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A. June 2015 Public Notice, Social Media Postings, and Mailing List
Public Notice

Anacostia River Watershed Restoration Project
Prince George’s County, Maryland

All Interested Parties: In compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District (USACE), is preparing an environmental assessment (EA) for multiple stream and wetland restoration projects being proposed in the Anacostia River watershed, Prince George’s County, Maryland. The study is being conducted in partnership with the Prince George’s County Department of the Environment to determine if there are restoration projects to be implemented by the Corps. If implemented, the projects would directly support USACE’s commitment to the Chesapeake Bay goals included in Executive Order 13508, *Chesapeake Bay Protection and Restoration*.

In February 2010, USACE, in cooperation with local resource agencies, completed the Anacostia Restoration Plan (ARP) which identified numerous environmental restoration opportunities in the Anacostia watershed. The current Anacostia River watershed restoration study includes more detailed consideration of some of the restoration projects previously identified in the ARP that USACE can implement in Prince George’s County. The EA under preparation also contains additional stream and wetland restoration projects that were not included in the ARP.

Ten stream segments totaling approximately 10 miles in length, have been selected for investigation (see attached map). The primary project objectives for the selected stream segments are to: (1) restore in-stream habitat; (2) remove fish barriers; and (3) restore floodplain wetlands and increase stream-floodplain connection. To achieve these objectives, stream and wetland restoration methods involving placement of in-stream structures, fish blockages removal/modification, excavating floodplain sediments, placing fill and soil in the floodplain, or planting native vegetation in the floodplain are being investigated. Projects would be formulated to optimize environmental benefits, avoid increasing flood risk, and minimize detrimental impacts to structures, properties, and human use of the streams and floodplain.

Alternatives that achieve project objectives are being planned and benefits and costs will be evaluated. This planning information will be presented in a draft EA integrated within a USACE feasibility report anticipated to be released for public review in late 2015. A notice of availability will be released to inform the public that the EA describing proposed actions is available for review and comment.

To assist in the development of the EA, we are requesting that you provide information concerning your interests or your organization’s area of responsibility or expertise within 30 days from the date of this notice to the address below. A timely review of this information and a written response will be greatly appreciated. Substantive public comments received via the NEPA process will be fully considered by USACE.

If you have any questions, please contact Christopher Spaur by email at christopher.c.spaur@usace.army.mil, by telephone at (410) 962-6134, or by mail at U.S. Army
Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District, ATTN: CENAB-PL-P (Spaur), P.O. Box 1715, Baltimore, Maryland 21203-1715.

Daniel M. Bierly
Chief, Civil Project Development Branch

Enclosure: Site Map
New! From the Bay Program

Join the Discussion on Management Strategies
As part of the new Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement, Bay Program partners are developing management strategies that will outline how we will accomplish the goals and outcomes that will lead to a restored watershed.

Bay Program partners are now crafting the management strategies for meeting the goals of the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement signed last June. Each week, we offer a listing below of upcoming open discussions and meetings for your information.

November
Tune in to the Managing Policy and Prevention Management Strategy

What We’re Reading
Our Path Forward: The Comprehensive Conservation & Management Plan for Maryland’s Coastal Bays
Our Path Forward represents a revision to the 1999 Comprehensive Conservation & Management Plan for the Coastal Bays of Maryland. The work is the culmination of three years (2013-2016) of technical investigation and community involvement to protect the future of the Coastal Bays.
For more: http://bay.nhp.gov

Greater Baltimore Wilderness Coalition To Expand Green Network in Central Maryland
Baltimore City and Baltimore County have launched a joint effort with the regional public, local, state, and federal agencies, non-governmental organizations, and professional associations to protect and enhance the natural resources of the Baltimore region. The project is designed to create a green network of open space between the city and county.
For more: http://bay.nhp.gov

Anacostia River Watershed Restoration Project
The Anacostia watershed is one of the most urbanized watersheds within the Chesapeake Bay Basin and has suffered from years of environmental neglect. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is currently working on an environmental assessment and are seeking any relevant information from members of the public and organizations until July 1. If implemented, the projects would directly support interagency commitments to the Chesapeake Bay goals included in Executive Order 13686, Chesapeake Bay Protection and Restoration.
For more: http://www.nhp.usace.army.mil/Missions/Environmental/AnacostiaRiverWatershedRestoration.aspx
NEW STUDY! The Anacostia watershed is one of the most urbanized watersheds within the #ChesapeakeBay Basin and has suffered from years of environmental neglect. The Baltimore District is preparing an environmental assessment for potential stream and wetland restoration projects in the Anacostia River watershed in Prince George's County, Maryland. In partnership with the Prince George's County Department of the Environment, 10 miles of stream have been selected for investigation. The district is requesting information on the study from the public and interested organizations by July 1.

For more info: http://1.usa.gov/1B41QW7

Anacostia Watershed Restoration

The official public website of the Baltimore District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

NAB.USACE.ARMY.MIL | BY BALTIMORE DISTRICT

183 people reached
PLEASE SHARE - U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District:
We are working on a study, in coordination with Prince George's County Department of Environmental Restoration, identifying several stream restoration and fish passage projects in the Anacostia River watershed in Prince George's County, Maryland. The Anacostia watershed is one of the most urbanized watersheds within the Chesapeake Bay Basin and has suffered from years of environmental neglect. We are currently working on an environmental assessment and are seeking any relevant information from members of the public and organizations until July 1. We can all work together to help restore the Bay! More info and study area maps can be found at: http://www.nab.usace.army.mil/anacostiawatershedrestoration/
We can all work together to help restore the Bay! Learn More about the Anacostia Watershed Restoration.
Can you help us?

Your input, suggestions and recommendations are needed by July 1, 2015!

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District and the Prince George's County Department of the Environment are working to identify several stream restoration and fish passage projects in the Anacostia River watershed. We are seeking any information from the public that may assist us in making final project decisions.

Remember...the deadline is JULY 1, 2015. Contact Christopher Spaur at (410) 962-6134 or christopher.c.spaur@usace.army.mil to share your thoughts.

We can all work together to help restore the Anacostia River watershed!

More information and a map of potential project locations is available here: http://www.nab.usace.army.mil/.../anacostiawatershedrestorati...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City, State Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dana Minerva</td>
<td>Anacostia Watershed Restoration Partnership</td>
<td>777 North Capitol Street, NE, Suite 300</td>
<td>Washington, D.C. 20002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Hoyt</td>
<td>Montgomery County, Maryland Department of Environmental Protection</td>
<td>255 Rockville Pike, Suite 120, Rockville, Maryland 20850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamid Karimi</td>
<td>District of Columbia District Department of the Environment</td>
<td>51 N Street, NE, 6th Floor</td>
<td>Washington, D.C. 20002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Shofar</td>
<td>Montgomery County, Maryland Department of Environmental Protection</td>
<td>255 Rockville Pike, Suite 120, Rockville, Maryland 20850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Wilson</td>
<td>Prince George’s County, Maryland Department of Environmental Resources</td>
<td>9400 Peppercorn Place, Suite 610, Largo, Maryland 20774</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Moki</td>
<td>Associate Director Prince George’s County, Maryland Department of Environmental Resources</td>
<td>9400 Peppercorn Place, Suite 610, Largo, Maryland 20774</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Eskin</td>
<td>Maryland Department of the Environment</td>
<td>1800 Washington Blvd.</td>
<td>Baltimore, MD 21230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Yetman</td>
<td>Maryland Department of Natural Resources Tawes State Office Building</td>
<td>580 Taylor Avenue, Annapolis, Maryland 21401-2397</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Capacasa</td>
<td>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III Department of Environmental Resources</td>
<td>3WP10, 1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103-2029</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Esher</td>
<td>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III Department of Environmental Resources</td>
<td>3WP10, 1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103-2029</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Montanio</td>
<td>National Oceanic and Atmospheric</td>
<td>1401 Constitution Avenue NW Room 6217</td>
<td>Washington, District of Columbia 20230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Brosnan</td>
<td>National Oceanic and Atmospheric</td>
<td>1401 Constitution Avenue NW Room 6217</td>
<td>Washington Dc, District of Columbia 20230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Smith</td>
<td>Anacostia Watershed Citizens Advisory Committee</td>
<td>777 North Capitol Street, NE, Suite 300</td>
<td>Washington, D.C. 20002-4201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Barber</td>
<td>Anacostia Watershed Citizens Advisory Committee</td>
<td>2839 Chesterfield Place</td>
<td>Washington, D.C. 20008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Verna Harrison
The Campbell Foundation
410 Severn Avenue Suite # 210
Annapolis, Maryland 21403

Linda Howard
The Summit Fund of Washington
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue N.W. Suite 525
Washington, District of Columbia 20037

Andrew Fellows
4500 Knox Road
College Park, MD 20740

Jim Foster
The George Washington House
4302 Baltimore Avenue
Bladensburg, MD 20710

