crisscross Court  
Columbia, Maryland 21045

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Bruckner:

This letter is in response to your correspondence of March 4, 1987 regarding our Project Planning study on the U.S. Route 29 corridor in Howard County. Since many of the comments you made were included in a similar letter to Mr. Neil J. Pedersen, I have enclosed a copy of his response.

In this letter, you asked that we consider restricting the speed of trucks on U.S. Route 29. We do not consider this a safe alternative. Limiting the speed of certain vehicles in a stream of traffic increases the frequency of accidents and produces more traffic congestion.


Your other request to resurface the existing roadway with "Popcorn Aggregate" is being investigated. While this may not be achieved in the near-term, we anticipate that when the additional lanes are constructed, joint repairs and resurfacing will be performed on the existing lanes.

As previously stated, I want to thank you for your interest in this study. Please contact us again if you have additional questions.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr.  
Deputy Director  
Project Development Division

by:

  
Randy Aldrich  
Project Manager

LHE:RCA:bh  
Attachment

cc: Mr. Wayne R. Clingan

We are located in Segment IX just behind the Gales/Kelly's Store House properties. We strongly urge you to adopt alternative A--the No Build Alternative. In addition, we urge you to either eliminate truck traffic or impose a lower speed limit for trucks, as is done in many European countries. This will not only decrease the present noise level but will also encourage truck traffic and much of the other traffic to use north south routes other than Route 29 thus eliminating some of the increase in traffic and noise levels. Certainly this would be the least costly alternative and allow great expenditures of monies and energy toward the improvement of other routes in less congested areas.

We are strongly opposed to Alternative C as it would destroy part of the buffer between our home and Route 29, encourage development of Old Columbia Road area, and greatly increase the noise level to a level unacceptable by Federal standards. The Environmental Assessment dated January 12, 1987, indicates that due to the small number of homes considered as benefiting from noise barriers, it would not be economically feasible to construct such barriers and we would then be left with a noise level of some 73 dBA, far above the Federal Noise Abatement Criteria. At the present noise level we must sleep with a white noise machine which even now does not begin to drown out the noise from Route 29 which begins at approximately 5:30 every morning. Should you plan to seriously consider Alternative C, we ask that the environmental assessment study be redone to include more than the 16 residences presently included. As one travels Route 29, it is easy to observe that the actual number of residences that would benefit from noise barriers is 5 to 6 times that amount. We also urge you to consider in addition to the use of noise barriers, the use of the paving surface known as Popcorn or Open Aggregate which we understand decreases the noise level by some 10 decibels.

Should Alternative C be adopted rather than Alternatives A or B, we urge that you adopt Alternative C-1 closing the cross over in the median strip but leaving open the access to Old Columbia Road. It would be an alternative that would be less costly than Alternative C-2 and would not encourage any development of the area on Old Columbia Road. Those older homes and those trees are the only buffer between our property and Route 29.

If Alternative C-2 is ultimately chosen, we would propose that the cul-de-sac shown in Alternative C, Concept 2 be moved to either of the areas shown in green on the attached map, or in the alternative, be made smaller to be simply a turn-around as opposed to a cul-de-sac. Our concern is that we do not want this area opened to additional traffic as it immediately abuts our property and the building of the cul-de-sac in that area would destroy part of the natural barrier between our property and Route 29 as well as some of the Columbia open space. Please respond as to the feasibility of these alternative proposals.

122



**Maryland Department of Transportation**

State Highway Administration

William K. Hoffmann  
Secretary  
Hal Kassoff  
Administrator

April 15, 1987

Re: Contract No. HO 606-101-770  
U.S. Route 29  
Patuxent River to  
U.S. Route 29  
P.D.M.S. No. 132046

Mr. and Mrs. Ray Lane  
6598 Seneca Drive  
Columbia, Maryland 21046

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Lane:

This letter is a follow-up to our visit on April 3, 1987. As Mr. Gil Gorsuch and I indicated at that visit, your home at 6598 Seneca Drive lies within the right-of-way proposed for our preferred grade separation concept for Seneca Drive. This concept, labeled Alternative C-5A at Seneca Drive, was presented at a combined Location/Design Public Hearing at Hammond High School on February 17, 1987. It is unfortunate our hearing was held at about the same time you purchased this home and that the previous owner neglected to inform you of our study.

We anticipate obtaining Location and Design approvals for this study in August, 1987. We will notify you by letter when that occurs. As Mr. Gorsuch stated in our meeting, with receipt of these approvals, we can proceed with advance acquisition of your home. Until that time, please contact me or Mr. Gorsuch if you have any questions.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr.  
Deputy Director  
Project Development Division

by: Randy Aldrich  
Randy Aldrich  
Project Manager

LHE/RCA/ih

cc: Mr. Wayne R. Clingan  
Mr. Richard Schindel  
Mr. George Hester

My telephone number is 333-1139

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech  
383-7555 Baltimore Metro - 565-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5062 Statewide Toll Free  
P.O. Box 717 / 707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203 0717



**Maryland Department of Transportation**

State Highway Administration

William K. Hoffmann  
Secretary  
Hal Kassoff  
Administrator

April 22, 1987

Re: Contract No. HO 606-101-770  
U.S. Route 29  
Patuxent River to U.S.  
Route 40  
P.D.M.S. No. 132046

Mr. Martin Pavlosky  
6602 Seneca Drive  
Columbia, Maryland 21046

Dear Mr. Pavlosky:

Last October, when we attended a meeting of the Allview-Arrowhead Civic Association at the Christ Memorial Presbyterian Church, you asked to be notified when our selection of a preferred grade separation concept of Seneca Drive was determined. Our Project Planning study of the U.S. Route 29 corridor in Howard County has progressed to that point. Concept 5A has been recommended to the Administrator as the preferred concept at this location. Later this year, the Administrator will make the final selection and seek concurrence from the Federal Highway Administration.

The approval process will be documented in the Final Environmental document. It will also investigate minor design changes to reduce the right-of-way requirements from your property at 6602 Seneca Drive.

I would like to thank you for your interest in the highway development process as it relates to this study. Please contact us again if we can provide further assistance.

Very truly yours,

Louis H. Ege, Jr.  
Deputy Director  
Project Development Division

by: Randy Aldrich  
Randy Aldrich  
Project Manager

LHE/RA/ih

cc: Mr. Neil J. Pedersen  
Mr. Wayne R. Clingan

My telephone number is 333-1139

Teletypewriter for Impaired Hearing or Speech  
383-7555 Baltimore Metro - 565-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5062 Statewide Toll Free  
P.O. Box 717 / 707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203 0717

123

B. Agency Correspondence

B. Agency Correspondence

In accordance with implementation procedures of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the following agencies were contacted to provide information or input in their particular discipline areas:

Howard County Office of Planning and Zoning, Department of Recreation and Parks

Howard County Public School System

Baltimore Regional Planning Council

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service

U.S. Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service

Maryland State Health Department, Office of Environmental Programs

Maryland Department of Natural Resources

Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission

Howard County Department of Public Works, Bureau of Environmental Services

Maryland Historical Trust

A summary of all responses received through the coordination process is provided on the following pages. Copies of correspondence are included at the end of this section.

<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>RESPONSE</u>	<u>DATE OF RESPONSE</u>
Howard County Office of Planning and Zoning, Department of Recreation and Parks	Provided information on area parks.	May 26, 1986
Howard County Public School System	Provided information on schools with bus routes, attendance areas, and residence areas within the project corridor. Concern that limited access may impact bus routes of students along affected streets.	June 2, 1986
Baltimore Regional Planning Commission	Provided zonal mapping; and information on population, households, employment, auto ownership, age, race, and income.	April 29, 1986
Howard County Fire Department		
Ellicott City Fire Company 2	Coordination letter was sent to local fire companies describing the project and requesting assistance in identifying potential project impacts and concerns. No responses have been received as of January, 1987.	
Savage Volunteer Fire Company 9		
Johns Hopkins Applied Physics Laboratory Fire Department		
Maryland Assoc. of Bicycle Organizations	Expressed concern that improvements may limit bicycle access.	July 21, 1986
U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service	Assisted in preparation of Farmland Conservation Impact Rating Form Results: total scores less than 160; minimal consideration for protection.	May 19, 1986
U.S. Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service	No federally listed threatened or endangered species.	Jan. 25, 1985
Department of Natural Resources	Wetlands field view. Provided input on significance of impact and mitigation suggestions. (Minutes located at end of this section.)	Oct. 1 & 20, 1986
	- Maryland Forest, Park and Wildlife Service	No threatened or endangered species.

<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>RESPONSE</u>	<u>DATE OF RESPONSE</u>
Department of Natural Resources (Cont'd)		
- Capital Programs Administration	No State or Federal endangered species. State-rare Walking Spleenwort found in Montgomery County.	Jan. 18, 1986
- Water Resources Administration	Waterway Construction Permit may be required for stream crossings. No in-stream work from: Oct-Apr for Class III streams, Mar-May for Class IV streams, Mar-June 15 for Class I streams.	May 27, 1986
letter also contained concerns of:		
Maryland Forest, Park and Wildlife Service	Concerned with potential impact on riverine wetlands.	
Tidewater Administration, Coastal Resources Division	Provided classification of wetlands in project area. Recommend subjects to be covered in the EA.	
- Water Resources Administration		May 28, 1986
letter contained concerns of:		
Natural Heritage Program of Capital Programs	Rare fish species found in Middle Patuxent. Two rare amphipods found in small streams adjacent to U.S. Route 29, south of U.S. Route 40. Recommends erosion control measures be strictly monitored to minimize impacts on wetlands.	
- Water Resources Administration		June 20, 1986
letter contained concerns of:		
Tidewater Administration, Fisheries Division	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Expansion of existing highway preferred over new alignments.</li> <li>2) Full and rigorous enforcement of erosion control measures.</li> <li>3) Proposed work produce zero degradation of stormwater management.</li> <li>4) Concerned with runoff pollutants.</li> <li>5) Specific concerns on streams in Montgomery County.</li> </ol>	

<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>RESPONSE</u>	<u>DATE OF RESPONSE</u>
Department of Natural Resources (Cont'd)		
- Tidewater Administration	Conducted site inspection of Hammond Branch and provided data sheets on water quality and fish and macroinvertebrate composition. Found Hammond Branch insufficient to support self-sustaining trout population; therefore, they wish to prevent further degradation.	August 7, 1986
- Tidewater Administration	Provided composition of macro-invertebrates and distribution of fish species by station for the Patuxent River watershed for 1980-1981.	August 11, 1986 (no letter provided.)
- Tidewater Administration	Provided fish distribution material for Patuxent River for 1966, 1967, and 1977. Comment that the cumulative effects of urbanization are severe, and additional effects can be expected with increased regional transportation capacity.	Sept. 9, 1986
- Maryland Geological Survey	Provided areas of archeological potential in the new right-of-way.	Nov. 13, 1985
- Maryland Geological Survey	Provided locations of two unconfirmed and one recorded archeological site for U.S. Route 29.	Oct. 21, 1985
- Maryland Geological Survey	No archeological sites were identified in the Phase I survey.	Dec. 23, 1986
- Water Resources Administration, Coastal Resources, Forest Parks and Wildlife Service, Fisheries Dept.	Wetlands field view. Provided input on significance of impact and mitigation suggestions. (Minutes located at the end of this section.)	Oct 1 & 20, 1986
Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission	Interested in project impacts on water quality and siltation in Rocky Gorge. Wish to review site plans and sediment control plans.	May 1, 1986
	(Asked for more specific information on park boundaries and uses. No response received as of January, 1987.)	



<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>RESPONSE</u>	<u>DATE OF RESPONSE</u>
Department of Natural Resources (Cont'd)		
Howard County Department of Public Works, Bureau of Environmental Services	Provided information from 208 Plan.	July 21, 1986 (no letter provided)
Maryland Historical Trust	Concurrence in possible National Register eligibility and boundaries of twelve properties.	Aug. 20, 1986
	Determination of effect on eligible sites in Howard County.	March 4, 1987
	Determination of effect on Kelly Store, Gales-Gaither House, and Athol.	July 10, 1987
Advisory Council On Historic Preservation	Determination of effect on Scagg's Place, Athol, Kelly's Store House, Gales-Gaither House, and Felicity	Nov. 3, 1987



10910 Route 108 /30  
Ellicott City, Maryland 21043-6198  
(301) 992-0500

RECEIVED

June 2, 1986

JUN 6 1986

GFC & C, INC.

Ms. Bettyann C. Bowers  
Environmental Manager  
Gannett Fleming  
Transportation Engineers, Inc.  
P. O. Box 1963  
Harrisburg, PA 17105

Re: U.S. Route 29 Improvements - Montgomery and Howard Counties

Dear Ms. Bowers:

Dr. John C. Murphy of the Board of Education asked me to respond to your recent letter concerning a request for input to the environmental study of the proposed improvements to U.S. Route 29 in Howard County. The answers to your questions and other related items are as follow:

1. Schools whose bus routes currently access school facilities using a left turn movement off or onto U.S. Route 29 at locations other than MD Routes 216, 32, 175, 108, 103, St. John's Lane, and Broken Land Parkway between MD Routes 32 and 175.

The remaining schools and locations other than those you identified are as follow:

School	Location
Hammond Elementary	Gorman Road
Atholton Elementary	Seneca Drive
Clemens Crossing Elementary	Owen Brown Road
Hammond Middle	Gorman Road
Clarksville Middle	Seneca Drive and Owen Brown Road
Atholton High	Gorman Road and Johns Hopkins Rd.
Hammond High	Gorman Road and Johns Hopkins Rd.
Oakland Mills High	Seneca Drive
Oakland Mills Middle	Seneca Drive
Northfield Elementary	Spring Valley Road
Dunloggin Middle	Spring Valley Road
Centennial High	Spring Valley Road

2. Schools whose attendance areas include both sides of U.S. Route 29:

Centennial High	Wilde Lake Middle
Mt. Hebron High	Clarksville Middle
Atholton High	St. John's Lane Elementary
Patapsco Middle	Northfield Elementary
Dunloggin Middle	Thunder Hill Elementary (beginning 1986-87)

Hearing Impaired Number:  
TDD/TTY 992-4942

Attached you will find a set of school attendance area maps for the current school year. You should keep in mind, however, that the attendance areas are subject to change on an annual basis. The maps should clarify your misinterpretation of "neighborhood schools." You might also be interested in knowing of the schools having pupils whose residences are actually located on U.S. Route 29. These schools are:

Talbott Springs Elementary	Hammond Middle
Atholton Elementary	Centennial High
Hammond Elementary	Oakland Mills High
Dunloggin Middle	Hammond High
Clarksville Middle	

You also asked for our reaction to any adverse aspects relative to the proposed alternatives. If, in fact, access is only limited to the intersections noted, then the roads noted below will be without direct access. Students do, in fact, reside on these roads and adjacent streets, and while there may be alternate bus routes available, the alternate routes will be more expensive and time consuming.

<u>Road</u>	<u>Side of U.S. Route 29</u>
Old Columbia Pike	East and West
Hillcrest Drive	East
Hammond Drive	East
Gorman Road	East
Johns Hopkins Road	West
Rivers Edge Road	West
Seneca Drive	East
Allview Drive	East
River Meadow Drive	East
South Entrance Road	West
Columbia Road	East
Pepple Drive	East
Diamondback Road	East
Spring Valley Road	East
Columbia Road	West (exit only)

You will note that some areas may not have school bus route/stop access. We do have data concerning the exact number of students assigned to each school listed by home address. If you are interested in this information or if you need additional information, please feel free to contact Mr. Robert S. Lazarewicz, Director of Operations, at (301) 992-0500, extension 233.

Thank you for providing an opportunity to respond to this proposed project. I would appreciate receiving additional information related to the progress of this project.

