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IN REPLY REFER TO:
NCPC File No. MP63

October 13, 2016

Mr. Thomas Franklin
Communications Center, SAF
245 Murray Lane, SW, Bldg. T-5
Washington, DC 20223

Re: James J. Rowley Training Center Master Plan Update Environmental Assessment – NCPC Scoping Comments

Dear Mr. Franklin:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide scoping comments on the preparation of the Environmental Assessment (EA) for the James J. Rowley Training Center Master Plan Update located in Beltsville, Maryland. The comments provided below are based on the National Capital Planning Commission's (NCPC) role as the central planning agency for the federal government in the National Capital Region (NCR). NCPC coordinates all federal planning activities within the NCR pursuant to the National Capital Planning Act, and has advisory review for master plans in the Washington, DC region.

In general, we support the purpose of the master plan update which is to utilize the campus more effectively, provide needed space for specialized programs, provide a physical fitness facility, accommodate external and inter-campus transportation, differentiate secured areas from non-secured public areas, and establish architectural design guidelines for the campus. NCPC staff understands that the main components included in this update are specialized training facilities; a defense tactical facility; vehicular training areas; a field house; and relocated canine facility.

The master plan update should be consistent with the goals and policies set forth in the 2016 Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital related to federal facilities within the NCR. NCPC staff submits the following scoping comments, which have been prepared in accordance with NCPC's Environmental and Historic Preservation Procedures and reflect the information that NCPC will require to review the master plan:

- Protect environmentally-sensitive areas including wetlands and forested areas, by demonstrating how it will meet various regulations such as the stormwater management requirements under the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 and Executive Order 13690: Establishing a Federal Flood Risk Management Standard and a Process for Further Soliciting and Considering Stakeholder Input.
• Improve environmental performance and reduce energy costs in existing federal buildings through targeted energy improvements.
• Avoid and/or minimize impacts to adjacent landowners and demonstrate how it will be compatible with these nearby land uses.
• Ensure no net loss of permeable surface area on the installation, which provides stormwater management capacity as well as can reduce the heat island effect.
• Evaluate transportation and circulation systems, including vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycling, to promote multi-modal travel within the campus. The EA should also evaluate any parking changes.
• Describe human health and safety during demolition, construction and after completion and occupation, including issues related to hazardous materials, noise and air quality.

NCPC staff appreciates the opportunity to participate in the scoping stage and we look forward to continued involvement in the master plan update. If you have any questions regarding our comments, please contact Carlton Hart at 202.482.7252 or carlton.hart@ncpc.gov.

Sincerely,

Diane Sullivan
Director, Urban Design and Plan Review
FYI, TOM

Thomas E. Franklin, REM  
Environmental, Sustainability, and Energy Manager  
Headquarters, United States Secret Service  
Phone: 240.624.3849 (RTC)  
HQ: 202.406.5641  
Cell: 202.567.1817  
Email: thomas.franklin@usss.dhs.gov

From: Montgomery, Lizabeth R. {Beth} (GSFC-2500) [mailto:lizabeth.r.montgomery@nasa.gov]  
Sent: Thursday, October 13, 2016 10:19 AM  
To: THOMAS FRANKLIN (SAF)  
Subject: Scoping Notice for the Rowley Training Center Master Plan Update

Hi Tom,

Thank you for the scoping notice for the supplemental Environmental Assessment you are preparing for the Rowley Training Center Master Plan update. At this time we do not have any comments. We are interesting in receiving the draft EA along with the Master Plan update when they are available for review. A soft copy or link is preferable. When do you think the draft EA will be available for review?

Thanks,

Beth Montgomery  
301-286-0469  
NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center NEPA Manager, Code 250  
8800 Greenbelt Road  
Greenbelt, MD 20771

All e-mail to/from this account is subject to official review and is for official use only. Action may be taken in response to any inappropriate use of the Secret Service's e-mail system. This e-mail may contain information that is privileged, law enforcement sensitive, or subject to other disclosure limitations. Such information is loaned to you and should not be further disseminated without the permission of the Secret Service. If you have received this e-mail in
error, do not keep, use, disclose, or copy it; notify the sender immediately and delete it.
All,

Below is an email from the new Director of the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center. Pretty sure he is referring to comments for the Master Plan.

Thanks, TOM

_Thomas E. Franklin, REM_
_Environmental, Sustainability, and Energy Manager_
_Headquarters, United States Secret Service_
_Phone: 240.624.3849 (RTC)_
_HQ: 202.406.5641_
_Cell: 202.567.1817_
_Email: thomas.franklin@usss.dhs.gov_

---

Mr Franklin -

Thanks for your memo requesting comments on plans at the RTC. I have no comments on the plans.

However, I do want to introduce myself as the new Director of the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center. I have been in this job for just over a year, so my introduction to you and the RTC staff is a bit overdue. Do feel free to contact me on any matters of mutual interest, and of course, please let me know if there is anything we can do for you.

John French
All e-mail to/from this account is subject to official review and is for official use only. Action may be taken in response to any inappropriate use of the Secret Service's e-mail system. This e-mail may contain information that is privileged, law enforcement sensitive, or subject to other disclosure limitations. Such information is loaned to you and should not be further disseminated without the permission of the Secret Service. If you have received this e-mail in error, do not keep, use, disclose, or copy it; notify the sender immediately and delete it.
Good morning,

Acknowledging receipt and Cc-ing Claire Sale, preparer of the SEA.

Thanks,
Lauren Bradshaw, AIA

HGA Architects and Engineers
Direct 703.317.6034

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.

---

FYI…

**Thomas E. Franklin, REM**
Environmental, Sustainability, and Energy Manager
Headquarters, United States Secret Service
Phone: 240.624.3849 (RTC)
HQ: 202.406.5641
Cell: 202.567.1817
Email: thomas.franklin@usss.dhs.gov

---

Hello Mr. Franklin: Concerning

**State Application Identifier:** MD20160930-0846
**Reply Due Date:** 10/27/2016
**Project Description:** Master Plan Update: Proposed Revision of the Master Plan to allow for the Gradual Expansion of and Program Improvement to the Center: renovate existing structures; newly-proposed specialized training facilities
**Project Location:** County of Prince George's,

here is the State Clearinghouse transmittal letter. Thank you for your cooperation.
STATE CLEARINGHOUSE RECOMMENDATION

State Application Identifier: MD20160930-0846
Applicant: U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Project Description: Scoping for Rowley Training Center Master Plan Update: Proposed Revision of the Master Plan to allow for the Gradual Expansion of and Program Improvement to the Center: renovate existing structures; newly-proposed specialized training facilities
Project Location: Prince George's County
Approving Authority: U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Recommendation: Consistent Contingent Upon Certain Actions

Dear Mr. Franklin:

In accordance with Presidential Executive Order 12372 and (Code of Maryland Regulations) 34.02.01.04-.06, the State Clearinghouse has coordinated the intergovernmental review of the referenced project. This letter, with attachments, constitutes the State process review and recommendation based upon comments received to date. This recommendation is valid for a period of three years from the date of this letter.

Review comments were requested from the Maryland Departments of Commerce, Natural Resources, Transportation, the Environment; the Governor's Office of Homeland Security; Prince George's County; the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission in Prince George's County; and the the Maryland Department of Planning, including the Maryland Historical Trust. As of this date, the Maryland Departments of Commerce, Transportation, the Governor's Office of Homeland Security, and Prince George's County have not submitted comments. This recommendation is contingent upon the Applicant considering and addressing any problems or conditions that may be identified by their review. Any comments received will be forwarded.

The Maryland Departments of Natural Resources, and the Environment; and the Maryland Historical Trust stated that their findings of consistency are contingent upon the Applicant taking the actions summarized below.