John Akridge III
The John Akridge Companies
601 13th Street NW, Suite 300N
Washington, DC 20005-3870

David Tuchman
The John Akridge Companies
601 13th Street NW, Suite 300N
Washington, DC 20005-3870

Eric Siegel
The Cohen Companies
2701 Tower Oaks Boulevard, Suite 200
Rockville, Maryland 20852

Michael Stevens

Eleanor Norton
The Honorable Eleanor Holmes Norton
United States House of Representatives
Rayburn House Office Building
National Press Building, Suite 900
529 14th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20045

Barbara Mikulski
1629 Thames Street, Suite 400
Baltimore, Maryland 21231

The Honorable Donna Edwards
United States House of Representatives
Attn.: Ms. Adrienne Christain
Rayburn House Office Building
9200 Basil Court, Suite 221
Largo, Maryland 20774

Steny Hoyer
The Honorable Steny H. Hoyer
US District Courthouse
6500 Cherrywood Lane, Suite 310
Greenbelt, MD 20770

Ben Cardin
The Honorable Benjamin L. Cardin
Baltimore Office
100 South Charles Street
Tower 1, Suite 1710
Baltimore, MD 21201

Donna Edwards
Price George's County Office
5001 Silver Hill Road
Suite 106
Suitland, MD 20746
The Honorable Chris Van Hollen  
United States House of Representatives  
1707 Longworth House Office Building  
Washington, D.C. 20515  

Sheila Besse  
District of Columbia  
District Department of the Environment  
51 N Street, NE, 6th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20002  

Catherine King  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III  
3WP10  
1650 Arch Street  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103-2029  

David Prevar  
Beltsville Agricultural Research Center  
10300 Baltimore Avenue  
Building 003 BARC-WEST  
Beltsville, Maryland 20705  

Susan Barnett  
Beaverdam Creek Watershed Watch Group  
P.O. Box 1244  
Greenbelt, MD 20768  

Zelda Bell  
Citizens to Conserve and Restore Indian Creek  
8515 60th Place  
Berwyn Heights, Maryland 20740  

Dennis Chestnut  
Groundwork Anacostia DC  
3939 Benning Rd. NE  
Washington, DC 20019  

Bill Duncan  
Friends of Still Creek  
13-D Ridge Road  
Greenbelt, Maryland 20770  

Anne Ambler  
Neighbors of the Northwest Branch of the Anacostia River  
P.O. Box 4314  
Silver Spring, MD 20914  

Michael Wilpers  
President, Friends of Sligo Creek  
7209 Spruce Avenue  
Takoma Park, Maryland 20912  

David Dunmire  
Eyes of Paint Branch  
1258 Cavendish Drive  
Silver Spring, Maryland 20904  

John Galli  
Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments  
Department of Environmental Programs  
777 North Capitol St. N.E.  
Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20002  

Phong Trieu  
Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments  
Department of Environmental Programs  
777 North Capitol Street, NE, Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20002  

Aubin Maynard  
Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments  
Department of Environmental Programs  
777 North Capitol Street, NE, Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20002
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization/Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Captain Singleton</td>
<td>Joint Base Andrews Naval Air Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1500 West Perimeter Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Room 2330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Base Andrews, MD 20762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Blasey</td>
<td>The Diamondback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Diamondback Newsroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3150 South Campus Dining Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Park, MD 20742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Wiltson</td>
<td>Martin Luther King, Jr Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4545 Ammendale Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beltsville, Maryland 20705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myra Allen</td>
<td>Kids In His Care Daycare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6011 Ammendale Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beltsville, MD 20705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle</td>
<td>Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11760 Baltimore Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beltsville, MD 20705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheye Calvo</td>
<td>Town of Berwyn Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5700 Berwyn Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Berwyn Heights, MD 20740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronnie Gathers</td>
<td>Department of Park and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6200 Pociac Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Berwyn Heights, MD 20740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Antolik</td>
<td>Berwyn Heights Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5700 Berwyn Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Berwyn Heights, MD 20740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berwyn Heights</td>
<td>Volunteer Fire Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8811 60th Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Berwyn Heights, MD 20740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Feliciotti</td>
<td>Elks Lodge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prince Georges County, MD No. 1778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6700 Kenilworth Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Riverdale, MD 20737-1316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Barney</td>
<td>The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6611 Kenilworth Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Riverdale, MD 20737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside Medical</td>
<td>Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6502 Kenilworth Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ste 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Riverdale, MD 20737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Johnson</td>
<td>Calvert Road Disc Golf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5277 Old Calvert Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Park, MD 20740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghassem Asrar</td>
<td>Joint Global Change Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5825 University Research Ct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite 3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Park, MD 20740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajay Pant</td>
<td>The Tennis Center at College Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5200 Paint Branch Parkway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Park, MD 20740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tara Minter</td>
<td>Rosa Parks Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6111 Ager Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hyattsville, MD 20782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Sommer</td>
<td>College Park Airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Park Airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1909 Corporal Frank Scott Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Park, MD 20740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmett Hendershot</td>
<td>Paint Branch Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5101 Pierce Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Park, MD 20740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Edwards</td>
<td>University of Maryland Fire and Rescue Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maryland Fire and Rescue Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4500 Paint Branch Parkway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Park, MD 20742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amitabh Varshney</td>
<td>University of Maryland Institute of Advanced Computer Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.V. Williams Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Park, MD 20740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Baker</td>
<td>Chesapeake Bay Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phillip Merrill Environmental Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Herndon Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annapolis, MD 21403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dr. Willie Taylor  
Department of the Interior  
Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance  
Department of the Interior  
1849 C Street, NW (Mail Stop 2340)  
Washington, DC 20240

Jordan Loran  
Maryland Department of Natural Resources  
Maryland Department of Natural Resources  
580 Taylor Avenue  
Annapolis, MD 21401-2352

David Craig  
Maryland Department of Planning  
Maryland Department of Planning  
301 West Preston Street  
Baltimore, MD 21201-2365

Linda Janey  
Maryland Department of Planning  
Maryland Department of Planning  
301 West Preston Street, Suite 1101  
Baltimore, MD 21201-2305

Genevieve LaRouche  
US Fish and Wildlife Service  
Chesapeake Bay Field Office  
US Fish and Wildlife Service  
177 Admiral Cochrane Drive  
Annapolis, MD 21401

Tony Redman  
Maryland Department of Natural Resources  
Integrate Policy and Review Unit  
Maryland Department of Natural Resources  
Tawes State Office Building, B-3  
580 Taylor Ave  
Annapolis, MD 21401

Elder Ghigiarelli  
Maryland Department of the Environment  
Wetlands and Waterway Construction Program  
Maryland Department of the Environment  
1800 Washington Blvd  
Baltimore, MD 21230

John Sarbanes  
House of Representatives  
Marilyn J. Praisner Community Recreation Center  
14906 Old Columbia Pike  
Burtonsville, MD 20866

Barbara Frush  
Maryland House of Delegates, 21st  
House Office Building, Room 364  
6 Bladen Street  
Annapolis, MD 21401

Benjamin Barnes  
House of Delegates, 21st  
House Office Building, Room 151  
6 Bladen Street  
Annapolis, MD 21401

Joseline Pena-Melnyk  
House of Delegates, 21st  
House Office Building, Room 425  
6 Bladen Street  
Annapolis, MD 21401

William Campos  
House of Delegates, 47b  
House Office Building, Room 206  
6 Bladen Street  
Annapolis, MD 21401

Diana Fennell  
House of Delegates, 47A  
House Office Building, Room 209  
6 Bladen Street  
Annapolis, MD 21401

James Tarlau  
House of Delegates, 47 A  
House Office Building, Room 2009  
6 Bladen Street  
Annapolis, MD 21401
Tawanna Gaines  
House of Delegates, 22nd  
House Office Building, Room 363  
6 Bladen Street  
Annapolis, MD 21401

Anne Healey  
House of Delegates, 22nd  
House Office Building, Room 361  
6 Bladen Street  
Annapolis, MD 21401

Alonzo Washington  
House of Delegates, 22nd  
House Office Building, Room 205  
6 Bladen Street  
anapolis, MD 21401

James Rosapepe  
Maryland Senate, 21st  
James Senate Office Building, Rm 314  
11 Bladen Street  
Annapolis, MD 21401

Victor Ramirez  
Maryland Senate, 47th  
James Senate Office Building, Rm 303  
11 Bladen Street  
Annapolis, MD 21401

Paul Pinsky  
State Senate, 22nd  
James Senate Office Building, Rm 220  
11 Bladen Street  
Annapolis, MD 21401

Mike Bolinder  
Anacostia Riverkeeper  
515 M St SE, Suite 218  
Washington, DC 20003

Jodi Rose  
Interfaith Partners for the Chesapeake  
Interfaith Partners for the Chesapeake  
501 Sixth Street  
Annapolis, MD 21403