Sincerely,




Charles I. Ecker  
Associate Superintendent  
Finance and Operations

CIE/RSL/sas

Attachments

cc: Board Members  
Mr. Hartmann  
Dr. Hickey  
Mr. Lazarewicz



**Regional Planning Council**

2225 North Charles Street Baltimore, Maryland 21218-5767 (301) 554-5600  
George F. Harrison, Jr., *Chairman* Alfred P. Gwynn, *Executive Director*

132

April 29, 1986

**RECEIVED**

MAY 1 1986

**GFC & C, INC.**

Ms. Betty Bowers  
Environmental Manager  
Gannett Fleming Transportation  
Enterprises, Inc.  
P. O. Box 1963  
Harrisburg, PA 17105

Dear Ms. Bowers:

Per your written request for zonal information along the Howard County portion of the U.S. 29 corridor, I have enclosed the following:

- ° transportation zone map,
- ° zonal population, households, employment, and auto ownership for 1980, and for the forecast years of 1990 and 2005, and
- ° age, race, income information from the 1980 Census Urban Transportation Planning Package.


Please note that our agency currently is in the process of preparing revised zonal demographic data forecasts. I hope that these data satisfy your information needs.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at (301)383-5845.

Sincerely,

Charles R. Goodman  
Assistant Director  
Transportation Division

CRG:sw  
Enclosures



133

# maryland association of bicycle organizations

reply to: James M. Tordella  
President, MABO  
10353 Maypole Way  
Columbia, MD 21044

21 July 1985

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

RECEIVED

JUL 23 1985

#940

DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF  
PLANNING & PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

Dear Mr. Pedersen:

[REDACTED] is vitally interested in the proposed improvement of U.S. Route 29 from I-495 to U.S. Route 40, as advertised in the paper. Many bicyclists in our member organizations live or work near U.S. 29. We all are concerned that the access we recently gained to U.S. 29 will be lost during some future upgrade of that road.

The Baltimore-Washington corridor contains no other roads which permit safe, efficient bicycle transportation in the corridor. Currently, only U.S. 29 is hospitable and legal for bicycles.

While a signed bike route does exist for part of the route, bicyclists require full access all along U.S. 29. South from MD Route 198, the bike path is usable, though often strewn with glass which must be periodically removed. The bike route crosses U.S. 29; this crossover capability must be maintained. Full bicycle access must be continued from the southern end of the bike route to the study limit, I-495.

North of MD Route 198 all the way through to the study limit, there is no possibility of bicycle transportation without using U.S. 29. We are concerned that at some future time bicyclists may be forbidden access to all or portions of this road, with no other alternative present. Limited river crossings and simple lack of any even remotely parallel roads require that bicycle transportation be provided for in your plan.

Interchanges constructed for U.S. 29 must also allow bicycle traffic to cross over U.S. 29 through wide curb lanes or separate structures conforming to AASHTO guidelines.


Bicycling is a cheap, highly efficient, and healthful way to commute. Bicycle commuting could relieve a noticeable amount of automobile traffic from U.S. 29, if it were provided for.

for better bicycling

Some are concerned for bicyclists' safety on the shoulders of divided highways. MABO notes that there have been no bicyclist fatalities since the recent enabling legislation was passed. I frequently ride on and commute to work on U.S. 29 and the new MD Route 32, and believe that route is vastly safer than old Md 32 and U.S. Route 1. People are being killed on those roads.

MABO believes that the Maryland Department of Transportation and the State Highway Administration have taken a large step forward in bicycle affairs through forming the MDOT Bicycle Advisory Committee. We look forward to working with you in that forum and in public hearings on U.S. 29.

Very truly yours,



James M. Tordella  
President, MABO

- cc: Howard County Council
- Columbia Council
- Michael Jackson, Bicycle Coordinator, D.C. DOT



United States  
Department of  
Agriculture

Soil  
Conservation  
Service

10 W. College Terrace  
Room 230  
Frederick, Maryland 21701

135

May 19, 1986

RECEIVED

MAY 21 1986

GFC & C, INC.

Ms. Betty Bowers  
Environmental Manager  
Gannett Fleming Transportation Engineers, Inc.  
P.O. Box 1963  
Harrisburg, PA 17105

Re: Farmland Conversion Impact Rating Form (AD-1006) for U.S. Rt. 29  
Improvements, Montgomery and Howard Counties, MD.

Dear Ms. Bowers:

Attached are AD-1006 forms covering only those alternative segments of the project which contained lands that qualify as prime or statewide important under the guidelines of the FPPA act. Separate forms were used for each county since our land evaluation systems are prepared on an individual county basis. Acreages of prime and statewide important soils are not precise due to difficulties in transferring soil mapping to the small scale plan maps provided in the package.

For clarification purposes, I will point out that percentages in Part II are based on the total land area in the respective county, and in Part IV.D. percentage is based on total farmland as defined in FPPA.

If I can be of further assistance, please contact me at 301 - 694-6822 in Frederick, Maryland.

Sincerely,

CARL E. ROBINETTE  
Area Soil Scientist

Enclosures

cc:

Rick Brush, District Conservationist, SCS, Rockville, MD  
Jack Helm, District Conservationist, SCS, Ellicott City, MD



The Soil Conservation Service  
is an agency of the  
Department of Agriculture

U.S. Department of Agriculture

**FARMLAND CONVERSION IMPACT RATING**

<b>PART I (To be completed by Federal Agency)</b>		Date Of Land Evaluation Request <b>4-4-86</b>
Name Of Project <b>U.S. Route 29 Improvements</b>		Federal Agency Involved <b>State Highway Administration</b>
Proposed Land Use <b>See attached</b>		County And State <b>Howard County, MD</b>

<b>PART II (To be completed by SCS)</b>		Date Request Received By SCS <b>4-10-86</b>
Does the site contain prime, unique, statewide or local important farmland? (If no, the FPPA does not apply - do not complete additional parts of this form).		Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Acres Irrigated <b>None</b> Average Farm Size <b>117</b>
Major Crop(s) <b>Corn, Small Grain, Soybeans, Hay</b>	Farmable Land In Govt. Jurisdiction Acres: <b>86,200</b> % <b>54</b>	Amount Of Farmland As Defined in FPPA Acres: <b>70,600</b> % <b>44</b>
Name Of Land Evaluation System Used <b>Howard Co. LESA</b>	Name Of Local Site Assessment System <b>Howard Co. LESA System</b>	Date Land Evaluation Returned By SCS <b>5/16/86</b>

<b>PART III (To be completed by Federal Agency)</b>	Alternative Site Rating *			
	Site A	Site B	Site C	Site D
	A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly	<b>96 maximum</b>		
	B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly	<b>0</b>		
C. Total Acres In Site	<b>96 maximum</b>			

<b>PART IV (To be completed by SCS) Land Evaluation Information</b>				
A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>		
B. Total Acres Statewide And Local Important Farmland	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>		
C. Percentage Of Farmland In County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted	<b>.008</b>	<b>.003</b>		
D. Percentage Of Farmland In Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative Value	<b>66.3</b>	<b>86.8</b>		

<b>PART V (To be completed by SCS) Land Evaluation Criterion</b>				
Relative Value Of Farmland To Be Converted (Scale of 0 to 100 Points)	<b>72</b>	<b>57</b>		

<b>PART VI (To be completed by Federal Agency)</b>		Maximum Points		
Site Assessment Criteria (These criteria are explained in 7 CFR 658.5(b))				
1. Area In Nonurban Use				
2. Perimeter In Nonurban Use	<b>See attached for</b>			
3. Percent Of Site Being Farmed	<b>Howard County LESA</b>			
4. Protection Provided By State And Local Government	<b>Site Assessment</b>			
5. Distance From Urban Builtup Area	<b>Criteria.</b>			
6. Distance To Urban Support Services				
7. Size Of Present Farm Unit Compared To Average				
8. Creation Of Nonfarmable Farmland				
9. Availability Of Farm Support Services				
10. On-Farm Investments				
11. Effects Of Conversion On Farm Support Services				
12. Compatibility With Existing Agricultural Use				
<b>TOTAL SITE ASSESSMENT POINTS</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>48</b>	

<b>PART VII (To be completed by Federal Agency)</b>				
Relative Value Of Farmland (From Part V)	<b>100</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>57</b>	
Total Site Assessment (From Part VI above or a local site assessment)	<b>160</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>48</b>	
<b>TOTAL POINTS (Total of above 2 lines)</b>	<b>260</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>105</b>	

Site Selected:	Date Of Selection	Was A Local Site Assessment Used? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
----------------	-------------------	--

Reason For Selection:  
\* Site A = VI-C-2; B = VI-C-3



HOWARD COUNTY LESA

Site Assessment Criteria

	<u>Maximum Points</u>	<u>Site A VI-C-2</u>	<u>Site B VI-C-3</u>
A. Percent of Area in Agriculture Within One Mile	5	1.25	1.25
B. Land in Agriculture Adjacent to Site	10	0	0
C. Protected Land Contiguous to Site	10	0	0
D. Size of Site	10	3.0	0
E. Percent of Site That Can Be Economically Farmed	5	5	5
F. Ownership and Operation	7	7 assume maximum*	7
G. Land Management	-10	0	0
H. Capital Investment in Permanent Buildings and Land Improvements	5	0	0
I. Actual Land Use	<u>5</u>	<u>3.75</u>	<u>3.75</u>
TOTAL SITE ASSESSMENT POINTS	57	20	17
ADJUSTED CATEGORY POINTS (Based on 200 points for Howard Co. LESA)	200	70	60
ADJUSTED POINTS FOR FORM AD-1006 (Based on 160 points)	160	56	48

\*No basis for answer, therefore, maximum assumed.

HOWARD COUNTY LESA  
SITE ASSESSMENT CRITERIA  
FOR  
CONCEPT VI-C-1 AT HOPKINS-GORMAN ROAD  
(ADDED AFTER COORDINATION WITH SCS)

	<u>Maximum Points</u>	<u>VI-C-1 at Hopkins-Gorman Road</u>
A. Percent of Area in Agriculture Within One Mile	5	1.25
B. Land in Agriculture Adjacent to Site	10	0
C. Protected Land Contiguous to Site	10	0
D. Size of Site	10	3
E. Percent of Site That Can Be Economically Farmed	5	5
F. Ownership and Operation	7	7*
G. Land Management	-10	0
H. Capital Investment in Permanent Buildings and Land Improvements	5	0
I. Actual Land Use	<u>5</u>	<u>3.75</u>
TOTAL SITE ASSESSMENT POINTS	57	20
ADJUSTED CATEGORY POINTS (Based on 200 points for Howard County LESA)	200	60
ADJUSTED POINTS FOR FORM AD-1006 (Based on 160 points)	160	56

\*No basis for answer; therefore maximum assumed.



# United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE  
DIVISION OF ECOLOGICAL SERVICES  
1825B VIRGINIA STREET  
ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND 21401

January 25, 1985

Ms. Cynthia D. Simpson  
Environmental Management  
State Highway Administration  
P.O. Box 717  
707 N. Calvert St.  
Baltimore, MD 21203

Dear Ms. Simpson:

This responds to your January 8, 1985, request for information on the presence of Federally listed endangered or threatened species within the area of U.S. Route 29, from I-495 in Montgomery County to U.S. Route 40 in Howard County, Maryland (P.D.M.S. No. 132046).

Except for occasional transient individuals, no Federally listed or proposed endangered or threatened species are known to exist in the project impact area. Therefore, no Biological Assessment or further Section 7 Consultation is required with the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS). Should project plans change, or if additional information on the distribution of listed or proposed species becomes available, this determination may be reconsidered.

This response relates only to endangered species under our jurisdiction. It does not address other FWS concerns under the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act or other legislation.

Thank you for your interest in endangered species. If you have any questions or need further assistance, please contact Andy Moser of our Endangered Species staff at (301) 269-6324.

Sincerely yours,

Glenn Kinser  
Supervisor  
Annapolis Field Office



**DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES**  
**Maryland Forest, Park & Wildlife Service**  
**TAWES OFFICE BUILDING**  
**ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND 21401**

**TORREY C. BROWN, M.D.**  
**SECRETARY**

**DONALD E. MacLAUCHLAN**  
**DIRECTOR**

January 24, 1985

Cynthia D. Simpson  
Environmental Management  
Maryland Department of Transportation  
P.O. Box 717  
707 North Calvert Street  
Baltimore, MD 21203-0717


RE: Contract No. HO-606-151-770  
U.S. Rt. 29 from I-495 in  
Montgomery Co. to U.S. Rt. 40  
in Howard Co. P.D.M.S.No.132046  
Contract No. AW 787-106-012 N  
Md. Routes 194 and 26 Intersection  
Reconstruction

Dear Ms. Simpson:

Your request for any information we may have concerning threatened or endangered species was reviewed by Gary J. Taylor.

There are no known populations of listed threatened or endangered species within the areas of project influence for the proposed intersection reconstruction of MD routes 194 and 26 (Contract No. AW 787-106-012 N); or the proposed improvements to U.S. route 29 from I-495 to U.S. route 40 (Contract No. HO 606-151-770).

Sincerely,

  
James Burtis, Jr.  
Assistant Director

JB:emp

cc: G. Taylor  
C. Brunori

JAN 27 1985



141

TORREY C. BROWN, M.D.  
SECRETARY  
JOHN R. GRIFFIN  
DEPUTY SECRETARY

STATE OF MARYLAND  
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES  
**CAPITAL PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATION**  
TAWES STATE OFFICE BUILDING  
ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND 21401

FRED L. ESKEW  
ASSISTANT SECRETARY  
FOR CAPITAL PROGRAMS

January 18, 1985

Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.  
Bureau of Project Planning  
State Highway Administration  
707 North Calvert Street  
Baltimore, Maryland 21203

Subject: Improvements to U.S. Route 29, from I-495 in  
Montgomery County to U.S. Route 40 in Howard County  
Contract No. HO 606-151-770

Dear Mr. Ege:

The Heritage Program has no record of any species presently included on the State or Federal Endangered Species lists occurring along this portion of U.S. Route 29. There is, however, a historic record for the state-rare Walking Spleenwort (Asplenosorus ebenoides), observed in 1937 on the "old highway bridge over Point Branch." I recommend that this bridge be examined to determine if the Walking Spleenwort is still present, before improvements are implemented. If I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

*Arnold W. Norden*

Arnold W. Norden  
Maryland Natural Heritage Program

AWN:mle

TORREY C. BROWN, M.D.  
SECRETARY

JOHN R. GRIFFIN  
DEPUTY SECRETARY



142  
JAMES W. PECK  
DIRECTOR

RECEIVED

JUN 2 1986

GFC & C, INC.

STATE OF MARYLAND  
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES  
**WATER RESOURCES ADMINISTRATION**  
TAWES STATE OFFICE BUILDING  
ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND 21401

May 27, 1986

Ms. Betty Bowers  
Environmental Manager  
Gannett Fleming Transportation  
Engineers, Inc.  
P. O. Box 1963  
Harrisburg, PA 17105

Re: WRA File No. 86-PP-0900  
US Route 29 Improvements  
Montgomery and Howard  
Counties, Maryland

Dear Ms. Bowers:

The Administration has made a preliminary review of the submittal (your letter of April 18, 1986, location map and Water Resources map) for the above referenced project. The aforementioned submittal has also been sent to other Agencies within the Department of Natural Resources for their review and comments. The following is a summary of the comments from this office, the Maryland Forest, Park and Wildlife Service and the Coastal Resources Division of the Tidewater Administration:

As you have indicated in your letter that US 29 crosses over three drainage sub-basins and will include 43 stream crossings, a Waterway Construction Permit must be obtained from this office for each one of the crossings to be affected by the proposed improvements and provided that any changes to the course, current, or cross-section of the channel or its floodplain exceeds 100 acres for the natural and recreational trout waters, or 400 acres for all other waters, except those areas delineated as having a special flood hazard by the Federal Insurance Administration.

In addition, no in-stream work will be allowed from October through April, inclusive, for the streams classified as Class III Natural Trout Waters. The in-stream work will be prohibited from March through May, inclusive, for Class IV Recreational Trout Waters and from March through June 15, inclusive, for all Class I Waters.

