

ATTACHMENT # 5

TITLE: *Alternatives Screening Matrix-Suggested Alternatives That Do Not Address All Or Part Of The Purpose And Need. Pages 1-6.*

Alternatives Screening Matrix - Suggested Alternatives that do not Address All or Part of the Purpose and Need

Summary of Current SHA Thinking	
<p>Suggested Alternative</p> <p>1. Improve I-495: An I-95/I-495 Capital Beltway Study is currently evaluating improvement of Maryland's 42-mile portion of the Capital Beltway, and is being coordinated with a similar study by Virginia DOT. Although the focus of the study is on provision of managed lanes, as part of that study, improvement of interchanges will also be considered.</p>	<p>Improvements to the Capital Beltway have and continue to be the subject of a separate project planning study to resolve an important but different set of transportation needs. The improvements to I-495 would not meet this project's purpose and Study Area needs.</p> <p>Community Mobility and Safety</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improvements to I-495 would not address traffic congestion on local routes in the study area. A sensitivity analysis, conducted as part of the 1990s ICC study, indicated that provision of HOV lanes on I-495 would alter traffic volumes on roads in the ICC study area by not more than 5% The Capital Beltway is a critical component in the region's transportation network and is in need of improvement, yet those are different needs not necessarily related to those outlined for the ICC study <p>Movement of Goods and People To and From Economic Centers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improvements to I-495 would not connect the corridor growth centers of I-270 near Rockville/Gaithersburg and I-95/US 29 near Laurel Even with improvements to the I-495 corridor, demand is expected to continue to exceed capacity. Thus, traffic to or from economic centers north of the Beltway would experience congestion if attempting to use I-495 <p>Local Land Use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improvements to I-495 would not link the planned medium density residential areas of eastern Montgomery County with the planned growth area of northern Prince George's County Improvements to I-495 would not serve the existing and planned developed area of eastern Montgomery County, due to the Beltway's location and the limited capacity (and adjacent dense development, which effectively precludes addition of substantial capacity) of the radial routes between the residential areas and the Beltway Improvements to the Beltway alone would not provide the much needed new capacity and system redundancy <p>Homeland Security</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improvements to I-495 would not provide enough additional east-west capacity and system redundancy to accommodate citywide and metro area evacuation in central and eastern Montgomery and northwestern Prince George's Counties
<p>2. An Auto-Train Route: Build railroad tracks and install a car carrying rail shuttle</p>	<p>Providing an auto-train linking the two growth corridors would not meet the project's purpose and Study Area needs.</p> <p>Community Mobility and Safety</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Previous transit and rail studies have shown that these modes do not attract enough ridership to reduce travel by auto. Transit service, particularly an auto-train route in lieu of an ICC highway, would generally be difficult to provide and sustain in outer suburbs <p>Movement of Goods and People To and From Economic Centers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 17.5 miles between the proposed ends of the ICC is an extremely short distance for auto trains, which are typically used for long distance travel (e.g., Virginia to Florida). The time required to load and unload vehicles would be in the order of 60 minutes/trip, which would more than offset time savings offered by an ICC, resulting in few people using the route The 1997 DEIS (p. VI-31) indicated that only about 25% of the ICC users had both an origin and a destination outside the study area. It is these motorists who are traveling from one end of the ICC to the other, that could be served by an auto train. The other 75% would not be well served <p>Local Land Use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An auto-train would not be consistent with land use in Montgomery County and would not support its orderly growth and development patterns <p>Homeland Security</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An auto-train route would not provide enough additional east-west capacity and system redundancy to accommodate citywide and metro area evacuation in central and eastern Montgomery and northwestern Prince George's Counties
<p>3. Alignment or Alternative Option: Extend ICC west of I-270 and/or east of US 1. As shown in the master plans of Montgomery and Prince George's Counties, the ICC would extend from I-270 on the west to US 301 south of Bowie on the east.</p>	<p>The definition of the project's limits is based on the need to link existing and proposed development areas between I-270 and I-95/US 1. Extending the project beyond those limits would not be consistent with the project's purpose and Study Area needs.</p> <p>Community Mobility and Safety/Movement of Goods and People To and From Economic Centers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prince George's County's master plans currently show the ICC (designated A-44 on the County's plans) extending east of US 1 to US 301. The County intends to begin an update of the master plans in the area east of US 1 in 2003, with a draft report expected to be completed in late 2004. The update, which will include travel demand modeling and evaluation of alternatives, will consider whether A-44 should be retained or dropped east of US 1. The modeling showed that traffic volumes on A-44 east of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway would be the same with or without the construction of the ICC west of US 29. This indicates that the ICC east of I-95/US 1 would serve a different market than the ICC west of I-95/US 1, and supports the thought that A-44 east of US 1 is a project independent of the current project <p>Local Land Use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An extension of the ICC west of I-270 would not be consistent with land use in Montgomery County The State of Maryland is currently working with Virginia on whether to analyze traffic crossing the Potomac River to gain insight on origins and destinations. A future crossing of the Potomac not address the purpose or need of the current project

