

Appendix – R-5
DEIS Comment Period Comments and Responses

Local Agency	Date of Letter	Comment # (in FEIS)	Local Agency Comment	SHA Response
City of Bowie	2.8.05	1	The City of Bowie Wishes to express its opposition to a specific project shown in the Financially CLRP, known as Willowbrook Parkway. The project is shown as project #39 on the Major Highway Improvements map, contained in Page 7 of the recently distributed informational brochure. The City wishes to note that this road is the segment of the Inter-County Connector lying between Central Avenue (MD 214) and US Route 301. As you are probably aware, the City has consistently opposed any aspect of the Inter-County Connector in Prince George's County. We respectfully request your assistance in having this project removed from the CLRP.	Thank you for your comments. This suggestion concerns a roadway that is well east of the study limits with this study.
City of Bowie	2.8.05	2	Please be aware that the Prince George's County Council passed Resolution CR-32-2002 opposing the construction of the Inter-County Connector between I-95 and I-270. Given the limited financial resources available for road construction projects at all levels of government, the City Council finds it difficult to understand why Willowbrook Parkway would be identified as a Major Highway Project in the CLRP when there are so many other pressing transportation needs in the region. We ask for your cooperation in deleting this project when the Transportation Planning Board updates the plan.	Thank you for your comments. This suggestion concerns a roadway that is well east of the study limits with this study.
City of Bowie	2.9.05	3	Please be advised the City Council opposes construction of this roadway east of I-95, due to its detrimental environmental impacts and impacts on the quality of life of current and future residents along its alignment and to minimize additional negative impacts to US Route 1 in the Laurel area.	Thank you for your comments. Your comments were considered during the decision-making process. The State Preferred Alternative includes an extension to US 1. Although extending the ICC to US 1 would increase costs as well as impacts to the natural and socioeconomic environment, it would improve overall transportation and connections within Montgomery and Prince George's County. This improved mobility was found to outweigh the additional environmental/social impacts and increased costs.
City of Bowie	2.9.05	4	We would also like to reiterate our opposition to any aspect of the Intercounty Connector in Prince Georges' County. A recent letter sent by the City to the Council of Governments Transportation Planning Board explains the City's perspective regarding use of scarce financial resources to build this road. In addition, the Prince George's County Council passed a specific resolution opposing the project (CR-32-2003) between I-95 and I-270.	Thank you. The Study Team is aware of the position of the City of Bowie as well as the resolution passed by the Prince George's County Council. The Study Team has worked closely with the Transportation and Housing committee of the County Council in ensuring they have all of the information and data needed to issue further comments regarding the project and the DEIS.
Montgomery County Department of Environmental Protection (DEP)	01.28.05	5	<p>The DEIS contains an abundance of well referenced environmental information that describes the current environmental conditions within the ICC corridors and the impacts associated with the different build alternatives. This information will support the detailed process required to weigh environmental considerations along with the other economic, community, and quality of life needs that must be considered to promote an informed and balanced decision on the ICC. The documents identify many opportunities for impact avoidance, minimization, and mitigation as required by law.</p> <p>DEP has participated in the field meetings and studies scheduled by SHA, and found the meetings extremely helpful in understanding the ICC project. We have been pleased to provide supporting data to the study team on the conditions of the local streams, vernal pools, and nesting bird communities an our assessment of what these data mean for the</p>	Thank you for your comments. Your comments were considered during the decision-making process.

Local Agency	Date of Letter	Comment # (in FEIS)	Local Agency Comment	SHA Response
			quality of the study environments.	
DEP	01.28.05	6	"Tridephia" needs to be "Triadelphia". For example, p. 104 and p. 215 of the NETR pdf. (page II-74 and II-185.)	Correction has been made in Sections II. E. 2. c. and IV. F. S. c.
