

# DRAFT

## Subtopic i3: Mitigation of Section 4(f) Resources

Three public and agency comments were received on the i3: Mitigation of Section 4(f) Resources subtopic. From these three comments, two common concern statements were developed. Themes related to the i3: Mitigation of Section 4(f) Resources subtopic include:

- The preferred alternatives would have adverse effects on Section 4(f) resources, particularly in the Georgetown area.
- The Draft EIS also does not provide mitigation policies for sensitive areas and has not sufficiently estimated mitigation costs.
- The Draft PEIS includes mixed messages associated with the mitigation of Section 4(f) impacts.

<b>CCS No.</b>	<b>Mitigation Common Concern Statements</b>
<b>Subtopic i3: Mitigation of Section 4(f) Resources</b>	
<b>i3-a</b>	<b>Lack of Policies for Sensitive Areas</b> The alternatives in the preferred group in the PEIS have an adverse effect on 4(f) resources in the Georgetown area, and mitigation costs have not been sufficiently estimated. Mitigation policies for sensitive areas are not established in the PEIS.
<b>i3-b</b>	<b>Draft PEIS Inconsistencies</b> The Draft PEIS includes mixed messages regarding the mitigation of impacts on Section 4(f) resources. One message is that “all the options for mitigation are still on the table,” which is contrary to the assertion that “detailed planning and some of those options are off the table.” This is an internal conflict.