Welcome / Sign-in Area

Board 1:

Welcome

Welcome to the Online Public Workshop for the I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study.

The boards presented in this online virtual meeting are the same boards displayed at the Spring 2019 Public Workshops held on April 11th, 13th, 23rd, 24th, 25th, and 27th and on May 14th and 16th. At these meetings, project staff members were stationed at each board to answer questions. Since you are reviewing this meeting online, we are offering this narrated version of the display boards for your information.

We welcome your comments on the study including the recommended Alternatives Retained for Detailed Study. At the end of this Online Public Workshop, information on how to submit your comments is provided. Persons requiring assistance to participate in the online public workshop, should contact the project toll-free number at 833-858-5960.

Station 1: Study Overview

Station 1 includes boards that provide a study overview by presenting information on the purpose of the Spring 2019 Public Workshops, the program need, traffic congestion, the P3 Program, and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process.

Board 2:

Purpose of Today's Public Workshop

This Managed Lanes Study is an Environmental Study which is the main topic of this online Public Workshop. The I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study is being conducted in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (known as NEPA) as well as other applicable federal and state environmental regulations.

This Online Public Workshop will:

- Present the engineering, traffic, and environmental analyses for the Screened Alternatives; and
- Present the recommendations for the Alternatives Retained for Detailed Study (ARDS) in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Future meetings will focus on the content included in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Board 3

Program Need: *Address Existing and Future Traffic Congestion*

Traffic congestion limits economic growth opportunities and diminishes the quality of life for Marylanders.

Ninety-eight percent (98%) of Maryland's weekday congestion occurs in the Baltimore/Washington region resulting in a loss of 87 hours and $2,000 annually.

According to the Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration (MDOT SHA) 2017 Mobility Report, congestion in the Maryland National Capital Region in 2016 cost $1.3 billion dollars, a 33% increase from 2013.

In the graphic on the right, you can see the Average Annual Daily Traffic volumes on I-495 and I-270 in 2018 and the projected volumes on both roadways in 2025 and 2040.

Board 4

Program Need: *Address Existing and Future Traffic Congestion*

The top five highest volume highway sections in Maryland are within the program area. On average, severe congestion lasts for seven hours each day on I-270 and ten hours each day on I-495.

The program area includes several of the most unreliable highway sections in Maryland because of the highly variable travel times from one day to the next. Many sections of I-495 and I-270 experience travel speeds less than 15 miles per hour under existing conditions and traffic is expected to to get worse.

The maps on the right show the travel speed within the program area at 5 PM in 2018 and in 2040. As shown in the legend: black represents speeds from 0 to 15 miles per hour, red represents speeds from 15 to 30 miles per hour, orange represents speeds from 30 to 45 miles per hour, yellow represents speeds from 45 to 60 miles per hour, and green represents speeds over 60 miles per hour.

By 2040, traffic during the pm peak period on the Capital Beltway will be congested the entire length in Maryland along with segments along northbound and southbound I-270.

Board 5

I-495 & I-270 P3 Program

The I-495 & I-270 Public-Private Partnership, or P3 Program, includes over 70 miles of highway improvements:

The first study, referred to as the I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study, is estimated at 48 miles in length and is the focus of the current NEPA study and this online virtual meeting

Future NEPA studies will be conducted covering I-270 from I-370 to I-70 and I-495 from MD 5 to the Woodrow Wilson Bridge.

The Virginia Department of Transportation, also known as VDOT, is conducting an environmental study referred to as the I-495 Northern Extension or NEXT project that is independent from this study. VDOT's project extends their Express Lanes 2.5 miles north to the American Legion Bridge.

The map to the right shows the limits of the entire I-495 and I-270 P3 Program in purple, the I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study portion in blue, the future I-270 NEPA study in green, the future I-495 NEPA study from MD 5 to the Woodrow Wilson Bridge in light blue, VDOT's I-495 NEXT Project in dark blue, VDOT's I-495 and I-95 Existing Express Toll Lanes in dashed dark blue, and VDOT's I-495 Untolled Lanes in dotted dark blue.

