

S. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Executive Summary summarizes information contained in the Hampton Roads Crossing Study (HRCS) Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS). Specifically, this summary discusses the history of the study, alternatives considered, environmental effects of the alternatives, temporary construction effects, and next steps for the study. The summary is presented in question and answer format and includes commonly asked questions regarding the study.

1. WHAT IS AN EIS?

An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is a document required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) that takes into consideration the effects of a Federal agency's proposed action on the environment. NEPA requires Federal agencies to prepare an EIS when an action they are proposing has the potential to significantly affect the environment. An EIS identifies the purpose and need for the action; considers alternatives to meet the Purpose and Need; describes the affected environment; and analyzes the environmental consequences of the alternatives.

2. WHAT IS A SUPPLEMENTAL EIS AND WHY IS IT NEEDED?

Following completion of an EIS, and prior to the implementation or construction of the Preferred Alternative, new information or changes to the project may arise that have significant impacts on the environment that had not been previously considered. When this happens, the EIS is required to be supplemented. The resulting SEIS introduces up-to-date information, reconsiders alternatives, as necessary, and identifies potential mitigation for new adverse impacts. In addition, the public is afforded opportunities to review the new information and provide input before any final decisions are made.

3. WHAT IS THE HISTORY OF THE HRCS?

The Intermodal Surface Transportation Act of 1991 allocated funds for highway projects demonstrating innovative techniques of highway construction and finance. The Interstate 64 (I-64) crossing of Hampton Roads was included as one of the innovative projects. A Major Investment Study (MIS) of the I-64 crossing of Hampton Roads was completed in 1997. The MIS documented an initial review of alternatives to reduce congestion at the I-64 crossing. Following the MIS, the HRCS Draft EIS (DEIS) and Final EIS (FEIS) were published in 1999 and 2001, respectively, documenting the preferred alternative. Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) issued a Record of Decision (ROD) in 2001, completing the NEPA process. Other studies were completed to further evaluate potential Hampton Roads crossing improvements. In 2003 FHWA and the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) completed a re-evaluation of the FEIS that analyzed implementing a portion of the preferred alternative. That re-evaluation validated the previous decisions. In 2011 FHWA and VDOT issued an Environmental Assessment (EA)/Re-evaluation of the HRCS FEIS covering the segments of the preferred alternative including the I-664 Connector, the I-564 Connector, and the VA 164 Connector. The Re-evaluation was not advanced due to fiscal constraints; no ROD was prepared. In 2012 FHWA and VDOT published the Hampton Roads Bridge-Tunnel (HRBT) DEIS. The DEIS evaluated options for improvements to I-64 between Hampton and Norfolk. The DEIS found that the Retained Alternatives would result in high impacts to historic and private properties. High impacts, along with lack of public and political support, led FHWA to rescind the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the project. In 2013 the 2011 EA was revised but the FHWA never made a final decision before the

decision to prepare a SEIS was made. This SEIS is being prepared in part due to the time that has lapsed since the 2001 FEIS. Environmental regulations and conditions in the Hampton Roads region and have changed substantially during the fifteen years that passed since the FEIS was completed, resulting in the need for a thorough reevaluation. Additionally, the preparation of this SEIS has been supported by the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE).

4. WHAT AREA DOES THE PROPOSED STUDY COVER?

The study covers the metropolitan region known as “Hampton Roads” in southeastern Virginia. The Study Area Corridors span several local jurisdictions including the cities of Chesapeake, Hampton, Newport News, Norfolk, Portsmouth, and Suffolk.

5. WHO IS LEADING THE STUDY?

FHWA is the lead federal agency for the NEPA study. VDOT is the lead state agency.

6. WHAT ARE STUDY AREA CORRIDORS AND HOW WERE THEY DEVELOPED?

The Study Area Corridors are buffers around the existing and proposed road corridors which comprise the different alternatives. The Study Area Corridors capture the natural, cultural and social resources that may be impacted by improvements to those corridors. The Study Area Corridors are sufficiently wide to account for any needed right-of-way and construction impacts, while providing flexibility for efforts to avoid and minimize those impacts. The Study Area Corridors are generally defined as 250 feet on either side of the centerlines of I-64, I-564, I-664, Route 164, and proposed new location alignments. Areas around the interchanges included in the Study Area Corridors vary based on the anticipated footprint of proposed modifications; for instance, the new and existing interchanges where more extensive improvements are anticipated have larger boundaries.