The primary concerns of the Maryland Forest, Park and Wildlife Service (MFPWS) are the various river crossings associated with the subject improvements and their potential impact on riverine wetlands. The MFPWS would like to be kept abreast of project planning and different stages as it progresses.

Telephone: (301) 269-2265

Ms. Betty Bowers  
May 27, 1986  
Page Two

A general outline of the types of non-tidal wetlands that presently exist in the US 29 corridor is listed below. Preliminary analysis of the National Wetland Inventory Maps by the Tidewater Administration's Coastal Resources Division revealed that there are more than 17 small wetlands in the project area:

Kensington Quad

R30WH - Upper perennial riverine, open water permanently flooded.

POWZh - Palustrine open water, impounded, intermittently exposed and permanently flooded.

Beltsville Quad

R30WH - Upper perennial riverine, open water, permanently flooded.

PF01A - Palustrine forested, temporarily flooded, broad-leaved deciduous vegetation.

POWZh - Palustrine open water, impounded, intermittently exposed and permanently flooded.

Clarksville Quad

PF01A - Palustrine forested temporarily flooded, broad-leaved deciduous vegetation.

R20WH - Riverine, lower perennial, open water, permanently flooded.

Savage Quad

PF01A - Palustrine forested, temporarily flooded, broad-leaved deciduous vegetation.

R20WH - Riverine, lower perennial, open water, permanently flooded.

PEM5A - Palustrine, emergent, temporarily flooded, narrow-leaved persistent vegetation.

P SS1A - Palustrine scrub/shrub (broad-leaved deciduous) -  
EM5 emergent (narrow-leaved persistent),  
temporarily flooded.

Ms. Betty Bowers  
May 27, 1986  
Page Three

Ellicott City Quad

PF01A - Palustrine forested, temporarily flooded, broad-leaved deciduous vegetation.

P ~~SS1~~A - Palustrine scrub/shrub (broad-leaved deciduous) -  
EM5 emergent (narrow-leaved persistent), temporarily flooded.


The Coastal Resources Division recommends the following information to be covered in the environmental assessment:

1. Field - identified data on the vegetative species including dominant, understory, and herbaceous plant types;
2. Soils characteristics of the wetlands, including hydrologic regime (e.g. temporary, saturated, seasonal, permanent, etc.) and drainage class (e.g. poorly drained, very poorly drained);
3. Wetlands acreage impacted, by type;
4. Aquatic and terrestrial wildlife in the project area;
5. Benthic invertebrates inhabiting the streams or rivers;
6. Details of proposed mitigation for wetland impacts; and
7. Wetland boundary delineation performed in the field and flagged with bright plastic ribbon and provided on map of the project.

Please keep in mind that additional comments are forthcoming from the Tidewater Administration's Fisheries Division and Capital Programs' Natural Heritage Section. Their comments will be forwarded to you as they become available.

If you have any questions regarding the above matters, please contact me at (301) 269-2265.

Sincerely,



M. Q. Taherian  
Project Engineer  
Waterway Permits Division

MQT:das

cc: C. Simpson, SHA  
R. Aldrich, SHA



TORREY C. BROWN, M.D.  
SECRETARY

JOHN R. GRIFFIN  
DEPUTY SECRETARY



145  
JAMES W. PECK  
DIRECTOR

RECEIVED

JUN 2 1986

GFC & C, INC.

STATE OF MARYLAND  
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES  
**WATER RESOURCES ADMINISTRATION**  
TAWES STATE OFFICE BUILDING  
ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND 21401

May 28, 1986

Ms. Betty Bowers  
Environmental Manager  
Gannett Fleming Transportation  
Engineers, Inc.  
P. O. Box 1963  
Harrisburg, PA 17105

Re: WRA File No. 86-PP-0900  
US Route 29 Improvements  
Montgomery and Howard  
Counties, Maryland

Dear Ms. Bowers:

As a follow-up to my letter dated May 27, 1986, providing you with a summary of review and recommendations of this office and other Agencies of the Department of Natural Resources, the following are the comments received this date from the Natural Heritage Program of Capital Programs on the project's impact on numerous wetlands and rare species:

Etheostoma vitreum (Glassy Darter)

This rare fish species is found in the middle Patuxent River at the Route 29 crossing. Any siltation or substrate alteration at this site would impact this population. Additionally, the impact of any major bridge alteration at this site could be devastating to this population.

Stygobromus t. potomacus

Stygobromus pizzinii rare invertebrates (amphipodidae)

These rare amphipods are found in a few small streams adjacent to Route 29 just south of its intersection with Route 40, in the area between Rolling Acres and Greencastle Road (U.S.G.S. Beltsville Quad). Stygobromus sp. are very sensitive to water quality changes, and would be impacted by runoff from highway construction.

(301) 269-2265


Telephone: \_\_\_\_\_

Ms. Betty Bowers  
May 28, 1986  
Page Two

In addition to the above areas, the Heritage Program recommends that erosion control measures be carefully applied and strictly monitored, maintained and enforced to minimize impact on wetlands adjacent to construction. Capital Programs would like to be kept up-to-date especially if there would be any changes on the planning or design.

If you have any questions regarding the above matters, please contact me at (301) 269-2265.

Sincerely,



M. Q. Taherian  
Project Engineer  
Waterway Permits Division

MQT:das

cc: C. Simpson, SHA  
R. Aldrich, SHA

147

TORREY C. BROWN, M.D.  
SECRETARY  
JOHN R. GRIFFIN  
DEPUTY SECRETARY



JAMES W. PECK  
DIRECTOR

RECEIVED

STATE OF MARYLAND  
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES  
**WATER RESOURCES ADMINISTRATION**  
TAWES STATE OFFICE BUILDING  
ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND 21401

JUN 23 1986

GFC & C, INC.

June 20, 1986

Ms. Betty Bowers  
Environmental Manager  
Gannett Fleming Transportation  
Engineers, Inc.  
P. O. Box 1963  
Harrisburg, PA 17105

Re: WRA File No. 86-PP-0900  
US Route 29 Improvements  
Montgomery and Howard  
Counties, Maryland

Dear Ms. Bowers:

The following are the comments received on June 18, 1986 from the Tidewater Administration's Fisheries Division on the above referenced project:

1. All the alternates being considered by SHA as part of its proposal involve improvements and expansion of an existing alignment. Generally speaking, Fisheries Division believes that if expansion of transportation facilities must be achieved it is preferable to expand an existing highway rather than penetrating relatively undisturbed areas with new alignments.
2. Full and rigorous implementation and enforcement of erosion and sediment control measures during the construction stage is assumed. Appropriate standards and specifications are SHA's own "Standard Erosion and Sediment Control Procedures" as well as WRA standards and specifications.
3. We are concerned about stormwater management and we expect full application of COMAR 05.08.05.05. There will be increases in imperious surface and traffic-induced polluted runoff. Fisheries Division insists that the proposed work produce zero additional degradation from stormwater management operations.
4. Improving I-29 in the project area will facilitate and accelerate the already rapid rate of development and suburbanization. This in turn will increase imperious surface, accelerate discharges of

Telephone: (301) 269-2265

Ms. Betty Bowers  
June 20, 1986  
Page Two

polluted runoff and increase the already serious problem of stream channel erosion and sedimentation. Past Fisheries Division attempts to raise this problem of "secondary effects" have never drawn much SHA response. Nevertheless, we continue to make the point for the record and for consistency.

5. Aside from the broad aspects touched on in items (1) through (4) above, Fisheries Division's specific concerns center around the three stream crossings in the subject Route I-29 highway segment. These are Northwest Branch, Paint Branch and an unnamed tributary to Little Paint Branch, whose situations are discussed separately below.
  
6. Northwest Branch Crossing: Route I-29 presently crosses Northwest Branch over a bridge that now accommodates six lanes of traffic - as much as is contemplated under any of the alternatives under consideration. Based on the information made available to us (SHA brochure for March 1, 1986, Alternatives Public Workshop), there appear to be no plans to alter this stream crossing in any major way. If this conclusion is in error we would like to be informed. There could be serious fisheries habitat concerns. Stormwater runoff (with its cargo of highway pollutants) enters directly into the stream at the bridge. Any upgrading of the highway should address this situation. Northwest Branch is Class IV (recreational trout) water. Stocking of trout is conducted in Northwest Branch, mostly just below (and upstream of) the Randolph Road crossing. Some of the stocked trout occasionally make their way down to the I-29 crossing, although this means traversing a concrete dam (with its fully-silted impoundment) located just upstream of I-29.
  
7. Paint Branch Crossing: Route I-29 crosses Paint Branch over a split, double bridge presently accommodating four lanes of traffic, as does most of I-95 north of New Hampshire Avenue. While not spelled out in the material made available to us, it appears that the wide median strip would be ample to accommodate six lanes without widening the basic highway alignment. However, the median strip does not get carried across the existing bridge. Thus, expansion to six lanes would involve substantial alteration and reconstruction of the bridge with the possibility of significant disruption to the stream habitat below. This problem will have to be addressed at the appropriate stage in the planning process. Stormwater runoff (with its cargo of highway pollutants) enters directly into the stream in the general vicinity of the bridge. Any upgrading of the highway or alteration of the existing bridge should address this problem - preferably by providing infiltration options for stormwater runoff from the highway.

Ms. Betty Bowers  
June 20, 1986  
Page Three

Paint Branch is Class III (naturally reproducing) trout water and the overall ecosystem supports a naturally-reproducing brown trout fishery with no stocking. Spawning has not been documented in the vicinity of the I-29 bridge crossing; it tends to be concentrated in the extreme upper Paint Branch ecosystem, especially the Good Hope tributary. However, adult brown trout up to 14 inches in length are regularly found in the stream in the vicinity of the bridge, both by trout fishermen and by DNR electrofishing (per comm. Charles Gougeon, Coldwater Fisheries Program). Acutually adult brown trout have made their way down Paint Branch all the way to the I-495 Beltway. The Paint Branch crossing represents very valuable and very fragile fisheries habitat. It warrants the utmost in protection by maximized BMP's to offset any possible disruption from highway upgrading.

I trust the above comments will provide you with essential input in preparation of your preliminary engineering and environmental studies for the proposed improvements of US 29.

If you should have any questions regarding the above matters, please contact me at (301) 269-2265.

Sincerely,



M. Q. Taherian  
Project Engineer  
Waterway Permits Division

MQT:das



150  
AUG 11 1986

GFC & C, INC.

TORREY C. BROWN, M.D.  
SECRETARY

JOHN R. GRIFFIN  
DEPUTY SECRETARY

STATE OF MARYLAND  
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES  
**TIDEWATER ADMINISTRATION**  
TAWES STATE OFFICE BUILDING  
ANNAPOLIS 21401

August 7, 1986

Gannett-Fleming Company  
Attention Dave Willis  
P.O. Box 1963  
Harrisburg, PA 17105

re: fish survey data for streams along  
the Route 29 corridor in Howard and  
Montgomery Counties, Maryland.

Dear Mr. Willis:

I have searched my files for fish data on those streams that may be impacted by construction activities generated by the MD Route 29 widening project. In addition, my associate Greg Golden and myself conducted site inspections on four streams where fish data was lacking, in order to access their trout fishery potential. Our site inspections were conducted on July 25, 1986, on the following streams: 1) Hammond Branch; 2) Red Hill Branch; 3) Tiber Branch; and 4) Hudson Branch. It should be noted that these streams were investigated in the past by Coldwater Fisheries personnel, and all were dismissed as potential candidates for self-sustaining trout populations.

Generally, the same conclusions were made of these streams following our site inspections. Data sheets with data/comments have been included for Hammond Branch and Red Hill Branch. The other streams were judged to be poor for trout survival based on habitat, water temperature, watershed characteristics and degree of sedimentation. In site of our findings that all four streams are insufficient to support self-sustaining trout populations, it is our responsibility to prevent further degradation of the waters of the state whenever possible.

Notes and references to Northwest Branch and Paint Branch are as follows:

Northwest Branch - According to our records, Northwest Branch has received annual stockings of hatchery reared trout since the spring of 1977 as part of the state's programs designed to provide recreational trout fishing to residents of the Washington-Metro area. The State of Maryland, Department of Natural Resources (DNR) currently plans to continue this trout stocking practice each spring between the months of March and the middle of May, downstream of Route 29 at the following locations: 1) Adelphi Mill bike path (Route 212, Riggs Road) and 2) immediately upstream and downstream of Univer-Boulevard (Route 193).

Fisheries will recommend that all construction activities be planned around the non-construction dates for Northwest Branch (Class IV streams, Recreational trout waters) as determined by the Water Resources Administration (WRA) of the State of Maryland.

Paint Branch -

Please find enclosed a copy of our most recent Federal Aid report (F-36-R). Paint Branch is our most sensitive stream segment with respect to the proposed Route 29 construction as it holds the only self-sustaining trout population in all of Montgomery County.

Fisheries will recommend that all construction activities be planned around the non-construction dates for Paint Branch (Class III stream, Natural Trout Waters) as determined by WRA.

A self-sustaining brown trout population has been documented in Paint Branch from its headwaters downstream to the capital beltway Route 495. All precautions must be taken to prevent further degradation/impact to the fishery downstream of the Route 29 bridge during the construction phase.

If you should need any additional information, please feel free to contact me at my office at Phone: 301 854-6060 or 301 442-2080.

Sincerely,

*Charles R. Gougeon*

Charles R. Gougeon  
DNR Biologist  
Tidewater Administration

17400 Annapolis Rock Rd.  
Woodbine, MD 21797

ajh



152  
SEP 12 1986

GFC & C, INC.

TORREY C. BROWN, M.D.  
SECRETARY

JOHN R. GRIFFIN  
DEPUTY SECRETARY

STATE OF MARYLAND  
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES  
**TIDEWATER ADMINISTRATION**  
TAWES STATE OFFICE BUILDING  
ANNAPOLIS 21401

September 9, 1986


Gannett Fleming  
PO Box 1963  
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105  
Attention: Nancy Eagle

Dear Ms. Eagle,

Enclosed is fish distribution material which you requested for the Patapsco and Patuxent Rivers in connection with the environmental statements for the upgrading of U.S. Rt. 29. I regret that I have been unable to find the expected material for the upper Anacostia, however, it should be similar, with the caveat that the Paint Branch tributary contains reproducing brown trout. Other portions of the upper Anacostia have been degraded somewhat due to urbanization; otherwise they would exhibit a normal piedmont fish fauna.

I would strongly suggest that your firm commission a survey of the areas in question, as urbanization related cumulative effects are severe throughout the three drainages and should be discussed in the environmental assessments, with evaluations of the additional effects to be expected with increased regional transportation capacity.

Sincerely,

  
W.R. Carter III

enclosures

WRC/cp



153



TORREY C. BROWN, M.D.  
SECRETARY

JOHN R. GRIFFIN  
DEPUTY SECRETARY

STATE OF MARYLAND  
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES  
MARYLAND GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

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

KENNETH N. WEAVER  
DIRECTOR  
MARYLAND GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

EMERY T. CLEAVES  
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

13 November 1985  
Division of Archeology

Ms. Rita Suffness  
Environmental Management Office  
Bureau of Project Planning  
State Highway Administration  
Room 314  
707 N. Calvert Street  
Baltimore, MD 21202

Re: US 29 (I-495 to Howard Co.)

Dear Rita:

I have indicated in red on the attached maps those portions of the subject project requiring new right-of-way that possess moderate to high archeological potential. They are all centered near the Maryland Route 198/U.S. Route 29 intersection, where a number of flats overlook headwater tributaries. These settings are similar to that of site 18MC47, a large multi-component site spanning the period from circa 6300 BC to AD 1600 (see my 1977 report on MD 198).

The remainder of the new right-of-way areas are considered to have moderate to low (mostly low) archeological potential. This is due primarily to suburbanization, prior disturbance, slope, and the limited extent of new right-of-way required.

