

11.0 COMMENTS, CONSULTATIONS, AND COORDINATION

11.1 Public Involvement

A. *Draft EIS Comments*

State Agency Comments

Dulles Corridor Steering Committee

State Comment: Pg. 11.16. - Dulles Corridor Steering Committee is "composed of the executives from each of the project's funding partners". Suggest adding that the committee is chaired by a member of Virginia's Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB), representing VDOT and VDRPT. (0421, 0421-A – 22)

Response: The following sentence has been added to Section 11.2 of the Final EIS: 'The CTB representative also represents the Virginia Department of Transportation on the Steering Committee.'

Regional Agency Comments

Need to Identify Best BRT Station/Stop Location

Regional Comment: The Airports Authority has not yet determined the best location for a BRT stop/station at the Terminal Building. Though the general plans call for three bus parking positions at the easternmost end of the commercial vehicle curb, the Airports Authority's desire is to further study the best location for a BRT facility if a BRT system becomes a part of the locally preferred alternative. (0440, 0440-A –17)

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

Public Comments

Opportunities for Public Input

Public Comment: Perhaps most disconcerting to TMS is the fact that throughout the more than 2 years WMATA was drafting the DEIS, WMATA never approached TMS to express an interest in acquiring or accessing TMS's property. In fact, WMATA never inquired about the effect its plans would have on TMS or the fact the BRT bridge and 2,000-car parking garage could shut down Tysons Self Storage and segregate the property from its neighbors and access to Route 7. It was not until earlier this year when the owners of TMS discovered an anonymous real estate appraiser hired by WMATA to investigate the Tysons Self Storage facility, that TMS realized its property was affected by the Tysons West station and associated facilities. More importantly, only after TMS called WMATA officials to complain about the appraiser and request a meeting did WMATA meet with TMS to advise them of WMATA's plans. That meeting occurred on March 28, 2002. For the first time, WMATA indicated that the DEIS would include designs for an aerial bridge across the TMS Property. By contrast, WMATA has been meeting with affected landowners, community stakeholders and many other citizens for years to discuss the various plans and alternatives; these meetings have even occurred with owners of properties not directly affected. When TMS expressed concerns to WMATA officials about the lack of notice and the impacts of the bridge, WMATA officials encouraged TMS to use the DEIS hearings as the forum to air its concerns; WMATA was not going to amend the DEIS at such a late date. Further, following release of the DEIS and TMS' inquires about shifting the BRT bus bridge off the TMS Property, WMATA suggested that TMS should supply alternative designs that relocate the bridge to neighboring properties, without debating the

need for its construction. For TMS, that is akin to being asked to select the method of its death, rather than being given the option of seeking a reprieve. As was noted earlier, construction of the BRT bridge, whether wholly on TMS's Property or shared with a neighbor, represents a physical and psychological barrier to the opportunity to create pedestrian-friendly, transit-oriented development, as the County's Comprehensive Plan envisions. (0135, 0391-L –18)

Response: *We apologize for not meeting with TMS regarding the Tysons Self Storage Facility sooner. The public hearings for the Draft EIS provided an excellent opportunity for TMS to participate in the project and to review and comment on the Draft EIS. The BRT/Metrorail and Phased Implementation Build Alternatives that would have affected TMS were eliminated from further consideration after the public and interagency review and comment on the Draft EIS.*

Public Comment: Who is the FTA rep on the project team? (0112, 0382-L –2)

Response: *The FTA point of contact is Mr. Brian Glenn, Director, Washington Metropolitan Office. He can be reached at (202) 219-3562.*

Public Comment: The above stated items are only the tip of the iceberg. We [Chathams Ford Drive] would gladly entertain a meeting with you and other officials to further discuss these matters. (0383, 0383- L- 7)

Response: *The Project Team would be happy to meet with the residents of Chathams Ford Drive. Please call the Project INFO Line at 1-888-566-7245 to schedule a meeting.*