Leo Brusi  
Land and Commercial, Inc.  
14416 Old Mill Road, Suite 201  
Upper Marlboro, MD 20772

Town of Bladensburg  
4229 Edmonston Road  
Bladensburg, MD 20710

Glenarden City  
8600 Glenarden Parkway  
Glenarden, MD 20706

Greenbelt City  
25 Crescent Road  
Greenbelt, MD 20770

City of Hyattsville  
4310 Gallatin Road  
Hyattsville, MD 20781

Mount Rainier City  
1 Municipal Place  
Mount Rainier, MD 20712
Michele Eastman  
University of Maryland  
1101 Main Administration Building  
College Park, Md 20742

Dr. Margaret Palmer  
University of Maryland  
1 Park Place, Suite 300  
Annapolis, MD 21401

Dr. Karen Prestegaard  
University of Maryland  
Department of Geology  
University of Maryland  
College Park, MD 20742

St John Baptist de la Salle  
5706 Sargent Rd  
Chillum, MD 20782

Riverdale Park  
5008 Queensbury Rd  
Riverdale, MD 20737

Len Carey  
Town of University Park  
6724 Baltimore Ave  
University Park, MD 20782
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Planning Division

NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY

Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration
Anacostia River Watershed, Prince George's County
Feasibility Report and Integrated Environmental Assessment

All Interested Parties: The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District (USACE), in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, has prepared an environmental assessment (EA) recommending a plan for aquatic ecosystem restoration in the Anacostia River watershed in Prince George's County, Maryland. The plan is being conducted in partnership with the Prince George's County Department of the Environment.

Purpose of Work: The purpose of the project is to restore in-stream physical habitat in the selected stream reaches and enhance aquatic ecosystem resilience by restoring fish passage and longitudinal connectivity.

Recommended Plan Description: The recommended plan proposes restoration of approximately 7 miles of in-stream habitat on six stream reaches within Northwest Branch, Sligo Creek, Northeast Branch, Paint Branch, and Indian Creek (see attached map). The plan will restore approximately 4 miles of fish passage, and connect approximately 14 miles of restored habitat. Fish blockages will be removed on Northwest Branch and Sligo Creek, providing anadromous fish species with access to their historical range. Restoration of in-stream habitat and fish blockage removal will utilize natural channel design principles, including the placement of in-stream structures (e.g., J-hooks, cross vanes) for riffle grade control and riffle/pool restoration.

An EA has been prepared for the actions relating to the construction of this project. Potential impacts were assessed with regard to aquatic ecosystem impacts; temporary construction impacts to water, air and traffic; endangered and threatened species; hazardous, toxic and radioactive substances; flooding; cultural resources; and the general needs and welfare of the public.

Any person who has an interest in the project may make comments and/or request a public hearing within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. Comments must clearly set forth the interest that may be adversely affected by this proposed action and the manner in which the interest may be adversely affected. Written comments received on or before this date will become part of the written record and will be considered in the determination of impacts to the environment. We anticipate the EA to result in a finding of no significant impacts.

The draft feasibility report and integrated EA are available for viewing electronically at http://go.usa.gov/cJwx9, and hard copies can be found at the following Prince George's County libraries: Beltsville, Greenbelt, Hyattsville, Mount Rainier, and Bladensburg. Comments will be accepted by email to CENAB-CC@usace.army.mil or by mail to: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District, Attn: Angie Sowers, 10 South Howard Street, Ste. 116000, Baltimore, Maryland 21201.

If you have any questions, please contact Angie Sowers by telephone at (410) 962-7440 or by email to Angela.Sowers@usace.army.mil.

Daniel Bierly
Chief, Civil Project Development Branch
Planning Division

Enclosure
Recommended Plan: NW-C + NE-A

- Study reach proposed for restoration
- Previously restored streams
- Fish blockages proposed for restoration
- Fish passage opened under plan
- Existing USACE channelization
- Natural limit of river herring range

Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

Miles

Study reach proposed for restoration
Previously restored streams
Fish blockages proposed for restoration
Fish passage opened under plan
Existing USACE channelization
Natural limit of river herring range
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AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION  ANACOSTIA RIVER

Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration
Anacostia River Watershed, Prince George's County
Feasibility Report and Integrated Environmental Assessment

All Interested Parties: The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District (USACE), in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, has prepared an environmental assessment (EA) recommending a plan for aquatic ecosystem restoration in the Anacostia River watershed, Prince George's County, Maryland. The plan is being conducted in partnership with the Prince George's County Department of the Environment.

Purpose of Work: The purpose of the project is to restore in-stream physical habitat in the selected stream reaches and enhancing aquatic ecosystem resilience by restoring fish passage and longitudinal connectivity. Any person who has an interest in the project may make comments and/or request a public hearing within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. The draft feasibility report and integrated EA are available for viewing electronically at http://go.usa.gov/cJwx9, and hard copies can be found at the following libraries: Bladensburg, Beltsville, Greenbelt, Hyattsville and Mount Rainier. Comments will be accepted by email to CENAB-CC@usace.army.mil or by mail to: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District, Attn: Angie Sowers, 10 South Howard Street, Ste. 116000, Baltimore, Maryland 21201.
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Baltimore – The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District, in cooperation with Prince George’s County Department of the Environment, is seeking comments for a 30-day period, beginning June 1, 2016, on a plan to restore aquatic habitat in previously-degraded streams along six sites in the Anacostia Watershed in Prince George’s County.

The tentatively selected plan is to restore three sites in the Northwest Branch, through Northwest Branch Park and near the Mall at Prince George’s and down to near Chillum Park; and to restore three sites in the Northeast Branch from south of Interstate Highway 495 North in Berwyn Heights through Indian Creek Park and Anacostia River Park near College Park Airport. The combined restoration will restore approximately 7 miles of in-stream habitat, 4 miles of fish passage on the Northwest Branch, and connect 14 miles of previously-restored habitat from other restoration projects.


The 86-square-mile portion of the Anacostia River watershed in Prince George’s County accounts for almost half of the total watershed area. Human development and alteration in the watershed have led to severe stream habitat damage, including excess sediment and erosion; physical blockages for fish movement; poor water quality; and loss of wetlands and forests along the Anacostia River and its tributaries.

“With our plan, we are hoping to turn some of these problems around,” said Anna Compton, Baltimore District project manager. “Through restoration, we can help the habitat for the critters that live in these streams. As a part of this proposed plan, we hope to increase fish health, movement and spawning areas, and, therefore, increase fish abundance and diversity.”

Historically, the watershed had more than 50 fish species. Now, it is limited to just 20 to 30 fish species.

Poor water quality and degraded habitat adversely affect fish abundance, biomass and diversity in the watershed, according to research. About 95 percent of stream miles in the entire Anacostia River watershed are estimated as falling under very poor to poor categories relating to fish and the invertebrates living at the bottom of the streams.

Alewife and blueback herring are species of concern. They travel from the sea to the river specifically to spawn; however, they are currently only using 10 to 20 percent of their natural range due to blockages and poor habitat.

The proposed plan removes fish blockages on Northwest Branch and Sligo Creek, providing the alewife and blueback herring access to their historical range on Northwest Branch, as well as access to higher-quality...
The proposed habitat restoration will also support diversity and abundance of native fish and other resident fish species.

“This plan provides substantial environmental improvements for the habitat within the recommended sites and contributes to a comprehensive watershed restoration strategy,” noted Adam Ortiz, Prince George’s County, Department of the Environment director. “Beyond the direct environmental benefits, we also hope to connect residents living in these areas back to their streams through recreational fishing and educational opportunities.”

Prince George’s County is the non-federal sponsor for this project. The Corps and the county evenly split the $1.8 million study costs.

Comments will be accepted until July 1, 2016, and may be sent via email to CENAB-CC@usace.army.mil or mail to:

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District
Attn: Angie Sowers
10 South Howard St., Ste. 11000
Baltimore, Md. 21201
* Please have mail postmarked by July 1, 2016.

Following review of the public comments, a more detailed design and plan will be published for public comment in 2017.

“We strive for resilient, cost-effective and sustainable approaches to manage our water-resource challenges,” said Col. Ed Chamberlayne, Baltimore District commander. “We looked at various sites in Prince George’s County to optimize improvements. Through connecting proposed projects to existing restoration projects like at Paint Branch and Northwest Branch, we are able to extend the benefits of these projects, as well as enhance federal investments.”

This plan is in alignment with the 2010 interagency Anacostia Restoration Plan that identified more than 3,000 projects for implementation within the watershed.
Baltimore – Fixing the degraded Anacostia watershed is a daunting task, but the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Prince George’s County Department of the Environment (DOE) are getting their toes in the water on a project designed to help.

On June 1, the agencies opened a month-long period for public comment concerning plans for habitat restoration at six sites in the Northwest Branch of the Anacostia River. The plan is currently in the feasibility study phase, where the Corps is determining where the restoration work could be done.

