

APPENDIX N:
MARYLAND STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION (SHA) COMMENT
RESPONSE MATRIX

Review Comment Sheet Revised Preliminary Draft EA - BEP Traffic and Utilities Mitigation Supplemental EA								
Comment #	Party	Reviewer Name	Page #	Section #	Line #	Question/Comment	Recommended Solution (Please provide a recommendation to address your concern)	Stell Response
71	SHA	Sara Al-Najjar	throughout	throughout	357 & 358 and throughout	MDOT SHA should be SHA	change Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration (MDOT SHA) to Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA)-- MDOT SHA change to SHA – general comment throughout	Changed
72	SHA	Sara Al-Najjar			394	change MDOT SHA to SHA and remove from parenthesis		Changed
73	SHA	Sara Al-Najjar			422	should it read "project's LOD" rather than "project LOD" ?		Changed to project's
74	SHA	Sara Al-Najjar			433	O3 should have the 3 as a subscript		Changed to subscript
75	SHA	Sara Al-Najjar			437	CAA should be defined (it's defined in the table above but not the text) -- not consistent with CWA in section below		Changed so both are defined upon first use (in the table)
76	SHA	Sara Al-Najjar			446	CWA is identified, also identified in same table with CAA (consistency issue)		Changed so both are defined upon first use (in the table)
77	SHA	Sara Al-Najjar			445-457	this section flips between calling it "401" and "Section 401 Water Certification"-- should be consistent		Revised to Section 401 Water Quality Certification for consistency
78	SHA	Sara Al-Najjar				Are any state funds being used for this? If it's not entirely within a PFA, would and may need to be presented to MDP Smart Growth. If state funds are not being used then Smart Growth would not apply	USACE response: no state funds are being used for this project. It is only federal.	No change
79	SHA	Sara Al-Najjar			826 & 1697	Noise section focuses on construction of the facility and not any of the intersection improvements. Clarify whether the intersection improvements are adding any capacity. Was there any quantitative/technical noise analysis completed for the intersection improvements? If so, is there any supporting documentation? Are there any sensitive noise receptors in those locations? Provide mapping showing relation to any homes or sensitive noise receptors. Are any of the intersection improvements occurring on State Roadways? Have you received any comments from FHWA?		We are adding capacity that was consistent with the Transportation Impact Study, but the increase doesn't take into account other projects/growth in the area; however, these other projects should be accounted for in the cumulative impacts. Refer to EIS for quantitative analysis of noise impacts resulting from capacity increase from operation of CPF. There is a map of sensitive noise receptors. We have received comments from FHWA. Modified sentence in Section 4.4.1.1 to: "While the ROI under Alternative 1 includes areas that are largely already subject to traffic noise and noise from farm equipment, construction of traffic and utility improvements would temporarily increase noise levels due use of construction equipment and machinery and an increase in traffic from heavy trucks and construction workers' privately owned vehicles traveling to and from the Project Areas where construction for roadway and utility improvements are proposed."
80	SHA	Sara Al-Najjar			1760	Air Quality sections: Are the intersection improvements adding any capacity? Was AQ & GHG looked at for the intersection improvements proposed?		See response above regarding capacity. Refer to EIS for analysis regarding increase in capacity from operation.
81	SHA	Sara Al-Najjar	General	General	General	Is any right-of-way needed for the intersection improvements?		Not for intersection improvements, only utilities
84	SHA	MK	1-2	1.3	368	The EA does not cite any applicability of the 23 CFR 772 Procedures for Abatement of Highway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise regulations, or the Maryland SHA Highway Noise Abatement Planning and Engineering Guidelines (2020).		Added both to table
85	SHA	MK	3-3	3.3	826	If any of the proposed improvements under each alternative include Type I improvements on state roadways as defined in the 23 CFR 772 and/or the Maryland SHA Guidelines, traffic noise analysis for adjacent noise sensitive land uses would be required. Provide a rationale if the improvements do not include Type I improvements.		Referencing this MD SHA document: https://www.roads.maryland.gov/OHD2/Project%20Type.pdf For MD 295 / Powder Mill Road interchange area. We are doing turn lane improvements which falls under Type 1 improvements. However, the TIS identified the need to install signals as part of the project, as such, the project is categorized as Type 2. Without signals, traffic operations would not be acceptable. For MD 201 / Edmonston Rd corridor. As the TIS identified the need to widen the roadway from 2 to 4 lanes within study area, this project is a Type 2. Without widening, traffic operations would not be acceptable.
86	SHA	MK	4-9	4.4	1697	If any of the proposed improvements under each alternative include Type I improvements on state roadways as defined in the 23 CFR 772 and/or the Maryland SHA Guidelines, traffic noise analysis for adjacent noise sensitive land uses would be required. Provide a rationale if the improvements do not include Type I improvements.		See response above