Board 6

The NEPA Environmental Process

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 requires federal agencies to evaluate the environmental effects of their proposed actions. The following steps, as detailed on this board, describe the I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study NEPA Process:

Step 1 was the initiation of the NEPA Process and included the development of the Purpose and Need for the project, collection of existing data within the project study corridor including the locations of parks, wetlands, streams, and other environmental features, as well as agency and public scoping meetings. This step of the process occurred in Spring 2018.

Step 2 included the development of the preliminary range of alternatives, identification of the alternatives screening criteria, and analysis of the existing conditions within the project study corridor using the data collected in Step 1. This step of the process was completed in Summer 2018.

Step 3 includes the alternatives analysis. The alternatives screening criteria are used to evaluate each alternative in the preliminary range of alternatives and narrow the range down to the Alternatives Retained for Detailed Study (ARDS). The environmental effects of each of the ARDS will be analyzed. These activities began in Fall 2018 and have continued through Spring 2019. The results of Step 3 are being presented as part of the Spring 2019 Public Workshops and this virtual online public meeting.

Step 4 includes the preparation of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, or DEIS. The Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration (MDOT SHA) will identify the recommended preferred alternative in the DEIS. The DEIS will document the alternatives analysis, environmental effects, conceptual mitigation, decision-making process, public input, and agency coordination that has been performed to date on the ARDS. The DEIS will be published and public hearings will be held as part of Step 4 of the I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study NEPA Process. The activities in this step began in Spring 2019 and are expected to be completed in Early Winter 2020.

Step 5 includes the preparation of the combined Final Environmental Impact Statement / Record of Decision, or FEIS/ROD. The comments received on the DEIS will be reviewed and responses developed for inclusion in the FEIS/ROD. The combined FEIS/ROD will be published during this step of the process. This step is scheduled to be complete in the Fall of 2020.

Step 6 includes the issuance of the federal permits and approvals that would be needed to construct the selected alternative in the FEIS / ROD. This step is scheduled to be complete during Winter 2021 to Winter 2022.

Public input is solicited and welcomed through the duration of the I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study NEPA Environmental Process.

Board 7

Station 2: Alternatives Process

Station 2 includes boards to provide information on the project Purpose and Need, Alternatives Screening Criteria, Alternatives Screening Process and Alternatives Development, the Recommended Alternatives Retained for Detailed Study, transit and multimodal considerations, and benefits of Express Toll Lanes or ETLs and High Occupancy Toll or HOT Lanes.

<u>Purpose & Need</u>

The purpose of the I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study is to develop a travel demand management solution or solutions that addresses congestion, improves trip reliability on I-495 and I-270 within the study limits and enhances existing and planned multimodal mobility and connectivity.

The needs identified for this study are to Accommodate existing traffic and long-term traffic growth, Enhance trip reliability, Provide additional roadway travel choices, Accommodate Homeland Security, and Improve movement of goods and services.

Additional goals of this study include incorporating funding sources for financial viability and developing the study in an environmentally responsible manner.

Board 8

Screening Criteria

Six screening criteria were used to evaluate, screen, and refine the Preliminary Range of Alternatives to the seven Screened Alternatives and then used to identify the ARDS. These criteria were based on the transportation needs and goals outlined in the study's Purpose and Need and applied to each alternative:

The engineering criteria considered were

- Accommodating existing traffic and long-term traffic growth
- Enhancing travel time reliability
- Providing additional roadway travel choice while retaining the general-purpose lanes
- Evaluating complex operating configurations that lead to driver confusion

The Homeland Security criteria considered were

- Accommodating Homeland Security by providing additional capacity to assist in accommodating population evacuation and the ability to quickly coordinate a traffic response by allowing use by emergency responders

The Financial Viability criteria considered were

- Evaluating potential construction costs compared to potential traffic in managed lanes