“We wanted to work where habitat was degraded, but not so degraded that there wasn’t potential for improvement,” said Jacqui Seiple, a geographer at the Army Corps of Engineers Baltimore District and the study manager for the project.
The draft documents available for public viewing and comments mention six potential sites: three in the area near the Mall at Prince Georges and Chillum Park and three near Berwyn Heights, south of 495 North close to Indian Creek Park and the Anacostia River Park near College Park. The Corps’ goal is to restore 6.9 miles of in-stream habitat for fish and macroinvertebrates and 4.3 miles of fish passages that would connect with 13.5 miles of passage restored in previous projects. Seiple said the project targets fish species such as blueback herring and shad whose populations have reached “historical lows” due in part to blockages preventing them from reaching the upper parts of the waterways where they spawn.

In 2010, the Anacostia Restoration Plan included approximately 3,000 projects throughout the 176-mile watershed. Seiple said this was where the Corps began the process of selecting sites.

“We identified ones the Corps could implement on its authority. We also sent out our own teams to evaluate a number of other sites,” she said.

Prince George’s County is home to 86 square miles of the watershed, and the county DOE is the lead non-federal sponsor on the restoration project.

“The thing with the Anacostia River watershed has been going on for decades. The county has been invested in this process for a while. Our main role here is to coordinate with the Corps of Engineers,” said Frank Galosi, project manager at DOE.

Costs – which are estimated to total $37.3 million – will be split 65-35 between the federal government and the county, with some of the county’s payments being in the form of in-kind services. Galosi said the county is budgeting for each phase of the process separately and has already committed the money for this feasibility study phase. That phase is a 50-50 cost-share.

The Corps and the county are seeking public input into the potential impacts to the community of working at the sites selected. Galosi said although no detailed plans have been made as to what the specific restoration work will entail, the draft document is worth reading.

“There is a lot of good information in this draft report. I think there’s a bulk of good information there for people to become educated,” he said.
They welcome feedback from citizens as well as other stakeholders, like the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, which owns land near the sites. Another stakeholder is Anacostia Riverkeeper, an advocacy group focused on protecting and restoring the river. Emily Franc, the riverkeeper there, said the group does plan to submit comments by the June 30 deadline.

“Anacostia Riverkeeper supports past and current restoration plans as outlined in the Anacostia River Watershed Restoration Plan. If followed, this restoration plan provides an effective roadmap for stakeholder engagement and systematic implementation of complementary remedies across the watershed instead of isolated projects,” she said.

Sieple said the project’s timing is opportune because it does allow for the systematic approach Franc advocates.

“Part of the problem in the Anacostia is water quality issues. We as the Corps can fix the habitat problems, but a lot of agencies are working on water quality issues now too. So it is coming at a good time,” she said.

Although the draft documents don’t detail exactly what work will be done, they do state that temporary dams or pumps would be used to drain sections of the river while work is occurring, and the team will use “natural channel design principals” such as step pools, J-hooks and cross vanes.

Franc said her organization supports that type of design.

“We support natural methods of stream flow management such as beaver dams over concrete channels and manufactured weirs,” she said. “Anacostia Riverkeeper is in favor of removing manmade barriers to fish passage and restoring natural stream and floodplain processes as much as is feasible in this densely urban environment.”

To view the draft and leave comments, visit http://go.usa.gov/cJwx9. The deadline for submitting comments is July 1.

Emily is a reporter at The Prince George's Sentinel and covers county and municipal government.

