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AGENCY COORDINATION PLAN

1.0 Purpose of Coordination Plan

Section 6002 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Act: a Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) requires that the lead agencies establish a plan for coordinating public and agency participation and comment during the environmental review process associated with the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

The purpose of this Coordination Plan is to define the process by which South Carolina Department of Transportation (SCDOT) will communicate information about the I-526 Mark Clark Expressway EIS project to the public and to the lead, cooperating, participating, and other agencies. The plan also identifies how input from agencies and the public will be solicited and considered.

The Coordination Plan integrates the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (NEPA) requirements with other environmental review and consultation requirements in order to reduce delay in the environmental review process. This plan has been prepared in collaboration with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and SCDOT for the completion of the I-526 Mark Clark Expressway in Charleston County, South Carolina.

This Coordination plan will:

- Identify the early coordination efforts;
- Identify cooperating and participating agencies to be involved in agency coordination;
- Establish the timing and form for agency involvement in defining the project’s purpose and need and study area, the range of alternatives to be investigated and methodologies, as well reviewing the preliminary Draft EIS (DEIS);
- Establish the timing and form for public opportunities to be involved in defining the project’s purpose and need and study area and the range of alternatives to be investigated, providing input on issues of concern and environmental features, and commenting on the findings presented in the DEIS and the Final EIS (FEIS);
- Describe the communication methods that will be implemented to inform the community about the project.

A mutual interagency effort is needed to achieve timely resolution of issues. Through this Coordination Plan the Cooperating and Participating Agencies agree to:
• Encourage constructive communication to avoid unnecessary stress on interagency relationships;

• Recognize disagreements as they occur and initiate dispute resolution procedures;

• Keep decision making at the team level, with staff who have specific project knowledge and relevant expertise; and

• Quickly elevate unresolved issues to higher-level decision makers, so they may apply a broader policy perspective, where needed.

The Coordination Plan will be updated periodically to reflect any changes to the project schedule and other items that typically require updating over the course of the project.

2.0 Project Background

Since the early 1970s, plans have been in place to complete the Mark Clark Expressway (I-526) connecting West Ashley, Johns Island, and James Island. A Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the Charleston Inner Belt Freeway (the future I-526) was completed in 1972 and portions constructed by the early 1990s. In 1995, a Draft Supplemental DEIS was prepared for the remaining portion of the original alignment, which connected US 17 (Savannah Highway) in West Ashley to the James Island Expressway on James Island. The SEIS recommended the same alignment that had been chosen in the 1972 FEIS, with a few adjustments to account for development and James Island County Park. This alignment did not move forward to construction due to a lack of funding.

In November 2004, the voters of Charleston County approved a transportation half-cent sales tax. In 2006, Charleston County applied for and received a commitment for funding from the South Carolina Transportation Infrastructure Bank (SIB).

SCDOT, in association with FHWA, Charleston County and the SIB, will move this important project forward through the planning phase with a new EIS, with the eventual goal of acquiring right-of-way and construction. SCDOT will develop the EIS, a process that will include the evaluation of alternatives and comparison of impacts on both the natural and human environment. The proposed completion of I-526 will add approximately 7 miles of new roadway between its current endpoint at US 17 (Savannah Highway) and the James Island Expressway Interchange at Folly Road.

As part of this study, a Purpose and Need Statement will be developed and refined based on input from agencies and the public during the initial coordination/scoping period. The purpose of the project, as defined in the previous environmental studies (the FEIS from 1972 and the Supplemental DEIS from 1995), is to improve the mobility in the surrounding areas by serving the anticipated future traffic growth. Proposed improvements will take into account the needs of neighboring communities and residents, along with the consideration of social, environmental and economic impacts of these improvements.
Preliminary needs have been identified for the project. As the project develops, these needs may be further refined. The needs have been identified as follows:

- Improve hurricane evacuation routes;
- Improve safety;
- Provide connectivity; and
- Improve traffic flow on area roadways.

Alternatives to be evaluated are expected to include: (1) No-build; (2) Transportation System Management (TSM); (3) alternative modes of transportation and (4) build alternatives including upgrades to existing roads and one or more new location alternatives. The alternatives to be investigated in the EIS will be developed with input from agencies and the public during the initial coordination/scoping period and subsequent agency and public involvement opportunities.
Figure 2: Draft Supplemental EIS - 1995 Preferred Alignment Map
3.0 Project Coordination

This section outlines the formal activities to initiate the study, definitions of the agencies coordination responsibilities, other organizations involvement and early coordination requirements of Section 106.

3.1 Project Initiation

On December 3, 2007, in conformance with the requirements of SAFETEA-LU, SCDOT formally notified FHWA in writing of its intent to initiate the NEPA EIS process for this project.

3.2 Notice of Intent

Following the project initiation, a Notice of Intent (NOI) to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement, as required by CEQ regulations 40 CFR 1501.7 was prepared. The NOI was published in the Federal Register on January 9, 2008.

The initial coordination/scoping process was initiated in order to obtain comments and input from agencies and the public to help determine the purpose and need for the project, alternatives to be evaluated, and the issues that will be examined as part of the EIS process. Notification of the Public Scoping Meeting was published in project area newspapers: The Post and Courier – March 28, 2008, The James Island Journal – April 3, 2008, The Charleston Chronicle - April 2, 2008, and Island Life News Magazine – insert placed in the March/April 2008 edition on April 1, 2008.

