



U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Railroad Administration



BALTIMORE-WASHINGTON SUPERCONDUCTING MAGLEV PROJECT



Public/Agency Coordination Plan

December 2017 Update



**BALTIMORE-WASHINGTON
SUPERCONDUCTING MAGLEV PROJECT**

**New High-Speed
Train Study Getting
Underway!**

**JOIN US AT AN
OPEN HOUSE**



Logos include: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, SHA State Highways Administration, dot DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION BALTIMORE CITY, US Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore Metropolitan Council, National Capital Planning Commission, d. District Department of Transportation, Maryland Aviation Administration, MDE, and U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Railroad Administration.

This page intentionally left blank

Table of Contents

1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Purpose of the Coordination Plan.....	1
2	PROJECT OVERVIEW.....	3
2.1	Project Background	3
2.2	Project Description.....	3
3	LEAD/COOPERATING/PARTICIPATING AGENCIES.....	7
3.1	Agencies, Roles, and Responsibilities.....	7
3.2	Agency Contact Information	12
4	COORDINATION POINTS AND ANTICIPATED COMPLETION DATES	15
5	AGENCY COORDINATION AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT.....	19
5.1	Agency Coordination	19
5.2	Public Involvement.....	25
6	REVISION HISTORY.....	31
LIST OF FIGURES		
	Figure 1: SCMAGLEV Study Area.....	5
LIST OF TABLES		
	Table 1: Lead Agencies and Invited Cooperating and Participating Agencies.....	9
	Table 2: Primary Point of Contact.....	12
	Table 3: Schedule of Key Milestone Dates for Baltimore Washington SCMAGLEV NEPA Study	16
	Table 4: Public Involvement by NEPA Milestone	29
	Table 5: Agency Comments on the SCMAGLEV Public/Agency Coordination Plan 12/4/17.....	33

This page intentionally left blank

1 INTRODUCTION

The Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to evaluate the Baltimore-Washington Superconducting Magnetic Levitation (SCMAGLEV) Project (the “Proposed Action” or the “Project”). As part of the NEPA process, FRA will follow “Efficient Environmental Reviews for Project Decisionmaking” (23 U.S. Code § 139), which specifies requirements for coordination by the lead federal agency within the US Department of Transportation with permitting and resource agencies that may have jurisdiction, authority, expertise, and/or relevant information with respect to the Project as well as with the public.

This Public/Agency Coordination Plan has been developed to guide the SCMAGLEV Project’s coordination activities with both the public and other interested, involved, cooperating and participating agencies through the duration of the NEPA process.

1.1 PURPOSE OF THE COORDINATION PLAN

The FRA has developed this Public/Agency Coordination Plan (Plan) to describe the SCMAGLEV Project’s coordination activities with both the public and other interested, involved, cooperating and participating agencies throughout the NEPA environmental review and approval process. The Plan summarizes key federal, state, and local agencies that are stakeholders and describes their responsibilities. It identifies key messages, themes, and general considerations to support the public outreach efforts associated with the planning, design, and study of the SCMAGLEV Project. This Plan also outlines the methodology for receiving input from agency and public stakeholders throughout the environmental review process.

This page intentionally left blank

2 PROJECT OVERVIEW

2.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND

In 2001, the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) published the Record of Decision (ROD) on a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) for the MAGLEV Deployment Program (MDP), established in the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21). The purpose of the PEIS was to identify potentially viable project locations in the United States to demonstrate the feasibility of MAGLEV technology.

Through a nationwide competition, FRA selected seven states – California, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Maryland, Nevada, and Pennsylvania — to receive pre-construction planning grants and participate in the development of the Draft and Final PEIS. Each state project was considered an alternative in the PEIS. The PEIS ROD concluded that MAGLEV was an appropriate technology to provide additional transportation options and the Maryland and Pennsylvania projects should be further considered as the preferred project alternatives for the MDP.

In cooperation with the Maryland Department of Transportation's (MDOT) Maryland Transit Administration (MTA), FRA then published and circulated a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) in 2003, for a MAGLEV system linking downtown Baltimore, MD, BWI Thurgood Marshall International (BWI Marshall) Airport and Union Station in Washington, DC. In 2007, MDOT/MTA, in cooperation with FRA, prepared but did not finalize a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). The revitalization of the Project is due in large part to the commitment of private and international funding for both the NEPA study and design and construction and because of technological advancements over the last decade that make project construction and operations more economically feasible.

In November 2015, the Maryland Public Service Commission approved the Baltimore Washington Rapid Rail's (BWRR) application to acquire a passenger railroad franchise to deploy a SCMAGLEV system between Baltimore, MD and Washington, DC. BWRR is a private corporation and, as the Project Sponsor and developer of the proposed SCMAGLEV system, will work with Federal and state agencies, including FRA, on this Environmental Impact Statement. In 2016, through the Safe Accountable Flexible Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), FRA awarded funds to MDOT to prepare preliminary engineering and conduct the NEPA process for the SCMAGLEV Project.

2.2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed system will utilize SCMAGLEV technology and build upon previous planning and environmental review efforts to provide a service between Baltimore and Washington. The Baltimore-Washington SCMAGLEV Project (Proposed Action) involves the proposed construction and operation of a high-speed superconducting MAGLEV train system between downtown Washington, DC and downtown Baltimore, MD with an intermediate stop at BWI Marshall Airport. The Project will include construction of a guideway (track) and three stations, a rolling stock storage depot, maintenance facility, power substations, vent plants, and an operations facility.

The study area (Figure 1) between Baltimore and Washington is approximately 40 miles long and 10 miles wide. The proposed SCMAGLEV system would be designed to run on a new, high-quality guideway with bidirectional service, an automatic train control system, and no at-grade crossings. The proposed SCMAGLEV design is anticipated to provide service between Baltimore and Washington in approximately

15 minutes of travel time. The Project Team, (members described in **Section 3.1**), anticipates the Project would be funded by federal and private funding, and would include construction of the new SCMAGLEV guideway, stations, and support facilities.

The purpose of the SCMAGLEV Project is to evaluate, and ultimately construct and operate, a safe, revenue-producing, high-speed ground transportation system that achieves the optimum operating speed of the SCMAGLEV technology to significantly reduce travel time in order to meet the capacity and ridership needs of the Baltimore-Washington region. To achieve the operational and safety metrics needed for a SCMAGLEV system, the Project must include:

- Infrastructure, vehicles, and operating procedures required for the SCMAGLEV system.
- An alignment which allows the highest practical speed that can be attained by SCMAGLEV technology at a given location and which avoids the need for reduction in speed other than that imposed by the normal acceleration and braking curves into and out of stations.
- A system that complies with federal safety requirements.
- Avoidance, minimization, and mitigation of impacts to the human and natural environment.

The objectives of the SCMAGLEV Project are to:

- Improve redundancy and mobility options for transportation between the metropolitan areas of Baltimore and Washington, DC.
- Provide connectivity to existing transportation modes in the region (e.g., heavy rail, light rail, bus, air).
- Provide a complementary alternative to future rail expansion opportunities on adjacent corridors.
- Support local and regional economic growth.

The purpose of the Project has been derived from the following needs:

- Increasing population and employment;
- Growing demands on the existing transportation network;
- Inadequate capacity of the existing transportation network;
- Increasing travel times;
- Decreasing mobility; and
- Maintaining economic viability.

FRA published a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an EIS for the SCMAGLEV Project in the Federal Register on November 25, 2016. An Environmental Impact Statement Scoping Document was also made available to the public in May 2017, via the Project website (www.bwmaglev.info).

FRA will coordinate with cooperating and participating agencies during development of the EIS pursuant to NEPA (23 USC 139) and Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (40 CFR Section

1501.6). FRA will also consult with the Maryland and District of Columbia State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPOs), Federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.




Figure 1: SCMaglev Study Area

This page intentionally left blank

3 LEAD/COOPERATING/PARTICIPATING AGENCIES

3.1 AGENCIES, ROLES, AND RESPONSIBILITIES

There are many Federal, District, state, regional, and local agencies with varied interests in the SCMAGLEV Project. In accordance with 40 CFR 1501.5 and 23 U.S.C. § 139, agency roles and responsibilities are defined below.

Lead Agencies and Project Sponsor

For projects subject to NEPA, the lead agencies are responsible for ensuring that the environmental review process is conducted properly and in accordance with all applicable environmental regulations. FRA is the lead Federal agency for the Project, and MDOT, as the grantee, is the joint lead agency. As the lead Federal agency, FRA is responsible for identifying, inviting, and proactively involving cooperating and participating agencies as well as the public.

BWRR, as the private Project sponsor and developer of the proposed SCMAGLEV system, will work with FRA to carry out preliminary engineering throughout the NEPA process.

Cooperating Agencies

According to CEQ regulations (40 CFR § 1508.5), a Cooperating Agency is defined as “any Federal agency other than a lead agency which has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved in a proposal (or a reasonable alternative) for legislation or other major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment.” A state or local agency of similar qualifications or when the effects are on a reservation, an Indian Tribe may, by agreement with the lead agency, become a cooperating agency. At this time the Project only has Federal Cooperating Agencies, and no state or local agencies or Indian Tribes have been granted Cooperating Agency status.

In accordance with (CEQ) regulations (40 CFR § 1501.6 and 23 USC § 139), each Cooperating Agency shall:

- Participate in the NEPA process at the earliest possible time.
- Participate in the scoping process.
- Assume, on request of the lead agency, responsibility for developing information and preparing environmental analyses including portions of the environmental impact statement concerning which the cooperating agency has special expertise.
- Make available staff support at the lead agency’s request to enhance the latter’s interdisciplinary capability.
- Normally use its own funds. However, the lead agency shall, to the extent available funds permit, fund those major activities or analyses it requests from cooperating agencies. Potential lead agencies shall include such funding requirements in their budget requests.

A cooperating agency may, in response to a lead agency’s request for assistance in preparing the EIS, reply that other program commitments preclude any involvement or the degree of involvement requested in the action that is the subject of the EIS. A copy of this reply shall be submitted to the Council.