thesencinel-emily@gmail.com
@smithkeleven @thesensinel
D. Compiled Public Comments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lori Byrne - MD DNR Wildlife and Heritage Service</td>
<td>The Wildlife and Heritage Service has determined that there is a record of the state-listed American Brook Lamprey (Lampetra appendix) documented for a portion of the Northwest Branch that overlaps with the project areas numbered 3 &amp; 13 on the map. While the restoration would ultimately benefit this species, we would want to emphasize the need for stringent BMPs for sediment and erosion control so that the likelihood of adverse impacts to this aquatic habitat is reduced.</td>
<td>Section 2.4.4 was updated to reflect the presence of American Brook Lamprey at these sites. Additionally, Sections 4.8 and 5.4.4 were updated to include documentation of the inclusion of BMPs during construction to minimize/avoid impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lori Byrne - MD DNR Wildlife and Heritage Service</td>
<td>The Wildlife and Heritage Service also has a record for state-listed endangered Trailing Stitchwort (Stellaria alsine) occurring within the floodplain of a portion of Indian Creek where the project area numbered 11 is on the map. This may warrant further coordination with us in order to develop protection measures, so that direct impacts may be avoided.</td>
<td>A site assessment was undertaken with MD DNR staff in July 2016, who subsequently provided recommendations to avoid project impacts to Stellaria Alsine. These recommendations were incorporated into the proposed feasibility design for site 11. The designs were sent to MD DNR in July 2017. The report has been edited (Section 5.4.4; Appendix A-7) to describe this and recommendations have been added to the report (Section 4.8). Coordination email have been included in Appendix C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Alvin McNeal/Glenn Ryan - PG MNCPPC</td>
<td>The draft report contains information regarding approaches to habitat improvement and begins to define the proposed scope of work. However, there are also inconsistencies and ambiguities that need to be addressed. For example, the report does not acknowledge, or address recent in-stream improvements - presumably for utility asset protection - that were completed by others on Sligo Creek, Indian Creek and Northeast Branch.</td>
<td>The report (end of Section 1.6) has been updated to include recent improvements and other ongoing work in the watershed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Alvin McNeal/Glenn Ryan - PG MNCPPC</td>
<td>There is no cumulative tracking of all anticipated environmental impacts and the project cost estimate, at initial review, seems to be more than the projected costs for fish passage improvements contained in the Anacostia Watershed Restoration Plan (ARP).</td>
<td>Section 5.6 addresses cumulative impacts in the watershed as required by the National Environmental Policy Act. The project includes more than just fish passage as identified in the ARP. The project is designed to address fish passage as well as in-stream habitat by providing stream bed and bank stability and velocity and depth diversity to meet fish habitat requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Alvin McNeal/Glenn Ryan - PG MNCPPC</td>
<td>The Department of Parks and Recreation anticipates that specific information with regards to the overall scope of work, project timeline, and the itemized impacts to park facilities - including impact to downstream facilities - proposed channel alignments, changes from the pre-to post-design conditions, and similar information will be forthcoming.</td>
<td>Concur. Please see response to Comment 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Alvin McNeal/Glenn Ryan - PG MNCPPC</td>
<td>With any future submittals please provide a comparison table of existing and proposed conditions on all park properties. The table should include acres of Capper Crampton park land and the facilities impacted, distance of stream channel that will be relocated, forested area to be removed, and non-tidal wetland area gained/lost. Mapping should indicate the new channel alignments and show changes in the 10-year and 100-year water surface elevations.</td>
<td>Concur. The feasibility level designs detail the limits of disturbance. Impacts are detailed in the report, Section 5. Modeling was performed to assess changes to water surface elevation and the flood plain (see Appendix E).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Alvin McNeal/Glenn Ryan - PG MNCPPC</td>
<td>With initial project budget estimates indicated that $37.3 million in resources will be required with a 2/3 share being provided by your agency, and 1/3 provided by the Sponsor - in this case Prince George's County - we are curious about how firm the commitment is to implement this project, and what is the projected timeline.</td>
<td>An estimated schedule for the project is shown in Section 4.4 of the report. Once the report is finalized and approved by the agency, implementation is dependent on authorization and appropriations through a Water Resources Development Act (Congress).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Alvin McNeal/Glenn Ryan - PG MNCPPC</td>
<td>The Park Planning Section will be the point of contact for providing information regarding the existing facilities, and the processes that may be necessary with regard to impacting Capper Crampton park lands. Capper Crampton lands ref to lands acquired utilizing federal funding during the acquisition process. As such, changes that impact the Master Plans in these parks will require review by the National Capital Planning Commission in Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>Based in this comment, USACE coordinated with the National Capital Planning Commission. It was their determination that this project does not alter park use and therefore is not within their jurisdiction. Documentation of their comments is included in Appendix C-6. Text was added to the report in Sections 2.5.4 and 5.4.4 to describe this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Alvin McNeal/Glenn Ryan - PG MNCPPC</td>
<td>Before construction starts, a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the three agencies (ACOE, PGDOE, M-NCPPC) may be appropriate. This step is mentioned for planning purposes and future project timelines may need to allow for completion of this effort.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dr. Harriette Phelps, UDC Biology Professor Emeritus</td>
<td>The use of small sediment-trap ponds to block the downstream transport of contaminated suspended sediment is being actively studied at the University of MD and elsewhere, along with contaminated sediment immobilization (see references in Phelps 2015 etc.). It is my suggestion that the USACE Sligo Creek fish habitat study provide funds to study reduction of legacy chlordane contamination in fish and sediment of Sligo Creek. This issue of tributary contaminants appearing in DC fish is presently being investigated by the DC City Council.</td>
<td>We agree that there is merit in furthering the understanding of legacy chlordane contamination in Sligo Creek; however, federal funding provided for this project is not able to be used for research purposes. Text has been added to Section 2.2.3 of the report to identify chlordane contamination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>It is indicated that only in-stream work will be conducted in the area of Paint Branch Creek adjacent to Landfill 3A (LF3A). The landfill was subject to Corrective Action. The &quot;Indirect Impacts&quot; indicated that there may be increased connection of the stream with its floodplain and that groundwater elevations adjacent to the stream could be altered. It is not clear, from reading this section, how the portion of the stream will be restored or how construction in this area may affect any potentially remaining contamination. This is important because groundwater levels adjacent to the creek have been shown to range from 2 to 15 feet below ground surface (bgs), with the creek bed elevation within that range. The contaminants have been shown to be present in low levels; however, EPA recommends that USACE continue to coordinate with EPA to ensure that contaminant levels on LF3A do not increase and that any floodplain reconnection done during restoration does not influence hyporheic exchange such that contaminates are introduced into surface waters of Paint Branch Creek.</td>
<td>Concur. A review of available data and reports, including EPA's &quot;Documentation of Environmental Indicator Determination, Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control, Environmental Indicator (EA) RCRIS code (CA750)&quot;, indicates that groundwater contamination is contained on the landfill site and is not migrating to Paint Branch. The RCRA Facility Investigation results (revised 6 April 2002, prepared by Environmental Resources Management [ERM]), documents that sampling of sediments, surface water and soil samples from Paint Branch did not show any release of Permit-list metals, volatile organic compounds (VOCs) or semivolatile organic compounds (SVOCs), as well as Permit-list VOCs or SVOCs in ground water. Permit-list metals were reported in groundwater. In 1999 ERM re-sampled the Permit-list metals, including PCBs, toxins, and methane, to conclude that groundwater conditions beneath the Paint Branch Landfill Areas do not pose unacceptable risks to human health or the environment. We have also reviewed more recent data (2014), which indicate low concentrations of MTBE at the monitoring well (PW-7) located along Paint Branch (not to be confused with the small tributary - Paint Branch Creek), and concentrations of dissolved hydrocarbons continue to decrease over time. As a result of the above information, we do not believe the restoration project will have an appreciable impact on contamination within or reaching Paint Branch. Coordination has been performed with EPA on this issue (see Appendix C) and text has been added to the report in Section 5.5.7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Marian Dombroski - Prince George's Vice Chair for AWCAC</td>
<td>Some years ago, the name of Brier Ditch Tributary was off officially changed to Briers Mill Run. Much work has been done on this stream by non-profits and citizen groups. They take offense at the continued use of the moniker Brier Ditch. Please change this on the map and report.</td>
<td>Concur. ‘Brier Ditch’ has been changed to ‘Briers Mill Run’ throughout the document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Private citizen</td>
<td>Anacostia Watershed needs this restoration and I am all in for it completely. About time somebody is going to take it on. Thank you so much and keep going. This email is adding my vote as YES for you to do it.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Private citizen</td>
<td>I would just like to put Wells Run up for consideration for future restoration. It is semi-restored in University Park, and then channelized and daylit culverted through Riverdale, until it enters into the NE Branch. I think the daylit culvert section between Rte. 1 and the Trolley Trail, in the middle of a local MNCPPC park, has excellent potential for restoration along the lines of the University Park section.</td>
<td>Comment noted for future opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>James Foster, President, Anacostia Watershed Society</td>
<td>It is of extreme importance to us that stream restoration work be conducted with the least amount on disturbance and impact to wildlife and water quality. Steps to be taken as mentioned in this Draft Report are consistent with acceptable methods to minimize impact and these should be carried out as the top priority. We are pleased that natural channel design principles will be used to restore in-stream physical habitat and that through this process some portions of the tributaries will be reconnected to the floodplain. Fish blockages are a major concern in the watershed. The removal and correction of these would certainly help species of conservation concern such as herring and shad reestablish populations in stream sections identified.</td>
<td>Comment noted. Impacts will be minimized as much as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Greg Golden - MD DNR</td>
<td>The Department is a strong advocate and supporter of Anacostia River and watershed restoration efforts and related initiatives. The Department has contributed to the planning efforts of the Corps by providing responses to scoping letters on fisheries and rare, threatened, and endangered species. We are available for further coordination on these and other natural resource interests, as needed. On resources such as migratory fish spawning runs, coordination may be broadly scoped. On a more specific level, we are available to coordinate on exact sites and sensitive species. An important specific location is Indian Creek near the Greenbelt Metro Station. It is our understanding that there will be additional coordination efforts for the State listed endangered plant, trailing stitchwort, documented in the vicinity of project site 11. A site assessment will help to identify sensitive or important habitat elements and areas at the site, and inform upcoming planning steps so that restoration efforts will maximize protection and long term resilience of the habitat for trailing stitchwort. As discussed, the sensitive habitat features in this case are not static and are more transient, so their protection will be part of an integrated habitat resiliency approach rather than just protection of specific current plant locations determined from one survey. More coordination will occur on habitat elements to be managed for this species.</td>
<td>A site assessment was undertaken with MD DNR staff in July 2016, who subsequently provided recommendations to avoid project impacts to Stellaria Alsine. These recommendations were incorporated into the proposed feasibility design for site 11. The designs were sent to MD DNR in July 2017. The report has been edited (Section 5.4.4; Appendix A-7) to describe this and recommendations have been added to the report (Section 4.8). Coordination email have been included in Appendix C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Greg Golden - MD DNR</td>
<td>We look forward to continued coordination and review as planning and site designs develop further for all the sites. We understand that the Corps intends to have one or more future review phases as plans develop, and we support that effort. In this way, designs are not locked in until adequate planning and agency and public participation occurs to result in the most optimized projects. As is common with many current, larger restoration initiatives, the importance of pre- and post construction monitoring and assessment should receive emphasis throughout the lifespan of the initiative. Adaptive management elements (and contingency approaches in the event of major flow or flooding events during or soon after construction) should also be important components of the planning efforts. And as one of our most important recommendations and advocacy points, project planning should aim to optimize riparian forest vegetation retention and afforestation, and management for native vegetation growth along with invasive species control. These are important factors for all restoration initiatives, but are even more in focus for the Anacostia River system, based on its designation within the State’s Scenic and Wild River Program.</td>
<td>Baseline monitoring was conducted by Tetra Tech in 2015, results of which are included in Appendix A. Post construction monitoring is planned for a period of 10 years following construction. This is detailed within the Monitoring and Adaptive Management Plan (Appendix H). Recommendations have been added to Section 4.8 and 5.4.5 regarding minimization of impacts to riparian vegetation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Private citizen</td>
<td>The project is good news attention to one of our area’s most valuable resources, the Anacostia River watershed. Hopefully, it is the start of a focus of effort to address the entire watershed in Prince George’s County, especially at the convergence of the streams near the District of Columbia line.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Kristy Beard - NOAA</td>
<td>Confirmed inclusion of the time of year restrictions for anadromous fish. No additional comments.</td>
<td>Comment noted. Time of year restrictions are documented in the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>PG Soil Conservation District</td>
<td>This is a most worthwhile effort in that watershed and the District is prepared to offer our technical assistance throughout the process.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Kristy Beard - NOAA</td>
<td>NMFS Greater Atlantic Region received the proposed report of the Chief of Engineers and the report of the district engineer on the Anacostia Watershed Restoration Project in Prince George's County, MD. We lack staff time to review and comment on the report. Please keep us updated as the project progresses.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Michael E. Noble - DOI</td>
<td>The Department of the Interior (Department) has reviewed the Draft Chief of Engineers Report regarding the Anacostia Watershed Restoration Project - Prince George's County Maryland. The Department as no comments to submit.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 23        | Aaron Blair - EPA         | EPA understands the purpose of the project and need to improve the degraded aquatic ecosystems in the Anacostia Watershed. The described recommended plan provides an effective means of accomplishing the purpose and need for the project with minimal impact to human health and the environment. We have one comment regarding agency coordination and existing stream restoration in the watershed. As this assessment covered a broad area, that being the entire Anacostia River watershed, it would be helpful to identify those existing stream restorations that have been implemented in the watershed beyond those conducted by USACE. In design phases and in future studies, it may be helpful to include coordination with local watershed groups as well as National Marine Fisheries Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service which may help identify the locations, designs, and effectiveness of previously implemented stream restoration in the project study area. Analysis of these existing projects may help inform design and implementation of stream restoration. Thank you for providing EPA with the opportunity to review this project. | Noted - We appreciate the review and comment.  