If I can be of further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

Dennis C. Curry  
Archeologist



154

TORREY C. BROWN, M.D.  
SECRETARY

JOHN R. GRIFFIN  
DEPUTY SECRETARY

STATE OF MARYLAND  
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES  
MARYLAND GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

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

KENNETH N. WEAVER  
DIRECTOR  
MARYLAND GEOLOGICAL SURVEY  
EMERY T. CLEAVES  
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

21 October 1985  
Division of Archeology

Rita Suffness  
Environmental Management Office  
Bureau of Project Planning  
State Highway Administration  
Room 314  
707 N. Calvert Street  
Baltimore, Md 21202

Re: US. Route 29  
MD Route 358 Extended

Dear Rita:


I have reviewed our sites files for the two subject projects. There are no sites recorded in or near the Maryland Route 358 (Extended) project in Somerset County.

For the U.S. Route 29 project, I have attached two maps showing the locations of two reported sites (unconfirmed) and one recorded site (18H079). There are no descriptions of the two reported sites, although they are probably prehistoric lithic scatters based on the name of the person who reported them. Site 18H079 is a late 18<sup>th</sup>-20<sup>th</sup> century site and possibly corresponds to MHT inventory #H087.

Let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

Dennis C. Curry  
Archeologist



155

TORREY C. BROWN, M.D.  
SECRETARY

KENNETH N. WEAVER  
DIRECTOR

JOHN R. GRIFFIN  
DEPUTY SECRETARY

MARYLAND GEOLOGICAL SURVEY  
EMERY T. CLEAVES  
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

STATE OF MARYLAND  
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES  
**MARYLAND GEOLOGICAL SURVEY**

2300 ST. PAUL STREET  
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND 21218

Division of Archeology  
(301) 554-5530

23 December 1986

Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.  
Deputy Director  
Division of Project Development  
State Highway Administration  
P.O. Box 717/707 North Calvert Street  
Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

RE: U.S. Route 29  
From I495, Montgomery County to  
U.S. 40, Howard County

Dear Mr. Ege:

I recently conducted a Phase I archeological reconnaissance of those areas currently considered for improvements of the Route 29 corridor in Montgomery and Howard counties. Most of 21.6 miles study involved proposed lane additions within narrow linear portions of already disturbed medians or along road berms. These areas did not require archeological survey. Consequently, the current survey consisted of areas proposed for interchanges, access roads and a relocation of U.S. Route 29 in the vicinity of Maryland Route 198.

The work consisted of background research and field reconnaissance. The background research included examining historic maps, site reports, and site files. Early structures were noted using the historic maps as a reference. Site reports were utilized to indicate portions of the project which had been surveyed previously. Site files provided information regarding known sites which had been recorded in the project area.

A total of 20 test loci were surveyed in the field over a course of several days (see attached map). Loci were selected on the basis of experience with site prediction models, and information gleaned from background research. Areas with good ground visibility were surface collected; otherwise shovel test pits were placed at 20-meter intervals in grass-covered or wooded areas. Given the rapid rate of development along U.S.

29 there were a number of areas not chosen for testing because of evident disturbances or lack of topographic integrity from construction-related activities. The following is a summary of what was accomplished:

Test Locus 1: (Lockwood Drive - Partial Interchange)

This locus appeared to be an undisturbed wooded hilltop on recent topographic maps. However, at the time of survey, it was being bulldozed for a proposed office building. Cleared ground was surface collected and trenches exposing stratigraphic layers were examined for cultural material. No archeological sites were located in this area.

Test Loci 2 (18MO271) and 3 (Stewart Lane - Partial Interchange)

Test Locus 2 was located in a level wooded area of the Dow Jones Chemical complex. Surface collection (no shovel test pits permitted) yielded 11 window glass fragments, 3 unidentified bottle glass fragments (1 etched), 1 bottle lip, 1 cut glass fragment, 1 whiteware sherd, 2 large quartzite flakes, and 1 small worked quartz flake. The historic component of this site may represent a dwelling noted on the 1879 atlas of Montgomery County as the Thomas Conley residences located on the opposite side of the present highway. The quartzite flakes may represent a portion of a small prehistoric encampment truncated by the construction of the Dow Jones Chemical parking lot, based on the locations of the representative artifacts.

Recommendations - Neither component of this site (18MO271) is recommended for additional work based on types, and locations of artifacts. The Conley house is either under the present highway or on the opposite side of the road and has been destroyed. The few prehistoric artifacts do not appear to be significant enough to warrant further testing.

No archeological material was found in any of the 4 shovel test pits placed along a level hilltop at Test Locus 3.

Test Locus 4 (Old Columbia Pike/Industrial Parkway turning bay)

Twenty-four shovel test pits placed across an expansive level grass-covered field located no cultural material, either prehistoric or historic.

Test Loci 5 (18MO272) and 6 (18MO273) (Interchanges at Randolph, Musgrove and Fairland Roads)

Shovel tests and surface collection at both loci located small prehistoric sites, representing small temporary camps. Surface collections at Test Locus 5 yielded 1 worked quartz chunk, 2 quartz flakes, 1 rhyolite secondary flake, and 1 oyster shell fragment, all located on a hilltop overlooking Route 29. No artifacts were found in 4 shovel tests placed on a grass-covered portion of the hilltop away from the highway. Test Locus 6 yielded 1 quartzite point fragment and 1 quartz chip on a large level ground exposed (40%) vegetable garden.

Recommendations - Neither site is recommended for addition work. Site 18MO272 was probably truncated by U.S. 29 and 18MO273 yielded a sparse amount of material. Thus, further investigation is not warranted.

Test Loci 7, 8 (18MO274), and 9 (Greencastle Road Interchange)

One prehistoric site (18MO274) located in a backyard vegetable garden of the Donna Newton residence at Test Locus 8 yielded 3 quartz biface fragments, 1 quartz biface, 9 quartz chunks, 2 quartz shatter, and 2 quartz secondary flakes as well as 1 rhyolite chunk in surface collection. Nine shovel test pits placed in a level wooded area at Test Locus 9 and surface collection of ground exposed areas of Test Locus 7 yielded no cultural material.

Recommendations - Because of the large amount of material found in a small area, site 18MO274 located at Test Locus 8 is recommended for additional work to determine site use, extent, cultural affiliation, integrity and its potential for inclusion to the National Register of Historic Places.

Test Loci 10 and 11 (Blackburn Road Full Interchange)

Surface collection in ground exposed areas (visibility 50-100%) yielded no cultural material either prehistoric or historic.

Test Loci 12, 13, and 14 (Realignment of U.S. 29 from Maryland Route 198 to Dustin Road)

Surface collection in a previously cultivated expansive level field covered in corn crop waste along with 7 shovel tests located no archeological material at Test Locus 13. Test Locus 12 was surface collected where it had been graded for development. No cultural material was found at this locus. Test Locus 14, a small hilltop located within SHA property boundaries was shovel tested to locate a possible historic site based on the presence of large trees and a driveway located near the hilltop. However, no cultural material was found in 7 shovel test pits.

Test Loci 15, 16, and 17 (Relocation of Old Columbia Road and Service Road A)

Four shovel test pits placed on a hilltop (Test Locus 15) proposed for access road A yielded no cultural material; seven shovel tests in an expansive level field along Route 29 proposed for median crossover (Test Locus 16) yielded no cultural material; as well, 4 shovel test pits along a small hilltop adjacent to the west side of U.S. 29 (Test Locus 17) yielded no cultural material.

Test Locus 18 (Service Road from Maryland 216)

Surface collection in an elongated field of corn crop waste along with 7 shovel test pits did not locate any archeological remains.

158

Test Locus 19 (18H0142) (Rivers Edge Road Underpass)

This test locus was shovel tested for prehistoric sites the entire length of a level wooded hilltop overlooking the Middle Patuxent River. Seven shovel test pits yielded no cultural material, either prehistoric or historic. However, a complex of foundation remains was located along with access roads leading to the complex from Old Columbia Road and U.S. 29. The foundations (3) appear to be of fairly recent construction (early 20<sup>th</sup> century) (cinderblock and stone). One shovel test pit placed near the stone foundation indicates that the area was used for a dump based on recent trash in the pit which consisted of glass bottle fragments oxidized metal fragments and ceramic sherds dating to the early to middle 20<sup>th</sup> century.

Recommendations - No additional work is recommended based on the late time period associated with this site.

Test Locus 20 (Service Road B at Gale Road)


Five shovel test pits placed in a small level wooded floodplain of an unnamed tributary failed to locate any archeological material.

As the result of the current survey, five archeological sites were located: 1 historic site (18H0142), 3 prehistoric (18MO272, 18MO273, and 18MO274) and 1 site (18MO27) with a prehistoric and a historic component.

Site 18MO274 is recommended for additional investigations to determine its eligibility for inclusion to the National Register. A study of the site may provide information regarding settlement patterns in the area and aboriginal subsistence. The remaining areas proposed for corridor improvements will not need additional work in their present design because of previous disturbance as the result of development.

A comprehensive report will follow shortly. In the meantime, if I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,



Hettie L. Ballweber  
Archeologist

HLB:lw

cc: Rita Suffness  
Cynthia D. Simpson



Maryland Department of Natural Resources

159

Maryland Geological Survey  
2300 St. Paul Street  
Baltimore, Maryland 21218  
Telephone: (301) 554-5500

William Donald Schaefer  
Governor

Torrey C. Brown, M.D.  
Secretary

Kenneth N. Weaver  
Director

Emery T. Cleaves  
Deputy Director

Division of Archeology  
(301) 554-5530

9 March 1987

Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.  
Deputy Director  
Division of Project Development  
State Highway Administration  
P.O. Box 717/707 North Calvert Street  
Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

RE: U.S. Route 29 from Interstate Route 495 to  
U.S. 40 Howard and Montgomery Counties  
(Extension from Interstate Route 495 to  
Slego Creek Parkway)

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT  
MARCH 10 10 32 AM '87

Dear Mr. Ege:

I have reviewed the above-referenced project with regard to archeological resources. There are no known or recorded archeological sites in the project area. A review of archival maps indicates that occupation in the area was scattered until the early 20th century when a spate of development took place. It has lasted up to the present time. Thus, the potential for prehistoric as well as historic sites is considered only poor to moderate because of the development. If sites existed in the area they have probably been destroyed.

If I can be of further assistance in this matter, please do not hesitate to call me.

Sincerely,

Hettie L. Ballweber  
Archeologist

HLB:lw

cc: Cynthia D. Simpson  
Rita Suffness  
Joseph Hopkins, III

COMMISSIONERS

Jesse L. Maury  
Chairman

Alexander Williams, Jr.  
Vice-Chairman

Ada Koonce Blumenschein

Robert M. Potter

Leonard H. Teitelbaum

Robert P. Will

Richard G. Hocevar  
General Manager

Washington Suburban  
Sanitary Commission

4017 Hamilton Street • Hyattsville, MD 20781 • 301 699-4000

TTY: 277-2311

160

RECEIVED

May 1, 1986

MAY 5 1986

GFC & C, INC.

Betty Bowers  
Environmental Manager  
Gannett Fleming  
Transportation Engineers, Inc.  
P.O. Box 1963  
Harrisburg, PA 17105

Dear Ms Bowers;

Thank you for alerting us to the proposed work on Route 29 in the Burtonsville area. Our greatest interest in the project will be how it impacts water quality and siltation in our Rocky Gorge raw water supply reservoir. We would appreciate the opportunity to review the site plans and sediment control plans for any area to be disturbed within our watershed in the vicinity of Route 29 Bridge over our reservoir.

Please forward the above information to Mr. John Corless, Water Operations Division Head, 6101 Sandy Spring Road, Laurel, MD 20707.

Yours truly,



Franklin E. Jamerson  
Acting Water Operations  
Division Head

FEJ/bre

cc: Bill Kennedy  
Mike Grear





Maryland Historical Trust

161

Aug 21 2 26 PM '86

PROJECT  
DEVELOPMENT  
DIVISION

August 20, 1986

Ms. Cynthia Simpson, Chief  
Environmental Management  
Maryland Dept. of Transportation  
State Highway Administration  
P. O. Box 717  
707 N. Calvert Street  
Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

RE: Contract HO 606-151-770  
U.S. Rt. 29  
from Sligo Cr. Pkwy. to U.S. 40

Dear Ms. Simpson:

In response to your letter of June 6, 1986, our office concurs in the possible NR eligibility and the proposed boundaries for the following properties:

- M 32/2 - Tax Parcel
- M 34/10 - Tax Parcel
- M 34/9 - Setting Outlined
- M 34/8 - Tax Parcel
- M 15/62 - Tax Parcel
- HO 269 - Setting Outlined
- HO 37 - Tax Parcel
- HO 154 - Tax Parcel
- HO 155 - Tax Parcel
- HO 430 - Tax Parcel
- HO 28 - Setting Outlined
- HO 87 - Tax Parcel.

We thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

J. Rodney Little  
Director State Historic  
Preservation Officer

JRL/AHL/mmc

CC: Mrs. Mary Louise Gramkow  
Mr. Ed Shull  
Ms. Mary Ann Kephart

Ms. Roberta Hahn  
Mr. Mark Walston, MNCPPC  
Ms. Rita Suffness

162



March 4, 1987

MAR 9 2 22 PM '87  
PROJECT DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

Maryland Historical Trust

Ms. Cynthia Simpson, Chief  
Environmental Management  
Maryland Department of Transportation  
State Highway Administration  
P. O. Box 717  
707 North Calvert Street  
Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

Re: Contract No. HO 606-151-770  
U.S. Route 29 from Montgomery/  
Howard County Line to U.S.  
Route 40  
PDMS No. 132046

Dear Ms. Simpson:

Thank you for your letter of December 18, 1986 concerning the above referenced project which was received by our office on January 2, 1987.

Our responses to your proposed determinations of effect for seven eligible sites in Howard County are as follows:

<u>Property</u>	<u>Alternate</u>	<u>MHT Determination</u>
Scaggs Place	B	Agree - No effect
Scaggs Place	C	Agree - No adverse effect
Athol	B	Agree - No adverse effect
Athol	C (6)	Agree - No adverse effect
Athol	C (7)	Agree - No adverse effect
Athol	C (5)	*Disagree - <u>Adverse</u> effect
Kelly's Store	B	*Disagree - No adverse effect
Kelly's Store	C (1)	*Disagree - No adverse effect
Kelly's Store	C (2)	Agree - No adverse effect
Gales-Gaither	B	*Disagree - No adverse effect
Gales-Gaither	C (1)	*Disagree - No adverse effect
Gales-Gaither	C (2)	Agree - No adverse effect
Felicity	B	*Disagree - No adverse effect
Felicity	C (1)	*Disagree - No adverse effect
Felicity	C (2)	*Disagree - <u>Adverse</u> effect
Dorsey Hall	B	Agree - No effect
Long Reach	B	Agree - No effect


In the case of Felicity C (2) we feel that the general setting would be too drastically altered, while in the case of Athol C (5) the alternate would involve a "taking" and a changed access.

163

Ms. Cynthia Simpson  
March 4, 1987  
Page 2

Our office thanks you for your cooperation. Should you have any further questions or comments feel free to contact Al Luckenbach at 974-4450.

Sincerely,




J. Rodney Little  
Director

JRL: AHL:lcb

cc: Ms. Rita Suffness  
Mr. Paul Wettlaufer  
Mrs. Mary Louis Gramkow  
Mr. Ed Shull

MARYLAND  
HISTORICAL



TRUST

164  
William Donald Schaeter  
Governor

J. Randall Evans  
Secretary, DECD

July 10, 1987

PROJECT  
DEVELOPMENT  
JUL 11 1987

Ms. Cynthia Simpson, Chief  
Environmental Management  
Maryland Department of Transportation  
State Highway Administration  
P. O. Box 717  
707 North Calvert Street  
Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

RE: Contract No. HO 606-151-770  
U.S. Route 29 from Montgomery/  
Howard County Line to U.S.  
Route 40  
PDMS No. 132046

Dear Ms. Simpson:

This letter is intended to augment our reply of March 4, 1987 concerning the above-referenced project, in response to the information and maps provided with your letter of June 17, 1987.

For Concept 2 (at Old Columbia Rd.) we agree that the proposed will not adversely effect Felicity. We also believe that the Kelly Store and Gales-Gaither House will be affected, but not adversely.