Suggested Alternative

Summary of Current SHA Thinking

4. Alignment or Alternative Option: Construct a roadway from I-270/Falls Road to the Master Plan Alternative at MD 97 in lieu of building Master Plan Alignment between I-370 and MD 97

- **Movement of Goods and People To and From Economic Centers**
- Connecting to I-270 at Falls Road near Rockville would not link to I-370, which is closer to the heart of the development in the I-270 corridor.
- Local Land Use**
- This alignment would pass through densely developed residential and commercial areas, including downtown Rockville and the Gude Drive/Southern Lane area, as well as through several neighborhoods such as Avery Lodge south of MD 115
- With no reserved corridor available through these areas, the residential and commercial impacts and costs would be prohibitive

5. Alignment or Alternative Option: Move road south of all other alternatives

- Providing a roadway closer to the Capital Beltway would not meet the project's purpose and Study Area needs. MDOT continues to explore the transportation needs in and around the Beltway Corridor with highway and transit corridor studies.
- Community Mobility and Safety**
- These alignments are too far south to address traffic congestion on local routes in the Study Area
- Previous studies have shown that improvements farther south and closer to the Capital Beltway would have very little effect on traffic volumes on the local streets in the central portions of the ICC Study Area

Movement of Goods and People To and From Economic Centers

- Improvements closer to the Beltway would not connect the corridor growth centers of I-270 near Rockville/Gaithersburg and I-95 near Laurel
- Local Land Use**
- Placement of a new east-west road in the highly developed areas noted is not practicable, as it would require an extremely large number of displacements and split established communities

Homeland Security

- Improvements closer to I-495 would not provide enough additional east-west capacity and system redundancy to accommodate citywide and metro area evacuation in central and eastern Montgomery and northwestern Prince George's Counties

6. Build I-95 to continue through the District

- Improvements to I-95 were considered in the past to resolve a different set of transportation needs. Improvements to I-95 would not meet this project's purpose and Study Area needs
- Community Mobility and Safety/Movement of Goods and People To and From Economic Centers**
- The extension of I-95 through the District of Columbia would result in the construction of a north-south road, with no significant benefit to east-west travel in the ICC study area
- No significant traffic congestion and mobility improvements in the Study Area would be realized
- Such a connection would not link development areas between I-270 and I-95

Local Land Use

- Such an extension has been considered in the past and dropped from plans by both Maryland and the District of Columbia due to socioeconomic impacts
- An extension of I-95 into the District of Columbia would not serve community and development areas in the Study Area

Homeland Security

- An extension of I-95 through DC would not provide any additional east-west capacity and system redundancy to accommodate citywide and metro area evacuation in central and eastern Montgomery and northwestern Prince George's Counties

7. Transportation Systems Management/Travel Demand Management (TSM/TDM) Alternative: Synchronizing traffic signals, improving transit, telecommuting, bicycles, transit-oriented development and better land use

- TSM/TDM measures could be effective in combination with other build alternatives. Alone, they are not sufficient to meet the ICC purpose and need. Many TSM and TDM measures are included in the potential study alternatives. For instance, many TDM measures are included in the region's travel models and therefore included in projections of need and benefit. Likewise for TSM improvements, many intersection upgrades have and continue to be constructed and improvements to transit service will be included with any proposed build alternative.