The Movement of Goods and Services criteria considered were

- Improving movement of goods via truck freight travel and enhancing the movement of services by improving access to employment centers

The Multi-Modal Connectivity criteria considered were

- Improving multi-modal connectivity by enhancing to and between existing transit facilities near the corridor and accommodating new or modified transit service within the alternative

The Environmental criteria considered were

- Considering key environmental resources, require additional property, and impact parks, historic properties, and wetlands and waters

Board 9

Screening Process and Alternatives Development

This graphic illustrates the screening process as it relates to the alternatives development. The screening process began with the preliminary range of alternatives that resulted in the development of 15 alternatives that were presented at the July 2018 public workshops. Following the July 2018 public workshops, the initial screening of alternatives was completed by applying the identified screening criteria to the full range of 15 preliminary alternatives. The initial screening narrowed the alternatives to seven screened alternatives that were identified in February 2019. Additional traffic, financial, and environmental analyses were completed on the seven screened alternatives during Winter 2019.

The additional analyses resulted in the identification of the Alternatives Retained for Detailed Study or ARDS. All seven screened alternatives were carried forward as alternatives retained for detailed study. These alternatives and the results of the additional analyses are being presented at the Spring 2019 Public Workshops and in this virtual online public workshop. Further avoidance and minimization analyses will be completed on the alternatives retained for detailed study which will continue into Fall 2019. A recommended preferred alternative will be identified in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, referred to as the DEIS. Public hearings will take place in early 2020 following the publication of the DEIS. Agency and public input has been accepted and welcomed throughout the alternatives development and screening process.

Board 10

Alternatives Retained for Detailed Study (ARDS)

This board shows the seven alternatives retained for detailed study along with brief descriptions of each retained alternative. After additional traffic, financial and environmental analyses were performed on the seven Screened Alternatives it was determined that all of seven Screened Alternatives be recommended to be retained for detailed study in the Environmental Impact Statement because they each meet the study's Purpose and Need. A brief description and the typical sections of the alternatives retained for detailed study are shown on this board.

Alternative 1 is the No Build, or existing condition alternative. This alternative includes all projects in the Financially Constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan (CLRP), including I-270 Innovative Congestion Management (ICM) improvements, Purple Line, Corridor Cities Transitway BRT, and increased trip capacity and frequency along all MARC lines.

All the remaining alternatives either contain High Occupancy Toll (HOT), Express Toll lanes (ETL) and/or High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes.

High-occupancy toll lanes also known as HOT or hot lanes, are dedicated managed lanes within highway rights-of-way that single occupancy vehicle motorists may use by paying a variably priced toll and high-occupancy vehicle motorists may use by paying a discounted toll or no toll at all. Toll payments may vary by time of day and level of congestion. Express Toll Lanes, or ETLs, are dedicated managed lanes within highway rights-of-way that any motorist, regardless of vehicle occupancy, may use by paying a variably priced toll.

Alternative 5 would add one High Occupancy Toll managed lane, referred to as hot or HOT, in each direction on I-495 and one existing High Occupancy Vehicle or HOV, lane in each direction would be converted to a HOT managed lane on I-270. The HOT managed lanes are shown in yellow.

Alternative 8 would add two managed Express Toll Lanes, referred to as ETLs, in each direction on I-495 and one ETL managed lane would be added and one HOV lane would be retained in each direction on I-270. The ETL managed lanes are shown in purple.

Alternative 9 would add two HOT managed lanes in each direction on I-495 and one existing HOV lane would be converted to a HOT lane managed lane and one HOT managed lane would be added in each direction on I-270. The HOT lanes are shown in yellow.

Alternative 10 would add two ETL managed lanes in each direction on I-495 and on I-270. One existing HOV lane would be retained in each direction on I-270 only. The ETL managed lanes are shown in purple.