Public Comment: Suggests that many of the project meetings were “secret” and not open to the public. (0486 01)

Public Comment: Opposes the use of on-call consultants rather than public agency employees. Suggests that the project is based on improprieties since DRPT was able to bypass state contracting regulations. (0486 02)

Response: *The Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT) is the project sponsor. Its approach to project development entails the following: 1) that DRPT is the program manager, Federal grant applicant and recipient, design/build contracting authority and initial owner of the Project, and 2) that WMATA is DRPT's technical manager of NEPA process, of preliminary engineering (PE) and of the design/build contract and will be the leaseholder of the Project, its operator and ultimate owner.*

DRPT has received FTA approval and funding to conduct preliminary engineering on the first phase of the Project, the Extension to Wiehle Avenue. All preliminary engineering activities that involve FTA grant management, FTA liaison and FTA project management oversight are the responsibility of DRPT. DRPT has negotiated and executed a Comprehensive Agreement with Dulles Transit Partners, LLC (DTP) to be its preliminary engineering consultant. DTP is a partnership of Bechtel Corporation and Washington Group International. WMATA will assist DRPT in the management of DTP.

For development of the project, DRPT is responsible for right-of-way acquisition, environmental permitting, interagency agreements, utility agreements, final financial plan, funding agreements and coordination with Federal, state, and local agencies.

The method used for scheduling meetings between representatives of the Office And Professional Employees International Union, Local No. 2, AFL-CIO and WMATA management is beyond the scope of the Draft EIS, Supplemental Draft EIS and Final EIS. It is suggested that the Local No. 2 representatives request a briefing through normal WMATA channels.

Public Comment: First some brief history so you will understand our justifiable skepticism: Sham Meetings - when the Dulles Access Road was first constructed, many public meetings were held just as is currently being done. The presenters sounded sympathetic but then proceeded to do exactly what suited them without any significant attention paid to the concerns for the impacted citizenry. For example, the radius of the highway curve running along the north edge of the Lemon Road Civic Association was actually reduced to save money with no regard for the increased noise. The 80-100 feet of trees that were going to be left as a buffer were reduced to 0 feet! (0087, 0087-L -2)

Public Comment: Put aside the political issues swirling around and listen to what the community wants. Give them enough information about both sides of this plan, so commuters and the like, can be informed in an educated manner. (0107, 0107-E -2)

Response: *The public comments received at the Public Scoping meetings (July 2000) and Public Information Meetings (January 2001) were considered in the development of the alternatives and in determining the range of issues to be studied in the Draft EIS. All comments received during the public hearings on the Draft EIS and proposed General Plans and on the Supplemental Draft EIS and revised General Plans were considered in the selection and revision of the Locally Preferred Alternative by WMATA's Board of Directors and the Commonwealth Transportation Board. Before and after the hearings and between the hearings there have been extensive public involvement activities.*

The Final EIS is being circulated to inform decision-makers and the public on the selection of the Metrorail extension as the LPA and on the potential consequences of implementing the proposed extension in the corridor. Overall, the potential adverse impacts of the extension on the human and natural environment are expected to be minor. Coordination with the public, stakeholders, resource agencies, and local governments has confirmed these findings.

As the project enters preliminary engineering, any design changes will be monitored and if deemed likely to cause potentially significant effects, additional environmental documentation will be prepared to fully document these effects and measures to mitigate the effects if found to be substantial.