Community Mobility and Safety

- These measures by themselves do not reduce the travel demand to such a degree that an ICC would not be needed
- TSM/TDM measures do not significantly affect mobility and safety beyond localized improvements

Movement of Goods and People To and From Economic Centers

- TSM/TDM measures do not provide sufficient highway capacity across the study area to be as efficient and reliable as needed to accommodate movement of goods and people to and from economic centers

Homeland Security

- TSM/TDM measures do not provide a reliable alternate east-west route for emergency response situations

8. Upgrade Existing Roads Alternative: The 1997 ICC DEIS included an Upgrade Existing Roads

- A system of arterial roadway improvements does not meet the project's purpose and the Study Area needs based on limited capacity (specifically at intersections) and lack of access control.

Suggested Alternative

Alternative (UERA) that called for widening approximately 34 miles of east-west and north-south roadways to or beyond the number of lanes specified in the counties' master plans, as well as the improvement of 26 major intersections. The improved roadways included MD 355, MD 115, MD 28, MD 198, Norwood Road, Briggs Chaney Road, Fairland Road, Cherry Hill Road, Old Gunpowder Road, and Contee Road.

Summary of Current SHA Thinking

Community Mobility and Safety

- The UERA places more traffic on local roads and arterials that, even with the improvements, would remain heavily congested
- Increasing the number of lanes beyond that already master planned would be extremely costly and impactive
- Motorists would be subject to frequent signalized intersections, entrances, and driveways
- With the UERA, transit trips between Laurel and Gaithersburg would take nearly twice as long than with an access-controlled highway. Likewise, auto trips would take nearly twice as long with the UERA compared to an access-controlled highway
- Long-distance trips would need to be made on a variety of different collectors and arterials, with travelers outside of the Study Area mixing with the more local traffic
- Motorists traveling east-west would need to use north-south arterials to reach the east-west travel corridors, making these disjointed trips longer than a direct link

Movement of Goods and People To and From Economic Centers

- The UERA would experience substantially more accidents on the arterial routes than on an access-controlled highway
- Does not provide a high quality connection between economic centers

Local Land Use

- Significant pressures for strip development and undesirable intens commercial development would be generated adjacent to the intersections
- Wider arterial roadways would tend to transform the character of a community of a medium-density nature to a more urban nature
- Many of the roadways identified as part of this alternative are lined with existing residences and established businesses that would be severely impacted or displaced by adding lanes to increase capacity

Homeland Security

- The time it would take to traverse the Study Area on an access-controlled highway is considerably less than on an arterial roadway like MD 355 or MD 28
- Because long-distance trips would need to be made on a variety of different collectors and arterials and mix with local traffic, the UERA would not provide a reliable alternate east-west route for emergency response situations

9. **Transit Only Alternative:** Transit Only Alternatives were evaluated in the 1997 DEIS and more recently suggested as part of the current study. A Transit Only Alternative would consist of options that only include transit systems such as a new light rail or commuter rail system on a dedicated transitway to connect origins and destinations in the I-270 and I-95 corridors. No new roadways or improvements to existing roadways would be included in this alternative. Three light rail transit alternatives were evaluated in the 1997 DEIS: (1) the Master Plan Transit Alternative along the ICC master plan corridor, (2) the Randolph Road Transitway, and (3) and the White Oak Transitway.

Transit Only Alternatives would only minimally reduce the number of automobiles and trucks using the already congested system of roadways in the Study Area and therefore would have a negligible effect on congestion. Transit Only Alternatives would not meet this project's purpose and Study Area needs. Each of the potential build alternatives will include a system of transit improvements including express bus along and feeder bus service to the alignments.

Community Mobility and Safety

- Circumferential transit service, as would be needed for transit in lieu of an ICC highway, is generally difficult to provide and sustain in less dense suburbs
- The travel demand model indicated that ridership in 2020 on the 1997 DEIS Master Plan Transit Alternative and the Randolph Road Transitway would be substantially less than the generally accepted minimum ridership threshold volumes for new rail systems in the United States
- The highest projected ridership on any of the three 1997 DEIS transit alternatives provided only a 1.0% reduction in travel by auto

Local Land Use/Movement of Goods and People To and From Economic Centers

- The wedges between radial corridors are planned for lower density and thus will not promote concentration of travel plans via transit
- Both the residential and workplace (or other non-home) ends of the trips would be in lower density environments, which is not conducive to effective transit service
- Moving goods as well as people cannot be done efficiently with transit

Homeland Security

- Transit-only measures would not provide a reliable alternate east-west route for emergency response situations such as citywide and metro area evacuation

