MD 210 Project Planning Study Comment Form

Location/Design Public Hearing
Thursday, June 21, 2001
Friendly High School Auditorium

PLEASE PRINT
Name CHARLES DAIS **Date** 06/18/01

Address 9711 TRAVERSE WAY

City/Town FTWASH **State** MD **Zip Code** 20744

PLEASE INDICATE YOUR PREFERENCES BY CHECKING THE BOXES BELOW.

Which of the 3 mainline options on MD 210 do you think are most appropriate?

1.) NO HOV [✓] 2.) Barrier Separated HOV [ ] 3.) Concurrent Flow HOV [ ]

MD 210 involves 9 intersections that are under study for improvements. What improvement option at each intersection do you think are the most appropriate? (Select from the non-shaded boxes)

	Optior A	Option A-1	Option A-2	Option B	Option C	Option D	Option E
Wilson Bridge Drive	X						
Kerby Hill Road		X					
Palmer Road	X						
Old Fort Road North				X			
Fort Washington Road					X		
Swan Creek Road				X			
Old Fort Road South					X		
Farmington Road	X						
MD 373	X						

Do you commute on MD 210 during the peak hours (6:30-8:30am) and (4:30-6:30pm)?

1.) yes [X] 2.) no [ ] Check if you carpool or would be willing to carpool if convenient park and ride services were available [ ]

Have you ever used side roads to avoid congestion on MD 210?

1.) yes [X] 2.) no [ ]

If there are any additional comments or inquiries you would like to share with us please list them below.

I THINK BRIDGES THAT YOU ACROSS 210 ~~THAT~~ AT INTERSECTION FROM OXON HILL RD DOWN TO SWAN CREEK RD WOULD BE NICE -

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

[ ] Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List

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

Project NO. PG221A11

Charles Dias

Supplemental Response:
See response to frequently stated comment 1, 3.

Alternative 5A Modified is the Selected Alternative. No HOV lanes or mainline capacity enhancements, other than auxiliary lanes to support the interchange/intersection improvements, will be provided. No HOV lanes or mainline capacity enhancements, other than auxiliary lanes to support the interchange/intersection improvements, will be provided. However the proposed improvements will not preclude rail, HOV or any other studies/improvements in the future.

SHA-Selected Alternative 5A Modified includes all interchanges proposed under Option 2. The proposed interchange locations are MD 210 at Kerby Hill Road, Palmer Road, Old Fort Road North, Fort Washington Road, Swan Creek Road and Old Fort Road South. At-grade intersection modifications are proposed with the SHA-Selected Alternative at Wilson Bridge Drive, Farmington Road and MD 373.

The specific intersection/interchange options included in the SHA-Selected Alternative consist of:

Wilson Bridge Drive Option A, (which is a modification of Option A-1), Kerby Hill Road Option C, Palmer Road Option E (which is a modification of Option D), Old Fort Road North Option C, Fort Washington Road Option D, Swan Creek Road Option G (which is a modification of Option E), Old Fort Road South Option C, Farmington Road Option A, and MD 373 Option A.

These options were selected as a result of coordination among MD 210 study team members, the focus group, environmental resource agencies and citizens, based on the extent to which they addressed safety and traffic operational needs and minimized impacts to sensitive resources.

The above-described interchanges include bridges over MD 210 for each major MD 210 for each major MD 210 intersection from Kerby Hill Road to Old For Road South. Wilson Bridge Drive will become right-in/right-out only at its intersection with MD 210.

The Oxon Hill Road intersection is also planned as a grade-separation, but will be constructed a s part of the separate Woodrow Wilson Bridge Project.

MD 210 Project Planning Study Comment Form

Location/Design Public Hearing
Thursday, June 21, 2001
Friendly High School Auditorium

PLEASE PRINT
Name SERENA E. DAVIS Date 6/18/01
Address 306 EAST TANTALLON DRIVE
City/Town FORT WASHINGTON State MD Zip Code 20744-6131

PLEASE INDICATE YOUR PREFERENCES BY CHECKING THE BOXES BELOW.

Which of the 3 mainline options on MD 210 do you think are most appropriate?

1.) NO HOV [X] 2.) Barrier Separated HOV [ ] 3.) Concurrent Flow HOV [ ]

MD 210 involves 9 intersections that are under study for improvements. What improvement option at each intersection do you think are the most appropriate? (Select from the non-shaded boxes)

	Option A	Option A-1	Option A-2	Option B	Option C	Option D	Option E
Wilson Bridge Drive							
Kerby Hill Road							
Palmer Road							
Old Fort Road North							
Fort Washington Road							
Swan Creek Road							
Old Fort Road South							
Farmington Road							
MD 373							

Do you commute on MD 210 during the peak hours (6:30-8:30am) and (4:30-6:30pm)?

1.) yes [X] 2.) no [ ] Check if you carpool or would be willing to carpool if convenient park and ride services were available [ ]

Have you ever used side roads to avoid congestion on MD 210?

1.) yes [X] 2.) no [ ]

If there are any additional comments or inquiries you would like to share with us please list them below.

I prefer the "no-build" approach to the problem of Congestion if it exist. Fumes from more auto's on the roads, hot Cement, in summer, spring & early fall, destruction of grassy areas and cut all vegetatives. Should push for Public transportation (Subway) to Indian Head & Waldorf.

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

[ ] Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List

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

Project NO. PG221A11

Serena E. Davis

Supplemental Response:
See response to frequently stated comment 1, 4.

Alternative 5A Modified is the SHA-Selected Alternative; however the proposed improvements will not preclude rail, HOV or any other studies/improvements in the future.

MD 210 Project Planning Study Comment Form

Location/Design Public Hearing
Thursday, June 21, 2001
Friendly High School Auditorium

PLEASE PRINT

Name _____ David L. Desjardins _____ **Date** _____

Address _____ 11001 McKay Rd. _____
Ft Washington, MD 20744-4122

City/Town _____ **State** _____ **Zip Code** _____

PLEASE INDICATE YOUR PREFERENCES BY CHECKING THE BOXES BELOW.

Which of the 3 mainline options on MD 210 do you think are most appropriate?

1.) NO HOV ☐ 2.) Barrier Separated HOV ☐ 3.) Concurrent Flow HOV ☐

MD 210 involves 9 intersections that are under study for improvements. What improvement option at each intersection do you think are the most appropriate? (Select from the non-shaded boxes)

	Option A	Option A-1	Option A-2	Option B	Option C	Option D	Option E
Wilson Bridge Drive							
Kerby Hill Road							
Palmer Road							
Old Fort Road North							
Fort Washington Road							
Swan Creek Road							
Old Fort Road South							
Farmington Road							
MD 373							

Do you commute on MD 210 during the peak hours (6:30-8:30am) and (4:30-6:30pm)?

1.) yes ☑ 2.) no ☐ Check if you carpool or would be willing to carpool if convenient park and ride services were available ☐

Have you ever used side roads to avoid congestion on MD 210?

1.) yes ☑ 2.) no ☐

If there are any additional comments or inquiries you would like to share with us please list them below.

With current gridlock, projected extra demand, and the Bay of Americas project these "plans" are just plain stupid without an immediate provision for a METRO line to Waldorf (and across the WW Bridge – as well as a biker-hiker trail. (1)

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

☑ Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List

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

Project NO. PG221A11

David L. Desjardins

Supplemental Response:
See response to frequently stated comment 2.

Proposed improvements include sidewalks and wider outside lanes for bikers and pedestrians throughout all of the interchanges to allow community access from either side of MD 210. All crossroads assume a five-foot wide bike lane outside the travel lanes in each direction within the limit of improvement. A five-foot wide sidewalk on each side of the crossroad has been assumed for each overpass design. Any intersections that are proposed to remain at-grade have been evaluated on a case-by-case basis for pedestrian/bicycle accommodation (e.g., sidewalk connections, crosswalks, etc.). Coordination between SHA and community residents will be maintained throughout the project planning and design phases to ensure appropriate accommodation of bicyclists and pedestrians with the proposed improvements. The current plans also show connections to Henson Creek Trail. For bicyclists traveling north and south within the corridor there are several local roads that will be signed as alternative bike routes. In addition, bicycles will not be prohibited from using the outside shoulder of MD 210 as they do today. (1)

Alternative 5A Modified is the SHA-Selected Alternative; however the proposed improvements will not preclude rail, HOV or any other studies/improvements in the future.

W.A. DIXON
1926 SKIPJACK DR.
FT. WASH. MD 20744

HOW ARE WE DOING?

In an effort to improve the effectiveness of our public involvement and outreach programs, we would appreciate it if you would take a few minutes to answer this questionnaire.

Please circle the most appropriate number

	Poor				Excellent
Clarity of the brochure	1	2	3	4	5
Was each part of the brochure easy to understand?					
Purpose of Workshop	1	2	3	(4)	5
Purpose of the Project	1	2	3	(4)	5
Adjacent Relative Projects	1	2	(3)	4	5
Program Status	1	(2)	3	4	5
Project Need	1	(2)	3	4	5
Existing Roadway	1	(2)	3	4	5
Intermodal Connectivity	1	(2)	3	4	5
Focus Group	1	(2)	3	4	5
Thinking Beyond the Pavement	1	(2)	3	4	5
Environmental Resources Summary	1	(2)	3	4	5
Alternatives Currently Under Consideration	1	(2)	3	4	5
Remaining Steps in Planning Process	1	(2)	3	4	5

Which part of the brochure was the most valuable?

Which part of the brochure was the least valuable?

What suggestions do you have for improvement?
THE MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION SHOULD FOCUS MORE ON BRINGING METRO RAIL TO MD 210 FROM I-95/I-495 TO MD 228.

Thank you for answering this questionnaire. You may either leave it at the receptionist's table as you leave or return it to us by mail.

W.A. Dixon

Supplemental Response:
See response to frequently stated comment 2.

Alternative 5A Modified is the SHA-Selected Alternative; however the proposed improvements will not preclude rail, HOV or any other studies/improvements in the future.

MD 210 Project Planning Study Comment Form

Location/Design Public Hearing
Thursday, June 21, 2001
Friendly High School Auditorium

PLEASE PRINT
Name SCOTT DUCAR **Date** 23 JUNE 01

Address PO BOX 267

City/Town ACCOKEEK **State** MD **Zip Code** 20607

PLEASE INDICATE YOUR PREFERENCES BY CHECKING THE BOXES BELOW.

Which of the 3 mainline options on MD 210 do you think are most appropriate?

1.) NO HOV [X] 2.) Barrier Separated HOV [ ] 3.) Concurrent Flow HOV [ ]

MD 210 involves 9 intersections that are under study for improvements. What improvement option at each intersection do you think are the most appropriate? (Select from the non-shaded boxes)

	Option A	Option A-1	Option A-2	Option B	Option C	Option D	Option E
Wilson Bridge Drive							
Kerby Hill Road			X				
Palmer Road	X						
Old Fort Road North					X		
Fort Washington Road						X	
Swan Creek Road						X	
Old Fort Road South					X		
Farmington Road				X			
MD 373				X			

Do you commute on MD 210 during the peak hours (6:30-8:30am) and (4:30-6:30pm)?

1.) yes [X] 2.) no [ ] Check if you carpool or would be willing to carpool if convenient park and ride services were available [X]

Have you ever used side roads to avoid congestion on MD 210?

1.) yes [ ] 2.) no [X]

If there are any additional comments or inquiries you would like to share with us please list them below.

NEED TO TURN 210 into A FREEWAY WITH NO SINGAL LIGHTS & NO HOV

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

[ ] Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List

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

Project NO. PG221A11

Scott Ducar

Supplemental Response:
See response to frequently stated comment 1, 3.

Alternative 5A Modified is the SHA-Selected Alternative. No HOV lanes or mainline capacity enhancements, other than auxiliary lanes to support the interchange/intersection improvements, will be provided. However the proposed improvements will not preclude rail, HOV or any other studies/improvements in the future. The result of the SHA-Selected Alternative improvements will be a highway, with no traffic signals, that functions similar to an expressway from north of Farmington Road to the Capital Beltway

SHA-Selected Alternative 5A Modified includes all interchanges proposed under Option 2. The proposed interchange locations are MD 210 at Kerby Hill Road, Palmer Road, Old Fort Road North, Fort Washington Road, Swan Creek Road and Old Fort Road South. At-grade intersection modifications are proposed with the SHA-Selected Alternative at Wilson Bridge Drive, Farmington Road and MD 373.

The specific intersection/interchange options included in the SHA-Selected Alternative consist of:

Wilson Bridge Drive Option A, (which is a modification of Option A-1), Kerby Hill Road Option C, Palmer Road Option E (which is a modification of Option D), Old Fort Road North Option C, Fort Washington Road Option D, Swan Creek Road Option G (which is a modification of Option E), Old Fort Road South Option C, Farmington Road Option A, and MD 373 Option A.

These options were selected as a result of coordination among MD 210 study team members, the focus group, environmental resource agencies and citizens, based on the extent to which they addressed safety and traffic operational needs and minimized impacts to sensitive resources.

MD 210 Project Planning Study Comment Form

Location/Design Public Hearing
Thursday, June 21, 2001
Friendly High School Auditorium

PLEASE PRINT
Name Milton Ellerbe **Date** June 26, 2001

Address 107- Battersea Lane

City/Town Fort Washington **State** MD **Zip Code** 20744

PLEASE INDICATE YOUR PREFERENCES BY CHECKING THE BOXES BELOW.

Which of the 3 mainline options on MD 210 do you think are most appropriate?

1.) NO HOV [X] 2.) Barrier Separated HOV [ ] 3.) Concurrent Flow HOV [ ]

MD 210 involves 9 intersections that are under study for improvements. What improvement option at each intersection do you think are the most appropriate? (Select from the non-shaded boxes)

	Option A	Option A-1	Option A-2	Option B	Option C	Option D	Option E
Wilson Bridge Drive	✓						
Kerby Hill Road		✓					
Palmer Road					✓		
Old Fort Road North				✓			
Fort Washington Road					✓		
Swan Creek Road							✓
Old Fort Road South					✓		
Farmington Road	✓						
MD 373				✓			

Do you commute on MD 210 during the peak hours (6:30-8:30am) and (4:30-6:30pm)?

1.) yes [✓] 2.) no [ ] Check if you carpool or would be willing to carpool if convenient park and ride services were available [ ]

Have you ever used side roads to avoid congestion on MD 210?

1.) yes [✓] 2.) no [ ]

If there are any additional comments or inquiries you would like to share with us please list them below.

build rapid transit - Metro II

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

[X] Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List

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

Project NO. PG221A11

Milton Ellerbe

Supplemental Response:
See response to frequently stated comment 1, 2.

Alternative 5A Modified is the SHA-Selected Alternative; however the proposed improvements will not preclude rail, HOV or any other studies/improvements in the future.

W. FRUCHT
707 CALVERT LANE
FT. WASHINGTON, MD 20744

HOW ARE WE DOING?

In an effort to improve the effectiveness of our public involvement and outreach programs, we would appreciate it if you would take a few minutes to answer this questionnaire.

Please circle the most appropriate number

	Poor				Excellent
Clarity of the brochure	1	2	3	4	5
Was each part of the brochure easy to understand?					
Purpose of Workshop	1	2	3	4	(5)
Purpose of the Project	1	2	3	4	(5)
Adjacent Relative Projects	1	2	3	4	(5)
Program Status	1	2	3	4	(5)
Project Need (Not rated)	1	2	3	4	5
Existing Roadway	1	2	3	4	(5)
Intermodal Connectivity (Not yet defined)	1	2	3	4	5
Focus Group	1	2	3	4	5
Thinking Beyond the Pavement	1	2	3	(4)	5
Environmental Resources Summary	1	2	3	4	(5)
Alternatives Currently Under Consideration	1	2	3	4	(5)
Remaining Steps in Planning Process	1	2	3	4	(5)

Which part of the brochure was the most valuable?
Graphical presentation of the alternative schemes.

Which part of the brochure was the least valuable?
No data on peak period volumes were shown

(1)

What suggestions do you have for improvement?
The project need does not, and cannot perhaps, reflect the political decisions made which ~~are~~ will cause the increase in vehicle traffic anticipated by year 2020

Thank you for answering this questionnaire. You may either leave it at the receptionist's table as you leave or return it to us by mail.

MD 210 Location / Design

W. Frucht

Supplemental Response:
The purpose of the study is to address the increasingly severe and frequent traffic congestion along MD 210 and it involves the development and analysis of reasonable alternates including the no build alternate. Traffic operations indicate that peak hour traffic entering or crossing MD 210 from side roads often require several signal cycles to go through the intersection. The short auxiliary lanes, severe skew angles, sharp curvatures, and the close proximity of the service roads created congestion for the side road traffic. Five of the nine major intersections in the project area are currently operating at failing conditions in the peak hour periods. By the year 2020, all nine study area intersections will reach level of service grade F (represents failing traffic flow with total congestion, where several cycles are required to clear traffic through an intersection) and some intersections will be handling almost twice the traffic they are designed to handle. In addition, the number of reported accidents occurring from Fort Washington Road to the Capital Beltway are significantly higher than the statewide average for similar facilities. By replacing the existing intersections with interchanges as proposed under the build alternates, consistent with the county master plan, traffic is projected to operate at acceptable levels of service (LOS F or better) in the design year 2020. (1)

Alternative 5A Modified is the SHA-Selected Alternative; however the proposed improvements will not preclude rail, HOV or any other studies/improvements in the future.