The Maryland Department of Natural Resources stated that this project is located in the Maryland Coastal Zone, and will likely have foreseeable effects on Maryland's coast resources and coastal uses. Please ensure that this project is consistent, to the maximum extent practicable, with the Maryland Coastal Program's enforceable policies.
Please ensure compliance with the Forest Conservation Act. The Forest Conservation Act requires that any project, on areas 40,000 square feet or greater, that is applying for a grading or sediment control permit shall have an approved Forest Conservation Plan, and Forest Stand Delineation (Natural Resources, Article 5-1601-5-16122, Annotated Code of Maryland). Projects proposed by a State or federal agency on State or federal land need to be submitted to the Maryland Department of Natural Resources Forest Service for review. Projects proposed for private land should be submitted to the local planning and zoning authority for review.

Any tree that originates within a public road right-of-way is considered a roadside tree under the Maryland Roadside Tree Care Law (Natural Resources, Article 5-406) and Regulations (COMAR 08.07.02) and any plans to remove, trim, or plant trees within the public right-of-way are required to obtain a Roadside Tree Permit from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources Forest Service.

Please contact:
Ms. Marian Honeczy, Maryland Department of Natural Resources (MD DNR) Forest Service, at (410) 260-8511 or via email at mhoneczy@dnr.state.md.us
Mailing address:
MD DNR Forest Service
580 Taylor Avenue, E-1
Annapolis, MD 21401.

The Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) submitted these comments contingent upon certain actions that are summarized below.

1. Any above-ground or underground petroleum storage tanks, which may be utilized, must be installed and maintained in accordance with applicable State and federal laws and regulations. Underground storage tanks must be registered and the installation must be conducted and performed by a contractor certified to install underground storage tanks by the Land Management Administration in accordance with (COMAR) 26.10. Contact the Oil Control Program at (410) 537-3442 for additional information.

2. If the proposed project involves demolition, any above-ground or underground petroleum storage tanks that may be on site must have contents and tanks along with any contamination removed. Please contact the Oil Control Program at (410) 537-3442 for additional information.

3. Any solid waste including construction, demolition and land clearing debris, generated from the subject project, must be properly disposed of at a permitted solid waste acceptance facility, or recycled if possible. Contact the Solid Waste Program at (410) 537-3315 for additional information regarding solid waste activities and contact the Waste Diversion and Utilization Program at (410) 537-3314 for additional information regarding recycling activities.

4. The Waste Diversion and Utilization Program should be contacted directly at (410) 537-3314 by those facilities which generate or propose to generate or handle hazardous wastes to ensure these activities are being conducted in compliance with applicable State and federal laws and regulations. The Program should also be contacted prior to construction activities to ensure that the treatment, storage or disposal of hazardous wastes and low-level radioactive wastes at the facility will be conducted in compliance with applicable State and federal laws and regulations.
5. Any contract specifying “lead paint abatement” must comply with Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) 26.16.01 - Accreditation and Training for Lead Paint Abatement Services. If a property was built before 1950 and will be used as rental housing, then compliance with (COMAR) 26.16.02 - Reduction of Lead Risk in Housing; and Environment Article Title 6, Subtitle 8, is required. Additional guidance regarding projects where lead paint may be encountered can be obtained by contacting the Environmental Lead Division at (410) 537-3825.

6. The proposed project may involve rehabilitation, redevelopment, revitalization, or property acquisition of commercial, industrial property. Accordingly, MDE's Brownfields Site Assessment and Voluntary Cleanup Programs (VCP) may provide valuable assistance to you in this project. These programs involve environmental site assessment in accordance with accepted industry and financial institution standards for property transfer. For specific information about these programs and eligibility, please contact the Land Restoration Program at (410) 537-3437. See the attached comments regarding special protections for high-quality waters, an aerial photograph, and a checklist.

The Maryland Historical Trust commented that the (United States) Department of Homeland Security should consult with the Maryland Historical Trust in the development of the master plan, and address cultural resources as one of the environmental issues included in the study, and comply with its historic preservation responsibilities under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

The Maryland Department of Planning found this project to be consistent with its plans, programs, and objectives.

The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission in Prince George's County mentioned that more details will be provided during the mandatory-referral process.

Any statement of consideration given to the comments should be submitted to the approving authority, with a copy to the State Clearinghouse. The State Application Identifier Number must be placed on any correspondence pertaining to this project. The State Clearinghouse must be kept informed if the approving authority cannot accommodate the recommendation.

If you need assistance or have questions, contact the State Clearinghouse staff person noted above at 410-767-4490 or through e-mail at bob.rosenbush@maryland.gov. Also please complete the attached form, and return it to the State Clearinghouse as soon as the status of the project is known. Any substitutions of this form must include the State Application Identifier Number. This will ensure that our files are complete.

Thank you for your cooperation with the MIRC process.

Sincerely,

Myra A. Barnes, Lead Clearinghouse Coordinator
Scoping for Rowley Training Center Master Plan Update
Maryland Department of the Environment - Science Services Administration

REVIEW FINDING: R2 Contingent Upon Certain Actions
(MD2016 0930-0846)

Special protections for high-quality waters in the local vicinity, which are identified pursuant to Maryland’s anti-degradation policy;

Anti-degradation of Water Quality: Maryland requires special protections for waters of very high quality (Tier II waters). The policies and procedures that govern these special waters are commonly called “anti-degradation policies.” This policy states that “proposed amendments to county plans or discharge permits for discharge to Tier II waters that will result in a new, or an increased, permitted annual discharge of pollutants and a potential impact to water quality, shall evaluate alternatives to eliminate or reduce discharges or impacts.” These permitted annual discharges are not just traditional Point Sources, it can include all discharges such as Stormwater.

Beaverdam Creek 1 and Beaverdam Creek 2, which are located within the vicinity of the Project, have been designated as Tier II streams. The Project is within the Catchments (watershed) of the Beaverdam Creek segments. (See Additional Comments and attached map)

A statement regarding the site being located in a Tier II High Quality Catchment should be included in the narrative of the Master Plan. It should also be noted that during and post construction enhanced BMPs or additional controls, potentially above those minimally required, should be utilized to protect high quality Tier II stream resources. (See attached High Quality Waters Enhanced Best Management Practices checklist) All items shall be considered, if applicable to the project. For more information regarding any disturbances (i.e. Construction) within a Tier II Catchment, contact Angel Valdez at 410-537-3606.

Planners should be aware of legal obligations related to Tier II waters described in the Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) 26.08.02.04 with respect to current and future land use plans. Information on Tier II waters can be obtained online at: http://www.dsd.state.md.us/comar/comarhtml/26/26.08.02.04.htm and policy implementation procedures are located at http://www.dsd.state.md.us/comar/comarhtml/26/26.08.02.04-1.htm

Planners should also note that since the Code of Maryland Regulations is subject to periodic updates. A list of Tier II waters pending Departmental listing in
COMAR can be found, with a discussion and maps for each county, at the following website:
http://www.mde.state.md.us/programs/Water/TMDL/Water%20Quality%20Standards/Pages/HighQualityWatersMap.aspx

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

For questions regarding Antidegradation please contact Angel Valdez at 410-537-3606.