Participating Agencies

Participating Agencies are Federal, state, or local agencies or Federally recognized tribal governmental organizations with an interest in the Project. The standard for Participating Agency status is more encompassing than the standard for Cooperating Agency status. Therefore, Cooperating Agencies are, by definition, Participating Agencies. However, not all Participating Agencies are designated as Cooperating Agencies. Cooperating Agencies have a higher degree of authority, responsibility, and involvement in the environmental review process than participating agencies. A Cooperating Agency with jurisdiction may adopt an EIS prepared by another agency without re-circulating the EIS as the lead agency when, after an independent review of the EIS, the Cooperating Agency concludes that its comments and suggestions have been satisfied. This provision is particularly important for permitting agencies that, as Cooperating Agencies, routinely adopt environmental documents prepared by the USDOT. As the lead Federal agency, FRA considered the distinctions noted above in deciding whether to invite an agency to serve as a participating agency.

The role of participating agencies is to:

- Provide input on defining the Project's purpose and need, the range of alternatives to be considered, and the methodologies and level of detail required in the alternatives analysis;
- Participate in coordination meetings and joint field reviews, as appropriate;
- As requested by FRA, provide timely review and comments on certain pre-draft or pre- Final environmental documents; and
- Provide timely comments on unresolved issues.

Concurring and Commenting Agencies

The NEPA Team for the SCMAGLEV Project is using Maryland's Streamlined Environmental and Regulatory Process to establish concurrent coordination of Section 106, Endangered Species Act, Clean Air Act, and Clean Water Act Section 404.

Concurring Agencies will review, comment and provide formal concurrence at three key milestones to comply with Maryland's Streamlined Environmental and Regulatory Process for issuance of required wetlands and waterways permits following the NEPA phase. Milestones are: 1) purpose and need; 2) alternatives retained for detailed study; and 3) selected alternative and conceptual mitigation. Concurring Agencies provide agreement to the decisions made at key milestones, unless there are substantial changes to the proposed action or significant new circumstances or information relevant to the environmental concern.

Cooperating and Participating Agencies will review and provide formal comments at the above three milestones. Both concurring and commenting agencies work closely with other Federal, state and local resource agencies during the NEPA phase of the Project.

Summary

FRA has invited applicable federal, state, county and local government regulatory and jurisdictional agencies within the SCMAGLEV study area to be Cooperating and Participating Agencies. The invited agencies are listed in **Table 1**. As study alternatives are developed and potential property impacts are determined, additional public landowners will be invited to participate in the NEPA process.

Table 1 lists the lead agencies as well as the agencies that have been invited and agreed to serve as Cooperating or Participating Agencies for the Project, with their responsibilities associated with the applicable area of jurisdiction or expertise. Any Federal agency that is invited by the lead agency to participate in the environmental review process for a project shall be designated as a Participating Agency by the lead agency unless the invited agency declines in writing; other agencies must accept in writing. FRA sent letters in late November 2016, inviting agencies to be either Cooperating or Participating Agencies and to participate in scoping for the Project. The invitations requested written responses by December 23, 2016.

Table 1: Lead Agencies and Invited Cooperating and Participating Agencies

Agency	Accepted Invitation	Responsibilities
Lead Agencies		
Federal Railroad Administration (FRA)	NA	Manage environmental review process; prepare EIS and NEPA decision document; provide opportunity for public and agency involvement; arbitrate and resolve issues.
Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT)	NA	Administer federal grant funding in amount of \$27.8M; oversee environmental studies and preliminary engineering being performed by other state agencies, including MEDCO and the MTA for BWRR's proposal; and oversee the public outreach process.
Maryland Department of Transportation Maryland Transit Administration (MDOT MTA)	NA	Oversee EIS documentation, which is being prepared by the Environmental Consultant, AECOM.
Cooperating Agencies		
Federal Agencies		
Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)****	Yes	Regulatory authority over BWI Marshall Airport. Consultation related to airport planning and FAA Form 7460 1, Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration.
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Yes	Consultation related to transit services and facilities including MTA Commuter Bus, Commuter Rail and Light Rail and WMATA Metrorail and Commuter Bus services.
National Capital Planning Commission (NCPIC)	Yes	Approval authority over Federal projects within the District, including all land transfers and physical alterations to Federal property, pursuant to the National Capital Planning Act of 1952. Federal properties noted within the study area include the Baltimore-Washington Parkway, Greenbelt Park, Kenilworth Park and Aquatic Gardens, US National Arboretum; Anacostia Park; Beall's Pleasure and the L'Enfant Plan Reservation 173 & 174.
U.S. Department of Interior (USDOL)-National Park Service (NPS)	Yes	NPS is responsible for managing the National Park System, including permitting on NPS land. The NPS has jurisdiction over Federal park land in the Study Area including Baltimore- Washington Parkway, Kenilworth Park and Anacostia Park. There are several National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed properties in the study area, including L'Enfant Plan (Reservation 173), the Baltimore and Washington Parkway, Greenbelt, and portions or all of the property that would be "used" (and thus are subject to review under Section 4(f) of the DOT Act). Actions that would require an NPS decision will require that NEPA compliance for this Project be easily adoptable by NPS (43 CFR 46.120) and should meet the policies set forth in NPS's Director's Order 12: Conservation, Planning, Environmental Impact Analysis, and Decision-Making (DO-12) and the NPS Compliance Handbook (2015).
Surface Transportation Board (STB)	Yes	STB has not determined if it has jurisdiction over construction of the SCMAGLEV Project. If the Board finds that it does have jurisdiction, then it will become a cooperating agency.
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)****	Yes	Review and permitting for impacts to rivers, streams, and wetlands under Rivers and Harbors Act, Section 10, and Clean Water Act (CWA) Sections 401 and 404. Oversees selection of the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA) pursuant to CWA Section 404 before the NEPA process is completed.
U.S. Coast Guard (USCG)	No	Consultation on the permitting of bridge construction in or over navigable waterways (Patapsco River, Anacostia River).

Agency	Accepted Invitation	Responsibilities
U.S. Department of Agriculture (DOA)–Beltsville Agricultural Research Center (BARC)	Yes	Provide protection to human health and the environment of BARC and the US National Arboretum (USNA) through compliance with all environmental related management requirements; specifically, through complying with Executive Order 13693.
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)****	Yes	NEPA Compliance, Hazardous Materials, Environmental Justice, Air Quality, Water Quality.

Participating Agencies

Federal Agencies		
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)*	Yes	Provides consultation related to the planning, construction, and maintenance of roadways within the study area.
Fort George G. Meade (U.S. Army)*	Yes	Consultation related to potential impacts to their property. Ft. Meade is a Participating Agency, but if an alternative impacting their property is in the DEIS, they will become a cooperating agency.
National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Goddard Space Flight Center (NASA/GSFC)**	Yes	Consultation related to impacts to their property and operations.
Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)	Yes	Consultation related to resilience and floodplain issues.
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)*; ****	Yes	Consultation related to Federally Listed Threatened & Endangered Species, Jurisdiction of Patuxent Research Refuge
U.S. Secret Service (USSS)	Yes	Consultation related to impacts to their property and operations.
National Security Agency (NSA)	Yes	Consultation related to impacts to their property and operations including potential impacts from SCMAGLEV's electromagnetic fields.
U.S. Commission of Fine Arts (CFA)	Yes	Review design proposals for public and private properties in the National Capital, as they affect the federal interest and preserve the dignity of the nation's capital.
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) - National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)*****	No	Consultation related to the federal management of United States fisheries under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA) and regarding management plans and regulations.
State		
Maryland Aviation Administration (MAA)	Yes	Consultation related impacts for compliance with requirements of FAA Orders 1050.1F.
Maryland Department of Natural Resources (DNR)	Yes	Consultation related to development within Chesapeake Bay Critical Area; resources regulated by Maryland's Forest Conservation Act; the presence of state listed rare, threatened and endangered species and critical habitat; and significant fisheries resources.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maryland Park Service • Wildlife and Heritage Service • Maryland Environmental Trust 		<p>Consultation related to Patapsco Valley State Park.</p> <p>Consultation related to rare, threatened, and endangered species.</p> <p>Consultation related to environmental easements.</p>
Maryland Department of Planning (MDP)	Yes	Consultation related to comprehensive plans, ordinances, and state and county level geographic information.
Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE)	Yes	Consultation related to compliance with Maryland's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements; Erosion and Sediment Control/Stormwater Management requirements; and Tidal and Nontidal Wetlands, Waterways and Floodplains.
Maryland Historical Trust (MHT)	Yes	Part of the MDP, the MHT serves as Maryland's State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) pursuant to the NHPA Section 106 for compliance.
Maryland Public Service Commission (PSC)	No***	Consultation related to compliance with requirements for operation of rail passenger services in Maryland.
Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration (MDOT SHA)	Yes	Consultation related to SHA's transportation system including its infrastructure, operations, safety, public space and right of way.

Agency	Accepted Invitation	Responsibilities
Regional		
Baltimore Metropolitan Council (BMC)	Yes	Administers the Baltimore region's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), Constrained Long Rang Transportation Plan (CLRP), and CAA compliance. BMC provides oversight for the regional transportation network and programming.
Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (COG)	No (declined)	Administers the region's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), Constrained Long Rang Transportation Plan (CLRP), and CAA compliance. MWCOG provides oversight for the regional transportation network and programming.
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA)	Yes	Consultation related to Metrorail facilities within the study area, including its station facilities, rail alignments, ridership statistics and future plans.
County		
Anne Arundel County Transportation Division	Yes	Consultation related to planning and engineering for SCMAGLEV Project and its impact to County transportation operations and adequate public facilities requirements.
Baltimore County Planning Office	No (declined)	Consultation related to County's land uses, development, and neighborhood planning.
Howard County Department of Planning and Zoning	Yes	Consultation related to County's land uses, development, and neighborhood planning.
Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (MNCPPC)	Yes	Consultation related to proposed impacts to Prince George's County parks, trails and recreations facilities. Consultation related to plans and studies used to guide future growth and physical development throughout the County, i.e. Master Sector Plans. Consultation related to transportation (bicycle/pedestrian/roadway) policies that guide growth and development while providing a countywide perspective.
Prince George's Public Works and Transportation*****	No	Consultation related to the county maintained roadway network impacts and transit connectivity.
Local		
Baltimore City Department of Planning	Yes	Consultation related to City's land uses, development, and neighborhood planning.
Baltimore City Department of Transportation (BCDOT)	Yes	Consultation related to City's transportation system including its infrastructure, operations, safety, public space and right of way.
District of Columbia Department of Transportation (DDOT)*	Yes	Consultation related to DDOT's transportation system including its infrastructure, operations, safety, public space and right of way.
District of Columbia Department of Energy & Environment (DOEE)	Yes	Consultation related to wildlife and habitat review; compliance with the CWA; regulatory review of stormwater management, sediment and erosion control, and floodplain management; oversight and compliance with Underground Storage Tank regulations (Risk Based Corrective Action process) and the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERLCA)..
District of Columbia Department of Public Works (DPW)	Yes	Consultation related to District waste management, parking enforcement and fleet management.
District of Columbia Historic Preservation Office (DC SHPO)	Yes	Review for National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Section 106 compliance in the District.
District of Columbia Office of Planning (DCOP)	Yes	Consultation related to District land uses, development, and neighborhood planning.
District of Columbia Public Service Commission	No (declined)	Regulatory agency responsible for landline telephone, electricity, and gas utility companies operating within the District.

