

# Appendix D1:

## Response to Federal Agency Comments

Environmental Protection Agency .....	1
Department of Interior.....	6
National Capital Planning Commission.....	8
National Marine Fisheries Service.....	10

ID	Comment	Response	Reference
<b>Environmental Protection Agency</b>			
<b>1A</b>	We appreciate the thoroughness of the document's alternatives discussion and the coordination done by FRA with resource agencies including the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). We suggest that the final EIS (FEIS) provide more detail on the coordination, including future coordination, with NMFS.	<p>Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT) would continue to coordinate with NMFS regarding avoidance and minimization measures for impacts during construction, as stated in the FEIS/Record of Decision (ROD). Additional commitments to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts to submerged aquatic vegetation have been added to the FEIS/ROD based on NMFS comments on the DEIS.</p> <p>On October 24, 2019 NMFS provided concurrence with FRA's conclusion that the Preferred Alternative is not likely to adversely affect any Endangered Species Act (ESA)-listed species under their jurisdiction. In their concurrence letter, NMFS stated that no further consultation pursuant to Section 7 of the ESA is required.</p>	<p>FEIS/ROD Section 2.3, Measures to Minimize Harm</p> <p>Commitment/Mitigation ID: A01</p>
<b>1B</b>	It is noted in the DEIS that impact to submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV) is likely from a new structure crossing the Potomac River. SAV has important function as aquatic habitat and in water quality. EPA recommends FRA investigate opportunities for the placement of green infrastructure best management practices (BMPs) in the study area to further capture stormwater runoff from entering the Potomac River.	Additional commitments to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts to submerged aquatic vegetation have been added to the FEIS/ROD based on NMFS comments on the DEIS. A commitment has also been added to investigate opportunities for the placement of green infrastructure best management practices (BMPs) in the study area to further capture stormwater runoff from entering the Potomac River.	<p>FEIS/ROD Section 2.3, Measures to Minimize Harm</p> <p>Commitment/Mitigation ID: B09; B10; B11; B12;</p>
<b>1C</b>	The preferred Action Alternative A will have permanent impacts to 3.7 acres of narrow strips of vegetation along the linear footprint of the proposed bridge. It is recommended that impacts to this vegetation be minimized and if permanent impacts result, we encourage consideration of compensatory mitigation for the loss of resource.	DRPT would be responsible for developing a vegetation protection plan during final design, which would minimize impacts to vegetation. Following construction, DRPT would reestablish vegetation where possible and restore areas to their pre-construction function and appearance to the extent possible. Trees and vegetation would be maintained for 3-5 years following planting.	<p>FEIS/ROD Section 2.3, Measures to Minimize Harm</p> <p>Commitment/Mitigation ID: B02; B03, B04, B05,</p>