3.3 Initial Coordination Package

SCDOT prepared an Initial Coordination Package that was distributed to the federal, state and local agencies that have been invited by letter (April 9, 2008) to an Initial Agency Scoping Meeting for this project. The Agency Scoping Meeting will be held on April 29, 2008. The packages included a transmittal letter, a project summary, a Draft Agency Coordination and Public Involvement Plan, and a project vicinity map.

3.4 Cooperating and Participating Agencies

3.4.1 Cooperating Agencies

Cooperating Agencies are those governmental agencies specifically requested by the lead agency to participate during the environmental evaluation process for the project. FHWA’s NEPA regulations (23CFR 771.111(d)) require that those federal agencies with jurisdiction by law (with permitting or land transfer authority) be invited to be Cooperating Agencies for an EIS.
The roles and responsibilities of cooperating and participating agencies are similar, but cooperating agencies have a higher degree of authority, responsibility, and involvement in the environmental review process. A distinguishing feature of a cooperating agency is that the CEQ regulations (40 CFR Section 1501.6) permit a cooperating agency to "assume on request of the lead agency responsibility for developing information and preparing environmental analyses including portions of the environmental impact statement concerning which the cooperating agency has special expertise." An additional distinction is that, pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.3, "a cooperating agency may adopt without re-circulating the environmental impact statement of a lead agency when, after an independent review of the statement, the cooperating agency concludes that its comments and suggestions have been satisfied."

This project will follow an outlined NEPA/404 Merger process established by FHWA, SCDOT and the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), therefore, the USACE is expected to be a cooperating agency for the development of the EIS. A copy of this merger process is included in Appendix A.

If new information reveals the need to request another agency to serve as a Cooperating Agency, SCDOT in consultation with FHWA, will issue that agency an invitation.

### 3.5 Participating Agencies

SAFETEA-LU (Section 6002) created a new category of agencies to participate in the environmental review process for EISs. These are federal and non-federal governmental agencies that may have an interest in the project because of their jurisdictional authority, special expertise, and/or statewide interest.

The roles and responsibilities of participating agencies include, but are not limited to:

- Participating in the NEPA process starting at the earliest possible time, especially with regard to the development of the purpose and need statement, range of alternatives, methodologies, and the level of detail for the analysis of alternatives.
- Identifying, as early as practicable, any issues of concern regarding the project's potential environmental or socioeconomic impacts. Participating agencies also may participate in the issue resolution process.
- Providing meaningful and timely input on unresolved issues.
- Participating in the scoping process.

Accepting the designation as a participating agency does not indicate project support and does not provide an agency with increased oversight or approval authority beyond its statutory limits.
These participating agencies are formally invited to participate in the environmental review of the project. After the Agency Scoping meeting, federal, state and local agencies will be invited by letter to be a participating agency for this project. Those who will be sent the letter of invitation are listed in Table 1.

If, during the progress of the project, new information indicates that an agency not previously requested to be a Participating Agency does indeed have authority, jurisdiction, acknowledged expertise or information relevant to the project, then SCDOT, in consultation with FHWA, will promptly extend an invitation to that agency to be a Participating Agency. SCDOT and FHWA will consider whether this new information affects any previous decisions on the project.

3.6 Other Governmental Agencies and Officials

This group may include federal, state, and local government agencies and officials with statewide interest to whom project information will be sent. A list of these agencies will be included and maintained in the Interested Parties List in Appendix A as the study progresses.

3.7 Non-Governmental Organizations

These are private organizations to whom project information will be sent. A list of these agencies is included in the Interested Parties List in Appendix A.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Agency Role</th>
<th>Contact Person/Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Patrick Tyndale/ Jessica Hekter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina Department of Transportation (SCDOT)</td>
<td>Joint Lead</td>
<td>David Kinard/ Chad Long/ Sean Connolly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston County</td>
<td>Joint Lead</td>
<td>Steve Thigpen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)</td>
<td>Cooperating</td>
<td>Elizabeth Williams/ Steve Brumagin USACE Project Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.C. Department of Health and Environmental Control (DHEC)</td>
<td>Cooperating</td>
<td>Mark Giffin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.C. DHEC Ocean and Coastal Resource Management (OCRM)</td>
<td>Cooperating</td>
<td>Barbara Neale Director of Regulatory Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Coast Guard</td>
<td>Cooperating</td>
<td>Randall Overton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley Charleston Dorchester – Council of Governments (BCDCOG)</td>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>Jeff Burns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Charleston</td>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>Herman Pena, Jr., Traffic and Transportation Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston County Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>Julie Hensley Director, Planning and Resource Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Aviation Administration</td>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>Douglas Murphy, Regional Administrator – Southern Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) – National Marine Fisheries</td>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>Kay Davy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.C. Department of Archives and History (SHPO)</td>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>David Kelly SCDOT Project Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.C. Department of Commerce</td>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>Lee Lawson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.C. Department of Natural Resources (DNR)</td>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>Susan Davis – Coast Env. Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.C. Emergency Management Division – Hurricane Coordinator</td>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>Mike Russell, Hurricane Program Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.C. State Ports Authority</td>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>Barbara Melvin, Manager of Govt. Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Agriculture Farm Service Agency (FSA)</td>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>J. Kenneth Rentiers, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)</td>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>Niles Glasgow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development</td>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>Louis Bradley, CPD Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)</td>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>Ramona McConney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)</td>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>Mark Caldwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catawba Indian Nation Tribal Historic Preservation Office</td>
<td>Consulting Party</td>
<td>Sandra Reinhardt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Charleston Museum</td>
<td>Consulting Party</td>
<td>John Brumgardt, Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.8 Section 106 Early Coordination