For Concept 5 at Seneca Drive (old Concept 7) we disagree with your no effect determination. As in our March 4th letter we consider Athol to be affected, but not adversely.

We appreciate your cooperation in this matter. If you have any further questions or comments, please contact Al Luckenbach at 974-4450.

Sincerely,

*George J. Andrevé*  
George J. Andrevé  
Project Review and  
Compliance Administrator  
Office of Preservation Services

GJA/AHL/mmc

cc: Mr. Paul Wettlaufer  
Ms. Rita Suffness  
Mr. Charles Keenan  
Mr. Charles Montgomery

*Maryland*

Department of Economic and Community Development  
State House, 21 State Circle, Annapolis, Maryland 21401 (301) 974-4450, 757-9000  
Temporary Address: Arnold Village Professional Center, 1517 Ritchie Highway, Arnold, Maryland 21012

185

# Advisory Council On Historic Preservation

---

The Old Post Office Building  
1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, #809  
Washington, DC 20004

---

NOV 3 1987

Mr. Emil Elinsky  
Division Administrator  
Federal Highway Administration  
The Rotunda - Suite 220  
711 West 40th Street  
Baltimore, MD 21211-2187

REF: Proposed Improvements to U.S. 29  
Howard County, Maryland

Dear Mr. ~~Elinsky~~ *Emil*:

On October 30, 1987, the Council received the additional information we requested in support of your determination that the referenced project would have no adverse effect upon Scagg's Place, Athol, Kelly's Store House, Gales-Gaither House, and Felicity, properties which are eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. We have reviewed your supporting documentation and we agree with your determination.

This letter confirms that the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and the Council's regulations have been met for this project. Both this letter and your supporting documentation should be retained in your environmental or project files.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

*[Signature]*  
Don L. Klima  
Chief, Eastern Division  
of Project Review

1115  
\* P.W.

C. Agency Comments on  
Environmental Assessment

870217  
1.5.0.1



OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS  
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND MENTAL HYGIENE

201 WEST PRESTON STREET • BALTIMORE, MARYLAND 21201 • AREA CODE 301 • 225-5270

TTY FOR DEAF: Balto. Area 383-7555  
D.C. Metro 565-0451

Adele Wilzack, R.N., M.S., Secretary

William M. Eichbaum, Assistant Secretary

February 17, 1987

Ms. Cynthia D. Simpson, Chief  
Environmental Management  
Project Development Division  
707 North Calvert Street, Room 310  
Baltimore, Maryland 21202

EW: Contract No. HO 606-151-770  
U.S. Route 29 from Montgomery/  
Howard County Line to U.S. Route 40

Dear Ms. Simpson:

I have reviewed the air impact analysis performed for the widening of the east segment of U.S. Route 29 from the Montgomery/Howard County line to U.S. Route 40 and concur with its conclusions.

Given the expected increase in traffic predicted for the region, the Department believes that alternate Plan C will yield the best air quality for the area.

The proposed project is consistent with the transportation control portion of the State Implementation Plan for the Metropolitan Washington Interstate Air Quality Control Region. Furthermore, adherence with the provisions of COMAR 10.18.06.03D will ensure that the impact from the construction phase of this project will be minimal.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this analysis.

Sincerely,

Mario E. Jorquera  
Division of Air Quality Planning  
and Data Systems  
Air Management Administration

MJ:dsd

No response required.

167



TORREY C. BROWN, M.D.  
SECRETARY

JOHN R. GRIFFIN  
DEPUTY SECRETARY

STATE OF MARYLAND  
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES  
TIDEWATER ADMINISTRATION  
TAWES STATE OFFICE BUILDING  
ANNAPOLIS 21401

February 27, 1987

RECEIVED  
MAR 6 1987  
WATERWAY PERMITS DIVISION  
WATER RESOURCES ADMINISTRATION

MEMORANDUM

TO: M.Q. Taherian  
Waterways Permit Division, WRA

FROM: W.P. Jensen, Director  
Fisheries Division

SUBJECT: Environmental Assessment (EA) for US Rte. 29 - Patuxent River Bridge  
to US Rte. 40, Howard County, MD. (86-PP-0900).

Fisheries Division has reviewed the subject EA for Permit application (86-PP-0900) and has the following comments which were prepared by Bob Schueler of our Environmental Assessment Program. On June 13, 1986 Fisheries Division submitted comments to you for that portion of the US Rte. 29 expansion from I 495 to the Howard County line (Patuxent River Bridge). We also participated in the joint field reviews of Oct. 1 and Oct. 20, 1986.

1. The general thrust of comments (1) through (4) in Fisheries Division's report of June 13, 1986 is also applicable to the subject segment of Rte. 29. The proposed work involves expansion of an existing alignment, with additional lanes being created out of the median strip.

2. This segment of Rte. 29 traverses the headwaters of the Little Patuxent, Middle Patuxent and Hammond Branch watersheds. The key role played by these smaller, usually wooded, headwater streams in maintaining the quality of the downstream ecosystem has been well documented (Carter, 1986, attached). These contributions are vulnerable to modifications and alterations that decrease infiltration and evapotranspiration capacity and increase overland run-off. These effects, in addition to decreasing the allochthonous material fall-in which controls stream trophic webs, act to degrade the entire stream-river continuum, from headwaters to higher order stream sections. Observations made during the joint field reviews confirmed the picture of a small stream network currently of good quality and fairly diverse aquatic life.

Response to the Tidewater Administration's  
Fisheries Division:

Response to the Fisheries Division Comments:

1. Comment is noted.
2. Comment is noted.

168



3. The direct effects of the proposed work consists of:

(a) Increased erosion and sediment generation during the construction phases of the additional lanes and access facilities. This can be controlled by rigorous implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) for erosion and sediment control during these phases. This implies the strictest of monitoring and enforcement, however; a situation that does not normally fully prevail. It has been estimated that the effectiveness of these BMPs in actual practice is of the order of 70 percent (Shaver, 1986 - personal communication).

(b) Modification of access arrangements will involve alterations to access roads and lengthening of existing culverts. Some of the existing culvert situations represent at least a partial barrier to fish movements (as noted during the field reviews). Fisheries Division would like to see all new culverts depressed at least one foot below stream invert to facilitate fish passage. Existing culverts should be retrofitted to facilitate fish passage either by culvert lowering or by cutting out a low flow channel in the base of the culvert wherever possible.

(c) At present stormwater discharges from the existing impervious highway surface flow directly into the streams or into ditches emptying into the streams. Besides increased streambank erosion and sedimentation triggered by this accelerated run-off, there will be increased pollution inputs to the stream. Run-off from road surfaces containing heavy metals, chlorides, PCBs, grease and oil etc. can be deleterious to the quality of surface waters and consequently to the fish species involved (Shaheen, 1975). As part of the proposed work, Fisheries Division would like to see serious consideration of stormwater management retrofitting as part of the highway expansion to bring stormwater management measures into full conformity with COMAR .05.08.05.05. This would involve incorporation of measures for infiltration and flow attenuation (e.g. infiltration pits, etc.) rather than the current direct shunting of run-off into stream systems or into ditches emptying directly into stream systems.

4. The question of "indirect" or "secondary" effects was raised in the June 13, 1986 comments of Fisheries Division. By this is meant the degree to which development and suburbanization (with consequent impacts on aquatic habits) are related to, and caused (or at least facilitated) by the I-29 expansion. From the standpoint of aquatic resources and habitat this is the basic impact that underlies all the other changes. The EA does not satisfactorily address this problem; it is possible that SHA believes such a discussion is beyond the scope of an EA. Therefore, Fisheries Division concludes that preparation of a full-scale EIS is indicated.

5. Fisheries Division concurs with the consensus decisions relating to wetlands as outlined in the summaries of the Oct. 1 and Oct. 20, 1986 field reviews, which have been incorporated in the EA.

Response to the Tidewater Administration's Fisheries Division: (con't)

3. (a) Comment noted. Best Management Practices (BMPs) sediment control will be employed.

(b) All culverts designed for stream crossings in this project will be lowered at least one foot below stream invert.

(c) As discussed in the EA, stormwater runoff will be managed under DNR's Stormwater Management Regulations and will be in compliance with COMAR 05.08.05.05. Stormwater management procedures will be incorporated for those areas directly affected by the project. Infiltration techniques for stormwater management will be investigated to control the quantity and quality of outfall from the roadway. As a minimum, this will address the additional surface area of the added lanes, and where possible, will address the surface area of the existing lanes.

4. The secondary impact of the U.S. Route 29 improvements is discussed under Land Use and Planning Impacts of the EA. This section states that Alternate C would increase the desirability of the area and enhance development potential. However, this impact is consistent with land use and development planning for the area. While it is realized that secondary impacts of development and suburbanization may have a corresponding impact on aquatic resources, the appropriate Class of Action for this project has been determined to be an EA. This decision was reached with the FHWA. As EIS is required when an action has a significant impact on natural or ecological resources, significant displacements, significant impact on air quality or noise, etc.

5. ...nen. ...tec

169

6. In summary, Fisheries Division concludes:

a. From the standpoint of fisheries resources and habitat Alternate A (No Build) is preferable, followed by Alternate B (widening but leaving all at-grade intersections intact). Alternate C (widening plus implementing access control by separating grades and/or installing service roads) is the least preferable, being the the most disruptive to existing aquatic life habitat as well as the most likely to facilitate secondary effects (additional development with consequent increases in impervious surface and non-point source pollution).

b. If Alternate C is chosen, the decision should be conditional on the following:

(1) rigorous implementation of erosion and sediment control BMPs during all construction stages in accordance with guidelines and specifications cited on pages IV-13 and IV-14 of the EA --- supported by adequate inspection and enforcement.

(2) as part of I-29 expansion the existing inadequate stormwater management system (i.e. direct discharge of polluted run-off to streams or ditches leading directly to streams) be retrofitted. Such retrofitting to emphasize infiltration measures eliminating direct discharge of polluted run-off from impervious highway surfaces.

(3) utilization of bridges in preference to culverts wherever possible.

(4) depression of all new culverts at least one foot below stream invert.

(5) retrofitting of existing culverts as necessary to facilitate fish passage either by depressing culverts at least one foot below stream invert or incorporating a low flow channel in the base of the existing culvert.

(6) provision of a "green belt" buffer at least 100' in width on each side of all stream.

c. The EA should be followed by production of a full DEIS, with particular attention to the problem of "secondary effects" as discussed in item 4. above.

WPJ/RS/cp

Response to the Tidewater Administration's Fisheries Division: (con't)

6. a. Alternate C, roadway widening with control of access, has been chosen as the recommended alternate.

b. (1) Erosion and sediment control BMPs will be rigorously implemented and supported by adequate inspection and enforcement.

(2) See response to 3-c.

(3) The determination of the usage of bridges in lieu of culverts will not be evaluated until the project advances to the final design stage. Detailed hydrologic and hydraulic studies completed in this stage are used to determine the practicality of type of stream crossing selected.

(4) See response to 3-b.

(5) SHA will investigate the feasibility of lowering the existing culvert at least one-foot below stream invert or incorporating a low flow channel in the base of the existing culvert during the final design stage of this project.

(6) SHA will investigate the availability of providing a "green belt" buffer during the final design stage of this project.

c. See response to #4.

170

REFERENCES CITED:

Carter, W.R. III, 1986. --"A discussion of small streams".  
Internal Position Paper, Maryland DNR, Oct. 1986.

Shaheen, D.C., 1975.--"Contributions of urban roadway usage  
to water pollution". EPA Environmental Protection  
Technology Series. EPA - 600/2-75-004. March 1975.

Attachment

cc: Project  
Journal  
Schueler  
Gougeon



RECEIVED

APR 21 1987

WATERWAY PERMITS DIVISION  
WATER RESOURCES ADMINISTRATION

TORREY C. BROWN, M.D.  
SECRETARY

STATE OF MARYLAND  
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES  
TIDEWATER ADMINISTRATION  
TAWES STATE OFFICE BUILDING  
ANNAPOLIS 21401

March 5, 1987

MEMORANDUM

TO: M. Q. Tasharian, Waterway Permits Division  
VIA: Elder Ghiglieri, CRD  
FROM: Mike Slattery, CRD  
SUBJECT: Environmental Assessment, U.S. Route 29, Patuxent River Bridge  
to U.S. Route 40, Howard County, Maryland

This is in response to your memorandum dated February 3, 1987 requesting comments subsequent to our review of the Environmental Assessment. Having reviewed the document, the Coastal Resources Division has the following comments to offer:

- 1 Several of the wetlands identified in the EA are classified as palustrine, scrub-shrub wetlands with an A, or temporarily flooded, water regime. A condition of inundation for a more extended period of time is often necessary to support scrub-shrub type wetlands. We would appreciate documentation of field verification of wetlands classifications and modifiers.
- 2 Based on contours and intermittent waterways indicated on U.S.C.S. Quad maps, we believe that non-tidal wetlands that have not been identified may exist at certain points along the alignment (see attachment). We request that their existence or non-existence be verified in the field.
- 3 Projects, such as the U.S. Route 29 Improvements project, are evaluated only in terms of the immediate impacts with which they are associated. Cumulative impacts sustained by the natural environment extend beyond the construction limits of the project. A more comprehensive approach to assessing impacts associated with such work would more adequately address the concerns and efforts associated with the Chesapeake Bay Initiatives. More specifically, we are concerned about the downstream impacts to water quality and aquatic resources both on short term and long term scales. There are also a number of other highway projects proximal to this watershed which share the same impacts.
- 4 Treatment of wetland impacts in the EA is inadequate. Acreages have been provided, but that is the extent of the wetlands impact information provided for review. In order to fairly assess impacts to non-tidal wetlands, or any other facet of the natural environment, treatment must be given to

Responses to the Tidewater Administration's Coastal Resources Division:

1. The classifications of wetlands were obtained from NWI maps for the area. On October 1 and October 20, 1986, a wetlands field view was conducted with the USFWS and DNR and included representatives from Waterway Permit Division, Fisheries Division, Coastal Resources Division, and Forest Park and Wildlife Service. (See minutes of Wetlands Field View in Section VI.) At this time, verification of wetlands presence and classification were obtained. Booklets were provided at the field view, listing location and classification of wetlands. The presence of three wetland areas was disputed and thus changed; but no dispute of the remaining wetlands' classification was voiced.
2. The areas identified in the vicinity of Rivers Edge Road were field viewed with the USFWS and DNR and determined not to be wetlands. The other wetland areas identified are not within the area included in the U.S. Route 29 Study. (See areas excluded from study area of Figure 2 of EA.) Roadway widening in these areas was covered under the Broken Land Parkway Study and the MD Route 103 Study.
3. While it is agreed that cumulative impacts may be sustained due to implementation of several projects, the purpose of this study was only to address the impacts from implementation of the U.S. Route 29 improvements.
4. Vegetation associated with the wetlands is provided in Section I.C of the EA, Description of Existing Environment. The functions of the impacted wetlands, including fish and wildlife habitat, are provided on page IV-17 of the EA. Overall impacts of aquatic communities and

172

MEMORANDUM TO: M. Q. Taharian  
EA - Rce. 29  
3/5/87  
Page 2

Floral and faunal composition, biotic communities, wildlife populations, and habitat values. This information, along with a quantitative and technical treatment of specific impacts that might be expected to result from such construction should be included in a fair assessment of projected environmental impacts.

MS/sme

wildlife habitat (including those associated with wetlands) are discussed in the Surface water impacts section and the Wildlife impacts section, respectively. Because the amount of wetlands area disturbed would be small, impacts on vegetation and wildlife are expected to be minor. Construction impacts on wetlands and mitigation measures are discussed on page IV-18 of the EA.