DEP	01.28.05	7	Page II-73. "...The Rocky Gorge watershed is considered and Environmental Preservation Area by the county, where very low-density development (i.e. development without substantial structural SWM) is expected to protect this sensitive resource area in combination with efforts to address existing sources of nutrients and sediments." This phrasing implies that the County is using development without substantial structural SWM as a way to protect its Environmental Preservation Areas. We recommend the following language:The Rocky Gorge watershed is considered and Environmental Preservation Area by the county, where very low-density development (i.e. development with a very low level of impervious and therefore minimal need for structural SWM) is expected to protect this sensitive resource area in combination with efforts to address existing sources of nutrients and sediments.	The text referred to is in the NETR and not the DEIS. The NETR will not be updated before the FEIS publication.
DEP	01.28.05	8	II-104, Table II-19: Dominant Cover Types listed for Northwest Branch - Mixed Oak should be on the same line; it should read 'Mixed Oak' as one type and 'Coniferous' as another, not 'Oak Coniferous'.	Correction has been made in Table II-19.
DEP	01.28.05	9	II-111, first paragraph, first sentence should read " <i>Microstegium</i> species" instead of "microstegium species".	Correction has been made in Section II.E.8.d.
DEP	01.28.05	10	Avoidance and Minimization of Impacts Techniques Summary - While the development of an approved Erosion and Sediment Control Plan is described in this document, sediment spills and accidents do happen on construction sites everyday. We strongly recommend that an 'emergency response plan' for sediment spills be prepared by the SHA and in place before construction begins. This plan should detail who to contact when a spill occurs, how to sequester the spill, and what procedures to follow to determine when and how the remove the sediments from floodplains, wetlands and streams.	SHA/MdTA is fully prepared to exceed MDE requirements for erosion and sediment control. In addition to routine plan approval and inspection, SHA/MdTA is taking extraordinary steps to minimize disturbance, and has committed to implementing redundant erosion and sediment control measures in Special Protection Areas and supplying full time environmental monitors to perform another level of quality control, beyond MDE inspectors and SHA inspectors. SHA/MdTA is well aware of the environmental damage and erosion of public trust that would likely occur if a sediment spill were to happen during construction of an ICC build alternative. A spill response plan has been developed.
DEP	01.28.05	11	IV-230-231. Revise the following sentence as follows: "Often, trees along a newly created edge die from a combination of different stresses that may occur over many years." Trees grown in forested conditions that are suddenly exposed to edges degrade over time and many finally die, especially if root systems are disturbed by grading activities. Tulip-poplars consistently degrade and die eight and ten years following disturbance, while oaks and hickories consistently degrade and die over 12 and 15 years. Additional light penetrating the forests from the newly exposed edges encourage a host of different plants including non-native invasive plants and birds.	Correction has been made in Section IV. F. 8. a.
DEP	01.28.05	12	IV-234, Table IV-65. No Action Alternative lists the Remaining FIDS Habitat as 0.0 acres; listing n/a would be more appropriate.	Correction has been made in Table IV-65.
DEP	01.28.05	13	IV-236, Northwest Branch subsection, 2nd paragraph, last sentence: Capitalize first word	Correction has been made in Section IV. F. 8. b.

Local Agency	Date of Letter	Comment # (in FEIS)	Local Agency Comment	SHA Response
			(the).	
DEP	01.28.05	14	IV-241, Champion and Specimen trees, impacts section says that there 'are no county champion trees know to be located in the Muddy Branch, Paint Branch, Upper Rock Creek, Indian Creek Rock Gorge, and the Upper Patuxent Watersheds.' Clarify whether this is true for the whole watershed, or just for the portion of the watershed that would be impacted by the ICC.	Correction has been made in Section IV. F. 8. c.
DEP	01.28.05	15	IV-241, Northwest Branch Watershed subsection states that 'Northwest Branch Option B would impact two county champion trees', but only lists one.	Correction has been made in Section IV. F. 8. c.
DEP	01.28.05	16	IV-26, Table IV-68 is referred to as containing recent breeding bird surveys within Rock Creek and the North Branch, it does not, Table IV-69 does.	Correction has been made in Section IV. F. 9. e.