Suggested Alternative	Summary of Current SHA Thinking
<p>10. Howard County Connection Alternatives: I-270 to I-95 utilizing MD 216, MD 32 or MD 100</p>	<p>The ICC is intended to link existing and proposed development areas between I-270 and I-95/US 1 within central and eastern Montgomery County and northwestern Prince George's County. A connection to Howard County would not achieve this.</p> <p>Community Mobility and Safety</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Howard County Connection would not provide a missing link in the Baltimore-Washington Transportation Grid, of which MD 32 is a component, as is the proposed ICC. Thus, a connection between I-270 and MD 32 in lieu of an ICC would replace two planned components of the grid with one, reducing capacity and interconnectedness <p>Movement of Goods and People To and From Economic Centers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A connection to MD 32 in Howard County would not link development areas in Montgomery and Prince George's Counties, as MD 32 does not pass through Prince George's County (the MD 32 interchange with I-95 is located seven miles north of the existing and planned development area in northern Prince George's County) It would not accommodate trips between medium-density residential areas of eastern Montgomery County and the employment and housing centers in the I-270 and I-95 corridors <p>Local Land Use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would be inconsistent with the Howard County land use plans, which call for relatively low-density residential development in the southern portion of Howard County west of US 29 I-270/MD 32 connection has substantial socioeconomic impacts and requires a crossing of the Patuxent River and the Montgomery County Agricultural Wedge The east side of I-270 from south of Rockville to north of Gaithersburg is almost entirely heavily developed, with no reserved corridor for such a connection <p>Homeland Security</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A connection into Howard County would not provide system redundancy to accommodate citywide and metro area evacuation in central and eastern Montgomery and northwestern Prince George's Counties
<p>11. LUTRAQ-Type or Balanced Land Use Alternative: Implement an alternative land use plan that provides more transit oriented development, revitalization of existing communities, and a better balance of housing and jobs (i.e., more housing and fewer jobs in the I-270 Corridor and less housing and more jobs in eastern Montgomery County/northern Prince George's County). The 1997 DEIS included a study that developed and evaluated the following alternative 2020 land use scenario:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The assumption that there would be no ICC Approximately 20,000 fewer jobs and 2,000 fewer households in the Study Area than assumed in the traditional land use forecasts A "better" balance of jobs and households in both the I-270 and I-95 corridors, i.e., more households and fewer jobs in the I-270 corridor and fewer households and more jobs in the eastern part of the study area The amount of growth did not exceed the maximum master plan limits in any given area or sub-area. 	<p>With substantial congestion in the Study Area today that is largely related to existing development, future changes in land use could not appreciably affect existing development and travel. A land use only alternative would not address this project's purpose nor satisfy the needs of the Study Area. However, as a result of previous studies, the local government has adopted many of these principles in their process of updating local master plans.</p> <p>Community Mobility and Safety</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results of the 1997 DEIS analysis showed a minimal impact (less than 2,000 trips per day) on east-west roadways, approximately 2% of the total travel volumes. (Section IIA.3b of the 1997 ICC DEIS) <p>Movement of Goods and People To and From Economic Centers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shifts in land use would not provide new highway capacity across the study area that is efficient and reliable as needed to accommodate movement of goods and people Does not provide a high quality connection between economic centers <p>Local Land Use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Wedges and Corridors concept, which is consistent with the more recently adopted Smart Growth initiatives, focuses development in designated areas and preserves outlying areas for low density residential or agricultural use (one-third of Montgomery County was placed in the Agricultural Preserve) The 1981 Eastern Montgomery County Master Plan reduced the density of planned land use in the Upper Paint Branch watershed to protect the stream system The ICC Study Area is already substantially developed, as noted in M-NCPPC records, with nearly 80 percent of the households and employment planned at build-out in place in 2003 <p>Homeland Security</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land use only measures would not provide a reliable alternate east-west route for emergency response situations such as citywide and metro area evacuation