Alternative 13B would add two HOT managed lanes in each direction on I-495 and the existing HOV lanes on I-270 would be converted to two HOT managed reversible lanes while maintaining general purpose lanes. The HOT managed lanes and reversible lanes are shown in yellow.

Alternative 13C would add two ETL managed lanes in each direction on I-495 and two managed, reversible ETLs would be added on I-270 while retaining one HOV lane adjacent to general purpose lanes. The ETL managed lanes and reversible lanes are shown in purple.

Board 11

What about Transit Alternatives?

Previous studies have concluded that no single solution, either transit or highway, would provide significant relief to the long-term demand; therefore, both transit and highway improvements are needed. The Capital Beltway/Purple Line Study were originally one planning study. The Purple Line is currently under construction, now the I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study and the bigger P3 Program are studying the Beltway improvements.

Although transit brings revenue through fares, it is not financially viable because it requires major government investment and subsidies and the state does not have these financial resources. While the National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board Constrained Long Range Plan proposes both highway AND transit improvements including the Purple Line, Corridor Cities Transitway Bus Rapid Transit, and increased train capacity and frequency along all MARC lines, the I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study is focused on highway improvements.

The map in the lower left corner of this board shows alignments for the Purple Line project in purple, Red Line Metro in red, potential Bethesda-Tysons Bus Service route in green, Silver Line Metro in gray, and the Orange Line Metro in orange.

Multimodal Considerations

Under the multimodal considerations, public buses will be allowed to use the managed lanes to enhance transit mobility and connectivity to existing and planned transit facilities. Improving the highway system will provide a less congested and more reliable route for bus transit.

MDOT has committed to working with WMATA to consider the results of the Washington Area Transformation Bus Study. Direct and indirect access to existing transit stations and transit-oriented

developments will be included at the Greenbelt, New Carrollton, Branch Avenue, Largo and Shady Grove metro stations.

Board 12

Express Toll Lane (ETL) / High Occupancy Toll (HOT) Lane Benefits

There are many benefits to ETLs and HOT lanes for everyone – even for those that may not use them.

Express Toll Lanes or ETLs and High-Occupancy Toll or HOT lanes provides options, upgrades the interstate system, reduces traffic on the local system, improves job accessibility, and improves the movement of goods.

The ETL and HOT lanes provide the opportunity for travelers to choose to pay a toll which varies in price to maintain constant speeds or throughput for guaranteed reliable and reduced travel lanes. All unrestricted free lanes will remain free. The ETL and HOT lanes provide reduced travel times for those who continue to use the free lanes.

New bridges and smoother pavement will be provided for all users at no cost to the Transportation Trust Fund, allowing funding that would have been needed to keep the system in a state of good repair, and not addressing congestion, to be used for other vital transportation improvements across the State.

Local roads outside the interstates will have less traffic. Accessibility to jobs in the region will be improved. The ETL and HOT lanes improves reliability for the movement of goods through the region.

As shown in the graphic on the right, the ETL and HOT lanes would be separated from the general purpose lanes and tolled to maintain traffic speeds or throughput. The general purpose lanes continue to function as unrestricted free lanes.

Board 13

Station 3: Traffic Analyses

Station 3 includes boards to provide information on traffic operations and other traffic considerations.

Traffic Operations

This board shows how the I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study project would be expected to relieve traffic congestion based on the metric of average user delay. The information on the left side relates to vehicles traveling on I-495 and I-270. The average delay per vehicle quantifies the amount of time motorists are stuck in traffic congestion. The table presents the anticipated percent reduction in average delay per vehicle compared to the 2040 No Build conditions for each alternative. The No Build condition is the scenario where are other planned local improvements are made, but the I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study improvements would not be implemented. All Build alternatives are projected to reduce average delay on I-495 and I-270 by 20 percent or more during the peak periods. As noted in the legend, a decrease in average delay greater than 30 percent is shown in green, 25 percent to 30 percent decrease is shown in yellow, 20 percent to 25 percent decrease is shown in orange, and less than 20 percent decrease is shown in red. These results were generated by using VISSIM traffic simulation models. The values reflect average delay in the year 2040 across all lanes, including general purpose lanes, managed lanes, ramps, and interchange junctions.