ID	Comment	Response	Reference
		<p>The vast majority of vegetation impacts are on property administered by National Park Service (NPS). DRPT would contribute a monetary value to NPS as compensation for permanent loss of vegetation. NPS would develop and implement a vegetation restoration plan that accounts for the equivalent amount and caliper of affected vegetation, as well as the work required by NPS introduce new trees to East and West Potomac Parks, George Washington Memorial Parkway (GWMP), Mount Vernon Memorial Highway (MVMH), and National Mall historic districts.</p>	<p>B06, B07, B08, C04, C05, C07, C08</p>
<p><b>1D</b></p>	<p>The DEIS states that there is potential permanent impact a total of 2,650 square feet of SAV from the pier construction and shading from the new deck, and some additional impact from the pedestrian walkway, based on the latest aerial survey performed by the Virginia Institute for Marine Science in 2017 (VIMS). If these impacts cannot be avoided, we recommend that compensating for the permanent loss be considered by FRA. Additionally, if there is a possibility of indirect impacts to SAV beds downstream in the Potomac River, resulting from scour and deposition from the installation of crossing piers, EPA suggests addressing minimization of these potential impacts in the FEIS. As VIMS has not performed a complete SAV survey since 2017, it may be prudent and beneficial to perform multi-year field surveys of the existing SAV beds prior to construction to update available information on the SAV resource condition and coverage in the local area. EPA would appreciate an opportunity to contribute and participate in the SAV field survey planning and implementation.</p>	<p>Specific mitigation for unavoidable impacts to SAV would be determined during the permitting process. Potential for scour is minimal to nonexistent because of commitments already made in terms of best practices for construction, including silt curtains. DRPT would update information on SAV resource condition and coverage prior to construction.</p>	<p>FEIS/ROD Section 2.4, Monitoring and Enforcement</p> <p>FEIS/ROD Section 2.3, Measures to Minimize Harm</p> <p>Commitment/Mitigation ID: B09; B10; B11; B12</p>
<p><b>1E</b></p>	<p>EPA appreciates continued coordination with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) as the project proceeds forward, including consultation to determine recommendations on time-of-year restrictions and</p>	<p>Commitments to minimize impacts to fish species are described in <b>FEIS/ROD Section 2.3, Measures to Minimize Harm</b>. DRPT would continue to coordinate with NMFS regarding avoidance and minimization measures for impacts</p>	<p>FEIS/ROD Section 2.3, Measures to Minimize Harm</p>

ID	Comment	Response	Reference
	<p>minimization techniques to migrating fish species. We suggest that the FEIS explain what measures will be implemented to minimize the impacts to all fish species during the construction phase, especially during the installation of bridge piers (this may include need for vibration attenuation such as bubble curtains to reduce impact to fish). We recommend the FEIS further address FRA's and DDOT's coordination with the NMFS for avoidance and minimization to migratory fish species, especially the <i>Acipenser brevirostrum</i>, shortnose sturgeon, and <i>Acipenser oxyrinthus</i>, atlantic sturgeon.</p>	<p>during construction, as stated in the FEIS/ROD. Additional commitments to avoid and minimize impacts to fish species have been added to the FEIS/ROD based on NMFS comments on the DEIS.</p>	<p>Commitment/Mitigation ID: A01; B17; B18; B19; B20; B21; B22</p>
1F	<p>It is mentioned in the DEIS that a stormwater management plan will be developed for the project in the design phase and it will detail the location and design of all planned stormwater management facilities. EPA recommends the FEIS include a proposed or preliminary stormwater management plan, identifying potential locations for best management practices (BMPs). We suggest the plan include the type of BMPs being evaluated and estimate the amount of stormwater runoff they would treat. We recommend evaluation of the use of green infrastructure techniques such as bio-swales, rain gardens, porous pavement, etc.</p>	<p>The FEIS does not include a proposed stormwater management plan, as that is not appropriate at this level of design. As described in <b>FEIS/ROD Section 2.3, Measures to Minimize Harm</b>, stormwater BMPs would be implemented to decrease runoff volume and peak flow rate and provide prescribed treatment volume and recharge volume.</p>	<p>FEIS/ROD Section 2.3, Measures to Minimize Harm  Commitment/Mitigation ID: B23</p>
1G	<p>It is recommended that a citation to the general conformity rule (40 CFR part 93, subpart B) and the de minimis thresholds (40 CFR 93.153) be included in the discussion of general conformity on page 10-2.</p>	<p>Citations added to Chapter 10, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases (line 43 and line 44)</p>	<p>FEIS/ROD Section 1.4, DEIS Errata and Other Changes  Errata ID: 47; 48</p>
1H	<p>Page 10-2 states, "Arlington County does not have regulations or ordinances that govern air pollutant emissions." Note that Arlington County is included in the Washington, DC-MD-VA marginal nonattainment area for the 2015 8-hour ozone NAAQS. Therefore, Virginia laws and regulations for both attainment and marginal</p>	<p>The statement was intended to indicate that there are no local ordinances that govern this area. Sentence revised to read: "Arlington County falls within the Washington DC-MD-VA area for EPA designations and therefore falls within the Virginia laws and regulations as well as the Federal CAA."</p>	<p>FEIS/ROD Section 1.4, DEIS Errata and Other Changes  Errata ID: 49</p>