The agency official (FHWA) or its designee (SCDOT) may use its procedures for public involvement under NEPA to satisfy the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) or Section 106 requirements for public involvement as well, providing they offer adequate opportunities for public involvement. The NHPA requires the federal agency or its designee to seek the participation and consider the opinions on interested and appropriate parties throughout the Section 106 process including the identification and evaluation of cultural resources potentially affected by the project, the evaluation of project effects to historic properties, and the development of appropriate mitigation plans as needed. This involvement is referred to as consultation. SCDOT shall consider the nature of the project and the kinds of historic properties potentially affected to identify the appropriate individuals, organizations, and entities with whom SCDOT will consult. Because SCDOT considers Section 106 requirements early in the NEPA process, compliance with both statues is coordinated throughout the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native American Tribe</th>
<th>Contact Person/Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catawba Indian Nation</td>
<td>Chief Donald Rodgers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma</td>
<td>Chief Leo Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Tuscarora Nation</td>
<td>Chief Ron Sparkman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FHWA will be responsible for all coordination with Native American Tribes.

4.0 Environmental Streamlining Coordination Points

SAFETEA-LU incorporates changes aimed at improving and streamlining the environmental process for transportation projects. Lead and participating agencies have legal and general governmental obligations to work cooperatively to improve the environmental review process. The roles and responsibilities specified in Section 6002 for lead and participating agencies form a part of those obligations.

The intent of coordination points is to set a deadline for agency input in order to move the project study forward. These coordination points do not require concurrence or total agreement between agencies. If there is not concurrence, the lead agencies will take information into account when project decisions are being made.

The agencies listed above will at a minimum be participating at the following four coordination points in the environmental review process for the I-526 Mark Clark Expressway EIS:

- Purpose and Need and Study Area
- Reasonable Alternatives to be Evaluated in the DEIS and Methodologies for Alternatives Analysis;
- Sufficiency/adequacy of the Pre-Draft DEIS; and
- Designation of proposed recommended alternative and preliminary mitigation.
The process for coordination associated with each of the major milestones (coordination points) for this project is listed below.

4.1  Coordination Point 1 – Purpose and Need and Study Area

Based upon comments received during the scoping period from agencies and the public, a draft purpose and need for the project will be prepared and submitted by SCDOT to FHWA for internal review. Upon incorporation of comments from FHWA, SCDOT will prepare and forward to the participating agencies the revised purpose and need statement and project study area map. If needed, a revised Coordination Plan will also be sent to the agencies. Additionally, information that may be included is the following:

- Description of the core objectives of the proposed action, and any secondary objectives;
- Explanation of the basis for the project in terms of:
  - Relevant Federal, state or local policies, which may include transportation, economic conditions, land use conditions, and other conditions;
  - Relevant data that may include information on transportation conditions, economic conditions, land use conditions, and other conditions;
  - Public and agency comments regarding the project’s objectives;
  - Define the categories and any other factors, such as cost, that will be considered in screening alternatives and used to reduce the number of preliminary alternatives to a reasonable number of alternatives;
  - Demonstration of the project’s logical termini and independent utility; and
  - A map detailing the study area.

The Participating Agencies will be given 30 days from receipt of the package to review and provide a response; a reminder will be sent to the agencies 7 days before the end of the review period. At the end of the 30-day period, SCDOT will consider agency input. A request can be made for a 15-day time extension. SCDOT will assume support from those agencies from whom it has not heard at the end of the 30-day period. The output of Coordination Point 1 should include input from the participating agencies on:

- The purpose and need statement and the study area of the project;
- The Coordination Plan; and
- Preliminary range of alternatives to be considered; and
- Provide input on environmental features, resources, and issues of concern.

Based on the output of Coordination Point 1, SCDOT will use public and agency input to revise as appropriate the Purpose and Need statement, the study area description, and Coordination Plan. Following this activity, SCDOT will hold a public information meeting to provide information to the public on the Purpose and Need statement and alternatives to be evaluated and to solicit comments.
4.2 **Coordination Point 2 – Reasonable Alternatives to be Evaluated**

Based on the output of Coordination Point 1, as well as the public meeting on purpose and need/preliminary alternatives, and preliminary alternatives analysis, SCDOT will prepare an information packet on the Reasonable Alternatives to be Evaluated. This information will be forwarded to the participating agencies and may include the following:

- Revised Purpose and Need statement and study area description;
- Revised Coordination Plan;
- Qualitative results of the preliminary alternatives analysis and environmental screening (based on existing data sources and GIS inventories);
- Define the categories and any other factors, such as cost, that will be considered in screening alternatives and used to reduce the number of preliminary alternatives to a reasonable number of alternatives;
- Methodologies to be used to assess impacts and level of detail required in the analysis of each alternative;
- Discussion of the no-build alternative; and
- A summary of all reasonable alternatives to be evaluated and their anticipated effectiveness in addressing the purpose and need of the project, as well as a map showing the location of the project alternatives.

The Participating Agencies will be given 30 days from receipt of the information to review and provide a response; a reminder will be sent to the agencies 7 days before the end of the review period. At the end of the 30-day period, SCDOT will consider agency input. A request can be made for a 15-day time extension. SCDOT will assume support from those agencies from whom it has not heard at the end of the 30-day period. The output of Coordination Point 2 should include input from the participating agencies on:

- Appropriate impact methodologies to be used and the level of detail required to screen SCDOT’s preferred alternative;
- The alternatives to be carried forward into the DEIS.