The information on the right side quantifies how the project will reduce delay on the local network. By serving more traffic on I-495 and I-270, each of the build alternatives are projected to reduce demand on the surrounding local roadway system, resulting in delay savings for travelers. The table on the right presents the projected daily percentage decrease in delay on the surrounding local roadway network for each alternative as compared to the 2040 No Build conditions. The legend shows no benefit as compared to the No Build as red, less than five percent reduction in daily delay in yellow, and greater than five percent reduction in daily delay in green. These results were generated using the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOG) regional forecasting model.

Board 14

Traffic Operations

This focuses on looking at traffic operations in an effort to move people through the project area and shows how the project would help move people through the corridors using a metric known as person-throughput. "Person-throughput" quantifies the efficiency of the roadway network in getting people to their destinations. It equals the number of people that pass by a given point in the roadway network in a set amount of time. The metric accounts for high-occupancy vehicles and buses, which are modes that carry more than one person per vehicle. The benefits of high person-throughput on the highway include more efficient use of the roadway, reduced peak spreading (i.e., less congestion in the off-peak hours) and reduced burden on the surrounding local roadway network (i.e., less cut-through traffic).

The map to the right shows the percent person throughput increase as compared to the 2040 No Build conditions for each build alternative at four key locations within the study area. The numbers shown in green in the table represent the highest increase in person-throughput for each location and time period. The numbers shown in red represent no benefit as compared to the 2040 No Build.

Board 15

Traffic Operations

This board includes a discussion of traffic operations based on corridor travel time and average speed in the year 2040. Travel time and speed are two additional important metrics used to evaluate transportation projects. The tables presented on this board show the average speed and travel time along I-495 and I-270 for six common trip pairs for each of the build alternatives, as well as the projected travel time savings compared to the 2040 No Build conditions. Average speed is reported in miles per hour for travel in the general purpose lanes and for travel in the managed lanes, either HOT or ETL. Travel times are shown in minutes, and the travel time savings versus No Build are reported in minutes per trip, minutes per year, and hours per year based on 260 commuting days per year.

The top three tables show results for the morning commute from College Park to Bethesda, from I-95 to the Woodrow Wilson Bridge, and from Suitland to the Greenbelt Metro Station. The bottom three tables show results for the afternoon commute from the American Legion Bridge to the ICC, from Silver Spring to Rockville, and from Chevy Chase to Landover. The results demonstrate that all road users would be projected to experience travel time savings, including motorists in the general purpose lanes.

The data shown on this board provides a representative sample of origins and destinations. A tool to calculate the travel times and average speeds between any two points within the study corridors for the 2040 No Build conditions compared to each build alternative has been developed and is available at the

"My Commute" station at each of the Spring 2019 workshops. Using this tool, individuals can calculate their projected travel time savings along the highways, personalized to their specific route. The "My Commute" tool is not available online.

Board 16

Other Considerations

Other items to consider when looking at traffic operations include the challenges with reversible lanes and with single-lane systems, as detailed on this board.

There are operational challenges with reversible lanes that need to be considered when evaluating the alternatives, specifically Alternative 13B and Alternative 13C. Alternatives with reversible lane elements would require costly daily maintenance to reverse the flow of traffic, would experience downtime during changeovers for several hours each day, and could introduce safety concerns and driver expectancy issues due to the lanes being used for different directions of travel at different times of day. The reversible lanes also offer less flexibility to adapt to incidents, and do not serve demand in the off-peak direction.

Additionally, there are challenges with single-lane managed lane systems that need to be considered when evaluating alternatives, specifically Alternative 5 and Alternative 8. For managed lane systems with only one lane, there can be a "snail" effect in the managed lane, where the speed is governed by the slowest moving vehicle in that lane because passing is constrained. This results in lower speeds in the managed lane, less flexibility to adapt to incidents, and creates a less reliable system than a multi-lane system.