7. WHAT OTHER AGENCIES ARE INVOLVED IN THE STUDY?

Other agencies include Cooperating Agencies and Participating Agencies. Cooperating Agencies are agencies other than a lead agency that have jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental resource impacted by the project. The following agencies have accepted invitations to be Cooperating Agencies: City of Hampton, City of Newport News, City of Norfolk, City of Portsmouth, City of Virginia Beach, Federal Transit Administration (FTA), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), USACE, US Coast Guard (USCG), US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), and the US Navy. Participating Agencies are those with an interest in the project. Several dozen Federal and state agencies and groups, as well as the localities within and adjacent to the Study Area Corridors, have served as Participating Agencies for the study. A complete list of the agencies and their role in the study is provided in the Coordination Plan (**Appendix C**). A copy of the Agency Correspondence received to date is included in **Appendix D**.

8. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THE HRCS AND WHY IS IT NEEDED?

The purpose of the HRCS is to consider alternatives that relieve congestion at the I-64 HRBT in a manner that improves accessibility, transit, emergency evacuation, and military and goods movement along the primary transportation corridors in the Hampton Roads region, including the I-64, I-664, I-564, and Route 164 corridors. The HRCS addresses the following needs:

- Accommodate travel demand – capacity is inadequate on the Study Area Corridors, contributing to congestion at the HRBT;
- Improve transit access – the lack of transit access across the Hampton Roads waterway;
- Increase regional accessibility – limited number of water crossings, inadequate highway capacity, and severe congestion decrease accessibility;
- Address geometric deficiencies – insufficient vertical and horizontal clearance at the HRBT contribute to congestion;
- Enhance emergency evacuation capability – increase capacity for emergency evacuation, particularly at the HRBT;
- Improve strategic military connectivity – congestion impedes military movement missions; and,
- Increase access to port facilities – inadequate access to interstate highway travel in the Study Area Corridors impacts regional commerce.

9. WHAT ALTERNATIVES HAVE BEEN CARRIED FORWARD FROM PREVIOUS STUDIES?

Candidate Build Alternatives (CBA) 1, 2, and 9 from the 2001 FEIS have been modified and re-evaluated as Alternatives A, B, and C, respectively, in this Draft SEIS.

10. WHAT ALTERNATIVES WERE CONSIDERED BUT NOT RETAINED FOR ANALYSIS?

The alternatives that were considered but not retained for further analysis in both the 2001 HRCS FEIS and the 2012 HRBT DEIS were re-examined for the Draft SEIS. Additional alternative concepts were also identified during the 2015 scoping period for this SEIS. The description of these alternatives and the reasons why they were not carried forward for detailed analysis are summarized in **Chapter 2** of this Draft SEIS.

11. WHAT ALTERNATIVES ARE BEING CONSIDERED IN THIS DRAFT SEIS?

Five alternatives are under consideration in this Draft SEIS: the No-Build Alternative and four Build Alternatives. Modified versions of the alternatives retained for analysis in the 2001 FEIS are under consideration as part of this SEIS (Alternatives A, B, and C). In addition, a fourth alternative has been identified which captures elements of all alternatives (Alternative D).

Alternative A would create a consistent six-lane facility along I-64 from I-664 in Hampton to the I-564 interchange in Norfolk. A parallel bridge-tunnel would be constructed west of the existing I-64 HRBT; the tunnel width would match the expanded capacity on the approaches.

Alternative B would include all of the improvements included under Alternative A and also includes improvements along the existing I-564 corridor that extends from I-64 west across the Elizabeth River via a new bridge-tunnel. A new roadway would extend south from the new bridge-tunnel, along the east side of the Craney Island Dredged Material Management Area (CIDMMA), and connect to existing VA 164. VA 164 would be widened to I-664.