MD 210 Project Planning Study Comment Form

Location/Design Public Hearing
Thursday, June 21, 2001
Friendly High School Auditorium

PLEASE PRINT
Name Fred Gamble, Jr. Date 7.10.01
Address 12819 Lampton Lane
City/Town Ft. Washington, State MD Zip Code 20744

PLEASE INDICATE YOUR PREFERENCES BY CHECKING THE BOXES BELOW.

Which of the 3 mainline options on MD 210 do you think are most appropriate?

1.) NO HOV ☐ 2.) Barrier Separated HOV ☐ 3.) Concurrent Flow HOV ☑

MD 210 involves 9 intersections that are under study for improvements. What improvement option at each intersection do you think are the most appropriate? (Select from the non-shaded boxes)

	Option A	Option A-1	Option A-2	Option B	Option C	Option D	Option E
Wilson Bridge Drive							
Kerby Hill Road	✓	✓					
Palmer Road	✓				✓		
Old Fort Road North					✓		
Fort Washington Road						✓	
Swan Creek Road							✓
Old Fort Road South					✓		
Farmington Road	✓						
MD 373	✓						

Do you commute on MD 210 during the peak hours (6:30-8:30am) and (4:30-6:30pm)?

1.) yes ☑ 2.) no ☐ Check if you carpool or would be willing to carpool if convenient park and ride services were available ☐

Have you ever used side roads to avoid congestion on MD 210?

1.) yes ☑ 2.) no ☐

If there are any additional comments or inquiries you would like to share with us please list them below.

We moved to our home in 1988 and was quite surprised to see MD 210 operating in its current conditions. I have never seen a major road run in this way before. It is very disgusting to be in so much traffic 2 times a day that must stop for signaled lights. I would like to see MD 210 developed into an expressway with no signals and overpasses.

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

☑ Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List

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

Project NO. PG221A11

Fred Gamble Jr.

Supplemental Response:
See response to frequently stated comment 3.

Alternative 5A Modified is the SHA-Selected Alternative including grade-separated interchanges from Kerby Hill Road to Old Fort Road South. At-grade intersections will remain at Wilson Bridge Drive (right-in/right-out only), Farmington Road and MD 373; however the proposed improvements will not preclude rail, HOV or any other studies/improvements in the future.

MD 210 Project Planning Study Comment Form

Location/Design Public Hearing
Thursday, June 21, 2001
Friendly High School Auditorium

PLEASE PRINT
Name George M. Garner Jr. Date 7/5/01
Address 15405 Old Marshall Hall Rd.
City/Town Accokeek State MD Zip Code 20607

PLEASE INDICATE YOUR PREFERENCES BY CHECKING THE BOXES BELOW.

Which of the 3 mainline options on MD 210 do you think are most appropriate?

1.) NO HOV [✓] 2.) Barrier Separated HOV [ ] 3.) Concurrent Flow HOV [ ]

MD 210 involves 9 intersections that are under study for improvements. What improvement option at each intersection do you think are the most appropriate? (Select from the non-shaded boxes)

	Option A	Option A-1	Option A-2	Option B	Option C	Option D	Option E
Wilson Bridge Drive	✓						
Kerby Hill Road	✓						
Palmer Road	✓						
Old Fort Road North	✓						
Fort Washington Road	✓						
Swan Creek Road	✓						
Old Fort Road South							
Farmington Road	✓						
MD 373	✓						

Do you commute on MD 210 during the peak hours (6:30-8:30am) and (4:30-6:30pm)?

1.) yes [✓] 2.) no [ ] Check if you carpool or would be willing to carpool if convenient park and ride services were available [ ]

Have you ever used side roads to avoid congestion on MD 210?

1.) yes [ ] 2.) no [ ]

If there are any additional comments or inquiries you would like to share with us please list them below.

Since over 70% of the trips originate or destinate in So. Maryland, extending light rail from Branch Avenue to waldorf & ultimately Patuxent would be a much better solution.

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

[ ] Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List

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

Project NO. PG221A11

George M. Garner Jr.

Supplemental Response:
See response to frequently stated comment 1, 2.

Alternative 5A Modified is the SHA-Selected Alternative. No HOV lanes or mainline capacity enhancements, other than auxiliary lanes to support the interchange/intersection improvements, will be provided. However the proposed improvements will not preclude rail, HOV or any other studies/improvements in the future.

SHA-Selected Alternative 5A Modified includes all interchanges proposed under Option 2. The proposed interchange locations are MD 210 at Kerby Hill Road, Palmer Road, Old Fort Road North, Fort Washington Road, Swan Creek Road and Old Fort Road South. At-grade intersection modifications are proposed with the SHA-Selected Alternative at Wilson Bridge Drive, Farmington Road and MD 373.

The specific intersection/interchange options included in the SHA-Selected Alternative consist of:

Wilson Bridge Drive Option A, (which is a modification of Option A-1), Kerby Hill Road Option C, Palmer Road Option E (which is a modification of Option D), Old Fort Road North Option C, Fort Washington Road Option D, Swan Creek Road Option G (which is a modification of Option E), Old Fort Road South Option C, Farmington Road Option A, and MD 373 Option A.

These options were selected as a result of coordination among MD 210 study team members, the focus group, environmental resource agencies and citizens, based on the extent to which they addressed safety and traffic operational needs and minimized impacts to sensitive resources.

MD 210 Project Planning Study Comment Form

Location/Design Public Hearing
Thursday, June 21, 2001
Friendly High School Auditorium

PLEASE PRINT
Name CLARK L. GLENN **Date** 18 JUNE 2001

Address 7514 BELLEFIELD AVE

City/Town FORT WASHINGTON **State** MD **Zip Code** 20744-3330

PLEASE INDICATE YOUR PREFERENCES BY CHECKING THE BOXES BELOW.

Which of the 3 mainline options on MD 210 do you think are most appropriate?

1.) NO HOV ☐ 2.) Barrier Separated HOV ☒ 3.) Concurrent Flow HOV ☐

MD 210 involves 9 intersections that are under study for improvements. What improvement option at each intersection do you think are the most appropriate? (Select from the non-shaded boxes)

	Option A	Option A-1	Option A-2	Option B	Option C	Option D	Option E
Wilson Bridge Drive	✓						
Kerby Hill Road		✓					
Palmer Road				✓			
Old Fort Road North					✓		
Fort Washington Road					✓		
Swan Creek Road					✓		
Old Fort Road South					✓		
Farmington Road				✓			
MD 373				✓			

Do you commute on MD 210 during the peak hours (6:30-8:30am) and (4:30-6:30pm)?

1.) yes ☐ 2.) no ☒ Check if you carpool or would be willing to carpool if convenient park and ride services were available ☐

Have you ever used side roads to avoid congestion on MD 210?

1.) yes ☒ 2.) no ☐

If there are any additional comments or inquiries you would like to share with us please list them below.

SOME EFFORT NEEDS TO BE MADE TO PROVIDE CONSISTENCY OF CROSS ROADS FROM ONE SIDE OF MD 210 TO ANOTHER. FOR EXAMPLE, WHEN LIVINGSTON RD STOPS AT MD 210 IT SHOULD CONTINUE AS LIVINGSTON RD ON THE OTHER SIDE. (1)

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

☐ Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List

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

I RECEIVE TWO COPIES. PLEASE DISCONTINUE ONE COPY.

Project NO. PG221A11

Clark L. Glenn

Supplemental Response:
Contact information for residents, businesses and the Focus Group will be forwarded to the final design team when the project moves from the project planning phase into the final design phase. Details, such as street naming, occur during the final design phase. Livingston Road is a county facility; comments about street naming will be forwarded to the proper county planning representative. (1)

Alternative 5A Modified is the SHA-Selected Alternative; however the proposed improvements will not preclude rail, HOV or any other studies/improvements in the future.

MD 210 Project Planning Study Comment Form

Location/Design Public Hearing
Thursday, June 21, 2001
Friendly High School Auditorium

PLEASE PRINT
Name Carl Gotzmer Date 7/4/01

Address 1285 Old Landing Rd

City/Town Accokeek State MD Zip Code 20607

PLEASE INDICATE YOUR PREFERENCES BY CHECKING THE BOXES BELOW.

Which of the 3 mainline options on MD 210 do you think are most appropriate?

1.) NO HOV ☒ 2.) Barrier Separated HOV ☐ 3.) Concurrent Flow HOV ☐

MD 210 involves 9 intersections that are under study for improvements. What improvement option at each intersection do you think are the most appropriate? (Select from the non-shaded boxes)

	Option A	Option A-1	Option A-2	Option B	Option C	Option D	Option E
Wilson Bridge Drive	☒						
Kerby Hill Road	☒						
Palmer Road	☒						
Old Fort Road North	☒						
Fort Washington Road	☒						
Swan Creek Road	☒						
Old Fort Road South							
Farmington Road	☒						
MD 373	☒						

Do you commute on MD 210 during the peak hours (6:30-8:30am) and (4:30-6:30pm)?

1.) yes ☒ 2.) no ☐ Check if you carpool or would be willing to carpool if convenient park and ride services were available ☒

Have you ever used side roads to avoid congestion on MD 210?

1.) yes ☒ 2.) no ☐

If there are any additional comments or inquiries you would like to share with us please list them below.

Bring rail to Waldorf and stop at Mary's
Rts Traffic from Wing 228 + 210

Bring 373 over 210 (1)

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

☒ Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List

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

Project NO. PG221A11

Carl Gotzmer

Supplemental Response:
See response to frequently stated comment 1, 2.

A grade-separated interchange at the intersection of MD 210 and MD 373 was not investigated since traffic studies show that at-grade improvements would provide adequate levels of service. (1)

Alternative 5A Modified is the Selected Alternative. No HOV lanes or mainline capacity enhancements, other than auxiliary lanes to support the interchange/intersection improvements, will be provided. However the proposed improvements will not preclude rail, HOV or any other studies/improvements in the future.

SHA-Selected Alternative 5A Modified includes all interchanges proposed under Option 2. The proposed interchange locations are MD 210 at Kerby Hill Road, Palmer Road, Old Fort Road North, Fort Washington Road, Swan Creek Road and Old Fort Road South. At-grade intersection modifications are proposed with the SHA-Selected Alternative at Wilson Bridge Drive, Farmington Road and MD 373.

The specific intersection/interchange options included in the SHA-Selected Alternative consist of:

Wilson Bridge Drive Option A, (which is a modification of Option A-1), Kerby Hill Road Option C, Palmer Road Option E (which is a modification of Option D), Old Fort Road North Option C, Fort Washington Road Option D, Swan Creek Road Option G (which is a modification of Option E), Old Fort Road South Option C, Farmington Road Option A, and MD 373 Option A.

These options were selected as a result of coordination among MD 210 study team members, the focus group, environmental resource agencies and citizens, based on the extent to which they addressed safety and traffic operational needs and minimized impacts to sensitive resources.

JOHN GREGG

HOW ARE WE DOING?

In an effort to improve the effectiveness of our public involvement and outreach programs, we would appreciate it if you would take a few minutes to answer this questionnaire.

Please circle the most appropriate number	Poor				Excellent
Was the brochure well laid out and easy to follow?	1	2	3	(4)	5

Comments: _____

Was each part of the brochure easy to understand?	Poor				Excellent
Purpose of Study	1	2	3	(4)	5
Purpose of Hearing	1	2	3	4	(5)
How to Comment on the Project	1	2	3	(4)	5
Program Status	1	2	3	(4)	5
Project History	1	2	3	(4)	5
Project Need	1	2	3	(4)	5
Smart Growth	1	2	3	(4)	5
Existing Condition	1	2	(3)	4	5
Congestion Management System	1	2	3	(4)	5
Alternatives Currently Under Consideration	1	2	(3)	4	5
Environmental Summary	1	2	3	(4)	5
Remaining Steps in the Project Planning Process	1	2	3	(4)	5
Typical Sections	1	2	3	(4)	5

Which part of the brochure was the most valuable? Existing Transit / Park and Ride Facilities / Traffic Volumes and Level of Service

Which part of the brochure was the least valuable? _____

What suggestions do you have for improvement? Metro Rail in Area and more about Prince George County Bus Service in 210 Area

Thank you for answering this questionnaire. You may either leave it at the receptionist's table as you leave or return it by mail.

MD 210
From I-95/I-495 to MD 228
PROJECT NO. PG 221A11

John Gregg

Supplemental Response:
See response to frequently stated comment 2, 4.

Alternative 5A Modified is the SHA-Selected Alternative; however the proposed improvements will not preclude rail, HOV or any other studies/improvements in the future.

MD 210 Project Planning Study Comment Form

Location/Design Public Hearing
Thursday, June 21, 2001
Friendly High School Auditorium

PLEASE PRINT
Name MIRENDA V. HALL **Date** 6/22/01

Address 13308 COLDWATER DR.

City/Town FT. WASH. **State** MD **Zip Code** 20744

PLEASE INDICATE YOUR PREFERENCES BY CHECKING THE BOXES BELOW.

Which of the 3 mainline options on MD 210 do you think are most appropriate?

1.) NO HOV [X] 2.) Barrier Separated HOV [ ] 3.) Concurrent Flow HOV [ ]

MD 210 involves 9 intersections that are under study for improvements. What improvement option at each intersection do you think are the most appropriate? (Select from the non-shaded boxes)

	Option A	Option A-1	Option A-2	Option B	Option C	Option D	Option E
Wilson Bridge Drive	X						
Kerby Hill Road			X				
Palmer Road				X			
Old Fort Road North						X	
Fort Washington Road						X	
Swan Creek Road					X		
Old Fort Road South					X		
Farmington Road				X			
MD 373				X			

Do you commute on MD 210 during the peak hours (6:30-8:30am) and (4:30-6:30pm)?

1.) yes [X] 2.) no [ ] Check if you carpool or would be willing to carpool if convenient park and ride services were available [ ]

Have you ever used side roads to avoid congestion on MD 210?

1.) yes [X] 2.) no [ ]

If there are any additional comments or inquiries you would like to share with us please list them below.

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

[ ] Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List

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

Project NO. PG221A11

Mirenda V. Hall

Supplemental Response:
See response to frequently stated comment 1.

Alternative 5A Modified is the SHA-Selected Alternative. No HOV lanes or mainline capacity enhancements, other than auxiliary lanes to support the interchange/intersection improvements, will be provided. However the proposed improvements will not preclude rail, HOV or any other studies/improvements in the future.

SHA-Selected Alternative 5A Modified includes all interchanges proposed under Option 2. The proposed interchange locations are MD 210 at Kerby Hill Road, Palmer Road, Old Fort Road North, Fort Washington Road, Swan Creek Road and Old Fort Road South. At-grade intersection modifications are proposed with the SHA-Selected Alternative at Wilson Bridge Drive, Farmington Road and MD 373.

The specific intersection/interchange options included in the SHA-Selected Alternative consist of:

Wilson Bridge Drive Option A, (which is a modification of Option A-1), Kerby Hill Road Option C, Palmer Road Option E (which is a modification of Option D), Old Fort Road North Option C, Fort Washington Road Option D, Swan Creek Road Option G (which is a modification of Option E), Old Fort Road South Option C, Farmington Road Option A, and MD 373 Option A.

These options were selected as a result of coordination among MD 210 study team members, the focus group, environmental resource agencies and citizens, based on the extent to which they addressed safety and traffic operational needs and minimized impacts to sensitive resources.

MD 210 Project Planning Study Comment Form

Location/Design Public Hearing
Thursday, June 21, 2001
Friendly High School Auditorium

PLEASE PRINT
Name Kevin Hannon **Date** 25 June 01

Address 10002 Edgewater Terrace

City/Town Fort Washington **State** Md **Zip Code** 20744

PLEASE INDICATE YOUR PREFERENCES BY CHECKING THE BOXES BELOW.

Which of the 3 mainline options on MD 210 do you think are most appropriate?

1.) NO HOV [X] 2.) Barrier Separated HOV [ ] 3.) Concurrent Flow HOV [ ]

MD 210 involves 9 intersections that are under study for improvements. What improvement option at each intersection do you think are the most appropriate? (Select from the non-shaded boxes)

	Option A	Option A-1	Option A-2	Option B	Option C	Option D	Option E
Wilson Bridge Drive	X						
Kerby Hill Road			X				
Palmer Road					X		
Old Fort Road North					X		
Fort Washington Road						X	
Swan Creek Road					X		
Old Fort Road South					X		
Farmington Road				X			
MD 373							

Do you commute on MD 210 during the peak hours (6:30-8:30am) and (4:30-6:30pm)?

1.) yes [X] 2.) no [ ] Check if you carpool or would be willing to carpool if convenient park and ride services were available [ ]

Have you ever used side roads to avoid congestion on MD 210?