* Agency was sent a Cooperating Agency invitation but chose to be designated as a Participating Agency instead.

** Agency is likely to become a Cooperating Agency if directly impacted by proposed improvements.

*** Agency was sent a Cooperating or Participating Agency invitation, and they did not respond at the time of this writing.

**** Agency is also a Concurring Agency.

***** Agency to be sent invitation and included.

3.2 AGENCY CONTACT INFORMATION

Table 2 lists the primary point of contact for each of the cooperating and participating agencies for the SCMAGLEV Project.

Table 2: Primary Point of Contact

Agency	Name	Address
Lead Agencies		
Federal Railroad Administration (FRA)	Brandon Bratcher	1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, MS-20, Washington DC 20590
Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT)	Bradley M. Smith	7201 Corporate Center Drive, Hanover, MD 21076
Maryland Department of Transportation Maryland Transit Administration (MDOT MTA)	Suhair Al Khatib	Planning, Program, Engineering, IT, MARC, and CB, 6 St. Paul Street, Baltimore, MD 21202
Cooperating Agencies		
Federal Agencies		
Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)	Andrew Brooks	Federal Aviation Administration, Eastern Regional Office; 1 Aviation Plaza, Jamaica, NY 11434
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Daniel Koenig	1990 K Street NW, Suite 510, Washington, DC 20006
National Capital Planning Commission (NCPCC)	Stacy Wood	401 Ninth Street NW, Suite 500, Washington, DC 20004
U.S. Department of Interior (USDOI)-National Park Service (NPS)	Tammy Stidham	1100 Ohio Drive SW, Washington, DC 20242
Surface Transportation Board (STB)	Victoria Rutson	Surface Transportation Board, 395 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20423
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)	Joseph P. DaVia; Donald R. Bole	10 S. Howard Street, Baltimore, MD 21201
U.S. Coast Guard (USCG)	Meredith L. Austin	Fifth Coast Guard District, 431 Crawford Street, Portsmouth VA 23704
U.S. Department of Agriculture (DOA)–Beltsville Agricultural Research Center (BARC)	Dana Jackson	10300 Baltimore Avenue, Building 003, Room 117, Beltsville, MD 20705
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	Kevin Magerr	1650 Arch Street, MS-3EA30, Philadelphia, PA 19103
Participating Agencies		
Federal Agencies		
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)	Jeanette Mar	31 Hopkins Plaza, Suite 1520, Baltimore, MD 21201
Fort George G. Meade (U.S. Army)	LTC Jaime D. Birmingham	4551 Llewellyn Avenue, Fort Meade, MD 20755
National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Goddard Space Flight Center (NASA/GSFC)	Lizabeth Montgomery	8800 Greenbelt Road, Code 250, Building 26 Room N250, Greenbelt, MD 20771
Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)	Amanda E. Ciampolillo	615 Chestnut Street, 6th Floor, Philadelphia, PA 19106
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)	Christopher P. Guy	177 Admiral Cochrane Drive, Annapolis, MD 21401

Agency	Name	Address
U.S. Secret Service (USSS)	Tom Franklin, Shawn McKee	9200 Powder Mill Road, Laurel Maryland 20708
National Security Agency (NSA)	Richard Wile Catherine Hill	9800 Savage Road, Fort George G. Meade, MD, 20755
U.S. Commission of Fine Arts (CFA)	Frederick J. Lindstrom	401 F Street NW, Suite 312, Washington, DC 20001
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)	Kristy Beard	177 Admiral Cochrane Drive, Annapolis, MD 21401
State		
Maryland Aviation Administration (MAA)	Paul Shank	PO Box 8766, BWI Airport, MD 21240
Maryland Department of Natural Resources (DNR)	Greg Golden	580 Taylor Avenue, Annapolis, MD 21401
• Maryland Park Service	TBD	580 Taylor Avenue, Annapolis, MD 24104
• Wildlife and Heritage Service	Lori Byrne	580 Taylor Avenue, Annapolis, MD 24104
• Maryland Environmental Trust	Jon Chapman	100 Community Place, 3rd Floor, Crownsville, MD 21032
Maryland Department of Planning (MDP)	Bihui Xu	301 W. Preston Street, Suite 1101, Baltimore, MD 21201
Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE)	Elder Ghigiarelli	1800 Washington Blvd, Suite 430, Baltimore, MD 21230-1708
Maryland Historical Trust (MHT)	Elizabeth Cole	100 Community Place, 3rd Floor, Crownsville, MD 21032
Maryland Public Service Commission (PSC)	Anthony Myers	6 St Paul Street, 6th Floor, Baltimore MD 21202
Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration (MDOT SHA)	Eric Beckett	707 North Calvert Street, Mail Stop C-502, Baltimore, MD 21202
Regional		
Baltimore Metropolitan Council (BMC)	Todd Lang	1500 Whetstone Way, Suite 300, Baltimore, MD 21230
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA)	James Ashe	600 5th Street NW, Washington, DC 20001
County		
Anne Arundel County Transportation Division	Ramond A. Robinson	2664 Riva Road, Annapolis, MD 21401
Howard County Office of Transportation	David Cookson	3430 Courthouse Drive, Ellicott City, MD 21043
Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (MNCPPC)		14741 Governor Bowie Drive, Upper Marlboro, MD 20772
• Community Planning	Scott Rowe	
• Countywide Planning	Tom Masog	
Prince George's Public Works and Transportation	Andrea Lasker	Office of the Director, 9400 Peppercorn Place, Suite 300, Largo, MD 20774
Local		
Baltimore City Department of Planning	Kyle B. Leggs	417 E. Fayette Street, 8th Floor, Baltimore, MD 21202
Baltimore City Department of Transportation (BCDOT)	Veronica McBeth	417 E. Fayette Street, 5th Floor, Baltimore, MD 21202

Agency	Name	Address
District of Columbia Department of Transportation (DDOT)*	Stephen L. Plano	55 M St SE, Suite 500, Washington, DC 20003
District of Columbia Department of Energy & Environment (DOEE)	Apurva Patil	1200 First Street NE, 5th Floor, Washington, DC 20002
District of Columbia Department of Public Works (DPW)	Christopher Shorter	2000 14th Street NW, 6th Floor, Washington, DC 20009
District of Columbia Historic Preservation Office (DC SHPO)	Andrew Lewis	1100 4th Street SW, Suite E650, Washington, DC 20024
District of Columbia Office of Planning (DCOP)	Dan Emerine	1100 4th Street SW, Suite 650 East, Washington DC 20024

4 COORDINATION POINTS AND ANTICIPATED COMPLETION DATES

Timeframes and review periods for the Project's NEPA review have been established in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ) regulations implementing NEPA (40 CFR parts 1500-1508), FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts (FRA's Environmental Procedures) (64 FR 28545, May 26, 1999, as updated in 78 FR 2713, January 14, 2013), and 23 USC 139. The key coordination points are summarized below, and **Table 3** provides a schedule of key milestone dates

- **Publish Notice of Intent (NOI):** The NOI was published in the Federal Register on November 25, 2016.
- **Scoping:** The Scoping Document was made available on the Project website in May 2017. Although not specified in the regulation, scoping comment periods are customarily a minimum of 30 days. For this Project, the comment period extended 15 additional days until January 9, 2017 for the public and until January 31, 2017 for participating and cooperating agencies (following January 31, agency meeting); comments received after these dates were also accepted. For additional information on scoping meetings held for this Project, see Section 5.2.3.
- **Invite Cooperating and Participating Agencies:** 23 USC 139 requires that within 45 days of the NOI (i.e., by January 9, 2017), FRA will invite any other Federal and non-Federal agencies that may have an interest in the Project to become participating agencies in the Project.

Letters were distributed to the agencies listed in **Table 1** above in November 2016, informing them about the initiation of NEPA, inviting them to attend the scoping meetings, and inviting them to serve as cooperating or participating agencies for the Project.

- **Coordination Plan:** As required by 23 USC 139, this Coordination Plan details the plan for agency and public involvement for the Project, including the anticipated milestones for involvement. This Coordination Plan includes a proposed schedule for completion of the environmental review (see **Table 3**), and upon finalization, will have been established in consultation with each of the participating agencies for the Project. Once established, this environmental review schedule will be made available to the public and the participating agencies via the Permitting Dashboard for Federal Infrastructure projects, including any subsequent updates to the established schedule.
- **Ongoing Coordination with Agencies:** Following the establishment of the Coordination Plan, FRA will conduct regular outreach with the Project's cooperating and participating agencies. This will include Interagency Meetings via face-to-face interaction, webinars, or at the Project site (typically on a monthly basis depending on the level of Project activity) to keep participants informed of the Project's progress. FRA will coordinate certain key milestones with Interagency Meeting briefings, as indicated in **Table 3**.
- **Project Documentation:** Cooperating and Participating agencies will have an opportunity to comment on the following Project documents: Purpose and Need; Preliminary Alternatives Screening Report; Alternatives Report; Preferred Alternative/ Conceptual Mitigation; and DEIS and FEIS documentation. 23 USC 139(g)(2)(B) requires the lead agency to establish comment deadlines for agency comments at a maximum of 30 days from the date of availability, unless otherwise agreed to by the agencies.