Alternative C would include improvements along I-564, across the Elizabeth River, and south to VA 164 that are included in Alternative B. However, this alternative does not include improvements to I-64 or VA 164. Instead, this alternative would continue west from I-564 over water and tie into I-664. This alternative would widen I-664 from I-64 in Hampton to I-264 in Chesapeake. A parallel bridge-tunnel would be constructed west of the existing Monitor-Merrimac Memorial Bridge-Tunnel (MMMBT); the tunnel width would match the expanded capacity on the approaches. Alternative C also converts the

HOV lanes along I-564 in Norfolk to transit only. The I-564 Connector and the I-664 Connector would be constructed with one transit-only lane in each direction. These transit-only lanes continue in each direction north along I-664 to the terminus with I-64 in Hampton.

Alternative D would include improvements to I-64 between Hampton and Norfolk with a new parallel bridge-tunnel west of the existing HRBT. It also includes improvements along the existing I-564 corridor from I-64 west across the Elizabeth River via a new bridge-tunnel. A new roadway would extend south from the new bridge-tunnel, along the east side of CIDMMA, and connect to existing VA 164. VA 164 would be widened to I-664. I-664 would be widened from Hampton to Chesapeake with a new parallel bridge-tunnel west of the existing MMMBT.

12. WHAT IS AN OPERATIONALLY INDEPENDENT SECTION?

Each alternative considered in this Draft SEIS can be implemented and built using operationally independent sections (OISs). The OISs are provided for analysis purposes so that when it comes time to identify a Preferred Alternative, identification of OISs may allow one alternative to incorporate less costly or less environmentally damaging sections, creating a hybrid alternative not currently considered. Decision-makers may employ this approach to advance an alternative that balances cost, impacts, and effectiveness while meeting the elements of Purpose and Need. More detail on OISs are provided in **Chapter 2** of the Draft SEIS.

13. WHEN WILL A PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE BE IDENTIFIED?

After the publication of this Draft SEIS, there will be a 45-day public comment period in accordance with 40 CFR 1506.10. This comment period will include Location Public Hearings that will provide an opportunity for the public to review and discuss the results of the study with study team members. Following the comment period, the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) will be briefed on the study; the alternative that FHWA, VDOT, and the Cooperating Agencies recommended as the Preferred Alternative; and the public and agency input that has been received to date. It is anticipated that following this briefing, the CTB will identify a Preferred Alternative. FHWA and VDOT will prepare a Final SEIS to document the Preferred Alternative and respond to substantive comments received on the Draft SEIS.

14. HOW WILL THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE BE IDENTIFIED?

Following the public comment period on the Draft SEIS, FHWA and VDOT will recommend to USACE the alternative the agencies believe should be identified as the Preferred Alternative and the preliminary Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA). This recommendation will be informed by the data presented in the Technical Reports and Draft SEIS. It will also be based on input received from the public during the Citizen Information Meetings, Location Public Hearings, and associated comment periods and input from the Cooperating and Participating Agencies. This may provide sufficient information for USACE to determine the preliminary LEDPA. The LEDPA is not identified until a permit application is submitted. Identifying a preliminary LEDPA as this stage in project development provides support that the Preferred Alternative is permissible and can be implemented via individual projects/permits. Once USACE had concurred on this recommendation, it will be presented to the Cooperating Agencies for concurrence as the recommended Preferred Alternative. This recommendation will then be presented to the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) for official action. If approved by the CTB, the Preferred Alternative will be carried forward to the Final SEIS.

15. COULD THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE BE A COMBINATION OF THE ALTERNATIVES EVALAUTED IN THE SEIS?

Consistent with the response to Question 11, the Preferred Alternative may be a combination of OISs from the different alternatives under consideration in order to balance cost, impacts, and the alternative's ability to meet the Purpose and Need, resulting in a hybrid alternative not evaluated as a stand-alone alternative in the Draft SEIS. Should decision makers select a hybrid alternative as the Preferred Alternative, it will be fully documented in the Final SEIS. Depending on the nature of a hybrid alternative, if selected, public involvement opportunities may be offered to solicit additional public comment.

This Draft SEIS includes impact information broken down by OISs to inform the development of potential hybrid alternatives (**Appendix A**).