Table 1: General Comments regarding Current Antidegradation Implementation Procedures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>For all land disturbing projects that do not implement a no-discharge alternative and therefore may adversely impact Tier II waters, MDE will require:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>MDE approval of all design elements and practices required by mandatory implementation of Environmental Site Design (ESD) to the maximum extent practicable and applicable innovative development practices as currently required by COMAR 26.08.02.04-1(K)(2) and the 2007 Stormwater manual (see, <a href="http://www.mde.state.md.us/programs/Water/StormwaterManagementProgram/Pages/Programs/WaterPrograms/SedimentandStormwater/swm2007.aspx">http://www.mde.state.md.us/programs/Water/StormwaterManagementProgram/Pages/Programs/WaterPrograms/SedimentandStormwater/swm2007.aspx</a>). MDE is also recommending ESD be employed for projects that are individually of minimal impact to Tier II resources, to account for the total cumulative effects of each project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Mandatory Riparian buffers determined in consideration of slope and soil type, with a minimum of 100 ft in all areas. Buffer requirements are based on similar requirements in the Critical Areas Program and the Chesapeake Bay Riparian Buffer/Reforestation Goals and other water quality objectives. Additional buffers beyond the minimum 100' will be required on sites with slopes greater than 5% and/or with poorly infiltrating soils. See Table 2 for guidance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>*Biological, chemical, and flow monitoring in the Tier II watershed by the applicant to determine remaining AC and any cumulative impacts of current and future developments for larger projects and/or in watersheds with little remaining forest buffering/AC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where 1 and 2 above cannot be fully implemented, Applicant is required to submit a detailed hydrologic study and alternatives analysis to demonstrate assimilative capacity will be maintained. If it is determined by MDE assimilative capacity still will not be maintained after the above analysis, an SEJ will be required.

Also, ESD is now being required for Program Open Space and School Construction projects. See http://www.bpw.state.md.us/static_files/advisories/2009-1.pdf

Maryland riparian buffering requirements in Tier II watersheds developed from modified USDA Forest Service recommendations*. These can also be found in the 2011 Maryland Standards and Specifications for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Table A.2 on page A.5. At a minimum, projects needing a state 401 Water Quality Certification will be required to implement the expanded Tier II buffers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soils</th>
<th>Slopes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ab</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Chesapeake Bay TMDL
With the completion of the Chesapeake Bay TMDL, the Chesapeake Bay Program Office (CBPO) will be able to provide loading data at a more refined scale than in the past. MDE will be able to use the CBPO data to estimate pollution allocations at the jurisdictional level (which will include Federal Facilities) to provide allocations to the Facilities. These allocations, both Wasteload (WLA) and Load Allocation (LA) could call for a reduction in both Point Sources and Nonpoint Sources. Facilities should be aware of reductions and associated implementation required by WIPs or FIPs.

Stormwater
The project should consider all Maryland Stormwater Management Controls. Site Designs should consider all Environmental Site Design to the Maximum Extent
Practicable and "Green Building" Alternatives. Designs that reduce impervious surface and BMPs that increase runoff infiltration are highly encouraged.

Further Information:
http://www.mde.state.md.us/programs/Water/StormwaterManagementProgram/Pages/Programs/WaterPrograms/SedimentandStormwater/swm2007.aspx

Environmental Site Design (Chapter 5):

Redevelopment Regulations:
http://www.dsd.state.md.us/comar/comarhtml/26/26.17.02.05.htm
Scoping for Rowley Training Center Master Plan Update
Prince Georges County, MD
MD2016 0930-0846
Person Completing Form: Date Complete:

Applicants must utilize enhanced BMPs or additional controls, potentially above those minimally required, to protect high quality Tier II stream resources.

Incorporate applicable items, check off practices incorporated, and identify the locations in plans. Some practices may be marked N/A (e.g. no sediment traps are used, so skip that section). If necessary, attach additional sheets detailing other practices not listed below, such as on-site or in-watershed reforestation, or any other BMPs that will help minimize impacts. If relevant, other narratives or documentation can also be provided.

Note: If this project will impact a Tier II stream/watershed segment with no assimilative capacity, impacts should be offset in order to satisfy the Antidegradation Review. Additional information or guidance may be provided depending upon project specifics.

Additional comments may be provided during the course of the review depending upon application specific circumstances. This includes future permits or approvals required by MDE.

### A. Erosion and Sediment Plan

- [ ] To the maximum extent practicable activities should take place during times when sediment transport are likely to be lower as predicted by NOAA 1 or 3 clear day weather forecast
- [ ] Conduct inspections on a daily basis. Log books may be reviewed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grading and Stabilization</th>
<th>Plan Sheet Locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ] If LOD allows, locate piles &gt; 100 ft from stream resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Permanent mulch application depth shall not exceed 6&quot;. E.g. Mulch spreading and matting as a temporary measure to minimize compaction is allowable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Filtering

- [ ] Near stream and wetland resources upgrade silt fencing to super silt fencing or an equivalent measure (e.g. large compostable filter logs, etc)
### A. Erosion and Sediment Plan, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sediment Trapping (traps/basins)- implement 1 or more of the following:</th>
<th>Plan Sheet Locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ For road adjacent work include: Trash rack, oil/water separator, and/or skimmers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Forebays or designs to maximize detention time (for example includes baffle boards)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Flocculants or other chemical additives (may require additional approvals or conditions for use)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dewatering**

| □ Enhanced buffer management: | |
| (A) discharges should take place beyond the existing stable vegetated buffer of 100 ft and/or | |
| (B) discharges within the buffer occur through | |
| Agency approved secondary or redundant control | |
| (e.g. sediment bag treated with sediment filtration aid, etc.) | |

**Miscellaneous Practices**

| □ Signage and flagging shall be installed to notify workers of sensitive high quality resources within the buffer zone | |
| □ Temporary access bridges shall be utilized over fords | |
| □ Vehicles operating within the stream buffer must carry oil/gas/grease clean up kits for spill accidents | |
### B. Stormwater Management Plan

- ESD to the MEP, and all other practices required by the Maryland Stormwater Design Manual, Volumes I & II (Effective October 2000, Revised May 2009), and
- Vegetated expanded riparian buffers: 100 foot minimum, based on slopes and soils, according to Table 1 at the end of this document.
  - Documentation of protection from clearing/major disturbances in perpetuity is required.
  - Provide a separate sheet detailing buffer locations, total acres, where impacted, and where offset.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Surfaces-</th>
<th>Plan Sheet Locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Green roofs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Porous pavements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Reinforced Turf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nonstructural Practices-</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Disconnection of rooftop runoff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Disconnection of non-rooftop runoff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Sheetflow to conservation areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infiltration Practices (with pretreatment)-</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Infiltration trench</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Infiltration basin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Micro-Scale Practices-</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Submerged gravel wetlands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Rainwater harvesting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Landscape infiltration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Dry wells</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Infiltration berms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Micro-bioretention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Rain gardens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Swales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Enhanced filters*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*Filtering Systems</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Surface sand filter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Underground sand filter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Perimeter sand filter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Organic filter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Pocket sand filter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Regarding In-stream Grout/Concrete activities: Where Applicable

Applicants should be aware that contact between in-stream water and uncured grout material could lead to extreme fluctuations in pH which may have an immediate adverse effect on water quality. The current State water quality standard (WQS) criterion for pH for Use I waters is 6.5-8.5. Because pH is established with a logarithmic scale, there is a large difference between the alkalinity at 8.5 and that at 9.0. To avoid and minimize potential impacts, MDE-SSA identifies the following practices for incorporation into pH management plans:


2. The applicant should monitor in-stream pH values at a point approximately 15 feet downstream of the edge of the turbidity curtain (or other measures implemented), either continuously or at intervals of no more than every 10 minutes during the grout pumping activities.

3. The monitoring should follow the protocols for the type of equipment utilized, with samples taken from a free flowing point from the thalweg at the mid depth.

4. If in-stream pH measurements are found to be greater than 8.5 at any time, pumping activities must cease and corrective action taken.

5. Corrective action may include, but is not limited to, waiting until in-stream pH values have returned to a value below 8.5. (Other options are located within the referenced study, and can be developed by reputable consultants familiar with the work).

6. If possible, an electronic data report of the monitoring plan, monitoring results, and any corrective actions necessary should be provided to MDE-SSA, attention Angel Valdez angel.valdez@maryland.gov within 30 days of project completion. This data will be used to determine if active monitoring is necessary for future projects. If data collected to date (from your project and other projects conducted over the past few years) demonstrates that the management actions are sufficient to address pH fluctuations, monitoring will no longer be required. Currently the dataset is too small to draw meaningful statistical conclusions. Any additional data you are willing to provide would be appreciated.