NOTE: This project was a spin-off from the Anacostia Restoration Plan (ARP). Extensive coordination with agencies and the public, including watershed groups, was performed during development of the ARP, including to identify existing projects and possible opportunities for restoration. Similar and other required coordination was conducted for this study, as discussed in Section 5.8 and Appendices C and D of the report. |
E. Submitted Public Comments
This page intentionally left blank
Dear Mr. Furney,

The Wildlife and Heritage Service has determined that there is a record of the state-listed American Brook Lamprey (Lampetra appendix) documented for a portion of the Northwest Branch that overlaps with the project areas numbered 3 & 13 on the map. While the restoration would ultimately benefit this species, we would want to emphasize the need for stringent BMPs for sediment and erosion control so that the likelihood of adverse impacts to this aquatic habitat is reduced.

The Wildlife and Heritage Service also has a record for state-listed endangered Trailing Stitchwort (Stellaria alsine) occurring within the floodplain of a portion of Indian Creek where the project area numbered 11 is on the map. This may warrant further coordination with us in order to develop protection measures, so that direct impacts may be avoided.

I realize the comment period had closed, but we will likely be submitting similar comments in the next phase of review for this project. Thanks for the opportunity to review and comment.

Lori Byrne

On Thu, Jul 7, 2016 at 9:39 AM, Furney, Frederick V NAB <FREDERICK.V.FURNEY@usace.army.mil> wrote:

All interested parties:

Just a reminder email that the comment period has closed on the above referenced study.

If you have any questions, please contact Angie Sowers by telephone at (410) 962-7440 or by email to Angela.Sowers@usace.army.mil.

Fred Furney
10 S. Howard Street
Baltimore, MD 21201
410-962-6136
Please find attached the Notice of Availability for the Anacostia Watershed Restoration, Prince George's County, Maryland, Feasibility Report and Integrated Environmental Assessment (EA). The draft feasibility report and integrated EA are available for viewing electronically at Blockedhttp://go.usa.gov/cJwx9, and hard copies can be found at the following Prince George's County libraries: Beltsville, Greenbelt, Hyattsville, Mount Rainier, and Bladensburg. Comments will be accepted until July 1, 2016. Please send comments by email to CENAB-CC@usace.army.mil or by mail to: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District, Attn: Angie Sowers, 10 South Howard Street, Ste. 116000, Baltimore, Maryland 21201.

If you have any questions, please contact Angie Sowers by telephone at (410) 962-7440 or by email to Angela.Sowers@usace.army.mil.

Thank you,

Fred Furney
10 S. Howard Street
Baltimore, MD 21201
410-962-6136

--

Lori A. Byrne
Environmental Review Coordinator

MD DNR
Wildlife and Heritage Service
Tawes State Office Building
410-260-8573

**Please use my new email address lori.byrne@maryland.gov**
June 30, 2016

Angela Sowers,
Integrated Water Resources Management Specialist
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District
10 South Howard Street, Ste. 116000
Baltimore, Maryland 21201.

RE: Anacostia Watershed Restoration, Prince George’s County, Maryland
Study and Integrated Environmental Assessment – Draft Report

Dear Ms. Sowers:

This is in response to your request to provide comments regarding the Draft Ecosystem Restoration Feasibility Study and Integrated Environmental Assessment for the Anacostia Watershed Restoration project. The report provides information about six stream reaches in Prince George’s County that are currently under consideration by your agency and the Prince George’s County Department of the Environment (DOE) for efforts related to habitat improvement. While each of the six project areas target streams that travel through land owned by the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, the stream channels, and the adjacent lands have reportedly been altered over time for flood control purposes. The report indicates a long-standing involvement and oversight by your agency in the Anacostia Watershed, particularly with these flood control initiatives including, but not limited to, a variety of post-construction maintenance efforts.

The draft report contains information regarding approaches to habitat improvement and begins to define the proposed scope of work. However, there are also inconsistencies and ambiguities that need to be addressed. For example, the report does not acknowledge, or address recent in-stream improvements – presumably for utility asset protection - that were completed by others on Sligo Creek, Indian Creek and the Northeast Branch. Likewise, there is no cumulative tracking of all anticipated environmental impacts and the project cost estimate, at initial review, seems to be more than the projected costs for fish passage improvements contained in the Anacostia Watershed Restoration Plan (ARP).

Since Prince George’s County is the project sponsor, we assume impacts to the important flood control facilities as a result of the proposed habitat improvements will be carefully scrutinized. As such, we are anticipating that Prince George’s County’s DOE will work with you to provide detailed and appropriate comments pertaining to the report content. Additionally, we assume that all stakeholders will review the report, plans and provide input. The Department of Parks and Recreation anticipates that specific information with regards to the overall scope of work, project timeline, and the itemized impacts to park facilities – including impact to downstream facilities - proposed channel alignments, changes from the pre- to post- design conditions, and similar information will be forthcoming.
With any future submittals please provide a comparison table of existing and proposed conditions on all park properties. The table should include acres of Capper Cramton park land and the facilities impacted, distance of stream channel that will be relocated, forested area to be removed, and non-tidal wetland area gained/lost. Mapping should indicate the new channel alignments and show changes in the 10-year and 100-year water surface elevations. With initial project budget estimates indicating that $375.3 million in resources will be required with a 1/3 share being provided by your agency, and 1/3 provided by the Sponsor – in this case Prince George’s County - we are curious about how firm the commitment is to implement this project, and what is the projected timeline.

The Park Planning Section will be the point of contact for providing information regarding the existing facilities, and the processes that may be necessary with regard to impacting Capper Cramton park lands. Capper Cramton lands refer to lands acquired utilizing federal funding during the acquisition process. As such, changes that impact the Master Plans in these parks will require review by the National Capital Planning Commission in Washington, D.C. To facilitate your project, we have enclosed exhibits that show the Capper Cramton park lands in the vicinity of the six proposed stream channel designs. Additionally, we have provided a list of developed facilities located in these parks. (Please contact my office should you require detailed or digital mapping of these areas.)

As a follow-up to this letter, Park Planning and Development Division will initiate discussions with the Prince George’s County DOE to obtain supplementary information regarding the proposed project scheduling milestones for design, permitting and construction phasing. Prioritization models and discussions relating to overall project budget, and real estate costs will also be requested. Finally, before construction starts, a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the three agencies (ACOE, PGDOE, M-NCPPC) may be appropriate. This step is mentioned for planning purposes and future project timelines may need to allow for completion of this effort.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. The Draft Report for the Anacostia Watershed Restoration – Ecosystem Restoration Feasibility Study and Integrated Environmental Assessment is another step in the region-wide interest to improve our local waterways.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Alvin R. McNeal  
Acting Division Chief  
Park Planning and Development Division

Enclosures

C: Sonja Ewing  
Frank Galosi  
Trevor Bourne  
Eileen Nivera  
Laura Connelly
This is an impressive and well-presented Plan to restore aquatic habitat in streams at six Anacostia Watershed sites in Prince Georges County. It could be used to address the legacy sources of the USA Priority Pollutant Chlordane found in Sligo Creek (Phelps 2015, attached). Chlordane is a serious PBT contaminant because it can bioaccumulate to harmful levels in fish-eating animals like birds, fish and man. Chlordane is responsible for warnings on the consumption of recreational fish in the District of Columbia. An active biomonitoring study using Corbicula clams found five Anacostia River subtributaries contained sites with bioavailable Technical Chlordane exceeding the USEPA Priority Pollutant maximum of 400 ug/gm. All tributary sites with high chlordane also had high heptachlor epoxide, indicating legacy sources. Sligo Creek biomonitoring below a sediment trap pond found the bioaccumulated chlordane was at reference level indicating chlordane was being transported by suspended sediment which was blocked by the sediment trap pond, as reported for other stream pollutants. High chlordane reappeared following the entrance of a small urban subtributary. High chlordane with heptachlor epoxide apparently originating in two Sligo Creek urban locations suggests legacy chlordane stream dump sites possibly dating back to the 1980 ban on use of chlordane for termite control.

Our most recent study on the link among MD legacy chlordane and DC food fish "Sources of Chlordane in Anacostia River Fish" (Phelps 2016, attached) verified chlordane contamination of Anacostia tributary minnows along with chlordane bioaccumulation in perch fished at the upstream tidal Anacostia Bladensburg Marina (Phelps 2016, attached). But in the Anacostia River near Washington DC highest chlordane (210 ug/gm) was found in the small gizzard shad which migrates upstream in spring with other herring but not fished due to small size and reputedly bad taste. Gizzard shad have small downpointing mouths and feed on organisms in surface sediment and also are a favorite food of DC food fish. The additional presence of heptachlor epoxide indicated chlordane-contaminated DC surface sediment from MD tributary sources including Sligo Creek as the likely source of DC fish chlordane contamination via the gizzard shad link.