- **Section 106:** For this Project, FRA will conduct outreach and consultation required under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act concurrently with the NEPA process. The Section 106 approach is discussed in Section 5 below.
- **Permitting:** Following the completion of the NEPA process, BWRR will obtain the required permits for the Project. The approach for permitting is discussed in Section 5 below.

Key milestones and coordination points are shown in **Table 3**. The Project Team will engage agency and public stakeholders to ensure relevant issues, constraints, and reasonable alternatives are addressed early in the NEPA process. Moreover, at various milestones throughout the process, the Project Team will provide additional opportunities for engagement, such as at interagency meetings and public meetings.

Table 3: Schedule of Key Milestone Dates for Baltimore Washington SCMAGLEV NEPA Study

Milestone	Anticipated Completion Date
Purpose and Need, Scoping	
Fall 2016 – Spring 2017	
Notice of Intent Published	November 25, 2016
Public Scoping Comment Period	November 25, 2016 through January 9, 2017
Cooperating and Participating Agencies Invited	November 25, 2016
Public Scoping Meetings	December 10 through December 15 2016
Interagency Meetings re. Purpose and Need and Scope	January 18, 2017; January 31, 2017
Scoping Document Available	May 17, 2017
Section 106 Consultation Initiated with MHT and the SHPO	May 15, 2017
Interagency Meeting re. Purpose and Need Comments	June 12, 2017
Joint Evaluation Meeting re. Purpose and Need	June 28, 2017
Interagency Concurrence on Purpose and Need	October 2017
Development of Alternatives	
Spring 2017 – Spring 2018	
Interagency Meeting re. Initial Alternatives	March 24, 2017; March 30, 2017
Public Meeting re. Initial Alternatives	April 10, 2017 through April 14, 2017
Interagency Field Meetings re. Initial Alternatives	July 19 and July 26, 2017
Joint Evaluation Meeting re. Prelim. Alternatives Screening Results	August 30, 2017
Interagency Meeting re. Preliminary Alternatives Screening Results	October 3, 2017
Public Meetings re. Preliminary Alternatives Screening Results	October 14 - 25, 2017
Final Preliminary Alternatives Screening Results	January 2018
Draft Alternatives Report	February 2018
Final Alternatives Report	April 2018
Interagency Concurrence on Alternatives Report (ARDS)	May 2018

Milestone	Anticipated Completion Date
Preparation of (Draft Environmental Impact Statement DEIS)	Winter 2018 – Summer 2019
Environmental Evaluations/Technical Reports	February 2018 - June 2018
Draft DEIS	July 2018
Admin Draft DEIS completed	August 2018
Admin DEIS sent to [participating] agencies for review (30-day comment period)	October 2018
Camera-ready DEIS for FRA Signature	December 2018
DEIS Completed; Publish Draft EIS Notice of Availability	January 2019
DEIS Public Hearings	February 2019
DEIS Public Comment Period (45 days)/Close of Availability	April 2019
Interagency Concurrence on Preferred Alternative/Conceptual Mitigation (PACM)	June 2019
Preparation of Final Environmental Impact Statement/Record of Decision (FEIS/ROD)	Summer 2019 – Winter 2019
Draft FEIS/ROD	July 2019
Admin Draft FEIS/ROD	August 2019
Interagency Review of FEIS	September 2019
Final FEIS/ROD	October 2019
Notice of Availability of FEIS/ROD	November 2019
FEIS Public Availability Period (30-days)/Close of Availability	December 2019
Combined FEIS/ROD Complete	December 2019

This page intentionally left blank

5 AGENCY COORDINATION AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

5.1 AGENCY COORDINATION

5.1.1 COOPERATING AND PARTICIPATING AGENCY COORDINATION

FRA and MDOT will collaborate with cooperating and participating agencies in defining the Project's purpose and need, range of alternatives, and methodologies for documenting environmental conditions and assessing impacts and in preparing for future permit applications. While consensus is not required in the development of impact assessment methodologies, FRA and MDOT must consider the views of the agencies with relevant interests before making a decision on a particular methodology. After collaboration has taken place, FRA will make the decision on the methodology and level of detail to be used.

Agencies will be notified of the availability of key Project documents, including the Scoping Report, Preliminary Alternatives Screening Report, Alternatives Report, DEIS and FEIS/ROD, and given appropriate comment opportunities. After release and circulation of the DEIS for public comment, FRA intends to issue a single document that consists of a combined FEIS and ROD under 23 U.S.C. 139(n)(2) unless it determines the statutory criteria or practicability considerations preclude issuing a combined document. Following issuance of the FEIS/ROD, the NEPA Team will consult the appropriate agencies to complete any necessary permits for the Project.

5.1.2 SECTION 106 CONSULTATION

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (36 CFR Part 800) requires Federal agencies to consider the effects of their undertakings on historic properties that are listed or meet the eligibility criteria for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. A Federal undertaking is defined as a project, activity, or program either funded, permitted, licensed, or approved by a Federal Agency. The Section 106 process has a specific public involvement component. In particular, the implementing regulations require that the Federal agency (FRA), in consultation with the SHPO's (in this case, the Maryland Historical Trust and DC SHPO) as applicable, identify appropriate points for seeking public input regarding the identification of historic properties in the Project's Area of Potential Effects (APE), assessment of the Project's effects to those properties, and resolution of any adverse effects.

"Consulting parties" are a component of the Section 106 public involvement process. As stipulated in 36 CFR Part 800.2 (c)(3), FRA has identified the following agencies and organizations that may be interested in participating as consulting parties in the Section 106 process:

- Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
- Anne Arundel County Historical Society
- Anne Arundel County Planning and Zoning, Cultural Resources Division
- Baltimore City Commission for Historical & Architectural Preservation (CHAP)
- Baltimore City Historical Society
- Cedarville Band of Piscataway Indian, Inc.
- Choptico Band of Piscataway

- City of Bowie Planning and Economic Development
- City of Bowie Museums
- College Park Department of Planning, Community & Economic Development
- DC Preservation League
- Historical Society of Baltimore County
- Howard County Historical Society
- Laurel Historical Society
- Maryland Historical Society
- Maryland Historical Trust
- MDOT
- Montgomery County Historical Society
- Montgomery County Planning and Zoning
- MTA
- National Arboretum
- National Park Service
- The National Railway Historical Society, Washington, D.C. Chapter, Inc.
- Piscataway Conoy Confederacy and Subtribes, Inc.
- Piscataway Indian Nation
- Preservation Maryland
- Preservation Howard County
- Prince George's County Historical Society
- Prince George's County Planning and Zoning
- USFWS

Public outreach for purposes of NEPA will satisfy Section 106 public outreach requirements, by providing information regarding the Project's effects on historic properties at NEPA public meetings and in the EIS. The public will be given the opportunity to provide FRA with comments on the identification and evaluation of effects to historic properties during the DEIS public comment period. Members of the public with a demonstrated interest in the Project (due to the nature of their legal or economic relation to the undertaking or affected properties, or their concern with the undertaking's effects on historic properties) may participate as Section 106 Consulting Parties.

FRA formally initiated Section 106 consultation with DC SHPO and MHT in letters dated May 15, 2017. As stipulated in 36 CFR Part 800.2 (c)(3), as part of the Section 106 initiation step, FRA identified several agencies and organizations that may be interested in participating as consulting parties in the Section 106 process and requested DC SHPO and MHT's feedback on the proposed list of consulting parties, including those recommended for removal or addition.

DC SHPO responded via letter on June 27, 2017 with a suggested list of consulting parties. FRA will continue to consult with DC SHPO and MHT to identify additional organizations or persons that should be invited to participate as Section 106 consulting parties. FRA will continue to coordinate to identify, accept, and notify interested parties of their status as Section 106 Consulting Parties. Information presented to the Consulting Parties will include the results of the historic architectural and

archaeological surveys, as well as any potential effects to historic properties within the APE or larger study area. The Consulting Parties will have the opportunity to comment on the identification and evaluation of historic properties, provide their views on effects to these properties and participate in the consideration of measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects on historic properties.

5.1.3 SECTION 4(f) COORDINATION

FRA will provide opportunities for coordination and comment to the official(s) with jurisdiction over any Section 4(f) resource that may be affected by the Project as well as to the U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI), and as appropriate, the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Resources protected under Section 4(f) include public parks, wildlife refuges, and historic resources. Section 4(f) historic sites, parks, and wildlife refuge properties will be identified through the Section 106 process and NEPA process, in consultation with MHT, DC SHPO, and any other relevant Consulting Parties or resource agencies. The public is provided an opportunity to review and comment on the Project's Section 4(f) evaluation in coordination with the NEPA public review periods.

The NEPA Team conducted the following meetings with NPS:

- Joint meeting with NPS and USFWS on 4/19/17 to discuss agencies goals and concerns and present initial alternatives and early screening results.
- Meeting with NPS on 8/28/17 to discuss NPS questions and concerns related to preliminary alternatives.
- Meeting with NPS on 11/20/17 to discuss NPS questions and concerns related to screening results, alternatives remaining for detailed study, and Section 4(f) requirements and next steps.
- Meeting with NPS to be held on 1/30/2018 as part of continued Section 4(f) coordination to extend through the Alternatives and DEIS periods.

5.1.4 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE OUTREACH

Executive Order (EO) 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, dated February 11, 1994, requires consideration of whether a proposed action would disproportionately affect minority or low-income groups (59 Fed Reg. 7629 [1994]). FRA will prepare an environmental justice analysis for the Project to identify and address disproportionate adverse impacts to environmental justice populations and to ensure that environmental justice populations are included in public outreach efforts throughout the life of the Project (during and after the NEPA process).

The environmental justice analysis for the SCMAGLEV Project follows the guidance and methodologies recommended in CEQ's Environmental Justice Guidelines under the National Environmental Policy Act (December 1997), the USDOT's Final Order 5610.2(a) on Environmental Justice (April 1997 and updated May 2012), the FTA's Environmental Justice Policy Guidance for Federal Transit Administration Recipients, Circular 4703.1, effective August 15, 2012, and relevant guidance from the State of Maryland and the District of Columbia.