Table 1: Expanded Tier II Riparian Buffer

Maryland riparian buffering in Tier II catchments developed from USDA Forest Service recommendations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjusted Average Optimal Buffer Width Key for HQ Waters (minimum width 100 feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Slopes (%)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soils</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PROJECT STATUS FORM**

Please complete this form and return it to the State Clearinghouse upon receipt of notification that the project has been approved or not approved by the approving authority.

**TO:** Maryland State Clearinghouse  
Maryland Department of Planning  
301 West Preston Street  
Room 1104  
Baltimore, MD 21201-2305

**DATE:**  
(Please fill in the date form completed)

**FROM:**  
(Name of person completing this form.)

**PHONE:**  
(Area Code & Phone number)

**RE:** State Application Identifier: MD20160930-0846  
Project Description: Scoping for Rowley Training Center Master Plan Update: Proposed Revision of the Master Plan to allow for the Gradual Expansion of and Program Improvement to the Center; renovate existing structures; newly-proposed specialized training facilities
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Mr. Thomas Franklin  
Communications Center, SAF, United States Secret Service  
U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
245 Murray Lane, SW, Building T-5  
Washington, DC 20223

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEW – ADDITIONAL REVIEWER COMMENTS RECEIVED  
State Application Identifier: MD20160930-0846  
Project Description: Scoping for Rowley Training Center Master Plan Update: Proposed Revision of the Master Plan to allow for the Gradual Expansion of and Program Improvement to the Center: renovate existing structures; newly-proposed specialized training facilities  
Project Location: Prince George's County  
Clearinghouse Contact: Bob Rosenbush

Dear Mr. Franklin:

We are forwarding the enclosed comments made by the Governor's Office of Homeland Security regarding the referenced project for your information. See the attached letter dated November 22, 2016.

Should you have any questions, contact the State Clearinghouse staff person noted above at 410-767-4490 or through e-mail at bob.rosenbush@maryland.gov. Your cooperation and attention to the review process is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Myra A. Barnes, Lead Clearinghouse Coordinator
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November 22, 2016

Mr. Stuart Sirota, AICP  
Assistant Secretary for Planning Services  
Maryland Department of Planning  
301 West Preston Street  
Baltimore, Maryland 21201-2305

State Application Identifier: MD20160930-0846

Dear Mr. Sirota:

It was indeed a pleasure speaking to you this morning regarding the Maryland intergovernmental review and coordination process pertaining the United States Department of Homeland Security, Secret Service master plan revision for the U.S.S.S. James J. Rowley Training Center (JJRTC), 9200 Powder Mill Rd, Laurel, Prince George’s County 20708.

I have reviewed the master plan revision propositioning expansion of the center with program improvement. I also noted that the plan included renovation of existing structures as well as proposing specialized training facilities. I concur with the plan in its entirety, without dissention on any of the elements contained therein.

I believe that the proposed expansion, renovations and new construction center will allow the U.S. Secret Service to improve efforts to provide training associated with protection, investigation, tactical operations and managerial training at the JJRTC. As such, I would recommend permission for the USSS to move forward with this project while ensuring that the constraints and considerations provided by the other State of Maryland entities involved in the review process be followed.

I trust that from here on out, our collective efforts regarding such reviews and coordination will commence without incident with the newly updated contact information for the Governor’s Office of Homeland Security. Please do not hesitate to contact me regarding this or other matters of mutual interest.

Respectfully,

Walter F. “Pete” Landon  
Director

cc. Roy McGrath, Deputy Chief of Staff
November 3, 2016

Thomas Franklin
United States Secret Service
245 Murray Lane, SW, Bldg. T-5
Washington, DC 20223

Subject: Fisheries Information for the updated Master Plan for the US Secret Service’s Rowley Training Center in Beltsville, MD, Prince George County.

Dear Mr. Franklin;

The above referenced project has been reviewed to determine fisheries species in the vicinity of the proposed project. The proposed activities include updating the Master Plan for the US Secret Service’s Rowley Training Center in Beltsville, MD, Prince George County.

The Unnamed Tributary to Beaver Dam Creek is located on the site and is classified as a Use I stream. Generally no instream work is permitted in Use I streams during the period of March 1 through June 15, inclusive, during any year to protect spawning fish.

These streams may support many resident fish species documented by our Maryland Biological Stream Survey. MBSS data can be accessed via the MDDNR web page at http://streamhealth.maryland.gov, allowing access to resource surveys in neighboring tributaries.

In addition there are Sensitive Species Project Review Areas located on the west and east sides of the property. The Maryland Dept. of Natural Resources Wildlife and Heritage Service should be further consulted to see if any Sensitive Species might be affected by further development of the site.

If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact me at 410 260-8736.

Sincerely;

Christopher Aadland
Environmental; Review Program
See Below…

Thanks, TOM

Thomas E. Franklin, REM
Environmental, Sustainability, and Energy Manager
Headquarters, United States Secret Service
Phone: 240.624.3849 (RTC)
HQ: 202.406.5641
Cell: 202.567.1817
Email: thomas.franklin@ussd.dhs.gov

Good Morning, Mr. Franklin.

I received Tuesday this week a copy of a September 27, 2016, letter asking for comments on a Rowley Training Center Master Plan Update.

In 2012 The Rowley Center master plan was reviewed through the mandatory referral process (MR-12001F). This affects how we rely to our request for comments.

I would appreciate some information so we know how to proceed. Thank you! Maria Martin

Maria Martin, Supervisor, Special Projects Section
Prince George’s County Planning Department, Countywide Planning Division
The Maryland - National Capital Park & Planning Commission
14741 Governor Oden Bowie Drive, Upper Marlboro, MD 20772
Phone: 301.952.3472   Fax: 301.952.3612
maria.martin@ppd.mncppc.org
FYI, TOM

Thomas E. Franklin, REM
Environmental, Sustainability, and Energy Manager
Headquarters, United States Secret Service
Phone: 240.624.3849 (RTC)
HQ: 202.406.5641
Cell: 202.567.1817
Email: thomas.franklin@usss.dhs.gov

From: Gail M. Bozeman [mailto:GBozeman@aacte.org]
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2016 3:38 PM
To: THOMAS FRANKLIN (SAF)
Subject: Scoping Notice for Rowley Training Center Master Plan Update

Dear Mr. Franklin:

Thank you for providing me with information regarding the Rowley Training Center (RTC) in Beltsville, MD. I’ve reviewed the list of proposed actions and I’m concerned about a noise upsurge. Currently, the training exercises are not a distraction and occur during times that are least disruptive for the neighborhood. However, the proposed specialized training facilities suggest that there may be increased training which could possibly elevate disturbances. Will this item be addressed within the environmental issues? I appreciate your cooperation and look forward to receiving additional details about the proposed plan.

Gail Mobley Bozeman
Chief of Staff
AACTE | 1307 New York Avenue, NW | Suite 300 | Washington, DC 20005
P: 202.478.4512 | gbozeman@aacte.org

Register now for the 2017 AACTE Annual Meeting “Acting as One: The Power of the Professional Community” – March 2-4 in Tampa, Florida

Connect with us:
aacte.org | Twitter | Facebook | LinkedIn | Vimeo | Ed Prep Matters Blog
All e-mail to/from this account is subject to official review and is for official use only. Action may be taken in response to any inappropriate use of the Secret Service's e-mail system. This e-mail may contain information that is privileged, law enforcement sensitive, or subject to other disclosure limitations. Such information is loaned to you and should not be further disseminated without the permission of the Secret Service. If you have received this e-mail in error, do not keep, use, disclose, or copy it; notify the sender immediately and delete it.
Good Morning Ms. Bozeman,

Thank you for your comments of concern for a potential noise upsurge from the United States Secret Service (USSS) proposed actions at the James J. Rowley Training Center in Beltsville, Maryland. We at the USSS do not expect any increase of noise disturbance due to the proposed actions. All current noise abatement restrictions will remain in place and we are constantly looking for new ways to decrease any potential disruptions for our neighbors. This, of course, will be addressed in our environmental evaluations of proposed actions and we will provide information to the public as additional details are made available.