The use of small sediment-trap ponds to block the downstream
transport of contaminated suspended sediment is being actively studied at the University of MD and elsewhere, along with contaminated sediment immobilization (see references in Phelps 2015 etc). It is my suggestion that the USACE Sligo Creek fish habitat study provide funds to study reduction of legacy chlordane contamination in fish and sediment of Sligo Creek. This issue of tributary contaminants appearing in DC fish is presently being investigated by the DC City Council.

Sincerely,

Harriette Phelps

--
Dr. Harriette Phelps
UDC Biology Professor Emeritus
45N Ridge Road, Greenbelt MD 20770
301-441-2207
hphelps@hers.com
Blockedhttp://www.his.com/~hphelps/
June 30, 2016

Ms. Angie Sowers
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District
10 South Howard Street, Ste. 116000
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

Re: Anacostia Watershed Restoration, Prince George’s County, Maryland Ecosystem Restoration Feasibility Study and Integrated Environmental Assessment

Dear Ms. Sowers:

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed the Anacostia Watershed Restoration, Prince George’s County, Maryland Ecosystem Restoration Feasibility Study and Integrated Environmental Assessment (EA). The EA was developed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Baltimore District, to comply with the requirements of the NEPA. The proposed project addresses the significant degradation of aquatic ecosystems in the Anacostia Watershed, a main priority of the Chesapeake Bay Program for restoration in the Bay watershed.

The purpose of the study is to restore ecological function, structure, and health in the Anacostia River watershed in Prince George’s County, which supports the goals of the Anacostia River Watershed Restoration Plan (ARP) and the Chesapeake Bay Restoration Executive Order (EO 13508).

The EA presents the no action alternative and two design alternatives (Alternative 2a and Alternative 2c). Both action alternatives include the same major components of action and include natural channel design measures, in-stream habitat improvement, stream restoration, floodplain reconnection, stream relocation, partial removal of concrete in channelized stream reaches, daylight pipes, fish passage provision at blockages, and invasive plant species removal. The only difference between the two action alternatives is that Alternative 2C does not stipulate that concrete be altered. Six tributary reaches were selected for restoration and categorized into two branches, the Northwest Branch and Northeast Branch, for which each has a different design alternative. This compilation of Northwest Branch Alternative 2C (NW-C) and Northeast Branch
Alternative 2A (NE-A) combine to make Plan NW-C + NE-A which is the Tentatively Selected Plan (TSP). The TSP is the recommended plan for implementation of aquatic ecosystem restoration to restore in-stream habitat and fish passage in the six selected stream reaches in the Anacostia River watershed in Prince George’s County.

EPA understands the purpose of the project and need to improve the degraded aquatic ecosystems in the Anacostia Watershed. The described alternatives provide an effective means of accomplishing the purpose and need of the project with minimal impact to human health and the environment. EPA has a comment regarding a former hazardous site, presented below:

In the “Direct Impacts” section of Hazardous, Toxic, and Radioactive Waste, it is indicated that only in-stream work will be conducted in the area of Paint Branch Creek adjacent to Landfill 3A (LF3A). The landfill was subject to Corrective Action. The “Indirect Impacts” indicate that there may be increased connection of the stream with its floodplain and that groundwater elevations adjacent to the stream could be altered.

It is not clear, from reading this section, how the portion of the stream will be restored or how construction in this area may affect any potentially remaining contamination. This is important because groundwater levels adjacent to the creek have been shown to range from 2 to 15 feet below ground surface (bgs), with the creek bed elevation within that range. The contaminants have been shown to be present in low levels; however, EPA recommends that USACE continue to coordinate with EPA to ensure that contaminant levels on LF3A do not increase and that any floodplain reconnection done during restoration does not influence hyporheic exchange such that contaminates are introduced into surface waters of Paint Branch Creek.

Thank you for providing EPA with the opportunity to review this project. If you have questions regarding these comments, the staff contact for this project is Aaron Blair; he can be reached at 215-814-2748.

Sincerely,

Barbara Rudnick
NEPA Team Leader
Office of Environmental Programs
Some years ago, the name of Brier Ditch Tributary was officially changed to Briers Mill Run. Much work has been done on this stream by non-profits and citizen groups. They take offence at the continued use of the moniker Brier Ditch. Please change this on the map and report. This is not a comment, we are pointing out an error.

Thanks,
Marian Dombroski
Prince George's Vice Chair for AWAC.

On Thu, Jul 7, 2016 at 9:39 AM, Furney, Frederick V NAB <FREDERICK.V.FURNEY@usace.army.mil> wrote:

All interested parties:

Just a reminder email that the comment period has closed on the above referenced study.

If you have any questions, please contact Angie Sowers by telephone at (410) 962-7440 <tel:%28410%29%20962-7440> or by email to Angela.Sowers@usace.army.mil <mailto:Angela.Sowers@usace.army.mil>.

Fred Furney
10 S. Howard Street
Baltimore, MD 21201
410-962-6136 <tel:410-962-6136>

-----Original Message-----
From: Furney, Frederick V NAB
Sent: Wednesday, June 01, 2016 10:47 AM
To: Seiple, Jacqueline A NAB <Jacqueline.A.Seiple@usace.army.mil> ; Sowers, Angela NAB <Angela.Sowers@usace.army.mil>
Subject: Anacostia Watershed Restoration, Prince George's County Environmental Assessment Notice of Availability

All interested parties:

Please find attached the Notice of Availability for the Anacostia Watershed Restoration, Prince George's County, Maryland, Feasibility Report and Integrated Environmental Assessment (EA). The draft feasibility report and integrated EA are available for viewing electronically at Blockedhttp://go.usa.gov/cJwx9, and hard copies can be found at the following Prince George's County libraries: Beltsville, Greenbelt, Hyattsville, Mount Rainier, and Bladensburg. Comments will be accepted until July 1, 2016. Please send comments by email to CENAB-CC@usace.army.mil <mailto:CENAB-CC@usace.army.mil> or by mail to: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District, Attn: Angie Sowers, 10 South Howard Street, Ste. 116000, Baltimore, Maryland 21201.

If you have any questions, please contact Angie Sowers by telephone at (410) 962-7440
Thank you,

Fred Furney
10 S. Howard Street
Baltimore, MD 21201
410-962-6136

--

Marian Dombroski, RA, LEED AP
301.775.1191
[EXTERNAL] Anacostia Watershed needs this restoration and I am all for it completely. About time somebody is going to take it on. Thank you so much and keep going. This email is adding my vote as YES for you to do it.
Sarah,

For your information.

Clem

-----Original Message-----
From:
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2016 2:30 PM
To: Corporate Communication Office-NAB <CENAB-CC@usace.army.mil>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Anacostia Restoration, PG County

Hello -

I am trying to look at your report while my son naps, and realize I will not even be able to scratch the surface. I would just like to put Wells Run up for consideration for future restoration. It is semi-restored in University Park, and then channelized and daylit culverted through Riverdale, until it enters into the NE Branch. I think the daylit culvert section between Rte. 1 and the Trolley Trail, in the middle of a local MNCPPC park, has excellent potential for restoration along the lines of the University Park section.

Thanks for your hard work,
July 6, 2016

Ms. Angie Sowers  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District  
10 South Howard Street, Suite 11000  
Baltimore, MD 21201  

Sent via email to CENAB-CC@usace.army.mil

Re: Ecosystem Restoration Feasibility Study and Integrated Environmental Assessment Draft Report – Anacostia Watershed Restoration, Prince George’s County, Maryland

Dear Ms. Sowers:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Ecosystem Restoration Feasibility Study and Integrated Environmental Assessment Draft Report for the restoration of aquatic habitats in the Anacostia River watershed in Prince George’s County. We appreciate the collaborative effort between the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Prince George’s County Department of the Environment to identify solutions to degraded and problematic stream systems. This proposed work is critical to returning the Anacostia River to a fishable and swimmable state per the Clean Water Act, the primary mission of the Anacostia Watershed Society.

It is of extreme importance to us that stream restoration work be conducted with the least amount on disturbance and impact to wildlife and water quality. Steps to be taken as mentioned in this Draft Report are consistent with acceptable methods to minimize impact and these should be carried out as the top priority.

We are pleased that natural channel design principles will be used to restore in-stream physical habitat and that through this process some portions of the tributaries will be reconnected to the floodplain. Fish blockages are a major concern in the watershed. The removal and correction of these would certainly help species of conservation concern such as herring and shad reestablish populations in stream sections identified.

We look forward to the implementation of this plan and continued partnerships to ensure the restoration of the Anacostia River and its tributaries.

Sincerely,

James R. Foster
President
The Project Review Division of the Maryland Department of Natural Resources has reviewed the Notice of Availability and the associated documents for the Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration, Anacostia River Watershed, Prince George's County, Feasibility Report and Integrated Environmental Assessment.