Following this activity, SCDOT will hold a public information meeting to provide information on the alternatives to be carried forward into the DEIS. The project website will also be updated with this information.

4.3 **Coordination Point 3 – Preliminary DEIS Document**

Based on the output of Coordination Point 2 and the subsequent detailed investigation of alternatives and analysis of impacts, SCDOT will prepare a Preliminary DEIS document. Cooperating agencies will be sent a copy of the Preliminary DEIS for review. SCDOT will inquire of Participating Agencies interest in reviewing and commenting on the Preliminary DEIS document.
The Participating Agencies will be given 30 days from receipt of the Preliminary DEIS document to review and provide a response; a reminder will be sent to the agencies 7 days before the end of the review period. At the end of the 30-day period, SCDOT will consider agency input. A request can be made for a 15-day time extension.

The output of Coordination Point 3 should include input on the adequacy of the preliminary DEIS. The agencies will be asked to specify whether additional information is needed to fulfill other applicable environmental reviews or consultation requirements. In addition, the participating agencies will specify any additional information needed to comment adequately on the draft DEIS analysis of site specific effects associated with the granting or approving by the agency of necessary permits, licenses, or entitlements.

Based on the output from this coordination point, SCDOT will prepare the DEIS for FHWA and USACE review. Based on FHWA approval of DEIS and the USACE concurrence memo, the DEIS will be circulated. After approval of the DEIS the Section 404 Individual Permit application will be submitted to the USACE. The document will be made available for a minimum 45-day public and agency review period.

4.4 Coordination Point 4 - Designation of proposed recommended alternative and preliminary mitigation.

Based on the output of Coordination Point 3, along with SCDOT and FHWA’s consideration of any issues, concerns and/or opportunities identified during the public hearings and comment period for the DEIS, SCDOT will prepare a Preferred Alternative and Preliminary Mitigation Package. The package to be forwarded to the participating agencies may include the following information:

- A quantitative table listing the various impacts of SCDOT’s preferred alternative;
- Rationale for recommending the preferred alternative;
- A preliminary mitigation summary describing the various elements of the proposed mitigation, including a map locating the impacts of the preferred alternative and preliminary mitigation; and
- A summary of major public and agency comments.

The Participating Agencies will be given 30 days from receipt of the package to review and provide a response; a reminder will be sent to the agencies 7 days before the end of the review period. At the end of the 30-day period, SCDOT will consider agency input. A request can be made for a 15-day time extension. SCDOT will assume support from those agencies from whom it has not heard at the end of the 30-day period.

The output of Coordination Point 4 should include comments from the participating agencies on the selection of the preferred alternative and preliminary mitigation. When avoidance of impacts to a resource is not practicable, participating agencies with jurisdiction by law or special expertise will assist SCDOT in determining appropriate and practicable mitigation, including all practicable measures to minimize harm. If the
agency determines that it does not have enough information to make a recommendation on mitigation measures, it will comment to that effect.

If the project impacts are deemed substantial by a regulatory agency to the extent that permits would probably be denied, the participating agencies will advise the lead agencies to modify the project to reduce impacts.

Based on output from this coordination point, SCDOT will select a preferred alternative and prepare the FEIS document for submittal to FHWA.

Based on FHWA’s approval of the FEIS, the FEIS will be made available for public and agency review for a minimum of 30 days. This period is the last period during which comments on the environmental evaluation process will be received from the public and agencies. Upon addressing the comments received in the comment period, SCDOT will forward a Record of Decision (ROD) to FHWA with the FEIS.

4.5 Integrated NEPA Process

The Integrated NEPA/404 Merger Process was developed by SCDOT, FHWA and USACE to streamline the environmental review process and to eliminate duplicate efforts from FHWA and USACE. The I-526 Mark Clark Expressway project is the initial project which will follow the NEPA/404 Merger Process. This process is outlined in Appendix B.

4.6 Public Hearings

One or more public hearings will be conducted in accordance with NEPA requirements and as outlined in the project’s Public Involvement Plan.

FHWA will submit the Notice of availability for publication in the Federal Register. USACE will advertise SCDOT and FHWA’s Public Hearing in the Public Notice for 30 days and a joint public hearing will be held.

4.7 FEIS

Substantive comments received during the 45-day review for the DEIS period will be addressed in FEIS. The USACE Public Interest Review Factors will be addressed in the FEIS.

Based on FHWA’s approval of the FEIS, the FEIS will be made available for public and agency review for a minimum of 30 days. This period is the last period during which comments on the environmental evaluation process will be received from the public and agencies. Upon addressing the substantive comments received in the FEIS comment periods, SCDOT will prepare a Record of Decision (ROD) indicating the Selected Alternative. FHWA approval of the ROD completes the NEPA process for the project.
4.8 Other Opportunities for Agency Involvement

Those agencies that are not “Participating Agencies” as defined in SAFETEA-LU will also have opportunities to provide input and comments on the project as it moves forward. The database of agencies developed as part of ongoing coordination efforts will be maintained and updated throughout the EIS process. Those agencies that participated in public meetings and/or provided input/comment during project development will receive notification of the DEIS and the FEIS.

Comments may be received at any point during project development.