1.) yes [X] 2.) no [ ]

If there are any additional comments or inquiries you would like to share with us please list them below.

Hurry !!!

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

[ ] Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List

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

Project NO. PG221A11

Kevin Hannon

Supplemental Response:
See response to frequently stated comment 1.

Alternative 5A Modified is the SHA-Selected Alternative. No HOV lanes or mainline capacity enhancements, other than auxiliary lanes to support the interchange/intersection improvements, will be provided. However the proposed improvements will not preclude rail, HOV or any other studies/improvements in the future.

SHA-Selected Alternative 5A Modified includes all interchanges proposed under Option 2. The proposed interchange locations are MD 210 at Kerby Hill Road, Palmer Road, Old Fort Road North, Fort Washington Road, Swan Creek Road and Old Fort Road South. At-grade intersection modifications are proposed with the SHA-Selected Alternative at Wilson Bridge Drive, Farmington Road and MD 373.

The specific intersection/interchange options included in the SHA-Selected Alternative consist of:

Wilson Bridge Drive Option A, (which is a modification of Option A-1), Kerby Hill Road Option C, Palmer Road Option E (which is a modification of Option D), Old Fort Road North Option C, Fort Washington Road Option D, Swan Creek Road Option G (which is a modification of Option E), Old Fort Road South Option C, Farmington Road Option A, and MD 373 Option A.

These options were selected as a result of coordination among MD 210 study team members, the focus group, environmental resource agencies and citizens, based on the extent to which they addressed safety and traffic operational needs and minimized impacts to sensitive resources.

STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS

PG221A11
LOCATION/DESIGN PUBLIC HEARING
MD 210
FROM I-95/I-495 TO MD 228

THURSDAY, JUNE 21, 2001 5:30 P.M. TO 9:00 P.M.
FRIENDLY HIGH SCHOOL
10000 ALLENTOWN ROAD
FORT WASHINGTON, MD

PLEASE PRINT

NAME Rhonda Hanson DATE 7-10-01

ADDRESS 3408 Rockwood Rd.

CITY Accokeek STATE MD ZIP 20607

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

Please — no HOV on Route 210! It will only encourage Sprawl Growth and bring more traffic from Charles and St. Mary's County. Route Commuter Traffic up Rte 5 to the new Branch Ave. Metro Stop — encourage the use of public transportation.

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

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

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

Rhonda Hanson

Supplemental Response:
See response to frequently stated comment 1, 4.

Alternative 5A Modified is the SHA-Selected Alternative. No HOV lanes or mainline capacity enhancements, other than auxiliary lanes to support the interchange/intersection improvements, will be provided. However the proposed improvements will not preclude rail, HOV or any other studies/improvements in the future.

MD 210 Project Planning Study Comment Form

Location/Design Public Hearing
Thursday, June 21, 2001
Friendly High School Auditorium

PLEASE PRINT
Name Mr. & Mrs. Calvin C. Hill **Date** 6/18/01
Address 501 Mace Drive
Fort Washington, MD 20744-5631
City/Town _____ **State** _____ **Zip Code** _____

PLEASE INDICATE YOUR PREFERENCES BY CHECKING THE BOXES BELOW.

Which of the 3 mainline options on MD 210 do you think are most appropriate?

1.) NO HOV ☐ 2.) Barrier Separated HOV ☒ 3.) Concurrent Flow HOV ☐

MD 210 involves 9 intersections that are under study for improvements. What improvement option at each intersection do you think are the most appropriate? (Select from the non-shaded boxes)

	Option A	Option A-1	Option A-2	Option B	Option C	Option D	Option E
Wilson Bridge Drive	X						
Kerby Hill Road	X						
Palmer Road	X						
Old Fort Road North	X						
Fort Washington Road	X						
Swan Creek Road	X						
Old Fort Road South							
Farmington Road	X						
MD 373	X						

Do you commute on MD 210 during the peak hours (6:30-8:30am) and (4:30-6:30pm)?

1.) yes ☐ 2.) no ☒ Check if you carpool or would be willing to carpool if convenient park and ride services were available ☐

Have you ever used side roads to avoid congestion on MD 210?

1.) yes ☐ 2.) no ☒

If there are any additional comments or inquiries you would like to share with us please list them below.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

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

☒ Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List

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

Project NO. PG221A11

Mr. And Mrs. Calvin C. Hill

Supplemental Response:
Alternative 5A Modified is the SHA-Selected Alternative. No HOV lanes or mainline capacity enhancements, other than auxiliary lanes to support the interchange/intersection improvements, will be provided. However the proposed improvements will not preclude rail, HOV or any other studies/improvements in the future.

SHA-Selected Alternative 5A Modified includes all interchanges proposed under Option 2. The proposed interchange locations are MD 210 at Kerby Hill Road, Palmer Road, Old Fort Road North, Fort Washington Road, Swan Creek Road and Old Fort Road South. At-grade intersection modifications are proposed with the SHA-Selected Alternative at Wilson Bridge Drive, Farmington Road and MD 373.

The specific intersection/interchange options included in the SHA-Selected Alternative consist of:

Wilson Bridge Drive Option A, (which is a modification of Option A-1), Kerby Hill Road Option C, Palmer Road Option E (which is a modification of Option D), Old Fort Road North Option C, Fort Washington Road Option D, Swan Creek Road Option G (which is a modification of Option E), Old Fort Road South Option C, Farmington Road Option A, and MD 373 Option A.

These options were selected as a result of coordination among MD 210 study team members, the focus group, environmental resource agencies and citizens, based on the extent to which they addressed safety and traffic operational needs and minimized impacts to sensitive resources.

MD 210 Project Planning Study Comment Form

Location/Design Public Hearing
Thursday, June 21, 2001
Friendly High School Auditorium

PLEASE PRINT
Name David + Susan Hoffman Date 7/4/2001

Address 1400 Laurel Drive

City/Town Accokeek State MD Zip Code 20607

PLEASE INDICATE YOUR PREFERENCES BY CHECKING THE BOXES BELOW.

Which of the 3 mainline options on MD 210 do you think are most appropriate?

1.) NO HOV [X] 2.) Barrier Separated HOV [ ] 3.) Concurrent Flow HOV [ ]

MD 210 involves 9 intersections that are under study for improvements. What improvement option at each intersection do you think are the most appropriate? (Select from the non-shaded boxes)

	Option A	Option A-1	Option A-2	Option B	Option C	Option D	Option E
Wilson Bridge Drive	X						
Kerby Hill Road							
Palmer Road							
Old Fort Road North							
Fort Washington Road							
Swan Creek Road							
Old Fort Road South							
Farmington Road							
MD 373	X						

Do you commute on MD 210 during the peak hours (6:30-8:30am) and (4:30-6:30pm)?

1.) yes [X] 2.) no [ ] Check if you carpool or would be willing to carpool if convenient park and ride services were available [ ]

Have you ever used side roads to avoid congestion on MD 210?

1.) yes [X] 2.) no [ ]

If there are any additional comments or inquiries you would like to share with us please list them below.

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

[X] Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List

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

Project NO. PG221A11

David and Susan Hoffman

Supplemental Response:
See response to frequently stated comment 1.

Alternative 5A Modified is the SHA-Selected Alternative. No HOV lanes or mainline capacity enhancements, other than auxiliary lanes to support the interchange/intersection improvements, will be provided. However the proposed improvements will not preclude rail, HOV or any other studies/improvements in the future.

SHA-Selected Alternative 5A Modified includes all interchanges proposed under Option 2. The proposed interchange locations are MD 210 at Kerby Hill Road, Palmer Road, Old Fort Road North, Fort Washington Road, Swan Creek Road and Old Fort Road South. At-grade intersection modifications are proposed with the SHA-Selected Alternative at Wilson Bridge Drive, Farmington Road and MD 373.

The specific intersection/interchange options included in the SHA-Selected Alternative consist of:

Wilson Bridge Drive Option A, (which is a modification of Option A-1), Kerby Hill Road Option C, Palmer Road Option E (which is a modification of Option D), Old Fort Road North Option C, Fort Washington Road Option D, Swan Creek Road Option G (which is a modification of Option E), Old Fort Road South Option C, Farmington Road Option A, and MD 373 Option A.

These options were selected as a result of coordination among MD 210 study team members, the focus group, environmental resource agencies and citizens, based on the extent to which they addressed safety and traffic operational needs and minimized impacts to sensitive resources.

MD 210 Project Planning Study Comment Form

Location/Design Public Hearing
Thursday, June 21, 2001
Friendly High School Auditorium

PLEASE PRINT
Name DIANE Holder **Date** 6-21-01

Address 6911 Heather Dr.

City/Town Bryans Rd. **State** MD **Zip Code** 20616

PLEASE INDICATE YOUR PREFERENCES BY CHECKING THE BOXES BELOW.

Which of the 3 mainline options on MD 210 do you think are most appropriate?

1.) NO HOV [X] 2.) Barrier Separated HOV [ ] 3.) Concurrent Flow HOV [ ]

MD 210 involves 9 intersections that are under study for improvements. What improvement option at each intersection do you think are the most appropriate? (Select from the non-shaded boxes)

	Option A	Option A-1	Option A-2	Option B	Option C	Option D	Option E
Wilson Bridge Drive							
Kerby Hill Road							
Palmer Road							
Old Fort Road North							
Fort Washington Road							
Swan Creek Road							
Old Fort Road South							
Farmington Road							
MD 373							

Do you commute on MD 210 during the peak hours (6:30-8:30am) and (4:30-6:30pm)?

1.) yes [X] 2.) no [ ] Check if you carpool or would be willing to carpool if convenient park and ride services were available [ ]

Have you ever used side roads to avoid congestion on MD 210?

1.) yes [X] 2.) no [ ]

If there are any additional comments or inquiries you would like to share with us please list them below.

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

[ ] Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List

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

Project NO. PG221A11

Diane Holder

Supplemental Response:
See response to frequently stated comment 1.

Alternative 5A Modified is the SHA-Selected Alternative. No HOV lanes or mainline capacity enhancements, other than auxiliary lanes to support the interchange/intersection improvements, will be provided. However the proposed improvements will not preclude rail, HOV or any other studies/improvements in the future.

MD 210 Project Planning Study Comment Form

Location/Design Public Hearing
Thursday, June 21, 2001
Friendly High School Auditorium

PLEASE PRINT
Name ADAM HOLZSAGER **Date** June 29, 2001

Address 7517 Catone Ct

City/Town Oxon Hill **State** MD **Zip Code** 20745

PLEASE INDICATE YOUR PREFERENCES BY CHECKING THE BOXES BELOW.

Which of the 3 mainline options on MD 210 do you think are most appropriate?

1.) NO HOV ☐ 2.) Barrier Separated HOV ☐ 3.) Concurrent Flow HOV ☑

MD 210 involves 9 intersections that are under study for improvements. What improvement option at each intersection do you think are the most appropriate? (Select from the non-shaded boxes)

	Option A	Option A-1	Option A-2	Option B	Option C	Option D	Option E
Wilson Bridge Drive	✓						
Kerby Hill Road		✓					
Palmer Road	✓						
Old Fort Road North					✓		
Fort Washington Road						✓	
Swan Creek Road							
Old Fort Road South							
Farmington Road							
MD 373							

Do you commute on MD 210 during the peak hours (6:30-8:30am) and (4:30-6:30pm)?

1.) yes ☑ 2.) no ☐ Check if you carpool or would be willing to carpool if convenient park and ride services were available ☐

Have you ever used side roads to avoid congestion on MD 210?

1.) yes ☑ 2.) no ☐

If there are any additional comments or inquiries you would like to share with us please list them below.

What, if any, residential or business sound barriers are included as a part of any of these options? (1)

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

☐ Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List

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

Project NO. PG221A11

Adam Holzsager

Supplemental Response:
Receptor sites within Noise Sensitive Areas (NSA) were selected to represent the overall noise environment and to determine locations where residences may be impacted by traffic noise associated with the Selected Alternative. Upon review of the results SHA, in collaboration with FHWA, directed THAT the barriers meeting reasonableness and feasibility criteria along the entirety of any community abutting proposed interchange/intersection improvements be included with the Selected Alternative. (1)

Alternative 5A Modified is the SHA-Selected Alternative. No HOV lanes or mainline capacity enhancements, other than auxiliary lanes to support the interchange/intersection improvements, will be provided. However the proposed improvements will not preclude rail, HOV or any other studies/improvements in the future.

SHA-Selected Alternative 5A Modified includes all interchanges proposed under Option 2. The proposed interchange locations are MD 210 at Kerby Hill Road, Palmer Road, Old Fort Road North, Fort Washington Road, Swan Creek Road and Old Fort Road South. At-grade intersection modifications are proposed with the SHA-Selected Alternative at Wilson Bridge Drive, Farmington Road and MD 373.

The specific intersection/interchange options included in the SHA-Selected Alternative consist of:

Wilson Bridge Drive Option A, (which is a modification of Option A-1), Kerby Hill Road Option C, Palmer Road Option E (which is a modification of Option D), Old Fort Road North Option C, Fort Washington Road Option D, Swan Creek Road Option G (which is a modification of Option E), Old Fort Road South Option C, Farmington Road Option A, and MD 373 Option A.

These options were selected as a result of coordination among MD 210 study team members, the focus group, environmental resource agencies and citizens, based on the extent to which they addressed safety and traffic operational needs and minimized impacts to sensitive resources.

MD 210 Project Planning Study Comment Form

Location/Design Public Hearing
Thursday, June 21, 2001
Friendly High School Auditorium

PLEASE PRINT
Name TOM ILKKA **Date** 6/21/01

Address 1114 ELLINGWOOD DR.

City/Town ACCOKEEK **State** MD **Zip Code** 20607

PLEASE INDICATE YOUR PREFERENCES BY CHECKING THE BOXES BELOW.

Which of the 3 mainline options on MD 210 do you think are most appropriate?

1.) NO HOV ☐ 2.) Barrier Separated HOV ☒ 3.) Concurrent Flow HOV ☐

MD 210 involves 9 intersections that are under study for improvements. What improvement option at each intersection do you think are the most appropriate? (Select from the non-shaded boxes)

	Option A	Option A-1	Option A-2	Option B	Option C	Option D	Option E
Wilson Bridge Drive	X						
Kerby Hill Road			X				
Palmer Road					X		
Old Fort Road North					X		
Fort Washington Road						X	
Swan Creek Road					X		
Old Fort Road South					X		
Farmington Road				X			
MD 373				X			

Do you commute on MD 210 during the peak hours (6:30-8:30am) and (4:30-6:30pm)?

1.) yes ☒ 2.) no ☐ Check if you carpool or would be willing to carpool if convenient park and ride services were available ☐

Have you ever used side roads to avoid congestion on MD 210?

1.) yes ☒ 2.) no ☐

If there are any additional comments or inquiries you would like to share with us please list them below.

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

☐ Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List

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

Project NO. PG221A11

V1-64

Tom Ilkka

Supplemental Response:
See response to frequently stated comment 1.

Alternative 5A Modified is the SHA-Selected Alternative. No HOV lanes or mainline capacity enhancements, other than auxiliary lanes to support the interchange/intersection improvements, will be provided. However the proposed improvements will not preclude rail, HOV or any other studies/improvements in the future.

SHA-Selected Alternative 5A Modified includes all interchanges proposed under Option 2. The proposed interchange locations are MD 210 at Kerby Hill Road, Palmer Road, Old Fort Road North, Fort Washington Road, Swan Creek Road and Old Fort Road South. At-grade intersection modifications are proposed with the SHA-Selected Alternative at Wilson Bridge Drive, Farmington Road and MD 373.

The specific intersection/interchange options included in the SHA-Selected Alternative consist of:

Wilson Bridge Drive Option A, (which is a modification of Option A-1), Kerby Hill Road Option C, Palmer Road Option E (which is a modification of Option D), Old Fort Road North Option C, Fort Washington Road Option D, Swan Creek Road Option G (which is a modification of Option E), Old Fort Road South Option C, Farmington Road Option A, and MD 373 Option A.

These options were selected as a result of coordination among MD 210 study team members, the focus group, environmental resource agencies and citizens, based on the extent to which they addressed safety and traffic operational needs and minimized impacts to sensitive resources.

STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS

PG221A11
LOCATION/DESIGN PUBLIC HEARING
MD 210
FROM I-95/I-495 TO MD 228

THURSDAY, JUNE 21, 2001, 5:30 P.M. TO 9:00 P.M.
FRIENDLY HIGH SCHOOL
10000 ALLENTOWN ROAD
FORT WASHINGTON, MD

PLEASE PRINT

NAME  Mr. Dion Johnson
215 Gingrich Dr
Accokeek MD 20607-2700

DATE 22 June '01

ADDRESS

CITY STATE ZIP

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

I am on the Wilson Bridge Stakeholder panel, appointed by our County Council Representative, James Estepp. I am a member of the Greater Accokeek Civic Association. Here I represent neither group, I speak only for myself.