If you have any further questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me.

Very Respectfully,

Thomas E. Franklin, REM
Environmental, Sustainability, and Energy Manager
Headquarters, United States Secret Service
Phone: 240.624.3849 (RTC)
HQ: 202.406.5641
Cell: 202.567.1817
Email: thomas.franklin@usss.dhs.gov
the environmental issues? I appreciate your cooperation and look forward to receiving additional details about the proposed plan.
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**AACTE | 1307 New York Avenue, NW | Suite 300 | Washington, DC 20005**  
P: 202.478.4512 | gbozeman@aacte.org

**Register now for the 2017 AACTE Annual Meeting** “Acting as One: The Power of the Professional Community” – March 2-4 in Tampa, Florida
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All e-mail to/from this account is subject to official review and is for official use only. Action may be taken in response to any inappropriate use of the Secret Service's e-mail system. This e-mail may contain information that is privileged, law enforcement sensitive, or subject to other disclosure limitations. Such information is loaned to you and should not be further disseminated without the permission of the Secret Service. If you have received this e-mail in error, do not keep, use, disclose, or copy it; notify the sender immediately and delete it.
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Section 1
James J. Rowley Training Center Transportation Management
Overview

1.1 Background Information (points of entrance and exit)

James J. Rowley Training Center (RTC), located in a predominantly agricultural/government
uses within Prince George’s County east of Beltsville, Maryland. It is east of the Baltimore
Washington Parkway (MD-295) on the north side of Powder Mill Road.

The RTC is owned and operated by the U.S. Secret Service (the Agency). The mission of the RTC
is to develop, administer, and coordinate all training programs related to the protective,
investigative, and administrative activities of the agency. The Agency proposes to update its
2012 Master Plan to allow for gradual expansion and program improvements over the next 10
to 15 years. The goal of the James J. Rowley Training Center Master Plan, 2017 Update (2017
RTC Master Plan) is the creation of a world-class campus that efficiently utilizes the extensive
land holdings of the RTC. The objectives are to provide tactical training facilities, classroom and
conference instruction space, recreational facilities, while updating the internal roadway and
utility infrastructure, and improving security measures for the entire campus.

This Transportation Management Plan (TMP) describes a variety of transportation demand
management (TDM) strategies that can be implemented as necessary by the RTC over the
course of the ten-year Master Plan to address traffic impacts associated with the potential
growth and development outlined in the Plan.

1.2 Potential 10-Year RTC Campus Growth

The RTC is currently subject to campus population projections established in the 2012 Master
Plan, specifically an overall trainee headcount projection of 200 trainees and an employee
headcount projection of 460 employees. The 2017 Master Plan maintains the same employee
population projections established in the 2012 Master Plan. The employee headcount has
remained well beneath the 460 projection since the approval of the 2012 Master Plan. The
current overall employee headcount is 298 (based on Summer 2016 payroll numbers). As a
result, the RTC has the planned capacity to grow its population by 162 employees. The 2017
Master Plan anticipates a 20 percent growth in trainee population from 200 to 240 trainees.
This represents an increase of just 40 trainees over that which was contemplated under the
current 2012 Master Plan.

Table 1.1 details the employee and trainee populations and projections associated with the
2012 Master Plan and the 2017 Master Plan.
Table 1.1
Existing RTC Population and Master Plan Employee and Trainee Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Daily Campus Population</th>
<th>2012 Master Plan</th>
<th>2017 Master Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current Projected Cap</td>
<td>Current Projected Cap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>285 460</td>
<td>298 460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainees</td>
<td>48 200</td>
<td>240 240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3 Existing and Projected Peak Hour Traffic by Mode

The two primary components of peak-hour traffic for the RTC are trainees and employees. The 2012 Master Plan allows for 200 trainees and 460 employees comprising a total of 660 people permitted to commute to the RTC on average on a daily basis. On average, the permitted trainee population comprises approximately 30 percent of the population on campus at any given time. Additionally, RTC visitors make up a relatively small percentage of trips. Therefore, the number of vehicle trips generated by the RTC under the 2017 TMP can be estimated based on the potential increase in the number of trainees and employees. The employee population is not projected to increase beyond the 460 allowed in the 2012 Master Plan. The trainee population is projected to increase by up to 40 trainees beyond what is currently permitted in the 2012 Master Plan. These 40 additional trips to the RTC represent a modest 6 percent increase beyond what is proposed in the 2012 Master Plan.

Currently, 29 percent of trainees arrive to the RTC in vanpools. It can safely be assumed that this same mode split will apply to the 40 new trainees. This yields 12 less trainees arriving by car or a net of 28 trainees arriving by car during the peak. In addition, on an average day there are approximately 10 in-service trainees who come to the RTC for training and arrive and depart outside of the peak. Based on 240 total proposed trainees, these in-service trainees represent about 4 percent of the trainee population arriving outside of the peak. It can safely be assumed that this same percentage will apply to the 40 new trainees. This yields 2 less new trainees arriving by car or a net of 26 new trainees arriving by car during peak.

These 26 net new trainees arriving to the RTC do not take into consideration the impacts of an enhanced TDM Program, which is spelled out in Section 4 of this TMP. With 29 percent of the anticipated 240 trainees arriving to the RTC by vanpool on an average day, 70 trainees would arrive on campus by vanpool. This represents a 10 percent non-SOV mode share. The TDM Plan is committing to increase the current non-SOV Mode split of 10 percent by 4 percent to 14 percent. Doing so would reduce the number of employees arriving on campus by another 28 SOV trips. So the net new trips arriving by car during the peak would be 2 less than is currently allowed in the 2012 Master Plan.

The TDM plan is offering an aspirational goal of 18 percent non-SOV mode share. Achieving that additional 4 percent reduction in SOV mode share would reduce the number of employees arriving on campus by another 28 SOV trips. This would bring the net number of peak SOV trips arriving on campus to 30 less than is currently allowed in the 2012 Master Plan.
Section 2
Assessment of Existing Transportation Options and TDM Support Strategies

Despite the transportation-related challenges and constraints associated with its location, the RTC currently enjoys a favorable SOV mode split. This has been achieved and is maintained by efforts of the RTC to ensure that trainees and employees have access to a variety of available transportation services and programs. Specifically, the RTC actively supports a variety of non-SOV options, most notably its trainee vanpools, to improve access to campus and help mitigate the impact of vehicular traffic on the surrounding roads. This section takes a full inventory of the existing transportation infrastructure connecting RTC to the region, identifies the Agency’s current efforts towards reducing vehicle trips to the RTC, and identifies existing regional programs aimed at encouraging trainees and employees to select non-SOV commute options.

2.1 Existing Campus Transportation Options

The RTC is primarily accessible by automobile, but there opportunities to arrive by other modes of transportation. Bicyclists can make use of numerous bike racks throughout campus. Various carsharing options (including use of official and vanpool vehicles) are also available on campus. An inventory of 791 on-campus parking spaces (a breakdown of which is in Table 2.3) are distributed across 14 parking facilities to support travelers that need to drive to campus. The sub-sections that follow provide more in-depth description of the various transportation options that exist to access the RTC.

2.1.1 Transit Access and Support Strategies

This section highlights the transit routes and stops serving the installation, both on-site and in the nearby area.

Metrorail

With 91 stations and over a hundred miles of rail, the WMATA Metrorail system is one of the largest high speed transit networks in the United States, providing intraregional connections between Virginia, Maryland, and Washington DC. The Green Line Metrorail Station closest to RTC’s campus is the Greenbelt Metrorail Station which is located six miles from campus, making it inconvenient to use as a mode of travel to the site.