173

THOMAS G. HARRIS, JR.  
DIRECTOR  
002-2280

DEAF TELETYPE NUMBER  
002-2272



OFFICE OF PLANNING & ZONING OF HOWARD COUNTY  
GEORGE HOWARD BUILDING  
3430 COURT HOUSE DRIVE, ELLICOTT CITY, MARYLAND 21043-4589

DIVISION OF LAND DEVELOPMENT  
AND ZONING ADMINISTRATION  
JOHN W. MUSSELMAN, CHIEF  
002-2202

DIVISION OF COMPREHENSIVE AND  
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING  
AMAR S. BANDEL, CHIEF  
002-2207

March 5, 1987

MEMORANDUM

TO: AMAR S. BANDEL, Chief  
Division of Comprehensive  
& Transportation Planning

FROM: CARL BALSER  
Division of Comprehensive  
& Transportation Planning

RE: U.S. 29 FROM MONTGOMERY COUNTY LINE TO U.S. 40  
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND LOCATION/DESIGN PUBLIC HEARING BROCHURE

Reference is made to the 1/23/87 memorandum from Thomas G. Harris, Jr. to you requesting that this office prepare review comments regarding the above referenced documents.

This office has coordinated with the Department of Public Works in preparing commentary on both the Environmental Assessment and the Location/Design Public Hearing Brochure. Where there is a known divergence of opinion between this office and the Department of Public Works, that item has been so noted. Subsequent to internal review, a formal set of comments by the Department of Public Works will be transmitted to you under separate cover.

The comments presented below generally follow the sequence of the text of the Environmental Assessment and have been subdivided by chapter.

I. Description of Proposed Action

- 1 Page I-7--The fire company "Columbia Company 7" is not west of Columbia but is near the center of the New Town.
- 2 Page I-8, Table 1--This table and the following Figure 3 map mix existing land use and proposed development. For example, Segments VI and VII include Montpelier Research Park which is not an existing use, whereas, the existing golf driving range at Old Columbia Road and Rivers Corporate Park are not shown.

Response to Office of Planning & Zoning of Howard County:

1. The location of "Columbia Company 7" fire station has been changed on the figure.
2. The changes to the existing land use and proposed development tables and figures have been noted.

174

March 5, 1987

- 3 Figure 3 also shows "Columbia Corporate Limits." Columbia is not incorporated. However, the line shown is generally correct for the boundary of the New Town District.
- 4 Page I-14, Table 2--Howard County totals match source. Corridor data are slightly different than our 1982 estimates by TZ for 1980. SHA total is 66,858; whereas, OPZ 1980 total for these zones is 72,948.
- 5 Page I-15, Figure 4--This map does not show all areas shown for change on the General Plan. For example, Cherry Tree Farms and Montpelier Research Park should be included.
- 6 Page I-21, Table 3--The average household size shown for the corridor is not correct. It should match Table 4 and be 2.77.
- 7 Page I-21, Table 4--These are corridor data from Round II forecasts prepared in 1982. Current forecasts of population and households are available, but labor force forecasts have not been revised.
- 8 Page I-23, Figure 6 again shows Columbia Corporate limit. Also, many non-New Town subdivisions are included, such as Allview Estates and Columbia Hills.
- 9 Page I-31, #52--delete "water"  
#56--children's zoo is gone
- 10 Page I-35, Historic Sites--HO 269 and HO 87 are primary sites, not key sites. The map showing historic sites in Section III does not extend far beyond the road, but sheet 8 does include HO 47 and HO 144, both key sites.
- 11 Page I-40, Table 6--Date and source of these data should be provided.
- 12 Page I-44--Lake Kittamaquidi is not fed by the Little Patuxent River. It is fed by the tributary that emerges from Wilde Lake.
- 13 Page I-49--The agency in question is the "Federal Emergency Management Agency" not the "Federal Emergency Agency."

## II. Need for the Project

- 14 Page II-3--The stated AM and PM peak hour percentages of 5.24 percent and 5.49 percent respectively of the ADT seem inordinately low for this facility. Furthermore, these percentages are not substantiated by the data shown in Table 14 from which this office has calculated that the existing peak hour traffic ranges from 9.1 percent to 10 percent of the ADT.
- 15 Page II-4, Table 14--The peak hour volume for Segment VI appears to be a typographical error.

Response to Office of Planning & Zoning of Howard County: (con't)

3. "Corporate" in "Columbia Corporate Limits," in this case, refers to the Corporation which developed Columbia; however, recognizing that this is misleading with the designation for incorporated places, the change is noted for both Figures 3 and 6.
4. The data presented in the Environmental Assessment was collected from Charles Goodman of the Regional Planning Council, April 29, 1986. At this time Mr. Goodman informed us that the Planning Council was currently in the process of preparing revised zonal demographic data forecasts. Conflicts in the estimates may have occurred depending on differences between zonal boundaries used by OPZ and SHA or changes made with prior revisions. In either case, the added 6,090 persons, living within the study area, do not affect the environmental analysis.
5. The inadvertent deletion of some areas shown on the General Plan has been changed.
6. The average household size on Table 3 is a typographic error, and the change will be made as noted.
7. At the time of the preparation of the technical basis report and the Environmental Assessment, the most current forecasts were not available. Current conditions on U.S. Route 29 warrant improvements suggested in these documents; any growth of the corridor would cause existing hazardous and congested conditions to worsen. Although we appreciate the timeliness of these new data, the incorporation of them into the report would not significantly change the socioeconomic analysis

175

8. Allview Estates and Columbia Hills have been noted as being non-New Town subdivisions.
9. The two deletions have been made as noted.
10. HO 269 and HO 87 are primary sites, not key sites. Nowhere are these terms used in the document. HO 47 and HO 144 are part of the Maryland Route 103 Interchange study and are not included in this project.
11. The data presented on Table 6: Commuter Patterns from U.S. Route 29 Corridor is based on 1983 census data generated from Baltimore Regional Planning Council in Urban Transportation Planning Package (UTPP) zones.
12. Lake Kittamaquidi is fed by the outlet stream of Wilde Lake.
13. The agency in question is the "Federal Emergency Management Agency" not the "Federal Emergency Agency" as was printed.
14. The AM and PM peak hour percentages are approximate, average, one-way percentages. The two-way percentages for the AM and PM peaks are approximately 8.6% and 8.8%, respectively, in the southern part of the County; 9.1% and 9.8%, respectively, in the central part of the County, and 7.9% and 9.9%, respectively, in the northern part of the County.
15. The 1985 peak hour traffic volume in Table 14 for Segment VI should be 2,380 vehicles per hour.



March 5, 1987

Page II-4, Table 15--Projected year 2015 traffic volumes in most locations are inconsistent with those generated by this office for year 2005, as well with SHA year 2015 projections developed for the U.S. 29 Mainline Study. The following State and County forecasts are noted:

- Segment VI: 50,100  
 - OPZ Year 2005 south of MD 216: 55,000 to 60,000  
 - OPZ Year 2005 north of MD 216: 67,250
- Segment VII: 51,800  
 - OPZ Year 2005: 67,520 south of MD 32
- Segment VIII: 78,500  
 - OPZ Year 2005: 63,338 south of Broken Land Parkway
- Segment IX: 92,100  
 - OPZ Year 2005: 60,550 south of MD 175  
 - SHA Year 2015: 63,000 south of MD 175 (from MD 100 Corridor Study)
- 16 - OPZ Year 2005: 67,120 north of MD 175  
 - SHA Year 2015: 89,000 north of MD 175 (from MD 100 Corridor Study)
- Segment X: 104,400  
 - OPZ Year 2005: 77,083 north of MD 108  
 - SHA Year 2015: 104,000 north of MD 108 (from MD 100 Corridor Study)
- Segment XI: 119,700  
 - SHA Year 2015: 120,000 north of MD 103 (from MD 100 Corridor Study)

It should also be noted that many of these same forecasting concerns were raised by the County in a meeting held on July 24, 1985 at SHA. Those in attendance were Barbara Ostrom, Robert Lambdin, Joe Pinkle, Randy Aldrich, Joe Langley, Matt Wolniak and Roger Jorss of SHA; Charles Goodman and Brian Betlyon of RPC; and Edward Stollof and George Phillips of Howard County Office of Planning and Zoning. Summary minutes from this meeting can be transmitted upon request.

### III. Alternates Considered

For each segment of the study area, three types of improvements were presented. Alternate A, the No Build option, and Alternate B, widening within the median but no access control, are not acceptable to this office. Alternates A and B are inconsistent with the Howard County General Plan and would provide insufficient carrying capacity to accommodate anticipated future traffic volumes. The following comments, therefore, focus on specific suboptions under Alternate C which consists of widening within the median plus access controls:

Response to Office of Planning and Zoning of Howard County: (con't)

16. The projected year 2015 traffic volumes shown in Table 15 were issued by the MD SHA Bureau of Highway Statistics on November 25, 1985. Discrepancies between this set of data and others may exist because the MD Route 100 interchange with U.S. Route 29 was not included in the November 1985 traffic distribution used for this study.
17. All comments on the alternates were reviewed and considered in the selection process with the exception of Segment VIII at Seneca Drive. In this case, the Seneca Drive concepts were modified after the date your agency commented on them. Analyzation of revised traffic studies indicates no adverse impacts for residents. Intersection geometrics were revised both east and west of Route 29 to upgrade levels of service and reduce impacts on local circulation at Seneca Drive.

177

March 5, 1987

Segment VI Howard County line to north of Johns Hopkins/Gorman RoadAt Columbia Road

This office supports Alternate VI-C-4 extending Cherry Lane from the Cherry Tree Farms subdivision to connect to Harding Road. In addition, it will be necessary to extend Service Road A on the east side of U.S. 29 to provide access to existing residences. This alternate results in the least disruption of existing land uses, requires no displacements and is the least cost option.

At Hammond Drive and Hillcrest Drive

This office supports Alternate VI-C-3 extending Crest Drive to Hammond Hills and the severing of access to U.S. 29 at Hammond Drive and Hillcrest Drive. This alternate is consistent with the General Plan, providing improved local circulation and efficient access to U.S. 29 via MD 216. The Department of Public Works supports coordinating this alternate with Alternate VI-C-2 which calls for extending Hammond Parkway across the Hammond Branch in order to provide a connection between MD 216 and Gorman Road. Alternate VI-C-2 is inconsistent with the General Plan as well as with the expressed desires of the local residents. Consequently, this office is opposed to Alternate VI-C-2.

At Johns Hopkins/Gorman Road

This office supports the need for an interchange with U.S. 29 at this location. However, we believe that this study is not the appropriate forum for commenting upon alternate designs for this location as extensive discussions have already taken place between the County, the State and the developer contributing to this project. On the other hand, since a discussion of the interchange is included in both the Environmental Assessment and in the Location/Design Public Hearing brochure, this office believes that all alternative interchange designs currently under consideration should be displayed and discussed in detail.

Segment VII North of Johns Hopkins/Gorman Road to north of MD 32At Rivers Edge Road

This office supports Alternate VII-C-4 providing full access at this location via an underpass of U.S. 29 at Rivers Edge Road to connect to Old Columbia Road plus right on, right off ramps on the east side of U.S. 29 and diamond type ramps on the west side of U.S. 29. In spite of the objections of some area residents and the required displacement of one home, this alternate is favored due to the better traffic service provided (especially for southbound to eastbound and westbound to southbound movements) and for improved safety conditions on the west side of U.S. 29 (longer weaving section on Rivers Edge Road approach to Longview Road). Of particular concern is the fact that Alternate VII-C-3 would attract

March 5, 1987

U-Turns within the Riverside Estates community. It is also noted that the environmental impacts of Alternatives VII-C-3 and VII-C-4 are comparable.

Segment VIII North of MD 32 to South Entrance Road

At Seneca Drive

The Department of Public Works does not believe that an interchange is warranted or safe at this location due to the proximity of the MD 32 and proposed Broken Land Parkway interchanges, plus other anticipated design problems. This office is supportive of providing connections to/from the communities on the east of U.S. 29. However, we believe that substantially more analysis is required before this office can take a position on any of the alternates presented, especially as they relate to the area west of U.S. 29. Of particular concern are the following:

- This office believes that the traffic projections for the Seneca Drive extension west of U.S. 29 (as presented in the Preliminary Traffic Report by Gannett Fleming dated September 1986) are low and do not reflect the significant attraction the proposed interchange would have, especially from developing communities north of Owen Brown Road along the future extension of Martin Road. In addition, this interchange is likely to attract some traffic from the Cedar Lane corridor.
- Similarly traffic impacts on Martin Road are not indicated in this study, especially north of Seneca Drive extended and at the Seneca Drive/Martin Road intersection. This office does not believe that residents in the area are fully aware of the potential dramatic rise in traffic which this interchange will likely precipitate at this location.
- Under all interchange options, various ramps and weaving areas are predicted by SHA to operate at unacceptable levels of service. SHA should attempt design revisions to mitigate these conditions before selecting a preferred alternate.
- Intersection geometrics on the east side of U.S. 29 at various locations depending upon the alternate under consideration would appear to have significant impacts on local circulation and would also have severely adverse visual impacts on the community.

This office feels that additional meetings are necessary between the State, the County and local citizens on both sides of U.S. 29 in order to clarify the impacts of these proposals and to discuss potential means for mitigating those impacts.

At Gales Lane

This office supports Alternate VIII-C-2 under which access to U.S. 29 would be severed and substitute access provided via a service road extension from Gales Lane in the River Meadows subdivision.

Segment IX South Entrance Road to MD 108

At Old Columbia Road

This office supports Alternate IX-C-2 to provide a driveway connection from the existing terminus of Old Columbia Road to Twin Knolls Road in order to provide access to residential properties which presently access U.S. 29.

17 At Pepple Road and Diamondback Drive

This office supports Alternate IX-C-3 under which access to U.S. 29 would be severed at the two locations and improvements would be made to the westbound to northbound ramp from MD 175 to U.S. 29.

Segment X MD 108 to MD 103

This office supports Alternate X-C-2 for the closure of access to Spring Valley Road. In addition, this office has repeatedly stated its belief that the State Highway Administration should be responsible for providing the analysis and construction of a second access route for the Columbia Hills community.

Segment XI MD 108 to U.S. 40

This office concurs with SHA that no further improvements are necessary within this segment as per the scope of this study. It should be noted that this office is awaiting the results of SHA's analysis of the U.S. 29/U.S. 40 interchange area as per our previous discussions.

IV. Environmental Impacts

18 The study does not adequately address the long-term, post-construction impacts of Route 29 improvements on water quality. Page IV-4 cites measures that "may" be used to mitigate the effects of increased storm water run-off due to increased pavement areas. This office believes this report ought to be more specific about what measures shall be taken, e.g., to maintain existing peak flows and prevent accelerated erosions of stream beds.

19 The report divides up the various environmental issues by topics, e.g., wetlands, floodplains, etc. This fragments the environment which is the sum of its parts. While this is acceptable for focusing on a particular issue, there is no attempt to summarize the cumulative effects of the proposed construction on specific environments, e.g., Hammond Branch. This office believes this report should be amended to at least include a chart or table to

18. At this point in the engineering design phase, it is not feasible to identify the specific mitigation measures which will be implemented in the final engineering design. A list of possible measures to minimize impact is provided to represent that SHA is aware of numerous means of mitigation. This Agency realizes this list is not all inclusive of stormwater management practices.

19. The Environmental Assessment is prepared in accordance with the guidelines set forth by the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration's "Guidance Material for the Preparation of Environmental Documents" dated February 24, 1982. These guidelines prescribed the discussion and presentation of each "element" of the natural environment.

181

Amar S. Bandel

-7-

March 5, 1987

list all detrimental impacts on the stream crossing areas that will be affected. The amended report should list together impacts on floodplain, wetlands, vegetation, storm water volume, etc. This will be a more meaningful assessment of the impacts of the proposal on the overall quality of areas of concern.

20 In general, the document makes no reference to the Patuxent River Policy Plan or to the issue of non-point pollution.

If you have any questions concerning the above, please contact me at your convenience.