Minority populations covered by the Executive Order include Native American or Alaskan Native, Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Asian, Black and not of Hispanic origin, Hispanic, and populations of two or more races. Minority populations should be identified where either: 1) the minority population of the affected area exceeds 50 percent, or 2) the minority population percentage of the affected area is meaningfully greater than the minority population percentage in the general population or other appropriate unit of geographic analysis.

Low-income populations are any readily identifiable group of low-income persons who live in geographic proximity, and, if circumstances warrant, geographically dispersed/transient persons who will be similarly affected by a proposed FRA program, policy, or activity. Low-income is defined as a person whose median household income is at or below the Department of Health and Human Services poverty guidelines.

It is the intent of the EIS process for this Project to ensure that stakeholders are provided opportunities to be heard and to participate meaningfully from the outset of the Project and throughout all phases of Project development. Preliminary research has identified potential environmental justice communities in the Project' study area. As part of the NEPA process, the local potential environmental justice communities within the Project's study area will be included in the public outreach process, to ensure that they can participate meaningfully in review of the Project and its potential effects on the human environment.

FRA will use demographic data from the U.S. Census Bureau to identify environmental justice communities by analyzing the composition of potentially affected populations and geographic distribution by race, ethnicity, and income. FRA will coordinate with the District of Columbia Office of Planning, Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Prince George's Public Works and Transportation, Anne Arundel County Transportation Division, Howard County Office of Transportation, Baltimore City Department of Transportation and other appropriate city and/or county departments (e.g., Health and Human Services) to identify potentially affected minority and low-income populations within their jurisdiction and to identify community facilities and organizations serving those communities. FRA will use the information to connect with individuals and/or groups (e.g., religious organizations, civic associations, business/ trade associations, labor organizations, legal aid providers, community and social service providers, neighborhood associations, tribal governments, educational institutes) to conduct targeted outreach to potentially affected communities. Targeted outreach may consist of small group meetings with targeted communities, media placements regarding public meetings in publications utilized by these communities, making information available in multiple languages, and making translation services available at public meetings upon advance request.

As a general rule, the following principles will be utilized by the NEPA Team to support involvement of the local environmental justice communities in the Project Study Area:

- Documents, notices, and meetings will be made concise, understandable, and readily accessible to the public;
- When appropriate, notices and meeting materials will be provided in both English and Spanish, as Spanish is the second most common language in the study area, and is spoken by many of the members of the environmental justice communities in the study area;

- The Project website is available in multiple languages in addition to English;
- Informational material will be made available through a variety of outlets, such as the Project website, public meetings, and flyers;
- All public events will be scheduled at convenient and accessible locations and times; and
- Various community leaders and groups will be contacted to increase public participation of constituent communities.

5.1.5 LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY (LEP) OUTREACH

Individuals who do not speak English as their primary language and who have a limited ability to read, speak, write, or understand English are considered “limited English proficient,” or LEP. Federal laws concerning language access rights and obligations include Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Executive Order 13166. Executive Order 13166, “Improving Access to Services for Persons with Limited English Proficiency,” was signed on August 11, 2000 and states that people who are LEP should have meaningful access to Federally conducted and funded programs and activities. The Executive Order requires Federal agencies to examine the services they provide, identify any need for services to those with limited English proficiency, and develop and implement a system to provide those services so LEP persons can have meaningful access to them.

The SCMAGLEV Project is taking steps to provide meaningful access to those LEP individuals expected to be most regularly encountered. This includes providing Project materials and meeting notices in Spanish, advertising accommodation for LEP individuals, including the ability for LEP individuals to have translation services available at public meetings upon advance request. Language interpretation and translation needs in the Project Study Area predominantly involve Spanish speaking individuals. In addition, instantaneous web-translation of the Project website is available on-line in multiple languages.

5.1.6 AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT COMPLIANCE

Public meetings will be held in locations that comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) to accommodate disabled or elderly attendees. Sign language interpreters will be available at public meetings, and other meetings, if requested in advance.

Public notices announcing public meetings will provide instructions for requesting other special accommodations. The Project website has been designed to accommodate people with visual impairments (i.e., adjustable text size, compatibility with screen readers).

5.1.7 PERMITTING AND APPROVALS

The Project Team will identify potential permits, approvals or other actions which may be necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative. Following completion of the NEPA process, BWRR will obtain the required permits for the Project. The approach for permitting is discussed below..

Clean Water Act: A joint federal and state permit for the alteration or occupation of Waters of the U.S. that identifies compensatory mitigation must be obtained for all unavoidable impacts. For the

proposed action, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Maryland Department of Environment, and the District of Columbia Department of Energy and Environment have jurisdiction over wetland and waterway resources. There is a public involvement process associated with the Clean Water Act permitting process that involves all adjacent property owners of impacted resources. Those property owners will be a part of the Project's mailing list.

Protected Species and Habitats: Multiple regulations including the Endangered Species Act, Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, Magnuson-Stevens Conservation and Management Act, and Maryland Forest Conversation Act provide for the conservation and management of protected species and habitats including rare, threatened and endangered species and Essential Fish Habitats. FRA will coordinate with all environmental regulatory agencies, including the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries, Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Maryland Department of the Environment, and the District of Columbia Department of Energy and Environment.

National Park Service Lands: Segments of the proposed action that would affect National Park Service (NPS) property would require coordination with NPS. The SCMAGLEV study area includes Anacostia Park, the Baltimore-Washington Parkway, and many other parcels under the National Park Service jurisdiction. As such, the National Park Service is a NEPA Cooperating Agency and will most likely be a NHPA Consulting Party. Therefore, FRA will coordinate closely with NPS to ensure that NEPA compliance will meet the policies set forth in NPS's Director's Order 12: Conservation, Planning, Environmental Impact Analysis, and Decision Making (DO 12) and the NPS Compliance Handbook (2015).

National Capital Planning Act of 1952: Pursuant to the National Capital Planning Act of 1952, federal property transfers in the District require National Capital Planning Commission (NCPCC) approval. All property transfers require submission of an official legal plat with a signature line for the NCPCC's Chair, and all property transfers will be addressed in the Draft and Final EIS/ ROD. If necessary, the FEIS/ROD will include a separate section for each land transfer along with a signature line for NCPCC's Executive Director. FRA will submit changes to Federal property for NCPCC review with appropriate supporting documentation.

5.1.8 AGENCY INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

The following meetings will be held to engage agency participation in the Project.

- Interagency Meetings
- Joint Evaluation Meetings
- Field Meetings

FRA will meet regularly with agencies via Interagency Meetings and Joint Environmental Committee (JE) meetings. These meetings will be held at NEPA milestones and will be held in both Maryland and DC. Locations and format (in-person and webinar) will vary depending on agency availability and preference. FRA, in coordination with the Project Team, will send the meeting invitations to Lead Agencies, Cooperating Agencies, and Participating Agencies. For those who cannot attend, the meetings will be conducted via a webinar, when possible. The presentation and meeting summary will be emailed following the meeting.

The purpose of Interagency meetings is to provide agencies an opportunity to:

- Provide comments, responses, or insight on those areas within the special expertise or jurisdiction of the agency;
- Provide meaningful input at Project milestones;
- Keep abreast of the Project's progress and schedule; and
- Provide timely review and comment on environmental documentation.

Cooperating and Participating Agencies will be provided an opportunity to comment on and/or concur upon the following Project documents:

- The Draft Purpose and Need (Comment and Concur*);
- Preliminary Alternatives Screening Report (Comment during Interagency Meeting);
- Alternatives Report (Comment and Concur*);
- Preferred Alternative/Conceptual Mitigation (Comment and Concur*)
- Environmental Analysis Methodology and Technical Reports (Comment Only);
- DEIS (Comment Only); and
- Final EIS/ROD (Comment Only).

*Concurring Agencies listed in **Table 1** are required to comment and/or concur (or not concur).

5.2 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

5.2.1 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

The SCMAGLEV Project will include an open, participatory environmental review process. FRA will inform and solicit early and continued feedback from the public; encourage open discussion of Project details and issues; and provide opportunities for comments and questions.

The goals of the public involvement plan for the Project are as follows:

- To provide an opportunity and a mechanism for public participants to engage in the development of the EIS and give relevant input to the Project.
- To focus public input in a structured manner that will allow decisions to be made with the maximum benefit from public involvement.
- To ensure that elected officials, agencies, stakeholders, and the general public are adequately informed about the Project and its implications for their communities, and to identify potential issues so that they can be addressed and resolved before the completion of the EIS process.

5.2.2 COMMUNICATING WITH THE PUBLIC

The public involvement plan will include a number of different outreach tools and activities to involve the public. These will include the following:

- **Permitting Dashboard:** The SCMAGLEV Project will be added to the Permitting Dashboard for Federal Infrastructure Projects (<https://www.permits.performance.gov/>), an online tool for Federal agencies, project developers and interested members of the public to track the Federal government's permitting and review process for large or complex infrastructure projects.
- **Project Website:** The SCMAGLEV Project website was launched on November 25, 2016 and can be found at www.bwmaglev.info. The website includes an overview of the Project and access to information on superconducting magnetic levitation technology, the NEPA process, Project documents, past and upcoming public meeting dates and locations, and public meeting displays and materials. The Project website allows interested parties to become involved in the NEPA process by joining the mailing list and locating contact information to reach out to Project Team members. The Project website will be the main source of Project information for the public and will be updated regularly. Project information developed for the website and social media platforms will be formatted for optimized viewing on mobile devices. All public meeting advertisements and additional public outreach materials will contain the website address and will encourage readers to visit the site.

In addition to the Project website, other federal, regional, and local jurisdictions and transportation agencies' websites, including websites for MDOT, FRA, MTA, Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Administration, and District Department of Transportation, may be used to periodically post Project information such as meeting dates and locations for upcoming Project milestones.