Metrobus

Metrobus, which is operated by WMATA, has one route (the Route 87 -Laurel Express Line) which has a stop that is 1 mile away from the front gate of the RTC. But there are no sidewalks or pedestrian amenities along Powder Mill Road to complete a safe walk from that stop to the RTC. What’s more is the morning service only has 25 minute headways. The inconvenient and unsafe location of the nearest bus routes along with the infrequent headways of the transit service make this route essentially unviable as a commute choice for employees and trainees at the RTC. Table 2.1 below provides an overview of current route operations. Figure 2.1 shows a map of the route.
Table 2.1
Metrobus Service in Beltsville

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Weekday Service Hours</th>
<th>Weekday AM Peak Hour Headway</th>
<th>Weekday PM Peak Hour Headway</th>
<th>Saturday Service Hours</th>
<th>Saturday Service Headway</th>
<th>Sunday Service Hours</th>
<th>Sunday Service Headway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>No Service</td>
<td>No Service</td>
<td>No Service</td>
<td>No Service</td>
<td>No Service</td>
<td>No Service</td>
<td>No Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2.1
Metrobus Service on Powder Mill Road
Transit Support Strategy

Although using transit to arrive to the RTC is challenging, the Agency offers the SmartBenefits pre-tax transportation program to employees on the campus which they can use towards travel costs for transit or vanpooling. Employees are also eligible to receive up to $245 per month on their SmarTrip Cards in tax free transit benefits through the Agency’s SmartBenefits program.

2.1.2 Vanpool Amenities and Support Strategies

RTC Funded Vanpool Services

Each year, the Agency spends over $90,000 to fund, operate and maintain a fleet of 10 trainee vanpools. These vanpools play a vital role in reducing driving and parking demands on campus by transporting an average of 70 out of town trainees per day to and from area hotels. Those hotels are highlighted in Table 2.2. These vanpools capture the largest share of non-auto commute trips to the RTC, with roughly 9 percent of all commute trips to campus arriving on vanpool. This represents 100 percent of the 11 percent total non-SOV trips arriving to campus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Operation Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homewood Suites by Hilton (Arundel Mills)</td>
<td>Route connects an average of between 25-30 trainees from their hotel to the RTC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Inn (Silver Spring)</td>
<td>Route connects an average of between 10-15 trainees from their hotel to the RTC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Inn (Greenbelt)</td>
<td>Route connects an average of between 10-15 trainees from their hotel to the RTC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Inn (Arundel Mills)</td>
<td>Route connects an average of between 5-10 trainees from their hotel to the RTC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.3 Bicycle Amenities and Support Strategies

RTC Funded Bicycle Amenities

The following amenities are maintained by RTC and are available for use by both employees and trainees.

- **Bike Racks** - The Agency actively works to evaluate and adjust its supply of bike racks at RTC to meet user demand. Bike racks are located across campus and are primarily used for training purposes, but may be deployed for use by commuters as needed and appropriate.

- **Showers and Lockers** - There are training facilities throughout the campus which offer free shower access to commuters who bike or walk to campus. Towel service and lockers are also offered.
Bicycle Support Strategies
The agency offers RTC employees a bicycle benefit of up to $20 per month or $240 a year to cover bike repairs and expenses so long as they’re riding “pedaled” bikes and not enrolled in the Agency’s other transit subsidies.

2.1.4 Carshare Amenities and Benefits Support Strategies
Carsharing refers to a shared short-term automobile made available for a limited timeframe, typically only a few hours. The cars allow travelers to accomplish short trips for errands or offsite meetings. Carsharing encourages travelers to use non-SOV modes because they can use carshare vehicles for mid-day trips rather than be forced to rely on their private vehicle. The RTC has numerous official and pool vehicles that serve the same function as carshare vehicles and are available for employees to use to get to places on or off campus.

2.1.5 Support Flexible Work and Learning Operations
Encourage RTC-wide teleworking and flexible schedules
In addition to changing the modes of transportation that people use to get to campus, changing the way people work can also influence travel behavior to campus and support efforts to achieve the performance standards established in Section 3. Applying telework techniques to various Agency operations eliminates the need for a trip to RTC altogether and flexible work hours allow travelers to avoid arriving to campus during the peak hour. The following flexible work and learning strategies can be pursued by the Agency in support of these operational approaches:

- **Telework** - A formal telework policy is in place for administrative and professional technical staff (APT). In order to increase the application of telework as a business practice at the RTC, various departments on campus allow their employees who qualify to take advantage of the existing telework policy and work remotely.

- **Flexible Schedules** – In addition to encouraging teleworking, the Agency allows departments on campus at RTC who have traditional office schedules to encourage flexible work schedules for their employees to arrive during off peak hours as appropriate for their business operations. Currently employees have the following flexible work arrangements available to them:
  - Compressed Work Week Schedules (Either 40 hours in four 10-hour days (4/40) or 80 hours in nine 5-hour days (9/80))
  - Flex-time for scheduled training purposes.

2.1.6 Parking Supply Management
This section provides a summary of existing and proposed parking by type of assignment (official cars, vanpools, carpools, single-occupant vehicles, handicapped persons, visitors, etc.). The on-campus parking facilities are summarized in Table 2.3.
On-Campus Parking Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Space Type</th>
<th>SOV</th>
<th>HOV*</th>
<th>ADA</th>
<th>Official Cars</th>
<th>Emergency Services</th>
<th>Visitor</th>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>Total Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The Merletti Building includes 10 striped parking spaces dedicated to the trainee vanpools. These spaces are intended to promote non-SOV use and discourage auto use.

2.2 Existing Regional Programs
In addition to transportation services and benefits at the RTC, many regional programs, benefits, and events are already in place and help to further educate and encourage employees and trainees to select non-SOV commute options.

2.2.1 Commute Assistance
Commuter Connections Rideshare Program
Commuter Connections Rideshare Program is a service that matches commuters with others who live and work in the same area.

http://www.mwcog.org/commuter2/commuter/ridesharing/index.html

RideSmart Commuter Services
RideSmart Solutions is an initiative of Prince George's County, created to provide employees, residents and visitors with the education and assistance they need to make more informed choices about traveling in the County. RideSmart offers FREE information and benefit programs for bus service, rail lines, carpooling, vanpooling and telecommuting as well as Employer specialized programs. http://www.ridesmartsolutions.com/

2.2.2 Commute Incentives/Benefits
NuRide Rewards Program
NuRide is a national rewards program for commuter using sustainable and green travel modes. Commuters accrue points with each green trip that may be redeemed for prizes.

https://www.nuride.com/

Commuter Connections Guaranteed Ride Home
Sponsored by the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOG), the Guaranteed Ride Home (GRH) program provides commuters who regularly (twice a week) carpool, vanpool, bike, walk or take transit to work with a free and reliable ride home when, due to unforeseen circumstances, they are unable to travel using their non-SOV commute choice.

http://www.mwcog.org/commuter2/commuter/grh/index.html

Commuter Connections Pools Program
Commuter Connections Pools Program offers financial rewards to SOV drivers who start or join a new carpool in the Metropolitan Washington Statistical Area.

http://www.mwcog.org/commuter2/commuter/ridesharing/PollRewardsProgram.html
SelectPass
SelectPass is a WMATA Program which can save riders money on short and mid-range trips within the Metro System. SelectPass users pay a flat rate for unlimited service on trips that are equal to or less than the amount of the paid segment. http://wmata.com/fares/selectpass.cfm

2.2.3 Events/Campaigns
Walk to Work Day
*Walk to Work Day*, which takes place each year in April, encourages commuters to travel to their place of employment on foot.

Earth Day
*Earth Day*, which is observed each April, encourages individuals to reduce their personal impact on the planet by cutting pollution and waste for the day. Started as a day of observance, Earth Day has evolved into a global action-driven event and provides an opportunity for cross-marketing of various TDM-related efforts.