DEP	01.28.05	17	IV-292, the document discusses construction impacts. The document only lists fugitive dust generation as an impact from the road construction project. The document should also address the emissions generated from construction equipment and methods to be employed to control those emissions. For example, the following types of construction equipment may be required: bull dozers, earth movers, graders, front end loaders, diesel trucks, etc. The ozone precursor emissions from this type of equipment can be substantial. There are controls available to minimize these emissions through retrofits-oxidation catalysts and idling restrictions. A successful example of a construction contract that required these types of controls is the "Big Dig" project in Boston. Additionally, Montgomery County's Air Quality Protection Strategy addresses this ambient air quality issue and is listed as action item 4.7.	More details of air quality impacts during construction are listed in the Air Quality Technical Report in Section II.D on pages II-3 through II-4. If any regulating agency wants more stringent regulation than COMAR 26.11.06.03D requires for emissions from construction vehicles, special provisions should be written into the construction contract(s) during the final design period.
DEP	01.28.05	18	The EIS needs to address air emission offsets from building the ICC. For example, increase in bus service, a dedicated bus lane or other public transportation project.	Air emission offsets, such as increased bus service, are incorporated in the total traffic volumes used in the Build and No-Build models for ICC. Transportation projects that are not included in the CLPR and TIP can not be included in either the microscale or macroscale ICC air quality models, since there are no current plans to fund these projects for construction. All projects included in the CLRP and TIP are reflected in the traffic volumes used to analyze the ICC air quality models.
DEP	01.28.05	19	IV-396. Whenever linear feet of stream are listed as being impacted it is extremely important to provide the reader with the map scale that reference is made from. Higher resolution map scales will have more linear feet of streams and more headwater stream linear feet than lower resolution maps of the same geographic area. For example, the Seneca Creek watershed has 194 stream miles at a map scale of 1:100,000 and 322 stream miles at a map scale of 1:24,000. Same watershed area, different map scale.	Thank you for your comments. Your comments were considered during the decision-making process. Impacts were calculated in GIS. The map scales used in the preparation of the DEIS are standard for this level of design detail. More detailed impact assessments will be presented in the FEIS summary and environmental impacts chapters using refined engineering design details.
DEP	01.28.05	20	Environmental Stewardship - In general, the maps in the DEIS were inadequate to accurately identify the exact location on many of the proposed projects, especially SWM retrofits. This has limited our ability to provide complete and accurate comments. Please provide coordinates and better location descriptions for the projects, especially the SWM retrofit projects.	Since the publication of the DEIS, a booklet of conceptual plans that includes the requested level of detail has been provided to all commenting agencies and IAWG participants. Please contact SHA if you have not yet received this information.
DEP	01.28.05	21	PB-37. DEP has this project under design (Middle Gum Springs). If this project is	From previous coordination with DEP it is SHA's understanding that DEP's

Local Agency	Date of Letter	Comment # (in FEIS)	Local Agency Comment	SHA Response
			selected by SHA, DEP will provide all information on the project design. An adjacent stormwater management pond project is scheduled for construction in the spring of 2005 and is expected to be completed in September 2005. The pond project includes some riparian reforestation along Middle Gum Springs. SHA should coordinate with DEP on possible access routes to PB-37 to ensure that the reforestation by DEP does not limit construction access for project PB-37.	project extends downstream from Bart Drive. SHA is planning to work well upstream of Bart Drive by working between Good Hope Road and Harold Drive. SHA will continue to coordinate with DEP to ensure both projects are done in the most efficient manner.
DEP	01.28.05	22	PB-49. This site is wooded. A pond that includes significant site grading will be difficult to construct without having thermal impacts. Temperature data should be collected and this pond should not be constructed unless the stream already has thermal problems which will not be increased by the new pond.	As noted in the project description, this site is proposed for improved SWM without thermal impacts. Additional temperature data will be collected prior to design of this site.
DEP	01.28.05	23	PB-54. This site is wooded. A pond that includes significant site grading will be difficult to construct without having thermal impacts. Temperature data should be collected and this pond should not be constructed unless the stream already has thermal problems which will not be increased by the new pond.	As noted in the project description, this site is proposed for improved SWM without thermal impacts. Additional temperature data will be collected prior to design of this site.