- **Social Media:** The use of social media platforms is an effective way to disperse information quickly to a large audience. The Project Team will use social media platforms to increase Project and superconducting magnetic levitation technology awareness, as well as provide information such as important dates, documents, and Project milestones. Social media can also be a powerful tool to solicit feedback from the public. The Project Team utilized social media to advertise for the scoping meeting, and currently posts on the MTA's Facebook, Twitter and Instagram social media outlets. Going forward, the FRA will continue to refine its social media strategy to expand the use of social media for the Project given that many of the Cooperating and Participating Agencies, as well as the local jurisdictions, have a social media presence. For example, the Project Team may post pictures and videos of existing SCMAGLEV trains in service, in addition to public meeting announcements on Cooperating Agency accounts. Project surveys and polls could be conducted to gather feedback on topics such as alignments, station locations and desire to ride on SCMAGLEV utilizing Cooperating Agency accounts in order to reach a larger audience.
- **Mailing List:** The Project Team has developed an initial mailing list that includes stakeholders such as community groups, chambers of commerce, neighborhood associations, and elected officials. This initial list was used to send postcards announcing the scoping meetings in December 2016 and preliminary alternatives meetings in October 2017. The Project Team is continuing to refine our process for additional interested parties such as the general public and businesses by developing an updated electronic mailing list using buffer areas surrounding the proposed alternatives for bulk mailings instead of using zone areas for bulk mail. The mailing lists will be used to inform interested parties about the Project status and meeting notifications. Stakeholders may request to be added to the mailing lists at public

meetings, via the website, email, reaching out to Project Team members, or during public and interagency meetings. The Project Team will continue to add stakeholders to these lists throughout the Project.

- **Project Fact Sheets:** Project fact sheets (in both English and Spanish) were developed at key milestones for the Project, for the purpose of educating the general public about the EIS process, providing information on the Project as it progresses, announcing public participation opportunities, and providing Project Team contact information.
- **Mass Email:** Email blasts have been used to inform the public about upcoming meetings and significant stages in the EIS development. Future email blasts will be used for future meeting updates and Project activities, and to disseminate newsletters electronically.
- **Local government and stakeholder briefings:** The lead agencies will brief the appropriate local government entities and stakeholders to provide information, answer questions, and receive feedback.
- **Public comment periods at specific NEPA milestones:** NEPA requires public comment periods to provide an opportunity for public input at critical points during the environmental review. Public comment periods are during scoping, purpose and need, preliminary alternative screening, alternative analysis, DEIS, and FEIS reviews. During these periods, public meetings will be held and the public will have an opportunity to provide comments orally or in writing.
- **News and Print Media:** In addition to social media and the Project website, the Project Team will use additional media outlets to advertise for upcoming meetings. The Project Team advertised the public scoping process and scoping meetings in a variety of local media sources. Advertisements were featured on afro.com, patch.com, desktop and mobile pages for Anne Arundel County and Takoma Park, the Prince George's County Sentinel, Baltimore Sun desktop and touchscreen pages, the Transportation Research Board (TRB) iPad and mobile applications, and The Washington Post desktop and mobile pages. Additional media platforms, including print, internet, radio, television, and billboards will be considered as the Project progresses.
- **Meeting flyers:** The flyers will be in English and Spanish, and will be mailed or emailed to the Project mailing list. Flyers will also be distributed to libraries and community centers..
- **Mass Transit Advertisements:** As appropriate, the Project Team will develop Project advertisements for use with regional and local mass transit agencies that operate within the study area. The ads will be featured in bus and train stations, at stops, airports, and on vehicles and trains. The ads will be used to inform current transit users about the Project and direct the public to the Project website.
- **ADA and Section 508 Compliance:** As noted previously in Section 5.1.6 of this document, public outreach materials have been generated to comply with ADA and Section 508 requirements to accommodate disabled or elderly citizens. In addition, all meeting materials and communications have been designed with the intent to fully accommodate people with hearing and/or visual impairments (i.e., written transcripts, closed captioning, adjustable text size, and compatibility with computer automated screen readers). MDOT MTA also offers additional assistance through the Office of Customer and Community Relations at 410-767-

3999 or 866-743-3682 or TTY 410-539-3497, through which sign language interpreters, foreign language interpreters, and assistance for the visually impaired are available upon request.

- **Other stakeholder outreach:** Project staff members are available to meet with any interested parties. The communications detailed above will indicate staff availability for meetings.

5.2.3 PUBLIC MEETINGS

Opportunities for public input throughout the Project will include the following:

- **Public Scoping Meetings:** Although NEPA does not explicitly require that a scoping meeting be held, scoping meetings were held for this Project between December 10 and December 15, 2016. The purpose of the meetings was to gather input and feedback from members of the public and elected officials on the draft purpose and need statement; goals and objectives; scope for potential alternatives for consideration; issues to be addressed in the environmental review; and methodologies to be used to evaluate impacts. Outreach and notification were conducted via the NOI; the Project website; local newspapers; social media; postcard mailings to community groups, chambers of commerce, and neighborhood associations; letters and phone calls to elected officials; and flyer distribution at community centers, recreation centers, libraries, and community organizations. The five scoping meetings included an open house where Project staff were available to talk informally about the Project with interested members of the public.
- **Public Information Meetings:** The Project Team held two rounds of public informational meetings via open houses to present initial alternatives and to highlight the findings of the preliminary alternatives screening analysis. Open houses for both initial alternatives and preliminary alternatives screening results were held in April 2017 and October 2017 respectively, and included informal discussions between Project Team staff and meeting attendees at five locations throughout the study area.
- **Public Hearings:** Following publication of the Draft EIS, there will be public hearings. The public hearing will include an open house, a presentation, and an opportunity for oral testimony. The oral testimony will be recorded by a stenographer. FRA will not respond to the oral testimony at the meeting, and conversations with Project staff during the open house portion of the meeting will not be reflected in the Project record.

The public meetings and information open houses will be accessible to persons with disabilities and persons with LEP. Translation will be provided in Spanish. Special services, such as an interpreter or sign language services, will also be available upon request. Public notices announcing these meetings will provide instructions for requesting these services.

5.2.4 STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

FRA will seek out the involvement of community leaders, elected officials, and other stakeholders in the Project Study Area. These individuals and organizations will assist FRA in understanding and addressing local concerns, including those of the environmental justice communities that could be affected by the Project. Stakeholder involvement activities will include:

- **Elected Officials Briefings:** Briefings will be held with elected officials and other key stakeholders before such events as the public scoping meetings and DEIS publication. These will be informal meetings where discussions can be held.
- **Section 106 Consulting Party Participation:** See discussion above (Section 5.1).
- **Environmental Justice Outreach:** The Project will include outreach efforts specifically targeted to reach environmental justice communities located in the Project Study Area in Project development.
- **Stakeholder Meetings:** Meetings may be held with individuals or small groups to discuss specific Project considerations.

Table 4: Public Involvement by NEPA Milestone

	Milestone						
	NOI	Scoping	Initial Alternatives	Preliminary Alternatives	Retained Alternatives	DEIS	Final EIS & ROD
Website	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Social Media	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Mailing List	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
News and Print Media	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Public Meetings (PM) and Hearings (H)		✓ (PM)	✓ (PM)	✓ (PM)	✓ (PM)	✓ (H)	
Community Focus Groups				✓	✓	✓	✓
Presentations to Stakeholder Groups and Businesses			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Advertisement using MTA Outreach Tools			✓	✓		✓	✓

5.2.5 PROJECT DOCUMENT REPOSITORIES

Local document repositories enable members of the public to examine Project documents, including EIS documents, and other informational materials. The document repositories include agency and municipal offices and public libraries. The names and addresses of the Project's document repositories will be provided in the coming months.

5.2.6 COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

Comment periods are required as part of the NEPA process at specific times during the life of a project. Agencies must allow comments during the NEPA Scoping phase and after the publication of the DEIS. A formal public hearing is also conducted after the publication of the DEIS. These comment periods must be advertised prior to the beginning of the commenting period and extend at least 30-45 days after they are announced. Comments received during the required comment periods are subsequently addressed in corresponding documents.

In addition to these required commenting periods, the Project Team will encourage feedback and comments from the public throughout the Project. The Project website includes a comment form and contact information for Project Team staff. During all scheduled public meetings and during all Project meetings with citizens, businesses, advocacy groups and other stakeholders, feedback and comments will be actively solicited from participants via onsite paper and electronic comment cards. For comments received outside of the comment periods, the Project Team will collect and file the comments in a database. Comments will be filed by category based on subject matter. Comments seeking response from the Project Team will be filed as “response needed” and will be forwarded to the correct Project Team discipline lead for a response.

6 REVISION HISTORY

Agency comments and responses are shown in **Table 5**.