ID	Comment	Response	Reference
	nonattainment areas apply to Arlington County as well as the federal Clean Air Act (CAA).		
<b>1I</b>	It is recommended that the paragraph on page 10-4 regarding the quantitative construction air quality analysis explain that the project is in the Washington, DC-MD-VA marginal nonattainment area for the 2015 8-hour ozone NAAQS, therefore, pursuant to the general conformity rule at 40 CFR part 93, subpart Band 40 CFR 93.153, a general conformity applicability analysis is required.	The following sentence was added to the end of the paragraph on page 10-4: The project is in the Washington, DC-MD-VA marginal nonattainment area for the 2015 8-hour ozone NAAQS, therefore, pursuant to the general conformity rule at 40 CFR part 93, subpart B and 40 CFR 93.153, a general conformity applicability analysis is required.	FEIS/ROD Section 1.4, DEIS Errata and Other Changes  Errata ID: 50
<b>1J</b>	Table 10-1 on page 10-6 shows 2017 design values, which are calculated using 2015-2017 monitoring data. However, page 10-5 refers to the data in Table 10-1 as being from 2014 to 2016. Also, note that 2018 design values are available.	The 2018 values were posted on 7/23/2019, which was after preparation of the analysis for the EIS. In addition, these values were provided for background information only and were not used to assess the impacts of the Project. A review of the critical values (CO, NO2 and Particulate Matter 2.5 micrometers or less [PM2.5]- where the project in in nonattainment or maintenance areas) reveal that the 2018 values are either similar or lower than the 2017 values for the locations listed and do not change the conclusions of the analysis.	n/a
<b>1K</b>	Page 10-5 states, "The EPA designates the District and Arlington County as nonattainment areas for 8- hour O3 ... ". It is recommended that it be clarified that the District and Arlington County are designated as marginal nonattainment for the 2015 8-hour ozone NAAQS. Both areas are maintenance for the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS.	Replaced text reading "The EPA designates the District and Arlington County as nonattainment areas for 8-hour O3 and maintenance areas for CO and PM2.5" with "The District and Arlington County are designated as marginal nonattainment for the 2015 8-hour ozone NAAQS. Both areas are maintenance for the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS. "	FEIS/ROD Section 1.4, DEIS Errata and Other Changes  Errata ID: 51
<b>1L</b>	It is suggested that a reference to EPA' s Green Book at <a href="https://www.epa.gov/green-book">https://www.epa.gov/green-book</a> be included.	Reference added.	FEIS/ROD Section 1.4, DEIS Errata and Other Changes  Errata ID: 51
<b>1M</b>	Page 10-6 provides background information on the Air Quality Index (AQI) but does not include information	The AQI information was provided for informational purposes only as background data of information available for the study area for air quality and was not used for any	FEIS/ROD Section 1.4, DEIS Errata and Other Changes