DEP	01.28.05	24	NB-1. This project should also include retrofit of the Cherrywood Regional SWM pond located next to Cherrywood Park on Cherry Valley Drive.	SHA will review this site and add this to the list of SWM retrofits proposed in the FEIS.
DEP	01.28.05	25	NB-2C. This project should be extended downstream of Cashell Road on the Norbeck Country Club (if permission from the Country Club can be obtained) and should include the retrofit of the Cashell Manor Regional SWM pond located east of Cashell Road and south of Williamsburg Run (this may be N-7).	SHA will review this site for potential restoration and inclusion in the final Compensatory Mitigation package. The suggested SWM project is currently included in SHA's package as site NB-7 in Table VI-6.
DEP	01.28.05	26	PB-12B. DEP has identified Hollywood Branch as a high priority for stream restoration in the Lower Paint Branch Watershed Study. The upper reach of Hollywood Branch from Randolph Road to Cannon Road is the top priority. The middle reach between Cannon Road and Lauries Drive is the second highest priority. The proposed reach from Laurie Drive to Paint Branch is the lowest priority. It is recommended the SHA coordinate with DEP so that restoration work begins with the upper reach and progresses downstream.	At DEP's suggestion, SHA has evaluated Hollywood Branch between Cannon Drive and Laurie Drive as a possible addition to the work proposed downstream of Laurie Drive in Table VI-6. SHA will continue to coordinate with DEP to ensure that the restoration of Hollywood Branch proceeds in the most efficient manner possible.
DEP	01.28.05	27	MR-5, SC-2, SC-19 & SC-21. DEP supports mitigation within watersheds directly impacted by a project. Any mitigation outside of impacted watersheds should be considered only if no opportunities exist for mitigation within impacted watersheds.	SHA has attempted to locate mitigation sites as close as possible to the watersheds in which the impacts are proposed. However, suitable opportunities for potential wetland mitigation sites have been limited in some watersheds. SHA has conducted its mitigation site search in accordance with the applicable guidance and policies established by the USACE and MDE and as such will only pursue mitigation outside affected watersheds as dictated by site availability.
DEP	01.28.05	28	PB-43. DEP has identified an opportunity to construct a SWM pond at the southern dead end of Timberlake Drive. Construction of a new SWM pond would provide greater benefits and would be preferred over improvements to the swale. DEP can provide the concept design for this site. Retrofit of the existing dry pond located on SHA property at the north end of Timberlake Drive should be added to this project.	SHA will consider the SWM site identified by DEP at the south end of Timberlake Drive and the SWM pond retrofit on the north end of Timberlake Drive for inclusion in its mitigation package. SHA would appreciate receiving the concepts plans for this facility.
DEP	01.28.05	29	PB-46. The retrofit of the dry pond located near the intersection of Perrywood Drive and Cabin Creek Drive should be added to this project. DEP can provide the concept design	SHA will consider the SWM site identified by DEP near the intersection of Perrywood Drive and Cabin Creek Drive as part of this project. SHA would

Local Agency	Date of Letter	Comment # (in FEIS)	Local Agency Comment	SHA Response
			for this site.	appreciate receiving the concepts plans for this facility.
DEP	01.28.05	30	Once the final stewardship sites have been selected, please coordinate with DEP during the design, build and project monitoring phases for those projects in Montgomery County.	SHA will continue to coordinate with DEP on the environmental stewardship package as needed.