The Department is a strong advocate and supporter of Anacostia River and watershed restoration efforts and related initiatives. Our work in the watershed includes involvement, often within interagency and public partnerships, in managing and monitoring various important natural resources within the watershed, including but not limited to coldwater streams, migratory anadromous fish, forest resources, and rare and sensitive species. The Department is also often involved in various ways with restoration projects and programs.

We are very supportive of the current US Army Corps of Engineers efforts and approaches described in the subject Feasibility Report and Environmental Assessment. We agree that fish passage restoration and related enhancement of ecosystem resilience are important factors in Anacostia River environmental planning. The proposed restoration areas will be important additions and connections to other past, present and future restoration reaches in the watershed. Specifically, the stream reaches within Northwest Branch, Sligo Creek, Northeast Branch, Paint Branch, and Indian Creek, each have their specific significance in a watershed approach to restoration. We agree that natural channel design principles, riffle grade controls, and riffle/pool restoration are advantageous approaches. A number of riffle grade control projects for fish passage enhancement were completed in the Anacostia watershed for the Woodrow Wilson Bridge project, and these efforts provided a significant foundation and catalyst for additional fish passage efforts, which are still very much needed in pinpointed locations of the watershed to further enhance re-open passage opportunities and eventually help strengthen anadromous fish spawning success.

The Department has contributed to the planning efforts of the Corps by providing responses to scoping letters on fisheries and rare, threatened, and endangered species. We are available for further coordination on these and other natural resource interests, as needed. On resources such as migratory fish spawning runs, coordination may be broadly scoped. On a more specific level, we are available to coordinate on exact sites and sensitive species. An important specific location is Indian Creek near the Greenbelt Metro Station. It is our understanding that there will be additional coordination efforts for the State listed endangered plant, trailing stitchwort, documented in the vicinity of project site 11. A site assessment will help to identify sensitive or important habitat elements and areas at the site, and inform upcoming planning steps so that restoration efforts will maximize protection and long term resilience of the habitat for trailing stitchwort. As discussed, the sensitive habitat features in this case are not static and are more transient, so their protection will be part of an integrated habitat resiliency approach rather than just protection of specific current plant locations determined from one survey. More coordination will occur on habitat elements to be managed for this species.

We look forward to continued coordination and review as planning and site designs develop further for all the sites. We understand that the Corps intends to have one or more future review phases as plans develop, and we support that effort. In this way, designs are not locked in until adequate planning and and agency and public participation occurs to result in the most optimized projects. As is common with many current, larger restoration initiatives, the importance of pre- and post construction monitoring and assessment should receive emphasis throughout the lifespan of the initiative. Adaptive management elements (and contingency approaches in the event of major flow or flooding events during or soon after construction) should also be important components of the planning efforts. And as one of our most important recommendations and advocacy points, project planning should aim to optimize riparian forest vegetation retention and afforestation, and management for native vegetation growth along with invasive species control. These are important factors for all restoration initiatives, but are even more in focus for the Anacostia River system, based on its designation within the State's Scenic and Wild River Program.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment at the current planning stage.
If you have any questions on the comments above, please contact me at your convenience.

Greg Golden  
Project Review Division  
Integrated Policy and Review Unit  
MD Department of Natural Resources  
410-260-8331 <tel:410-260-8331>

please note my new email address:  greg.golden@maryland.gov <mailto:greg.golden@maryland.gov>
The project is good news attention to one of our area’s most valuable resources, the Anacostia River watershed. Hopefully, it is the start of a focus of effort to address the entire watershed in Prince George’s County, especially at the convergence of the streams near the District of Columbia line.

Cheverly, MD
Hi Angie,

Thanks for including the time of year restrictions for anadromous fish. Just wanted to let you know I don't have any additional comments.

Have a great long weekend!
Kristy

---------- Forwarded message ----------

From: Furney, Frederick V NAB <FREDERICK.V.FURNEY@usace.army.mil>
Date: Wed, Jun 1, 2016 at 10:46 AM
Subject: Anacostia Watershed Restoration, Prince George's County Environmental Assessment Notice of Availability

To: "Seiple, Jacqueline A NAB" <Jacqueline.A.Seiple@usace.army.mil>, "Sowers, Angela NAB" <Angela.Sowers@usace.army.mil>

All interested parties:

Please find attached the Notice of Availability for the Anacostia Watershed Restoration, Prince George's County, Maryland, Feasibility Report and Integrated Environmental Assessment (EA). The draft feasibility report and integrated EA are available for viewing electronically at Blockedhttp://go.usa.gov/cJwx9, and hard copies can be found at the following Prince George's County libraries: Beltsville, Greenbelt, Hyattsville, Mount Rainier, and Bladensburg. Comments will be accepted until July 1, 2016. Please send comments by email to CENAB-CC@usace.army.mil or by mail to: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District, Attn: Angie Sowers, 10 South Howard Street, Ste. 116000, Baltimore, Maryland 21201.

If you have any questions, please contact Angie Sowers by telephone at (410) 962-7440 or by email to Angela.Sowers@usace.army.mil.

Thank you,

Fred Furney
10 S. Howard Street
Baltimore, MD 21201
410-962-6136

Thank you,

Fred Furney
10 S. Howard Street
Baltimore, MD 21201
410-962-6136

--

Kristy Beard
Marine Habitat Resource Specialist
Habitat Conservation Division
Good morning Ms. Angie,

I was just reading through the news release regarding public comment on the Anacostia Watershed Restoration Project.

We will review and offer comments if prudent.

This is a most worthwhile effort in that watershed and the District is prepared to offer our technical assistance throughout the process.

Please call upon myself or Mr. John Tarr-District Engineer if we can be of service.

Kind regards,

Steve

Steven E. Darcey, CPESC
Executive Director
Prince George’s Soil Conservation District
5301 Marlboro Race Track Road
Upper Marlboro, MD 20772
301-574-5162 x3
pgscd.org
Hi Jeff,

NMFS Greater Atlantic Region received the proposed report of the Chief of Engineers and the report of the district engineer on the Anacostia Watershed Restoration Project in Prince George's County, MD. We lack staff time to review and comment on the report. Please keep us updated as the project progresses.

Thanks!
Kristy

--
Kristy Beard
Marine Habitat Resource Specialist
Habitat Conservation Division
NOAA Fisheries
177 Admiral Cochrane Drive
Annapolis, MD 21401
410-573-4542
United States Department of the Interior
Office of the Secretary
Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance
1849 C Street, NW - MS 5538 - MIB
Washington, D.C. 20240

AUG 29 2018

ER 18/0358

Mr. Joseph H. Redican
Acting Chief, Planning and Policy Division
Directorate of Civil Works
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
CECW-P (SA)
7701 Telegraph Road
Alexandria, VA 22315-3860

Re: Anacostia Watershed Restoration Project – Draft Chief of Engineers Report

Dear Mr. Redican:

The Department of the Interior (Department) has reviewed the Draft Chief of Engineers Report regarding the Anacostia Watershed Restoration Project - Prince George's County, Maryland. The Department has no comments to submit.

For questions or further information regarding this response, please contact Cheryl Kelly on my Environmental Review Team, at 202-208-7565 or at cheryl_kelly@ios.doi.gov.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Michaela E. Noble
Director, Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance

Electronic distribution: Jeff Trulick, jeff.trulick@usace.army.mil

cc: Lindy Nelson, REO Philadelphia, lindy_nelson@ios.doi.gov
Patricia Bee, USACE: patricia.l.bee@usace.army.mil

TRANSMITTED ELECTRONICALLY – NO HARDCOPY TO FOLLOW
Ms. Sowers and Ms. Seiple -

Below is EPA Region III’s comment on the Anacostia Stream Restoration EA Final Report:

EPA understands the purpose of the project and need to improve the degraded aquatic ecosystems in the Anacostia Watershed. The described recommended plan provides an effective means of accomplishing the purpose and need of the project with minimal impact to human health and the environment. We have one comment regarding agency coordination and existing stream restorations in the watershed. As this assessment covered a broad area, that being the entire Anacostia River watershed, it would be helpful to identify those existing stream restorations that have been implemented in the watershed beyond those conducted by USACE. In design phases and in future studies, it may be helpful to include coordination with local watershed groups as well as National Marine Fisheries Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service which may help identify the locations, designs, and effectiveness of previously implemented stream restorations in the project study area. Analysis of these existing projects may help inform design and implementation of stream restoration.

Thank you for providing EPA with the opportunity to review this project. If you have questions regarding these comments please contact myself at 215-814-2748 or Kevin Magerr at 215-814-5724.

Best,

Aaron

Aaron Blair
Physical Scientist
U.S. EPA Mid-Atlantic Region 3
Environmental Assessment and Innovation Division
1650 Arch Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
215-814-2748