ID	Comment	Response	Reference
	specific to the project area. We would be pleased to discuss recommended detailed air quality data for the study.	analysis. The AQI is utilized more as real-time data. Section 10.3.2 removed so the focus is more on the monitoring data provided in Section 10.3.1.	Errata ID: 53
<b>1N</b>	EPA recommends Table 10-2 Air Quality Index and Associated Health Effects be moved under section 10.3.2 Air Quality Index.	This table has been deleted based on the previous comment/response.	FEIS/ROD Section 1.4, DEIS Errata and Other Changes  Errata ID: 53
<b>Department of Interior</b>			
<p>See <b>Appendix F, Agency, Operator, and Organization Letters Received</b> for the full text of the letter from DOI. Substantive comments are responded to below. In the letter, DOI stated that “the Department understands that, due to the current location, this project will result in significant permanent and temporary impacts of the following Section 4(f) resources:” the George Washington Memorial Parkway/Mount Vernon Memorial Highway, Mount Vernon Trail, East Potomac Park, and Hancock Park. The letter from DOI summarized the significance of each of these resources and described the impacts of the Project to these resources. The letter then provided the statements below related to the Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation.</p> <p>In reference to the Section 106 consultation process, the DOI letter stated that: “the Department agrees with the statements in both the DEIS and Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation that the Project would result in a determination of “adverse effect” under Section 106 National Historical Preservation Act (Section 106) to GWMP,MVMH, EPP and WPP historic resources.” The letter then summarized the adverse effects to these resources.</p>			
<b>2A</b>	FRA has determined that the use of Hancock Park is <i>de minimis</i> . The temporary use is for construction access and staging. The NPS does not concur with this finding as a third of this very small park will be unavailable for use by the public for a duration of three years. The NPS considered this a temporary use under Section 4(f).	<p>The statement about a <i>de minimis</i> finding is an error and has been corrected in the Final Section 4(f) Evaluation. NPS’s statement about the amount of the park affected is based on earlier plans previously shared with NPS. Through discussions with NPS, FRA and DDOT reduced the area required from 0.3 acres to 0.09 acre. This would be a construction access area to allow contractors to bring railroad materials, equipment, and crews into the railroad corridor. This would not be a staging area. In addition, the area of the park near 7th Street SW, where the majority of the public use occurs today, would remain available for public use.</p> <p>FRA finds that this temporary occupancy does not constitute a Section 4(f) use of Hancock Park based on the criteria for a temporary occupancy exception in 23 CFR</p>	Appendix A: Final Section 4(f) Evaluation, Lines 567 - 655

ID	Comment	Response	Reference
		774.13(d). FRA has added additional detail to the Final Section 4(f) Evaluation to support this conclusion.	
<b>2B</b>	With regard to the draft Section 4(f), the Department understands no feasible and prudent alternatives that avoid the use of Section 4(f) properties were identified and that the action alternatives evaluated have somewhat equal impacts to Section 4(f) properties. The draft Section 4(f) Evaluation does not make a determination regarding prudent and feasible, as defined in 23 CFR 774.17.	This determination has been added to the Final Section 4(f) Evaluation.	Appendix A: Final Section 4(f) Evaluation, Lines 1298 - 1313
<b>2C</b>	Document states that FRA will complete the Final Section 4(f) Evaluation at the same time as the FEIS for the Project. It will include a determination of the impacts to Section 4(f) properties resulting from the Preferred Alternative and documentation of measures to minimize harm. As a result, the Department is not likely to concur at this time.	Noted.	n/a
<b>2D</b>	The Department will require more information regarding alternatives, mitigation and minimization as well as FRA determination of prudent and feasible.	FRA has provided additional detail in the Final Section 4(f) Evaluation.	Appendix A: Final Section 4(f) Evaluation, Section 4.0, Avoidance Alternatives Analysis and Section 5.0, Planning Undertaken to Minimize Harm
<b>2E</b>	Implementation of the bicycle/pedestrian bridge is an element that would be a benefit to the NPS properties being impacted and would enhance access and connectivity to and through NPS properties.	DRPT has committed to funding and construction of the bike-pedestrian bridge as mitigation for impacts to Section 4(f)-protected resources. See <b>Table 2-22 in FEIS/ROD Section 2.3, Measures to Minimize Harm.</b>	FEIS/ROD Section 2.3, Measures to Minimize Harm  Commitment/Mitigation ID: B60; B85; C01
<b>2F</b>	Finally, the Department understands the need to provide additional long-term railroad capacity and improve the overall reliability of railroad services and understands the rationale for expanded capacity to occur within this	FRA, DDOT, and DRPT will continue to work with NPS to minimize and mitigate impacts to resources. Project planning has involved efforts to minimize impacts to NPS resources, including coordination with NPS to develop an	FEIS/ROD Section 2.3, Measures to Minimize Harm