This page intentionally left blank

Table 5: Agency Comments on the SCMAGLEV Public/Agency Coordination Plan 12/4/17

#	Document Location	Agency/Commenter	Comment	Response	Edits to Public/Agency Coordination Plan	Approved Y/N
1	Page 4, Section 2.2, Paragraph 2, Bullet Point 2	FAA/Andrew Brooks	At the end of the bullet point, replace “existing” with “exiting”.	Agree with comment	Section updated for consistency with Final P&N. Paragraph 2, Bullet 2 was updated as part of this process.	Approved w/Comment
2	Page 4, Section 2.2, Paragraph 6, Sentence 1	FAA/Andrew Brooks	and the CEQ guidelines? Reference: Council on Environmental Quality National Environmental Policy Act Regulations, 40 CFR § 1501.6, Cooperating Agencies	Sentence changed	Inclusion of “(CEQ) regulations (40 CFR Section 1501.6)” to Sentence 1.	
3	Page 7, Section 3.1, Paragraph 5, Sentence 1	FAA/Andrew Brooks	Is this what FRA is requesting of each CA? Requirements listed under the CEQ guidelines, U.S.C. 23 definitions and FHWA/FTA's SAFETEA-LU guidance on Participating and Cooperating Agencies, differ from this list.	FRA requires Participating and Cooperating agencies roles/responsibilities consistent with 40 CFR 1501.6 and 23 U.S.C. § 139.	The list has been rewritten for consistency with 40 CFR 1501.6 and 23 U.S.C. § 139.	
4	Page 8, Section 3.1, Paragraph 1	FAA/Andrew Brooks	For consideration/discussion outside of this document: has there been consideration of 'one federal decision' and the recent emphasis (through EO 13807) of having all CA's (and permitting agencies) sign one ROD?	Yes, FRA is working with other relevant cooperating agencies including USACE, to complete a single record of decision. FRA and the Project Sponsor have established a permitting timetable for environmental reviews and authorizations at key concurrence points during the NEPA process. FRA is also finalizing this coordination plan to serve as a Coordinated Project Plan (CPP) per FAST-41.	No change required to document.	
5	Page 12, Section 3.2, Table 2, FAA Contact	FAA/Andrew Brooks	Update POC/Contact Info	Updated POC in Table 2	Table 2 updated for FAA POC to: Andrew Brooks; Federal Aviation Administration, Eastern Regional Office; 1 Aviation Plaza, Jamaica, NY 11434	
6	Page 19, Section 5.1.2	FAA/Andrew Brooks	Does FRA need formal designation as lead for 106?	FRA is the Federal agency responsible for the undertaking, in terms of National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 consultation. Our understanding is the need for a “lead Federal agency” comes into play when two federal agencies are providing funding or licensing for an undertaking. Individual Federal agencies that may have an interest in the undertaking, such as the National Park Service, will be participants in the consultation process leading to development of a Memorandum of Agreement or Programmatic Agreement.	No change required to document.	
7	Page 20, Section 5.1.2, Paragraph 1	FAA/Andrew Brooks	What about the other agencies listed? Have they been invited to be consulting parties?	FRA will formally invite above agencies and organizations to become Consulting parties following selection of alternatives retained for detailed study.	Sentence added to Paragraph 1 specifying status.	
8	Page 21, Section 5.1.4	FAA/Andrew Brooks	I think this section should clarify various agency roles/support functions in these processes.	Agree with comment.	Paragraph 6, identifying agencies and roles has been added to Section 5.1.2.	
9	Page 22, Section 5.1.5, Paragraph 2, Sentence 2	FAA/Andrew Brooks	Typo: notices	Agree with comment	Changed to notices	
10	Global	MAA/Paul Shank	No comments at this time.		No change required to document.	Approved w/o Comments

#	Document Location	Agency/Commenter	Comment	Response	Edits to Public/Agency Coordination Plan	Approved Y/N
11	Global	CFA/Frederick Lindstrom	For coordination with U.S. Commission of Fine Arts – the staff is available for informal consultation as needed. However, for formal consultation with the Commission itself, a submission and presentation to the Commission is needed. The staff can advise on whether presentations to the Commission will be appropriate during the EIS process, and/or later during the design process. A presentation would occur at one of the Commission’s regularly scheduled meetings (typically 3rd Thursday of each month, except August and December). The staff will then provide a written summary of the Commission’s advice, approximately one week after the presentation to the Commission.	Coordination process noted. Formal consultation to begin following selection of alternatives retained for detailed study.	No change required to document.	Approved w/Comments
12	Global	MDP/E. Scott Hansen	No comments at this time.		No change required to document.	Approved w/o Comments
13	Page 4, Purpose & Objectives	MDP/Bihui Xu, AICP	The purpose and objectives of the SCMAGLEV Project listed on page 4 of the draft Public/Agency Coordination Plan are not the same ones listed on page 4 of in the Purpose and Need report dated as October 12, 2017. I assume the ones in the Purpose and Need report are updated, aren't they?	The purpose and objectives from final Purpose and Need report should be used.	Purpose and Objectives were updated to reflect final Purpose and Need report.	
14	Global	MHT/Tim Tamburrino	No comments at this time.		No change required to document.	Approved w/o Comments
15	Page 5, Figure 1	NASA GSFC Beth Montgomery	Mt Rainier is spelled incorrectly (Mt Ranier) on the map.	Agree with comment	Spelling of Mt Rainier was corrected on map.	Approval subject to Comments Resolution
16	Page 8, Concurring and Commenting Agencies	NASA GSFC Beth Montgomery	Concurring and Commenting Agencies – Confusing as to how concurring/ commenting agencies relate to coordinating/participating agencies. Suggest an explanation.	Paragraphs updated	Included additional language to distinguish Concurring and Commenting agencies	
17	Page 8, Summary, Lines 4-5	NASA GSFC Beth Montgomery	Delete NASA Goddard Space Flight Center in sentence. NASA is a participating agency. Check to ensure others in list are correct.	Agree with comment	Summary paragraph was revised and simplified.	
18	Page 10, Table 1, Participating Agencies	NASA GSFC Beth Montgomery	Include Goddard Space Flight Center with NASA anytime it is used.	Agree with comment	Revised by adding NASA GSFC	
19	Page 12, Table 2, Participating Agencies	NASA GSFC Beth Montgomery	Include Goddard Space Flight Center with NASA anytime it is used.	Agree with comment	Revised by adding NASA GSFC	
20	Page 19, Section 5.1.1, Paragraph 2, Line 4	NASA GSFC Beth Montgomery	Delete “and”.	Agree with comment	Removed the word “and” between ROD and under.	
21	Page 19-20	NASA GSFC Beth Montgomery	“Choptico Band of Piscataway” is listed twice.	Agree with comment	Removed “Choptico Band of Piscataway” between these bullets, since it occurs in list on previous page.	
22	Page 22, Last Line, Word 1	NASA GSFC Beth Montgomery	Missing “n”.	Agree with comment	Corrected spelling by adding “n”	
23	Page 27, Section 5.2.3, Lines 7-8	NASA GSFC Beth Montgomery	Update to past tense for October meetings.	Agree with comment	Paragraph was updated to reflect past tense of October meetings.	
24	Page 29, Section 5.2.6	NASA GSFC Beth Montgomery	Delete line in between 2nd and 3rd paragraphs.	Agree with comment	Space between Paragraphs 2 and 3 was deleted forming one paragraph.	
25	Signature Form	Include Goddard Space Flight Center with NASA.	Include Goddard Space Flight Center with NASA.	Agree with Comment	Change Made to Signature Form	
26	Global	BMC/Todd Lang	No comments at this time.		No change required to document.	Approved w/o Comments
27	Global	NCPC/Stacy Wood	No comments at this time.		No change required to document.	Approved w/o Comments
28	Global	DDOE/Apurva Patil	No comments at this time.		No change required to document.	Approved w/o Comments

#	Document Location	Agency/Commenter	Comment	Response	Edits to Public/Agency Coordination Plan	Approved Y/N
29	Global	STB/Victoria Rutson	No comments at this time.		No change required to document.	Approved w/o Comments
30	Global	Baltimore County Department of Planning/ Andrea Van Arsdale	Lack of response does not mean I concur. Please do not represent it as such.	Understood. We will remove Baltimore County as Participating Agency. We will reach out to County as study progresses on status.	Indicate that an invitation to be a participating agency was extended, but declined in Table 1. Delete County in Table 2.	Not expected to approve at this time.
31	Global	USDA ARS/Dana Jackson	<p>To whom it may concern: After reviewing the linked document I have become very concerned that the Federal participation process is not working. The USDA's Agricultural Research Services, Beltsville Agricultural Research Center (BARC), clearly signed on to be participate early on in this process and is yet again not listed among your Federal Agencies in the Public/Agency Coordination Plan Table that is presented in the document to the public.</p> <p>This oversight is unacceptable. BARC is one of the largest potential impacted Federal property owners in the SCMAGLEV venture and it expects to be fully engaged as a participant in this EIS process. We were not coordinated with, nor notified prior to the publication this or of the final 3 alignments selected to move forward into the EIS process. As part of this process BARC was also clearly not included in the preliminary siting process for the proposed rail maintenance yards that have been included in the EIS process as well.</p> <p>This document needs to be revised ASAP to reflect USDA's current participation and should be notified and provided draft documents for review prior to publication to assure accuracy and mandatory inclusion in any future Federal Agency discussions as this process moves forward.</p> <p>In addition, BARC expects any and all field work to be coordinated through BARC's Real Property Office. (Contacts Provided Below). Through this office all SCMAGLEV contractors are required to request and obtain a Revocable Permit (RP), as are all other Federal and non-Federal entries that conduct work or research on our facility. The revocable permit is the legal vehicle that will allow access to BARC's Federal property. It, at a minimum, will establish the parameters for that access, will describe in detail the specific project requirements to be performed on BARC, the duration of the project, and allowable access times to enter our Federal property from public or Federally owned roads to conduct EIS related field surveys. In addition to adhering to the RP, BARC also has specific environmental and coordination with BARC Security which are strictly enforced. Any violation of the RP, environmental regulation, or security lapsed are cause RP termination.</p> <p>Lisa Bynum, Real Property Specialist, USDA, Agricultural Research Service, Henry A. Wallace Beltsville Agriculture Research Center, 10300 Baltimore Avenue, Building 003, Room 308A Beltsville, Maryland 20705-2350, Phone: 301-504-5188; Fax: 301-504-5556E-Mail: Lisa.Bynum@ars.usda.gov</p> <p>Claudette Joyner, Real Property Specialist, USDA, Agricultural Research Service, Henry A. Wallace Beltsville Agriculture Research Center, 10300 Baltimore Avenue, Building 003, Room 308 BARC-West, Beltsville, MD 20705, Phone: 301.504.5221 (Voice); Fax: 301.504.5556 (Fax) Claudette.Joyner@ars.usda.gov</p> <p>The Real Property Office is responsible for matters related to space utilization, land management (revocable permits, easement deeds, master plans, and boundary surveys), historic preservation, and demolition/disposal at BARC, which is comprised of over 6,500 acres and approximately 600 active and non-active buildings and structures</p>	<p>FRA received BARC's response from invitation letter sent Nov 2016. BARC responded to be listed as a Cooperating and Participating agency. They are currently listed as a Cooperating Agency in the Coordination Plan.</p> <p>Kelly Lyles, MTA Environmental Manager, spoke with Dana Jackson via call on November 28, 2017. She indicated that an IRM webinar will be held on December 7th (10am) to discuss developments since the Oct 3rd IRM. She also offered to meet with him if he feels more information is needed after the IRM.</p> <p>Brandon L. Bratcher Environmental Protection Specialist Office: (202) 493-0844 Mobile: (202) 868-2626 Federal Railroad Administration 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE Washington, DC 20590</p>		Not expected to approve at this time.