16. IS TRANSIT BEING CONSIDERED?

Each alternative retained for analysis in this SEIS accommodates transit. In some cases, as with Alternative C, this occurs through dedicated transit lanes and offers a competitive time advantage to transit operations. For other alternatives, transit operations occur in lanes open to other vehicles. Specific descriptions of how transit could operate under each alternative are included in **Chapter 2** of this Draft SEIS. If appropriate, additional transit modeling would occur once the Preferred Alternative is identified and would be summarized in the Final SEIS.

During the initiation of the HRCS SEIS, the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transit (DRPT) and Hampton Roads Transit Agency provided preliminary ridership projections for rail and bus transit along the Study Area Corridors. As a result of this preliminary analysis, DRPT recommended that dedicated light rail transit should not continue to be studied. DRPT also noted that the results of the preliminary analysis supported continued study of high frequency Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) service in a fixed guideway or in shared high occupancy vehicle (HOV) or high occupancy toll (HOT) lanes. Therefore, BRT is the mode of transit considered in this Draft SEIS.

17. WILL THERE BE TOLLS?

The alternatives in the SEIS can accommodate general purpose lanes, HOV lanes, HOT lanes, or lanes tolled/managed in other ways. The traffic analysis for the Draft SEIS was based on general purpose lanes and in the case of Alternative C, general purpose lanes and dedicated transit lanes. If the identified Preferred Alternative includes a specific toll or management scenario, that scenario would be documented and analyzed in the Final SEIS. It should be noted that the identification of HOV, HOT, or toll management is not required to conclude the NEPA process. Such decisions could be made after the NEPA process, when more detailed design and cost estimating would occur.

18. HOW WOULD TRAFFIC ON THE HRBT AND MMMBT CHANGE?

The impact to traffic volumes on the HRBT and MMMBT depends on the alternative under consideration. In general, travel demand across Hampton Roads is projected to increase between now and 2040. This increased travel demand will result in increases in daily traffic on both the HRBT and the MMMBT even without any improvements (No Build alternative).

When capacity is added on either the HRBT or MMMBT, traffic will tend to shift to the facility with the most capacity. Under Alternatives A and B, the HRBT would see additional increases in traffic daily volume compared to No Build conditions, while traffic volumes on the MMMBT would decrease slightly. Conversely, traffic volumes would decrease on the HRBT and would increase on the MMMBT under Alternative C, compared to No Build conditions. Under Alternative D, which includes widening on both the HRBT and the MMMBT, the overall increase in traffic volumes would be spread between the two bridge-tunnels, and traffic volumes on both the HRBT and MMMBT are projected to be higher than those under No Build conditions.

19. WOULD REGIONAL TRAFFIC PATTERNS CHANGE?

Regional traffic patterns would change in concert with the shift in traffic between the HRBT and MMMBT, depending on where tunnel capacity is increased. In addition, local roadways that parallel the Study Area Corridors that would be widened under the project and currently accommodate spill-over traffic could experience traffic volume reductions as drivers gravitate to improved roadways with better travel conditions.

20. WHAT IMPACTS ARE ANTICIPATED TO RESULT FROM THE ALTERNATIVES?

Potential environmental consequences of the alternatives were estimated based on each alternative’s limit of disturbance (LOD). The LOD has been identified for alternative comparison purposes and decision-making during the NEPA process and would be further refined during final design. Proposed impacts of the alternatives are summarized in **Table S-1**. Values provided include both permanent and temporary impacts.

Table S-1: Impact Matrix

Resource	No-Build Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Right-of-Way number of properties (acres)	0	86 (10.3)	130 (248.9)	201 (340.6)	248 (319.6)
Residential	0	24 (0.5)	29 (0.6)	58 (1.9)	69 (2.1)
Commercial	0	6 (1.3)	10 (2.7)	23 (4.7)	23 (5.5)
Industrial	0	6 (0.9)	14 (54.8)	35 (104.2)	33 (94.1)
Institutional	0	9 (2.8)	14 (113.3)	15 (117.7)	20 (120.1)
Military	0	4 (0.6)	7 (22.5)	3 (23.2)	7 (22.5)
Open Space	0	14 (1.1)	27 (23.9)	59 (44.1)	66 (44.0)
Other	0	23 (3.1)	29 (31.2)	8 (44.9)	30 (31.2)
Potential Residential Relocations	0	9	9	11	20
Potential Commercial Relocations	0	0	0	5	4
Other Relocations*	0	2	4	8	9
Military Facilities # (acres)	0	1 (22.4)	4 (162.9)	4 (168.1)	4 (163.7)