National Bike to Work Day
*Bike to Work Day*, which takes place in May of each year, encourages commuters to bike to work and raises awareness of alternative modes for transportation.

Dump the Pump
*Dump the Pump*, hosted in June of each year, encourages commuters to utilize alternative transportation modes in order to avoid driving.

Try Transit Week
*Try Transit Week*, which takes place in September of each year, encourages commuters to use transit and other alternative forms of transportation for their commutes. Participants are encouraged to pledge to not drive during that week in exchange for winning prizes.

International Car Free Day
*International Care Free Day* is an international event celebrated every September 22. Commuters are encouraged to travel without cars and instead ride a train, bus, bicycle, carpool, subway, vanpool, walk or telework.
Section 3

RTC Stated Commitments and Aspirational Goals

As part of the 2017 TMP, the Agency has established both a performance commitment as well as an aspirational goal with respect to campus traffic volumes over the ten-year term of the Plan. Specifically, the Agency will commit to managing its traffic impacts to ensure that it supports achievement of a non-SOV mode split of 14 percentage points. In addition, as an aspirational goal, the Agency will strive to achieve a non-SOV mode split of 18 percentage points to remain consistent with the national average total non-SOV mode split of 23 percent\(^1\) minus the national average transit mode split of 5 percent. This aspirational goal reflects the reality that transit is not a realistic mode of transportation to the RTC but that there is opportunity to enhance use of other non-SOV modes.

The proposed non-SOV mode split commitment and aspirational goal were extensively analyzed, reviewed, and discussed with the Agency.

\(^1\) Based on 2010 ACS Census data
Section 4
Supplemental TDM Strategies

As noted previously, given its location, the Agency’s existing investment in and commitment to TDM and transportation-related efforts has resulted in a reasonable SOV mode split as well as meaningful pedestrian and vehicular circulation improvements in and around campus. Substantially improving upon current mode split conditions will be challenging and require significant resources. Nonetheless, the Agency is, as reflected in the TDM commitment and goal set forth in Section 3, focused on enhancing its efforts to build upon the foundation of its existing transportation infrastructure and TDM efforts.

This section introduces additional TDM elements and Parking Management Program recommendations aimed at effectively mitigating campus traffic volumes over the ten-year term of the Master Plan. Given this long-term planning horizon, the TDM Plan must be flexible in order to respond to changes in campus demographics, technology, transportation services and various mitigation options available. Accordingly, it is envisioned that over time new approaches in addition to those listed below will be identified and programs developed to respond to these changes. When combined, the existing and future TDM strategies represent a “toolkit” of various options that the Agency can implement as necessary to meet the performance-based TDM commitment and strive to achieve the aspirational TDM goal.

TDM strategy recommendations included in this Section are informed by stakeholder comments and recommendations from Wells + Associates staff based on their professional experience in implementing effective TDM programs. These strategies are premised and organized around three key synergistic pillars:

- **Campus Transportation Coordination** – Coordinate and communicate with stakeholders and commuters to improve the effectiveness of alternative modes to SOV travel
- **Transportation Infrastructure** – Build upon and improve existing transportation services at the RTC
- **Parking Management** – Discourage SOV driving through effective parking management

4.1 Campus Transportation Coordination
The Agency has identified the need to dedicate specific staffing resources to focus on implementation of the goals and objectives of this TMP in order to maximize the utilization of existing travel options, to successfully identify, develop and deploy new initiatives, and to effectively coordinate and communicate with commuters and other interested stakeholders. Accordingly, the Agency will establish a Transportation Coordinator (TC) function within the Office of the Environmental Manager. In this capacity, the TC will be responsible for reaching out to and assisting Agency trainees and employees with their travel to the RTC. A summary of general activities under the purview of the TC with regard to RTC Transportation Planning Coordination include:
4.1.1 Carpool/Vanpool Ridematching

ENCOURAGE AND FACILITATE CARPOOLS WITH AGENCY TRAINEES AND EMPLOYEES

Carpooling and vanpooling are important vehicle trip reduction strategies given that not all trainees or employees are able to live near the RTC or transit options. Geographic analyses of employee home zipcode data captured indicate that carpool has the greatest potential to reduce RTC’s drive alone mode split. Carpooling programs are most effective when potential carpool partners are identified for those who are actively interested in carpooling as well as those who would not proactively seek a carpool match on their own, but might be open to it if someone did it for them. Accordingly, the TC can utilize the following approaches to improve the efficacy of the RTC’s carpool program:

- **Commuter Database** – The TC will establish a database of current home locations of employees and local trainees to identify potential carpool matches and proactively reach out with targeted communications to those who have given permission to contact them. It is envisioned that this database will allow the TC to quickly identify and communicate with potential carpool options upon request. It will also provide the TC with the opportunity to communicate transportation changes and issues as they occur to affected portions of the population. This database will integrate current employee databases used by the Office of Human Resources to generate reports identifying those who are new to the RTC or have recently moved (based on an updated address). The TC will not only actively promote this service, but will also serve as a facilitator between parties and assist with registering carpools.

- **Dynamic Ridematching** – Some commuters’ schedules may change from day to day making it difficult to form traditional carpools. To address this challenge, new technology supporting “on-demand carpooling” apps should be explored. On-demand carpool matching apps allow drivers to schedule their drive home and offer others to “book” their seat on that drive. The greater the participation in the program, the more potential rides are available. The TC should evaluate real-time carpool Matching Apps and determine their appropriateness for the RTC community.

4.1.2 Internal TDM Communications

CONDUCT TDM COMMUNICATIONS WITH TRAINEES AND EMPLOYEES

Strategy recommendations can only be effective at achieving the Agency’s goal if RTC trainees and employees are properly informed and educated about their available transportation choices. Accordingly, the effective communication of transportation amenities, benefits, and incentives is critical to the success of this TDM Plan. Based on the background research from Section 2, the TC will deploy targeted communication strategies on an ongoing basis to effectively reach a wide range of RTC stakeholders. This multi-faceted approach may include the following programs and opportunities:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communications Opportunities</th>
<th>Action Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TDM Communications Plan</strong></td>
<td>CREATE AN ANNUAL COMMUNICATIONS PLAN TO ENSURE THAT TDM CAMPAIGNS ARE STRATEGICALLY COORDINATED</td>
<td>The TC will be responsible for establishing a comprehensive communications plan, which will outline the campaigns to be executed to promote the strategies which will most effectively achieve the established goals. The plan will include communications messaging as well as the channels and tools that will be used to most effectively execute the campaigns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Hire Outreach</strong></td>
<td>INVITE NEW HIRES TO SPEAK WITH THE TC AS PART OF THE HIRING PROCESS</td>
<td>It is recommended that all new hires be invited as part of orientation to meet with the TC to discuss transportation logistics for their new commute to campus and receive an up-to-date transportation access guide. This will allow the introduction of alternative transportation commute options and benefits (like SmartBenefits) as well as establish desired commute habits at the beginning of a new employee’s tenure at the RTC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lifestyle Change Targeted Communications</strong></td>
<td>INVITE EMPLOYEES WHO HAVE CHANGED THEIR ADDRESS TO CONTACT THE TC</td>
<td>Behavioral science studies show that habits are best changed when significant life impacts occur. Changing one’s home location is a significant opportunity to reinforce the desired commute behavior of not driving alone to campus. For this reason, a change in employee address (as noted by the Human Resources office) provides an opportunity for the TC to contact the employee to invite them to schedule a meeting to discuss their new transportation options and receive an up-to-date access guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guaranteed Ride Home Promotion and Education</strong></td>
<td>INTRODUCE GUARANTEED RIDE HOME PROGRAM REGISTRATION TO NEW HIRES</td>
<td>Best practices in TDM find that the biggest obstacle for commuters to switch from driving alone to another transportation choice is their fear of needing their car in case of an emergency. As described in Section 2.2.2, the Commuter Connections GRH provides commuters who regularly (twice a week) commute by non-SOV modes a free ride home in an emergency. As part of new hire paperwork, information about the MWCOG Guaranteed Ride Home (GRH) program will be provided and new employees will have the opportunity to enroll. The TC will also actively encourage existing employees to register for the program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.2 Transportation Infrastructure**

Building upon the Agency’s current multimodal access as described in Section 3, TDM Plan strategies included within this section seek to augment alternative mode access to campus through infrastructure improvements. The following strategies are recommended to be included as supplements to the Agency’s TDM “toolkit”.