Board 17

Station 4: Alternative Retained for Detailed Study

Station 4 provides information on the preliminary environmental impacts associated with each of the screened alternatives or ARDS as well as a brief overview of the online mapping tool that is available to view environmental resources and each of the build alternatives.

Preliminary Effects Comparison of Screened Alternatives by Program Phase

This board provides an overview of the preliminary effects that could result under each alternative scenario. The tables show a comparison of the screened alternatives based on environmental and engineering metrics. The environmental and engineering resources for the screened alternatives were quantified and are presented in the tables by phase.

To implement the improvements of a build alternative, a potential phasing plan would be considered. It would be proposed in three phases. Phase 1 would start on I-495 at the George Washington Memorial Parkway, including improvements to the American Legion Bridge, and extend to I-95. Phase 2A on I-270 would start at I-495 and extend to I-370. Phase 2B on I-495 would start at I-95 and extend to west of MD 5.

This phasing would address the most congested freeway segments first and allow Phases 2A and 2B to be delivered concurrently. Phase 1 is anticipated to begin shortly after approval of a Record of Decision while Phases 2A and 2B are anticipated to begin within two years of beginning Phase 1.

There are a few items to note when reviewing the tables:

- All alternatives follow the existing highways, therefore, the quantities in the tables are similar.
- Property and environmental needs are preliminary at this point in the I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study. As the study moves forward, further avoidance and minimization to reduce property and environmental needs will be evaluated and prioritized. This includes incentivizing the private sector through innovation.
- The preliminary impacts shown in the tables assume total impacts; temporary and permanent impacts will be differentiated in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement or DEIS.
- The Air Quality analysis for the study is still ongoing. The methodologies and assumptions used in the assessment will be outlined in the DEIS and supporting documentation.

Screenshot of Interactive Online Map

A mapping tool was developed to allow you to learn more about the proposed improvements under consideration. The tool is intended to provide a general overview of the roadway layouts for the ARDS to date. Click on the interactive online map link to explore environmental features, community resources, details of the preliminary roadway design concepts, and preliminary limits of disturbance. The limits of disturbance have been developed using the proposed roadway typical section and roadside grading plus an additional buffer area to account for construction. The information shown on the map was created for the purpose of determining environmental impacts and preliminary cost estimates and is subject to change during final design. Any reliance on these concepts are made with the full understanding of their draft status.

Board 18

Station 5: Potential Property Needs

Station 5 includes boards that answers questions regarding potential property needs as well as the property acquisition process should a property need arise.

<u>Property Needs – Frequently Asked Questions</u>

As detailed on this board, property and environmental needs are preliminary at this point in the I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study. As the study moves forward, further avoidance and minimization to reduce property and environmental needs will be evaluated and prioritized. This includes, incentivizing the private section through innovation.

What determines if my property is needed?

Many factors are analyzed in developing a transportation facility such as environmental, traffic operations, safety and property effects. If the improvements are wider than MDOT SHA's property, your property is needed.

What are my rights related to property acquisition?

MDOT SHA complies with State and Federal laws to determine just compensation for impacts to your property. Just compensation is based on the fair market value of the property and includes the compensation for property needed plus any decrease in the value to any remaining property. For full details on the acquisition process, please refer to the *MDOT SHA Your Land and Your Highways: Your Rights and Benefits Guide.*

How far in advance will I know that my property is needed?

MDOT SHA will advise you well in advance of actual negotiations. A letter will be mailed to you explaining that your property will be appraised and you have the right to be present. The mere fact that a study is ongoing does not mean that transportation improvements will affect your property.

What will I be paid for my property if it is needed?

MDOT SHA will offer fair market value of your property which will include compensation for the property and decrease in value to the remaining property. Relocation assistance is a separate benefit that is provided if the owner is eligible.