Suggested Alternative	Summary of Current SHA Thinking
<p>12. Combined Balanced Land Use and Enhanced Transit Alternative: In early 2000, the Montgomery County Planning Board established the Transportation Policy Report Task Force (TPR-2) to analyze Montgomery County's role in the region and to recommend changes as part of new policies or modifications to existing ones. Two land use alternatives were considered by the TPR-2 for 2025 and 2050: Master Plan Land Use and Alternative Land Use. Both kept the same numbers of projected households and jobs in Montgomery County in 2025 and 2050, but the Alternative Land Use Scenario redistributed jobs and households in an attempt to place jobs and households even closer together. The Alternative Land Use scenario was evaluated with both an Enhanced Road Network and an Enhanced Transit Network.</p>	<p>Summary of Current SHA Thinking</p> <p>Studies of a combined land use and transit alternative have shown no appreciable reduction in the demand for roadway travel. This combined alternative, like its component parts, would not address this project's purpose nor satisfy the Study Area's needs.</p> <p>Community Mobility and Safety</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The combined Alternative Land Use and Enhanced Transit Network would reduce auto trips by only 5%, equivalent to a few years worth of normal traffic growth, and therefore would not obviate the need for roadway improvements <p>Movement of Goods and People To and From Economic Centers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shifts in land use in combination with transit improvements would not provide new highway capacity across the study area that is efficient and reliable as needed to accommodate movement of goods and people Does not provide a high quality connection between economic centers <p>Local Land Use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on the results of numerous technical studies, Montgomery County's Planning Board and County Council decided against wholesale changes in land use, but are pursuing a better balance of jobs and housing and more Transit Oriented Development as area master plans are updated The 1981 Eastern Montgomery County Master Plan reduced the density of planned land use in the Upper Paint Branch watershed to protect the stream system <p>Homeland Security</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land use and transit measures would not provide a reliable alternate east-west route for emergency response situations such as citywide and metro area evacuation
<p>13. Hybrid Alternatives:</p> <p>Hybrid #1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A six-lane highway from I-370 to MD 198 at Van Dusen Road, a connection from this six-lane highway to Midcounty Highway at Shady Grove Road, having full access control, except through Spencerville and along MD 198 west of I-95, where the road would have partial or no access controls; At-grade intersections would be provided along MD 198 at Good Hope Road, Thompson Road, Peach Orchard Road, Oursler Road, Kuhn Road, McKnew Road, Riding Slabie Road, Old Gunpowder Road, and Sweitzer Lane A 6-lane roadway from US 29 to US 1 along the Master Plan Alternative (MPA) alignment, with a two-lane extension westward to Fairland Road Intersection improvements along Randolph Road (at MD 355, MD 586, MD 85, MD 97, and MD 650) <p>Hybrid #2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A fully access controlled highway between I-370 and I-95, with four lanes west of US 29 and six lanes to the east. The roadway generally followed the NA alignment from I-370 to MD 198 near the County Line, where it followed MD 198 as a four-lane roadway with flanking two-lane, one-way frontage roads A six-lane roadway from US 29 to US 1 along the MPA alignment Intersection improvements along Randolph Road. 	<p>An arterial roadway with intersection improvements along Randolph Road would have the same deficiencies in addressing the ICC Purpose and Need as described in the discussion of the UERA, including placing more traffic on local roads and arterials that, even with the improvements, would remain heavily congested. Furthermore, most of the Randolph Road intersection improvements have been or are being addressed as part of the Congestion Relief Study. The Hybrid Alternatives would not address the purpose and need of this project.</p> <p>Community Mobility and Safety</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> With the Hybrid #1 Alternative, the placement of five at-grade intersections through Spencerville and four west of I-95 (along with numerous private entrances in both areas) within a 17-mile long access-controlled highway would necessitate changes in speeds and driver expectations as motorists switch back and forth between freeway and arterial conditions The intersection improvements along Randolph Road would place more traffic on local roads and arterials that, even with intersection improvements, would remain heavily congested Utilizing MD 198 from just west of the Montgomery County/Prince George's County line to Van Dusen Road east of I-95 would not provide a direct new connection to I-95 for the major east-west roadway It would either have at-grade intersections and private entrances along MD 198 west of I-95 (Hybrid #1) with attendant safety and capacity deficiencies, or introduce frontage roads in the area (Hybrid #2) with substantial impacts on adjoining residences and businesses It would tend to increase traffic on MD 198 through Laurel, thereby exacerbating traffic congestion in the downtown area <p>Movement of Goods and People To and From Economic Centers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utilizing MD 198 from just west of the Montgomery County/Prince George's County line to Van Dusen Road east of I-95 would alter the existing and planned role of MD 198 through Spencerville as an arterial serving more of a local than regional role <p>Local Land Use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant pressures for undesirable strip development and more intense commercial development could be generated adjacent to the intersections Arterial roadways would tend to transform the character of a community of a medium-density nature to a more urban nature <p>Homeland Security</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arterial roadways would not provide a reliable alternate east-west route for emergency response situations such as citywide and metro area evacuation