Montgomery County Department of Public Works and Transportation (MCDWPT)	2.24.05	31	Executive Douglas Duncan previously testified at the ICC Public Hearing in Gaithersburg on January 5, 2005, this is the most important road project currently being considered in the State of Maryland. The need for the project is very well documented, and its purpose is abundantly clear. Therefore, he stated that the ICC should be built along Corridor 1, the Master Plan alignment. This letter provides additional details regarding issues identified in the ICC DEIS.	Corridor 1 has been selected as the State Preferred Alternative. Your comments have been considered in the decision making process. Corridor 1 would perform better than Corridor 2 in meeting the elements of the ICC Purpose and Need that are related to community mobility, movement of people and goods, and serving existing and future development patterns. Corridor 1 would have fewer community impacts and is projected to carry more traffic on the ICC than Corridor 2, in part because Corridor 1 is part of the existing County Master Plan and existing and planned development has occurred in anticipation of the highway in the Corridor 1 location. In addition, residents have been alerted to Corridor 1 through a Montgomery County ordinance requiring notice of, and an opportunity to review, area Master Plans as a prerequisite to all real estate closings in the county since the early 1970s. Corridor 1 would also be located within a greater portion of PFAs, thereby making this corridor more consistent with State Smart Growth laws, and able to better serve both existing development and planned future development.
MCDWPT	2.24.05	32	With respect to the No-Action Alternative, it is opposed because it does not address any of the five identified project needs, fails to fulfill the project purpose, and is inconsistent with the County's master plans.	Thank you for your comments. Your comments were considered during the decision-making process.
MCDWPT	2.24.05	33	Regarding the Corridor 2 Alternative, we are less in favor of it because of its impact on community and historic resources; it would undo years of careful master planning; would subject the County's land use planning and zoning regulation to the "change/mistake" process; is an inferior transportation solution compared to Corridor 1, and lacks the same degree of public support as Corridor 1.	Thank you for your comments. Your comments were considered during the decision-making process.
MCDWPT	2.24.05	34	We support the Corridor 1 Alternative because it best implements the County's long-standing and highly participatory master planning process, careful land use regulatory efforts, and balanced approach to community building and care for the environment, thereby keeping faith with the people of Montgomery County. It also best addresses the project purpose and need, and is a superior transportation solution. In sum, Corridor 1 is the alternative that most completely balances all of the factors impinging on this decision.	Thank you for your comments. Your comments were considered during the decision-making process.
MCDWPT	2.24.05	35	We strongly support Rock Creek Option "A." Option "A" more closely adheres to the master plan alignment for the ICC, displaces fewer residences (and no businesses), has fewer residential noise impacts and costs less compared to Option "C."	Thank you for your comments and your preference has been noted. SHA's preferred option is Rock Creek Option C with a grade-separated crossing with the ICC under Olde Mill Run Road. SHA considered the many important factors in making this recommendation. Rock Creek Option C (grade separated) would require substantially less parkland acquisition than Rock Creek Option A (37.3 acres compared to 12.3 acres). Rock Creek Option C would use a portion of the corridor reserved for the Mid County Highway which is shown in the local Master Plan to cross through the Winters Run

Local Agency	Date of Letter	Comment # (in FEIS)	Local Agency Comment	SHA Response
				SCEA. The results of these studies have been included in the FEIS.
NCPC	2/2/2005	100	The information in the DEIS regarding the Stream Valley Parks that occur within Montgomery County, after staff review, has been determined adequate to establish that no Commission jurisdictional interest exists in connection with the Capper-Cramton Act of May 29, 1930, regarding necessary approvals to secure final parkland revisions affected by any potential roadway alignment.	
NCPC	2/2/2005	101	I note with concern, however, the cumulative impact of the proposed ICC build alternatives as described in the DEIS. Secondary and cumulative impacts from the ICC involving natural systems are, in the opinion of NCPC staff deliberation, major and adverse in their effects to the National Capital Region with regard to open space, water quality impacts, and forested habitat. These resulting cumulative impacts also conflict with the Commission's Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital. The magnitude of effects is summarized in the DEIS table below. It is unmistakable that the cumulative impact of the ICC to the environment of the region is measured in hundreds of acres of adverse impact to floodplains, thousands of acres of important impacted and fragmented forested land, and thousands of acres of significant and important Chesapeake Bay associated watershed streamside areas.	In compliance with relevant laws and regulations, SHA has recommend mitigation for direct project impacts (see FEIS for Details). In addition to mitigation requirements, SHA has also proposing other environmental stewardship initiatives as part of the purpose and need for this project (see Section VI of the FEIS). As such, environmental restoration and enhancements to improve the natural, cultural and community environmental conditions, include, but not limited to those that exist today because of unrelated past actions. Avoidance and minimization design strategies that have been incorporated into the existing roadway design will result in the minimization of direct impacts. Environmental enhancement, above and beyond mitigation required by laws or regulations, is being proposed as part of this project to improve the environment holistically. It is anticipated that the combination of mitigation and enhancement measures being proposed will address area-wide concerns, not just the immediate influence of the project.