Resource	No-Build Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Number of Census Block Groups with Environmental Justice Populations Present	0	8	17	25	35
Community Facilities (#)	0	2	3	4	5
Parks & Recreation	0	1	2	2	3
Place of Worship	0	0	0	1	0
Cemetery	0	0	0	0	0
School / University	0	1	1	1	2
Land Use (acres)	0	27.8	260.4	333.0	335.9
Residential	0	0.5	0.6	2.6	2.7
Commercial	0	1.8	3.2	6.3	7.5
Industrial	0	0.7	72.1	119.9	112.1
Institutional	0	2.8	113.3	117.4	119.8
Military	0	20.8	47.4	40.4	47.4
Open Space	0	1.2	23.9	46.4	46.4
Section 4(f) Properties (#)	0	6	7	5	9
Farmland	0	0	0	0	0
Stream Impacts (linear feet)	0	0	0	547.9	547.9
Navigable Waters (acres)	0	147.3	215.6	369.9	480.9
Maintained Navigable Channels	0	12.3	24.4	57.1	62.3
Wetlands (acres)	0	7.8	72.6	111.5	119.9
Resource Protection Areas (acres)	0	1.1	16.0	139.8	127.1
Floodplains (acres)	0	112.6	213.3	213.3	313.3
Hampton Roads Aquatic Habitat (acres)	0	155.7	201.2	572.6	660.7
Benthic Communities	0	153.9	240.7	664.7	741.5
Essential Fish Habitat, Habitat Areas of Particular Concern, and Anadromous Fish Use Areas (acres)	0	138.4	214.3	565.4	636.3
Threatened & Endangered Species Habitat (acres)	0	1.0	111.9	163.9	153.7
Submerged Aquatic Vegetation (acres)	0	1.8	1.8	0	1.8
Terrestrial Habitat (Forested Area) (acres)	0	14.9	73.1	179.5	177.6
Water Quality	No impact	Short-term and minor, beneficial long-term impacts			
Historic Architecture Resources (#)	0	6	11	10	16
Archaeology Resources (#)	0	6	10	26	33
Noise Impacts (#)	0	953	1,987	1,014	2,548

Resource	No-Build Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Air Quality	No impact	Minor Short-term Impacts	Minor Short-term Impacts	Minor Short-term Impacts	Minor Short-term Impacts
Potential Hazardous Materials Sites	0	27	70	194	232
Visual Impacts	No impact	Minor to moderate			
Energy Requirements and Conservation Potential	No impact	Minor energy requirements			

Notes: Right-of-Way data was gathered from each of the localities. Land use data was gathered from HRTPO. *Other parcels include industrial, institutional, military, and open space.

21. HOW MUCH WILL EACH ALTERNATIVE COST?

The estimated construction costs of each alternative are provided by each alignment section that makes up the operationally independent sections of the alternatives. Detailed cost estimates are provided in **Chapter 2** and summarized in **Table S-2** below. The costs are in 2016 dollars and include a 40 percent contingency. Once a Preferred Alternative is identified, refinement of that alternative in the Final SEIS could result in updates to the costs presented in this Draft SEIS.

Table S-2: Alternative Cost Estimates

Cost Estimate Elements	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Construction Cost	\$3.0B	\$5.9B	\$11.2B	\$10.6B
Preliminary Engineering	\$237.6M	\$487.4M	\$857.9M	\$809.3M
Right-of-Way and Utilities	\$68.8M	\$224.9M	\$466.3M	\$466.0M
Total Cost	\$3.3B	\$6.6B	\$12.5B	\$11.9B

22. WHEN WILL THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE BE CONSTRUCTED?

There is no schedule for construction at this time, and there are a number of steps that would need to occur before construction could begin on a Preferred Alternative. Following the Draft SEIS and Location Public Hearings, a Preferred Alternative will be identified and a Final SEIS will be prepared. Before FHWA can issue its ROD for the project, funding will need to be identified to construct the project, and that funding will need to be programmed in the Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization’s (HRTPO) Long Range Transportation Plan and Transportation Improvement Program, as well as the VDOT Statewide Transportation Improvement Program. Once a ROD is issued, decisions would be made on how the project funding will be procured. These decisions would affect the sequence and timing of subsequent steps like detailed design, acquisition of permits, right-of-way activities, and construction.