ID	Comment	Response	Reference
	<p>corridor. However, we also understand the major significant impacts the project will have on NPS property, visitor use, access, and experience, impacts to additional Section 4(f) resources and that the disruption during construction will last between four and five years. The Department remains concerned with significant impacts to NPS resources and looks forward to the continued collaboration with FRA, DDOT, and DPRT during this long-term planning process to continue to mitigate and minimize these impacts.</p>	<p>access and staging plan that is acceptable to NPS, as described in Section 5.0, Planning Undertaken to Minimize Harm, in the Final Section 4(f) Evaluation. Additional minimization measures which FRA, DDOT, and DRPT have committed to include implementation of a construction management control plan, NPS participation in design review for elements of the Project introduced into NPS-administered properties, and a vegetation protection plan.</p> <p>For unavoidable impacts to NPS resources, FRA, DDOT, and DRPT have committed to significant mitigation in the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (<b>Appendix B</b>), the DRPT-NPS Mitigation Agreement (<b>Appendix C</b>) and the Record of Decision. In addition to the new bike-pedestrian crossing of the Potomac River which will substantially improve connectivity within the regional trail network, mitigation commitments include a vegetation restoration plan, vegetation replacement, viewshed protection plans for the GWMP and East Potomac Park, cultural landscape inventories for the MVMH, East Potomac Park, and National Capital Region Headquarters Campus, and compensation for the loss of parking.</p>	<p>Commitment/Mitigation ID: A09; A12; A15; A17; A18; A19; A20; B01; B02; B03; B04; B05; B06; B07; B08; B09; B24; B36; B37; B40; B41; B42; B43; B44; B45; B58; B59; B60; B61; B66; B67; B68; B69; B70; B71; B72; B73; B74; B75; B76; C01; C02; C03; C04; C05; C06; C07; C08; C09; C10; C11; C12; C13; C14; C15; C16; D04</p> <p>Appendix B, Section 106 Programmatic Agreement</p> <p>Appendix C, DRPT-NPS Mitigation Agreement</p>
<b>National Capital Planning Commission</b>			
<b>3A</b>	<p>The DEIS references NCPC’s review authority over potential federal land transfers, with several locations described in the Environmental Consequences Report (Appendix D3), Scoping Report (A1), and Property and Land Use (12) chapter. The final EIS should provide more detail pertaining to transfer area size, location, impervious area change, tree removal, visual impact, and proposed mitigation. Additionally, the Record of Decision should contain a separate land transfer section to help facilitate NCPC review.</p>	<p>A land transfer/exchange section has been added to the Record of Decision (ROD) to facilitate NCPC review. This section includes a summary of the areas to be transferred or exchange, and the impacts to those properties.</p>	<p>FEIS/ROD Section 2.6.9, Land Exchange/Transfer</p>