#	Document Location	Agency/Commenter	Comment	Response	Edits to Public/Agency Coordination Plan	Approved Y/N															
32	Tables 1 & 2	MNCPPC / Tom Masog	<p>Add the following info:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Agency</th> <th>Accepted Invitation</th> <th>Responsibilities</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>National Capital Park and Planning Commission (MNCPPC)</td> <td></td> <td>Consultation related to proposed impacts to Prince George's County parks, trails and recreations facilities.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Community Planning</td> <td></td> <td>Consultation related to plans and studies used to guide future growth and physical development throughout the County, i.e. Master Sector Plans.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Countywide Planning</td> <td></td> <td>Consultation related to transportation (bicycle/pedestrian/roadway) policies that guide growth and development while providing a countywide perspective.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Prince George's Public Works and Transportation</td> <td></td> <td>Consultation related to the county maintained roadway network impacts and transit connectivity</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Agency	Accepted Invitation	Responsibilities	National Capital Park and Planning Commission (MNCPPC)		Consultation related to proposed impacts to Prince George's County parks, trails and recreations facilities.	• Community Planning		Consultation related to plans and studies used to guide future growth and physical development throughout the County, i.e. Master Sector Plans.	• Countywide Planning		Consultation related to transportation (bicycle/pedestrian/roadway) policies that guide growth and development while providing a countywide perspective.	Prince George's Public Works and Transportation		Consultation related to the county maintained roadway network impacts and transit connectivity	Agree with Comment	Information added to Tables 1 & 2.	Approval subject to Comment Resolution
Agency	Accepted Invitation	Responsibilities																			
National Capital Park and Planning Commission (MNCPPC)		Consultation related to proposed impacts to Prince George's County parks, trails and recreations facilities.																			
• Community Planning		Consultation related to plans and studies used to guide future growth and physical development throughout the County, i.e. Master Sector Plans.																			
• Countywide Planning		Consultation related to transportation (bicycle/pedestrian/roadway) policies that guide growth and development while providing a countywide perspective.																			
Prince George's Public Works and Transportation		Consultation related to the county maintained roadway network impacts and transit connectivity																			
33	Global	Baltimore City Planning/ Kyle Leggs	No comments at this time.		No change required to document.	Approved w/o Comments															
34	Tables 1 & 2	Howard County Office of Transportation/David Cookson	Revise Howard County Department of Planning and Zoning to Howard County Office of Transportation in the text.	Done	Howard County Information revised in Tables 1 & 2.	Approved w/Comment															
35	Table 2	FHWA/Jeanette Mar	New address for FHWA is: Federal Highway Administration, 31 Hopkins Plaza, Suite 1520, Baltimore MD 21201	Done	Updated made to Table 2	Approved w/Comment															
36	Global	SHA / Eric Beckett	No comments at this time		No change required to document.	Approved w/o Comments															
37	Global	NPS/Laurel Hammig	Re-add Laurel to the distribution list. Email: laurel_hammig@nps.gov	Done	No change required to document.																
38	Page 7, bullet 1	NPS/Tammy Stidham	Asked for NPS input on alternatives after all but three alternatives were dismissed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SCMaglev Team held a joint meeting with NPS and USFWS on 4/19/17 to discuss agencies goals and concerns and present initial alternatives and early screening results. SCMaglev team met with NPS on 8/28/17 to discuss NPS questions and concerns related to preliminary alternatives. SCMaglev team met with NPS on 11/20/17 to discuss NPS questions and concerns related to screening results, alternatives remaining for detailed study, and Section 4(f) requirements and next steps. 	No change required to document.	Approval subject to Comment Resolution															
39	Page 8	NPS/Tammy Stidham	NPS not listed as cooperating agency.	Agree with comment.	Summary paragraph has been revised.	Approval subject to Comment Resolution															

#	Document Location	Agency/Commenter	Comment	Response	Edits to Public/Agency Coordination Plan	Approved Y/N
40	Page 9	NPS/Tammy Stidham	NPS's role in this project is more than just Section 4f consultation. NPS has approval authority on many aspects of this project.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NPS is responsible for managing the National Park System, including permitting on NPS land. The NPS has jurisdiction over Federal park land in the Study Area including Baltimore- Washington Parkway, Kenilworth Park and Anacostia Park. There are several National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed properties in the study area, including L'Enfant Plan (Reservation 173), the Baltimore-Washington Parkway, Greenbelt, and portions or all of the property would be "used" (and thus are subject to review under Section 4(f) of the DOT Act). Actions that would require an NPS decision will require that NEPA compliance for this Project be easily adoptable by NPS (43 CFR 46.120) and should meet the policies set forth in NPS's Director's Order 12: Conservation, Planning, Environmental Impact Analysis, and Decision-Making (DO-12) and the NPS Compliance Handbook (2015). 	Table 1 has been their updated to include this language.	
41	Page 10	NPS/Tammy Stidham	USFWS - In our last meeting you showed 2 alternatives that was within the refuge, which is not consistent with the direction USFWS has given. If this alternative is still on the table, then they need to be a cooperating agency. If the direction is to not move forward with the use of refuge, then that leaves is only one alternative. NPS will ask that (regardless of whether the use of the refuge will be considered) additional alternatives be considered that avoid and/or minimize, to the greatest extent practicable, alternatives that directly impact NPS administered properties.	USFWS indicated that they wish to remain a participating agency for now. FRA will revisit the status of USFWS should alternatives retained for detailed study be located within the Patuxent Wildlife Refuge. At that time the coordination plan will be updated if necessary.	No change required to document at this time.	
42	Page 19, Section 5.1.2	NPS/Tammy Stidham	Has the National Arboretum and USFWS been asked to be a 106 consulting party?	Invitations letters to consulting parties to begin following selection of alternatives retained for detailed study. We will include National Arboretum and USFWS.	Added National Arboretum and USFWS to list on Page 19.	
43	Page 20	NPS/Tammy Stidham	The sentence "The NEPA Team conducted coordination meetings with NPS regarding Section 4(f) and Section 106 issues on April 19, 2017 and August 29, 2017. " This is not accurate. Neither of these meetings were focused on Section 4f or Section 106 issues. Once NPS comments are address, please resend for review and sign-off.	<p>Similar to Comment #37 above</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SCMaglev Team held a joint meeting with NPS and USFWS on 4/19/17 to discuss agencies goals and concerns and present initial alternatives and early screening results. SCMaglev team met with NPS on 8/28/17 to discuss NPS questions and concerns related to preliminary alternatives. SCMaglev team met with NPS on 11/20/17 to discuss NPS questions and concerns related to screening results, alternatives remaining for detailed study, and Section 4(f) requirements and next steps. 	This information will be added to Page 20.	
44	Pages 26-28	Anne Arundel County/ Ramond Robinson	Thanks for the opportunity to comment. Based on the information in the plan, Communications with the public need to identify alternatives for printed materials. The plan should include the process for multiple forms for visual or hearing impaired. This would be specific to the items on pages 26- 28.	Agree with comment.	Paragraph added to Section 5.2.2, Communicating with the Public, ADA and Section 508 Compliance. This paragraph describes alternative methods of communication for visual or hearing impaired participants.	Provided Comments Only

#	Document Location	Agency/Commenter	Comment	Response	Edits to Public/Agency Coordination Plan	Approved Y/N
45	Tables 1, 2 and Section 5.1.7	Greg Golden/Maryland Department of Natural Resources	<p>In a nutshell, I mistakenly missed the deadline of the Plan response referenced here. Essentially, it is ok for concurrence to be interpreted as stated on the deadline, but I do have a few comments, and sounds like you are still working on edits, so maybe the timing of these comments works for you.</p> <p>I am the correct contact for MD DNR. However, the document describes MD DNR roles awkwardly, and in a very limited sense. It describes only the Critical Area. There are many DNR roles, it would take additional coordination for me to even suggest the best language. If you team with experienced MDOT interagency team project managers (especially SHA, or MDTA, perhaps MTA) or the local environmental consultants experienced in MDOT work, I think the language for MD DNR can be tuned and details. Aspects include the STATE endangered species law/regulations, Forest Conservation Act, resource scoping and commenting for impact avoidance and minimization, participation in the regulatory review process for wetlands and waterways, State Scenic and Wild Rivers, partnering with MDE on Coastal Zone Consistency, public lands management (Patapsco Valley State Park), MD Environmental Trust for environmental easements, fish passage, and likely a few more. Of course these could be consolidated and summarized as needed. Critical Areas definitely apply as well, although Critical Area Commission participates separately in most interagency venues.</p> <p>The FCA is already referenced in the plan, but seemed to be the lead reference in State RTE species, and that should be a different reference to State endangered species law. I can get you the contacts if MDOT or the consultants don't have them on file.</p> <p>Although not my direct connection, I notice it appears you did not include NOAA (National Marine Fisheries Service NMFS) ?. I forwarded the info to Kristy Beard with NMFS 10 minutes before the call. She thought she was on the contact and reference list previously. NMFS is a very important participant in interagency review.</p> <p>Finally, we definitely need to be sure coordination with MD Park Service on Patapsco valley State Park is time, as well as additional detailed scoping and coordination on rare, threatened, and endangered species with myself and DNR Wildlife and heritage Service (Lori Byrne). Also, MD Environmental Trust on environmental easements (Jon Chapman).</p> <p>I look forward to discussing with other permit and commenting agencies in the wetland and waterway regulatory team at the JE meeting.</p>	<p>Comments are accepted.</p> <p>Agree with comment regarding role of DNR in Table 1. The role of DNR has been expanded and we added roles for Offices of Maryland Park Service, Wildlife and Heritage Service, and Maryland Environmental Trust. Contacts for these offices were added to Table 2.</p> <p>The NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) was also added to Tables 1 and 2.</p> <p>Agencies above will be sent invitation letters to serve as a participating Agency.</p> <p>We recognize that FCA is on a federal level. Section 5.1.7, Permitting and Approvals, Paragraph 3, is intended to be comprehensive with details in Tables 1 and 2. We did not make changes to this section.</p>	Revisions made to Tables 1 and 2.	Approved w/Comments