  
CARL Balsler

CB/sl

cc: Elizabeth A. Calia  
Joseph W. Rutter, Jr.  
David Holden  
Files, TR 2 (aa) and TC 87  
3187B

Response to Office of Planning and Zoning of  
Howard County: (con't)

20. Information on the Patuxent River Policy Plan was obtained, after completion of the EA, from Mr. David Holden of your staff. Although not cited in the EA, all efforts will be made to follow the guidelines and objectives set forth in the Plan, especially as they relate to the two main issues: non-point pollution and integrity of stream-site environment. Highway runoff and sedimentation from construction activities are types of non-point pollution and are discussed in the document. Full and rigorous implementation and enforcement of erosion and sediment control measures, and stormwater management regulations will be conducted. These also are discussed in the EA. All efforts will be taken to maintain the integrity of stream-site environment, including stability of banks and limiting removal of vegetation.

181



Maryland Department of Transportation

State Highway Administration

William K. Holzmann  
Secretary  
Hal Kausoff  
Administrator

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT DIV. 6 31 AM '87

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr., Deputy Director  
Division of Project Development  
FROM: J. L. White, P.E., Chief  
Bureau of Planning and Program Development  
SUBJECT: Howard County  
US Route 29  
Environmental Assessment

This office has reviewed the subject Environmental Assessment and offers the following comments for consideration.

- 1 Page I-1 of the document provides a list of interchanges developed as individual projects. The John Hopkins/Gorman Road interchange should be added, indicating that preliminary studies are underway.
2 A list of recommendations begins on page I-22 and is continued on page I-32, separated by several maps. This creates confusion for the reader, especially since another listing, identifying community facilities is provided on page I-31.
3 The second complete paragraph on Page II-2 mentions various improvements that provide additional capacity on US Route 29. Omitted from these improvements are the preliminary studies for the US Route 29/Johns Hopkins/Gorman Road interchange.
4 The last paragraph on page II-2 references the inclusion of improvements, at the US Route 29/Maryland Route 103 interchange, in the 1982 Highway Needs Inventory (HNI). It should be mentioned that these improvements are included in the revised 1984 HNI. Reference of these interchange improvement's inclusion in the 1984-1989 Consolidated Transportation Program (CTP) is made at the top of page II-3. The construction of a new interchange at US Route 29/Maryland Route 103 is included in the 1987-1992 CTP, with construction scheduled to begin in Fiscal Year 1989.

Response to the Bureau of Planning and Program Development:

- 1. Hopkins/Gorman is an individual project, and we are only presenting it in the environmental document. The inadvertent deletion of this interchange from the list of interchanges developed as individual projects has been noted.
2. The confusion caused by separating the list of recommendations with several maps has been noted.
3. The omission of the preliminary studies for U.S. Route 29/John Hopkins/Gorman Road interchange from the list of improvements that provide additional capacity has been noted.
4. The updated Highway Needs Inventory (HNI) and Consolidated Transportation Program (CTP) information has been noted.

182

Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.

Page 2

5 Under Alternate VIII-C-2 on page III-2 improvements are identified at Pepple Drive. In the next paragraph reference is made to Pepple Road. Pepple Road is again referenced several times on pages III-10 and III-11.

6 A description of alternates is provided in section III. On page III-4 in the description of Alternate VI-C-1 Service Road 'A' is not mentioned. At the Design Public Hearing (February 17, 1987) it was indicated that under this alternate Service Road 'A' would extend south from Maryland Route 216 on the east side of US Route 29.

7 In the description of Alternate VIII-C-2 (page III-10) under key points it should be mentioned that this alternate requires the crossing of a minor tributary.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this document. If you have any questions regarding our comments, please contact John Bruck or Dennis Yoder on extension 1127.

cc: Mr. John D. Bruck  
Mr. Randy Aldrich /

Response to the Bureau of Planning and Program Development: (con't)

5. All references to Pepple Road should be changed to Pepple Drive and the road is referenced in concept IX-C-2 not VIII-C-2.
6. The unintentional deletion of Service Road "A" in the description of Alternate VI-C-1 has been noted.
7. The addition of the crossing of a minor tributary as a key point in Alternate VIII-C-2 has been made.

183



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
BALTIMORE DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
P.O. BOX 1718  
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND 21203

REPLY TO ATTENTION OF:

10 March 1987

Planning Division

Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.  
Deputy Director  
Project Development Division (Room 310)  
State Highway Administration  
707 North Calvert Street  
Baltimore, Maryland 21202

Dear Mr. Ege:

Reference Neil Pedersen's letter of 20 January 1987, regarding the review of the Environmental Assessment (EA) for the U.S. Route 29 Patuxent River Bridge to U.S. Route 40 in Howard County, Maryland. The comments provided below address the Corps of Engineers areas of concern, including direct and indirect impacts on Corps of Engineers existing and/or proposed projects, flood control hazard potentials, and permit requirements under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

There are no existing or proposed Corps of Engineers projects that would be affected by the work described in the EA.

1 According to the subject report, portions of the proposed project will be located in the 100-year flood plain of various streams presently crossing U.S. Route 29. The report should include documentation of the effects of the proposed project on the flood plain. Efforts to minimize impacts should comply with Federal, state, and local flood plain management regulations, as appropriate.

2 Federal and federally assisted activities must comply with Executive Order 11988, Flood Plain Management, dated 24 May 1977. The objectives of the Order are to avoid the adverse effects of occupying and modifying the flood plain and to avoid direct and indirect support of development in the flood plain. The Order requires that activities not be located in the flood plain unless it is the only practicable alternative. Activities which must be located in the flood plain must incorporate measures to: (1) reduce the hazard and risk associated with floods; (2) minimize the adverse effects on human health, safety, and welfare; and (3) restore and preserve the natural and beneficial values of the flood plain.

PROJ. DEV. DIV.  
MAR 10 10 56 AM '87

Response to the Department of Army, Corps of Engineers:

1. Section IV.G.4., Floodplains, of the EA discusses impacts to the 100-year floodplain, including acreage within the floodplain, specific construction at each area impacted (i.e., roadway widening, pier extension, culvert extension, etc.), type of encroachment, and significance of each encroachment. Paragraph 4 on page IV-20 states that if Alternate B or C is chosen, detailed surface hydrology studies will be conducted during final design to quantify the amounts of fill and resultant impacts. Also the last paragraph on page IV-20 discusses the possible loss of floodplain capacity at Hammond Branch and the requirement that water surface elevation not be increased by more than one foot. Efforts to minimize impacts on floodplains will comply with federal, state, and local floodplain management regulations. Mitigation measures are discussed on page IV-21 of the EA.
2. Compliance with E.O. 11988, Floodplain Management, will be met. As described in the following, the activities in the floodplain are the only practicable alternative. Because the existing roadway is already within the floodplain, roadway widening cannot avoid impact within the floodplain. the only recommended C concept that encroaches on the floodplain is due to a service road construction. This service road is required for local access due to access control along U.S. Route 29. Measures will be incorporated to reduce hazard and risk; minimize effects on health, safety, and welfare; and restore and preserve the natural and beneficial floodplain values. The use of design measures to reduce impact and mitigative measures during construction are discussed in the EA on pages IV-20 and IV-21.

181



3

Under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, Department of the Army authorization will be required prior to any discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States, including wetlands, as proposed in Alternatives A, B, and C. Any application would have to include all wetlands within the project corridor (the Patuxent River to U.S. Route 40). Any wetlands to be impacted as a result of filling or other impairment must be delineated and typed by the Maryland State Highway Administration prior to application. Additionally, compliance with Executive Order 11990, Protection of Wetlands, dated 24 May 1977, as well as compliance with EPA's Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines (40 CFR 230) should be provided. If you have any questions pertaining to Army permits, please contact Ms. Linda Michling in the Baltimore District, Regulatory Branch at (301) 962-4253.

If you have any other questions on this matter, please feel free to call me or my action officer, Mr. Larry Lower, at (301) 962-4710.

Sincerely,

*Harold L. Nelson*

for James F. Johnson  
Chief, Planning Division

Response to the Department of Army, Corps of Engineers: (con't)

3. A Section 404 permit will be obtained for the project (page IV-21 of EA). Wetlands impacted were typed and delineated in the EA (pages I-46 to I-48 and IV-15 to IV-17). Additionally, a field view with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and various divisions within MD DNR was conducted to verify the location and classification of wetlands. Compliance with E.O 11990 and EPA's Section 404 guidelines will be met.

185



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
REGION III

841 Chestnut Building  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107

Cynthia D. Simpson, Chief  
Environmental Management  
Project Development Division (Rm. 310)  
MD State Highway Administration  
707 North Calvert Street  
Baltimore, MD. 21202

MAR 17 1987

PROJECT  
DEVELOPMENT  
DIVISION

MAR 23 3 51 PM '87

Re: MD Rt 29 Improvement Study  
Air Quality Analysis

Dear Ms. Simpson,

In accordance with the responsibilities delegated to EPA under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act and the National Environmental Policy Act, EPA Region III has reviewed the above referenced document. We are satisfied with the approach outlined for analyzing the air quality impacts of the project and offer no objections to completing this portion of the environmental study.

Thank you for including EPA in the coordination process. Should you have any questions, or if we can be of additional assistance, please contact me at 215/597-9302.

Sincerely,

*Jeffrey M. Aiper*  
Jeffrey M. Aiper, Chief  
NEPA Compliance Section

No response required.

186



UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Division of Ecological Services  
1825 Virginia Street  
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

April 7, 1987

Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.  
Deputy Director  
Project Development Division  
State Highway Administration  
707 N. Calvert Street, Room 310  
Baltimore, Maryland 21202

Dear Mr. Ege:

1 We have reviewed the subject document with respect to project impacts upon fish and wildlife resources and their habitats, and offer these comments for your consideration. Although there are impacts associated with the two build alternatives presented, Alternatives B and C, it appears that the cumulative impacts associated with projects proposed, completed, or under construction within the Route 29 corridor, will have far greater impacts upon fish and wildlife resources than this single project. For example, the proposed Brokenland Parkway/Routes 29 interchange will fragment, if not completely eliminate, a viable portion of the Little Patuxent River floodplain. This river system is already stressed due to upstream and adjacent urbanization. The proposed Brokenland Parkway/Routes 29 interchange will further alter the Little Patuxent River floodplain's ability to buffer increasing upstream and adjacent land use perturbations upon downstream aquatic resources.

We realize that the State Highway Administration does not dictate land use zoning. However, the impression given in this document is that Howard County officials will have the masterplan road system built to accommodate future growth, regardless of environmental costs. The unfortunate reality is that short-sighted land use decisions upstream adversely affect downstream resources. Therefore, we cannot ignore the fact that this project, combined with the interchanges proposed, built, or under construction, will adversely impact fish and wildlife resources within the project area as well as downstream. The environmental assessment for the proposed project isolates the impacts of this project and is therefore inadequate. For example, inclusion of a discussion of the Little Patuxent River watershed's water quality, particularly those areas draining immediately upstream and downstream of the project corridor, would provide a more objective description of the environmental health of the river system. Although it is stated in the EA that implementation of stormwater

APR 13 10 04 AM '87  
PROJECT  
DEVELOPMENT  
DIVISION

Response to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service:

1. The Environmental Assessment states that the following interchanges with U.S. Route 29 were previously studied under separate projects and environmental documents were prepared for these areas: Maryland Route 216, Maryland Route 32, Broken Land Parkway, Maryland Route 175, Maryland Route 108, and Maryland Route 103. Impacts of these projects were not included in the Howard County document because they had been addressed in separate, project-specific documents. In addition, the construction of interchanges and the implementation of improvements on the mainline will not occur in the same relative time frame which would make cumulative, short-term impact assessment nearly impossible.

187

management measures will occur, such statements do little to clarify the relationship and need of stormwater management measures for this project and existing water quality degradation. Justifying the building of larger and more efficient roadways in order to accommodate future growth, planned or otherwise, obscures the fact that past, and even present, land use decisions are responsible for the degraded conditions found within the Little Patuxent River system. Implementing stormwater management measures at random intervals in lieu of a comprehensive stormwater management plan for the watershed, does little to abate the continued decline of important commercial and recreational resources.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

2 Section II, A. Purpose, page II-1, paragraph one: Please define the difference between service and access with respect to Route 29's function.

3 Section IV, G.3. Wetlands, page IV-18, paragraph one: To minimize impacts on existing wetlands, it is stated that steepening the replacement wetland slopes to 1 1/2:1 is recommended. This statement is also made in Section V, page V-39, first sentence, referring to Service recommendations. We recommended during the October 6, 1986, field review that steepening the road's fill slopes to 1 1/2:1 will minimize encroachment into existing wetlands. Both references need correcting.

Thank you for providing us the opportunity to comment on this project.

Sincerely yours

  
Supervisor  
Annapolis Field Office

Response to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service:  
(con't)

2. The primary function of the highway is service, which means the movement of people through the U.S. Route 29 corridor. Access, or the provision of ingress/egress to and from the communities adjoining the highway, is not the main purpose of the proposed improvements.
3. As your letter stated, the references to 1 1/2:1 slopes on pages IV-18 and V-39 should refer to the Service's recommendations for the placement of fill into existing wetlands to minimize wetland encroachment.

158

TORREY C. BROWN, M.O.  
SECRETARY  
JOHN R. GRIFFIN  
DEPUTY SECRETARY



JAMES W. PECK  
DIRECTOR

STATE OF MARYLAND  
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES  
**WATER RESOURCES ADMINISTRATION**  
TAWES STATE OFFICE BUILDING  
ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND 21401

April 23, 1987

Mr. Louie H. Ege, Jr.  
Deputy Director  
Project Development Division  
State Highway Administration  
707 N. Calvert Street  
Baltimore, MD 21202

Re: WRA No. 86-PP-0900  
SHA No. HO-606-101-770  
Environmental Assessment for US 29  
Patuxent River Bridge to US 40  
Howard County

Dear Mr. Ege:

The Environmental Assessment document for the above referenced project has received necessary review by the Water Resources Administration's Waterway Permits Division and the Resource Protection Program. The Tidewater Administration, the Forest, Park and Wildlife Service and the Capital Programs Administration of the Department of Natural Resources were also provided with a copy of the subject document for their review and comments. As a result of the above review, the Administration has the following comments:

1. In accordance with COMAR 08.05.03.01 to 08.05.03.13, "Rules and Regulations Governing Construction on Non-Tidal Waters and Floodplains", Waterway Construction Permits are required for the proposed work where the course, current, or cross-section of the streams or their associated 100-year floodplain limits are to be impacted. More specifically, the main US 29 crossing of the Middle Patuxent River which requires new construction, the widening of the bridge over the Middle Patuxent River for Alternates B and C, and the tributaries which will be impacted by extension of the existing culverts and/or placement of new culverts to allow the construction of ramp or service roads require Waterway Construction Permits from this office. Some of the tributaries with limited drainage areas may be exempt from the requirements of a permit from the Administration under COMAR 08.05.03B.

Telephone: (301) 974-2265

TTY FOR DEAF: BALTIMORE 286-2609 WASHINGTON METRO 585-0450

Response to the Water Resources Administration's  
Waterway Permits Division:

1. Waterway Construction Permits will be obtained for construction at the main crossing of the Middle Patuxent River and the tributaries that will be impacted by extension of culverts or placement of new culverts. Note that the only construction at the main crossing of the Middle Patuxent would be the filling of approximately 240 square feet for extension of existing piers.

189


Mr. Louis H. Ege, Jr.  
April 23, 1987  
Page Two

2. The proposed relocation of one of the streams at Hopkins-Gormeo Road must be the last alternative considered. Moreover, our permit process will require advertisement of the Notice of Opportunity for Public Hearing provided that the subject relocation does not fall under the permit exemptions.
3. The Administration recommends the least impacted alternative to be considered in the selection of the final alternate.
4. In accordance with Section 8-1105 and 8-11A-05 of the Natural Resources Article, Annotated Code of Maryland, the project will require approval relative to sediment and erosion control and stormwater management requirements.
5. The Resource Protection Program found the project not to be inconsistent with their Program.

Enclosed is a copy of the comments received from the Tidewater Administration's Fisheries Division and the Coastal Resources Division on the subject Environmental Assessment.

Thank you for allowing us to comment on your project.