ID	Comment	Response	Reference
3B	The DEIS concludes that a nearby potential East Potomac Park memorial site (#13), identified by the NCPC Memorials and Museums Master Plan (2M Plan), is “not incompatible” with the preferred alternative. Both action alternatives would construct new tracks along the northside (opposite side from Site # 13) of the existing railway alignment. DDOT should ensure that the site’s functionality as a future commemorative use is preserved once potential railway improvements are complete.	As noted in NCPC’s comment, the Preferred Alternative would expand the railroad right-of-way on the opposite side of the railroad from Site #13 (see Figure 12-6 in the DEIS). After crossing I-395, the railroad expansion would occur on the same side of the railroad as Site #13 (see Figure 12-7 in the DEIS). It is not expected that this expansion would affect the features that led to identification of this site as a Prime Site for a future commemorative site. DRPT would coordinate with NCPC during final design to ensure the site’s functionality as a future commemorative site is preserved.	DEIS Chapter 12, Land Use and Property  FEIS/ROD Section 2.3, Measures to Minimize Harm  Commitment/Mitigation ID: A15
3C	NCPC supports a new pedestrian/bicycle bridge across the Potomac River as important 4(f) mitigation for potential Long Bridge project improvements. The DEIS describes the benefit of such a crossing as improving connectivity between Long Bridge Park, George Washington Memorial Parkway, Mount Vernon Trail, and East Potomac Park. Pedestrians and bicyclists would be able to cross the Potomac River without the inconvenience and discomfort of traveling alongside motorized traffic as under current conditions. Though the new bridge is not funded at this time, NCPC supports bridge funding in conjunction with future Long Bridge-related improvements, with future design to be development in coordination with NPS, Arlington County, and other important stakeholders.	DRPT has committed to funding and construction of the bike-pedestrian bridge as mitigation for impacts to Section 4(f)-protected resources. See <b>Table 2-22 in FEIS/ROD Section 2.3, Measures to Minimize Harm.</b>	FEIS/ROD Section 2.3, Measures to Minimize Harm  Commitment/Mitigation ID: B60
3D	As noted in the DEIS, Long Bridge is in a visible area, spanning between George Washington Memorial Parkway and East Potomac Park, near the Jefferson Memorial, within several significant/gateway view-sheds. NCPC seeks to preserve the sensitive nature of the study area setting as articulated through Commission policies from the Urban Design Element and its accompanying Technical Addendum. We encourage DDOT and other study stakeholders to identify appropriate project mitigation including	The Section 106 Programmatic Agreement includes a design review process that would include consultation with District Historic Preservation Office (DC SHPO), Virginia Department of Historic Resources (VDHR), NPS, NCPC and Commission of Fine Arts (CFA). The Design review would address, but is not limited to the following unresolved design elements: a) new railroad bridge design and engineering, including structure type, vertical clearance, visual appearance of the structural system, and alignment; b) aesthetic treatment of new	FEIS/ROD Section 2.3, Measures to Minimize Harm  Commitment/Mitigation ID: C01

ID	Comment	Response	Reference
	screening/softening vegetation and exploring multiple steel bridge girder and pier façade treatments as the study process continues. In particular, selecting natural paint tones and/or stone façade materials may harmonize the existing and/or new bridge spans with the surrounding natural landscape and complement existing or adjacent bridge structures. The final EIS and ROD should include specific mitigation proposals such as these.	component bridges or other structures introduced into NPS-administered properties; c) landscape design within the limits of disturbance of the Project; d) any additional signage or lighting necessitated by the Project; e) design of the bike-pedestrian crossing and any associated access ramps and trail connections; and f) construction staging and access procedures. The FEIS/ROD does not include specifics related to these elements, to allow the design review process to provide meaningful input on these elements.	
3E	NCPC encourages continued coordination between DDOT and the National Park Service (NPS) to effectively mitigate anticipated visitor use, access, experience, and Section 4(f) resource impacts to NPS property. We note that all potential affected federal property is under NPS jurisdiction. Project mitigation should be commensurate with the amount of property needed temporarily for construction and permanently over the long-term, and the expected removal of trees.	FRA, DDOT, and DRPT have coordinated extensively with NPS throughout the National Environmental Policy Act Process (NEPA) process to minimize impacts to NPS-administered property and develop acceptable mitigation for unavoidable impacts. Mitigation commitments are included in the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement and the signed Mitigation Agreement between DRPT and NPS. DRPT would continue to coordinate with NPS during construction to minimize traffic disruptions and maintain vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle mobility on roadways during construction.	Appendix B, Section 106 Programmatic Agreement  Appendix C, DRPT-NPS Mitigation Agreement  FEIS/ROD Section 2.3, Measures to Minimize Harm  Commitment/Mitigation ID: A09; A12; A13; A15; A17; A18; A19; A20; B03; B24; B41; B42; B69; C01
<b>National Marine Fisheries Service</b>			
4A	The proposed project is located above the estuarine mixing zone in tidal fresh water and is not designated as essential fish habitat (EFH) for federally managed species. However, as you describe in your EIS, anadromous species have been documented as spawning near and/or migrating through the study area, including: blueback herring ( <i>Alosa aestivalis</i> ), hickory shad ( <i>Alosa mediocris</i> ), alewife ( <i>Alosa pseudoharengus</i> ), American shad ( <i>Alosa sapidissima</i> ), and	DRPT would continue coordination with NMFS during final design to determine whether time-of-year restrictions are required on in-stream construction work during specific periods when migratory fish species are most likely to be present in the Project Area or whether other avoidance and minimization measures may preclude the need for time-of-year restrictions.	FEIS/ROD Section 2.3, Measures to Minimize Harm  Commitment/Mitigation ID: A01