4.9 Issue Resolution Process

The Federal Lead Agency (FHWA), Joint Lead Agency (SCDOT) and Cooperating and Participating Agencies shall work together in accordance with this section to identify and resolve issues that could delay completion of the environmental review process or could result in denial of any approvals required for the project under applicable laws.

Based on information received from the Federal Lead Agency (FHWA), Joint Lead Agency (SCDOT) and Cooperating and Participating Agencies shall identify, as early as practicable, any issues of concern regarding the project’s potential environmental or socio-economic impacts. Issues of concern include any issues that could substantially delay or prevent the granting of a permit or other approval that is needed for the project.

Reasons to initiate the Dispute Resolution Process include, but are not limited to:

- Unresolved disagreements at coordination points;
- Lack of response within agreed-upon time limits;
- Substantive departure from the interagency coordination process;
- Disagreement over adequacy or interpretation of information;
- Disagreement on the nature and extent of impacts; and
- Disagreement over application of legal requirements.

A proposed resolution process is outlined below:

- Level One - Resolution through intensified communication on an issue includes: recognition that there is an issue that needs to be resolved; clear articulation of that issue and bringing the issue to the attention of the other agencies; open and respectful discussion of the issue in a forum specifically focused on that issue, where all perspectives are aired and heard; joint problem solving to seek a solution that will satisfy the diverse needs of the various agencies involved; and documentation of decisions.

- Level Two – Elevation to a focused, informal discussion between interested agencies at higher levels of authority. The goal of elevation is to move unresolved issues quickly up to the next level of decision making, where there is broader perspective and more authority.
- **Level Three** - Any issue not resolved by Level Two will be referred to the highest state and regional officials of each agency (Level Three). This will be the final arbiter of unresolved issues.

### 4.10 Facilitation as a Tool to Aid Issue Resolution

To aid deliberations and keep discussions focused and constructive, the agencies may enlist the assistance of internal or outside facilitators to provide management of communication and meetings. When appropriate, SCDOT or FHWA will arrange for facilitation services to help resolve issues at any level in the dispute resolution process.

### 5.0 Schedule

The anticipated schedule for the completion of the EIS and issuance of a ROD for this project is Winter 2011. This schedule will be revised/updated as the project moves forward and new information is revealed that may result in schedule adjustments.

The following list identifies the schedule highlights:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>April, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Information Meetings</td>
<td>Fall, 2008 – Spring, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCDOT’s Preferred Alternative</td>
<td>Summer, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft EIS</td>
<td>Summer, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearing</td>
<td>Summer, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEIS</td>
<td>Fall, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA ROD</td>
<td>Winter, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USACE ROD</td>
<td>Winter, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor ROW Plans</td>
<td>Fall, 2010 – Winter, 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PLAN

6.0 Opportunities for Public Involvement

As required by SAFTEA-LU Section 6002, the public will be provided opportunities to provide specific input on the Purpose and Need and the range of alternatives. A project specific plan for public input has been developed which outlines the opportunities to be provided to the public to be involved in the project development process and describes strategies for encouraging public input, as required by NEPA.

6.1 Introduction

The Public Involvement Plan is designed to provide a clear description of how SCDOT will solicit input, develop two-way communication with communities, local citizens, and other interested parties, document public opinions regarding the proposed I-526 Mark Clark Expressway within the study area.

6.2 Interested Parties and Key Messages

6.2.1 Interested Parties

The initial interested parties for the I-526 Mark Clark Expressway study are included in Appendix A. This list is not all inclusive, as interested parties are identified, they will be added to the list.

6.2.2 Key Messages

There are several key messages that will be emphasized and communicated to the public throughout the study. These messages are intended to support the goals of the Public Involvement Plan:

- The study is an objective process to help determine what actions, if any, are needed to best serve the transportation needs of the area.
- Before a major highway project can be constructed, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) requires the completion of an environmental study.
- This study is expected to be complete by November, 2010.
- There is funding for construction through the SIB application.
- SCDOT encourages the public’s participation and will actively seek out and engage all who may be affected.
- The public has a voice in the decision-making process and SCDOT will listen to and consider all input.
6.3 Public Outreach Activities

6.3.1 Public Meetings and Public Hearing

One public scoping meeting (April 10, 2008), two public information meetings (between November, 2008 and November, 2009) and one public hearing (February, 2010) will be held to communicate the study objectives with the public as well as gather comments/recommendations about the study, possible impacts and potential solutions.

The public scoping and information meetings will be held within or adjacent to the study area. The meetings will be held in an open-house format with the opportunity for attendees to view display boards and graphics, and talk one-on-one with project staff. Comment forms will be available at each of these meetings and attendees will be encouraged to provide written comments, questions, and concerns that they have regarding the project. No formal presentations are planned for information meetings.

A summary of the meetings will be prepared following each public meeting. The summary will be included in the Public Involvement Chapter of the EIS.

In accordance with NEPA and SCDOT requirements, public hearings will be held in conjunction with the identification of SCDOT’s preferred alternative and the publication of the Draft EIS. The public hearing will consist of an open-house format with members of the study team on hand to meet with the public. The open-house portion of the hearing will be followed by a formal presentation with the opportunity for the public to make verbal comments. The study team will prepare an official transcript of the public hearing.

Notification of the public meetings and the hearings will be accomplished by the website, hotline, mailings of meeting notification postcards, signs within the study area, the project newsletter, distribution of news releases and/or other materials to appropriate media.

Comment forms will be distributed at each public meeting and at the public hearing to gather written feedback from meeting/hearing attendees. A tape recorder will also be used to record any oral comments from attendees. Attendees have at least 15 days to return comments.

6.3.2 Community Groups, Business, Civic and Special Interest Organizations Update Meetings

Briefings with community/civic groups, business groups, or other interested groups or organizations over the course of the EIS process will be used as an opportunity to introduce the project, provide project updates, and receive public input on the project. SCDOT will be available for community groups/
neighborhood update meetings which will be held in the project area throughout the development of the EIS.

6.3.3 Interested Parties/Governmental Officials Update Meetings

Briefings with local interested parties/government officials will be used over the course of the EIS process as an opportunity to provide updates at project milestones and facilitate the flow of information between city/county/local officials, SCDOT and FHWA. SCDOT will be available for other interested parties/government officials update meeting which will be held in the project area throughout the development of the EIS.

A large number of elected officials have a strong interest in this project, including members of the federal Congressional Delegation, South Carolina State Senators and Representatives, county officials (such as county council members and county managers/administrators), and municipal officials (mayors, council members, and administrators).

6.3.4 Identification of Special Outreach Areas

Populations may be identified in the project area that require special outreach to ensure they have access to information and the opportunity to make comments, regardless of race, religion, age, income or disability. Identification of these populations may include using Census data, information obtained from field investigations, public meeting sign-in sheets, mailing lists and groups or organizations known to have knowledge of these populations. Database addresses may be geo-coded and tracked to identify areas where participation and/or input is lacking.

If any of these populations are identified within the project area, special effort will be made to meet with leaders in these communities, go to activity centers such as churches and social service organizations to inform, educate and seek input from residents and businesses in these areas. Special attention will be paid to tailor materials and outreach techniques to these communities to ensure full and fair participation of all populations throughout the EIS study process.

6.3.5 Media Relations

SCDOT will handle all contact with the media during the project. Project updates will be provided to the media at major project milestones. Notices of public meetings and hearings will be advertised in local media outlets. Minority media outlets will be included.

Specific newspapers to be used are: The Post and Courier, The James Island Journal, The Charleston Chronicle, and Island Life News Magazine.
6.3.5.1 Public Service Messages in Newspapers, Radio and Television

Public involvement meetings will be advertised to maximize public participation. This will necessitate preparing Public Service Announcements (PSA). SCDOT will prepare and distribute Public Service Announcements to the appropriate media outlets before public meetings in order to advertise the date, time, and place, and to encourage as much participation as possible. SCDOT will also be available to appear on the Charleston County RoadWise cable access television show (30 minute segments related to transportation sales tax projects).

6.3.6 Project Newsletters

Six editions of a project newsletter will be published over the life of the project to keep project area residents, businesses and property owners, interested citizens, civic groups, schools, local agency officials, and local public officials informed of the progress and status of the project. Newsletters will be published both in print and on the Project Web Site for distribution in the study area.

6.3.7 Project Website Content

The website for the project, http://www.scdot.org/I526, will be updated with newsletters, public meeting announcements, frequently asked questions, and other project information as needed.

6.3.8 Project Telephone Hotline

The hotline for the project, 1-800-MCE-I526, will be updated with project information. The project hotline will include a recorded message that will provide information on upcoming project events/meetings, a brief project status and other project contact information. When you call, you may leave a project-related message that will be incorporated into the project file.

6.3.9 Project Database

A project database and mailing list of interested parties will be established at the outset and maintained throughout the project. It will be designed to allow for targeted mailings and updating information. This database will be designed to allow for innovative means for communicating with the public, and allowing for citizens to decide to receive project information electronically or by paper mail.

6.4 Public Involvement Notebook

A public involvement notebook will maintain a record of relevant media articles, meeting dates and summaries, mailing lists, and mailing distribution numbers. This notebook will be incorporated in the Agency Coordination and Public Involvement section of the EIS.
7.0 Revision History

Identify changes to the Coordination Plan. Note: If a schedule was included in the original coordination plan and it is the item that requires modification, concurrence on the schedule change is required only if the schedule is being shortened and then only from cooperating agencies, not all participating agencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6/11/08</td>
<td>Karen Hadley</td>
<td>Updated Table 1: Lead, Cooperating and Participating Agencies with agency responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8/26/08</td>
<td>Karen Hadley</td>
<td>Updated Table 1: Lead, Cooperating and Participating Agencies with agency responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3/24/09</td>
<td>Karen Hadley</td>
<td>Updated Table 1: Lead, Cooperating and Participating Agencies with agency responses. Updated Interested Parties List.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4/13/09</td>
<td>Jana Bean</td>
<td>Updated Table 1: updated contact person information Updated Interested Parties List.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8/13/09</td>
<td>Jana Bean</td>
<td>Updated Table 1: contact person information Updated dates of DEIS, Public Hearing, and SCDOT’s Preferred Alternative Changed to “SCDOT’s” Preferred Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5/25/10</td>
<td>Jana Bean</td>
<td>Updated Section 5.0 Schedule with revised completion dates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A

Interested Parties List
I-526 Interested Parties List
DRAFT

* - Denotes districts within direct project area

**SCDOT Commissioners**
District 1* – Danny Isaac
District 6* – Marvin Stevenson

**Charleston County Council Members**
District 1 – Joe McKeown
District 2 – Dickie Schweers
District 3 – J. Elliott Summey
District 4 – Henry Darby
District 5 – Teddie Pryor, Sr.
District 6 – A. Victor Rawls
District 7 – Colleen Condon
District 8* – Curtis Inabinett
District 9* – Paul Thurmond

**Charleston County Representatives**
Allen O’Neal, County Administrator
Jim Armstrong, Program Manager Charleston County RoadWise

**City of Charleston**
Mayor Joseph P. Riley
Hernan Pena, Director, Traffic & Transportation
Josh Martin, Director, Planning & Neighborhoods

**City Council – City of Charleston**
District 1 – Gary White, Jr
District 2 – Deborah Morinelli
District 3 – James Lewis, Jr.
District 4 – Robert Mitchell
District 5 – Jimmy Gallant, III
District 6 – William Gregorie
District 7* – Louis L. Waring
District 8* – Yvonne Evans
District 9* – Aubry Alexander
District 10 – Larry Shirley
District 11* – Timothy Mallard
District 12 – Kathleen Wilson

Town of James Island*
Mayor Mary Clark

City of Folly Beach
Mayor Carl Beckmann, Jr.

Town of Kiawah Island
Mayor William Wert

Town of Seabrook Island
Mayor Frank McNulty

Town of Rockville
Mayor Libby Holst

Town of Meggett
Mayor Grange Coffin, Jr.

Berkeley – Charleston – Dorchester Council of Governments
Ron Mitchum, Executive Director

State Infrastructure Bank Board Members

Charleston County Legislative Delegation

Senate (District)
Ray Cleary (34)
Larry Grooms (37)
Randy Scott (38)
Glenn McConnell (41)
Robert Ford (42)
Chip Campsen (43)
Clementa Pinckney (45)

House of Representatives (District)
Heyward Hutson (94)
Annette Young (98)
James Merrill (99)
Vida Miller (108)
David Mack, III (109)
Chip Limehouse (110)
Floyd Breeland (111)
Ben Hagood, Jr. (112)
J. Seth Whipper (113)
Robert Harrell, Jr. (114)
Wallace Scarborough (115)
Robert Brown (116)
Thomas Dantzler (117)
Leon Stavrinakis (119)

**Johns Island Council**
Sam Brownlee

**James Island Council**
Leonard Blank
Joseph Qualey
Bill Wilder
Parris Williams

**NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS**
**Neighborhood Associations**
(Jane Baker, Neighborhood Planning, City of Charleston)

EDGEWATER PARK HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
FOLLY CREEK POINT HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
HEADQUARTER'S ISLAND PLANTATION PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
INDIGO PALMS HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
INDIGO TERRACE HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
STAFFORDSHIRE HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
TERRABROOK HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
WALDEN PARK PROPERTY HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
WAYNE SCOTT COURT HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
GLENDALE CROSSING HOME OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
OSPREY COVE PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
ABBAPPOOLA FARMS PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
GOLF CLUB AT BRIAR'S CREEK PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
PLANTATION POINTE OWNERS ASSOCIATION
REMINGTON ISLAND HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
SEDGWICK SITES HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, LLC
TURKEY HILL LANE HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
WHIPPOORWILL FARM HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
POLLY POINT PLANTATION PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
WADMALAW SOUND HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
119 ASHLEY AVENUE PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
206 ASHLEY AVENUE PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
253 RUTLEDGE AVENUE PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
35 CAROLINA STREET PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
900 JOHNNIE DODDS HORIZONTAL PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
95 BEAUFAIN STREET PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
ARCHFIELD PLANTATION HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
INDIGO POINTE HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
LIVE OAKS AT BATTERY CREEK HOME OWNERS ASSOCIATION
OLDE TOWNE VILLAS HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
SEAGATE HORIZONTAL PROPERTY REGIME, INC.
SUMMERTREES HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
377 KING STREET HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
BEND AT RIVER ROAD LANDING PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
CHARLES TOWNE PLACE HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
ENTERPRISE CENTER OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
GRIMBALL GATES PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
HAULOVER POINTE HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC. THE
KIAWAH RIVER ESTATES PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
NEEDLEGRASS HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
PRESERVE AT FENWICK HALL PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
SIMMONS CREEK PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
1038 JENKINS ROAD PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
187 COMING STREET CONDOMINIUMS HORIZONTAL PROPERTY REGIME, INC.
BATTERY ISLAND DRIVE HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
BENTON'S BEND PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
CAMP ROAD ESTATES HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
CREEK'S EDGE HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
EDENWOODS HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, LLC
FAIRWAY VILLAS JAMES ISLAND HOA
HASSELL STREET CONDOMINIUMS HORIZONTAL PROPERTY REGIME, INC.
HELD CIRCLE TOWNHOMES PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
HILLSIDE FARMS PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
OAK ISLAND PHASE II PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
PALMETTOS @ FOLLY OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC. THE
PARROT CREEK HOMEOWNERS ASSOC.
PEMBERTON VIEW HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
RETREAT AT RIVERLAND HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
RIPLEY COVE PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
RIVERFRONT HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
RIVERLAND PLACE PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
RIVERS POINT ROW PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
SALTGRASS POINTE HOME OWNERS ASSOCIATION, LLC
WILDWOOD TOWN HOMES PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION
FAIRWAY ONE AT OCEAN WINDS PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
FIDDLERS COVE II TOWNHOUSE OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
HOMES OF HIDDEN OAKS PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC. THE
RIVERSIDE AT ELLIS OAKS HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
SAVAGE ROAD MEDICAL CENTER OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
SLIPS AT RIPLEY PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
CENTRAL COMMONS HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
CLOUDBREAK COURT HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
COOSAW COMMONS HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
ELLIS CREEK LANDING HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
ISLAND CLUB TWO OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
PRESTON AT PARK WEST HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
UNIVERSITY PARK HOA
WHITE GABLES HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
CRYSTAL HARBOR HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
AUTUMN CHASE/MAGNOLIA LAKES AT GRANDE OAK PLANTATION HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION OF RIVER RUN, INC.
INDIGO HALL AT HOPE PLANTATION HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
MARSH COTTAGE PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
MEADOWS AND VINEYARDS PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC. THE
WINDSWEPT VILLAS III HORIZONTAL PROPERTY REGIME, INC.
BOHOCKET OAKS HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, LLC
OTRANTO PLACE PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.

Business Associations
   Chamber of Commerce
   Lowcountry Senior Center
   Charleston Executive Airport

Churches
   Greater Bethel AME
   Mt. Sinai Evangelical Church
   St. Stephens AME
   St. James Episcopal Church
   First Baptist Church

Citizens’ Groups
   Concerned Citizens of the Sea Islands
   Coastal Conservation League
   Islanders for Responsible Expansion
   Coastal Cyclists
   Others to be determined
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Integrated NEPA Process for Projects that Require an Individual Permit
Integrated NEPA Process for Projects that Require an Individual Permit
Integrated NEPA Process for Projects that Require an Individual Permit
Integrated NEPA Process for Projects that Require an Individual Permit
Integrated NEPA Process for Projects that Require an Individual Permit

1 Purpose, Need, Public Involvement Plan, Scope, and Termini

- Purpose and Need has to be valid for both federal agencies (may require more than one purpose & need).
- The USACE will define the basic and overall project purpose that will be included in the document.
- Define scope of project to be done (the magnitude of the study area and the level detail of effort for each category under consideration).
- Define project termini.
- Define roles and responsibilities of agencies.
- Public scoping meeting (may be replaced with Public Involvement Meeting on smaller projects) and agency scoping meetings (agency scoping for smaller projects may consist of LICE meeting). Get list of issues important to each agency.
- Discuss potential secondary and cumulative impacts, including how to appropriately address them.
- Establish overall schedule for project completion.

2 Methodology & Preliminary Evaluation Criteria

- Define the categories that will be evaluated to reduce the number of preliminary alternatives to a reasonable number of alternatives.
- Project specific.
- Way to identify and reduce the preliminary alternatives from a broad range of alternatives to more specific.

3 Data Gathering Including Cultural Resources and T&E

- Preliminary data gathering selected based on established evaluation criteria and scope.
- Maximizes use of existing and available data.
- Financing of data collection may be shared.

4 Development of Preliminary Alternatives

- Develop broad range of alternatives to represent potential alternatives.
- Define roles and responsibilities of agencies.
- Agency input.
Preliminary Alternatives Evaluation

- Use established criteria to review alternatives and designate reasonable alternatives.

Designate Reasonable Alternatives

- Concurrence memo for file and distribution.
- Cooperating agency input.
- Matrix development.

Refine Evaluation Criteria

- Based on project issues.
- Increase the level of detail that the categories are evaluated.
- Increase in number of categories based on evaluation criteria previously evaluated, if needed.

Limited Field Work of Reasonable Alternatives

- Data gathering based on refined evaluation criteria and scope.
- More detailed and comprehensive information.

Reasonable Alternatives Analysis

- Prepare documentation of evaluation.
- Develop matrix.
- Use refined criteria to review alternatives and designate preferred alternatives.

Draft Environmental Document (Designate Recommended Preferred Alternative)

- Acceptance by USACE that the alternatives analysis meets requirements.
- 404 (b)(1) Guidelines need to be addressed in Draft Environmental Document.
- Public Interest Review Factors.

SCDOT, FHWA, and USACE Review
Draft Environmental Impact Statement
- Concurrence memo for file and distribution

Application submitted to USACE

Application Acknowledged

Review of Application for Completeness

Federal Register Notice of Availability, FHWA/USACE Notice of Public Hearing (if needed) & Public Notice
- FHWA submits to USEPA for publication.
- USACE’s issues notice of Public Hearing.

Public Hearing & 15-30 Day Comment Period; begin Section 106 and Section 7 processes
- Provide Public Hearing date, so that USACE can advertise SCDOT/USFWS’s informal Public Hearing in notice for 30 days. Unless USACE requires a formal Public Hearing, then a joint informal hearing may be applicable.

Revise Recommended Preferred Alternative
- To address public and agency comments and/or issues that result from detailed field work.

Response to Comments
- Respond to comments received from the public and agencies.

Impact Analysis
Scope of Final Environmental Document

- Concurrence memo for file from USACE that document meets their needs.
- Discussion of comments received and how to address the comments.
- Take into consideration requirements of SCDHEC to obtain Section 401/CZM certification. Participation by SCDHEC in meeting for input on water quality.
- 404 (b)(1) Guidelines.
- USACE Public Interest Review Factors need to be addressed.

Draft Final Environmental Impact Statement

- Prepare document in accordance with scope established in previous step.

SCDOT, FHWA, and USACE Review

Final Environmental Impact Statement

FHWA ROD & USACE ROD

- Preparation of FHWA Record of Decision.
- Preparation of USACE Record of Decision.

Issue Permit

Deny with Prejudice