Accokeek, a village type complex, has a long history and a feeling of solidarity among the inhabitants. The village is located on both sides of Route 210. Unfortunately, the highway severely splits this fine old community.

Not only must changes in the design of Route 210 not increase the division between the two portions of Accokeek, but should decrease this division. To accomplish this crossing the of 210 at 373 must be easier, not more difficult.

This can be readily accomplished by lowering 210 below grade and keeping 373 at its current level. As 210 is on a hill at this point, lowering its grade would faciltate traffic flow, increase drivers range of vision along the highway and eliminate a stop lite. Entrance to and from 210 would be from parallel access roads, two of which already exist. (1)

This idea is not my quick thoughts at tonight's meeting but rather the results of deliberations by a group of 25 - 30 interested community activists who gathered at The National Colonial Farm of The Accokeek Foundation a week ago to discuss the future development of the Greater Accokeek area. Not much was decided, but it quickly became crystal clear that 210 presented a real barrier to the development of Accokeek and that converting 210 into an underpass was the only real solution to bringing the two parts closer together.

Furthermore, any program that would destroy B& J Carryout is unacceptable.

Thank you for your attention.

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

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

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

VI-65

Dion Johnson

Supplemental Response:
See response to frequently stated comment 1.

Impacts to existing level of community cohesion are not anticipated as a result of improvements to MD 210 at MD 373 with the SHA-selected Alternative. The Selected Alternative would not physically bisect the community at a new location in the Accokeek area as MD 210 is currently a 6-lane divided highway with auxiliary lanes crossing MD 373. A grade-separation at the intersection of MD 210 and MD 373 was not investigated since traffic studies show that at-grade improvements would provide adequate levels of service. (1)

Alternative 5A Modified is the SHA-Selected Alternative; however the proposed improvements will not preclude rail, HOV or any other studies/improvements in the future.

MD 210 Project Planning Study Comment Form

Location/Design Public Hearing
Thursday, June 21, 2001
Friendly High School Auditorium

PLEASE PRINT
Name DION JOHNSON **Date**

Address 215 GINGRICH DR

City/Town ACCOKEEK **State** MD **Zip Code** 20607

PLEASE INDICATE YOUR PREFERENCES BY CHECKING THE BOXES BELOW.

Which of the 3 mainline options on MD 210 do you think are most appropriate?

1.) NO HOV [X] 2.) Barrier Separated HOV [ ] 3.) Concurrent Flow HOV [ ]

MD 210 involves 9 intersections that are under study for improvements. What improvement option at each intersection do you think are the most appropriate? (Select from the non-shaded boxes)

	Option A	Option A-1	Option A-2	Option B	Option C	Option D	Option E
Wilson Bridge Drive							
Kerby Hill Road							
Palmer Road							
Old Fort Road North							
Fort Washington Road							
Swan Creek Road							
Old Fort Road South							
Farmington Road							
MD 373							

Do you commute on MD 210 during the peak hours (6:30-8:30am) and (4:30-6:30pm)?

1.) yes [ ] 2.) no [X] Check if you carpool or would be willing to carpool if convenient park and ride services were available [ ]

Have you ever used side roads to avoid congestion on MD 210?

1.) yes [X] 2.) no [ ]

If there are any additional comments or inquiries you would like to share with us please list them below.

at At 373 lower 210 to pass under 373 eliminating a stop light & greatly easing traffic flow, for Vehicle & Bicycle, between the two halves of Accokeek. (1)

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

[ ] Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List

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

Project NO. PG221A11

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

MD 210 Project Planning Study Comment Form

Location/Design Public Hearing
Thursday, June 21, 2001
Friendly High School Auditorium

PLEASE PRINT
Name Phil Jones Date 7-4-01

Address 1520 Laurel Dr

City/Town Accokeek State md Zip Code 20607

PLEASE INDICATE YOUR PREFERENCES BY CHECKING THE BOXES BELOW.

Which of the 3 mainline options on MD 210 do you think are most appropriate?

1.) NO HOV [X] 2.) Barrier Separated HOV [ ] 3.) Concurrent Flow HOV [ ]

MD 210 involves 9 intersections that are under study for improvements. What improvement option at each intersection do you think are the most appropriate? (Select from the non-shaded boxes)

	Option A	Option A-1	Option A-2	Option B	Option C	Option D	Option E
Wilson Bridge Drive	X						
Kerby Hill Road	X						
Palmer Road	X						
Old Fort Road North	X						
Fort Washington Road	X						
Swan Creek Road	X						
Old Fort Road South				NO	NO		
Farmington Road	X						
MD 373	X						

Do you commute on MD 210 during the peak hours (6:30-8:30am) and (4:30-6:30pm)?

1.) yes [ ] 2.) no [X] Check if you carpool or would be willing to carpool if convenient park and ride services were available [ ]

Have you ever used side roads to avoid congestion on MD 210?

1.) yes [ ] 2.) no [X]

If there are any additional comments or inquiries you would like to share with us please list them below.

- DO NOT BRING CHARLES + ST MARY'S CO. TRAFFIC THRU OUR NEIGHBORHOOD (1)
- DO NOT FURTHER DIVIDE OUR NEIGHBORHOODS WITH HIGH SPEED HIWAY
- USE RTE 5 (+ FINISH WIDENING IT) TO CHANNEL TRAFFIC TO BRANCH AVE METRO
- CONTINUE METRO DOWN RTE 5 TO WALDORF OR USE FEEDER BUSES TO METRO
- BUILD PURPLE LINE (GET PEOPLE OUT OF THEIR CARS !!!)

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

[ ] Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List

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

Project NO. PG221A11

Phil and Susan Jones

Supplemental Response:
See response to frequently stated comments 1, 2.

The purpose of the study is to address the increasingly severe and frequent traffic congestion along MD 210 and it involves the development and analysis of reasonable alternates including the no build alternate. Traffic operations indicate that peak hour traffic entering or crossing MD 210 from side roads often require several signal cycles to go through the intersection. The short auxiliary lanes, severe skew angles, sharp curvatures, and the close proximity of the service roads created congestion for the side road traffic. Five of the nine major intersections in the project area are currently operating at failing conditions in the peak hour periods. By the year 2020, all nine study area intersections will reach level of service grade F (represents failing traffic flow with total congestion, where several cycles are required to clear traffic through an intersection) and some intersections will be handling almost twice the traffic they are designed to handle. In addition, the number of reported accidents occurring from Fort Washington Road to the Capital Beltway are significantly higher than the statewide average for similar facilities. By replacing the existing intersections with interchanges as proposed under the build alternative, consistent with the county master plan, traffic is projected to operate at acceptable levels of service (LOS B or better) in the design year 2020. (1)

Alternative 5A Modified is the Selected Alternative. No HOV lanes or mainline capacity enhancements, other than auxiliary lanes to support the interchange/intersection improvements, will be provided. However the proposed improvements will not preclude rail, HOV or any other studies/improvements in the future.

SHA-Selected Alternative 5A Modified includes all interchanges proposed under Option 2. The proposed interchange locations are MD 210 at Kerby Hill Road, Palmer Road, Old Fort Road North, Fort Washington Road, Swan Creek Road and Old Fort Road South. At-grade intersection modifications are proposed with the SHA-Selected Alternative at Wilson Bridge Drive, Farmington Road and MD 373.

The specific intersection/interchange options included in the SHA-Selected Alternative consist of:

Wilson Bridge Drive Option A, (which is a modification of Option A-1), Kerby Hill Road Option C, Palmer Road Option E (which is a modification of Option D), Old Fort Road North Option C, Fort Washington Road Option D, Swan Creek Road Option G (which is a modification of Option E), Old Fort Road South Option C, Farmington Road Option A, and MD 373 Option A.

These options were selected as a result of coordination among MD 210 study team members, the focus group, environmental resource agencies and citizens, based on the extent to which they addressed safety and traffic operational needs and minimized impacts to sensitive resources.

MD 210 Project Planning Study Comment Form

Location/Design Public Hearing
Thursday, June 21, 2001
Friendly High School Auditorium

PLEASE PRINT

Name Susan Jones Date 7-4-01

Address 1520 Laurel Dr

City/Town Accokeek State md Zip Code 20607

PLEASE INDICATE YOUR PREFERENCES BY CHECKING THE BOXES BELOW.

Which of the 3 mainline options on MD 210 do you think are most appropriate?

1.) NO HOV [✓] 2.) Barrier Separated HOV [ ] 3.) Concurrent Flow HOV [ ]

MD 210 involves 9 intersections that are understudy for improvements. What improvement option at each intersection do you think are the most appropriate? (Select from the non-shaded boxes)

	Option A	Option A-1	Option A-2	Option B	Option C	Option D	Option E
Wilson Bridge Drive	✓						
Kerby Hill Road	✓						
Palmer Road	✓						
Old Fort Road North	✓						
Fort Washington Road	✓						
Swan Creek Road	✓						
Old Fort Road South				no	no		
Farmington Road	✓						
MD 373	✓						

Do you commute on MD 210 during the peak hours (6:30-8:30am) and (4:30-6:30pm)?

1.) yes [ ] 2.) no [X] Check if you carpool or would be willing to carpool if convenient park and ride services were available [ ]

Have you ever used side roads to avoid congestion on MD 210?

1.) yes [ ] 2.) no [X]

If there are any additional comments or inquiries you would like to share with us please list them below.

Avoid sprawl — Use existing METRO with buses + roads to feed rail

Feed traffic up Rte 5

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

[ ] Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List

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

Project NO. PG221A11

Impacts to existing level of community cohesion are not anticipated as a result of improvements to MD 210 at MD 373 with the SHA-selected Alternative. The Selected Alternative would not physically bisect the community at a new location in the Accokeek area as MD 210 is currently a 6-lane divided highway with auxiliary lanes crossing MD 373. A grade-separation at the intersection of MD 210 and MD 373 was not investigated since traffic studies show that at-grade improvements would provide adequate levels of service.

MD 210 Project Planning Study Comment Form

Location/Design Public Hearing
Thursday, June 21, 2001
Friendly High School Auditorium

PLEASE PRINT
Name MRS. TONI KALOZ **Date** 6-19-01

Address 2229 ROSEDELL PL.

City/Town FT. WASHINGTON **State** MD **Zip Code** 20744

PLEASE INDICATE YOUR PREFERENCES BY CHECKING THE BOXES BELOW.

Which of the 3 mainline options on MD 210 do you think are most appropriate?

1.) NO HOV [X] 2.) Barrier Separated HOV [ ] 3.) Concurrent Flow HOV [ ]

MD 210 involves 9 intersections that are under study for improvements. What improvement option at each intersection do you think are the most appropriate? (Select from the non-shaded boxes)

	Option A	Option A-1	Option A-2	Option B	Option C	Option D	Option E
Wilson Bridge Drive	✓						
Kerby Hill Road		✓					
Palmer Road	✓						
Old Fort Road North					✓		
Fort Washington Road						✓	
Swan Creek Road							✓
Old Fort Road South					✓		
Farmington Road				✓			
MD 373				✓			

Do you commute on MD 210 during the peak hours (6:30-8:30am) and (4:30-6:30pm)?

1.) yes [X] 2.) no [ ] Check if you carpool or would be willing to carpool if convenient park and ride services were available [ ]

Have you ever used side roads to avoid congestion on MD 210?

1.) yes [X] 2.) no [ ]

If there are any additional comments or inquiries you would like to share with us please list them below.

WHY CAN'T YOU DO TO 210 WHAT THEY DID TO RTE. 5? WE NEEDED WORSE THEN THEY DID! HURRY UP & DO IT!! (1)

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

[ ] Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List

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

Project NO. PG221A11

VI-69

Mrs. Arnold Kaloz

Supplemental Response:
See response to frequently stated comments 1, 3.

The purpose of the study is to address the increasingly severe and frequent traffic congestion along MD 210 and it involves the development and analysis of reasonable alternates including the no build alternate. Traffic operations indicate that peak hour traffic entering or crossing MD 210 from side roads often require several signal cycles to go through the intersection. The short auxiliary lanes, severe skew angles, sharp curvatures, and the close proximity of the service roads created congestion for the side road traffic. Five of the nine major intersections in the project area are currently operating at failing conditions in the peak hour periods. By the year 2020, all nine study area intersections will reach level of service grade F (represents failing traffic flow with total congestion, where several cycles are required to clear traffic through an intersection) and some intersections will be handling almost twice the traffic they are designed to handle. In addition, the number of reported accidents occurring from Fort Washington Road to the Capital Beltway are significantly higher than the statewide average for similar facilities. The solution proposed under the MD 210 SHA-selected Alternative is similar to that being constructed on MD 5. By replacing the existing intersections with interchanges as proposed under the SHA-selected Alternative, consistent with the county master plan, traffic is projected to operate at acceptable levels of service (LOS E or better) in the design year 2020. (1)

Alternative 5A Modified is the Selected Alternative. No HOV lanes or mainline capacity enhancements, other than auxiliary lanes to support the interchange/intersection improvements, will be provided. However the proposed improvements will not preclude rail, HOV or any other studies/improvements in the future.

SHA-Selected Alternative 5A Modified includes all interchanges proposed under Option 2. The proposed interchange locations are MD 210 at Kerby Hill Road, Palmer Road, Old Fort Road North, Fort Washington Road, Swan Creek Road and Old Fort Road South. At-grade intersection modifications are proposed with the SHA-Selected Alternative at Wilson Bridge Drive, Farmington Road and MD 373.

The specific intersection/interchange options included in the SHA-Selected Alternative consist of:

Wilson Bridge Drive Option A, (which is a modification of Option A-1), Kerby Hill Road Option C, Palmer Road Option E (which is a modification of Option D), Old Fort Road North Option C, Fort Washington Road Option D, Swan Creek Road Option G (which is a modification of Option E), Old Fort Road South Option C, Farmington Road Option A, and MD 373 Option A.

These options were selected as a result of coordination among MD 210 study team members, the focus group, environmental resource agencies and citizens, based on the extent to which they addressed safety and traffic operational needs and minimized impacts to sensitive resources.

MD 210 Project Planning Study Comment Form

Location/Design Public Hearing
Thursday, June 21, 2001
Friendly High School Auditorium

PLEASE PRINT
Name TIM KONKUS **Date**

Address 13701 PISCATAWAY DRIVE

City/Town FORT WASHINGTON **State** MD **Zip Code** 20744

PLEASE INDICATE YOUR PREFERENCES BY CHECKING THE BOXES BELOW.

Which of the 3 mainline options on MD 210 do you think are most appropriate?

1.) NO HOV ☐ 2.) Barrier Separated HOV ☒ 3.) Concurrent Flow HOV ☐

MD 210 involves 9 intersections that are under study for improvements. What improvement option at each intersection do you think are the most appropriate? (Select from the non-shaded boxes)

	Option A	Option A-1	Option A-2	Option B	Option C	Option D	Option E
Wilson Bridge Drive	A-1						
Kerby Hill Road		A-1					
Palmer Road	A						
Old Fort Road North					C		
Fort Washington Road						D	
Swan Creek Road							E
Old Fort Road South					C		
Farmington Road				B			
MD 373				B			

Do you commute on MD 210 during the peak hours (6:30-8:30am) and (4:30-6:30pm)?

1.) yes ☒ 2.) no ☐ Check if you carpool or would be willing to carpool if convenient park and ride services were available ☒

Have you ever used side roads to avoid congestion on MD 210?

1.) yes ☒ 2.) no ☐

If there are any additional comments or inquiries you would like to share with us please list them below.

LIGHT RAIL OR METRO RAIL WOULD BE THE BEST USE OF THE MEDIAN LAND ON 210.

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

☐ Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List

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

Project NO. PG221A11

VI-70

Tim Konkus

Supplemental Response:
See response to frequently stated comment 2.

Alternative 5A Modified is the SHA-Selected Alternative. No HOV lanes or mainline capacity enhancements, other than auxiliary lanes to support the interchange/intersection improvements, will be provided. However the proposed improvements will not preclude rail, HOV or any other studies/improvements in the future.

SHA-Selected Alternative 5A Modified includes all interchanges proposed under Option 2. The proposed interchange locations are MD 210 at Kerby Hill Road, Palmer Road, Old Fort Road North, Fort Washington Road, Swan Creek Road and Old Fort Road South. At-grade intersection modifications are proposed with the SHA-Selected Alternative at Wilson Bridge Drive, Farmington Road and MD 373.

The specific intersection/interchange options included in the SHA-Selected Alternative consist of:

Wilson Bridge Drive Option A, (which is a modification of Option A-1), Kerby Hill Road Option C, Palmer Road Option E (which is a modification of Option D), Old Fort Road North Option C, Fort Washington Road Option D, Swan Creek Road Option G (which is a modification of Option E), Old Fort Road South Option C, Farmington Road Option A, and MD 373 Option A.

These options were selected as a result of coordination among MD 210 study team members, the focus group, environmental resource agencies and citizens, based on the extent to which they addressed safety and traffic operational needs and minimized impacts to sensitive resources.

STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS

PG221A11
LOCATION/DESIGN PUBLIC HEARING
MD 210
FROM I-95/I-495 TO MD 228

THURSDAY, JUNE 21, 2001, 5:30 P.M. TO 9:00 P.M.
FRIENDLY HIGH SCHOOL
10000 ALLENTOWN ROAD
FORT WASHINGTON, MD

PLEASE PRINT

NAME Millie Kriemelmeyer DATE 6/21/01

ADDRESS 16900 Mattawoman Lane

CITY Waldorf STATE MD ZIP 20601-3801

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

HOV 2/Bus should be available from Waldorf on MD 228 to ~~the~~ MD 210. On MD210, HOV 2/BUS should be available from Bryans Road to Beltway. ADT supports HOV 2/BUS from Waldorf & Bryans Road to the Beltway. Farmington Rd, MD 373 & MD 228 would require interchanges. A Park and Ride Lot would be needed on MD 228 in Waldorf. (1)

Alt. 5C best describes the improvements required to return free-flowing traffic to this corridor. Option 2 should include Farmington Rd & MD 373 for interchanges. Should allow HOV access from more locations. MD 5 overpasses on Surratts Rd & MD 381/373 should be done. US 301/MD 228 interchange should be done with flyover. New MD 5 flyover at US 301 should be done. (2)

Highways should be better maintained. Lights should be timed better. Striping should be repainted more often. (3)

MD 210 should have overhead electronic signs warning of accidents & construction ahead on Beltway & other MD & US highways.

The MD 210 improvements should be funded.

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

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

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

Millie Kriemelmeyer

Supplemental Response:
See response to frequently stated comment 3.

Alternative 5A Modified is the SHA-Selected Alternative. This does not include any HOV options; however, this alternative does not preclude studies such as HOV or rail along MD 210 in the future. HOV is not included in the SHA-Selected Alternative since the less costly, less impactive non-HOV alternative is forecast to provide adequate levels of service in the design year 2020.

SHA-Selected Alternative 5A Modified includes all interchanges proposed under Option 2. The proposed interchange locations are MD 210 at Kerby Hill Road, Palmer Road, Old Fort Road North, Fort Washington Road, Swan Creek Road and Old Fort Road South. At-grade intersection modifications are proposed with the SHA-Selected Alternative at Wilson Bridge Drive, Farmington Road and MD 373.

The specific intersection/interchange options included in the SHA-Selected Alternative consist of:

Wilson Bridge Drive Option A, (which is a modification of Option A-1), Kerby Hill Road Option C, Palmer Road Option E (which is a modification of Option D), Old Fort Road North Option C, Fort Washington Road Option D, Swan Creek Road Option G (which is a modification of Option E), Old Fort Road South Option C, Farmington Road Option A, and MD 373 Option A.

These options were selected as a result of coordination among MD 210 study team members, the focus group, environmental resource agencies and citizens, based on the extent to which they addressed safety and traffic operational needs and minimized impacts to sensitive resources.

The purpose of the study is to address the increasingly severe and frequent traffic congestion along MD 210 and it involves the development and analysis of reasonable alternatives including the no build alternative. Traffic operations indicate that peak hour traffic entering or crossing MD 210 from side roads often require several signal cycles to go through the intersection. The short auxiliary lanes, severe skew angles, sharp curvatures, and the close proximity of the service roads created congestion for the side road traffic. Five of the nine major intersections in the project area are currently operating at failing conditions in the peak hour periods. By the year 2020, all nine study area intersections will reach level of service grade F (represents failing traffic flow with total congestion, where several cycles are required to clear traffic through an intersection) and some intersections will be handling almost twice the traffic they are designed to handle. In addition, the number of reported accidents occurring from Fort Washington Road to the Capital Beltway are significantly higher than the statewide average for similar facilities. By replacing the existing intersections with interchanges as proposed under the build alternates, consistent with the county master plan, traffic is projected to operate at acceptable levels of service (LOS E or better) in the design year 2020. (1)

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

The MD 5 corridor needs, including multi-modal considerations in Waldorf, are being addressed as part of a separate SAH Project Planning study.

SHA's Office of Traffic and Safety (OOTS) continually monitors and optimizes signal timing and phasing. At the request of several focus group members, OOTS representatives have monitored MD 210 and have confirmed little, if any, further improvement in operations or reduction in delays can be made by further changes in signal timing within the study area. (2)

The local SHA District 3 Office oversees striping and maintenance of MD 210 and all local issues should be referred to their office. (3)

MD 210 Project Planning Study Comment Form

Location/Design Public Hearing
Thursday, June 21, 2001
Friendly High School Auditorium

PLEASE PRINT
Name Richard A. Krueger **Date** 21 June '01

Address 700 Muirfield Cir.

City/Town Ft. Washington **State** MD **Zip Code** 20744

PLEASE INDICATE YOUR PREFERENCES BY CHECKING THE BOXES BELOW.

Which of the 3 mainline options on MD 210 do you think are most appropriate?

1.) NO HOV [X] 2.) Barrier Separated HOV [ ] 3.) Concurrent Flow HOV [ ]

MD 210 involves 9 intersections that are under study for improvements. What improvement option at each intersection do you think are the most appropriate? (Select from the non-shaded boxes)

	Option A	Option A-1	Option A-2	Option B	Option C	Option D	Option E
Wilson Bridge Drive	X						
Kerby Hill Road			X				
Palmer Road					X		
Old Fort Road North					X		
Fort Washington Road						X	
Swan Creek Road							X
Old Fort Road South					X		
Farmington Road				X			
MD 373				X			

Do you commute on MD 210 during the peak hours (6:30-8:30am) and (4:30-6:30pm)?

1.) yes [ ] 2.) no [X] Check if you carpool or would be willing to carpool if convenient park and ride services were available [ ]

Have you ever used side roads to avoid congestion on MD 210?

1.) yes [X] 2.) no [ ]

If there are any additional comments or inquiries you would like to share with us please list them below.

Alternatives such as Option B at Old Fort North, Option C at Ft Wash. Rd will recreate the Rt 5 Chinese Walls on Rt 210. They should be eliminated. If HOV is required, it should be concurrent flow – not barrier separated. HOV on 210 is advantageous only if it flows smoothly into HOV on 95/495 and 295. Without HOV on these Interstates, it is not worth it on 210.

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

[ ] Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List

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

Project NO. PG221A11

VI-73

Richard Krueger

Supplemental Response:
See response to frequently stated comment 1.

Alternative 5A Modified is the Selected Alternative. No HOV lanes or mainline capacity enhancements, other than auxiliary lanes to support the interchange/intersection improvements, will be provided. However the proposed improvements will not preclude rail, HOV or any other studies/improvements in the future.

SHA-Selected Alternative 5A Modified includes all interchanges proposed under Option 2. The proposed interchange locations are MD 210 at Kerby Hill Road, Palmer Road, Old Fort Road North, Fort Washington Road, Swan Creek Road and Old Fort Road South. At-grade intersection modifications are proposed with the SHA-Selected Alternative at Wilson Bridge Drive, Farmington Road and MD 373.

The specific intersection/interchange options included in the SHA-Selected Alternative consist of:

Wilson Bridge Drive Option A, (which is a modification of Option A-1), Kerby Hill Road Option C, Palmer Road Option E (which is a modification of Option D), Old Fort Road North Option C, Fort Washington Road Option D, Swan Creek Road Option G (which is a modification of Option E), Old Fort Road South Option C, Farmington Road Option A, and MD 373 Option A.

These options were selected as a result of coordination among MD 210 study team members, the focus group, environmental resource agencies and citizens, based on the extent to which they addressed safety and traffic operational needs and minimized impacts to sensitive resources.

STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
QUESTIONS AND/OR COMMENTS

PG221A11
LOCATION/DESIGN PUBLIC HEARING
MD 210
FROM I-95/I-495 TO MD 228

THURSDAY, JUNE 21, 2001, 5:30 P.M. TO 9:00 P.M.
FRIENDLY HIGH SCHOOL
10000 ALLENTOWN ROAD
FORT WASHINGTON, MD

PLEASE PRINT

NAME Min di Lab DATE 7/20/200

ADDRESS 124 Chatswith Dr

CITY Accokeek STATE MD ZIP 20607

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

Please No Metro Lane - No Buses - No Toll Road Palace Queen and Preserve in this Area NO HOV -

(1)

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

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

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

Min di Lab

Supplemental Response:
See response to frequently stated comment 1.

The purpose of the study is to address the increasingly severe and frequent traffic congestion along MD 210 and it involves the development and analysis of reasonable alternates including the no build alternate. Traffic operations indicate that peak hour traffic entering or crossing MD 210 from side roads often require several signal cycles to go through the intersection. The short auxiliary lanes, severe skew angles, sharp curvatures, and the close proximity of the service roads created congestion for the side road traffic. Five of the nine major intersections in the project area are currently operating at failing conditions in the peak hour periods. By the year 2020, all nine study area intersections will reach level of service grade F (represents failing traffic flow with total congestion, where several cycles are required to clear traffic through an intersection) and some intersections will be handling almost twice the traffic they are designed to handle. In addition, the number of reported accidents occurring from Fort Washington Road to the Capital Beltway are significantly higher than the statewide average for similar facilities. By replacing the existing intersections with interchanges as proposed under the build alternative, consistent with the county master plan, traffic is projected to operate at acceptable levels of service (LOS E or better) in the design year 2020. (1)

Alternative 5A Modified is the Selected Alternative. No HOV lanes or mainline capacity enhancements, other than auxiliary lanes to support the interchange/intersection improvements, will be provided. However the proposed improvements will not preclude rail, HOV or any other studies/improvements in the future.

MD 210 Project Planning Study Comment Form

Location/Design Public Hearing
Thursday, June 21, 2001
Friendly High School Auditorium

PLEASE PRINT
Name Michael S. Leventhal Date 30 June 2001

Address Box 217, 1130 Apple Valley Rd

City/Town Accokeek State MD Zip Code 20607

PLEASE INDICATE YOUR PREFERENCES BY CHECKING THE BOXES BELOW.

Which of the 3 mainline options on MD 210 do you think are most appropriate?

1.) NO HOV [X] 2.) Barrier Separated HOV [ ] 3.) Concurrent Flow HOV [ ]

MD 210 involves 9 intersections that are under study for improvements. What improvement option at each intersection do you think are the most appropriate? (Select from the non-shaded boxes)

	Option A	Option A-1	Option A-2	Option B	Option C	Option D	Option E
Wilson Bridge Drive	X						
Kerby Hill Road	No	No	No				
Palmer Road	~~No~~			No	No	No	
Old Fort Road North	X						
Fort Washington Road	X						
Swan Creek Road	X						
Old Fort Road South				No	No		
Farmington Road	X						
MD 373	X						

Do you commute on MD 210 during the peak hours (6:30-8:30am) and (4:30-6:30pm)?

1.) yes [X] 2.) no [ ] Check if you carpool or would be willing to carpool if convenient park and ride services were available [ ]

Have you ever used side roads to avoid congestion on MD 210?

1.) yes [ ] 2.) no [X]

If there are any additional comments or inquiries you would like to share with us please list them below.

① Retain all ROW trees on 210
② Improve 301 so South County traffic does not move to 210 (1)
③ Improve, expand light rail/Subway into P.G. County
④ Keep all traffic at grade (2)
⑤ Pedestrian bridge at Virginia 210 in Accokeek

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

[ ] Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List

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

Project NO. PG221A11

VII-75

Micheal S. Leventhal

Supplemental Response:
See response to frequently stated comments 1, 2.

US 301 is outside the study area for this planning study and thus not considered as part of this project; however MD 5/US 301 needs are being addressed as part of a separate project planning study. (1)

The purpose of the study is to address the increasingly severe and frequent traffic congestion along MD 210 and it involves the development and analysis of reasonable alternates including the no build alternate. Traffic operations indicate that peak hour traffic entering or crossing MD 210 from side roads often require several signal cycles to go through the intersection. The short auxiliary lanes, severe skew angles, sharp curvatures, and the close proximity of the service roads created congestion for the side road traffic. Five of the nine major intersections in the project area are currently operating at failing conditions in the peak hour periods. By the year 2020, all nine study area intersections will reach level of service grade F (represents failing traffic flow with total congestion, where several cycles are required to clear traffic through an intersection) and some intersections will be handling almost twice the traffic they are designed to handle. In addition, the number of reported accidents occurring from Fort Washington Road to the Capital Beltway are significantly higher than the statewide average for similar facilities. By replacing the existing intersections with interchanges as proposed under the build alternative, consistent with the county master plan, traffic is projected to operate at acceptable levels of service (LOS E or better) in the design year 2020 (2)

Alternative 5A Modified is the Selected Alternative; however the proposed improvements will not preclude rail, HOV or any other studies/improvements in the future.

A pedestrian bridge at MD 373 in Accokeek was not considered as part of this study due to low observed pedestrian traffic volumes, visual impact concerns, cost, and historic data regarding the general lack of use of pedestrian overpasses. (3)

MD 210 Project Planning Study Comment Form

Location/Design Public Hearing
Thursday, June 21, 2001
Friendly High School Auditorium

PLEASE PRINT
Name Dan Lieman **Date** June 30, 2001

Address 13216 Park Lane

City/Town Ft. Washington **State** MD **Zip Code** 20744

PLEASE INDICATE YOUR PREFERENCES BY CHECKING THE BOXES BELOW.

Which of the 3 mainline options on MD 210 do you think are most appropriate?

1.) NO HOV [X] 2.) Barrier Separated HOV [ ] 3.) Concurrent Flow HOV [ ]

MD 210 involves 9 intersections that are under study for improvements. What improvement option at each intersection do you think are the most appropriate? (Select from the non-shaded boxes)

	Option A	Option A-1	Option A-2	Option B	Option C	Option D	Option E
Wilson Bridge Drive	Good						
Kerby Hill Road	———	Better					
Palmer Road	Best					#2	
Old Fort Road North					Best		
Fort Washington Road					(Fails)	Best	
Swan Creek Road							Best
Old Fort Road South					Best		
Farmington Road				Better			
MD 373				Better			

Do you commute on MD 210 during the peak hours (6:30-8:30am) and (4:30-6:30pm)?

1.) yes [X] 2.) no [ ] Check if you carpool or would be willing to carpool if convenient park and ride services were available [ ]

Have you ever used side roads to avoid congestion on MD 210?

1.) yes [X] 2.) no [ ]

If there are any additional comments or inquiries you would like to share with us please list them below.

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

[ ] Please add my/our name(s) to the Mailing List

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

Project NO. PG221A11

Dan Lieman

Supplemental Response:
See response to frequently stated comments 1, 3, 4.

Alternative 5A Modified is the Selected Alternative and contains: Wilson Bridge Drive at-grade Option A, Kerby Hill Road Interchange Option C, Palmer/Livingston Road Interchange Option B, Old Fort Road North Interchange Option C, Fort Washington Road Interchange Option D, Swan Creek Road Interchange Option G, Old Fort Road South Interchange Option C, Farmington Road at-grade Option A and MD 373 at-grade Option A. The proposed improvements will not preclude rail, HOV or any other studies/improvements in the future.

Maryland Department of Transportation
State Highway Administration
Office of Planning and Preliminary Engineering
Mail Stop C-301 - Box 717
Baltimore, MD 21203-0717

Subject: Location and Design Public Hearing, MD210 from I95/I495 to MD228

Project No. PG221A11

June 30, 2001

Enclosed are my comments about the proposed improvements of MD210 between I95/I495 and MD228. I discuss all of the options and alternatives based on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and the Alternatives Mapping Supplement. I provide detailed opinions about the benefits and disadvantages of every design. I suggest that a pair of ramps be added to all options on Livingston Road north of Swan Creek Road to replace unsafe existing connections to and from southbound MD210. I also mention technical errors in some design descriptions in the DEIS.

As a regular participant in the MD210 Focus Group, several of my earlier ideas have been accepted or modified. I treat the MD210 publications as a new set of designs to be analyzed. I expect the MD210 Focus Group will continue to assist the selection process by viewing and discussing the opinions of the members of the public who provided their comments on the proposed MD210 improvements. Together we will derive highway, interchange, and intersection designs that are the most beneficial to the users of MD210 and its connecting roads. (1)

Thank you for your consideration.

Dan Lieman

Dan Lieman
13216 Park Lane
Fort Washington, MD 20744

VI-77

See responses to frequently stated comments 1, 3 and 4.

Throughout the MD 210 Project Planning Study process, the design team has met regularly with SHA Project Planning, Administration, Highway Design, Bridge Design, Highway Hydraulics, Environmental Landscaping, Traffic and Safety, and District Right of Way teams. The team have also met regularly with County and local officials, focus group members, community organizations, private citizens and resource agencies to best derive a Selected Alternative that best fits the needs and requirements of all the citizens within the MD 210 study area. As you have noted and as the study has progressed, interchange and at-grade option refinement has been a continual process and will continue as the project continues into final design. (1)
The Selected Alternative currently under consideration represent improvements developed in accordance with design criteria for the purpose of improving traffic flow and safety in an environmentally sensitive manner, while promoting aesthetic quality, community cohesiveness, multi-modal accessibility and bicycle/pedestrian mobility.