ID	Comment	Response	Reference
	<p>striped bass (<i>Marone saxatilis</i>). We generally recommend that in-water construction activities that could impact the migration or spawning of these species be avoided from February 15 through June 15. We recognize that multiple, overlapping time of year restrictions make construction timelines difficult, and we will be happy to work with you and the permitting agencies to develop a timeline of what activities would be restricted at what times of year to assist in planning purposes.</p>		
<b>4B</b>	<p>You state in the EIS that SAV impacted by the temporary construction pier would likely return after removal of the pier. Given that the construction pier would be in place for more than five years, it is possible that SAV would not rebound post-removal. As a result, these impacts should be considered permanent and you should provide compensatory mitigation to offset the loss.</p>	<p>The FEIS/ROD has been revised to indicate that the construction impacts to SAV would likely be permanent due to the length of time the cofferdam would be in place.</p> <p>A mitigation commitment has been added that during final design DRPT would develop appropriate mitigation strategies for impacts to SAV in coordination with regulatory agencies. Potential strategies include transplanting, re-establishment of vegetation in the impact zone, in-kind mitigation at an agreed-upon ratio, or credits.</p>	<p>FEIS/ROD Section 1.4, DEIS Errata and Other Changes</p> <p>Errata ID: 11</p> <p>FEIS/ROD Section 2.3, Measures to Minimize Harm</p> <p>Commitment/Mitigation ID: B12</p>
<b>4C</b>	<p>Because of the ecological value of SAV, we recommend that if impacts cannot be avoided that in-kind mitigation be undertaken unless it can be demonstrated that the planting of SAV is not practicable. We typically recommend an in-kind compensation ratio for SAV impacts of 3:1.</p>	<p>Mitigation commitment added stating that for permanent impacts to SAV, DRPT would develop appropriate mitigation strategies in coordination with regulatory agencies. Potential strategies include transplanting, re-establishment of vegetation in the impact zone, in-kind mitigation at an agreed-upon ratio, or credits.</p>	<p>FEIS/ROD Section 2.3, Measures to Minimize Harm</p> <p>Commitment/Mitigation ID: B12</p>
<b>4D</b>	<p>Compensatory mitigation should be provided for the loss of open water habitat resulting from installation of permanent bridge piers and for the temporary and permanent losses of SAV.</p> <p>Because there is successful SAV in the area now, and you will not be changing the depth or sediment type in the</p>	<p>Mitigation commitment added stating that for permanent impacts to SAV, DRPT would develop appropriate mitigation strategies in coordination with regulatory agencies. Potential strategies include transplanting, re-establishment of vegetation in the impact zone, in-kind mitigation at an agreed-upon ratio, or credits.</p>	<p>FEIS/ROD Section 2.3, Measures to Minimize Harm</p> <p>Commitment/Mitigation ID: B12</p>

ID	Comment	Response	Reference
	<p>project area, we recommend that after removing the construction pier you:</p> <p>(1) allow the sediment to settle;</p> <p>(2) re-plant the area for the following growing season to restore existing conditions;</p> <p>(3) mitigate for the temporal loss of SAV habitat by planting additional SAV at a 3:1 ratio, preferably in locations where SAV has been successful in the past but has disappeared or has minimal density; and</p> <p>(4) monitor the entire project site for five years to determine if there are additional SAV losses resulting from the proposed project that require mitigation and to determine the success of re-planting. If SAV growth has not been documented by year three, a second round of planting may be necessary.</p>		