23. HOW HAS THE PUBLIC BEEN INVOLVED IN THE STUDY?

Public input has been solicited since the study began and will continue throughout the study process. As part of the NOI to prepare the SEIS (published in June 2015), FHWA solicited input on issues that should be considered in the study. At the same time, VDOT initiated scoping to gather information from a variety of local, state, and Federal agencies and the public. Two rounds of Citizen Information Meetings were held in July and December of 2015 to present the public with study information and to solicit feedback on the conduct of study, Purpose and Need, and alternatives to be retained for analysis. Email updates have been regularly sent to a study mailing list which includes citizens who have requested more information on the study. The project website, www.HamptonRoadsCrossingStudy.org, has been regularly updated with study information, public meeting materials, and various technical studies and documents. The website also provides the public with an option to submit comments to VDOT at any time. EPA issued a Notice of Availability for this Draft SEIS in the Federal Register to notify the public that the document is available for review and comment, and VDOT has used a number of strategies to notify the public of the document's availability. VDOT will conduct Location Public Hearings within the 45-day comment period for the Draft SEIS and notify the public of the Hearing dates and locations via mailings and newspapers and project website notifications.

24. WHAT OPPORTUNITIES HAVE BEEN PROVIDED FOR AGENCIES TO BE ENGAGED IN THE STUDY?

At the onset of the study agencies and localities were invited to be Participating and Cooperating Agencies (see details provided in **Appendix C** [Coordination Plan]). FHWA and VDOT have held and will continue to hold regular meetings with the Cooperating Agencies to keep them informed and engaged as the study progresses. The Federal Cooperating Agencies have been asked to provide written concurrence on the various study elements including: Purpose and Need, Alternatives Considered, and the recommended Preferred Alternative/preliminary LEDPA. The Cooperating Agencies have reviewed drafts of the supporting technical documents and the preliminary Draft SEIS. VDOT and FHWA have also had a number of meetings with the Participating Agencies and have afforded them an opportunity to review and comment on the Purpose and Need of the project as well as the Alternatives Considered. Finally, VDOT has briefed other agencies, localities, and groups as the study has progressed (see **Chapter 6** for more detail).

25. HOW CAN THE PUBLIC COMMENT ON THIS SUPPLEMENTAL EIS?

The public will be notified in local newspapers, other media outlets, and the Federal Register when the Draft SEIS is available for public review. Pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.10 and 23 CFR 771.123(i), the public (including local, state and federal public agencies) will be provided at least 45 calendar days to review and provide comments on the Draft SEIS after the Federal Register notice. VDOT will also hold a Location Public Hearing approximately 30 days following the Federal Register notice pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.6(c) and 23 CFR 771.111(h). Comments may be submitted to VDOT electronically using the project website (www.HamptonRoadsCrossingStudy.org) or at the Location Public Hearing by oral testimony or written comment form. Additional information regarding how to comment will be included in the public notices.

All comments received during the 45-day comment period on the Draft SEIS, including at the Location Public Hearing, will be considered and all substantive comments will be addressed in the Final SEIS, which is scheduled for Spring 2017.

26. WHAT ARE THE NEXT STEPS?

Following the publication of this Draft SEIS there will be a 45-day comment period in accordance with 40 CFR 1506.10. During this time the Draft SEIS will be made available for review and the results will be presented at the Location Public Hearings. Following the comment period, VDOT and FHWA will coordinate with USACE to identify the preliminary LEDPA. Once the agencies have agreed on the preliminary LEDPA, VDOT, FHWA, and the other Federal Cooperating Agencies will concur on the recommended preferred alternative. This recommendation will be presented to the CTB along with the study findings and input received on the Draft SEIS. If the CTB approves the Preferred Alternative, a Final SEIS will be prepared to document the Preferred Alternative and respond to substantive comments received on this Draft SEIS. Once funding is identified for the Preferred Alternative, FHWA will be in a position to issue a ROD.