DAN LIEMAN

Remarks on
MD 210 Multi-Modal Study Prince George's County I-95 / I-495 to MD228
Draft Environmental Impact Statement (*DEIS*)
With Alternatives Mapping Supplement (*Supplement*)
June 2001

Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS):

The Vicinity Map in figure S-1 between DEIS pages S-2 and S-3 has an old map with information prior to its date of December 2000. The western half of MD228 is shown as an undivided highway instead of a divided highway. The presence of four lanes (two lanes east and west) on MD228 is significant for the increasing traffic levels on MD210. The old north-south section of MD228 was renumbered to MD229. The cover of the DEIS uses the same old map. (2)

In paragraphs II.F.2.d, II.F.3.d, and II.F.4.d on pages II-17/18, II-23/24, and II-29/30 of the DEIS, the Option A description for Palmer Road – Livingston Road mentions that a "new access road is proposed behind the existing businesses (displacing one business) in the northeast quadrant". The northeast quadrant relative to the MD210 main intersection has no access road and no displaced business under any option. Option A and Option B have an access street but no displaced business in the southeast quadrant. Option C and Option D have an access street with two separate businesses displaced by the ramp connections in the southeast quadrant. All four options displace two businesses by ramp connections in the southwest quadrant. All four options displace one business in the northwest quadrant with an access road positioned in front of other businesses. The Option A statement above is incorrect. For the Option B description, the statement "but the proposed access road differs by not displacing any businesses" is wrong and the reason given for a front access road ("because there is no proposed ramp in the northwest quadrant") does not apply. For the Option C description, the statement "proposes a grade-separation" and the "proposed access road" sentence apply to all four options. For the Option D description, the statement "proposes a grade-separation" applies to all four options and "the access road is ... behind the existing businesses" is incorrect. (3)

In paragraphs II.F.2.g, II.F.3.g, and II.F.4.g on pages II-19/20, II-25/26, and II-31/32 of the DEIS, the Option E description for Swan Creek Road – Livingston Road says "The benefit of this option is the elimination of any movements in the environmentally sensitive southwest quadrant." In an environmental impact statement, it would be appropriate to mention environmental sensitivity for Option B, Option C, and Option D. Also, for Option C and Option D, the two-lane connection between Swan Creek Road and Livingston Road in the northwest quadrant might be an environmental improvement because it simplifies a connection to a hospital. For Option E, the bridge for Livingston Road over MD210 simplifies the hospital connection from east of MD210. (4)

In figures II-2A, II-2B, II-2C, and II-2D after page II-40 of the DEIS, intersection diagrams show turn alternatives from all directions. The diagram for each proposed intersection is discussed below across alternatives and options and pages for comparison.

Wilson Bridge Drive: (Alternative 5A – Capacity Option 1, A5A-CO1) [Option A] A solid line needs to be drawn in the intersection diagram between the right-to-left arrows and the left-to-right arrows to show the closed median. Essentially the same diagram needs to be used for both capacity options of Alternative 5A and Alternative 5C in Option A.

Kerby Hill Road (KHR) – Livingston Road (LR): KHR (A5A-CO1) [Option A-1] The right side of the intersection diagram needs a straight arrow pointing left across the intersection. The oval with the levels of service needs a marker on the left to indicate another branch of the intersection. The resulting intersection and oval diagrams need to be repeated for all KHR alternatives and capacity options in Option A-1. KHR (A5C-CO1) [Option A-2] This option has another intersection at the exit-entrance from southbound MD210. An intersection diagram may be appropriate for all alternatives and capacity options in Option A-2. KHR (A5A&A5B-CO1&CO2) [Option A-2] The oval with the "F(F)" levels of (5)

The cover and Vicinity Map have been updated. (2)

The description in the DEIS incorrectly referred to the "Northeast" quadrant. "Northwest" is the correct reference, and this change has been made to applicable FEIS text. (3)

Numerous refinements have been made to the previously proposed Swan Creek Road interchange options in developing the design of the option associated with the SHA-Selected Alternative. (4)

Mapping included in this document has been updated to reflect the individual proposed interchange/intersection designs associated with the SHA-Selected Alternative at each location. (5)

service needs to be changed to "A(B)" for consistency. LR (A5A&A5B-CO1&CO2) [Option A-2] This intersection diagram needs to be repeated for all LR alternatives and capacity options in Option A-1 and Option A-2. The one-line ramp diagram for LR needs to be replaced by the two-line version used by all other representations of LR alternatives and capacity options in Option A-1 and A-2. The oval with the "F(F)" levels of service needs to be changed to "B(D)" for consistency. Also, no diagram shows Option A-1 can be used at KER-LR with either capacity option of Alternative 5C.

Palmer Road (PR) – Livingston Road (LR): PR (A5A-CO2) [Option A] This intersection diagram needs to be repeated for all PR alternatives and capacity options in Option A and Option B. PR (A5A-CO1&CO2) [Option C and Option D] The left traffic lane from the top of the intersection diagram needs a straight-left arrow. The one-line ramp diagram for PR needs to be replaced with a two-line version. The resulting intersection and ramp diagrams need to be repeated for all PR alternatives and capacity options in Option C and Option D. LR (A5A-CO1) [Option A] The left traffic lane from the top of the intersection diagram needs a straight-left arrow. The right traffic lane from the right of the diagram needs a right-only arrow. The resulting diagram needs to be repeated for all LR alternatives and capacity options in Option A and Option D. The oval with the levels of service needs a marker on the left to indicate another branch of the intersection. This marker needs to be placed on level of service ovals for all LR alternatives and capacity options in Option A, Option B, Option C, and Option D. LR (A5A-CO1&CO2) [Option B and Option C] The left traffic lane from the top of the intersection diagram needs a straight-left arrow. The right traffic lane from the top of the diagram needs a straight-right arrow. The left side of the diagram needs a straight arrow pointing left and right-straight-left arrows pointing right. The left traffic lane from the bottom of the diagram needs a straight-left arrow. The right side of the diagram needs a straight arrow pointing left. The resulting diagram needs to be repeated for all LR alternatives and capacity options in Option B and Option C. LR (A5A-CO1&CO2) [Option B, Option C, and Option D] The one-line ramp diagrams for LR need to be replaced with two-line versions and need to be repeated for all LR alternatives and capacity options in Option B, Option C, and Option D. A one-line ramp from southbound MD210 to LR outside the intersection needs to be added for Option D to match LR (A5B&A5C-CO1&CO2) [Option D]. This form of the one-line ramp needs to be copied for all LR alternatives and capacity options in Option A. Also, there is no indication in the text why duplicate PR-LR intersection diagrams within the interchange options have different level of service values for different alternatives or capacity options.

Old Fort Road North: MD210 intersection (A5A-CO1) [Option A] The right traffic lane from the right of the intersection diagram needs a right turn arrow. The right traffic lane going to the right of the diagram needs an acceleration lane. MD210 intersection (A5B-CO1) [Option B] This intersection is bypassed by exits from northbound MD210 and southbound MD210. Ramp lines need to be added outside the oval in the southeast and northwest quadrants. A similar change needs to be made in MD210 intersection (A5C-CO1) [Option B]. East (E) intersection (A5A-CO2) [Option C] The left traffic lane from the bottom of the intersection diagram needs a straight-left arrow. The diagram needs to be copied to E (A5B-CO2) [Option C]. E (A5A&A5B-CO2) [Option D] The left traffic lane from the bottom of the intersection diagram needs a straight-left arrow. The one-line ramp diagram needs to be replaced with a two-line version. The level of service "F(F)" needs to be replaced with something appropriate. The information also applies to E (A5C-CO2) [Option D]. West (W) intersection (A5A-CO2) [Option C] The left traffic lane from the top needs a straight-left arrow. The diagram needs to be copied to W (A5B-CO2 and A5C-CO2) [Option C]. The ramp lines, the level of service oval, and the intersection diagram need to be repeated for W (A5A&A5B-CO2, and A5C-CO2) [Option D].

Fort Washington Road: MD210 intersection (A5A-CO1) [Option A] The right traffic lane going to the left of the diagram needs an acceleration lane. MD210 intersection (A5A-CO1) [Option B] The level of service oval does not specify level of service values. It is probably "F(F)", the same as Option A. East (E) intersection (A5B-CO2) [Option D] In the intersection diagram, the straight arrow from the right needs to be removed and the left traffic lane from the bottom needs to be changed to a straight-left arrow. The right end of the wiggle line in the ramp representation needs to connect to the service road (probably just a stub) instead of northbound MD210. The intersection diagram, the level of service oval, and the ramp diagram need to be copied to E (A5A-CO2 and A5C-CO2) [Option D]. Option D does not show the right in right out intersection at current Fort Washington Road for any of the alternatives.

VI-79

(5)

Mapping included in this document has been updated to reflect the individual proposed interchange/intersection designs associated with the SHA-Selected Alternative at each location. (5)

Swan Creek Road (SCR) – Livingston Road (LR): MD210 intersection (A5A-CO1) [Option A] The right traffic lane from the top of the intersection diagram needs a straight-right arrow. The right traffic lane going to the left of the diagram needs an acceleration lane. MD210 intersection (A5C-CO1) [Option B] The right traffic lane going to the left of the intersection diagram needs an acceleration lane. No intersection diagrams are shown for the ramp intersections east and west of the MD210 intersection. Similar intersection diagrams (with double arrow HOV lanes) need to be used for the MD210 intersection (A5B-CC1) [Option B] and its two ramp intersections. Note that the MD210 intersection (A5B-CO1) [Option B] does not have a bridge proposal for the reversible HOV lanes in figure 11-42 of the Supplement. Top LR intersection (A5A-CO2) [Option C] This intersection diagram needs to be copied to the top LR (A5B-CO2 and A5C-CO2) [Option C]. Bottom LR intersection (A5C-CO2) [Option C] This intersection diagram needs to be copied to the bottom LR (A5A-CO2 and A5B-CO2) [Option C]. LR intersection (A5B&A5C) [Option D] This intersection needs an intersection diagram. SCR intersection (A5A-CO2) [Option C] The ramp diagram needs a stub to the left. This ramp diagram and intersection diagram need to be copied to SCR (A5B-CO2 and A5C-CO2) [Option C] and SCR (A5B&A5C-CO2) [Option D]. MD210 intersection (A5B&A5C-CO2) [Option D] The level of service oval is positioned as if the intersection is with MD210 rather than on a bridge over MD210. The single HOV ramp connection is drawn as if double northbound and southbound MD210 connection ramps are intended. This special intersection oval should be removed from the mainline MD210 position and placed in an inset with a short line just as an intersection diagram is shown. The Option E interchange based on a Livingston Road bridge is not represented for Capacity Option 2 of Alternative 5A, Alternative 5B, or Alternative 5C.

(5)

Old Fort Road South: MD210 intersection (A5A-CO1) [Option A] and MD210 intersection (A5B-CO1, A5C-CO1, and A5A-CO1) [Option B] The right traffic lane going to the right in each intersection diagram needs an acceleration lane. MD210 intersection (A5A-CO1) [Option B] The level of service oval has unspecified "?(?)" values. East (E) intersection (A5A-CO2) [Option C] The left traffic lane from the bottom of the diagram needs to be a straight-left arrow. This diagram needs to be copied to E (A5B-CC2 and A5C-C02) [Option C]. West (W) intersection (A5B-CO2) [Option C] The left traffic lane from the top of the intersection diagram needs to be a straight-left arrow. This diagram needs to be copied to W (A5A-CO2 and A5C-CO2) [Option C].

VI-80

Farmington Road MD210 intersection (A5A-CO1) [Option A] The right traffic lane going to the right in the intersection diagram needs an acceleration lane to match the No-Build Alternative. MD210 intersection (A5A-CO2) [Option B] The right traffic lane going to the right in the intersection diagram needs a right turn arrow instead of a straight arrow. Option B ramp intersections east and west of MD210 are not represented with intersection diagrams.

MD373: MD210 intersection (A5A-CO2) [Option B] Ramp intersections east and west of MD210 are not represented with intersection diagrams. MD210 intersection (A5B-CO1, A5B-CO2, A5C-CO1, and A5C-CO2) [Option B] Ramp intersections east and west of MD210 are not represented with intersection diagrams. These intersections have identical designs. A5B has lower expected traffic than A5C. (A5C-CO1) has the same level of service values as (A5B-CO1) and (A5B-CO2). (A5C-CO2) has a better level of service value than the others.

Comments on High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lanes:

I am against HOV lanes because I believe a proposed Metro rapid transit connection over the Woodrow Wilson Bridge would be more beneficial than HOV lanes connecting only to MD210 HOV lanes. The Metro Purple Line could not reasonably be constructed between Maryland and Virginia without utilizing the bridge lanes designated for HOV. Construction and destruction of HOV lanes and ramps in this area would cost millions of dollars that would delay Metro improvements by decades and be wasted whenever the Purple Line is built. The major Maryland "contribution" to Woodrow Wilson Bridge HOV lanes would be MD210 HOV lanes. I am against MD210 HOV lanes.

(6)

Regarding the proposed MD210 HOV lanes, the entire study area is only ten miles. There are no major work sites on MD210. Most proposed improvements to MD210 involve turns, entrances, and exits via the right lane. Potential users of the HOV lanes must cross through three busy general lanes to enter or

The rail decision along the Woodrow Wilson Bridge is being addressed as part of the Capital Beltway Corridor Transportation Study and the Woodrow Wilson Bridge Project and would not be precluded by a decision on MD 210.

(10)

leave the HOV lanes on MD210. The proposed HOV intersection for I95/I495 to/from the Woodrow Wilson Bridge would be the first traffic light on MD210 in three to seven miles, depending on which proposed interchanges are built. Nearby, most MD210 traffic would need to stop again at the traffic light where the ramp from southbound I95/I495 turns left onto southbound MD210. This extraneous traffic light would reduce the capacity of the southbound I95/I495 exit to southbound MD210. There is no HOV connection from MD210 to northbound I95/I495 general lanes and no HOV lanes on I95/I495 north of MD210. The proposed HOV ramps for the I295 extension would only connect with general lanes on I295 that are already overburdened with traffic. The only other consideration for accessing the HOV lanes is one proposed ramp for the interchange at Swan Creek Road – Livingston Road. Alternative 5C is proposed as a possibility for most of the study area. With the Alternative 5C concurrent flow HOV lanes, enforcement of HOV lane restrictions would be difficult without blocking the HOV lanes or the general lanes. Alternative 5B with reversible HOV lanes is proposed as a possibility north of Swan Creek Road. The current heights of northbound and southbound roadways of MD210 are different. Alternative 5B slip ramps for the HOV to general lane connections would need to traverse the height change. Another study suggests the use of tolls (also known as "variable prices") in the MD210 HOV lanes. Even if tolls are collected electronically, enforcement requirements would be worse than for HOV alone and there is already no room for enforcement without affecting traffic.

In my opinion, Alternative 5A (no HOV lanes) and no tolls (variable pricing) should be selected. (7)

Comments on the Alternatives Mapping Supplement:

Oxon Hill Road:

The proposed Oxon Hill Road interchange with MD210 is of interest to the same people as those who want information about the other MD210 improvements. Although it is not included in the MD210 study, any diagrams shown the public and decision-makers should have the latest proposals from the Woodrow Wilson Bridge Project. Most of the proposed Oxon Hill Road interchange with MD210 is depicted using onetime proposed designs more than a year out of date. Currently, there is no proposed connection between westbound Oxon Hill Road and southbound I95/I495. Also, the relocation of the bridge for Bald Eagle Road is proposed to be opposite the perpendicular connection between Oxon Hill Road and the MD210 ramps in the southwest quadrant of the interchange. The bridge for Bald Eagle Road will be used for both automobiles and bicycles. These errors are duplicated in figures II-3, II-18, II-33, and II-55 of the Supplement and should be corrected before any final report.

I295 Ramps for MD210 HOV Lanes:

Alternative 5A does not change the I295 interchange because no HOV lanes are included. In figures II-3 and II-18 of the Supplement, the southbound connection of MD210 and the I295 extension derived from the Woodrow Wilson Bridge Project show two lanes from MD210 and two lanes (or maybe three lanes) from the I295 extension. In my opinion Alternative 5A should be selected.

For Alternative 5B and Alternative 5C, two options are proposed for HOV ramps between the I295 extension and MD210. In my opinion, neither option should be built because the HOV lanes should not be built.