NCPC	2/2/2005	102	Other cumulative impacts from the ICC proposal as they affect the District of Columbia involve the subwatershed areas, specifically the Anacostia River watershed. This is a major concern to the Commission staff given the importance of the planning initiatives in the District as they relate to that resource.	
NCPC	2/2/2005	103	The Anacostia River subwatershed exceeds the 80th percentile of resource impact for undeveloped farmland, forest impact, and streams (and assumed associated water quality since the connection with water quality is related to watershed size and land management practices) affected by the ICC proposal. This high level of impact is not fully addressed regarding what specific mitigation would occur, or how avoidance of this magnitude of effects might occur under any scenario, which would effectively reduce impacts. Most importantly, this degree of resource degradation would directly and indirectly affect federal properties and resources of the National Capital Region. The steady conversion of undeveloped land and parkland to impervious surface is an ongoing risk to the region's federal streamside forests and wetlands in federal research areas, and within National Park Service parklands and parkways, due to development densities that result in amplified stormwater run-off volumes that produce erosion, adverse nutrient loading, and added pollution problems for high-value wetlands and lower watershed aquatic resources. Also, a loss of stream and forested habitat from the Anacostia tributaries, combined with losses from other affected areas highlighted in the DEIS, demonstrates an overall significant impact that materially affects the regional biodiversity important to the river and the region as a whole, as has been highlighted to you by further comment from the Department of Interior on the ICC DEIS.	

Local Agency	Date of Letter	Comment # (in FEIS)	Local Agency Comment	SHA Response
NCPC	2/2/2005	104	While the Commission staff recognizes cumulative consequences are not all under the control of any one project planning agency, nevertheless, the DEIS does not adequately define the significance of the cumulative impacts, nor does the DEIS address mitigation measures for any cumulative natural system effects, except to note that unspecified state laws and regulations could reduce the cumulative impacts. Specific criteria for cumulative significance and mitigation should be explicitly identified and described for all impacted resources. It is NCPC staffs conclusion that the ICC NEPA process must meet the standard that is required of all federal environmental reviews. The requirement that an EIS contain a detailed discussion of possible mitigation measures emanates from the language of NEPA and the Council on Environmental Quality regulations.	
NCPC	2/2/2005	105	An agency has latitude for the degree of detail based on reasonable level of information at draft development, but improved and better detail at the time of a final evaluation is the measure to be expected. At a minimum, NCPC would expect the state and federal agencies to conclude with some concrete mechanisms to define and enforce additional measures directed toward the cumulatively impacted project area. These efforts might involve adaptive management techniques based on defined and enforceable commitments.	