Suggested Alternative

14. **Midcounty Highway-MD 198 (MM 198) Alternative:** In the 1997 DEIS, MM 198 was a six-lane urban arterial extending from the Midcounty Highway/ Shady Grove Road intersection to MD 198 at Van Dusen Road east of I-95 with the following components:

- MM 198 would not connect to I-370 and provides no new connection to I-95
- MM 198 would have a 50 mph design speed, compared to 60 mph for an access-controlled highway
- MM 198 would be an arterial, with two 38-foot wide roadways and no shoulders
- MM198 would have twenty at-grade intersections and two interchanges.

Summary of Current SHA Thinking

As an arterial roadway, MM 198 would not address this project's purpose nor satisfy the Study Area's needs. Based on many of the features of the original MM 198 Alternative, the footprints of all alternatives are being reduced to minimize environmental impacts. In addition, portions of the MM 198 Alternative are being included as alignment options as part of Corridor 2. The following pertains to the arterial nature of the MM 198 as proposed in the 1997 DEIS:

Community Mobility and Safety

- Unless the intersections along MM 198 were very large (requiring very large amounts of right-of-way, in some cases as much, if not more, than an interchange), a LOS D or better could not be attained at most of the intersections
- Arterial roadways with intersections typically experience accident rates four times as high as access-controlled facilities, and fatal accidents tend to occur at a rate three times as high on arterial roadways
- The MM 198 Alternative provides only one corridor to be shared by both local and through traffic, whereas the freeway alternatives provide a new corridor for through traffic and allow the existing roadway network to be used by local traffic. The MM 198 Alternative results in conflicts between local and through traffic and therefore increases accident potential

Movement of Goods and People To and From Economic Centers

- The previous alignment of MM 198 did not connect directly to I-270 and provides no new access to I-95
- With MM 198, motorists would need to travel heavily congested roads such as Shady Grove Road to access I-270
- As an example and as summarized in the 1997 DEIS P. IV-50, MM 198 would not by itself generate extensive economic growth outside of a corridor surrounding the new arterial
- The MM 198 Alternative directs traffic through the City of Laurel, whereas the freeway alternatives would not provide a direct connection to MD 198

Local Land Use

- Significant pressures for undesirable strip development and more intense commercial development could be generated adjacent to the intersections with an arterial roadway
- An arterial roadway would tend to transform the character of a community of a medium-density nature to a more urban nature

Homeland Security

- A highway is needed that can provide high quality, uninterrupted flow between government facilities and to aid in an area evacuation is crucial to national security

Summary

- The concept of an arterial roadway is recommended to not be studied further
- Many of the alignment options of MM 198 will be carried forward as part of the Corridor 2 alternatives (see #16)
- The end points of MM 198 are being modified to more directly connect to I-270 and I-95 with a higher quality new interchange

Alternatives Screening Matrix - Suggested Alternatives Recommended to be Studied Further

15. Corridor 1

Corridor 1 generally follows the alignment of the Master Plan Alternative studied in the 1997 DEIS. However, the alternatives to be developed in this corridor will reflect significant differences in the footprint and design features to reduce impacts from the alternatives previously developed. Options for ending the ICC at I-95 will also be evaluated in this corridor.

The Study Team recommends that Corridor 1, with various alignment options, should be carried forward for detailed study.

16. Corridor 2

Corridor 2 essentially follows the corridor of the Northern and Midcounty/MD 198 (MM198) alternatives studied in the 1997 DEIS, but with changes to reflect this project's Purpose and Need. Alternatives in Corridor 2 will seek to include the best alignment opportunities from both of the 1997 alternatives in an effort to reduce environmental impacts and to respond to development growth that has occurred since the last study. Alternatives in Corridor 2 will incorporate a generally smaller footprint than the previous Northern Alternative, and will include limited access and less impactful design features consistent with this Purpose and Need. Options for ending the ICC at I-95 will also be evaluated in this corridor.

The Study Team recommends that Corridor 2, with various alignment options, should be carried forward for detailed study.