**WELLS + ASSOCIATES**
Transportation Demand Management Consultants
4.2.1 Expand Vanpool Stops to Include Metrorail and/or MARC stations

CONTINUE TO EVALUATE IMPROVEMENTS TO THE CURRENT VANPOOL SYSTEM

As described in Section 2.1.1, the RTC’s distance from the nearest Metrorail and Metrobus stops make it challenging for employees and local trainees to take transit to the campus. In order to make transit to RTC more accessible for employees and local trainees, the Agency should consider the expansion of the trainee vanpools running from local hotels to include stops at the closest Metrorail and/or MARC stations, which may include but not limited to the following:

- Greenbelt Metro Station
- Jessup MARC Station
- Savage MARC Station
- Laurel MARC Station
- Muirkirk MARC Station

4.2.3 Improve Bicycle Infrastructure

IMPROVE BICYCLE INFRASTRUCTURE BY REPLACING AND PROVIDING ADDITIONAL BIKE RACKS AS WELL AS ADDITIONAL LOCKERS AND SHOWERS

In order to continue the RTC’s efforts to make bike commuting more convenient and desirable, the Agency will explore ways to enhance its existing bicycle infrastructure.

- **Bicycle Storage** - In recent years, the RTC has provided additional bicycle parking capacity on campus. Specifically, in 2016, the RTC purchased 50 racks, primarily for training purposes, which can be deployed as demand necessitates for bicycle storage throughout the campus. Over the ten-year term of this 2017 Master Plan, the RTC will continue to explore opportunities to deploy additional bicycle parking throughout campus, as demand necessitates.

- **Lockers and Showers** - The Agency will continue to provide and explore opportunities to expand the use of locker and shower facilities for bike commuters at appropriate locations throughout campus by way of promotions.
Section 5

TDM Monitoring and Evaluation

To fully assess the Agency’s efforts towards achieving the peak hour mode split commitment and aspirational goal described in Section 3, a Monitoring Study which includes a review and analysis of the results of a RTC-wide survey and a summary report on TDM activities is recommended.

- Elements of the Monitoring Study:
  - The percent of SOV trips arriving to RTC during the peak hour.
  - Surveys shall be conducted when RTC training is in session.
  - Surveys shall be conducted in the fall season of a given year (between September and November).
  - Surveys will be completed during a week without any holidays and when area schools are in session.
  - Surveys may be conducted by mail, telephone and/or email. Regardless of the type of survey ultimately used, a high degree of follow-up is recommended.
  - A mode split survey to identify the mode of transportation for trainees and employees.
  - The mode split survey may also be used to inform decisions regarding specific TDM strategies to be used to achieve the mode split commitment.
  - A list of TDM measures in effect at the time the study was conducted and the number of trainees enrolled and staff employed at the time the study was conducted.

- Sequencing of Monitoring Studies
  - Monitoring studies shall be conducted during the Fall each year beginning the year following the approval of the Master Plan.

If compliance with the aforementioned Mode Split Commitment is not demonstrated, the Agency will work with the MNCPPC to review changes to the then-current TDM strategies as well as explore, develop, and implement new TDM strategies.
Section 6

TDM Potential Cost Estimates

As detailed in Section 3, the TMP includes non-SOV mode split goals performance targets (both a commitment and an aspirational goal) that were developed as realistic opportunities to decrease the number of autos driving to the RTC during peak hours. Specifically, the performance commitment requires that non-SOV mode split will meet or exceed a level that is fifteen percentage points. In addition, as an aspirational goal, the Agency will strive to achieve a non-SOV mode split of up to twenty-three percentage points.

While the performance-based commitment and goal are clearly established, the TDM measures that will be utilized to achieve them need to be flexible enough to evolve and change over time, particularly given the ten-year term of the Master Plan. Accordingly, Table 6.1 presents an overview of the estimated potential costs associated with implementing various initiatives detailed in Sections 2 and 4 which together comprise a comprehensive TDM “toolkit”. The actual long-term costs of implementation of the RTC’s TDM Plan will depend on which tools and initiatives are most effective in achieving the TDM commitment and making progress toward the aspirational goal over the term of the Master Plan.
### Table 6.1

**TDM Potential Cost Estimates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TDM Initiative</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost Assumption Notes</th>
<th>FY 2016 One-Time Costs</th>
<th>Estimated Ongoing Annual Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SmartBenefits</strong></td>
<td>Employees are also eligible to receive up to $245 per month on their SmarTrip Cards in tax free transit benefits through the Agency’s SmartBenefits program.</td>
<td>Based on prior two fiscal years</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vanpools</strong></td>
<td>Fleet of 10 vans available to transportation trainees between their hotel and the RTC.</td>
<td>Based on prior two fiscal years</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bike Racks</strong></td>
<td>Bicycle racks with capacity for more than 50 bicycles throughout campus.</td>
<td>Procurement of and installation of 50 new bike racks.</td>
<td>$5,250</td>
<td>see below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Showers and Lockers</strong></td>
<td>Shower access throughout campus offered free of charge to commuters who bike or walk to campus.</td>
<td>Includes cost of towel service.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>see below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bicycle Benefit</strong></td>
<td>Bicycle benefit of up to $20 per month or $240 a year to cover bike repairs and expenses.</td>
<td>Based on up to 10 participants per year.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carshare</strong></td>
<td>The RTC has numerous official and pool vehicles that serve the same function as carshare vehicles and are available for employees to use to get to places on or off campus.</td>
<td>Part of operating budget for official and pool vehicles.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carpooling and Vanpooling Incentives</strong></td>
<td>Provide Free Reserved Parking for Carpools</td>
<td>Includes cost to stripe and sign dedicated carpool spaces and lost parking revenue.</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CURRENT TDM INITIATIVES: ESTIMATED TOTAL COSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TDM Strategy</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost Assumptions</th>
<th>Estimated Start Up or One-Time Costs</th>
<th>Estimated Ongoing Annual Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campus Transportation Coordination</strong></td>
<td>Facilitating carpool/vanpool ridematching</td>
<td>Includes 0.20 FTE staffing and program administration costs associated with full scope of Transportation Coordinator (TC) function</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$15,000.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>Expand Vanpool Stops to Include Metrorail and/or MARC Stations.</td>
<td>Based on additional wear and tear at $0.56/mile. Assumes extra 6 miles driven per vanpool (@ 5 vanpools) per day for 260 work days.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$3,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improve Bicycle Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>Includes cost of additional/replacement bike racks, sheltered storage/bike lockers, dedicated shower facilities</td>
<td>See Above</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### POTENTIAL TDM “TOOLKIT” INITIATIVES: ESTIMATED TOTAL COSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TDM Initiative</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost Assumptions</th>
<th>Estimated Start Up or One-Time Costs</th>
<th>Estimated Ongoing Annual Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wells + Associates</strong></td>
<td>Transportation Demand Management Consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL ESTIMATED COSTS</th>
<th>CURRENT TDM INITIATIVES: ESTIMATED TOTAL COSTS</th>
<th>POTENTIAL TDM “TOOLKIT” INITIATIVES: ESTIMATED TOTAL COSTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>$6,250</strong></td>
<td><strong>$99,900</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20