Board 19

<u>Reduction of Potential Property Needs</u>

Property and environmental needs are preliminary at this point in the I-495 & I270 Managed Lanes Study. As the study moves forward, further avoidance and minimization to reduce property and environmental needs will be evaluated and prioritized. This includes, incentivizing the private section through innovation.

How have we reduced potential property needs?

At this early stage, considering the information available and level of design for each alternative, we have worked diligently in attempting to stay within existing rights-of-way to the extent possible to avoid and/or minimize potential property needs from residents and businesses.

In locations where potential property needs were identified, a series of design adjustments were applied to reduce the amount of potential property needed. This included reducing grass and grading areas next to the roadway and including retaining walls.

How will we continue to reduce potential property needs?

MDOT SHA is committed to working with residents and businesses to identify approaches that could further reduce potential property needs or mitigate any effects to property as this process moves forward.

Further avoidance and minimization **is** a priority as the development process moves forward. This includes continuing to evaluate the reduction of property needs as the preferred alternative is identified and refined. MDOT SHA will engage and incentivize the private sector through innovation to further reduce property needs.

Board 20

<u>What Happens if My Property is Directly Affected?</u>

Timeline of the Acquisition Process in the event that your property is directly affected is detailed on this board.

From Spring 2019 to Summer 2020, further avoidance and minimization to reduce needs will be evaluated and prioritized including incentivizing the private sector through innovation. Following the completion of the National Environmental Policy Act study in Fall 2020 the acquisition process will begin.

Step 1 is Identification - During final design, MDOT SHA determines if property is needed to construct the project no earlier than 2021.

Formal Notification is made in Step 2, wherein the Property owner will receive a notification letter from MDOT SHA's Office of Real Estate.

Step 3 is Pre-negotiation where MDOT SHA determines the amount of land that may be needed for the new improvement and the effects on your remaining property.

A qualified real estate appraiser will appraise your property in Step 4 and MDOT SHA's Office of Real Estate Appraisal Review Division will set the just compensation to be offered.

A real property specialist will contact you to set up an appointment to discuss the acquisition and the offer in Step 5.

Additional information is available in MDOT SHA's "Your Land and Your Highways Your Rights and Benefits Guide" located at the website link at the bottom of the board.

Board 21

Station 6: Noise

Station 6 includes boards on the Noise Process.

<u>How do we Study Noise Impacts?</u>

As part of NEPA, MDOT SHA evaluates the need for noise mitigation when alternatives propose changes to the existing noise environment. This evaluation includes three requirements:

Requirement one is to determine if a noise impact currently exists or is projected to exist as a result of the alternatives.

A property is considered affected when the noise level is equal to or higher than 66 decibels, or when projected noise levels are anticipated to increase substantially (10 to 15 decibels) over existing noise levels.

Requirement 2 is to determine if noise mitigation is feasible.

This requires at least 50 percent of the impacted properties within a community to receive a 5-decibel reduction in noise if noise mitigation were constructed, and that the proposed abatement is constructible.

Requirement 3 is to determine if noise mitigation is reasonable.

This requires that a majority of the impacted owners and residents be in favor of the mitigation, and that the area of a noise wall per benefitted resident be equal to or less than 2,700 square feet.

Board 22

What is MDOT SHA's Noise Mitigation Policy?

This board provides details on MDOT SHA's Noise Mitigation Policy as well as provides a website link to the August 2011 MDOT SHA Highway Noise Policy where additional details can be found.

The MDOT SHA Noise Policy requires mitigation be feasible and reasonable.

To determine feasibility, we must determine if effective mitigation can be constructed by considering:

- Acoustic considerations, can mitigation reduce projected noise levels by at least 5 decibels at 50 percent of impacted sites? Reduction of noise levels may be limited where external noise sources exist, such as where aircraft flight paths exist. In these situations, noise barriers may not be feasible.
- Safety and Access Considerations, will noise mitigation block access for driveways, local streets or pedestrians? Will it cause unsafe conditions, for example by limiting sight distance? If so, mitigation is not feasible.
- Site Constraint Assessment, will construction of the noise mitigation require additional considerations, for example: a retaining wall; major utility conflicts; acquisition of right-of-way?