City of Greenbelt	2/2/2005	106	It will have a minimal impact on reducing traffic on the Beltway, I-95, or I-270 because it will open new areas to development interests and will likely increase traffic throughout the region.	<p>Improved mobility and safety in the ICC study area is not designed or intended to relieve Capital Beltway (I-495) congestion. This has been true throughout the ICC's history. The ICC serves a different travel market than does the Beltway, which is intended for motorists traveling to and from communities and employment centers that surround the Washington, DC urban core, whereas the purpose of the ICC is to connect the growth corridors of I-270 and I-95 in eastern Montgomery County and northwestern Prince George's County.</p> <p>The Beltway has reached its current capacity, and is congested most hours of the day. To address this, an I-95/I-495 Capital Beltway Study is currently being conducted to evaluate improvements to Maryland's 42-mile portion of the capital Beltway, and is being coordinated with a similar study by Virginia DOT. Although the focus of that study is on provision of managed lanes, improvement of interchanges will also be considered. For more information about the Capital Beltway Study, please contact the project manager Ms. Sue Rajan at (410) 545-8514 or toll-free at (800) 548-5026.</p>

Local Agency	Date of Letter	Comment # (in FEIS)	Local Agency Comment	SHA Response
City of Greenbelt	2/2/2005	107	It has an enormous price tag - currently estimated at up to \$3 billion including financing costs. Already, components of the project, such as the bike trail, are being removed to manage the cost. Further, the proposal to use future federal transportation receipts to pay the debt service will limit available funding for other necessary transportation projects in our region.	The cost of the 18-mile ICC as presented in Table S-2 of the DEIS is estimated to range from \$1.76 billion to \$2.22 billion. SHA's cost estimate is conservative compared to other major (over \$1 billion) highway, bridge and transit projects in metropolitan areas nationwide (e.g., extending Metrorail 11.6 miles to Reston, Virginia is estimated to cost \$1.6 billion). This estimate was reviewed and approved by the FHWA's Mega Project Team. The highest cost items for the ICC project are right-of-way due to the study area's high property values, earth-moving for extensive cut and fill sections due to the study area topography, paving, and bridges associated with new highway construction. In addition, the cost estimate includes the improvements to intersecting roads (e.g., MD 97, US 29, I-95). For example, along I-95, these improvements extend from the north side of MD 212 to north of MD 198. The costs also include environmental mitigation and stewardship measures to enhance and protect the study area natural environment. Considering the project's economic benefits are over \$300 million per year as quantified by the University of Maryland's independent analysis, that 25 percent of the project's costs will come from user tolls, and the degree to which the ICC satisfies the project's purpose and needs, either ICC Build Alternative is cost-effective.
City of Greenbelt	2/2/2005	108	The project will have devastating impacts on cultural and natural resources, including wetlands, streams, flood plains, mature woodland, and animal habitats, which ultimately will negatively impact efforts to restore the Chesapeake Bay and the region's air quality.	In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Lead Agencies have made efforts to include all possible planning to minimize harm to environmental resources. Coordination has been ongoing with the environmental resource agencies to avoid or minimize potential impacts. Impact Mitigation and Environmental Stewardship is also provided as part of the project. Mitigation will be used to replace or lessen negative effects of resources directly impacted by the ICC. Environmental Stewardship has been incorporated into the ICC in recognition that past urban development within the study area has resulted in long term impacts that will require steps above and beyond the norm to reverse these trends. Environmental stewardship measures have been incorporated previously on many transportation projects but the ICC represents a previously unsurpassed commitment to this program in Maryland. At the national and state level ES is being provided more frequently in recognition of the social and natural environmental connection that transportation projects often have. The "corrects" needed in the study area were gathered from federal, state and local resource managers and are detailed in Chapter VI of the DEIS.
Montgomery County Council	12/3/2005	109	The first resolution reiterates our position in favor of constructing the ICC on its master-planned alignment. This alignment has been identified in County plans for more than 30 years, and in some segments for more than 50 years. We continue to honor this decades-long compact with our citizens.	The Council's strong support for the Master Plan Alignment (Corridor 1) has been noted and was considered during the decision-making process.

Local Agency	Date of Letter	Comment # (in FEIS)	Local Agency Comment	SHA Response
Montgomery County Council	12/3/2005	110	We request that the State Highway Administration extend the deadline for comments by 28 days, from February 1 to March 1, 2005. The February 1 deadline allows only 71 days for comment, much of it over the winter holidays. An extension to March 1 will provide 99 days for public review, which is still less than the 103 days allowed for the 1997 DEIS that was of similar scope and length.	Please know that Lead Agencies want to ensure that all individuals and interested parties have the opportunity to participate in the review and comment process: therefore, the comment period was been extended for two additional weeks.