In Option A, the ramp from the northbound MD210 HOV lane rises in the median of MD210 and veers left over the southbound MD210 lanes to connect with the general northbound lane of the I295 extension beyond the exit to southbound I95/I495. Also, the southbound I295 extension general lane has a left side ramp that abuts the opposite ramp and veers right to the southbound HOV lane in the median of MD210. In figure II-33 of the Supplement, Alternative 5B Option A mostly has a two-lane ramp that splits into two single lane ramps for the connections to the I295 extension. This would cause bottlenecks at both ends as ramp traffic merges to a single lane before joining the I295 extension on the northern end or MD210 on the southern end. The two-lane part of the ramp should be reduced to one lane until the split at the northern end. In figure II-55 of the Supplement, Alternative 5C Option A mostly has a one-lane ramp that splits into two single lane ramps before joining the I295 extension on the northern end. The concurrent HOV alternative needs two one-way lanes the entire length of the ramp. Both figures show three MD210 general lanes from the I295 extension and two MD210 general lanes that merge to one lane. This change needs to be removed because the left lane merge is just beyond the merge of the proposed ramp from Oxon

VI-81

Alternative 5A Modified is the SHA-Selected Alternative. No HOV lanes or mainline capacity enhancements, other than auxiliary lanes to support the interchange/intersection improvements, will be provided. (7)

Hill Road to southbound MD210. The rightmost MD210 lane should merge instead to form four general lanes.

In Option B, the ramp from the northbound MD210 HOV lane rises in the median of MD210, curves right over the general northbound lanes, veers left to abut the general ramp to northbound I295, and seems to start merging on the left before the right exit to southbound I95/I495. It is very dangerous to connect the northbound ramp to the I295 extension prior to the southbound I95/I495 exit lane without a barrier because some HOV drivers will attempt to exit by crossing all of the I295 extension lanes. Also, the southbound I295 extension general lane has a left side ramp that abuts the opposite ramp, veers right over the southbound and northbound lanes of MD210, and crosses the northbound lanes again prior to merging with the southbound MD210 HOV lane. In figure II-34 of the Supplement, Alternative 5B Option B has one lane at the MD210 end and two single-lane parts for the connections to the I295 extension. This is correct for the reversible HOV land alternative. In figure II-56 of the Supplement, Alternative 5C Option B has the same one lane on the MD210 end and two single-lane parts for the connections to the I295 extension. The concurrent HOV alternative needs two one-way lanes the entire length of the ramp. Both figures show three MD210 general lanes from the I295 extension and two MD210 general lanes that merge to one lane. This change needs to be removed because it is just beyond the merge of the proposed ramp from Oxon Hill Road to southbound MD210. The rightmost MD210 lane should merge instead to form four general lanes.

I prefer the Option A design if HOV ramps are built. Option A traffic does not cross the northbound general lanes while Option B traffic crosses the northbound general lanes twice. Also, the later merge of Option A to northbound I295 compared to Option B prevents dangerous attempts to cross from the left to the right for the exit to southbound I95/I495. Since the Woodrow Wilson Bridge Project study has not yet determined whether HOV lanes or Metro subway tracks will be built, it is possible that MD210 HOV lanes will end at the I295 ramps or just merge with the general MD210 lanes.

VI-82

Wilson Bridge Drive:

The only option specifies southbound MD210 right turns in and out. The present intersection is eliminated. This is a useful option for MD210 traffic. Currently, there is a bus stop on northbound MD210 at Wilson Bridge Drive. A pedestrian bridge over MD210 will be needed to provide continued bus service.

Between Wilson Bridge Drive and Kerby Hill Road – Livingston Road:

Currently, the service road adjacent to southbound MD210 serves two houses and provides a few parking spaces for their owners and guests. Figures II-5, II-20, II-36, and II-58 of the Supplement show a widened two-way service road. The service road has a new connection to the parking lot of the Brookside Park Apartments. Since the intersection at Wilson Bridge Drive with northbound MD210 was removed, this design would enable access to the apartment community from the south by residents, guests, emergency vehicles, and delivery vehicles. The extra traffic may prevent all parking for the houses. I suggest that changing the service road to one-way northbound could provide the same access plus limited parking for the houses. Wilson Bridge Drive would be used as the exit to southbound MD210. An easement to allow cars and other vehicles serving the houses to use the parking lot roadway may be required.

Currently, there is a bus stop on northbound MD210 opposite the Wilson Towers Apartments. A pedestrian bridge over MD210 will be needed to provide continued bus service.

(8)

Kerby Hill Road – Livingston Road:

Two slightly different options are proposed for interchanges at MD210 and the Kerby Hill Road – Livingston Road connection. Option A-1 is shown in figures II-5, II-20, and II-36 of the Supplement. Figure II-58 has Option A-2. Both options are complete interchanges allowing all combinations of turns and both can be used with Alternatives 5A, 5B, and 5C. A pedestrian crossing is needed on the bridge over MD210. The bridge should be built to allow four general lanes on MD210 if the lanes are not built initially. Near Livingston Road east of MD210, both options are the same. Option A-1 connects the western end of the bridge at Kerby Hill Road with two apartment complexes north of the interchange. A traffic light is likely at this intersection for both Option A-1 and Option A-2 connections. Option A-2 connects the southbound MD210 exit-entrance ramps to the two apartment complexes. The minimal visibility of a sharp intersection of two roadways leaving tunnels would require an extra traffic light and retain continual danger of right turn on red.

(9)

Proposed pedestrian overpass concepts were dropped from the study due to responses received from transportation agencies and residents for reasons such as cost, operations and aesthetics.

(8)

SHA-Selected Alternative 5A Modified includes all interchanges proposed under Option 2. The proposed interchange locations are MD 210 at Kerby Hill Road, Palmer Road, Old Fort Road North, Fort Washington Road, Swan Creek Road and Old Fort Road South. At-grade intersection modifications are proposed with the SHA-Selected Alternative at Wilson Bridge Drive, Farmington Road and MD 373.

(9)

The specific intersection/interchange options included in the SHA-Selected Alternative consist of:

Wilson Bridge Drive Option A, (which is a modification of Option A-1), Kerby Hill Road Option C, Palmer Road Option E (which is a modification of Option D), Old Fort Road North Option C, Fort Washington Road Option D, Swan Creek Road Option G (which is a modification of Option E), Old Fort Road South Option C, Farmington Road Option A, and MD 373 Option A.

These options were selected as a result of coordination among MD 210 study team members, the focus group, environmental resource agencies and citizens, based on the extent to which they addressed safety and traffic operational needs and minimized impacts to sensitive resources.

Under either option, access for the gas station will be a traffic problem. The gas station property currently has one entrance/exit on Kerby Hill Road and two entrances/exits on a stub of the MD210 service road. These entrances/exits will be located on the common ramp of the southbound MD210 entrance/exit and the southbound MD210 entrance ramp itself. I suggest that a right turn in/out be permitted from/to the southbound MD210 entrance. The common ramp can accept right and left turns to/from the gas station. Some cars will need to make a U-turn inside the gas station property. Possibly, the gasoline entrance for the combination gas station and convenience store should be from the southbound MD210 entrance ramp and the exit should be on the common ramp, currently called Kerby Hill Road. It may be necessary for the southbound MD210 entrance ramp to have an opposing lane for the segment adjacent to the service station. The turn situation would be more complicated with Option A-2.

In my opinion, Option A-1 should be selected.

Currently, there are bus stops on southbound and northbound MD210 near the intersection for Kerby Hill Road – Livingston Road. Since pedestrian sidewalks are proposed for the bridge over MD210, staircases from the bridge down to southbound and northbound MD210 bus stops will be needed to provide continued bus service. Possibly, a pedestrian bridge is needed near the Wilson Towers Apartments.

(8)

Between Kerby Hill Road – Livingston Road and Palmer Road – Livingston Road:

This area is illustrated in figures II-5/6, II-20/21, II-36/37, and II-58/59 of the Supplement.

The farm property west of MD210 between Kerby Hill Road – Livingston Road and Palmer Road – Livingston Road will probably be developed. The farm used a gravel driveway connection directly to southbound MD210. As shown near the match lines of the figures, a gravel driveway is located near the business. Left and right turns were allowed to/from northbound MD210. During improvements on MD210, the crossover will be closed and right turns for a gravel driveway will not be appropriate. At the old gravel driveway, right in and right out turns from/to southbound MD210 would be needed for any development. The developer should provide internal roadways for the property. For multiple properties with different owners, a state-supplied service road may be required, preferably behind the trees. A narrow dirt path near Henson Creek Stream Valley Park should not become an excuse for another right in/out intersection on MD210 near the Palmer Road – Livingston Road interchange.

(9)

Currently, there are northbound and southbound bus stops on the two-way service road east of MD210. There are MD210 crossovers at the southern end of the service road and near the middle of the service road. The MD210 crossovers will be closed and the southern end of the service road will lose its connection with northbound MD210. New northbound MD210 and southbound MD210 bus stops will be needed. A pedestrian bridge over MD210 would be needed to provide continued bus service. Possibly, the southern end of the service road could be made one-way northbound from a connection to the Option A-B ramp from Palmer Road to northbound MD210. Option C-D could have a direct connection from northbound MD210. (This could be a standard exit since no reverse traffic would be allowed.) The southbound direction on the service road should terminate at an entrance to a future development area to support the local residents. The northern end of the service road has no highway outlet. A ramp to northbound MD210 is possible at the northern end of the service road but the driveway to the last house must be moved across its yard for safety. If the SHA builds ramps on the northern and southern ends, it may be useful to close the MD210 connection at the middle of the service road. Figures II-36/37 and II-58/59 add a small loop at the middle connection to facilitate turns from northbound MD210 to the southbound service road. If you keep the middle connection, I suggest an acceleration lane be added to northbound MD210 to allow entering cars to merge more easily into traffic.

Palmer Road - Livingston Road:

This area is illustrated in figures II-6/7, II-21/22, II-37/38, and II-59/60 of the Supplement.

Four interchange options are proposed to replace this intersection. All options are complete interchanges. The bridge structure over MD210 between Palmer Road and Livingston Road is the same for all four options. All options have the same Livingston Road ramp to southbound MD210. A pedestrian crossing is needed on the bridge. The bridge should be built to allow four general lanes on MD210 if the lanes are not built initially. All options need a traffic light to control left turns from southbound Livingston Road to the ramp to southbound MD210, from the new street connecting businesses closest to the bridge to northbound Livingston Road, and from northbound Livingston Road to the new street. The traffic light will also allow crossovers from the new street to the ramp to southbound MD210. One business must be removed to allow for construction of the new street. The building for the business needs to be relocated on

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

the property to utilize the open space for the Fort Washington Golf Range. A 100-year flood plain may preclude the use of the large property for other businesses. This land might be available for a wetland mitigation site if the building cannot be rebuilt on the site.

Option A and Option B both have the same diamond ramp design east of MD210. Left turns are allowed from the ramp from northbound MD210 to westbound Palmer Road and from eastbound Palmer Road to the ramp for northbound MD210. Option C and Option D have one diamond ramp and one loop ramp east of MD210. The diamond ramp from northbound MD210 allows left turns to westbound Palmer Road. Left turns are allowed from westbound Palmer Road to the loop ramp to northbound MD210. Two residences are removed by Option C-D and are not removed by Option A-B. A traffic light will be needed at the Palmer Road intersection with the ramps under both Option A-B and Option C-D. The main benefit of Option C-D is the possible reduction in wetland effects compared to the construction of Option A-B. This may override any other conditions affecting the design. The ramp to northbound MD210 for Option A-B could also connect to the southern end of the service road. For Option C-D, northbound MD210 could have an exit to the southern end of the service road. Otherwise, differences in traffic counts for right and left turns might be used to distinguish the two designs.

Option A and Option D both have the same ramp design west of MD210. A ramp from southbound MD210 to southbound Livingston Road provides access to the business area on Livingston Road. Another ramp from southbound MD210 allows right turns to northbound Livingston Road and eastbound Palmer Road.

Option B and Option C have the same ramp design west of MD210. A three-lane ramp from southbound MD210 allows right turns to northbound Livingston Road and eastbound Palmer Road and left turns to southbound Livingston Road. The center lane should also cross the intersection to the new street. The traffic light will be needed to control these crossovers and left turns in addition to other movements. The SHA needs to determine whether the storage capacity of this exit from southbound MD210 is sufficient to keep the ramp from southbound MD210 from backing up to the mainline MD210 while vehicles wait for a green traffic light at Livingston Road. Currently, the left turn lane from southbound MD210 to eastbound Palmer Road is very long. The dual MD210 exits of Option A-D seem to provide extra storage capacity. Option A-D and Option B-C both allow right-turn-on-red-after-stop for turns to northbound Livingston Road.

I believe Option A provides the best combination of conditions east and west of MD210. Option D is best if wetland considerations cause the removal of Option A.

Old Fort Road North:

Three intersection options and two interchange options are proposed for Old Fort Road North. Two different intersection options are called "Option B". All options remove the Old Palmer Road intersection with Old Fort Road North and provide new connections from Old Palmer Road to local streets. The bridge for interchange options should be built to allow four general lanes on MD210 if the lanes are not built initially.

In figure II-8 of the Supplement, Option A widens the intersection for Alternative 5A. It cannot be used with HOV lanes. Four traffic lanes are proposed each way on MD210 south of Old Fort Road North. This lowest cost option also has the shortest useful life span of the four options. A traffic light continues to be needed on MD210. Left turns are allowed in all directions. Red light backups will grow on MD210. Option A can be used to increase the intersection capacity somewhat until an interchange is needed. Since the MD210 study is intended for 20-year capacity needs, an interchange requirement is likely before the 20-year boundary. Figure II-2A of the DEIS shows an unacceptable "F(F)" level of service for Option A.

In figure II-39 of the Supplement, one Option B widens the intersection and includes an overpass for MD210 HOV lanes. A traffic light continues to be needed for MD210 general lanes. Left turns are allowed from eastbound/westbound Old Fort Road North to MD210. Indirect left turns are allowed from the right lane of northbound/southbound MD210 to Old Fort Road North. Traffic lights may be needed at the two ramps from MD210. They should be coordinated with the traffic lights at MD210. Acceleration lanes are needed for southbound MD210 and northbound MD210 at the right turns from Old Fort Road North. Red light backups are likely to grow on MD210 unless the use of HOV lanes significantly reduces traffic in the general lanes. The extra width of MD210 caused by the HOV lanes would reduce the crossover capacity of Old Fort Road North in both directions. The HOV overpass for Option B can increase the intersection capacity somewhat for MD210, but it cannot be replaced easily when an

(9)

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

interchange is needed. Figure II-2B of the DEIS shows an unacceptable "F(F)" level of service for this Option B.

In figure II-61 of the Supplement, another Option B widens the intersection. It is possible an overpass was intended for MD210 HOV lanes to match the first Option B. A traffic light continues to be needed for MD210 general lanes. Left turns are allowed from eastbound/westbound Old Fort Road North to MD210. Indirect left turns are allowed from the right lane of northbound/southbound MD210 to Old Fort Road North. Traffic lights may be needed at the two ramps from MD210. They should be coordinated with the traffic lights at MD210. Longer acceleration lanes are needed for southbound MD210 and northbound MD210 at the right turns from Old Fort Road North. Red light backups are likely to grow on MD210 unless the use of HOV lanes significantly reduces traffic in the general lanes. The extra width of MD210 caused by the HOV lanes would reduce the crossover capacity of Old Fort Road North in both directions. This Option B can increase the intersection capacity somewhat for MD210 only if an HOV overpass is built, but it cannot be replaced easily when an interchange is needed. Figure II-2C of the DEIS shows an unacceptable "F(F)" level of service for this Option B.

In figures II-23 and II-44 of the Supplement, Option C replaces the intersection with a diamond interchange. Option C is a complete interchange. Traffic lights will be needed at the ramp intersections with Old Fort Road North. The proposed bridge over MD210 realigns Old Fort Road North to the south. Two residences are removed in the southeast quadrant and one residence is removed in the southwest quadrant. Option C widens Old Fort Road North to its intersection with Livingston Road. Westbound Old Fort Road North should have a left turn light at Livingston Road.

In figures II-23 and II-44 of the Supplement, Option D replaces the intersection with a diamond interchange west of MD210 and one diamond ramp plus one loop ramp east of MD210. Option D is a complete interchange. Traffic lights will be needed at the ramp intersections with Old Fort Road North. The proposed bridge over MD210 realigns Old Fort Road North to the south. One residence is removed in the northeast quadrant and one residence is removed in the southwest quadrant. Option D widens Old Fort Road North to its intersection with Livingston Road. Westbound Old Fort Road should have a left turn light on Livingston Road.

Old Fort Road will need an interchange within twenty years. Traffic counts should determine whether Option C or Option D should be selected. Traffic for the shopping center in the northwest quadrant may result in the selection of Option D.

VII-85

Fort Washington Road:

One interchange option and four intersection options are proposed for Fort Washington Road. Two intersection options are called "Option C". The bridge for the interchange option should be built to allow four lanes on MD210 if the lanes are not built initially.