To determine reasonableness, we must determine if it is reasonable to construct noise mitigation in this location by considering:

- Viewpoints of Benefited Property Owners and Residents, if more than 50 percent of benefited residents in the impacted area are opposed to the noise mitigation, it is deemed not reasonable.
- Benefited Residences and Design Goal, at least 50 percent of benefited residences must receive at least a 7 decibel reduction from the proposed abatement for the abatement to be considered reasonable.
- Cost Effectiveness, a barrier system will be considered reasonable if the area of wall provided per benefited residence is equal to or less than 2,700 square feet.

Board 23

Station 7: Stay Connected / Provide Feedback

Station 7 includes boards that provide additional information on how to stay connected and provide feedback.

Stay Connected

MDOT SHA is committed to keeping the public informed about this important study. To learn more about the study:

Visit the project website at **495-270-p3.com.** Email the study team at 495-270-P3@sha.state.md.us. Call the toll-free line at 833-858-5960. Or, Sign up for email notifications on the website at **495-270-P3.com**.

Board 24

Provide Feedback

We want your comments on the Alternatives Retained for Detailed Study (ARDS). Comments for the ARDS will be accepted through June 14, 2019. Please comment through one of these methods:

Hard copy comment form that can be dropped off at the workshops or in the mail. Provide oral comments to the verbatim recorder. Submit an Online comment form at 495-270-P3.com. Email comments to 495-270-P3@sha.state.md.us.

By mail at: Maryland Department of Transportation

State Highway Administration
I-495 & I-270 P3 Office
707 North Calvert Street
Mail Stop P-601
Baltimore, MD 21202

Board 25

The last boards provide information on what MDOT SHA has been in and around communities throughout Montgomery and Prince George's counties helping stakeholders and communities stay informed on where we are in the study.

This board lists the stakeholder and community meetings that the study team has attended in an effort to spread the word about the I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study.

Since January 2019, MDOT SHA has met with the stakeholders and community members listed in the table, as shown.

If you would like MDOT SHA to come and meet with your community, please email or call us to schedule a meeting.

Board 26

Public-Private Partnership information is detailed on two boards. The first board details what a P3 is while the second board details what a P3 is not.

A public private partnership (P3) is an alternative delivery model that seeks to harness private sector expertise and innovation in the delivery of public infrastructure for the benefit of the public owner and users of the infrastructure. Constraints and authority, P3s can successfully leverage the respective strengths of the public and private sectors to deliver large, complex infrastructure projects in a cost effective and timely fashion. Functions under a P3 delivery model may include designing, building, financing, operating, and maintaining an infrastructure facility.

There are benefits to P3 projects. P3 project can be delivered faster, moving projects forward when the public owner does not have available funding.

P3 projects provide equity and financing – Without a P3, proposed improvements of this magnitude would take decades and would use Maryland's entire transportation budget.

Operations and maintenance are functions included in the P3 – The P3 developer operates the facility and maintains it over the term of the agreement at a more economical cost.

There is a Transfer of risks with P3s. – The public owner and the private partner share the risks based on who can best manage each risk to provide the best value to the public owner, such as revenue risk, design and construction risks, long-term operations and maintenance risks.

Board 27

A P3 is not A funding source – Projects require user fees or tax dollars regardless if a P3 is used.

A P3 is not Privatization – The private partner does not obtain any ownership. The state is still the owner.

A P3 is not Transfer of State Responsibility – The state retains the ultimate responsibility to ensure the facility meets its intended public need. The private sector also cannot have decision making in the environmental process as it is a government function.

Thank you for participating in the Online Public Workshop for the I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study!