Sincerely,



Stan Wong  
Chief, Waterway Permits Division

SW:MQT:das

Enclosures

Response to the Water Resources Administration's  
Waterway Permits Division: (con't)

2. Alternate C, roadway widening with control of access, is the recommended alternate. Any C-concept chosen at Hopkins-Gorman Road and Old Columbia Road to provide for local access since all access points along U.S. Route 29 in this area would be severed. The access road would necessitate rechannelization of the intermittent tributary of the Middle Patuxent at this location. If the stream relocation does not fall under permit exemptions, the necessary permit will be obtained and a Notice of Opportunity for Public Hearing will be advertised.
3. The C-concepts chosen as the recommended alternate were chosen in light of their environmental impacts.
4. Approval as per Section 8-1105 and 8-11A-05 of the Natural Resources Article, Annotated Code of Maryland, relative to sediment and erosion control and stormwater management will be obtained.

**Section VI**

**Summaries of Wetlands Field Views**

WETLANDS FIELD VIEW

U.S. ROUTE 29 IMPROVEMENT STUDY

DATE: October 1, 1986

ATTENDEES:

- Diane Eckles -- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- M.Q. (Cas) Taherian -- MD DNR, Water Resources Administration
- Mike Hollins -- MD DNR, Coastal Resources
- Jonathan McKnight -- MD DNR, Forest Parks and Wildlife Service
- Bob Schueler -- MD DNR, Fisheries
- Sharon Preller -- MD SHA
- Wayne Willey -- Gannett Fleming
- Dave Willis -- Gannett Fleming
- Nancy Eagle -- Gannett Fleming

The purpose of the wetlands field view was to gain the USFWS and DNR input on the significance of impact on wetlands, and determine the need for replacement of impacted wetlands. Other mitigation suggestions from these agencies were also solicited.

Gannett Fleming provided a handout to be used as a guide during the field view. The handout included: mapping showing the location of wetlands, a table summarizing the nature of impacts created by each concept; and a sheet for each wetland where mitigation and other comments could be noted.

At each site a description of impacts (of each concept) was given, and USFWS and DNR provided suggestions on mitigation.

It was emphasized that not all of the alternates or concepts (within alternates) being studied would impact wetlands. Only those concepts noted on the impact summary page (for each county) of the handout would impact wetlands.

USFWS feels every impact on wetlands is significant, and all takings of wetlands would require 1:1 replacement. At first, it was stated that the replacement should be on site; but after noting the difficulty in accomplishing this (i.e., limited area), USFWS stated one large wetland could possibly be used to replace all takings of wetlands. The USFWS will make this determination after they have viewed all wetlands.

Six of the twelve wetlands in Howard County were viewed on this date. It was agreed that we would meet again on the earliest available date to finish Howard County. Then we would meet again to cover Montgomery County.

The following summarizes the mitigation suggestions and other comments received at each of the six wetlands:

WETLANDS REFERENCE #1

Little patuxent tributary at MD175 ramp (n.b. to U.S. 29)

NWI Classification: <sup>pss1</sup> EM5

It was noted that the culvert would be extended a maximum of ten feet for Concept C-2.



USFWS suggested slopes of replacement wetlands be 1½:1

Fisheries Department noted it was a fairly good quality stream. Some minnows were seen. No anadremous fish.

Small animal tracks were noted in the culvert.

Replacement site adjacent to impacted wetland was considered, but this may not be possible due to limited available area. The other side of the ramp (south side) was also discussed. It was at this point that the possibility of one large wetland to collectively replace all impacts was suggested. USFWS and DNR would make this determination after looking at all wetlands.

WRA noted that during construction at ramp, silt fences or temporary berm also be used on opposite side of ramp (southside) to protect wetlands at this location.

It was noted by Fisheries Department that the existing box culvert was slightly higher than the water level and thus may act as a barrier to the fish. They suggest channels in culverts for low flow passage.

WRA suggested that all new culverts be dropped one foot below low flow.

WETLANDS REFERENCE #2

Little Patuxent tributary at Gales Lane

NWI Classification: PF01A

Concept C-2 would extend roadway to complete connection of Gales Lane. This concept would go through stream bed.

The stream bed was dry; rather deep (4 feet) in some areas.

The area was an old growth forest, containing many large trees (38 inch diameter poplars, etc.)

There was much detrital material; therefore, one of the functions is nutrient cycling.

USFWS position is to avoid this wetland, since you cannot really replace a mature palustrine, forested wetland.

WETLANDS REFERENCE #3A

Beaver Run at Seneca Drive, east of U.S. Route 29

NWI Classification: none, believed to be <sup>PSS1A</sup>EH5

Concepts C-4 and C-5 require extending this existing culvert about 10 feet

Some stream relocation may be required for extending, since the stream bends at culvert.

Mayflies, stonefly, caddisfly, and minnows noted.

Fisheries Department noted that it was a viable stream with fairly good water quality. No anadromous fish. There was no impediment to fish movement through the culvert; natural stream bottom through culvert.

Fisheries is not too concerned about added length of culvert (i.e. believe fish get through existing culvert under U.S. 29) as long as stream bottom remains the same through the culvert.

It was suggested that erosion and sediment control measures be maximized and vegetation along banks be kept.

USFWS recommends 1½:1 slopes and retaining wall.

WETLANDS REFERENCE #3B

Beaver Run at Seneca Drive, west of U.S. Route 29

NWI Classification: none, believed to be PF01A

Concepts C-3 and C-4 require a new culvert approximately 150 feet upstream on Beaver Run. C-5 would require extending the existing culvert at Beaver Run.

USFWS prefers the tight ramps (C-5) -- extending the culvert.

USFWS recommends minimizing slopes and replacing loss. Would consider replacing in the field west of the stream.

WETLANDS REFERENCE #4

Three ponds east of U.S. Route 29 near Seneca Drive

NWI Classifications: POWZh, POWFh, POWZh

It was stated there is no direct impact on the ponds.

WETLANDS REFERENCE #5A

Middle Patuxent tributary east of U.S Route 29, south of Rivers Edge Road

Concepts C-3 and C-4 would place ramp through this area, culvert required.

USFWS and DNR, Coastal Resources, determined this area was not a wetland. This was based on vegetation and confirmed through auger samples.

The area was identified as a "mesic cove".

USFWS recommended that the shoulder of the roadway be kept as narrow as possible. They also recommended minimal clearing and making the side slopes 1½ to 1.

No replacement is required.

WETLANDS REFERENCE #5B

Middle Patuxent tributary east of U.S. Route 29, across from Rivers Edge Road

Concepts C-3 and C-4 require extending Rivers Edge road over this stream (culvert)

USFWS and DNR, Coastal Resources, determined this area was not a wetland.

Yellowboy was noted in the stream between 5A and 5B.

USFWS recommended taking out the existing concrete channel and restoring the riffle:pool ratio to that of upstream.

No replacement required.

WETLANDS REFERENCE #6

Middle Patuxent tributary at Rivers Edge Road

NWI Classification: none, believed to be PSS1A

Concepts C-3 and C-4 would require filling portions of this wetland and use of a long culvert and stream relocation.

It was determined this area was a wetland.

The stream is very degraded, containing yellowboy and concrete. The stream comes off a stormwater management area.

There is no room for mitigation on site.

DNR, Coastal Resources, said they would not argue if this area was filled and replaced elsewhere.

Other mitigation suggested was stream enhancement including adding limestone for acid drainage.

It was also suggested bridging stream (possibly wooden bridge) for ramps construction instead of using culverts.

We believe these minutes accurately reflect what transpired at the field view. However, we will appreciate comments involving a different understanding of what occurred.

- NKE/rw
- cc: Attendees
- C. Simpson, SHA
- R. Aldrich, SHA
- B. Bowers, GFTE

Rancy K. Eagle

WETLANDS FIELD VIEW  
U.S. ROUTE 29 IMPROVEMENT STUDY  
HOWARD COUNTY (CONT'D)

DATE: October 20, 1986

- ATTENDEES: Diane Eckles -- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
 M.Q. (Cas) Taherian -- MD DNR, Water Resources Administration  
 Bob Schueler -- MD DNR, Fisheries  
 Sharon Preller -- MD SHA  
 Randy Aldrich -- MD SHA  
 Nancy Eagle -- Gannett Fleming

The field view of wetlands in Howard County was continued from where it was ended on October 1, 1986.

The following summarizes the mitigation suggestions and other comments received on the remaining six wetlands.

WETLANDS REFERENCE #7

Middle Patuxent River (main branch) at U.S. Route 29

NWI Classification: P2OWA & RF014; however area impacted under bridge is PSS1A

The two existing piers would be extended by all B and C Alternates to widen the bridge over the River for addition of a third northbound lane.

Approximately 240 SF of scrub/shrub wetlands on banks of River would be lost.

USFWS determined that replacement wetlands are not necessary. Vegetation will return if rip-rap is provided behind piers.

Other mitigation suggested was to place good size rip-rap behind piers for erosion control and confine construction, (ie, with sheet piling, for pier construction).

Erosion and sediment control should be strictly adhered to especially if the glassy darter is present in this area.

WETLANDS REFERENCE #8

Middle Patuxent tributary south of main branch

NWI Classification: PF01A

All C concepts would require relocation of about 600 feet of this stream for construction of Service Road.

USFWS determined this area is not a wetland; it is a mesic cove.

USFWS voiced opposition to disturbing this area for access for 5 or 6 driveways. It was stated that other alternatives should be considered to avoid this area, or justification must be strong for disturbance.

WETLANDS REFERENCE #9A

Hammond Branch between Hammond Drive and Hammond Parkway.

NWI Classification: PF01A

USFWS noted that an emergent area is also present on the north side of Hammond Branch.

Concept C-2 would extend Hammond Drive to Hammond Parkway over Hammond Branch by means of a box culvert. Approximately 0.4 acres of wetlands would be taken.

USFWS and DNR would like to see a bottomless culvert used at this location because it is a good quality stream.

WETLANDS REFERENCE #9B

Wetland area northwest of 9A, off of Hammond Parkway

NWI Classification: PF01A

This area may be impacted by C-2 if new driveway at this location is not kept tight against back yards of home on Gavin Way.

Vegetation and soils indicate this area is a wetland.

USFWS recommended building a driveway as close to property line, which would significantly reduce impacts on wetlands.

WETLANDS REFERENCE #10

Hammond Branch tributary at Crest Road.

This area will not be impacted by our project. The connection at the southern end of Crest Road (near MD 216) is part of a county project.

WETLANDS REFERENCE #11

Patuxent River tributary east of U.S Route 29 near Old Columbia Road.

NWI Classification: PF01A

USFWS determined that this area is not a wetland from soils and vegetation at this site.

USFWS favors an alternative that avoids this area, because of stream and floodplain, even though wetlands are not present.

WETLANDS REFERENCE #12

Patuxent River tributary north of Harding Road, near Golf Driving Range and farm.

NWI Classification: none, believed to be PF01A

USFWS determined this are is not a wetland. It is a small drainage area through a farming operation.

Nancy Eagle  
Submitted by Nancy Eagle

NKE/rw

199

WETLANDS FIELD VIEW  
US ROUTE 29, HOWARD COUNTY

DATE: September 15, 1987

ATTENDEES: Abbie Hopkins, Corps of Engineers  
Sharon Preller, MD SHA  
Mona Dave, MD SHA  
Nancy Eagle, Gannett Fleming

The purpose of this wetlands field view was to show the Corps of Engineers the wetland areas that would be impacted by the selected alternative, and receive input from the Corps regarding these wetlands. (The US Fish and Wildlife Service and various divisions with DNR viewed the wetlands previously).

In preparation for this field view, Gannett Fleming flagged the wetland areas that would be impacted.

Wetland mapping in the study corridor was provided by Gannett Fleming, with the impacted areas highlighted. A table was also provided identifying each wetland, its classification, the stream it is associated with, the soil mapping unit, vegetation, and impacted acreage. A copy of the table is attached.

Each of the eight wetland areas was viewed and the representative from the Corps of Engineers generally concurred with the extent of the wetlands, and the areas that would be impacted.

At Rivers Edge Road, the representative from the Corps felt that based on vegetation, soil conditions, and water present, the area south of existing Rivers Edge Road should also be considered a wetland. This wetland area is approximately as wide as that north of Rivers Edge Road; and approximately the same acreage (0.1 acre) would be impacted since the ramps are similar on both the north and south of the road. This change is reflected on the attached table.

The areas east of US 29 at Rivers Edge Road were also field viewed. The Corps agreed that these areas were not wetlands.

It is believed these minutes accurately reflect what transpired at the field view. However, any comments would be appreciated involving a different opinion or understanding of what occurred.

submitted by: Nancy Eagle  
Nancy Eagle

NKE/rw  
cc: Attendees  
C. Simpson, SHA  
R. Aldrich, SHA  
W. Willey, GFTE  
B. Bowers, GFTE

US ROUTE 29--HOWARD COUNTY WETLANDS

WETLAND SITE NUMBER	CLASSIFICATION	HYDROLOGY	SOIL	VEGETATION	IMPACTED ACREAGE
#3- At Hammond Drive	PFO1A and PEM5A	Hammond Branch	*Co--Codorus silt loam and EkD2--Eliok silt loam	tulip poplar (FACU) red maple (FAC) sycamore (FACW-) sensitive fern (FACW)	<del>Sel. Con. (3)= 0 acre</del> Concept 1= 0 acre Concept 2=0.5 acre
#5--US 29 at Middle Patuxent River (main crossing)	PSS1A	Middle Patuxent River	Cs--Comus silt loam Ha--Hatboro silt loam	sycamore (FACW-) black willow (FACW+) slippery elm (FAC) deergrass (OBL) jewelweed (FACW)	All alternatives included selected: <u>0.006 acre</u>
#6--Rivers Edge Road <i>#6A - north</i> <i>#6B - south</i>	PSS1A	tributary to Middle Patuxent River	Ha--Hatboro silt loam	jewelweed (FACW) black willow (FACW+)	<sup>C.2</sup> <del>Sel. Con. (4)=0.1 acre</del> Concept 3= <del>0.2</del> acre <i>C.4</i>
#11--Seneca Drive east of US 29	PSS1A	Beaver Run	Ha--Hatboro silt loam	jewelweed (FACW) black willow (FACW+) bristly locust	<del>Sel. Con. (5B)=0.02 acre</del> Concept 4, 5A, & 5A mod= 0.02 acre Concept 3=0 acre



US ROUTE 29--HOWARD COUNTY WETLANDS  
CONTINUED

WETLAND SITE NUMBER	CLASSIFICATION	HYDROLOGY	SOIL	VEGETATION	IMPACTED ACREAGE
#12--Seneca Drive west of US 29	PFO1A	Beaver Run	Ha--Hatboro silt loam	red maple (FAC) black willow (FACW+) river birch (FACW) silver maple (FACW) black locust	<u>Sel. Con. (5B)=0.4 acre</u> Concept 3, 4, 5A, & 5A mod=0.2 acre
#13--Gales Lane	PFO1A	tributary to Little Patuxent River	G1B2--Glennelg loam Ba--Baile silt loam	tulip poplar (FACU) black willow (FACW+) river birch (FACW) sycamore (FACW-) gray birch (FAC)	<u>Sel. Con. (2)=0.1 acre</u> Concept 1=0 acre
#18--Twin Knolls Rd.	PFO1A	tributary to Little Patuxent River	*Co--Codus silt loam	tulip poplar (FACU) pin oak (FACW) sycamore (FACW-) striped maple jewelweed (FACW) black locust	<u>Sel. Con. (2)=0.03 acre</u> Concept 1=0 acre
#19--MD 175 Ramp	<u>PSS1A</u> EM5	tributary to Little Patuxent River	*GnB2--Glenville silt loam	jewelweed (FACW) swamp rose (OBL) weeping willow (FACW-) bristly locust	<u>Sel. Con. (3)=0.1 acre</u> Concept 1=0.1 acre

\*Hydric Soils

Note: The Selected Concept involving Wetland #12 is 5A modified; 5B was inadvertently identified as the Selected Group.