Figure II-9 of the Supplement shows that both Option A and Option B would widen the MD210 intersection and the T intersection with the service road east of MD210. In Option B, a northbound segment is added to the service road to connect as a ramp with northbound MD210. Neither Option A nor Option B can be used with HOV lanes. Four traffic lanes are proposed each way on MD210. These low cost options have shorter useful life spans than Option D. (Both versions of Option C are incomplete designs and should not be selected.) For Option A and Option B, traffic lights continue to be needed on MD210. For Option A, left turns and right turns are allowed in all directions at both MD210 and the service road. For Option B, all left turns and most right turns are allowed. For Option B, service road left-right or right-right turns to northbound MD210 are replaced with the ramp connection. For both options, red light backups will grow on MD210. Either Option A or Option B can be used to increase the intersection capacity somewhat until an interchange is needed. Since the MD210 study is intended for 20-year capacity needs, an interchange requirement is likely before the 20-year boundary. For the intersection option, I prefer Option B because it would somewhat reduce the congestion at the T intersection with the service road. Figure II-2A of the DEIS shows an unacceptable "F(F)" level of service for Option A. Figure II-2D of the DEIS shows an unspecified "?(?)" level of service for Option B. The Option B level of service is probably unacceptable "F(F)", the same as Option A.

Two versions of Option C try to widen the MD210 intersection and the T intersection with the service road east of MD210. In figure II-40 of the Supplement, one Option C includes an overpass for MD210 HOV lanes. In figure II-62, a slightly different Option C does not include an overpass for MD210 HOV lanes. Neither Option C design should be selected because each is incomplete. They do not provide all combinations of turns. Traffic lights would continue to be needed for MD210 general lanes. Left turns

(9)

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

are allowed from Fort Washington Road and the stub of Fort Washington Road to MD210. An indirect left turn is allowed from the right lane of southbound MD210 to the stub of Fort Washington Road and the service road. NO direct or indirect left turn is allowed from northbound MD210 to westbound Fort Washington Road. Red light backups are likely to grow on MD210 unless the use of HOV lanes significantly reduces traffic in the general lanes. Option C with an HOV overpass may increase the intersection capacity, but the loss of a turn cannot be fixed until an interchange is built. However, Option C with the HOV overpass cannot easily be replaced when an interchange is needed. The extra width of MD210 caused by the HOV lanes would reduce the crossover capacity of Fort Washington Road in both directions. Figures II-2B and II-2C of the DEIS show an unacceptable "F(F)" level of service for both versions of Option C.

Figures II-24, II-45, and II-67 of the Supplement show that Option D replaces the full Fort Washington Road intersection with an interchange and modified intersection. The intersection of Fort Washington Road continues to allow right turns from and to southbound MD210. Crossovers and left turns are removed from the intersection. A new connector road to Fort Washington Road is proposed north of the current Fort Washington Road. The connector road has most of the actual interchange with MD210. The connector road starts at Livingston Road west of MD210, crosses over MD210 on a bridge, and ends as an extension of the service road east of MD210. One residence and one business are removed by the construction of the connector road. A short street joins the connector to business Fort Washington Road. Southbound MD210 has a ramp to the westbound connector road. The ramp has a left branch with a left turn to the eastbound connector road and a crossover to a two-way service road used for a shopping center west of MD210 and businesses on Fort Washington Road. Northbound MD210 has diamond ramps to and from the connector road. Traffic lights may be needed at the intersection of the connector road with these ramps for northbound MD210. Northbound traffic on the two-way service road east of MD210 can turn right to the ramp to northbound MD210, can cross the connector bridge to westbound Fort Washington Road, and can turn left to the service road west of MD210 to use the shopping center. Either the service road west of MD210 or the street to business Fort Washington Road can be used to reach southbound MD210. Traffic lights may be needed at the connector road and the service road west of MD210. Just east of Livingston Road, Fort Washington Road has three lanes, including eastbound and westbound directions. At Livingston Road, westbound Fort Washington Road should have two lanes (one lane should be used for left turns onto southbound Livingston Road) and eastbound traffic should have one lane. Approaching the split for the connector road, eastbound Fort Washington Road should have two lanes and westbound traffic should have one lane.

I prefer interchange Option D for Fort Washington Road.

Between Fort Washington Road and Swan Creek Road – Livingston Road:

Figures II-26A, II-48A, and II-70A of the Supplement show a ramp from southbound MD210 to Livingston Road near the post office. A similar ramp should be added from Livingston Road to southbound MD210. This combination of ramps would allow right turns in and right turns out and would operate like the proposed right in and right out ramps between northbound MD210 and Livingston Road southeast of Swan Creek Road. The ramps to and from southbound MD210 would service the post office, the hospital, and businesses on Livingston Road. I suggest these ramps be built to replace the tiny right in and right out connection between MD210 and Livingston Road for any chosen alternative (5A, 5B, or 5C), either capacity option (1 or 2), and any design option (A, B, C, D, or E). The tiny connection in figures II-11, II-26, II-42, II-47, II-48, II-64, II-69, and II-70 of the Supplement is dangerous because it has no storage space for cars and has no acceleration lane onto southbound MD210 after requiring each car to stop. The location of the new ramp would also increase the distance to the exit at Swan Creek Road.

Swan Creek Road – Livingston Road:

Two intersection options and three interchange options are proposed for this location. Options A, B, C, and D allow southbound MD210 right turns to/from Livingston Road west of MD210. (A safer relocation of this function is suggested above.) The bridge for all interchange options should be built to allow four lanes on MD210 if the lanes are not built initially.

In figure II-11 of the Supplement, Option A widens the intersection. It cannot be used with HOV lanes. Four traffic lanes are proposed each way on MD210. This lowest cost option also has the shortest useful life span of the five options. Traffic lights continue to be needed on MD210. Left turns are allowed in all directions. Red light backups will grow on MD210. The current U-right turn combination (almost a

(9)

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

left turn) from eastbound Swan Creek Road to northbound Livingston Road west of MD210 is not shown. This unusual turn is used to access the nearby hospital. (Its only alternative path is through the shopping center parking lot.) Option A can be used to increase the intersection capacity somewhat until an interchange is needed. Since the MD210 study is intended for 20-year capacity needs, an interchange requirement is likely before the 20-year boundary. Figure II-2A of the DEIS shows a limit of acceptable delay "E(E)" level of service for Option A.

In figures II-42 and II-64, Option B wicens the intersection and provides indirect left/right turns from MD210 for HOV Alternatives 5B and 5C. A traffic light continues to be needed for MD210 general lanes. Left turns are allowed from eastbound Swan Creek Road to northbound MD210 and from northbound/westbound Livingston Road to southbound MD210. The direct right turns from southbound MD210 to westbound Swan Creek Road and from northbound MD210 to eastbound/southbound Livingston Road are probably removed. The current U-right turn combination (almost a left turn) from eastbound Swan Creek Road to northbound Livingston Road west of MD210 is not shown. This unusual turn is used to access the nearby hospital. (Its only alternative path is through the shopping center parking lot.) An indirect left turn is allowed from the right lane of southbound MD210 to Swan Creek Road and from northbound MD210 to Livingston Road. Traffic lights may be needed at the two ramps from MD210. They should be coordinated with the traffic lights at MD210. A ramp from Swan Creek Road to southbound MD210 is included. A longer acceleration lane is needed for northbound MD210 at the right turn from Livingston Road east of MD210. Red light backups will grow on MD210. The extra width of MD210 caused by the HOV lanes would reduce the crossover capacity of Swan Creek Road – Livingston Road in both directions. The Option B ramps in the southwest quadrant may not be allowed because of wetland restrictions. This would remove intersection options for HOV lanes. If Option B is permitted, it could be used to increase the intersection capacity until an interchange is needed. Since the MD210 study is intended for 20-year capacity needs, an interchange requirement is likely before the 20-year boundary. Figures II-2B and II-2C of the DEIS show an unacceptable "E(F)" PM level of service for Option B.

In figures II-26, II-47, II-48, II-69, and II-70 of the Supplement, Option C and Option D interchanges replace the intersection. Both interchanges allow all combinations of turns. These options are identical west of MD210 and are similar east of MD210. Right and left turns are allowed at each ramp. Traffic lights will be needed at the ramp intersection with Swan Creek Road. For Option C, traffic lights may not be needed at the single ramp intersections with Livingston Road east of MD210. For Option D, traffic lights will be needed at the dual ramp intersections with Livingston Road east of MD210. For both options, the current U-right turn combination (almost a left turn) from eastbound Swan Creek Road to northbound Livingston Road west of MD210 is removed. A Swan Creek Road service road connects with Livingston Road west of MD210 to access the nearby hospital and other businesses. East of MD210, Option C realigns the service road next to a new ramp to northbound MD210. Option D has a ramp to northbound MD210 at a Livingston Road location slightly to the south. Option D includes a median ramp between the MD210 HOV lanes and the bridge over MD210. This HOV ramp can also be built with Option C. Since a commuter parking lot is located on Swan Creek Road, primary access to the northbound HOV ramp will be a left turn from eastbound Swan Creek Road. The curve of the bridge and its walls may limit visibility. Traffic lights may be needed on the bridge. The median ramp for Option D is drawn adjacent to the southbound lanes of MD210 for Alternative 5B reversible HOV lanes and between the HOV lanes for Alternative 5C concurrent HOV lanes. In the absence of HOV lanes, the Option D right in right out connection between MD210 and Livingston Road could be useful even without a bridge connection to HOV lanes. The Option C and Option D ramps in the southwest quadrant may not be allowed because of wetland restrictions. This would remove interchange Option C and Option D from consideration.

In figures II-26, II-48, and II-70 of the Supplement, Option E replaces the Swan Creek Road – Livingston Road intersection with a MD210 interchange on Livingston Road and a right in right out connection at Swan Creek Road. An improved acceleration lane from eastbound Swan Creek Road to southbound MD210 seems to be needed. With Option E, Livingston Road has a bridge over MD210. One gas station is removed at the north end of the bridge. A nearby business labeled "gas station" was a tire dealer that is now closed. Swan Creek Road no longer has a direct connection to Livingston Road, but has an indirect connection around the back of the shopping center. There may be more traffic eastbound on Swan Creek Road approaching MD210 than southbound on Livingston Road approaching MD210. The proper capacity for the road behind the shopping center (including HOV vehicles, trucks, and other delivery vehicles) needs to be determined. With the completion of the right in right out ramps between southbound MD210 and Livingston Road north of the post office, Option E is a full interchange. Access to the hospital

(9)

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

from Livingston Road east of MD210 will be improved. Access to the hospital from Swan Creek Road may be either through the shopping center, as it often is now, or via the road behind the shopping center. (I cannot judge the relative speed of the two directions.) Vehicles may enter or leave the shopping center in three Swan Creek Road driveways or a northeast driveway near Livingston Road. With Option E, there is no construction in the southwest quadrant of MD210 and Swan Creek Road. There should be no wetland restrictions for this option.

I believe Option E will be the preferred interchange. Option C and Option D are equivalent if wetland considerations do not remove them from consideration.

Old Fort Road South:

Two intersection options and one interchange option are proposed for Old Fort Road South. The bridge for the interchange option should be built to allow four lanes on MD210 if the lanes are not built initially.

In figure II-12 of the Supplement, Option A widens the intersection. It cannot be used with HOV lanes. Four traffic lanes are proposed each way on MD210 north of Old Fort Road South. This lowest cost option also has the shortest useful life span of the three options. Traffic lights continue to be needed on MD210. Left turns are allowed in all directions. Red light backups will grow on MD210. The right turn ramp from westbound Old Fort Road South to northbound MD210 is already built. An acceleration lane is needed on southbound MD210 for the right turn from eastbound Old Fort Road South. Option A can be used to increase the intersection capacity somewhat until an interchange is needed. Since the MD210 study is intended for 20-year capacity needs, an interchange requirement is likely before the 20-year boundary. Figure II-2A of the DEIS shows an unacceptable "E(F)" PM level of service for Option A.

In figures II-43 and II-65 of the Supplement, Option B widens the intersection and includes some indirect left turns for HOV Alternative 5C. Alternative 5B was included for a complete mapping plan since only concurrent HOV lanes are proposed Swan Creek Road to MD373. Traffic lights continue to be needed for MD210 general lanes. Left turns are allowed from eastbound/westbound Old Fort Road South to MD210. Indirect left turns are allowed from the right lane of northbound/southbound MD210 to Old Fort Road South. Traffic lights may be needed at the ramp from southbound MD210. They should be coordinated with the traffic lights at MD210. An acceleration lane is needed on southbound MD210 for the right turn from eastbound Old Fort Road South. Red light backups will grow on MD210. The extra width of MD210 caused by the HOV lanes would reduce the crossover capacity of Fort Road South in both directions. Option B might increase the intersection capacity of MD210 somewhat. Since the MD210 study is intended for 20-year capacity needs, an interchange requirement is likely before the 20-year boundary. Figures II-2B and II-2C of the DEIS show unacceptable "E(F)" and "F(F)" levels of service for Option B. Figure II-2D of the DEIS shows does not specify a level of service for Option B with Alternative 5A, no HOV lanes.

In figures II-27, II-49, and II-71 of the Supplement, Option C replaces the intersection with a diamond interchange for Alternatives 5A and 5C. Alternative 5B was included for a complete mapping plan since only concurrent HOV lanes are proposed Swan Creek Road to MD373. Right and left turns are allowed at each ramp. The ramp in the southwest quadrant has two-way traffic to support nearby residences. Traffic lights will be needed at the ramp intersection west of MD210 and possibly east of MD210. An unused gas station is removed in the southeast quadrant.

I prefer interchange Option C for Old Fort Road South.

Between Old Fort Road South and Farmington Road:

Figures II-14, II-29, II-51, and II-73 of the Supplement show an unlabeled street called "The Mall" which currently has a T intersection with MD210 that allows left turns across the median of MD210. The proposal for MD210 removes the crossover and specifies northbound MD210 right turns in and out. This is useful for MD210 traffic. Direct or indirect U-turns will be provided at Old Fort Road South and Farmington Road.

Farmington Road

Two intersection options are proposed for Farmington Road.

In figure II-15 of the Supplement, Option A widens the intersection. It cannot be used with HOV lanes. Traffic lights continue to be needed on MD210. Left turns are allowed in all directions. Red light backups will grow on MD210. Option A can be used to increase the intersection capacity somewhat until

(9)

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

an interchange is needed. The MD210 study is intended for 20-year capacity needs. An interchange may be needed after the 20-year boundary. Figure II-2A of the DEIS shows an acceptable "C(D)" level of service for Option A.

In figures II-30, II-52, and II-74 of the Supplement, Option B widens the intersection and includes some indirect left turns. Option B can be used with Alternative 5A or Alternative 5C. Alternative 5B was included for a complete mapping plan since only concurrent HOV lanes are proposed Swan Creek Road to MD373. Traffic lights continue to be needed for MD210. Left turns are allowed from eastbound/westbound Farmington Road to MD210. Indirect left turns are allowed from the right lane of northbound/southbound MD210 to Farmington Road. Traffic lights may be needed at the ramps for MD210. Red light backups will grow on MD210. Option B can increase the intersection capacity somewhat. The MD210 study is intended for 20-year capacity needs. An interchange may be needed after the 20-year boundary. Figure II-2A of the DEIS shows an acceptable "C(D)" level of service for Option B without HOV lanes. Figures II-2B and II-2C of the DEIS show a limit of acceptable delay "D(E)" PM level of service for Option B with HOV lanes.

I prefer Option B without HOV lanes for Farmington Road.

MD373:

Two intersection options are proposed for MD373.

In figure II-17 of the Supplement, Option A widens the intersection. Option A cannot be used with HOV lanes. Traffic lights continue to be needed on MD210. Left turns are allowed in all directions. Red light backups will grow on MD210. Option A can be used to increase the intersection capacity somewhat until an interchange is needed. The MD210 study is intended for 20-year capacity needs. An interchange may be needed after the 20-year boundary. Figure II-2A of the DEIS shows an acceptable "D(D)" level of service for Option A.

In figures II-32, II-54, and II-76 of the Supplement, Option B widens the intersection and includes some indirect left turns. Option B can be used with Alternative 5A or Alternative 5C. Alternative 5B was included for a complete mapping plan since only concurrent HOV lanes are proposed Swan Creek Road to MD373. Traffic lights continue to be needed for MD210. Left turns are allowed from eastbound/westbound MD373 to MD210. Indirect left turns are allowed from the right lane of northbound/southbound MD210 to MD373. Traffic lights may be needed at the ramps for MD210. They will need coordination with the MD210 traffic light. Red light backups will grow on MD210. Option B can increase the intersection capacity somewhat until an interchange is needed. The MD210 study is intended for 20-year capacity needs. An interchange may be needed after the 20-year boundary. Figure II-2A of the DEIS shows an acceptable "D(D)" level of service for Option B without HOV lanes. Figure II-2B and II-2C of the DEIS show a limit of acceptable delay "D(E)" PM level of service for Option B with HOV lanes.

I prefer Option B without HOV lanes for MD373.

MD228:

No improvement options are proposed for the T intersection of MD228 with MD210. MD228 is the busiest intersecting road on MD210 south of Oxon Hill Road (MD414) and the traffic is growing from the extensive development in Charles County. Substantial widening of the intersection was completed in 2000. Red light backups will grow on both MD210 and MD228. The MD210 study is intended for 20-year capacity needs. An interchange requirement is almost certain before the 20-year boundary.

VI-89

(9)

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK