

3.0 SOCIAL EFFECTS

3.1 Land Use and Socio-Economics

A. Draft EIS Comments

Federal Agency Comments

Changes in Land Use and Zoning

Federal Comment: The project must include changes to land use policies and zoning that will support Transit Oriented Development in the project station areas. This should include higher allowable densities, a mix of uses, and compact walkable development patterns within a ½ mile radius of the stations. (0492 04)

Response: *The change in development character in the corridor is discussed in Chapter 5 of the Final EIS. The analysis in the Final EIS addresses potential development at the proposed transit station areas. As stated in the Final EIS, the land use plans adopted by local government within the Dulles corridor all contain guidelines to support transit, higher densities, mixed-use development, and walkable, bike-friendly development patterns in close proximity to the transit stations. The Project Team will work with the local government to support access to transit stations for pedestrians and cyclists and to implement transit-oriented development initiatives, although implementation of this form of development, including the provision of bike lanes, parking regulations, and demand management measures is under the jurisdiction of the local government. The proposed stations are designed to provide access to pedestrians, cyclists, and feeder bus services, as well as transit-oriented development that might be implemented in proximity to the stations.*

State Agency Comments

Potential for Future Air Rights Development at Stations

State Comment: The engineering for rail should allow for future air rights development. (0131, 0131-T-10)

Response: *Proposed parking facilities will be the subject of continuing coordination with Fairfax and Loudoun counties during preliminary engineering. Station designs do not preclude construction of additional parking by others beyond the station facilities. With respect to air rights development above Metrorail stations in freeway medians, the Project Team acknowledges that the two Counties govern land use and that FAA, MWAA, VDOT and TRIP II, as the owners and/or operators of the DIAAH, Dulles Toll Road and Dulles Greenway, must be involved. Therefore, the Project Team will await any initiative of the two Counties with the involvement of the highway owners and operators.*

Local Agency Comments

Ability of Rail to Encourage Clustered Development

Local Comment: The Draft Environmental Impact Statement has laid out several viable alternatives. Close attention must be paid to the potential impacts of each to surrounding developments, especially residential. The road network in Tyson's Corner is at its limit. Important improvements can and will be made; however, the solution to Tyson's Corner's transportation problems is not in road expansion. And while there are some favorable characteristics of Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), there are clear advantages to rail: The capacity of rail is nearly four times that of buses and, under current proposals, no BRT stations would be located in the heart of Tysons Corner. Moreover, BRT has significant up-front costs and will not encourage the concentration of density at transit hubs, the way rail, with its built-in density triggers, will.

Rail will contain sprawl by creating a magnet for clustered development around stations and will maximize convenience to those living, working, and shopping in Tyson's. And, at a time when our region is struggling to meet EPA's ground-level ozone attainment requirements, rail transportation will improve air quality by removing the most drivers from the road. (0130, 0289-L-4)

Response: *Comment noted. The Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) is a Metrorail Extension. BRT was eliminated from further consideration after the public and interagency review and comment on the Draft EIS. The LPA is described in more detail in Chapter 2.*

Public Comments

Land Use and Development at Station Areas

Public Comment: We think the photos are of concern in terms of the attitude of the EIS towards land use. In fact, all the photos have large parking areas and parking structures in them, none illustrating sort of a new urbanist fabric of community that we can have. (0149, 0180-T-12)

Response: *It is assumed that this comment refers to the illustrations of station designs in Volume I of the Draft EIS. Stations need to accommodate multiple arrival modes, including pedestrian, feeder bus, and private autos. Each is important in building and maintaining ridership, and availability of daily parking is particularly influential in attracting riders that have a car available for a trip but choose to use transit. Providing such parking does not preclude transit-oriented development adjacent to stations; mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented, compact development can take place around and/or above parking areas. The Project Team will continue to coordinate station plans with adjacent development, in conjunction with VDOT, local governments, and adjacent property owners and developers throughout the Project's implementation.*

Public Comment: The Moorefield Station development to the south and the Loudoun Station to the north are currently being designed with the planned transit station as a focal point. The Loudoun Station plan directs major pedestrian and vehicular activity (via a "Kiss & Ride" and bus stops) toward a plaza opposite the platform, while Moorefield station is proposing an internal bus loop to connect the non-core areas with the station platform. (0014, 0014-L-10)

Public Comment: Reservation Area: The layout of the reservation area has changed as part of the charrette process and the property owners are dedicating 12 acres as shown for the transit station. Subject to the board of supervisor's land use approval of Moorefield Station, the final EIS should incorporate the revised land reservation, with the exact configuration subject to future design. The ultimate access should consider the provision of the separation of the local bus traffic from the public street system. Based on our engineer's review, the footprint shown in the DEIS station plans can be accommodated in the proposed reservation. (0451, 0451-L-6)

Response: *The design team has incorporated these comments into the final General Plans (Final EIS Volume V), based on a site plan provided by the owner/developer that includes a bus-only roadway adjacent to the Dulles Greenway. During preliminary engineering, the Project Team will continue to refine proposed station facilities at the Route 772 Station in coordination with Loudoun County and adjacent landowners and developers.*

Public Comment: We need to be much more proactive in dealing with the interrelationship in three dimensions of land use, the types of land use, the circulation patterns, pedestrian patterns, bicycle patterns, the vehicular patterns of all sorts, internal transportation. I would urge the local officials to put more emphasis on that. (088, 0172-T-10)

Response: *Regulations concerning land use, including its relationship to circulation patterns, pedestrian patterns, bicycle patterns, vehicular patterns, and internal transportation are under the control of the local governments in the corridor. The Project Team will work with local*

jurisdictions to support them in implementing land use regulations and access patterns that are developed in proximity to the transit station platforms.

Public Comment: TMS is concerned that the construction of the BRT facilities, particularly the proposed parking structure and aerial bus bridge, bifurcates the substantial land area available for transit-oriented redevelopment, which has a domino effect on accessibility, ridership, and future operating subsidies of the transit system. In particular, creating an origination station in Tysons Corner through construction of a parking facility, particularly in that area, that currently has sprawling vehicle-oriented development, coupled with a permanent bus bridge, represents a substantial physical and psychological barrier to transit-oriented redevelopment within walking distance of the rail station and is inconsistent with the county's comprehensive plans. (0135, 0135-T –5)

Response: *The Project Team recommended and the decision-makers selected the Metrorail Extension with Alignment T6 in Tysons Corner as the Locally Preferred Alternative. The BRT/Metrorail and Phased Implementation Alternatives were eliminated from further consideration after the public and interagency review and comment on the Draft EIS. Therefore, the Project no longer has effects on the TMS Property or Tysons Self-Storage.*

Public Comment: Reston East/ Wiehle Avenue Station - Whether by bus, metro or whatever, the Station and surrounding area destined for residential?, commercial?, parking? or all of these, must be a visual as well as functional planned architectural solution with the pedestrian in addition to the motorist in mind. As a twenty year resident of the adjacent South Lakes community, I feel fortunate Sunrise Valley Drive from Hunter Mill west to the Reston Parkway has remained so attractive with ample green space still surviving. Only the behemoth Siemens parking affair and associated building has spoiled the landscape. (0072, 0072-CC-1)

Public Comment: And if there are plans for major new facilities like terminals and parking on the sides of the roadway, is there a master plan that integrates that construction with commercial and residential construction? (0181, 0181-T –8)

Response: *As described in Section 3.1 of the Final EIS, the land use plans adopted by local government within the Dulles corridor all contain guidelines to support higher densities, mixed-use development, and walkable, bike-friendly development patterns in close proximity to the transit stations. These plans are under the jurisdiction of local government, including the initiation of transit-oriented development around stations. The project will work with local government and developers that might be interested in developing transit-oriented development around stations. As described in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS, this transit-related development would have an induced effect on the level of density expected to occur in the corridor.*

Public Comment: The Draft EIS ignores the impact of growth associated with the alternatives studied. The population growth in station areas will lead to dramatic increases in vehicular use in other areas besides near the stations. A projected substantial increase in population for the Mid-Corridor, represents a tremendous increase in car traffic due to density increases. The Draft EIS does not address this impact and must do so quantitatively. (0510 03-04)

Response: *The Project's ridership forecasts are based on regionally adopted population and employment forecasts for the opening and horizon years. The density bonuses associated with the Metrorail Extension are not part of these regionally adopted forecasts and therefore were not calculated as part of the demand forecasting process for the Supplemental Draft EIS and Final EIS.*

The impacts of congestion due to density bonuses was included in Chapter 9 of the Draft EIS and the Travel Demand Forecasting Methodology and Results Technical Report (June 2002). The overall level of development expected to occur as a result of the density bonuses in the transit station areas has been discussed in Chapter 5 of the Draft EIS. The projected level of growth and related traffic and other effects were assessed. All neighborhoods within a half-mile of the

transit stations were analyzed to see if they would experience an increase in cut-through traffic or other traffic impacts due not only to the construction of the transit alternatives, but also due, in part, to the increase in traffic associated with the development.

No Build Growth Implications

Public Comment: How does your plan compare to doing nothing if you include changes in behavior? In a sense what I have heard here tonight is that you assume that you need to increase the throughput, okay. On page S-23 of the EIS, it dismisses the possibility of doing nothing because it does not include changes in behavior, whereas doing nothing may encourage businesses to decentralize and move out to where the people are, or people to move in to where the businesses are and end up with a more cost-effective and environmentally beneficial system. (0166, 0166-T –6)

Response: *Population and employment projections, as well as, the regional trends in land use, as presented in Section 3.1 and Chapter 5 of the Final EIS, and the historical trends in development in the region do not support this comment's assertion.*

Need for Coordination with VDRPT

Public Comment: Our overall concern is coordination. The County and VDRPT must actively coordinate land use and road planning with the planning and construction of rail. RA will be happy to assist in that continuing coordination. The recommendations of Supervisor Hudgins' 3-day charette are important to good development and to mitigating the effects on our community. (0233, 0426-M –3)

Public Comment: Now there has been much progress in addressing the land use issue, both in the Fairfax and Loudoun comp plans, and most significantly in the Reston charette recently, but we also think much work remains to be done. (0149, 0180-T –5)

Response: *The Project Team has been actively coordinating with VDOT, Fairfax County, Loudoun County, and other state and local agencies since the project's initiation. Please see Chapter 11 of the Final EIS for a summary of the Project Team's coordination activities since the EIS process was initiated in June 2000.*

Fairfax County Supervisor Hudgins has appointed the Wiehle Avenue Steering Committee, which advise the County staff in the creation of a Request For Proposal (RFP) to solicit transit-oriented joint development proposals for a mixed use development of the County-owned parcel adjacent to the station. Using the conclusions from the Supervisor's Reston Charrette as a starting point, the committee is establishing the process, scope and criteria for the RFP.

Physical Impacts of Tysons Parking Structure

Public Comment: However, the Owners do have concerns over the specific facility designs for the Tysons [West] rail station. All Metrorail alternatives and the BRT alternative in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement propose that a 2,000-car commuter-parking garage be located on the Security Storage and Templeton Oldsmobile sites. This large structure would occupy one of the key redevelopment sites at the Tysons West Station and is a major concern to the Owners. We suggest that a commuter parking garage of this magnitude is not appropriate for this area. Tysons Corner is viewed as the "downtown" of Fairfax County and, as such, rail service should be planned to implement that vision. Attracting commuters into Tysons Corner so that they may park and use Metrorail to reach other destinations such as Washington, DC, Arlington or Dulles Airport seems contrary to the Tysons Corner Comprehensive Plan. This station area should be planned so as to maximize the number of residents and workers within walking distance of the station. Not only will this garage occupy one of the "100% corners" at the Tysons West station, it will also impede pedestrian flow from adjacent property north and west of the station area. We suggest that this commuter garage be relocated to another station outside of the Tysons Corner area and allow the Tysons Corner stations to function in a more urban not suburban design. (0400, 0400- L-2)

Public Comment: However, if it is concluded that a commuter-parking garage is a necessary component to the Tysons West station, we suggest that there are other design alternatives that would make this commuter facility blend in better with other transit related mixed-use development. For example, if the 2,000-car requirement were spread out over several sites as opposed to being massed on one site, it would allow for better distribution of commuter parking spaces and an ability of the property owners to absorb this commuter-parking requirement as part of their private development. This essentially would result in a joint development effort of public parking and private parking to support a private transit related mixed-use development. We have commissioned studies of how the commuter parking could be integrated into proposed development plans for the 22 acres and find that it could be accommodated without requiring WMATA's acquisition of the Security Storage and Templeton Oldsmobile sites. (0400, 0400- L-3)

Response: *For Tysons West Station entrance and facilities, the Project Team recommended, and the decision-makers selected Option E site plan to replace the plan presented in the Supplemental Draft EIS and revised General Plans. Option E has its station entrance at the inbound, east end of the station near Spring Hill Road. The bus bays and Kiss & Ride of Option E are located between Tyco Road and Spring Hill Road, set back from Route 7.*

The park-and-ride facility at Tysons West has been reduced from 2,000 to 500 spaces specifically in response to concerns regarding traffic impacts. The 500-space park-and-ride would be part of a joint development project, so the private sector would be involved in the design and development. However, the specific location and design is not yet known. The park-and-ride would be accessed from local roads, and its cost is part of Wiehle Avenue Extension.

B. Supplemental Draft EIS Comments

Local Agency Comments

Issues Related to Comprehensive Plans and Zoning

Local Comment: Section 3.1.1.2. The second bullet under "B. proposed LPA Phase I", is not true since the Comprehensive Plan envisions higher intensity at future stations west of Wiehle Avenue. This bullet should be reworded to indicate that the LPA Phase I is not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan; the wording could be similar to the 3rd bullet which addresses Loudoun County. (0093 0109-12)

Response: *The commenter is correct that Wiehle Avenue Extension (formerly LPA Phase 1) is partially consistent with the Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan's goal for high-capacity transit throughout the western part of the Dulles Corridor. This was the intended meaning of the second bullet under Section 3.1.1.2 (B) of the Draft EIS.*

Local Comment: Section 3.1. In the 2nd and 3rd sentence of the 2nd paragraph, the information about the Tysons II rezoning is not correct. The zoning case increased the PDC's potential from about 4,655,000 sq.ft. to 6,821,000 sq. ft. (or an increase of almost 2.2 million square feet). The maximum building height is 30 stories, not 25 stories. The development has 12 high-rise buildings of which four are built (or eight new buildings). The two sentences need to be corrected based on the information provided. (0093 0109-11)

Response: *Comment noted. Information regarding the amount of development allowed under the Tysons II rezoning is clarified in Chapter 3 the Final EIS.*

Issues Related to Adjacent Development

Local Comment: Another issue concerns joint development on the north side of the [Wiehle Avenue] station; the final EIS should demonstrate how transit improvements do not conflict with the County's joint development objective for this property. (0093 0109-17)

Response: *In accord with the final Team recommendations for Wiehle Avenue Station, the final General Plans include a site plan that accommodates future joint development at the station. The site of the joint development would be on the current Reston East park-and-ride facility along Wiehle Avenue.*

Fairfax County Supervisor Hudgins has appointed the Wiehle Avenue Steering Committee, which advise the County staff in the creation of a Request For Proposal (RFP) to solicit transit-oriented joint development proposals for a mixed use development of the County-owned parcel adjacent to the station. Using the conclusions from the Supervisor's Reston Charrette as a starting point, the committee is establishing the process, scope and criteria for the RFP.

Public Comments

Issues Related to Comprehensive Plans and Zoning

Public Comment: The following claims need to be further evaluated in light of realities instead of simply presented by fiat: a. That Phase 1 is consistent with comprehensive plans, planned development and local zoning requirements (e.g., at TABLE 2-2). These claims are particularly questionable since the rail project would drive a wedge between a 640-acre swath of the Upper Potomac Planning District residential properties that serve under the Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan as a low-density buffer between higher densities of Reston and Tysons Corner. (0068 0173-17)

Response: *The Wiehle Avenue Extension (formerly LPA Phase I) is considered compatible with the Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, which includes high-capacity rapid transit improvements in the Dulles Corridor as part of its long-term plan for the county. Similarly, the Wiehle Avenue Extension would be partially compatible with planned development, as a number of development projects that are currently in various stages of implementation have been planned and designed with the expectation of high-capacity transit in the corridor. Therefore, the Wiehle Avenue Extension would be consistent with the planned development in the eastern part of the corridor, but not in areas west of Wiehle Avenue. The Wiehle Avenue Extension would also be consistent with existing zoning at station areas because the current zoning of property within the proposed station areas permits the construction of transportation facilities as compatible uses. Additional detail about the land use effects of the Full LPA and the Wiehle Avenue Extension is included in Section 3.1 of the Final EIS.*

Public Comment: We also suggest that Fairfax County re-evaluate its mode split data in all future traffic analysis associated with rezoning applications requested for increase in density at rail stops. (0123 0158-12)

Response: *Comment noted. This analysis has been revised in the Final EIS. Population, households, and employment forecasts, which are the basis for the ridership and modal evaluations, were recalculated in the Final EIS using the updated Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOC) Round 6.3 Cooperative Forecasts. This information is discussed in Chapters 3 (Social Effects), 5 (Economic Effects), and 6 (Transportation Effects).*

Public Comment: Table 3.1.1 Summary of Land Use Effects. While we generally agree with the macro assumptions in the table, the Tysons Plan, APR nominations and very specific land use applications must further define and quantify the intent of the Tysons Plan. For instance, the Tysons Plan calls for intensifying development up to 1.0 and 1.5 FAR with a 30% increase in height within 1000 and 1600 foot circles around the Tyson's East platform. The text in the current Tysons Plan for Sub-Unit R-2 states certain area plans are limited to a 0.65 FAR, yet land is zoned at 1.0 FAR, C-3. Is the 1.5 FAR based on underlying C-3 zoning, 0.65 limitation in plan or if rezoned to a 3.0 PRM would an increase from 3.0 PRM to 4.5 FAR and limitless height be allowed? The Tysons Plan needs to be modified to be consistent with Rail LPA. (0113 0132-6)

Response: *Comment noted. By federal regulation, regionally approved forecasts must be used in the analysis of the Build Alternatives. Population, households, and employment forecasts, which are the basis for the ridership and modal evaluations, were recalculated in the Final EIS using the updated Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOG) Round 6.3 Cooperative Forecasts. This accepted land use data is based on regionally agreed to development parameters such as FAR.*

Public Comment: WEST*GROUP endorses the EIS recommendations of the stated purpose and need with the following provisions: The Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan and specifically the Tysons Corner Urban Center Plan (the "Tysons Plan") must be reviewed, modified and tailored to meet the "higher-density, mixed use development" that is appropriately called for around the proposed rail stations. No action has been taken by the County to accept Annual Plan Review applications, revise the Tysons Plan, create a task force or even discuss required modifications to the Tysons Plan to accommodate increased densities at rail stations. It appears Fairfax County may be waiting for developers to provide "visions plans" at rail stations and concurrently modify Policy and Tysons Plans to accommodate visions, but nothing has been articulated to this date. The Board of Supervisors must articulate the means and methods of accepting, reviewing and vetting "Smart Growth" rail station plans as soon as the Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA) is in place, if not sooner. (0123 0158-2)

Public Comment: Clearly, there is a need to revisit the Tysons Corner Urban Center plan now that the site locations have been finalized and a fourth station added to the previously proposed three. This is another station area planning effort that would have to be lead by Fairfax County. (0060 0169-10)

Public Comment: While we generally agree with the macro assumptions in the table, the Tysons Plan, APR nominations and very specific land use applications must further define and quantify the intent of the Tysons Plan. (0123 0158-8)

Response: *Comment noted. The development and revision of the Tysons Corner Urban Center Plan are the responsibility of Fairfax County through its comprehensive planning process.*

Public Comment: While stating one of the purposes of rail is to support the new Loudoun County comprehensive plan and its 1995 plan to "land uses in the vicinity of future transit centers in specific corridors, including centers at the western end of the Dulles Corridor," the project team did not use the County's new land use plan in its travel demand projections. While the project team had no choice but to use Round 6.2 of the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments' (COG) Cooperative Forecasts for the DEIS -- which relies on the pre-2001 Loudoun plan -- Version 6.3 was available in draft as early as February 2003. This plan calls for high density development near transit stations, but has about 80,000 fewer households than the pre-2001 plan, part of Round 6.2. This means the projections for ridership in this SDEIS could be too low or too high. (0016 0122-17)

Response: *By federal regulation, regionally approved forecasts must be used in the analysis of the Build Alternatives. The Project Team used the demographic and land use projections prepared by the MWCOG (Round 6.2 Cooperative Forecasts) for the Draft EIS and Supplemental Draft EIS, which were the regionally-approved forecasts in place at the time the analysis was conducted. For the Final EIS, the Project Team used the updated Round 6.3 demographic and land use data, which were adopted as the regionally approved forecasts on October 8, 2003.*

Issues Related to Adjacent Development

Public Comment: Since the properties are already improved, how will the reuse plan be prepared and implemented? (0042 0043-5)

Response: *Both Fairfax and Loudoun counties have adopted policies to implement transit-oriented development at the new stations of the Metrorail Extension. The land use plans adopted by local jurisdictions within the Dulles Corridor all contain guidelines to support transit, higher densities, mixed-use development, and pedestrian and bicycle-friendly development patterns*

near the transit stations. These recommendations have been adopted in the comprehensive plans of Fairfax and Loudoun counties, and would be implemented by the counties through application of their respective zoning ordinances. The Project Team will work with the local jurisdictions to support implementation of comprehensive plan goals.

Public Comment: It is imperative that the final Tysons East Station plan and its appurtenances be carefully coordinated and integrated with WEST*GROUP's master plan. As a dedicator of right of way, rail facilities and a 25% economic stakeholder in the funding of rail, we feel our input demands recognition and we are willing to work with the designers and constructors of rail to come up with the best possible public private plan of the Tysons East Station as well as the balance of the project and look forward to more dialogue as the rail project goes forward. (0113 0132-23)

Public Comment: In addition to CapOne's 1.2 million square feet of development adjacent to the platform, under the existing Tysons Plan, 3.7 million square feet of new density can be achieved on WEST*GROUP's properties within the 1000 and 1600 foot boundaries of the station that must be coordinated and integrated to maximize ridership at the Tysons East Station. We look forward to showing you the WEST*GROUP master plan within the next 30 - 45 days which will impact WMATA's current design. (0123 0158-6)

Public Comment: While it appears WMATA has spent a considerable amount of time coordinating the Tysons East Station with CapOne, WEST*GROUP has been virtually ignored. In addition to CapOne's 1.2 million square feet of development adjacent to the platform, under the existing Tysons Plan, 3.7 million square feet of new density can be achieved on WEST*GROUP's properties within the 1000 and 1600 foot boundaries of the station that must be coordinated and integrated to maximize ridership at the Tysons East Station. We look forward to showing you the WEST*GROUP master plan within the next 30 - 45 days which will impact WMATA's current design. (0113 0132-4)

Response: *Coordination between DRPT, WMATA, and adjacent property owners, including WEST*GROUP, would continue throughout preliminary engineering and final design.*

Land-Use and Development at Station Area

Public Comment: While local land use policy is not within the direct purview of the Supplemental Draft EIS, local government emphasis upon effective land use at each station should considerably expand potential transit ridership well beyond the estimates used by the consultants to evaluate the economic feasibility of the system in the Draft EIS report. (0041 0042-6)

Response: *Regionally adopted Cooperative Population and Employment forecasts developed by the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOCG) were used in the development of its ridership forecasts. These forecasts also reflect the inputs of the local jurisdictions in the region, including Fairfax and Loudoun counties. Some station areas would have "density bonuses" related to the presence of rail included in the respective County comprehensive plans. However, these bonuses are not included in the regional forecasts noted above because rail does not yet funded or in operation. A separate analysis showing the impacts of the density bonuses was included in Chapter 9 of the Draft EIS to provide an understanding of their effects.*

Public Comment: Supervisor Hudgins had another public meeting where she committed to appoint a citizens advisory committee to work on land use issues around the Wiehle Avenue Station. I think it is really important to involve the community in the planning for this station, particularly when you take a look at the proposals for parking at the Wiehle Avenue Station. (0060 0063-3)

Public Comment: DCRA believes that the areas around the station should be left to local land use decisions. Likewise, any designs around the station should involve a broad complement of the community actively involved in the design process. (0037 0060-4)

Response: *All local land use decisions, including development around transit stations, are*

controlled by local jurisdictions. In accord with the final Team recommendations for Wiehle Avenue Station, the final General Plans include a site plan that accommodates future joint development at the station. The site of the joint development would be on the current Reston East park-and-ride facility along Wiehle Avenue.

Fairfax County Supervisor Hudgins has appointed the Wiehle Avenue Steering Committee, which advise the County staff in the creation of a Request For Proposal (RFP) to solicit transit-oriented joint development proposals for a mixed use development of the County-owned parcel adjacent to the station. Using the conclusions from the Supervisor's Reston Charrette as a starting point, the committee is establishing the process, scope and criteria for the RFP.

Public Comment: [W]e would urge that this community become very much involved in providing the design guidelines for future development around the station. This could include providing the parking and air rights over the Dulles Access Road, even building over the potential bus turnarounds that were illustrated here tonight. (0060 0063-5)

***Response:** Proposed parking facilities will be the subject of continuing coordination with Loudoun and Fairfax counties during preliminary engineering. Station designs do not preclude construction of additional parking by others beyond the station facilities. With respect to air rights development above Metrorail stations in freeway medians, the Project Team acknowledges that the two Counties govern land use and that FAA, MWAA, VDOT and TRIP II, as the owners and/or operators of the DIAAH, Dulles Toll Road and Dulles Greenway, must be involved. Therefore, the Project Team will await any initiative of the two Counties with the involvement of the highway owners and operators.*

Public Comment: As designs for the station at Route 772 are finalized, we encourage the county, the project planners, and staff at the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) to work together to develop station facilities that also include a mix of shops and services that support nearby residents and workers and create lively and safe station areas. (0060 0169-4)

***Response:** Comment noted. Local development plans are under the jurisdiction of the local governments. However, the Project Team will continue to work with local officials throughout the implementation process to support joint development around stations. See Section 3.1 and Chapter 5 of the Final EIS for more information on land use regulations and potential joint development effects of the proposed project. See the final General Plans (Final EIS Volume V) to review current station site plans.*

3.2 Neighborhood, Community Services and Community Cohesion Impacts

A. Draft EIS Comments

State Agency Comments

Potential Effects on Adjacent Communities

State Comment: Will there be any change in lighting in the [WFC S&I] yard or on the mainline? If so, will light trespass and pollution be curbed and contained as it is now? (0424, 0424-E -2)

***Response:** There are currently no proposed changes to the current lighting levels and lighting configuration of the West Falls Church Yard in conjunction with this Project. Rail vehicle headlights directed toward the tracks will be the only lighting associated with the mainline. Lighting of stations and facilities will be planned to minimize spillover into residential areas.*

State Comment: With regard to the traction/transformer building [WFC S&I Yard]: will there be any electrical noise (humming)? If so, will it be muffled? Will lights be controlled as above? (0424, 0424-E – 3)

Response: *Traction Power Substations (TPSS) do not emit a significant amount of noise or humming and should not be noticeable outside of the building. Lighting at the TPSS will be minimal and provided only at the entranceway to allow for safe entrance by workers, when needed.*

Community Access and Potential Community Effects

State Comment: Toward that end, I comment and support the work of the Dulles Rail Now!, the McLean Citizens' Association and Hallcrest Heights. I agree with their positions. I particularly call your attention to the MCA statement for its thoroughness in highlighting the importance of pedestrian and bus access to the Tysons' stations, as well as the need to mitigate the impact of construction and system noise on nearby communities and businesses. (0012, 0468-L –2)

Response: *DRPT is the Project's sponsor and initial owner. However, the responsibility for modifications of sidewalks and trails as part of station access is with Fairfax County, Loudoun County, Town of Herndon, City of Falls Church and VDOT. DRPT will continue to coordinate with these jurisdictions and agencies during preliminary engineering and final design to determine the improvements for station access beyond the station site plans, as well as their ownership and maintenance. Impacts due to construction and noise on communities and businesses are included in the Final EIS and, if appropriate, proposed mitigation measures are identified. A summary of these mitigation measures is provided in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS.*

State Comment: Page 188 (of the Land Use Technical Report) Table 4-8 - SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY IMPACTS OF METRORAIL ALTERNATIVE "Access Changes - T1, T6, T9, and T4. Congestion affects two neighborhoods...". This statement would be true if the construction of rail transit in the corridor did not also allow for increased densities. However, the comprehensive plans within the local jurisdictions provide for higher densities with the introduction of rail transit. Therefore, any reduction in auto travel due to the availability of rail transit is exceeded by the increase in demand resulting from the increased densities, and congestion will increase throughout the corridor and beyond.

"Property Values - T1, T6, T9, and T4 Increase at station areas "The comprehensive plans within the local jurisdictions provide for higher densities with the introduction of rail transit. Therefore, any reduction in auto travel due to the availability of rail transit is exceeded by the increase in demand resulting from the increased densities. While this may still result in increased property values at station areas, the increase in congestion throughout the corridor may result in a decrease in property values in other areas. (0421, 0421-A –5)

Response: *The Project's ridership forecasts are based on regionally adopted population and employment forecasts for the opening and horizon years. The density bonuses associated with the Metrorail Extension are not part of these regionally adopted forecasts and therefore were not calculated as part of the demand forecasting process for the Supplemental Draft EIS and Final EIS. Chapter 5 of the Final EIS does present an analysis of the potential effects of increasing densities on the level of development as a result of the two Build Alternatives. The effects of implementing density bonuses in the corridor at Metrorail station areas is also quantified and presented in Table 5.3-1. In addition, density bonuses were included in the analysis of secondary development effects that is presented in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS in relation to traffic. This analysis was included in the Final EIS in order to address comments about the need to quantify the potential effects of increased density on traffic at Metrorail station areas.*

The counties' development permitting process would mitigate the impacts due to increased densities within the corridor. Fairfax County has adopted non-degradation policies that will limit development that would result in traffic congestion, thus reducing the level of development and

limiting any negative impacts on property values due to congestion. In addition, an evaluation of property values along other transit corridors in the Washington metropolitan area does not indicate any decrease in property values, even in areas experiencing congested conditions. Actual implementation of transit-oriented development and the timing and increase in densities is under the jurisdiction of the local government, so any mitigation needed to support the increase in densities is also under the jurisdiction of the local government, and they have included measures in their land use regulations.

State Comment: Although viewed mainly as a business center, Tysons Corner is also a major residential area. The preferences of the residents of the Rotonda and other established residential communities deserve special consideration. The goal is to improve the quality of life for residents in the corridor; no one's quality of life should suffer as a result. (0298, 0298-L –5)

***Response:** Metrorail Alignment T4, which affected the Rotonda condominium, was eliminated from further consideration after the public and interagency review and comment on the Draft EIS. Neighborhood impacts are identified in Section 3.2 of the Final EIS, including those within Tysons Corner. Neighborhood impacts are considered as part of the evaluation process.*

Local Agency Comments

Effects on Community Facilities

Local Comment: The issue of "glare" including guideway, station lighting, and vehicle headlights should be examined. (0479, 0479-L –9)

***Response:** There are currently no proposed changes to the current lighting levels and lighting configuration of the West Falls Church Yard in conjunction with this Project. Rail vehicle headlights directed toward the tracks will be the only lighting associated with the mainline. Lighting of stations and facilities will be planned to minimize spillover into residential areas.*

Local Comment: We recognize as well that there are significant pedestrian and school traffic throughout this area. (0165, 0165-T –7)

***Response:** Impacts to community facilities are discussed in Section 3.2 of the Final EIS.*

Local Comment: The Draft EIS at Section 3.0 addresses social effects of the proposed Project. It attempts to analyze and identify potential effects on each of the affected communities and their services and facilities. The document, at Section 3.2, states that the section includes consideration of schools. However, the potential impact upon the Falls Church City Public School system, due to the close proximity of the Project and the attendant traffic and safety concerns, is completely omitted. This is another significant oversight that must be addressed. (0122, 0122-A –27)

Local Comment: Overall, we strongly believe the Draft EIS' lack of full analysis could prove disastrous for the City (of Falls Church), the surrounding neighborhoods and our educational structures. Moreover, we suspect there may be a tremendous safety concern if proper evaluations are not conducted. We believe our neighborhood streets will be inundated with motor vehicles and the project will be considered a failure. Existing infrastructures will be adversely affected and must be effectively remedied by operational plans and new facilities. (0122, 0122-A –28)

***Response:** Potential impacts to community facilities, such as schools, are summarized in Section 3.2 of the Final EIS. Community facilities located within 300 feet of the centerline of the Build Alternatives and within one half-mile of the proposed station areas were identified for evaluation. Community facilities were evaluated for changes to community cohesion, isolation effects, noise and vibration, access changes, and safety. No effects on the school system of the City of Falls Church are anticipated due to the two Build Alternatives. The athletic fields at George Mason High School, a Falls Church public school, were considered in Section 3.6 of the*

Final EIS. No effects on this recreational resource are anticipated as a result of implementing the Build Alternatives.

Based on the analysis of the forecast traffic volumes for the East and West Falls Church Metrorail Stations, the Project Team does not anticipate that overflow parking onto residential streets will be a problem. Moreover, since completion of the Draft EIS analysis, WMATA has programmed a 960-space parking facility at West Falls Church to be completed in early 2005. The Project Team also initiated meetings with the City of Falls Church to discuss the issues of overflow parking and cut-through traffic.

Large increases in the number of vehicle trips are also not anticipated in the West Falls Church Station area due to the Project. The Project will initially divert a number of Metrorail customers from this station to the Dulles Corridor stations. Over time, due to population growth and latent demand not directly associated with the project, the traffic activity at West Falls Church Station will return to its former level. Nevertheless, the Project Team does not anticipate any increases in Project-related cut-through traffic in the City of Falls Church.

Public Comments

Traction Power Substation Locations and Potential Effects

Public Comment: The proposed location of the [Traction Power] Substation severely impacts 2 residences in the [Chathams Ford] neighborhood, which will suffer aesthetic impairment and undue loss of property value. The neighborhood as a whole will also be negatively impacted. (0174, 0300-L –15)

Public Comment: Construct the Traction Power Substation in the cul-de-sac at the end of Chathams Ford Drive where there would be minimal impact to the neighborhood. It's important to demonstrate what these buildings look like. First, they are not like the power utility boxes which many of us have in our front yards. These utility boxes are 4 feet high and 3 feet wide and 3 feet deep. The Traction Power Substations are substantial buildings as much as 90 feet long, 90 feet deep and one story tall. On Chathams Ford Drive, they will be located about 20 feet from the property line and will extend from the driveway of 9613 to the driveway of 9611. There will also be another building called a Remote Train Control Room constructed next to the Substation. These are substantial structures that do not belong in residential neighborhoods. (0174, 0300-L –16)

Public Comment: We recommend that the Traction Power Substation and its companion building be constructed further down Chathams Ford Drive in a vacant cul-de-sac. This location minimizes any reduction in housing values and the aesthetic impairment to the neighborhood. (0174, 0300-L –17)

Public Comment: Next, the proposed Traction Power Substation to be built across from 9613 and 9611 Chathams Ford will create additional noise pollution because of the electrical apparatus inside the building. (0174, 0300-L –9)

Public Comment: The final issue is the traction power stations which will have an impact on several homes. These are very large buildings, up to 90 feet long and 90 feet in depth. We recommend they be moved to the cul-de-sac. (0174, 0174-T –7)

Response: *The location of traction power substations and tie-breaker stations are preliminary. As described in the Final EIS, these ancillary facilities were sited based on systems engineering requirements, environmental, and right-of-way constraints. A power analysis was conducted to determine the number and size of substations required and the optimal spacing for these stations. The locations and enclosure designs of these facilities will be evaluated further during the preliminary engineering and final design phases of the project. See the final General Plans (Final EIS Volume IV) for the current locations of these facilities.*

Community Connectivity

Public Comment: The other thing that I'm noticing is not only for the bus rapid transit, but for metro, is a lack of connection to the surface. (0255, 0255-T –3)

Response: *Comprehensive feeder bus plans have been developed for the LPA. These plans identify service frequencies throughout the day, number of trips, routings, and station/stops served. These plans were developed based on consultation with technical staff from Fairfax and Loudoun counties. These plans also reflect county technical staff's estimates of demand for the feeder service as well as additional demand estimates developed by the Project Team. Ultimate responsibility for running these feeder networks will rest with Fairfax and Loudoun counties, who are responsible for the current operations of the systems in each county. See Chapter 6 of the Final EIS for more information.*

Public Comment: One of the things I'm noticing from the statistics here is that for the same operating cost for the bus rapid transit system, you could get triple the penetration of the local neighborhoods. This is particularly important to me because under the current plan, Sterling Park gets apparently nothing. It's a four-mile car trip or, if you're lucky, by bicycle just to get to a station. And likewise, a heavy rail system also needs connectivity to the neighborhoods to work. (0255, 0255-T –5)

Response: *The feeder bus plans developed as part of the LPA were completed in consultation with technical staff from Fairfax and Loudoun counties. These plans also reflect county technical staff's estimates of demand for the feeder service. See Chapter 6 of the Final EIS for more information.*

Community Effects of Nighttime Construction

Public Comment: Another frightening aspect of your study is the statement that heavy rail construction at the Orange Line/Dulles connection would take place at night! The only impact I could find was the suggestion that fewer travelers would be inconvenienced. What about those of us who must sleep at night in the surrounding neighborhoods? (0145, 0452-E –6)

Response: *The short-term construction effects and noise generated by construction were included in the noise analysis and any adverse effects on neighborhoods identified. Certain construction work at junction of the Metrorail Extension and the existing Orange Line and in the West Falls Church Yard must be completed during Metrorail non-revenue hours.*

Public Comment: What is the perceived impact on the quality of life for all communities and/or neighborhoods near the corridor and proposed transit stations? (0147, 0459-L –10)

Response: *A variety of factors were evaluated as part of the community impact assessment included in Section 3.2 of the Final EIS, all of which could affect quality of life. Adverse noise, traffic, and physical intrusion impacts are limited due to the location of the two Build Alternatives within existing rights-of-way. Positive impacts such as increased property values and mobility benefits due to the introduction of transit are also identified in the Final EIS.*

Community Impact Assessment

Public Comment: My neighborhood's concerns revolve around noise, vibration, and traffic. My community [Ellison Heights-Mt. Daniel] borders I-66, rail, and the West Falls Church transit station. Ironically, my community was not listed as an impacted neighborhood. Nor was the Villages condominium complex right next to the Pavilion. Nor were the three neighborhoods bordered by I-66, Haycock Road, and Great Falls Street, a triangle of land where residents already suffer significant noise impacts from I-66 and the connector split. You didn't include the Lemon Road community, one that already suffers from the noise from your maintenance yard. (0145, 0452-E –1)

Response: *Neighborhood impacts are assessed in Section 3.2 of the Final EIS. A community impact assessment for each neighborhood within 300 feet of the centerline of the two Build Alternatives and within a half-mile of new stations were included for evaluations with regards to changes to community cohesion, isolation effects, displacements, noise and vibration, access changes, and safety. Neighborhoods located between the East Falls Church and West Falls Church stations and already in close proximity to rail were not included in the analysis because there are no projected changes in service due to the project in this section of the corridor. However, the 300-foot boundary was used only for the direct community impact assessment and neighborhoods that had projected visual or noise impacts beyond the 300-foot boundary were also assessed in the Final EIS, which is why the Pavilion was included in the neighborhood assessment. Noise impacts for residents in proximity to West Falls Church Station and I-66 were included and have been identified for the Idylwood and Westhampton communities. The Villages Condominium complex was not included because no effects --either community, noise, visual, or traffic-- are projected in relation to the two Build Alternatives. The same is true for the Ellison Heights-McDaniels neighborhood, which is located south of I-66 and just east of the West Falls Church Station, for which no increase in traffic is projected. The same is true for the neighborhoods located in the triangle of land identified in the comment; no through traffic is projected to West Falls Church Station and no community impacts have been identified.*

Public Comment: Your report says that neighborhoods within 300 feet of the centerline of the build alternatives and within one-half mile of the station areas were identified for evaluation. You missed some of us even using those criteria! In addition, we believe your criteria for selecting neighborhood impacts were flawed. Noise and traffic carry much further than 300 feet. We would like to see the impacts identified for a broader area. (0145, 0452-E -2)

Public Comment: So, within the EIS analysis, the listing of neighborhoods that will be impacted by noise and/or vibration for various alternatives is incomplete, thereby making all conclusions incorrect. Please go back, do a thorough analysis of the neighborhoods that may be impacted, and revise your report. (0145, 0452-E -3)

Public Comment: The study area was too restrictive. Neighborhoods within 300 feet of the centerline of the Build Alternative alignments and within one half-mile of the proposed station areas were identified for evaluation. (3-2) (0147, 0459-L -8)

Public Comment: So within the EIS analysis, the listing of neighborhoods that will be impacted by noise and/or vibration for various alternatives is incomplete, thereby making all the conclusions incorrect. Please go back, do a thorough analysis of the neighborhoods that may be impacted, and rewrite the report. (0145, 0145-T -6)

Public Comment: As residents of the Westhampton neighborhood which is next to the West Falls Church Metro station, we also wish to express our wish that the problems of increased noise and traffic, especially cut-through traffic in our neighborhood will receive careful consideration and planning. We hope the Project will include necessary and adequate road and noise mitigation improvements. (0483, 0483-E-2)

Response: *The methodology used for identifying impacts to neighborhoods is based on the techniques described in the Federal Highway Administration's Community Impact Assessment: A Quick Reference for Transportation. Neighborhoods and community facilities were identified within 300 feet of each proposed alignment. Noise impacts were further analyzed within 1,000 feet of the proposed alignment. Generally, noise impacts from the types of facilities proposed are not expected to exceed 200 to 400 feet, depending on the topography. Traffic analyses were also conducted for areas outside of the 300-foot boundary including intersections and routes that provide access to the stations, and all neighborhoods within a half-mile of any new stations were also evaluated.*

The boundary for the noise assessment is not dependent on the listing of neighborhoods. All neighborhoods within 300 feet of the centerline of the two Build Alternatives and within a half-mile of new stations were included as a starting point for the analysis of direct community impacts such as community cohesion, the creation of barrier effects, displacements within neighborhoods, changes in access, or effects on community facilities. Any other neighborhoods outside of this boundary that were projected to experience noise and/or vibration or traffic impacts were then added to this boundary. Noise impacts were further analyzed within 1,000 feet of the proposed alignment. Neighborhoods that are not included in the Final EIS are not projected to experience any effects due to the two Build Alternatives.

The analysis of neighborhoods was based on the best available data and consisted of information obtained from local jurisdictions, field visits, and ADC maps. Neighborhoods that are located between the East Falls Church and West Falls Church stations and that are already near rail were not included in the analysis, since there are no projected changes in service due to the project in this section of the corridor and no potential for neighborhood impacts.

Public Comment: The DEIS reports that the social and environmental effects from the project are anticipated to be minor, especially given the length and complexity of the project, because most of the proposed improvements would occur within the medians of the Dulles Connector Road, DAAR and the Dulles Greenway. (S-27) This conclusion establishes a bias and restricts the community impact assessment. (0147, 0459-L –17)

Response: *This conclusion was reached after an objective analysis of the community impacts associated with the two Build Alternatives. The use of the 300-foot buffer on either side of the alignment and half-mile radii at the transit station areas resulted in the inclusion of numerous neighborhoods in the corridor that were evaluated for impacts as discussed in Section 3.2 of the Final EIS. Few impacts have been identified other than noise and traffic impacts for the vast majority of neighborhoods assessed. Since the two Build Alternatives are located primarily within existing transportation rights-of-way there are few neighborhood and community impacts, in comparison to other alignments on new locations that could include numerous residential displacements.*

Public Comment: There was a lack of public involvement in defining the project's study area. The project team conducted 55 meetings with communities, associations, and other organized groups. Out of the 55 meetings, only 7 were held with community associations. An examination of the listing of meetings, the project team conducted more meetings for business groups or associations that have gone on record supporting the Rail alternative. To gather this information, the study area should be expanded to include all neighborhoods that border or have a link to the geographical area. For example, neighborhoods such as Equestrian Park, Hunter Mill Estates, and Victoria Farms should have been included in community impact analysis. This information should be included in the DEIS for public review. (0147, 0459-L –18)

Public Comment: The DEIS failed to meet the standard described in the Federal Highway Administration's Community Impact Assessment: A Quick Reference for Transportation. (3-33) This resource states that analysts should recognize that the project may have social consequences to communities well beyond the immediate geographic area (p. 12). Analysts for this project failed to fully analyze the community impact beyond the immediate geographic area. (0147, 0459-L –9)

Response: *The methodology used for identifying impacts to neighborhoods is based on the techniques described in the Federal Highway Administration's Community Impact Assessment: A Quick Reference for Transportation. The Project Team did consider consequences to communities beyond the immediate geographic area. Neighborhoods and community facilities were identified within 300 feet each of proposed alignment. Noise impacts were further analyzed within 1,000 feet of the proposed alignment. Generally, noise impacts from the types of facilities proposed are not expected to exceed 200 to 400 feet, depending on the topography. Traffic analyses were also conducted for areas outside of the 300-foot boundary including intersections*

and routes that provide access to the stations, and all neighborhoods within a half-mile of any new stations were also evaluated. The 300-foot buffer and half-mile radii were the starting point and focus for the direct community impact assessment included in Section 3.2 of the Final EIS. Any other neighborhoods that were projected to have dispersed effects, such as noise or traffic effects, outside of this boundary were added to the neighborhood analysis.

Public Comment: The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) failed to analyze the community impact resulting from placing an industrial level rail facilities at the Golf Park on Hunter Mill Road. The Golf Park is bounded on the west by Hunter Mill Rd, on the north by Crowell Road, on the south by the Dulles Toll Road and on the east by Victoria Farms, a community of single family homes on Rural Estate (RE) planned and zoned land. It should be noted this property has been the subject of much community activity to include a law suit that went to the Virginia Supreme Court where it was reaffirmed the underlying planning for this property remains RE, even with the Golf Park use. (0148, 0463-L –1)

Response: This property is identified as residential on the land use map as described in Chapter 3 of the Final EIS. Federal regulations require that analysis of parkland effects, as included in Section 3.6 of the Final EIS, include publicly owned and operated areas protected under Section 4(f) regulations. Thus, the privately owned Golf Park, also known as the Thoburn property, was not included in the analysis. It should be noted that the Golf Park is already buffered from the Dulles Toll Road and surrounding developments by existing berms, and that the property owner has submitted redevelopment plans for the Golf Park, although those have not been approved by Fairfax County.

Public Comment: More importantly, the proposed system would create much new activity in our neighborhood, including years of construction and increased traffic and then probably an elevated track with associated noise. There also is proposed a "driver comfort station" immediately adjacent to our neighborhood, which is sure to be a nuisance. The elevated track would parallel my street, Greenwich, and would be a major disturbance. (0307, 0307-E –2)

Response: The BRT with its bus layover facility in the median of the Dulles Connector was eliminated from further consideration after the public and interagency review and comment on the Draft EIS. See Chapter 2 of the Final EIS for a summary of impacts and mitigation associated with the Locally Preferred Alternative.

Public Comment: If the project does go through, I urge consideration of noise/traffic abatement measures and construction of appropriate barriers. Possibly such construction could include development of a long-needed pedestrian walkway parallel to the barriers and the Dulles access right-of-way, which could allow persons to finally walk safely and efficiently from our neighborhood and adjacent areas to the West Falls Church station. (0307, 0307-E –4)

Response: Noise abatement and traffic mitigation measures will be incorporated into the design of the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) as specified in Chapters 4 and 6 of the Final EIS. Noise abatement measures would be located within the median of the Dulles Connector Road adjacent to the alignment of the Wiehle Avenue Extension and would not include the construction of a parallel pedestrian walkway as requested in the comment.

Public Comment: WMATA and VDRPT need to provide more detail on social and community impacts. The documents provide scant review of the impacts of increased traffic on residential streets leading to rail stations. (0112, 0462-L –49)

Public Comment: In addition, we believe your criteria for selecting neighborhood impacts were flawed. Noise and traffic carry much further than 300 feet. (0145, 0145-T –5)

Public Comment: Your report says that neighborhoods within 300 feet of the centerline of the build alternatives and within one-half mile of the station areas were identified for evaluation. You missed some of us even using those criteria. (0145, 0145-T –4)

Public Comment: Not only is this present evaluation incomplete and inadequate for the area selected (1/2 mile of a rail station), limiting the study to that area failed to reflect the true impact throughout the community. I don't know what organization selected that 1/2 mile radius, but it resulted in a study that is flawed by any objective standard. Nobody desiring a complete objective study of the environmental impact of the project would accept such a limited view of such a massive project. Reston is a planned community and its neighborhoods are interdependent and not islands separated by artificial boundaries (i.e., the 1/2 mile circle) such as the ones selected for examination by the draft EIS. The failure to fully evaluate these impacts show a failure of the draft Environment Impact Statement to fulfill the requirements of such an endeavor. I am in favor of rail to Dulles and have been for years; however, the incomplete evaluation presented by the EIS is not acceptable and fails to inform the public adequately. (0454, 0454-E -3)

Public Comment: Though Sections 3 and 9 of the DEIS may meet some threshold technical compliance with NEPA, they do not answer the affected residential community's most obvious and fundamental questions about impact on school boundaries, traffic volumes for local roads, and the natural environment. With the enormous public resources and expertise assembled for this project, a reasonable person expects that impact on communities served by local roads between Reston and Tysons Corner and Reston and Oakton would be a focus of the study. (0460, 0460-L -2)

Response: *The analysis of neighborhoods was based on the best available data and consisted of information obtained from local jurisdictions, field visits, and ADC maps. Neighborhoods that are located between the East Falls Church and West Falls Church stations and that are already near rail were not included in the analysis, since there are no projected changes in service due to the project in this section of the corridor and no potential for neighborhood impacts.*

The methodology used for identifying impacts to neighborhoods is based on the techniques described in the Federal Highway Administration's Community Impact Assessment: A Quick Reference for Transportation. Neighborhoods and community facilities were identified within 300 feet of each proposed alignment and within a half mile of new stations in order to assess traffic on roads that provide access to the stations. The detailed evaluations are included in the Land Use and Socioeconomics Technical Report (June 2002) and summarized in the Final EIS. In evaluating the potential for an increase in cut-through traffic in residential areas, all access points to neighborhoods were evaluated. In most cases, the primary access routes to the stations are not through residential areas, but along major arterials such as Route 123, Route 7, Wiehle Avenue, and Reston Parkway that border neighborhoods. See Chapter 2 of the Final EIS for a summary of potential impacts and mitigation associated with the Project.

Public Comment: On the pages 333 of the EIS, in reference to impacts to neighborhoods, communities and community services, it is noted that the topic areas described in the Federal Highway Administration's Community Impact Assessment, A Quick Reference for Transportation, certain topics were used. I have a copy of that book because I have used it in other things looking at community impact. There are many other areas in here talking about community impact that I would like for you to analyze. Specifically it notes that you should look at the impact of traffic shifts in the community. You have to look at the impact of communities when there's not sufficient parking. You were supposed to look at -- or you could look at land uses when these findings could make an impact on schools. (0147, 0249-T -3)

Response: *The analysis of traffic shifts and parking spillover in neighborhoods were included in the Final EIS. These impacts are summarized in Section 3.2 of the Final EIS. Potential impacts to community facilities, such as schools, were also considered in the analysis. Community facilities located within 300 feet of the centerline of the LPA and within one half-mile of the proposed station areas were identified for evaluation. Community facilities were evaluated for changes to community cohesion, isolation effects, noise and vibration, access changes, and safety. In addition, after the noise and visual impact analysis became available, it was reviewed to ensure that all neighborhoods affected were included in the analysis.*

Public Comment: As you and other leaders consider the selection of an alignment, please remember that the area of the Tysons Central B station is where the greatest density of residents in Tysons live today. It is also the location of the greatest planned residential growth in Tysons for the future, with or without the transit station. These residents will want and deserve the convenient access to transit that alignment T4 provides. You have the ability to plan for that now. (0084, 0084-L -8) (0084, 0458-E -7)

Response: *The Alignment T4 was eliminated from further consideration after the public and interagency review and comment on the Draft EIS, due to its visual effects. However, the Locally Preferred Alternative evaluated in the Final EIS includes four Tysons stations along Alignment T6.*

Public Comment: Citizens deserve unbiased and adequate community impact assessment. Draft EIS failed to follow Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) Community Impact Assessment methodology. The Draft EIS fails to supply a meaningful level of detail of impacts to communities. (0148 03-01)

Response: *The analysis of neighborhoods was based on the best available data and consisted of information obtained from local jurisdictions, field visits, and ADC maps. The methodology used for identifying impacts to neighborhoods was based on the Federal Highway Administration's Community Impact Assessment: A Quick Reference for Transportation.*

Public Comment: The Project Team failed to consider important factor in FHWA's Community Impact Assessment and failed to consider a larger study area for communities to be affected by the project. Also a failure of the Project Team to analyze and report interconnections between community impacts. The Project Team should have assessed and reported how differing impacts relate to each other, noting direct and indirect impacts as well as cumulative and counter-balancing impacts. (0148 03-02)

Public Comment: Project Team failed to meet FHWA standards and Draft EIS fails to account for impacts by limiting study area to 300 feet. The Project Team should be required to follow the FHWA methodology and expand the geographic area. (0148 03-03)

Response: *The FHWA methodology was used as a guide since FTA does not have a comparable methodology for assessing community impacts. Neighborhoods and community facilities were identified within 300 feet of each proposed alignment and within a half-mile of new stations to assess traffic on roads that provide access to the stations. Noise impacts were further analyzed within 1,000 feet of the proposed alignment. Section 3.2 of the Final EIS discusses neighborhood and community impacts, and the Land-Use and Socioeconomic Technical Report (June 2002) provides a detailed discussion of impacts and a complete listing of all communities that would be affected by this project. Where applicable, interconnections between neighborhoods and impacts are discussed together, particularly in Tysons Corner and the Mid-Corridor. Chapter 9 of the Draft EIS and the Final EIS discuss direct and indirect, or secondary and cumulative effects of the project on the surrounding neighborhoods.*

Public Comment: The Project Team failed to assess impacts of higher densities due to bonuses, especially with regard to increased travel demand on Hunter Mill Road, Sunset Hills Road, and Sunrise Valley Drive at the intersection of Hunter Mill Road. The Draft EIS failed to complete a community impact assessment that evaluated the impacts on identified nearby roadways. (0148 03-04)

Response: *Based on a decision by the Fairfax County Land-Use Task Force, no land use changes are slated for the Hunter Mill Road area; therefore, the projected increase in densities does not apply to Hunter Mill Road.*

Concerns Over in Change in Development Character Near Stations

Public Comment: The draft EIS does not show the impacts to neighbors that can result from increases in density that can be granted in the vicinity of rail stations. The EIS should be revised to show the zoning categories and density that can be granted under both existing and proposed density bonuses in the vicinity of the proposed rail stations. This information should be shown on maps, and the change this

represents in density and zoning categories over current conditions should be described. (0392, 0392-L-16)

Response: *The change in development character around potential station area locations in the corridor is discussed in Chapter 5 of the Final EIS. The analysis presents the potential effects of increasing densities as part of the discussion of secondary development. This analysis was included in the Final EIS to address comments received during the public scoping process about the need to quantify the potential effects of increased density at transit station areas.*

Need for Appropriate Mitigation of Neighborhood Impacts

Public Comment: While recognizing the need for a new transportation infrastructure, appropriate measures must be planned to mitigate increased noise, pollution, and traffic that will affect the quality of life and reduce property values for the surrounding communities, including the Westhampton neighborhood near the West Falls Church Metro Station. (0414, 0414-L-2)

Response: *The Final EIS does identify noise impacts to residences within the Westhampton neighborhood. Mitigation is summarized in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS for all impact areas evaluated for the proposed project. No increase in traffic is projected through the neighborhood itself and there is no projection of a loss of property values in the Westhampton neighborhood, since the only impact identified --noise-- will be mitigated.*

Public Comment: Community impacts are relatively minimal. The fact that there will be no residences and less than 10 business properties directly taken for this 24-mile project needs to be stressed. Just compare this minimal impact to what the Beltway expansion would do as presented recently. There will be noise impacts, but generally not severe except where trains must turn or switch tracks. Mitigation for nearby residences at such locations is available. In the worst cases, though the DEIS does not seem to indicate the need, mitigation may require enhancing the soundproofing of affected residences near rail yards or tail tracks. The elevated portions and above ground stations create the most visual impacts. Attractive designs and co-location of existing above ground utilities, particularly along Route 7 and elsewhere at Tysons, with the rail elevated structures would be a benefit to the community. (0208, 0208-M-4)

Public Comment: Aesthetics - The heavy substructure of the proposed aerial heavy rail in Tysons Corners is visually intrusive. It resembles elevated trains from the past rather than 21st century technology. (0402, 0402-L-13)

Response: *The Project Team recognizes that the aerial guideway and stations are important visual elements that merit careful study and sensitive treatment; these elements would be refined during preliminary engineering and final design. The final Team recommendations state: "With respect to Metrorail aerial structures, the Project Team should consider aesthetic designs that are compatible with the surrounding environment."*

Public Comment: Concerned about overflow parking from transit stations. There is no information about alternative mitigation measures due to increased densities. (0148 03-05)

Response: *The Project Team is not anticipating overflow parking at transit stations as a result of the project. Fairfax and Loudoun counties and their residential communities might implement 'parking by permit only'. The level of development projected in the Final EIS represents a worst-case analysis and local government may limit growth if their mitigation measures designed to limit the effects of increased density are not being achieved. Actual implementation of transit-oriented development and the timing and increase in densities is under the jurisdiction of Fairfax and Loudoun counties, so any mitigation needed to support the increase in densities is also under the jurisdiction of the counties, and they have included measures in their land use regulations.*

Public Comment: Requests continued dialogue between design team and communities on project impacts and mitigation throughout the design process. (0430 03-04)

Response: *The Project Team will coordinate with the Westhampton neighborhood and Fairfax County through the preliminary engineering and final design phases of this project.*

Concern for Impacts to Neighborhoods and Community Facilities

Local Comment: Commenter does not have any comments on the *Public Hearings Report*, however, he would like to receive conceptual and final design plans, as the project may affect the City's water system. (0497 3-01)

Response: *The City of Falls Church Public Utilities Department has been added to the mailing list and will receive the Final EIS and final General Plans.*

Public Comment: What is the anticipated noise, vibration, and visual impact for the Hunter Mill Estates and Victoria Farms communities, which are adjacent to the Dulles Corridor? (0460, 0460-L –10)

Response: *There are no noise, vibration, or visual impacts identified in Hunter Mill Estates or Victoria Farms neighborhoods.*

Public Comment: Now with metrorail all residents of 8340 Greensboro will never have a peaceful life after a hard day of work. Please think of another alternative and develop the project closer to the larger corporation i.e., Gannett office. They need it more. (0055, 0055-CC-1)

Public Comment: I really believe that if they put in an elevated railway through Tyson's Corner, they're going to make a slum area out of it. They're going to turn it into a slum area. There's no two ways about it, because there's nobody in their right mind. Let's say for argument's sake I have an apartment right on West Park Drive. There's going to be a station there, according to that T-4 plan. Who could I sell that apartment to when I want to retire? (0085, 0281-T –2)

Public Comment: I'm fully in agreement, we do need the transportation to relieve the traffic congestion. But everybody seems to be talking about either buses or trains, that are Metrorail's. But when they speak of the Metrorail, nobody seems to be particularly concerned about whether it's above-ground or underground. And I feel certain, after all my years living in various cities throughout the United States and other places, that wherever they put a Metrorail or a railroad through a residential area, or any sort of congested area, you create a slum. (0085, 0281-T –1)

Public Comment: The anticipated noise, vibration and view stand to reduce the desirability of the affected [Rotunda] units and thus reduce their resale value. This comment is based on the post-construction value. The value of these units during construction would be even worse. (0156, 0156-T –3)

Public Comment: My condo, bldg. 2-222 second floor unit, backs to Westpark Drive. The existing traffic & noise is awful. Can't imagine how horrible additional people, traffic and noise would be if this loop or spur were run on Westpark behind our 2 bldgs. (0020, 0020-L –2)

Public Comment: I am very concerned about the impact it is going to have on the value of the properties in the Rotunda Condominiums. Also the noise, dirt and new traffic problems. (0053, 0053-CC-1)

Response: *Alignment T4 was eliminated from further consideration after the public and interagency review and comment on the Draft EIS, in part due to its visual effects.*

Public Comment: We do have serious issues, however. These would be about noise and traffic - both during and after construction! For our purposes, neither of these issues is sufficiently addressed, if at all, in the EIS. I and others have personally attended all the public meetings on this issue over the last two

years, and in speaking with the project representatives at such meetings, we were assured that our concerns would be addressed in detail. Sadly, this has not happened. (0126, 0126-E –2)

Response: *Noise impacts are assessed in Section 4.7 of the Final EIS. Specific impacts of operation and construction are also discussed. Traffic impacts are discussed in Chapter 6. In these sections, the impacts are identified, and proposed mitigation measures available to reduce unavoidable impacts are discussed.*

Public Comment: It is our impression that The Project has bigger fish to fry, and cannot take the time to address localized issues, although this in fact is a legal requirement. Our property is not even listed in the EIS as an impacted neighborhood, although we are located virtually next to the West Falls station and the turnout and curve for the new Dulles extension. (0126, 0126-E –3)

Public Comment: It is our impression that The Project has bigger fish to fry, and cannot take the time to address localized issues, although this is in fact a legal requirement. Our property is not even listed in the EIS as an impacted neighborhood, even though we are located virtually next to the West Falls station and the turnout and curve for the new Dulles extension!! (0126, 0199-M –3)

Response: *With the Supplemental Draft EIS and revised General Plans (October 2003) the Project Team lowered the Metrorail profile such that the top-of-rail is, on average, 25 feet above the median of the Dulles Connector Road. Localized issues, including a community impact assessment, have been considered in the Draft and Final EIS. Neighborhoods within the vicinity of the West Falls Church Station include residences in close proximity to the station, and are most likely located in either the Idylwood or Westhampton neighborhoods, which were included in the analysis.*

Public Comment: Chathams Ford Drive is a half-mile-long street which runs adjacent to the eastbound lanes of the Dulles Toll Road between Beulah and Trapp Roads. There are approximately 17 residences in the neighborhood. We believe that the residences will experience a series of numerous disruptions from whatever transit proposals are selected. The adverse impacts fall into three categories: Excessive noise, water hazards, and intrusive buildings. (0174, 0174-T –1)

Response: *Effects to the Chathams Ford neighborhood were evaluated as part of the Final EIS. Such effects are summarized in Section 3.2 of the Final EIS. Mitigation measures proposed to address noise effects are described in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS.*

A stormwater best management pond and traction power substation are proposed to be constructed north of Chathams Ford Drive in an undeveloped strip of land between Chathams Ford Drive and the Dulles Toll Road. These facilities are located primarily within the right-of-way for the Dulles Toll Road and no water impacts or intrusion in the neighborhood due to these facilities are projected. The locations shown in the General Plans of these ponds throughout the corridor are approximate and were included to illustrate that a potential need for one of these facilities exists in the vicinity of the location shown. During preliminary engineering, a comprehensive drainage study will be undertaken for the entire corridor to address final locations of all Best Management Practices (BMP) and Stormwater Management (SWM) ponds. This effort should result in some facilities being eliminated, consolidated, or relocated to further minimize impacts to the adjacent areas.

The location of traction power substations and tie-breaker stations are preliminary. As stated in Section 2.4 of the Final EIS, these ancillary facilities were sited based on systems engineering requirements and environmental and right-of-way constraints. In addition, a power analysis was conducted to determine the number and size of substations required and the optimal spacing for these stations.

Public Comment: I worry when I read that rail transit systems do not reduce traffic congestion. I worry about the impacts on our neighborhoods, the traffic, the schools, road widenings. (0147, 0177-T –3)

Response: Discussion of impacts to neighborhoods, community facilities such as schools, and the transportation system are included in Section 3.2 of the Final EIS.

Public Comment: Please tell us what redeeming social features are provided by an elevated train operating adjacent to our home. (0021, 0021-L-3)

Response: Alignment T4 in Tysons Corner was eliminated from further consideration after the public and interagency review and comment on the Draft EIS, in part due to its visual effects. At junction of the Metrorail Extension and the existing Orange Line, the Project Team lowered the Metrorail profile such that the top-of-rail is, on average, 25 feet above the median of the Dulles Connector Road.

Community impacts to neighborhoods are discussed in Section 3.2 of the Final EIS. Potential impacts include noise, vibration, visual, and traffic impacts within specific neighborhoods. Positive impacts associated with the project include improved mobility and access to transit services, and for neighborhoods located within proximity to a transit station, a projected increase in property values.

Public Comment: Believes that the Westhampton neighborhood is subject to disproportionate share of impacts of noise, traffic, air, and visual pollution. States that nowhere else on the Metrorail system are a park-and-ride facility, freeway (Dulles Connector Road), rail yard, and an aerial track simultaneously located near residences. (0430 03-01)

Response: The Project Team is aware of Westhampton's concerns. With the Supplemental Draft EIS and revised General Plans (October 2003) the Project Team lowered the Metrorail profile such that the top-of-rail is, on average, 25 feet above the median of the Dulles Connector Road. The Project Team will coordinate with the Westhampton neighborhood and Fairfax County through the preliminary engineering and final design phases of this project.

Public Comment: The Draft EIS lacks an analysis of how increased residential development would affect educational infrastructure and school districting, particularly when facing a substantial increase in population. (0510 03-01)

Response: Chapter 9 of the Final EIS analyzes secondary and cumulative effects.

Public Comment: The Project Team did not use a 'systems approach' to address community concerns and should implement a systems approach to impacted communities or explain why such an approach was not used. Had a systems approach been used, the core principles of TEA-21 and the planning goals of FTA would be incorporated and the report would address the problems of total noise mitigation, pedestrian access, and the provision of adequate feeder bus service. (0392 03-01)

Response: The Draft EIS, the Supplemental Draft EIS and the Final EIS document the systematic approach that was undertaken to assess the potential effects of the proposed alternatives. Each document references the relevant laws and regulations considered, describes the methodologies used, define the study areas assessed, documents the existing conditions in the study areas, predicts the direct and construction related effects, and identifies proposed mitigation measures available to for any unavoidable substantial impacts.

Public Comment: Increased concerns regarding crime, particularly auto thefts near the Rotonda. It is widely known that there is a higher crime rate at parking garages and locations where commuters leave their cars all day. (0496 3-01)

Response: Metrorail Alignment T4, which affected the Rotonda condominium, was eliminated from further consideration after the public and interagency review and comment on the Draft EIS.

The Project Team agrees that safety is a serious concern and, as standard practice, WMATA employs many measures to ensure patron safety at each of the stations and on the trains. Section 3.7 of the Final EIS addresses safety and security issues related to existing and proposed Metro stations, parking areas, and vehicles.

Public Comment: Although a transit station in the area will make commuting between Dulles and D.C. easier, it would turn a residential area like the Rotonda into an area that resembles a busy section of D.C., which will drive down the value of our homes. Also concerned about the views from the apartments causing a decrease in property values. (0496 3-02)

Response: *Alignment T4, which was aerial at the Rotonda condominium, was eliminated from further consideration after the public and interagency review and comment on the Draft EIS, due to its visual effects, in part due to its visual effects.*

Potential Effects on Adjacent Communities

Public Comment: Light Flashes at Tie Breaker Locations: A brilliant flash of light because of electrical arcing can occur when a train third-rail shoe crosses a tie-breaker in the third rail. This is a potential nighttime nuisance to adjacent residential neighborhoods. The EIS should be revised to discuss this situation and describe how adjacent residential areas would be protected from this potential nighttime nuisance where it would occur. (0392, 0392-L –21)

Public Comment: Light flashes - The light flashes created when trains pass over tie breakers is a potential nighttime nuisance for nearby residents and others. (0402, 0402-L –14)

Response: *The design for the contact rail system provides for bridgeable and non-bridgeable gaps, and complies with WMATA design criteria. It is the non-bridgeable gaps (greater than about 45 feet) that cause the arcing/bright lights. This is due to the fact that a shoe actually departs from an electrical circuit, such as the third rail. Bridgeable gaps require an additional rail section and a direct current feeder breaker at the associated tie-breaker station or substation. The proposed sectionalizing scheme, while costing more, eliminates current interruption to the traction motor on the vehicle, reduces wear and tear on motors, and eliminates the arcing.*

Most of the WMATA gaps are bridgeable and, therefore, will not produce any flashing. The exceptions are:

- 1. At mainline turnouts to yard(s). Note that this traffic would probably be low speed, and arcing would, therefore, be considerably reduced compared to what would be produced by an accelerating or high-speed train.*
- 2. At some of the storage/pocket track turnouts (but only in the direction of the storage track; the mainline gap is bridgeable). As with the mainline turnouts, these gaps are probably associated only with low-speed train operation.*
- 3. At the junction of the Metrorail Extension and the Orange Line outbound from East Falls Church Station.*

During preliminary engineering, these locations can be evaluated further to determine if it is possible (and desirable) to provide non-bridgeable gaps

Need to Service Dense Residential Areas

Public Comment: As you and other leaders consider the selection of an alignment, please remember that the area of the Tysons Central B station is where the greatest density of residents in Tysons live today. It is also the location of the greatest planned residential growth in Tysons for the future, with or without the transit station. These residents will want and deserve the convenient access to transit that alignment T4 provides. You have the ability to plan for that now. (0084, 0084-L –8) (0084, 0458-E –7)

Response: Alignment T4 was eliminated from further consideration after the public and interagency review and comment on the Draft EIS, in part due to its visual effects. However, the Locally Preferred Alternative evaluated in the Final EIS includes four Tysons stations along Alignment T6. The mobility benefits cited have been identified in the assessment of community impacts in Section 3.2 of the Final EIS.

Compliance with NEPA

Public Comment: The Draft EIS and the *Public Hearings Report* do not meet the requirements of NEPA and related law, regulations, and guidelines. (0148 03-06)

Response: The Draft EIS fully complies with the regulations cited. The Draft EIS included a detailed analysis and objective evaluation of a No-Build Alternative as well as four Build Alternatives. All alternatives carried forward for detailed study in the Draft EIS were those deemed to be reasonable from a common sense, technical, and economic standpoint, as documented in the Final Alternatives Analysis Report (May 2001).

The Project Team is confident in the comprehensiveness of the Draft EIS, having received a positive statement from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). EPA has granted the Draft EIS its highest rating for environmental documentation, and remarked that it has not identified any potential impacts that would require substantive changes to any alternative.

B. Supplemental Draft EIS Comments

State Agency Comments

Need to Mitigate Community Impacts

State Comment: This table (Table 3.1-1) indicates that there is “no change” in effects of T6/Y15 vs. the Full LPA. This section of the report needs to address how increased traffic volume, traffic congestion, and spillover parking will be handled by the Project. (0091 0106-4)

Response: The “No Change” in Table 3.1-1 of the Supplemental Draft EIS refers to the difference in impacts estimated for the Metrorail Alternative that was evaluated in the Draft EIS compared to those estimated for the LPA that was evaluated in the Supplemental Draft EIS. The impacts to community resources are listed in the columns with the heading “Locally Preferred Alternative.”

Public Comments

Concern for Impacts to Neighborhoods and Community Facilities

Public Comment: As residents in the West Lewinsville Heights neighborhood of McLean, Virginia, we are submitting this letter to the officials of the Dulles Corridor Rapid Transit Project, Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, and to our local representatives. We are one of many households that border the Dulles Connector Road and as such, the proposed Dulles Corridor Rapid Transit Project will directly impact us. Our concerns are that the Project will impose additional adverse impacts on our property and our quality of life in the following categories:

- Increased noise pollution
- Increased light pollution
- Adverse visual aesthetics
- Increased drainage problems

We feel that if the Rapid Transit rail line is built in the median strip as proposed, the noise pollution, added lighting, and the visual aesthetics to our home and to others in similar circumstances will be profoundly impacted in a negative way.

We do not oppose the construction of the Rapid Transit Project, but we do feel that due to the increased burden it's construction will place on those of us who are directly adjacent to the project, that the WMATA should place a high priority on protecting homeowners from adverse environmental impacts both during the construction of the Rapid Transit Project and after the construction has been completed and the trains are running. In our opinion an environmental wall would be the major solution to our concerns. Such a wall would alleviate three of our major concerns, noise, light, and visual impact. (0147 03-01)

Public Comment: We are one of many households that border the Dulles Connector Road and as such, the proposed Dulles Corridor Rapid Transit Project will directly impact us. Our concerns are that the Project will impose additional adverse impacts on our property and our quality of life in the following categories:

- Increased noise pollution
- Increased light pollution
- Adverse visual aesthetics
- Increased drainage problems

We feel that if the Rapid Transit rail line is built in the median strip as proposed, the noise pollution, added lighting, and the visual aesthetics to our home and to others in similar circumstances will be profoundly impacted in a negative way. (0081 0107-1) (0124 0159-1) (0125 0160-1) (0126 0161-1) (0127 0162-1) (0128 0163-1) (0129 0164-1) (0133 0172-1) (0100 0116-1) (0101 0118-1)

Response: *The estimated effects of the Full LPA (formerly, the LPA) and the Wiehle Avenue Extension (formerly LPA Phase 1) on visual conditions, noise, and water resources are presented in Sections 3.4, 4.2, and 4.7 of the Final EIS, respectively. The specific neighborhoods that have been identified that could experience effects due to the LPA are listed in Table 4-9 of the Land Use and Socioeconomics Technical Report (June 2002). There are no noise, vibration, or visual impacts identified in the West Lewinsville Heights and Great Falls Manor neighborhoods. The Final EIS further refined the assessment of impacts and identified potential commitments to mitigate those impacts.*

Issues Related to Impacts on Neighborhoods

Public Comment: As a resident of the Pimmit Hills neighborhood, located near the proposed Tysons East station, I am interested in trying to build momentum and support for DC RTP in my neighborhood by showing residents that their home will increase in value significantly when the extension is built. (0031 0032-1)

Response: *While the Draft EIS and Supplemental Draft EIS do not quantitatively estimate any changes in the relative socio-economic characteristics of the neighborhoods that would benefit from proximity to the project, increased transportation access in the Dulles Corridor is expected to have a corresponding increase in property values near the stations.*

Public Comment: Proposed financing mechanisms and historic transit construction costs do compound my concern that irrevocable damage will be done to the Reston Community if Wiehle is utilized as a terminus/collector station. (0047 0048-2)

Public Comment: I live off Soapstone near Sunrise Valley Drive, and strongly oppose any Dulles Rail stop at Wiehle Avenue. Reston Town Center would be a fine location for a stop because there are restaurants, shops and the beautiful Hyatt Regency. Wiehle is a residential area that would be compromised by the addition of Dulles Rail. Dulles Rail would add NOTHING to this area except more traffic and countless other problems that accompany a rail stop. Reston does not need two stops -- the Town Center stop will be sufficient. (0051 0052-1)

Response: *The Project Team will continue to coordinate with local residents, stakeholders, and local jurisdictions to preserve to the extent possible the integrity of each community along the Dulles Corridor. See Chapter 11 for a summary of the extensive public participation process that has occurred to date.*

Public Comment: c. That Phase 1 will have no effect on community cohesion (e.g., at TABLE 2-2). This claim is particularly suspect, given the fact that a protracted construction project would ensue, with congestion before the buildout is completed as well as increased tolls on Route 267 then and thereafter forcing many cars to take alternative cut-through routes to and beyond Tysons Corner and Falls Church that inevitably will result in congestion on small, community-access routes as well as more traffic accidents on the hilly terrain where such roads are located. (0068 0173-19)

Public Comment: The new rail line will provide many more places to go by Metrorail, like Dulles airport and the many businesses at Tysons Corner, for area residents who will access the Metrorail system at the WFC station. Also, a primary route for residents of Falls Church and McLean to access the new rail line at the East Falls Church and new Tysons stations is via the intersection at Haycock Road and Great Falls Street. This intersection is already a bottleneck during rush hours, which creates a back up that encourages people to cut through our neighborhood streets. (0026 0027-11)

Response: *In the analysis conducted for the Final EIS, all neighborhoods within a half-mile of transit stations were analyzed to see if they would experience an increase in “cut-through” traffic or other traffic impacts due not only to construction of the LPA, but also due to the increase in traffic associated with continued growth and development. These traffic effects are not projected to impact community cohesion and social interaction, nor are other neighborhoods in the corridor projected to experience reduced community cohesion.*

Public Comment: Our community should get priority for mitigation because we will be subject to an unprecedented level of noise and visual pollution from two freeways, a Metrorail station, two intersecting rail lines, a large rail yard and a steeply curved aerial rail track with a steel and concrete bed all near homes. No other community in the entire metropolitan area is subject to this many sources of noise all together. (0087 0102-2) (0104 0121-2) (0099 0115-2) (0089 0104-2) (0026 0027-2)

Response: *The Draft EIS and Supplemental Draft EIS evaluated the potential for noise and vibration impacts and provided recommendations on potential mitigation strategies to avoid significant impacts. The Final EIS further refined the assessment of impacts and identified potential commitments to mitigate those impacts. See Chapter 4.7 of the Final EIS for the results of the noise and vibration analysis and the end of Chapter 4 for a summary of proposed mitigation measures.*

Issues Related to Impacts on Individual Properties

Public Comment: I would like to know exactly how the LPA will affect my residence. Will it change my street or nearby streets? The map does not go into detail as to where my house is in relation to the LPA. I want to know exactly how close the metrorail and metrorail station will [be] to my house. Please send detailed pictures or whatever you have by email. Thank you. (0002 0002-1)

Response: *The Project would be built in the median of the Dulles Connector Road, some distance from your house on Pimmit Drive. The first station in Tysons Corner, which would be near the Capitol One building, appears to be the station closest to your house. Fairfax County zoning map 40-1 would give you an idea of the distance between the Dulles Connector Road and your residence; this can be accessed on the Fairfax County web site, www.fairfaxcounty.gov.*

Tie-Breaker Station #2

Public Comment: We received the Draft EIS and we are apparently going to be one of the properties that will be adversely impacted by this project. We live at 1838 Baldwin Drive on the cul de sac where this Tie Breaker Station defined as B-2 TBS is to be constructed. What we want to know is what it is, how big a structure and will it extend beyond the present barrier wall. It would have been better if your document had contained some explanations of the components that appeared on the maps. People whose property will be impacted by these things have no idea what they are or what they look like. Looking at the red lines for B-2 on the map it appears that some components of the TBS will extend to the cul de sac. (0003 0003-1)

My wife and I will be attending the briefing on November 25th at the Mclean Community Center. We live at 1838 Baldwin Drive, where we and our neighborhood will be severely impacted by the present proposed plan. Hopefully at this meeting there will be better and more detailed information on what this "Tie Breaker Station (B2) is, what it will look like and why our entire neighborhood has to be disrupted by the proposed access from our now private Cul de Sac. (0003 0013-1)

The tie-breaker station which will be 25 by 50 feet, one story, will be placed effectively in our backyard since the sound wall put up by the FAA in 1980 was really put - - it was a setback from the property line, so we have a sense of where that is going to go. So we are going to have a station and a roadway. (0025 0065-2)

The aerial photo indicates that the roadway would bisect my backyard and it really should be put along the property line, parallel to and adjacent to, the property line and not straddling the property line which does greater damage to my neighbor. (0025 0065-1)

Everyone is very familiar with people who complain about "Not In My Back Yard," i.e., the "NIMBY" syndrome. However, for me this is a literal reality. I am a true NIMBY. As depicted in the aerial photo, the proposed roadway will bisect my yard, leaving my property on either side of the roadway. I ask that the roadway be moved so that it runs adjacent to and parallel to my property line. The roadway should NOT straddle the property line, since this is even more harmful to the neighborhood. Project officials should replace what is removed for construction, e.g., as trees, structures, etc. In other words, make the land "whole." (0025 0026-1)

Public Comment: The Station, as depicted, will be situated between the wooden fence and the Dulles Connector Road, directly behind my house. The Station will be a one-story, brick structure that will be visible from the back of my house. Currently, our view is of trees and of the wooden sound wall that separates the neighborhood from the Connector Road. The visual impact of the Station will adversely affect the unobstructed view that we have enjoyed for many years. (0025 0026-2)

Response: *A typical tie-breaker station is approximately 45 feet by 20 feet and about 13 feet high. Tiebreaker stations are usually located at crossovers in the rail tracks, and sometimes require an adjacent remote train control room that is approximately 20' by 20'. They break the rail line into sections, allowing power in one or more sections to be shut down for maintenance without affecting the power supply to the rest of the system.*

The Project Team has recommended Option A as the location of TBS-2. The implementation of the Project Team's detailed recommendations should mitigate any effect of TBS-2 on residential property values. DRPT will compensate the owner of 1836 Baldwin Drive for the permanent easement for the access driveway and apron at fair market value. TBS-2 itself will be located within the existing public right-of-way for the Dulles Connector Road.

The Team recommends that that a new wooden noise wall surround the TBS-2 for its security, for enhanced community safety and for the aesthetics of the neighborhood. Since TBS-2 would not be visible from the Baldwin Drive neighborhood, it would not receive any architectural treatment. The new wooden noise wall would have doors at the location of the doors of the TBS-2 and the remote train control room. The height of the new wooden noise wall would be sufficient to screen the TBS-2, which has a height of 13 feet.

The roadway in question is a narrow access driveway used to bring maintenance workers and equipment up to the adjacent tie-breaker station. It was located to minimize impacts to the two adjacent properties. As currently planned, the location of the access driveway and any temporary construction easement will be fully within the property of 1836 Baldwin Drive. The centerline of the access driveway will be parallel with the property line between 1836 and 1838 Baldwin Drive. The driveway and apron of TBS-2 might be of alternate materials, such as geo-grid or open concrete block with grass turf in their cells; the type of materials will be determined during preliminary engineering and final design. During the same phases, the drainage of the TBS-2 site, including its driveway and apron, will be addressed. Specific arrangements regarding landscaping and mitigation of construction impacts will be addressed with affected property owners.

Protecting Quality of Life

Public Comment: I recognize the Project as a potential asset to the greater community and appropriate to and reflective of the growth experienced in the immediate and surrounding regions. However, I do not want to see an end result that is corrosive to the quality of life that has become emblematic of our community.

My challenge to the Dulles Corridor Rapid Transit Project is that you be sensitive to the anticipated impact of the project on my community as well as the surrounding residential communities that share our concerns. Moreover, I challenge the Project and DRPT specifically, to champion our noise/visual concerns as you deliberate these and other matters with the many authorities that you interact with as you progress your agenda rather than simply direct us to some other agency. As the single entity closest to the proposed rail link development, the Dulles Corridor Transit Project has a singular opportunity to step up as an ally and champion of impacted residents. I see this as a course far preferable to the alternative of failing to act proactively to protect the quality of life enjoyed in the community you have pledged to serve. (0014 0015-4)

Public Comment: Again, we support the potential benefits of this project, given the over-development of this region, but we urge you to simultaneously protect the property values and quality of life of we longtime and preexisting area residents. (0017 0018-2)

Response: *The Project Team will continue to coordinate with local residents, stakeholders, and local jurisdictions to preserve to the greatest extent possible, the integrity of each community along the Dulles Corridor.*

Need to Mitigate Community Impacts

Public Comment: We support the underground construction option mentioned on p. 6-25 for the track leading from the WFC rail yard to the Dulles Connector Road median.

Mitigation such as sound walls and traffic calming falls under the jurisdiction of state and local transportation agencies, although transit agencies are causing the impact. Each is only responsible for either road or train noise, but to our community, it is just noise. We expect someone to fix it, and we expect someone to find the budget to pay for it. (0026 00)

Response: *The estimated noise effects of the project are described in Section 4.7 of the Final EIS. Currently, conventional highway noise walls barriers are not proposed along the Dulles Connector Road or the Dulles Toll Road as part of the project. Three-foot parapets or track edge barriers are the standard used for aerial Metrorail guideway sections, although four- and six-foot parapet barriers are proposed, as mitigation is some areas where exceedances of FTA noise criteria are expected. The types and location of the recommended mitigation measures are described in Section 4.7 of the Final EIS. Figures 4.7-5a and 4.7-5b in the Final EIS are included*

to help identify the location of the proposed four- and six-foot parapet barriers closest to your street.

Public Comment: We ask that the Final EIS add mitigation for any construction impacts for Westhampton. (0026 0027-9)

Response: *The Final EIS specifies mitigation measures that could be used throughout the corridor. Along all sections of the Dulles Corridor, every effort would be made to mitigate construction impacts to businesses and residences during construction periods. DRPT will maintain ongoing communication among all public and private stakeholders throughout the implementation of the project in order to minimize construction effects. Prior to any construction activities taking place, specifications regarding the practices to be undertaken to mitigate potential impacts will be developed. These practices will also be monitored during construction as well to assure compliance.*

Public Comment: Post-construction study of noise, visual and traffic impacts on neighborhoods and contingency funds to pay for additional mitigation if impact is greater than anticipated. (0087 0102-10) (0089 0104-10) (0099 0115-10) (0104 0121-8)

Response: *Visual, noise, and traffic impacts of the LPA are assessed in Sections 3.4, 4.7, and 6.2 of the Final EIS. In these sections, the impacts are identified and proposed mitigation measures available to reduce unavoidable impacts are discussed.*

3.3 Property Acquisition and Displacement

A. Draft EIS Comments

Federal Agency Comments

Residential Displacement

Federal Comment: The environmental impacts are less than the typically more environmentally damaging highway improvements. For example this project is projected to move up to 87,000 riders a day by 2025 with no residential displacements. (0303, 0303-A –3)

Response: *Comment noted. Due largely to the use of existing transportation rights-of-way, minimal impacts are projected.*

Compensation for Acquired Properties

Federal Comment: According to FAA policy, FAA would be required to obtain fair market value in compensation for any airport property used for this project. This policy applies to the DAAR and any stations or other facilities that would be located on airport land. (0485 03-01)

Response: *DRPT will continue to coordinate with MWA and FAA to determine an appropriate methodology for valuation of property required for the Project and the most appropriate legal mechanism for property conveyance. According to FAA policy, "Airport property can be made available at less than fair-market value for public transit terminals, rights-of-way, and related facilities without being considered a violation of federal statutes governing airport finances if (a) the transit system is publicly owned and operated and (b) the facilities are directly and substantially related to the air transportation of passengers or property. A lease of nominal value would be consistent with the requirements for airports to be self-sustaining."*

Public Comments

Compensation for Acquired Properties

Public Comment: Commenter just learned that his property would be taken as part of the north entrance pavilion for the Tysons Central C Station for the Locally Preferred Alternative. Believes that the company would receive little, if any, compensation and that he would not be able to find affordable property, or property that is zoned for a tire and auto store. (0498 3-01)

Response: *As discussed in Section 3.3 of the Final EIS, all federally funded actions are required to meet certain standards for the fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced by those actions. Relocation assistance will follow the guidelines set forth in Title 49, Part 24 of the Code of Federal Regulations (49 CFR Part 24).*

Property Acquisition Concerns

Public Comment: Requesting that the location of the north entrance pavilion for the Tysons Central C station be moved from the Merchant's property. (0498 3-02)

Response: *The proposed location of the north entrance pavilion for the Tysons 123 Station (formerly Tysons Central C Station) was developed to be consistent with the transit-oriented development goals of Fairfax County and trackwork alignment geometry for the Metrorail Extension. However, potential adjustments could occur during preliminary engineering and final design. The proposed Metrorail Extension alignment and facilities can be viewed in the final General Plans (Final EIS Volumes IV and V).*

Public Comment: One acre of their land will be acquired for a storm water retention pond. The commenters feel that their comments were merely acknowledged and not completely addressed because they feel that their lives will be changed in a drastic manner. (0383 03-01)

Public Comment: Oppose the proposed acquisition of one acre of their land for the construction of a stormwater retention pond. They suggest that a present noise problem would be exacerbated with the proposed construction of the retention pond, which would cause the destruction of at least 100 mature hardwood trees that provide auditory and visual buffers to the Dulles Toll Road. (0383 03-02)

Response: *The locations shown in the final General Plans for Best Management Practice (BMP) and Stormwater Management (SWM) ponds throughout the corridor are approximate and were included to illustrate that a potential need for one of these facilities exists in the vicinity of the location shown. During preliminary engineering, a comprehensive drainage study will be undertaken for the entire corridor to address final locations of all BMP and SWM ponds. This effort should result in some facilities being eliminated, consolidated or relocated to further minimize impacts to the adjacent areas. Any acquisition required will be consistent with the Real Property and Relocation Assistance Act: Title 49, Part 24 of the Code of Federal Regulations (49 CFR Part 24).*

The proposed pond location in question currently is a natural depression with a culvert outfall. If a pond were constructed in this location, little or no grading would be required to convert existing depression into a stormwater management facility. It is unlikely that many of the trees would need to be removed.

B. Supplemental Draft EIS Comments

Local Agency Comments

Magnitude of Impacts

Local Comment: Table 3.3-1 seems to have an error in the LPA Phase I (2025) and LPA Phase 1 (Opening Year) columns; Since Phase I will impact fewer properties than the Full LPA, the acreage impacted should be notably less than 139.3 acres. (0093 0109-13)

Response: *This table has been corrected in the Final EIS. The Full LPA) would require approximately 32 acres of private property and 166 acres of government-owned or proffered property. The Wiehle Avenue Extension (formerly LPA Phase 1) would result in approximately 18 acres of private property and 15 government-owned or proffered properties. Additional information on property acquisition and displacements is provided in Section 3.3 of the Final EIS*

Public Comments

Property Acquisition Concerns

Public Comment: By this letter, I would ask that you confirm your intention (the authority's intention) to take the building at the corner of Gosnell and Leesburg Pike which The Business Bank currently occupies. We would not object to the placement of a transit system that would not result in a taking of the building. We strongly object to the proposed taking of our building. The taking of our headquarters building would result in a profound diminishment of our business and severely restrict our ability to serve our customers.

For these reasons, I formally ask that you revisit your plans such that they do not necessitate the taking of the building located at 8399 Leesburg Pike, Vienna, Virginia. On behalf of Building owners, The Board of Directors of United Financial Banking Companies, Inc. and The Business Bank, I thank you in advance for favorable consideration of our request to construct the underground rail by some other means than "cut and cover".(0148 03-01s)

Response: *The Acquisition List of the Project does not include this property as a relocation. The Property Identification Plans do not show the bank building within a permanent easement. However, the construction of the underground Metrorail line will place its shoring of line of influence alongside the building; therefore, there will be construction effects upon the bank. The construction effects and the concerns of the property owner will be addressed during preliminary engineering, when construction methods, limits of construction, lines of influence, and a right-of-way acquisition plan are developed.*

Magnitude of Impacts

Public Comment: The SDEIS seems to indicate that 11 additional commercial properties need to be acquired in a phased project, vs. a non-phased project. This increment needs to be explained and assessed. (0068 0173-26)

Response: *The change in effects identified in the Supplemental Draft EIS of 11 additional commercial properties refers to the difference in effects estimated for the Metrorail Alternative (T6/Y15) that was evaluated in the Draft EIS, as compared to the effects estimated for the Full LPA evaluated in the Supplemental Draft EIS. These changes are primarily due to changes in the design of proposed station facilities. See Section 3.3 of the Final EIS for a discussion of anticipated acquisitions.*

Impacts on Businesses

Public Comment: I don't believe this plan could have affected one business better in a more disastrous way than if it had tried. Not only will it eliminate an entire business, but it will disrupt all three locations. There will be impairment and blockage of ingress and egress of the two businesses on the south side of Route 7. It will take a significant portion of the Aston Martin lot and there is potential encumbrance of ingress and egress on the Mercedes lot. Now, all of this impact in this area for this West Tysons Station is focused one business, HBL. (0070 0079-1)

Public Comment: 3. A Bus transfer location at the Route 7 frontage removes prime commercial property. In the case of the Parcel 55 in the northeast quadrant of Route 7, the existing C-7 zoning allows commercial uses and is the location of the new Porsche-Audi, just opened last month and the site is completely within the County Highway Overlay District. (0053 0054-2)

Public Comment: Taking the entire Porsche-Audi lot on the northwest corner will eliminate between 100 and 150 jobs. It will eliminate nearly \$4 million in tax revenues for the Commonwealth of Virginia and Fairfax County. It will eliminate approximately \$100 million in business activity in the Tysons area. (0070 0079-2)

Public Comment: HBL operates three automobile dealerships at the corner of Tyco Road and Route 7, and under an L-shaped walkway plan proposed under the supplemental draft EIS, one HBL business would be completely closed. Portions of the other two may be taken, and both of those businesses would face serious impacts or disruptions at a significant loss of between 100 and 150 jobs over \$100 million in business activity, and approximately \$3-to-\$4 million in lost state and local tax revenues. (0070 0138-1)

Response: For Tysons West Station entrance and facilities, the Project Team recommended, and the decision-makers selected Option E site plan to replace the plan presented in the Supplemental Draft EIS and revised General Plans. Option E has its station entrance at the inbound, east end of the station near Spring Hill Road. The bus bays and Kiss & Ride of Option E are located between Tyco Road and Spring Hill Road, set back from Route 7.

Displacement impacts of the Full LPA are discussed in Section 3.3 of the Final EIS. The Project Team will work with the property owners to minimize impacts to the extent possible, while providing the necessary space required for station facilities. Upon completion of a more detailed design for the project, a comprehensive relocation plan would be developed to ensure that the orderly relocation of all displaced businesses would be accomplished. Relocation assistance would be available to all residential, business, and nonprofit entities and individuals that would be displaced, without discrimination.

Public Comment: As owners of the above-referenced property, along with the tenant on the site, TBC Corporation, trading as Merchant's Tire, we wanted to express our opposition to the proposed plan for the total taking of the property before the following options are carefully considered: 1. The entrance pavilion shown on our site comprises a foot print of 75' x 90' or 6,650 square feet being approximately 25% of our total lot. There is a grassy area to the west of our lot that is a set back or green area for the neighboring property (SAIC). This grassy area measures approximately 50' x 60' or 3,000 square feet. By shifting the entrance pavilion into this unimproved grassy area, it would reduce the area required on our lot by 10% allowing our lot to still be functional. It could possibly be expanded further if the taking went into a row of parking that abuts this area. Utilizing this undeveloped area makes sense economically and logistically. (0092 0108-1)

Public Comment: 2. There is a 20' outlet road on the east side of our site, one half of which is on our property. This road gives access to the property behind ours. We could possibly utilize this as a new access into our property should we need to give up our existing entrance. As per discussions with the tenant, they would like to continue operating there and they feel the loss of a portion of the front area and existing access would not greatly impact their ability to continue to conduct business. They are willing to discuss limiting any claim for damage from any partial taking once the exact amount of the taking is determined. (0092 0108-2)

Public Comment: 3. There needs to be a thorough exploration of the possibility of switching the entrance to the west side of the platform which I understand has been requested by the owner of that property. (0092 0108-3)

Response: The proposed location of the north entrance pavilion for the Tysons 123 Station (formerly Tysons Central C Station) was developed to be consistent with the transit-oriented

development goals of Fairfax County and trackwork alignment geometry for the Metrorail Extension. However, potential adjustments could occur during preliminary engineering and final design.

DRPT will work with the property owners and tenants to minimize impacts to the extent possible, while working to provide the necessary space required for the station entrance, associated circulation, and maintenance access. The proposed Metrorail Extension alignment and facilities can be viewed in the final General Plans (Final EIS Volumes IV and V).

Public Comment: As the owner of the Property [Tysons Corner Embassy Suites Hotel], and having reviewed the SDEIS, attended the hearings, and otherwise kept abreast of developments, CGLIC has very serious and sincere concerns as to the Project, as presently proposed. Please note that a proposed portal is to be located immediately in front of/adjacent to the Property, and it is planned that the service road fronting the Property, and portions of the Property itself, are to be used/condemned for, among other things, construction easements. Accordingly, CGLIC expects the Project in its present form could have a very detrimental impact on the Property, its operations and its value both long term and short term, including without limitation negative impacts as to noise, access and diminished alternative access, ingress and egress, parking, appearance, business interruption, and reduced utility of the Property. (0106 0124-1)

Response: As currently shown in the General Plans, there would be access and visual effects to this property from the selected LPA. The analysis of visual and aesthetic conditions in support of the EIS considered the relationship of the Project to Tysons Corner as whole and Route 7 for its entirety. The analysis considered the types of viewers and their sensitivity to visual changes and also the degree of visual impact to these viewers. DRPT will work with the property owners to minimize impacts to the greatest extent possible, while providing the necessary space required for station facilities.

Public Comment: Let me first state for the record that at no time before the issuance of the supplemental draft, which I believe was in October of 2003, did anyone approach me from Fairfax County, The Commonwealth of Virginia or WMATA to discuss the proposed taking of my property, the 4.59 acres on Sunset Hills Road that is currently Reston Business Park and Mini Storage. It came as a complete shock to me in late October when someone who had seen the draft EIS called to tell me that the Reston Business Park was scheduled for demolition. (0130 0165-1)

Public Comment: As we ultimately discussed when we me[t] on December 17, 2003, this is by far the most valuable property in the entire Wiehle area for several reasons:

1. The existing office warehouse and storage business that has been built up over the last twenty-eight years generates very high net operating income making it more profitable than other commercial uses along the corridor.
2. The comprehensive plan for area G-4 (see attached Exhibit A) allows for up to a 2.5 FAR for rail oriented mixed use development. As we have discussed, mine is the only property that can be zoned at these densities because it is not restricted by the existing covenants for the area along the corridor that is the Reston Center For Industry And Government (RCIG) (see attached Exhibit B). There must be a residential component of no less than forty percent (40%) to get to these higher densities and the RCIG covenants do not allow residential development of any kind.
3. The comprehensive plan calls for consolidation of parcels and we also own the adjoining property to the south known as 11417 Sunset Hills Road with land area of 72,986 square feet (see attached Exhibit C). This parcel fronts directly on The Dulles Access Road and the proposed ramp to the Wiehle Station. By combining these sites, a probable 2.5 FAR could be achieved on the over 273,000 square feet of land. This could translate to a high-density mixed-use project of almost 700,000 square feet- supporting the tax district, WMATA operations and fulfilling the vision of the community.

4. We currently have fourteen (14) businesses that operate from Reston Business Park and 600 self-storage units. This property has always been a significant asset to the community.

5. We have worked in a cooperative effort with the community and the Fairfax County Government for a substantial number of years to achieve the planning and development of this property as envisioned by the County's Comprehensive Plan. Our ongoing planning process will soon result in a rezoning application consistent the Comprehensive Plan, which we expect to be approved in the near future, consistent with the highest and best use of this very valuable property. We would hope that the specter of rail would not interfere with our plans that we have been developing for so many years.

In the final analysis this parcel is far too valuable to be used as a parking lot, temporarily or permanently. I look forward to working with you on the future of Wiehle Station. (0130 0165-2)

***Response:** With the exception of a new roadway connection to Sunset Hills Road, the Wiehle Avenue station facilities would be situated upon the Reston East park-and-ride lot owned by Fairfax County. The final General Plans do not depict use of the Reston Business Park for temporary park-and-ride facility during the construction of the Wiehle Avenue Station facilities. During the construction of those facilities, DRPT would, if necessary, locate temporary bus facilities and parking on an alternative, but economical, site. The Reston Business Park owner may elect to participate in a joint development proposal to include the station facilities.*

3.4 Visual and Aesthetic Conditions

A. Draft EIS Comments

State Agency Comments

Concern for Visual and Aesthetic Impacts

State Comment: Visual pollution and loss of privacy. Many houses along the rail line will be in sight of the elevated tracks and areas for bus parking and the train yard [Westhampton neighborhood]. (0386, 0386-E -4) (0398, 0398-L -4) (0399, 0399-L -4) (0403, 0403-L -3) (0412, 0412-L -4) (0415, 0415-L -4) (0416, 0416-L -4) (0430, 0430-E -4) (0431, 0431-E -4) (0438, 0438-E -4) (0442, 0442-L -4) (0465, 0465-L -4) (0466, 0466-L -4) (0467, 0467-L -4) (0469, 0469-L -4) (0422, 0422-E -2) (0421, 0421-A -13) (0470, 0470-L -4)(0471, 0471-L -4) (0473, 0473-L -4) (0474, 0474-L -4)

***Response:** With the Supplemental Draft EIS and revised General Plans (October 2003), the Project Team lowered the Metrorail profile such that the top-of-rail is, on average, 25 feet above the median of the Dulles Connector Road. Visual impacts in the Westhampton neighborhood associated with construction of the Metrorail Extension were considered and evaluated in the Final EIS. The Project Team will work with surrounding landowners and local government to integrate Project elements into the surrounding development.*

Regional Agency Comment

Visual Effects of Ancillary Facilities

Regional Comment: DEIS Section 3.4.3 on visual and aesthetic effects indicates that views of the IAD tower and Main Terminal from the Dulles International Airport Access Highway (DIAAH) would not be blocked by the east rail portal or by traction power substations; however, the DEIS does not discuss whether views would be affected by fencing or other barriers in the DIAAH median, particularly near Sully Road. (0440, 0440-A -5)

Response: The Section 106 Memorandum of Agreement in Appendix F of the Final EIS describes the Project's adverse effect on the remaining historic "peekaboo" views of the main terminal control tower for approaching travelers from the Dulles International Airport Access Highway (DIAAH) and the mitigation measures. One measure is that the vertical profile of the Metrorail tracks and the concrete safety barrier will be constructed as low as practicable given site conditions to minimize any obstruction of these views of the main terminal control tower. Fencing and other facilities in the median at this location will be minimal and the fencing itself would be transparent to the viewer and should not affect the peekaboo view. Any further design refinements of the approach to the airport will be coordinated with VDHR and MWAA.

Local Agency Comments

Mitigation of Visual Impacts

Local Comment: Mitigate visual impact of the construction of Dulles Corridor Rapid Transit Project by incorporating innovative design features, enhanced lighting, public art and green space. (0437, 0437-E – 10)

Response: Proposed mitigation measures for visual effects are summarized in Section 3.4 of the Final EIS.

Public Comments

Potential Visual Pollution

Public Comment: Apparently there has been little effort to deal with the visual pollution that will be caused by elevated tracks, bus parking areas, and train storage and inspection yards. (0432, 0432-E –1)

Response: The Final EIS describes proposed measures to mitigate unavoidable adverse effects. Some of the mitigation techniques include working with property owners to re-establish landscaping removed for facilities and making alignment adjustments. Elements of the land use in the corridor allow for public art and green space and FTA requires 0.5 percent of the Project's capital cost to go towards public art. The final Team recommendations state: "With respect to Metrorail aerial structures, the Project Team should consider aesthetic designs that are compatible with the surrounding environment."

In the final General Plans, the station architecture of the Dulles Corridor Metrorail Project incorporates WMATA's "New Look" design that is now being completed for New York Avenue Station, and the two stations of the Largo Extension. This concept retains key principles of Harry Weese's original design, with more inviting and better-defined entrances, an emphasis on customer information, and an open, graceful, and light feel through the use materials such as steel and glass for enclosures. These are systemwide "signature" elements that support a unified system identity as well as economical design and construction. The project is expected to maintain a high level of design quality through the use of a special architectural consultant during preliminary engineering and final design.

Concern for Impacts to Neighborhoods and Community Facilities

Public Comment: Requests that the Project Team project the visual impact and loss of privacy for the homes in the Westhampton neighborhood and implement solutions so that the trains are not visible from the homes. (0117 03-01)

Response: With the Supplemental Draft EIS and revised General Plans (October 2003) the Project Team lowered the Metrorail profile such that the top-of-rail is, on average, 25 feet above the median of the Dulles Connector Road. Visual impacts in the Westhampton neighborhood associated with construction of the LPA are evaluated in the Final EIS. The Project Team will

work with surrounding landowners and local governments to integrate Project elements into the surrounding environment.

Concern for Visual and Aesthetic Impacts

Public Comment: The Rotonda has over 1000 units and slightly less than 5% of the units back up to Westpark Drive. There is sufficient permanent vegetation in the form of mature White Pines to block the view of Westpark Drive for those on the first three floors of building 2 and the majority of the remaining units would have sufficient elevation to see over the proposed line. (0120, 0120-L –3)

Response: *It is assumed that the comment refers to Alignment T4 of the Metrorail Alternative. Alignment T4 was eliminated from further consideration after the public and interagency review and comment on the Draft EIS.*

Public Comment: In addition, the rail solutions create a number of design and aesthetic issues of concern, particularly in Tysons Corner. (0139, 0139-T –2) (0139, 0280-T-2)

Response: *The Final EIS describes in detail the various aesthetic and visual issues associated with the elevated alignments and stations throughout Tysons Corner. Section 3.4 of the Final EIS outlines the visual impacts of the project, including those impacts that are predicted to occur in Tysons Corner. The chapter includes a description of physical changes, where visibility is an issue, the types of viewers involved, the viewers' sensitivity to the physical changes, and what the impact of the visual changes is anticipated to be. In addition, the final Team recommendations state: "With respect to Metrorail aerial structures, the Project Team should consider aesthetic designs that are compatible with the surrounding environment."*

Public Comment: The other negative component on this alignment [T4] was the visual and aesthetic impact of aerial tracks along Westpark Drive. It is unfortunate that the underground alternative of this alignment was eliminated from the EIS, as this would have been preferable. However, I believe that Lincoln at Tysons residents and other renters along Westpark will be best served by and will strongly support the aerial line, given the huge benefit of transit service next door. Furthermore, the negative impacts of an aerial alignment would not be eliminated with any other rail alignments, since each of the alternatives includes some aerial segments through Tysons. I would, of course, support reexamination of undergrounding a segment of this alignment if it became necessary to mitigate this impact. (0084, 0458-E –4)

Public Comment: In addition, we argue that the visual and aesthetic impact of aerial tracks along Westpark Drive applies to all four proposed alignments for Tysons Corner. While we would support further exploration of tunneling all or a portion of the T4 alignment, we believe that the positive gains of providing Metro access to ALL of Tysons Corner will far outweigh this perceived negative. (0455, 0455-L –4)

Public Comment: What will be the change in the aesthetic character of those communities and/or neighborhoods located along the corridor? (0147, 0459-L –12)

Response: *The Final EIS describes in detail the various aesthetic and visual issues associated with the elevated Alignment T6 and its aerial stations throughout Tysons Corner. Section 3.4 of the Final EIS outlines the visual impacts of the Project, including those impacts that are predicted to occur in Tysons Corner. Alignment T4 was eliminated from further consideration after the public and interagency review and comment on the Draft EIS. In addition, the final Team recommendations state: "With respect to Metrorail aerial structures, the Project Team should consider aesthetic designs that are compatible with the surrounding environment."*

Public Comment: Although we favor the metrorail option over the bus transit options for transit development on the Dulles Corridor, we are deeply concerned about the noise and visual impact to our community [Greenwich Street] that is directly adjacent to the proposed rail construction. Because our

neighborhood is below the grade of the proposed track site, and the rail is elevated, the effect for our homes in winter will be somewhat like living next to the monorail in a safari park. A visual barrier, such as a row of very tall evergreens (perhaps Norway spruce, white pine or other fast-growing, dense evergreen), strategically sited along the VDOT right-of-way is needed to separate the neighborhood from the transit route. (0389, 0389-E -1)

Public Comment: From what I understand of present planning, my neighbor, Scott Mays, eventually will endure the sight of an 8-car metro train, high in the air, whipping along at eye level every three minutes. His property is bounded by the sound barrier for the Dulles Connector Road...so the distance from his balcony railing to the metro rail action is only the length of his backyard, plus one half the width of the DCR. This situation = residences located below rail level = extends from approximately 745+00 to 785+00 on both sides of the DCR. Potential property buyers would have to weigh the convenience of having the West Falls Church Metro Station within walking distance against having the actual trains essentially in their back yards. Surely this would not be a positive sales feature and could only be a negative influence on property values. (0432, 0432-E -4)

Response: *With the Supplemental Draft EIS and revised General Plans (October 2003) and as depicted in the final General Plans, the Project Team lowered the Metrorail profile such that the top-of-rail is, on average, 25 feet above the median of the Dulles Connector Road.*

Visual impacts in the Westhampton neighborhood associated with construction of the Metrorail Extension are evaluated in the Final EIS. In general, however, the Project Team will work with surrounding landowners and local government to integrate Project elements into the surrounding environment.

Public Comment: The Reston area is rated in the draft (page 3-102, table 3.4-2) as that rail service will have "less than substantial visual impact." The rating neglects the fact that air rights and the adjacent Reston properties are planning to be of mixed use, including housing. In addition, the Rail Corridor will succeed in exacerbating the detrimental effects of the existing highway. Presently the highway includes some green landscaping that provides a modicum of relief from all the hot & noisy paving. Rail service will replace most of the green landscaping with the added noise, chain-link fencing, and that most ugly image of industry: railroad tracks. Most importantly, the combination of two highways and a railway will form a very formidable wall cutting Reston in two. We have the opportunity, instead, to use the rail service to improve the visual/aesthetic conditions and physically unite and encourage more efficient face-to-face interaction, by allowing more direct connections between north and south Reston. This can be accomplished by building the Reston stations below grade. (0441, 0441-E -3)

Public Comment: I submit that, based on the FHWA methodology, the route through Reston should be rated "substantial visual impacts" (see def. on page 3-71). Consequent mitigation should include grade cutting that places the Town Center and Wiehle Avenue stations (and highway) below grade. (0441, 0441-E -5)

Response: *Chapter 3 of the Final EIS states that the actual physical change associated with the Metrorail Extension in the median will be minimal due to the removal of the landscaping for motorists, transit riders, and viewers in adjacent land uses, which would include any new residential development built as part of a mixed-use development. The stations were also determined to have a minimal impact since they are transportation facilities located within a transportation right-of-way and are not inconsistent in scale from the offices and major structures located on adjacent land uses.*

In the final General Plans, the station architecture of the Dulles Corridor Metrorail Project incorporates WMATA's "New Look" design that is now being completed for New York Avenue Station, and the two stations of the Largo Extension. This concept retains key principles of Harry Weese's original design, with more inviting and better-defined entrances, an emphasis on customer information, and an open, graceful, and light feel through the use materials such as steel and glass for enclosures. These are systemwide "signature" elements that support a unified

system identity as well as economical design and construction. The project is expected to maintain a high level of design quality through the use of a special architectural consultant during preliminary engineering and final design.

The pedestrian bridges and stations are designed so that pedestrians may cross from one side of the corridor to the other without having to enter the stations and pay a fare.

Public Comment: As shown on Metro Alignment Exhibit T-4 (Exhibit C), the elevation of the first floor of 8484 Westpark Drive is at 472 feet, while the second floor is at 485 feet and the third floor is at 497 feet. As reflected in the August 27, 2002 letter from John F. Amatetti of VIKA, Incorporated (Exhibit D), "[t]he closest point between the road and building is approximately 84 feet. The distance from the existing wall and the edge of the rail is approximately 33 feet. ...the elevation [of the T-4 alignment] at its closest proximity to the wall and building is at approximately elevation 490.00." At this point, the westbound track of the T-4 alignment is heading southbound on Westpark Drive, on a significant down gradient angle, and cuts sharply across the front of the property inside the curb line of the intersection. The train is an additional 11 feet above the rail, or elevation 501. This means that the rail and train will obscure the views of tenants located on the first, second and third floors of the building. Noise, vibration resulting from the short distance between the train, the retaining wall and the building pose serious economic concerns. (0461, 0461-E -3)

Public Comment: The building presently provides tenants with attractive surroundings at a prestige address conveniently located in the core of the Tysons Corner business center. These attributes enable Northwestern to successfully compete with similarly situated buildings in retaining and attracting tenants including, the high end restaurant and its customers. However, the eyesore of the above-grade alignment will so degrade the quality of the surroundings that this visual blight will obscure and overshadow any remaining positive attributes of the property, and will undermine the ability of Northwestern to retain and attract tenants. Because of the adverse impacts of visual blight, Northwestern will be forced to make significant financial concessions with respect to rates, tenant allowances and lease terms. The building's fair market value will decline substantially as a result of these financial concessions. (0461, 0461-E -4)

Public Comment: Apart from its ownership of its National Headquarters, NADA has a limited partnership interest in the Westpark Corporate Center adjacent to NADA's property. The visual impact from the immediate proximity of this segment of the T-4 alignment, coupled with the noise and vibration of the train, will invariably erode the value of NADA's investment in that property. As shown on Metro Alignment Exhibit T-4 Option, prepared by VIKA Incorporated and the NADA Impact Studies as set forth in five sketches prepared by VIKA Incorporated (Sketches), the horizontal proximity of the T-4 alignment to one of the Westpark Drive and Route 7 is about 33 feet from the existing wall and the edge of the rail. The foregoing Sketches show that the elevation of the first floor of the building is at 472 feet, while the second floor is at 485 feet and the third floor is at 497 feet. The rail elevation is at 490 feet. This means that the rail and train will obscure the views of tenants located on the first, second and third floors of the building. The noise, both during and after construction, will cause distraction. Vibration resulting from the short distance between the train and a retaining wall pose serious safety concerns. (0477, 0477-L -5)

Public Comment: The other source of visual blight upon NADA's headquarters is the above-grade alignment of T-4. As stated in the VIKA Incorporated letter dated August 27, 2002 (Engineering Report) "The first floor of the building is at elevation 502.00. The second floor is at 514.00. The third floor is at 526.00. Based on this, and the rail elevation of 530 feet, the views of most of the tenants on most of first, second, and third floors are obscured by the rail and train profile." (0477, 0477-L -7)

Public Comment: The Headquarters Building presently provides tenants with attractive surroundings at a prestige address conveniently located in the core of the Tysons Corner business center. These attributes enable NADA to successfully compete with similarly situated buildings in retaining and attracting tenants. However, the eyesore of the Substation and the above-grade alignment will so degrade the quality of the Headquarters' surroundings that this visual blight will overshadow any remaining positive attributes of the Headquarters property. (0477, 0477-L -9)

Response: *Alignment T4 was eliminated from further consideration after the public and interagency review and comment on the Draft EIS, due to its visual effects. However, the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) evaluated in the Final EIS includes four Tysons stations along Alignment T6. An assessment of project-related visual impacts is presented in Section 3.4 of the Final EIS.*

Public Comment: Aesthetics -- The appearance of the aerial structure and the aerial stations will have a tremendous impact on the ability of the Metro facilities to be integrated into the area aesthetically. Before the WMATA Board approves the Dulles line, the design configurations for both the stations and the aerial structures should be thoroughly vetted and approved by the community and the County. Obviously, little work has been done to date in this regard. For example, the engineering plans show one aerial structure configuration (similar to that used at National Airport and elsewhere on the Metro system), while the architectural drawings show a significantly different configuration, one that's entirely new to the Metrorail system. (0387, 0387-L –13)

Public Comment: General. The design of the aerial structure in the architectural plans does not match the design of the aerial shown with the alignment drawings. Is the design of the aerial structure as shown in the architectural plans even feasible? Which structure design will be used? Is there any difference in cost? (I would bet that there would be.) (0387, 0387-L –47)

Response: *The Project Team recognizes that the aerial guideway and stations are important visual elements that merit careful study and sensitive treatment. The final Team recommendations state: "With respect to Metrorail aerial structures, the Project Team should consider aesthetic designs that are compatible with the surrounding environment." This will occur during preliminary engineering and final design. The aerial guideway configuration has not been selected at this time; both configurations shown in the final General Plans are under consideration and both are structurally feasible. The cost difference between the two alternatives has not been determined. This selection will be based on an analysis of aesthetics, cost and structural performance.*

Public Comment: No specific information was provided on whether there were visual or vibration impacts and no commitments for mitigation were made. (0430 03-02)

Response: *With the Supplemental Draft EIS and revised General Plans (October 2003) the Project Team lowered the Metrorail profile such that the top-of-rail is, on average, 25 feet above the median of the Dulles Connector Road. Comments pertaining to potential visual impacts in the Westhampton neighborhood have been addressed in the Final EIS. Ground-borne vibration and ground-borne noise levels from activities at project facilities, such as a Metrorail Service and Inspection Yard, are expected to be well below the ambient background levels. Therefore, no exceedances of the FTA or WMATA impact criteria are expected.*

Public Comment: Additional study of the feasibility of running the feeder rail line to the West Falls Church S&I Yard underground near the Westhampton neighborhood to address visual and noise pollution concerns. (0500 03-01)

Public Comment: Additional study of the feasibility of running the feeder rail line to the West Falls Church S&I Yard underground near the Westhampton neighborhood to address visual and noise pollution concerns. (0501 03-01)

Response: *The planning for the connection to the Orange Line of the proposed Metrorail extension has always incorporated the use of at-grade and aerial methods of construction for connecting the flyover from the median of I-66 to the median of the Dulles Connector Road. Provisions for this connection were made with the original construction of the Orange Line in the early 1980s, including the construction of a pier and foundation in between the Orange Line tracks to facilitate such an aerial structure to minimize eventual disruption to the Orange Line during construction.*

The impacts and costs for underground construction of this connection were not evaluated as part of any current alternative in the Final EIS. Making this connection would present extremely complex construction challenges to keep the Orange line fully operational and not impact both directions of I-66, a major interstate highway. Due to its complexity, the cost of this underground construction for this segment would be significantly greater than typical cut-and-cover construction, and many times greater than the planned at-grade and aerial construction.

Public Comment: Concerned with visual and noise impacts since the community lies within 80 feet of the right of way, at the exact location where the Metrorail alignment would become elevated and curve into Tysons Corner. (0137 03-01)

Response: *Section 3.4 of the Final EIS describes in detail the various aesthetic and visual issues associated with the project. This chapter outlines the visual impacts of the LPA, including those impacts that are predicted to occur in Tysons Corner. In addition the chapter includes a description of physical changes, where visibility is at issue, the types of viewers involved, the viewers' sensitivity to the physical changes and what the impact of the visual changes is anticipated to be.*

Public Comment: Commenter says that Alignment T6 was recommended over Alignment T9 because it has less visual impact. Figure 3.4-7 in the Draft EIS conflicts with this reasoning. Figure shows that double column and extra track width of T6 has much greater visual effect than T9 for the entire length of the above grade section. Suggested architectural treatments do nothing to minimize shadow effect on the Route 7 corridor. This effect will have long term negative impact on property owners along the corridor, and will not balance the positives of increased transit options. (Bob Wilberg, Prentiss Properties)

Response: *In Section 3.4 of the Draft EIS, the visual impacts of the Alignments T6 and T9 alignments were listed as identical. Both alignments would have resulted in substantial visual effects to viewers such as motorists, transit riders, and office/commercial workers. These viewers have a moderate sensitivity to visual changes. Impacts to residents, who are more sensitive viewers but whose views are distant, would be less than substantial. With Alignment T6, the Tysons Central 7 Station is underground, while with Alignment T9; the Tysons Central C Station would have been high above ground and would have resulted in more visual effects. As shown in Figure 3.4-7 in the Draft EIS, the areas traversed by the aerial portions of Alignments T6 and T9 include relatively wide roadways surrounded by substantial office and retail development. The addition of an aerial transit alignment and stations would not be out of character with such areas and appropriate architectural treatments are planned.*

Public Comment: Concerned about direct effects on his property at 8521 Leesburg Pike. Transition from underground to aerial will cut off access to Route 7, and would relocate the service road into his front door. T6 will also have visual effects. (0488 03-01)

Response: *As currently shown in the General Plans, there would be access and visual effects to this property from Alignment T6 of the selected LPA. The analysis of visual and aesthetic conditions in support of the EIS considered the relationship of the Project to Tysons Corner as whole and Route 7 for its entirety. The analysis considered the types of viewers and their sensitivity to visual changes and also the degree of visual impact to these viewers.*

Mitigation of Visual Impacts

Public Comment: At any rate, what I wanted to say was in the statements that Mr. Dittmeier made, he mentioned that there were impacts and conflicts which were mitigated in the report. I wish to take exception to that. One of the statements in the report - I may be not exactly quoting verbatim, but it says that the aerial system will dominate the view from hundreds of apartments, many of them, hotel rooms, and certainly from office space. That's true. That is an impact. But it has not been mitigated in the report. (0160, 0160-T-1)

Response: *Alignment T4 was eliminated from further consideration after the public and interagency review and comment on the Draft EIS, in part due to its visual effects.*

Public Comment: Mitigation for visual pollution, such as additional and higher walls, tree plantings, and a structure to cover the rail line [near Westhampton]. (0386, 0386-E -8) (0398, 0398-L -8) (0399, 0399-L -8) (0403, 0403-L -7) (0412, 0412-L -8) (0415, 0415-L -8) (0416, 0416-L -8) (0430, 0430- E- 8) (0431, 0431-E -8) (0438, 0438-E -7) (0442, 0442-L -7) (0465, 0465-L -8) (0466, 0466-L -7) (0467, 0467-L -7) (0469, 0469-L -7) (0470, 0470-L -8) (0471, 0471-L -7) (0473, 0473-L -8) (0474, 0474-L -8)

Response: *With the Supplemental Draft EIS and revised General Plans (October 2003) the Project Team lowered the Metrorail profile such that the top-of-rail is, on average, 25 feet above the median of the Dulles Connector Road. Visual impacts in the Westhampton neighborhood associated with construction of the Metrorail Extension are evaluated in the Final EIS. The Final EIS states: "DRPT and WMATA would consider designs for Metrorail stations, aerial structures, and portals that are compatible with the surrounding environment."*

Public Comment: Use shrubs and trees to bring parking/storage/inspection/maintenance areas into harmony with residential areas. (0432, 0432-E-7)

Response: *The Project Team will work with property owners to re-establish landscaping removed for the construction of facilities and alignment.*

Public Comment: Visual pollution and loss of privacy at many of the houses in Westhampton due to elevated tracks, bus parking areas, and the train yard. Mitigation for visual pollution, such as additional and higher walls and tree plantings. (0483 03-01)

Public Comment: Visual pollution and loss of privacy at many of the houses in Westhampton due to elevated tracks, bus parking areas, and the train yard. Mitigation for visual pollution, such as additional and higher walls, tree plantings, and a structure to cover the rail line are needed. (0499 03-01)

Public Comment: Visual pollution and loss of privacy at many of the houses in Westhampton due to elevated tracks, bus parking areas, and the train yard. Mitigation for visual pollution, such as additional and higher walls, tree plantings, and a structure to cover the rail line are needed. (0500 03-02)

Public Comment: Visual pollution and loss of privacy at many of the houses in Westhampton due to elevated tracks, bus parking areas, and the train yard. Mitigation for visual pollution, such as additional and higher walls, tree plantings, and a structure to cover the rail line are needed. (0501 03-02)

Public Comment: Is concerned that the responses in the *Public Hearings Report* focused exclusively on adding rail to the median of the DAAR. Since their homes lie 20 to 30 feet below the level of the adjoining roadway, they will be exposed to both the sight and sound of the project. While the community supports the project and recognizes its value, without mitigation, the Metrorail Alternative will substantially affect their quality of life. (0137 03-02)

Response: *With the Supplemental Draft EIS and revised General Plans (October 2003), the Project Team lowered the Metrorail profile such that the top-of-rail is, on average, 25 feet above the median of the Dulles Connector Road. Section 3.4 of the Final EIS describes in detail the various aesthetic and visual impacts associated with the Locally Preferred Alternative. The effects vary with respect to the type of visibility involved, the types of viewers involved, the viewer's sensitivity to the physical changes, and the level of physical change anticipated to occur. The final Team recommendations state: "DRPT and WMATA would consider designs for Metrorail stations, aerial structures and portals that are compatible with the surrounding environment."*

Opportunities for Aesthetic Enhancements

Public Comment: What we need here in Reston East is an inspired "gateway." (0072, 0072-CC-2)

Response: *In accord with the final Team recommendations for Wiehle Avenue Station, the final General Plans include a site plan that accommodates future joint development at the station. The site of the joint development would be on the current Reston East park-and-ride facility along Wiehle Avenue.*

Fairfax County Supervisor Hudgins has appointed the Wiehle Avenue Steering Committee, which advise the County staff in the creation of a Request For Proposal (RFP) to solicit transit-oriented joint development proposals for a mixed use development of the County-owned parcel adjacent to the station. Using the conclusions from the Supervisor's Reston Charrette as a starting point, the committee is establishing the process, scope and criteria for the RFP.

While an "inspired gateway" is not explicitly part of the Metrorail Extension, it is possible that a joint development project at Wiehle Avenue Station could include "gateway" elements.

Need to Maintain and/or Improve Visual Quality of Area

Public Comment: County and Reston Center for government and industry architectural review priorities should be to maintain or improve the visual quality of the station areas. (0170, 0170-T –14)

Public Comment: County and RCIG Architectural Review priorities must be concerned about the visual quality of the station area. Reston is interested in innovative design of the corridor stations and measures that mitigate the visual impact of removing the grassy median and trees. (0233, 0426-M –10)

Response: *The Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan is implemented through its Area Plans, which convey the Policy Plan's goals and objectives at the more-detailed Planning District and Community Planning Sector levels. The change in character at the transit stations is discussed in Chapter 5 of the Final EIS. The Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan includes several design guidelines for the Reston area to maintain or improve visual quality. These include guidelines on character and form, building design and height, access considerations, provisions to enhance the pedestrian environment such as the use of plazas and courtyards, subtle design features such as building facades and rooflines, and creating a sense of enclosure and defined space. Fairfax County and the Reston Association govern the refinement of design guidelines in Reston.*

In the final General Plans, the station architecture of the Dulles Corridor Metrorail Project incorporates WMATA's "New Look" design that is now being completed for New York Avenue Station, and the two stations of the Largo Extension. This concept retains key principles of Harry Weese's original design, with more inviting and better-defined entrances, an emphasis on customer information, and an open, graceful, and light feel through the use materials such as steel and glass for enclosures. These are systemwide "signature" elements that support a unified system identity as well as economical design and construction. The project is expected to maintain a high level of design quality through the use of a special architectural consultant during preliminary engineering and final design.

In addition, as discussed in Section 3.4 of the Final EIS, the removal of stands of trees from the median of the DIAAH would represent a minimal visual impact along the corridor.

Public Comment: Western Portal At Dulles Airport - The western rail portal at Washington Dulles International Airport should be moved to a point north of Rudder Road to preserve as much as possible the views of the historically-protected main terminal building [for T6]. It would also move the portal and the noise of the trains further away from the Dulles Airport Marriott hotel and its guests. (0071, 0214-M – 7)

Response: *With the Supplemental Draft EIS and revised General Plans (October 2003) the Project Team relocated northward the portal at the western end of the Dulles Airport tunnel so that the Project's effects on the Dulles Airport Marriott have been reduced. This relocation is part*

of the Full LPA and final General Plans.

The Section 106 Memorandum of Agreement, included as Appendix F of the Final EIS, describes the mitigation of the Project's effects on the Dulles Airport historic district. One mitigation measure is that "The design of aerial structures and portals located within the historic district boundaries will consider, and incorporate where appropriate, concepts and materials that are mutually agreed to be compatible with the historic terminal and other contributing elements of the historic district." Noise effects near the Marriott at Dulles Airport from Metrorail trains are not anticipated to exceed criteria require mitigation measures.

Public Comment: WATF welcomes the comments in Section 7.3.2 of the *Public Hearings Report* on page 595 regarding adequate landscaping and consideration to visual impacts. However, WATF believes that the responses should be strengthened and made a specific requirement for the project. Additionally believe that, project landscaping should be maintained as part of the project and should not be an airport cost. Believes good public architecture should be a requirement. (0133 03-01)

Public Comment: The WATF applauds the reduction in visual intrusion for aerial tracks reported in the revised DEIS, and urges project managers to continue to pay very careful attention to landscaping and architecture for the reasons stated earlier. In addition, good, well maintained landscaping and architecture can increase rider ship as some potential users take them as evidence of a safe and efficient system. Also, visual appeal saves money by generating good will and reduced complaints. (0108 0127-6)

Response: *Landscaping plans of station facilities will be developed during preliminary engineering and final design. In the final General Plans, the station architecture of the Dulles Corridor Metrorail Project incorporates WMATA's "New Look" design that is now being completed for New York Avenue Station, and the two stations of the Largo Extension. This concept retains key principles of Harry Weese's original design, with more inviting and better-defined entrances, an emphasis on customer information, and an open, graceful, and light feel through the use materials such as steel and glass for enclosures. These are systemwide "signature" elements that support a unified system identity as well as economical design and construction. The project is expected to maintain a high level of design quality through the use of a special architectural consultant during preliminary engineering and final design.*

Public Comment: Suggests depressing the rail line in a covered trench, as was done for Centennial Village near Addison Road on the Metrorail Blue Line. Believes that it is possible to cross under (instead of over) the two eastbound lanes of the Dulles Toll Road, and still be high enough to approach an elevated station at Tysons East. Suggests that it would be much more economical than tunneling, and that this cut and cover solution would be much better in terms of visual and noise impacts. (0137 03-03)

Response: *Placing the Metrorail Extension underground between the Dulles Connector Road and an aerial Tysons East Station presents several difficulties, foremost cost, which would be many times more expensive than the approved aerial segment. The Tysons East Station and adjacent alignment was carefully located horizontally and vertically to work in concert with current and future land-use and roadway plans for this area*

Importance of Neighborhood Compatibility of Stations

Public Comment: I would also like to make the following suggestions: Every effort should be made to provide high quality stations with ample parking to help ensure that the stations are not only convenient, but attractive additions to the surrounding neighborhoods. (0393, 0393-L -3)

Response: *In the final General Plans, the station architecture of the Dulles Corridor Metrorail Project incorporates WMATA's "New Look" design that is now being completed for New York Avenue Station, and the two stations of the Largo Extension. This concept retains key principles of Harry Weese's original design, with more inviting and better-defined entrances, an emphasis*

on customer information, and an open, graceful, and light feel through the use materials such as steel and glass for enclosures. These are systemwide “signature” elements that support a unified system identity as well as economical design and construction. The project is expected to maintain a high level of design quality through the use of a special architectural consultant during preliminary engineering and final design.

B. Supplemental Draft EIS Comments

Public Comments

Potential Changes in Character of Neighborhoods

Public Comment: We anticipate the adverse visual impact of the rail link as described in current planning documents. While no longer raised as it passes by our immediate community, even the at-grade rail bed will have a visual impact due to the fact that we do not have the benefit of neither noise abating nor privacy fencing. I envision the effect to something akin to turn-of -the century New York City rail systems or current day "El" in downtown Chicago - neither of which is what my family and neighbors envisioned when acquiring our otherwise bucolic setting where we make our home. (0014 0015-2)

Response: Comment noted. Chapter 3 of the Final EIS describes the visual effects of the Project and its effects on neighborhoods.

In regards to the absence of conventional highway noise walls, the final Team recommendations state “With respect to the concerns of communities on the noise of the Dulles Connector Road, the Commonwealth of Virginia will seek to address the existing noise effects upon the residential communities with noise abatement measures. If the Commonwealth decides to proceed with noise abatement measures, it would bear most of the cost of the abatement, since this is an existing condition due mainly to traffic to and from the Dulles Toll Road. The Project itself would share in the cost of abatement proportional to the Project’s contribution to the future levels of noise and to its visual effects. DRPT has been identified as the lead agency for the coordination among VDOT, MWAA, WMATA, FTA, Fairfax County officials and staff, and representatives of the affected communities.”

Public Comment: The SDEIS needs to evaluate visual effects throughout the entire corridor and its affected environs, not merely in Tysons Corner, the W&OD Railroad Regional Park and the Dulles Airport Historic District (e.g., at TABLE 2-2). The evaluation needs to include not only an operational metrorail system, but also years of construction, resulting gridlock and the likely increase in traffic along arterial routes as drivers avoid the increased tolls due to this project. (0068 0173-27)

Response: Section 3.4 of the Final EIS provides a visual analysis of the entire Project corridor, including a description of the existing visual character, quality of views, and important visual resources along the corridor; an assessment of the project’s potential impacts on these resources; and a discussion of proposed mitigation measures in areas where any substantial impact was determined to possibly occur. The final Team recommendations state: “DRPT and WMATA would consider designs for Metrorail stations, aerial structures and portals that are compatible with the surrounding environment.”

Public Comment: n. The SDEIS needs to provide detailed explanation as to what is contemplated in the contention that east of Wiehle Avenue a change in visual character at stations will result (e.g., at TABLE 2-2). This explanation needs to be detailed in respect of both geographic extent – how far east? – and the type of visual character change anticipated in order for the public to be adequately informed for purposes of public comment. (0068 0173-31)

Response: The Final EIS states that the visual impact of the project in the Tysons Corner area would be reduced relative to the impacts described in the Draft EIS. Based on comments received during the Draft EIS process, a segment of the proposed alignment immediately west of

the Route 123/Dulles Connector Road interchange was revised to reduce visual impacts. By shifting a portion of the proposed alignment to the north side of Route 123, a series of structural bents for a lengthy oblique crossing of aerial structure over Route 123 was eliminated.

Public Comment: While your report states in Section 3.4.3 that "neither the proposed LPA nor the proposed LPA Phase I would result in any substantial visual impacts to resources along the corridor." As one of those "resources," our community will be exposed to 8 car trains running at speed (or braking) at a height of 52 feet over the level of our homes as they curve into Tysons. (0036 0037-2)

Public Comment: Second, the visual impact of the elevated and curved rail line at our location should also not be overlooked. While your report states, in Section 3.4.3, that "Neither the proposed LPA nor the proposed LPA Phase 1 would result in any substantial visual impacts." We feel that we will be impacted by that as we are exposed to eight-car trains running at speed or braking at a height, as I understand the profile, of about 52 feet over the level of our homes as they curve into Tysons. (0036 0062-2)

Response: *Potential visual impacts of the LPA are discussed in Section 3.4 of the Final EIS and noise impacts are discussed in Section 4.7. Proposed mitigation to alleviate potential impacts is discussed at the end of each section and summarized for all impact areas in Chapter 2. DRPT will continue to communicate with residents of the Hallcrest Heights neighborhood and other adjacent property holders throughout preliminary engineering and final design to address neighborhood concerns.*

3.5 Cultural Resources

A. Draft EIS Comments

State Agency Comments

Section 106 Process

State Comment: We are currently working with the FTA, USDOT, VDRPT, WMATA, the FAA, and their consultant, Parsons Engineering Science, Inc., on the identification of historic properties within the proposed transportation corridor. Currently, Parsons is drafting a Programmatic Agreement among the federal and state agencies and our department. This programmatic agreement will outline the procedures to be followed in the identification and evaluation of historic properties as well as plan for the mitigation of effects to properties eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. We encourage the federal and state agencies involved to continue coordinating with our office as the project evolves. (0407, 0407-A –40)

State Comment: Historic Structures and Archaeological Resources. The Department of Historic Resources indicates that it is working with project management agencies and their consultant on the identification of historic properties in the proposed corridor. The agencies involved will sign a Programmatic Agreement with the Department of Historic Resources which outlines procedures for the identification and evaluation of historic properties and plans for mitigation of effects upon properties listed on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. We encourage the agencies involved to continue coordinating with the Department of Historic Resources as this project evolves. (0407, 0407-A – 7)

State Comment: Cultural Resources Technical Report - (June 2002)

§ As stated in previous comments, this study has not established which resources previously identified are in fact eligible for the National Register. This is a fundamental flaw. There are clearly a number of resources previously documented within the APE (for example Bois de Gosses, Shiloh Baptist

Church, Plantation, Wiehle/Sunset Historic District, etc) that have not been evaluated by the FTA or VDHR. Comments on eligibility for each resource need to be obtained from VDHR.

- § Without knowing which resources are eligible for listing in the National Register, an effect determination cannot be made.
- § Without knowing which resources are eligible and what their boundaries are, Section 4(f) evaluations cannot be made.
- § If documentation is provided by the FTA (or their consultants) to VDHR, several of the resources may well drop from consideration in the context of Section 106. There appear to be very few resources that will be eligible for listing in the National Register.
- § The report states on page 111, that additional architectural resources may exist beyond those previously documented. This is a potentially fatal flaw in the study. If there are other eligible historic properties they need to be identified now. Their location may well effect a location decision (via Section 4(f)).
- § Page 111 - Archaeological survey needs should be depicted on maps. (0421, 0421-A –8)

State Comment: To date the Section 106 process has not been initiated. Other than the meeting on held on February 28, 2001, agency has not received any information regarding NHPA compliance. Understand that the identification of previously identified historic properties is well under way and that the identification of previously unidentified properties will begin in the near future. (0516 03-01)

***Response:** Appropriate coordination regarding the Section 106 process continued through the development of the Final EIS. The executed Section 106 Memorandum of Agreement is included as Appendix F of the Final EIS. Additional information on impacts to the Dulles Airport historic district is included in Chapter 7 of the Final EIS (Section 4(f) Evaluation).*

Regional Agency Comments

Need for Appropriate Mitigation

Regional Comment: As the development of the IAD Metrorail station would occur below grade, it would not have direct visual impact on the Main Terminal or historic district; however, this new facility would still technically fall within the historic district and the architectural design would need to take into account the general historic character of the airport. The original Saarinen plan included a careful consideration of both the inbound and outbound "passenger experience." As the new facility will become a new element of that experience, architectural sensitivity to the character of the airport will need to be addressed. Further consultation with the Airports Authority and the review agencies (under the terms of a Programmatic Memorandum of Agreement) would be required to assess potential effects and develop mitigation measures (if required). (0440, 0440-A –7)

***Response:** The Section 106 Memorandum of Agreement, included as Appendix F of the Final EIS describes the mitigation of the Project's effects on the Dulles Airport historic district. Per the terms of that agreement the design of the Dulles Airport Metrorail station and terminal connections will consider, and incorporate where appropriate, established airport design themes and finishes within the context of the WMATA design criteria, approved system-wide facility requirements and operational practices in effect at the time of the design. In addition, the design of aerial structures and portals located within the historic district boundaries will consider, and incorporate where appropriate, concepts and materials that are mutually agreed to be compatible with the historic terminal and other contributing elements of the historic district.*

Boundaries of the Washington Dulles International Airport (IAD) Historic District

Regional Comment: The eligible historic district at IAD is substantially larger than that shown in Figure 7.3-1b, and includes the proposed location of the rail tunnel portal and elevated track northwest of the Main Terminal. The effects of these structures need to be addressed in the context of cultural resources and the Section 4(f) evaluation. (0440, 0440-A –6)

Response: Further coordination occurred during the preparation of the Final EIS and Section 106 Memorandum Agreement to confirm the boundaries of the Dulles Airport historic district. Additional information on impacts to the Dulles Airport historic district is included in Section 3.5, Cultural Resources, and Chapter 7 (Section 4(f) Evaluation) and Appendix F (Section 106 MOA) of the Final EIS.

Local Agency Comments

Concern for Impacts to Previously Identified and Potential Cultural Resources

Local Comment: From the standpoint of this office, site 44FX1569 is of particular interest from an overall resource planning perspective. The site was subjected to a phase 2 assessment in the 1980s. The results were conclusive from a functional standpoint but without chronological data the functional data is largely worthless. To justify the phase 2 cost to the public this situation should be rectified. I urge the oversight agencies to build additional phase 2 testing or construction monitoring into the plans for any construction that will destroy this site. Arrangements can be made with FCAS for this archeological work. (0306, 0306-A –8)

Response: As noted in Section 3.5 of the Final EIS, the referenced site underwent Phase II testing in 1989 during studies related to the Dulles Toll Road Extension. The site was determined to be eligible for the NRHP and Phase III testing was recommended, prior to construction. No record of Phase III excavations was found. No impacts to this site are anticipated to occur as a result of implementing the LPA. In addition, this site as well as the other archaeological sites within the Area of Potential Effect (APE) for the project would be avoided in siting construction staging areas. Therefore, no testing at Site 44FX1569 is warranted as a part of this project.

Local Comment: The Cultural Resource Protection Group (CRP) of the Fairfax County Park Authority has reviewed the alignments for the Dulles Rapid Transit Corridor. Construction along this corridor will impact six parks owned by the Fairfax County Park Authority. The parks included in this assessment are Scott's Run, McLean Hamlet, Ashgrove, Difficult Run, Olney and Hutchison School Site. A number of important archaeological resources were found to exist in these parks. Important sites found within the parks include 44FX 2470 (Odrick Site), 44FX1597 (Ashgrove and other related sites, including 44FX2205 and 44FX2203). The CRP recommends complete avoidance of these sites. All of these sites are important to the history of Fairfax County, and as such, deserve special attention. (0306, 0306-A –5)

Response: All resources potentially affected by the LPA were identified in the Final EIS. See Section 3.5, and Chapter 7 for a discussion of historic resources and anticipated effects.. Mitigation commitments for adverse effects to historic properties are detailed in the Section 106 MOA (Appendix F).

Local Comment: As noted on the figures from County Archaeological Services, areas of moderate or high potential for archaeological sites should also be surveyed prior to any construction. (0306, 0306-A – 6)

Response: Areas with moderate or high potential for archaeological sites within the APE of the LPA were investigated and discussed in the Final EIS. No effects to archaeological resources are anticipated. The Section 106 Memorandum of Agreement in Appendix F of the Final EIS discusses the mitigation of one adverse effect to a historic property.. See Section 3.5, Chapter 7, and Appendix F (Section 106 MOA) for a discussion of all potential impacts and mitigation measures associated with cultural resources.

Coordination with Local Entities

Local Comment: Areas of cultural and historical resources were identified in the DEIS primarily based on information provided by the State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPO). To augment the information provided by the SHPO, we have attached an archeology impact assessment, analysis and

recommendations from the County Archeologist and FCPA Cultural Resource Protection Group. Please note that the County Archeologist has offered to assist in any archeological work that may be undertaken. (0306, 0306-A –2)

Response: See Section 3.5, Chapter 7, and Appendix F (Section 106 MOA) for a discussion of all potential impacts and mitigation measures associated with cultural resources.

. The Project Team will continue to coordinate with VDHR, the County Archaeologist, and the FCPA Cultural Resource Protection Group throughout preliminary engineering and final design.

Public Comments

Concern for Impacts to Previously Identified and Potential Cultural Resources

Public Comment: The Draft EIS makes the common mistake of presuming that adequate cataloguing has occurred with respect to archaeological and architectural resources so that planners would have advance knowledge of any adverse impact. Based on recent experience, adequate cataloguing has not taken place and resources have been destroyed. The project should not further this loss. (0510 03-02)

Response: As described in Section 3.5 of the Final EIS, identification of historic and archaeological resources was conducted in accordance with applicable laws and regulations. The Project Team continued to coordinate with VDHR, the County Archaeologist, and the FCPA Cultural Resource Protection Group throughout preparation of the Final EIS to ensure that all resources were identified. .

Public Comment: How will the new traffic patterns and traffic volumes generated by this project affect the scenic and historic character of Hunter Mill Road, which was declared eligible for listing as an historic district in state and national historic registries in 2002 and has been named a Virginia Byway? (0460, 0460-L –3)

Public Comment: The Draft EIS does not recognize that the Hunter Mill Road corridor was declared eligible for listing as a historic district in 2002 and has been named a Virginia Byway. The impact that the proposals would have on this resource should be assessed. (0510 03-03)

Response: . The proposed Hunter Mill Road historic district was included in the assessment of effects to cultural resources in Section 3.5 of the Final EIS. No effects from the Project are projected for communities in proximity to Hunter Mill Road. The increase in densities allowed by Fairfax County is also not anticipated to occur within these neighborhoods.

Need for Section 106 Review

Public Comment: Finally, the Westhampton neighborhood, which is a 50 year-old subdivision would experience a significant architectural impact from the development of any raised structures which are located in or near the neighborhood. Therefore, we believe that any development under the Dulles Rail Corridor be done in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, and that an A-106 analysis be conducted and impacts to the Westhampton view shed be incorporated in the mitigation plans for the Dulles Corridor Project. (0388, 0388- L- 5)

Response: As noted in the Final EIS, an Area of Potential Effect (APE) was identified for the project in coordination with the Virginia Department of Historic Resources. Although a portion of the Westhampton neighborhood was within the APE, this neighborhood not identified as an historic resource eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

Since the Westhampton neighborhood was not identified as an eligible historic resource impacts related to the view shed were only evaluated as part of the visual conditions Analysis presented in Chapter 3

B. Supplemental Draft EIS Comments

State Agency Comments

Need for a Programmatic Agreement

State Comment: We welcome the opportunity to discuss this project further at our next scheduled Section 106 meeting on December 16, 2003. At that meeting we will also continue our dialogue regarding the development of a Programmatic Agreement (PA) for the undertaking. We request that you continue to consult with DHR through the Section 106 process on this undertaking. (0010 0010-3)

Response: *DRPT continued to coordinate with the Department of Historic Resources on a Section 106 Memorandum of Agreement for the Project. The executed MOA is included as Appendix F of the Final EIS.*

Issues Related to the Dulles Airport Historic District

State Comment: Similarly, the report cites "further analysis" confirming that the proposed LPA would not cause an adverse visual effect on the "peekaboo" sequence along the approach to Dulles Airport. We have not had the opportunity to review and comment on the aforementioned analysis. Therefore, we cannot agree that your assertion is correct. In fact, the issue of an appropriate National Register boundary for the airport is still an outstanding issue that must be settled before the discussion of effect can happen. (0010 0010-2)

State Comment: Regarding the potential establishment of an eastern boundary of the Dulles International Airport Historic District, any decision/actions that would lead to minimization of harm to the district should not preclude (or should take into account) any future surface transportation improvements on the DTR/DAAR (Sections 3.5 & 7) for the entire length of the Project. (0091 0106-22)

Response: *The executed Section 106 Memorandum of Agreement, included as Appendix F of the Final EIS, describes the Project's adverse effect on the remaining historic "peekaboo" views of the main terminal control tower for approaching travelers from the Dulles International Airport Access Highway (DIAAH) and the mitigation measures. One measure is that the vertical profile of the Metrorail tracks and the concrete safety barrier will be constructed as low as practicable given site conditions to minimize any obstruction of these views of the main terminal control tower.*

Based on further consultation with MWAA and VDHR during the preparation of the Final EIS and Section 106 Memorandum Agreement, the eastern boundary of the Dulles Airport historic district has been confirmed.

Issues Related to Hunter Mill Road

State Comment: The revised EIS asserts that there would be no adverse effect to architectural resources as a result of the LPA. We cannot concur with this statement. The project corridor crosses the boundary of the Hunter Mill Road Historic District. Despite the claim that "because the Hunter Mill Road Historic District is located within an existing transportation corridor, impacts to the district associated with this project would be minimal," you have not provided the Department of Historic Resources (DHR) sufficient information in order for us to agree with this statement. (0010 0010-1)

Response: *DRPT continued coordination with the Virginia Department of Historic Resources during the preparation of the Final EIS and Section 106 Memorandum of Agreement. The results of this work are contained in Chapter 7 (Section 4(f) Evaluation) and Appendix F (Section 106 MOA). That coordination and the analyses in support of the Final EIS and the Section 106 process did not identify any adverse effects on the Hunter Mill Road Proposed Historic District.*

Regional Agency Comments

Issues Related to the Dulles Airport Historic District

Regional Comment: Regarding the discussion of the Dulles Airport Historic District (page 3-33), the Airports Authority maintains that the eastern boundary of the eligible historic district does not extend east of the location on the DIAAH where westbound travelers are first able to view the Main Terminal and the original Air Traffic Control Tower. (0131 0166-5)

Response: *DRPT continued to coordinate with the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority and the Virginia Department of Historic Resources regarding the eastern boundary of the Dulles International Airport historic district during development of the Final EIS. The Section 106 Memorandum of Agreement in Appendix F of the Final EIS describes the Project's adverse effect on the remaining historic "peekaboo" views of the main terminal control tower for approaching travelers from the Dulles International Airport Access Highway (DIAAH) and the mitigation measures. One measure is that the vertical profile of the Metrorail tracks and the concrete safety barrier will be constructed as low as practicable given site conditions to minimize any obstruction of these views of the main terminal control tower. The*

Based on further consultation with MWAA and VDHR during the preparation of the Final EIS and Section 106 Memorandum Agreement, the eastern boundary of the Dulles Airport historic district has been confirmed.

Local Agency Comments

Definitions of the Area of Potential Effect

Local Comment: The County should continue to be a consulting party as impact mitigation strategies are discussed. Additionally, the Area of Potential Effect (APE) was defined as 200 feet beyond station footprints to allow for possible variation during construction. The County should be contacted if variations to the proposed alignment will impact additional sites. (0084 0099-2)

Response: *Coordination efforts undertaken by DRPT during the preparation of the Final EIS have resulted in the development of both a Section 4(f) Evaluation and Section 106 Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) outlining potential effects and proposed mitigation to address impacts to cultural resources.*

Issues Related to Hunter Mill Road

Local Comment: Section 3.4.1.2 Under the last bullet on this page, the text refers to the "Hunter Mill Road Historic District". This area is not a "District"; the area is eligible for being considered for placement on the state or national registers; in other words a proposed "District". The bullet should be corrected by referring to this area as a "proposed District". References to this area are throughout the SEIS; (0093 0109-14)

Local Comment: Section 3.5 the last row of the third column indicates that the Road [Hunter Mill] has "not yet" been designated a Scenic Byway, which is not correct. The Road has been designated a Scenic Byway. (0093 0109-15)

Response: *Thank you for your comments on the status of the Hunter Mill Road Proposed Historic District. Both of the items identified by the commenter have been clarified in the Final EIS.*

3.6 Parklands and Recreation Areas

A. Draft EIS Comments

State Agency Comments

Impacts on Existing or Planned Recreational Facilities

State Comment: Lastly, the proposed project is not anticipated to have any adverse impacts on existing or planned recreational facilities. Nor will it impact any streams on the National Park Service Nationwide Inventory, Final List of Rivers, potential Scenic Rivers, or existing or potential State Scenic Byways. Please contact DCR for an update on this information if a significant amount of time passes before it is utilized. (0407, 0407-A –29)

Response: *Comment noted.*

Regional Agency Comments

Construction Impacts to Parklands

Regional Comment: The Draft EIS states that construction would be timed for low-use periods and continued access to the park would be maintained during hours of peak use. The Draft EIS also states that construction would be in compliance with the Park Authority's Guidelines for the Development of W&OD Trail Bridge Crossings. It is Park Authority policy and the intent of the Guidelines that the trail is to remain open and safe at all times during bridge construction. Overhead protection for the trail, phased construction across the park property, trail detours, and other safety features will be required as necessary. Although not addressed in the Draft EIS, it is assumed that construction access to the Toll Road easement area will be along the Toll Road and not along the W&OD paved or gravel trails. (0456, 0456-L –2)

Response: *DRPT will continue coordination with the Northern Virginia Regional Park Authority to maintain safe access to the W&OD Railroad Regional Park during construction.*

Maintenance Responsibilities

Regional Comment: Section 7.3.2. of the *Public Hearings Report* states that any artificial lighting, which might be required by the project, would be the maintenance responsibility of the park owners. Since the artificial lighting is proposed as mitigation for the project's negative visual and safety impacts on park property, its maintenance would be the responsibility of the project sponsor.(0456 03-01)

Response: *Based on further coordination with the Northern Virginia Regional Park Authority during preparation of the Final EIS, it was determined that artificial lighting was not necessary.*

Local Agency Comments

Enhancing Accessibility to Parklands

Local Comment: FCPA comments on the NEPA EIS Scoping Process were provided on August 15, 2000. These comments stated that FCPA favors the rail alternative for the Dulles Rapid Transit Project. FCPA continues to support this alternative as the best alternative for improving regional transportation options, enhancing public accessibility to parkland and long term protection of Park resources. Further, our previous comments, a copy of which is attached, identified potential areas of impact to FCPA-owned properties. The impacts to FCPA properties are relatively similar for each alternative and have been adequately identified in the DEIS. (0306, 0306-A –1)

Response: *Comment noted. The Project Team recommended and the decision-makers selected the Metrorail Extension with Alignment T6 in Tysons Corner as the Locally Preferred Alternative.*

Local Comment: FCPA reiterates its concerns that trail crossings within Stream Valley Parks adjacent to the transit alignment be included in design efforts. Further, connections from existing and planned trails to the planned stations should be designed to enhance station access. Accommodations for pedestrian and bicycle access and trail connections should be coordinated with FCPA and the County trails planner and incorporated into right of way acquisition and rail alignment planning and development. (0306, 0306-A – 3)

Response: *The Project Team will continue coordination with the FCPA regarding the trail crossings within Stream Valley Parks that will be spanned by the LPA. The responsibility for modifications of sidewalks and trails as part of station access is with Fairfax County, Loudoun County, Town of Herndon, City of Falls Church and VDOT. DRPT will, coordinate with these jurisdictions and agencies during preliminary engineering and final design on issues related to station access .*

Incorporation of Park-related Amenities at Stations

Local Comment: Potential partnerships with FCPA to incorporate park and recreation related amenities at station locations should be explored. As mentioned in our previous comments, features such as green space, landscaping, picnic tables, cultural or natural resource interpretive areas or open space design with fountains or other elements creating a sense of place should be explored. (0306, 0306-A –4)

Response: *Most station facilities would include landscape elements. Other amenities cited in this comment could be provided by others, and would be subject to coordination with project site access, functional requirements, risk management, real estate constraints and regulations of local government. Further coordination will occur as the project moves through preliminary engineering and final design.*

B. Supplemental DEIS Comments

State Agency Comments

Issues Related to the W&OD Trail

State Comment: the SDEIS does a thorough job of addressing the impacts of crossings of the Washington and Old Dominion (W&OD) Trail. It should be noted that a planned future greenway/trail in the area is not addressed in the SDEIS. That trail, the Fairfax Cross-Country Trail, is to connect Great Falls National Park with Fort Belvoir. The transit corridor will cross this trail corridor; accordingly, the proponents should consider, and provide accommodation for, this trail in final plans. (0080 0094-8)

Response: *The Fairfax Cross-Country Trail is identified in Section 3.6 of the Final EIS.*

Issues Related to Other Trails and Recreational Areas

State Comment: Although there is “no change” in effects from the DEIS, this table [Table 3.6-1] indicates that there may be possible impacts to future trails from Tysons East Station, Tysons Central 7 Station, Tysons 7 Station, Tysons Central 123 Station, and Wiehle Avenue Station. Please indicate actions the Project will take to address these possible impacts. It is important to provide non motorized facilities for transit riders to access these stations, particularly in Tysons Corner. (0091 0106-6)

State Comment: “Increased vehicle traffic at Wiehle Avenue Station may impact future trails proposed in Fairfax County’s Countywide Trails Plan (June 2002).” Please indicate actions the Project will take to address these possible impacts. (0091 0106-7)

Response: *Should any of the future trails included in the Fairfax County Countywide Trails Plan be constructed prior to construction of the Wiehle Avenue Extension (formerly LPA Phase 1), mitigation measures would be similar to those discussed in Section 3.6 of the Final EIS for existing park and recreation facilities.*

Regional Agency Comments

Issues Related to the W&OD Trail

Regional Comment: The Supplemental Draft EIS states that at the W&OD Railroad Regional Park, access to the park would be maintained during hours of peak use. As stated in previous comments on the Draft EIS, it is Park Authority policy and the intent of the Guidelines for the Development of W&OD Trail Bridge Crossings that the trail is to remain open and safe at all times during bridge construction. Overhead protection for the trail, phased construction across the park property, trail detours, and other safety features will be required as necessary. (0086 0101-1)

Response: *All bridge design and construction would be completed in accordance with the Northern Virginia Regional Park Authority's Guideline for the Development of W&OD Trail Bridge Crossings. Details relating to park access during construction activities would be coordinated with the Northern Virginia Regional Park Authority.*

Regional Comment: Also, please confirm that construction access to the Toll Road easement area will be along the Toll Road and not along the W&OD paved or gravel trails. (0086 0101-2)

Response: *Access for the construction of the Metrorail Extension in the median of the DIAAH will be via the DIAAH and would not be along the W&OD Railroad Regional Park's paved or gravel trails.*

Local Agency Comments

Issues Related to Other Trails and Recreational Areas

Local Comment: The document states that temporary construction impacts at the Moorefield Station recreation center and athletic fields will be mitigated, but does not provide any information as to how impacts will be mitigated. (0084 0099-3)

Response: *Although temporary increases in noise, vibration, and air-borne particles could occur in the vicinity of the proposed recreation center and athletic fields at Moorefield Station during the construction of the Route 772 Station, construction activities would occur at least one-half mile from these sites. Therefore, no potential impacts to facility use or access during construction have been identified and mitigation measures are not recommended.*

3.7 Safety and Security

A Draft EIS Comments

Federal Agency Comments

Concern About Airport Security

Federal Comment: Concerned about security at Dulles Airport. Concerned that the project, particularly the Service and Inspection (S&I) Yard (Site 15) would be a substantial intrusion into airport property. Would not be comfortable with anything unless the Transportation Security Agency (TSA) "signs off" on the project. (0485 03-02)

Response: During preliminary engineering, DRPT will coordinate with TSA, MWAA, and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) regarding airport security issues.

State Agency Comments

Protection Against Potential Hazards

State Comment: SWM ponds may require access for maintenance - show how this is to occur. Also these are regarded as hazards to be protected by guardrail - If joint pond, the pond will need to meet state or county design standards as appropriate. (0421, 0421-A –30)

Response: The pond locations are preliminary. Access for maintenance and protection of roadways adjacent to proposed ponds would be designed in accordance with applicable federal, VDOT, or local jurisdiction design criteria. This will be further defined during preliminary engineering and final design.

State Comment: Review guard rail / barrier requirements beyond normal roadway warrants if a vehicle striking obstruction would result in hazard or result in collateral hazard to road or rail if hit. IE would damage to facility cause further injury or loss of life (power stations/control facilities). (0421, 0421-A –31)

Response: Preliminary engineering and final design will comply with current federal or VDOT standards for roadside barrier design.

State Comment: Limited access facilities have special requirements that must be met even for the infrequent access to maintain ponds/power stations. If access can be reasonably or economically provided from other than the limited access facility this is recommended. (0421, 0421-A –32)

Response: No access points are currently planned for ponds or ancillary facilities directly from the limited access freeways (Dulles Connector Road, Dulles Toll Road or Dulles Greenway). Access points currently shown along interchange ramps would be evaluated during preliminary engineering to determine if they can be safely implemented without impacting operations of the freeway.

Safety of Structural Design

State Comment: All structures including columns should be of adequate design, location and depth so that planned / future interchanges shall not have to replace, reinforce or underpin these structures. (0421, 0421-A –33)

Response: The Project Team has developed and coordinated the preliminary structural designs with planned/future interchange locations to ensure that there is no reconstruction of rail structures during implementation of identified, planned roadway improvements. This coordination would continue through preliminary engineering and final design.

State Comment: In general, structures/ column placement at intersections should be placed to meet sight distance requirements for streets, side road and entrances. (0421, 0421-A –34)

Response: Design of columns and structures will comply with federal and VDOT standards for sight distance criteria, which will be examined in more detail during preliminary engineering.

Regional Agency Comments

Public Safety and Security Concerns

Regional Comment: As stated in the Draft EIS, the planned widening of the Dulles Toll Road overpasses and the new bridge for Metrorail would nearly eliminate the existing light well between the

existing overpasses resulting in "a visual impact to the trail." The Draft EIS states that the visual impact can be mitigated with the incorporation of natural and artificial lighting under the bridge. It should also be noted that elimination of the light well might result in safety and security impacts such as reduced visibility and crime. The Final EIS should address safety and security issues related to elimination of the light well and related mitigation, such as lighting and call boxes. Moreover, the Park Authority must be involved in the development of mitigation measures during all design phases. (0456, 0456-L –1)

Response: *DRPT will continue coordination with the Northern Virginia Regional Park Authority regarding appropriate mitigation measures for effects to the W&OD Railroad Regional Park. The current design for the Metrorail bridge shown in the final General Plans (Volume IV of the Final EIS is a three-span overpass. Based on further coordination with the Northern Virginia Regional Park Authority during preparation of the Final EIS, it was determined that requested artificial lighting was no longer necessary.*

Local Agency Comments

Public Safety and Security Concerns

Local Comment: The draft EIS has failed to adequately address public safety and infrastructure issues regarding pedestrian traffic (especially students) conflicting with vehicular traffic in and around the West Falls Church Metro Station, given the prediction for increased vehicle trips per day. (0122, 0122-A –4)

Local Comment: We suspect there may be tremendous safety concerns if proper evaluations are not conducted. We believe our neighborhood streets will be inundated with motor vehicles and that the project will be considered a failure by our citizens. Existing infrastructures will be adversely affected and must be effectively remedied by operational plans and new facilities. (0122, 0164-T –10)

Response: *Based on the analysis of the forecast traffic volumes for the East and West Falls Church Metrorail Stations, the Project Team does not feel that overflow parking onto residential streets will be a problem. Moreover, since completion of the Draft EIS analysis, WMATA has programmed a 960-space parking facility at West Falls Church to be completed in early 2005. The Project Team also initiated meetings with the City of Falls Church to discuss the issues of overflow parking and cut-through traffic.*

Large increases in the number of vehicle trips are not anticipated in the West Falls Church Station area due to the Project. The Project will initially divert a number of Metrorail customers from this station to the Dulles Corridor stations. Over time, due to population growth and latent demand not directly associated with the project, the traffic activity at West Falls Church Station will return to its former level. Nevertheless, the Project Team does not anticipate any increases in project-related cut-through traffic in the Westhampton neighborhood.

Local Comment: Provide safety and security to the community and the rail system by delineating law enforcement roles and through early implementation of rail to provide needed transportation capacity in the corridor for emergency or disaster events. (0437, 0437-E –11)

Response: *WMATA operates a police force that has jurisdiction in the stations, trains, buses, and parking lots of the Metrorail, Metrobus and MetroAccess systems. Outside the WMATA system, law enforcement is handled by local jurisdictions or agencies. In some cases, WMATA operates with local and state police agencies under mutual aid agreements. A similar mutual aid agreement would need to be finalized before the start of operations of the Metrorail Extension.*

Public Comments

Protection Against Potential Hazards

Public Comment: Underground emphasis enhances anti-terrorism defense and facility security. This should enable additional federal funding to be provided. (0047, 0047-CC-2)

Response: *Comment noted. Security was a major concern for both the airport and the Project Team throughout the project. Safety and security issues are discussed in further detail in Section 3.7 of the Final EIS.*

Public Safety and Security Concerns

Public Comment: Safety is a serious concern! Boys from "the hood" will try to scale the high iron perimeter fence just replaced in 2001, at considerable expense. (0058, 0058-CC-2)

Public Comment: Bus safety is inferior to rail safety. Official Federal Transit Administration records show that rail service averages less than one injury or very rare fatality per million passenger-miles. Urban bus service averages closer to two such, at least seventy (70) percent more dangerous. (0013, 0013-L –11)

Response: *The Project Team agrees that safety is a serious concern and, as standard practice, WMATA employs many measures to ensure patron safety at each of the stations and on the trains. Section 3.7 of the Final EIS addresses safety and security issues related to existing and proposed Metrorail stations, park-and-ride facilities, and vehicles.*

Public Comment: One extremely negative aspect of Bus Rapid Transit for Dulles is the double crossover at stations. Diagrams show buses at center island stations below a mezzanine. Buses have doors on the right hand (curb) side, so to use island platforms they have to operate a British style on the left lane. This means they must cross in front of each other in opposite directions both entering and leaving stations. This is extremely dangerous when there will be a bus every 72 seconds in each direction. On most days there will be no problem, but with over a million such conflicts a year, it is too much to assume perfection. A safety rate of 99.999 per cent would still result in one head-to-head collision per month. A safety signal system would slow travel, but should be required by the National Transportation Safety Board. (0013, 0013-L –18)

Public Comment: As I said in the hearing, the double cross-overs create unnecessary vehicle conflicts. But one can simply get around that by putting outside platforms at the stations. If you're not worried about a passing lane for the buses, this can be shoe-horned into 52 feet, with elevators, with ADA access. If you want a passing lane in the center, which would be a good idea if you're looking for a permanent Bus Rapid Transit system, then you could put that into 66 feet. This might require, in some locations, a minor adjustment to a half-lane adjustment to the Dulles Toll Road alignments, which would run up the cost somewhat. But if this is a permanent solution, it would be well worth it. (0255, 0420-T –1)

Public Comment: One of the first things I noticed in looking at the [BRT] plans is the actually crossing the buses over each other at each station to get to a metrorail type transit station twice. This kind of vehicle conflict is just asking for trouble. (0255, 0255-T –2)

Response: *BRT was eliminated from further consideration after the public and interagency review and comment on the Draft EIS.*

Public Comment: Big parking lots and empty walkways over highways at night are creepy and dangerous. The West Falls Church Metro is a good example. Please keep safety and accessibility at the top of your priorities in planning the new stations and surrounding developments. Let's give teenagers, women, men, children, all of us, the chance to use the Metro line at all times. Our community will truly benefit. (0232, 0232-L –4)

Public Comment: My major point for the public record is that we need to make the Metro stations and ways to access them safer and less creepy, especially at night, or citizens will choose their cars. I would

like a study to be done on a few stations to understand how people use the station - what time of day, do they walk there, bicycle, drive, avoid it at certain times? I lived in Arlington on N. 17th St., a 15 minute walk to the Ballston Station, for three years. I tried to take the Metro a few times in the evening, but there was no one around when I walked. I've had a big knife pulled on me once in a similar situation. Isolation and a woman walking at night in a non-pedestrian friendly station and surroundings is a dangerous combination. I chose my car. (0232, 0232-L -2)

Response: *WMATA operates a police force that has jurisdiction in the stations, trains, buses, and parking facilities of the Metrorail, Metrobus and MetroAccess systems and will continue to work hard to ensure patron safety. Section 3.7 of the Final EIS addresses safety and security issues related to existing and proposed Metrorail stations, park-and-ride facilities and vehicles.*

Public Comment: Include in the project's draft environmental impact statement an analysis of and mitigation strategies for human health and environment impacts of pollution and cut-through traffic on the public safety and compliance with federal Clean Air and Water Acts of surrounding communities [Westhampton]. (0386, 0386-E -10) (0398, 0398-L -10) (0399, 0399-L -10) (0403, 0403-L -9) (0412, 0412-L -10) (0415, 0415-L -10)(0416, 0416-L -10) (0430, 0430-E -10) (0431, 0431-E -10)(0438, 0438-E -9)(0442, 0442-L -9)(0465, 0465-L -10)(0466, 0466-L -9)(0467, 0467-L -9) (0469, 0469-L -9) (0470, 0470-L -10) (0471, 0471-L -9) (0473, 0473-L -10) (0474, 0474-L -10)

Public Comment: Requests that the Project Team include an analysis of human health and environmental impacts of pollution and cut-through traffic on surrounding communities in terms of public safety and compliance with the federal Clean Air and Water Acts in the Final EIS. Also requesting appropriate mitigation strategies to address impacts. (0117 03-02)

Public Comment: Public safety hazards and pollution from increased cut-through traffic. The new facility will result in increased Metro ridership. This will in turn result in many more cabs and cars dropping off passengers at the West Falls Church Kiss and Ride and an increased volume of traffic cutting through our neighborhood to avoid the light at Haycock and Great Falls Streets. The cut-through traffic will create a public safety hazard to pedestrians and increased pollutants from cars in the form of exhaust; fugitive dust; and routine gasoline and oil leaks affecting the health of residents and contaminating Pimmit Run, a tributary of the Potomac River that passes through our neighborhood. (0386, 0386-E -5) (0398, 0398-L -5) (0399, 0399-L -5) (0403, 0403-L -4) (0412, 0412-L -5) (0415, 0415-L -5) (0416, 0416-L -5) (0422, 0422-E -3) (0430, 0430-E -5) (0431, 0431-E -5) (0465, 0465-L -5) (0470, 0470-L -5)(0473, 0473-L -5) (0474, 0474-L -5)

Response: *Based on the analysis of the forecast traffic volumes for the East and West Falls Church Metrorail Stations, the Project Team does not feel that overflow parking onto residential streets will be a problem. Moreover, since completion of the Draft EIS analysis, WMATA has programmed a 960-space parking facility at West Falls Church to be completed in early 2005. The Project Team also initiated meetings with the City of Falls Church to discuss the issues of overflow parking and cut-through traffic.*

Large increases in the number of vehicle trips are not anticipated in the West Falls Church Station area due to the Project. The Project will initially divert a number of Metrorail customers from this station to the Dulles Corridor stations. Over time, due to population growth and latent demand not directly associated with the project, the traffic activity at West Falls Church Station will return to its former level. Nevertheless, the Project Team does not anticipate any increases in project-related cut-through traffic in the Westhampton neighborhood.

While some of the proposed improvements near the West Falls Church Yard and in the median of the Dulles Connector Road would be located near an unnamed tributary to Pimmit Run, there would be virtually no impacts to the floodplain elevation, water quality, hydrology, or the CBPA and EQC designations of this resource. As discussed in Chapter 4 of the Final EIS, best management practices would be employed during the construction and operation of the transit improvements. With the use of these best management practices for stormwater management

and erosion and sediment control during the construction and operation of the LPA, degradation of surface water and groundwater quality would be minimal and would be limited to the immediate vicinity of the proposed improvements. Therefore, resources such as the Potomac River would not be affected.

Public Comment: In addition, the traffic congestion on Haycock Rd. has already produced cut-through traffic in the Westhampton Neighborhood, as cars attempt to avoid the light at Haycock Road and Great Falls St. This is a danger to residents of the Westhampton neighborhood. We believe that the mitigation strategies in the plans for the Dulles Corridor Project should include measures such as speed bumps on Grayson Place and signs forbidding cut-through traffic in the Westhampton neighborhood. This should be coupled with increased traffic enforcement by Fairfax County. Such measures would help reduce mobile source air pollution impacts on the health of residents in the neighborhood and improve compliance with the provisions of the federal Clean Air Act. (0388, 0388- L-3)

Public Comment: There is a current problem with motorists who cut through our Westhampton neighborhood to avoid stoplights at the intersection of Haycock Road and Great Falls Street. Instead, they detour via Reynolds Street, to Grayson Place, to Romney Street, to Hutchison, to Great Falls. Narrow streets; fast driving; no sidewalks, curbs, or gutters; abrupt turns with several visual barriers; and occasional one-way "choke points" because [of] shoulder parking create safety hazards that can only grow worse. Residents have asked for help to "calm" the traffic, but according to Fairfax County guidelines, the neighborhood does not currently meet traffic volume criteria. With completion of the Dulles Corridor Rapid Transit Project...including construction of a new, 2,000-car park-and-ride facility...the cut-through problem will become more acute. It seems reasonable that traffic control features should be put into place along with construction of the Dulles Project/park-and-ride in anticipation of future traffic volumes. Therefore, it seems to me that there is a need for WMATA, VDT, and Fairfax County to coordinate planning and installation measures to deal with this potentially dangerous situation in a timely manner. (0432, 0432-E -14)

Response: *Based on the analysis of the forecast traffic volumes for the East and West Falls Church Metrorail Stations, the Project Team does not feel that overflow parking onto residential streets will be a problem. Moreover, since completion of the Draft EIS analysis, WMATA has programmed a 960-space parking facility at West Falls Church to be completed in early 2005. The Project Team also initiated meetings with the City of Falls Church to discuss the issues of overflow parking and cut-through traffic.*

Large increases in the number of vehicle trips are not anticipated in the West Falls Church Station area due to the Project. The Project will initially divert a number of Metrorail customers from this station to the Dulles Corridor stations. Over time, due to population growth and latent demand not directly associated with the project, the traffic activity at West Falls Church Station will return to its former level. Nevertheless, the Project Team does not anticipate any increases in project-related cut-through traffic in the Westhampton neighborhood.

It is not the responsibility of the Dulles Corridor Rapid Transit Project to mitigate existing roadway/traffic issues, such as cut-through traffic on Grayson Place. Since the project would not be increasing vehicle traffic within the station area, but would actually be ameliorating the number of vehicle trips, speed bumps an/or additional signage would not be required as mitigation measures as part of this Project.

Based on the analysis provided in Chapter 6 of the Final EIS, mitigation would not be warranted at the Haycock Road/Great Falls Street intersection for the LPA. . For the traffic analysis, the Project Team used the Synchro software package, which optimizes consecutive traffic signals as a unit so that they all run on the same cycle. The traffic signals that were optimized/synchronized for the traffic analysis include the Great Falls Street/Haycock Road, Haycock Road/West Falls Church Metrorail Station entrance, and Haycock Road/Route 7 intersections.

Public Comment: Need to analyze project impacts of cut-through traffic and related safety and air quality effects. Was not done in the Draft EIS. (0430 03-03)

Response: *The Project Team does not anticipate any increases in project-related cut-through traffic in the Westhampton community. Additionally, since the project would not be increasing cut-through traffic, the Project would not have additional negative effects on air quality.*

Public Comment: Concerned that the pond will create a drowning and fall hazard for children and that the pond could serve as a breeding ground for mosquitoes, which could increase the threat of West Nile Virus. (0383 03-03)

Response: *None of the proposed dry ponds would have a permanent water surface elevation, and all will have security fencing discouraging unauthorized access.*

Emergency Evacuation Using Rail

Public Comment: Use of Metrorail during 9/11 evacuation demonstrated utility of heavy rail to move large # of people in an emergency. (0047, 0047-CC-4)

Response: *The LPA would provide the ability to move large numbers of people during emergencies that do not affect the transit system (e.g., loss of power).*

Need to Integrate the Project within the Context of the National Transportation Emergency System

Public Comment: The only rational way to discuss the transportation problems of the Dulles Rail Corridor is within the context of the National Transportation Emergency which currently exists. The ongoing breakdown of the rail and airline systems of the United States currently represents a grave threat to the national security of our country, as well as to the integrity of our nation and national economy. We don't need patchwork; we need a federally funded, national emergency program. (0482, 0482-E -1)

Response: *The Final EIS considered rapid transit improvements within the Dulles Corridor. The development of a federally funded national emergency program is beyond the scope of the study and would not be within the control of the Project Team.*

B. Supplemental Draft EIS Comments

Public Comments

Safety Hazards Related to Construction

Public Comment: The noise is so severe in our neighborhood that one cannot walk along our streets safely due to the inability to hear an approaching automobile from behind. This is a public safety hazard that will only be made worse by the construction of Metrorail without the construction of sound walls along the Dulles Toll Road. (0116 0141-5)

Response: *Comment noted. A discussion of noise impacts and proposed mitigation along the corridor is contained in Section 4.7 of the Final EIS.*

Safety Hazards Related to Stormwater Retention

Public Comment: The pond that is to be constructed on my property is said to be a dry pond. I have consulted a licensed PE who was formerly employed by Fairfax County that actually maintain these ponds. He informed me there would always be some moisture in these ponds which provides for an excellent breeding ground for mosquitoes, which raises the threat of West Nile virus, especially for the senior citizens and immuno compromise who live within the bounds of our neighborhood. (0116 0141-7)

Response: *The locations shown in the General Plans of Best Management Practice (BMP) and Stormwater Management (SWM) ponds throughout the corridor are approximate and were included to illustrate that a potential need for one of these facilities exists. During preliminary engineering, a comprehensive drainage study will be undertaken for the entire corridor to address final locations of all BMP and SWM ponds. This effort should result in some facilities being eliminated, consolidated, or relocated to further minimize impacts to the adjacent areas.*

Final design of stormwater management facilities would meet all jurisdictional standards and approval requirements of Fairfax County. According to the Fairfax County Department of Public Works and Environmental Services, “dry” stormwater retention ponds, as designed, are meant to hold water for brief periods of time. Typically, a “dry” facility is designed to hold water for a maximum of 48 to 72 hours. However, proper maintenance would be required to ensure that these facilities operate as designed. Mosquito larvae require 7 to 10 days in standing water to produce mosquitoes. Properly maintained “dry” retention ponds should not provide adequate conditions for mosquito larvae to survive long enough to produce mosquitoes. For more information, please refer to the Fairfax County government website and practices relating to mosquito control.

3.8 Environmental Justice

A. Draft EIS Comments

No comments pertaining to this topic were received.

B. Supplemental Draft EIS Comments

Public Comments

Outreach Efforts to Minority Groups

Public Comment: A question was asked that you identify the public outreach programs to minority groups. Your responded by referring me to the DEIS. On p II-8 of the DEIS, there is a lack of evidence noting the public outreach to minority groups. Therefore, my environmental justice question has not been appropriately answered.(0109 03-01)

Response: *Chapter 11 of the Final EIS provides additional detail regarding the comprehensive public involvement effort employed by the Project Team, including media outlets, project information, and press statements prepared in both Spanish and English.*

Issues Related to Potential Discrimination

Public Comment: Discriminates against the Less Affluent: The proposal is to spend as much to enhance an existing rapid transit service to the wealthiest single community in Virginia as the Governor’s Six-Year Plan proposes to spend on all transportation projects in Northern Virginia from now through 2009. Meanwhile, the State provides over that same period no transit service enhancements at all to the un-served and under-served less affluent communities in N. VA and the rest of the state. (0072 0150-7)

Response: *The Dulles Corridor Rapid Transit Project is an important part of the region’s approved constrained long-range transportation plan. The project was designed to link the region’s busiest activity centers and bring Metrorail to Washington Dulles International Airport.*

The Project will also offer an opportunity for reverse commuting from the District of Columbia and other jurisdictions to the Corridor. Job-seekers from across the region will be able be reach employment opportunities in one of the nation’s fastest-growing business centers.

Public Comment: What are the environmental justice issues that will be present when Reston East to West Falls Church is eliminated? (0107 0125-14)

Response: *The existing bus service between the Reston East Park-and-Ride and West Falls Church would be replaced by Metrorail service upon the start of operations of the Wiehle Avenue Extension. The impacts of the Project on communities considered for environmental justice impacts under Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, are discussed in Section 3.8 of the Final EIS.*

Public Comment: What is the minority bus ridership on the present Reston East to West Falls Church? (0107 0125-13)

Public Comment: What percentage of ridership from Reston East bus riders is drawn from minority groups? Please do not state that this analysis was not done. This analysis is an environmental justice issue that is required by the NEPA process. If this analysis was not done, then please explain why not and what steps you will take to rectify. (0109 0128-14)

Public Comment: The SDEIS must contain meaningful data concerning the disproportionate impacts to Minority/Low income populations (e.g., TABLE 2-2).

This aspect demonstrates the critical importance of conducting a meaningful, objective Alternatives Analysis, since the issue is not whether phasing a Metrorail project will disproportionately affect minority/low income populations, but whether rail vs. some other mode of mass transit would have a less disproportionate impact on those populations. (0068 0173-28)

Response: *Data on minority bus ridership between Wiehle Avenue and West Falls Church Station is not collected because it does not support any of the route and service planning done by Fairfax County.*

Section 3.8 of the Final EIS explains the methodology used to conduct the environmental justice analysis for the project. This analysis was completed in accordance with Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, as well as relevant guidance from the Council on Environmental Quality, U.S. DOT, and U.S. EPA.

Public Outreach to Minority Groups

Public Comment: What public outreach programs were implemented to reach minority groups? Be very specific and identify. The listing in the back of the DEIS and SDEIS fails to clearly identify this type of outreach. How was the environmental justice requirement met? How many DEIS and SDEIS were distributed to minority groups? How many community meetings were held with minority groups? (0109 0128-24)

Response: *Section 3.8 of the Final EIS describes the methodology used to meet federal requirements on environmental justice, per Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations. Since the start of the Project's environmental review, extensive public outreach to all communities has been conducted through the use of various types of media, public displays, community meetings, and public hearings. The largest minority community identified throughout the Dulles Corridor is Spanish-speaking. Therefore, all newsletters and updates have a section in Spanish that informs Spanish-speaking individuals how to obtain more detailed project information in Spanish. In addition to Spanish-speaking communities, other minority groups were informed through various communications outlets directed toward minority populations. All communities and minority groups were encouraged to participate in the public outreach process. Chapter 11 of the Final EIS outlines the public outreach efforts throughout the course of the project. A list of document recipients can be found in Appendix B of the Final EIS.*