Public Comment: Requests continued dialogue between design team and communities on project impacts and mitigation throughout the design process.(0388 11-3)

Response: *As the NEPA process ends and the preliminary engineering begins, DRPT, the project sponsor, will continue an active community outreach program. It will continue to coordinate with adjacent communities and stakeholders*

Stakeholder Concerns

Public Comment: The Draft EIS refers to stakeholders as those who will experience an impact from one or more of the alignments or station locations. Northwestern clearly is a stakeholder, and should be added to the stakeholder list which appears on page J-6-3. (0461, 0461-E -2)

Public Comment: The Draft EIS does not define the term "stakeholders" as such. However, the Draft EIS refers to stakeholders as those that will experience an impact from one or more of the alignments or stations locations. NADA clearly is a stakeholder. Going forward, NADA requests that you add the Association to the stakeholder list that appears on page J-6-3. (0477, 0477-L -3)

Response: *The Project Team has added you to the list of recipients of the Final EIS. Since you were not originally invited or possibly did not attend the stakeholder meetings of December 2000, you did not appear in the list of attendees in Appendix J-6 of the Draft EIS.*

Public Comment: All of the organizations and groups mentioned in the above recommendations should be brought together in another charrette in the near future to brainstorm ideas for implementation of these

and other related goals and objectives (including those in the DEIS, such as mitigation measures for traffic impacts). Following this charrette, Fairfax County should take the lead in establishing the appropriate implementation mechanisms. (0478, 0484-E –25)

Response: *DRPT, the project sponsor responsible for project development, is willing to attend and/or make presentations at charrettes planned by Fairfax County or others.*

Public Comment: The Board of Directors, and through them, the Ownership, are ready to meet with you or other representatives to further discuss the improvement plans, especially Option T-4. Please continue to maintain contact with The Rotonda through our General Manager, Stephen C. Wright. (0220, 0220-M –2)

Response: *Alignment T4 Alternative was eliminated from further consideration after the public and interagency review and comment on the Draft EIS. Nevertheless, DRPT, the project sponsor, remains available to continue coordination efforts with the Rotonda Board of Directors and their General Manager in regards to access to the stations of the selected LPA alignment.*

Coordination with Local Entities

Public Comment: You would certainly - should certainly work with local planners and citizens in defining what alternatives to analyze. This is not planning. It is providing your expertise to assist decision makers on these complex issues. It will constitute integration of land use and transportation planning. Hallelujah. Which is a mandate of the regional plan. And it can be part of the EIS. (0158, 0158-T –4)

Public Comment: It is the sincere hope of our [West Falls Village] Association that the Dulles Corridor Rapid Transit Project means it when it says in the EIS that it will "coordinat(e) with local communities to address outstanding issues related to facility design, potential effects, and mitigation." We look forward to seeing that the final project plans will include the construction of a noise barrier to protect our community so that we will be able to support this project. (0435, 0435-E –6)

Response: *The Project Team has coordinated extensively with local government, public agencies, the general public, potentially affected property owners, civic associations, homeowners groups, businesses, and other stakeholders throughout the length of the environmental review process of the Project. DRPT will continue this coordination through preliminary engineering, final design, and construction.*

Comprehensive Agreements Among Stakeholders

Public Comment: We have suggested the following specific steps to DCRTP representatives: The negotiation and completion, as soon as possible, of a form of comprehensive agreement between the Dulles Greenway and the DCRTP sponsors, including WMATA, the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transit (DRPT), and other sponsors who will be involved in the design, permitting, construction and operation of this project. This Comprehensive Agreement would cover such things as: Reimbursement of the Greenway for expenses incurred by the Greenway in connection with the design, permitting, and construction of the DCRTP. Redesign of the DCRTP to eliminate or reduce impacts on the Greenway outside of the existing median. In a nutshell, make it work within the existing median. Stormwater management ponds, tie breaker stations, transfer power switching stations, and the like should be located on land acquired by the project sponsors, outside the Greenway right of way. If the redesigned project cannot eliminate all impacts of the Greenway other than use of the existing median, the Greenway, as a private property owner, expects to be compensated for any use of its land. The agreement should address detailed construction standards and mitigation measures to ensure that construction is performed at night, off peak hour, and in a way that will minimize the impact on the Greenway's customers. The agreement should address detailed standards for operation and ownership of the DCRTP, to make sure that all additional costs, maintenance expenses, and other impacts of this project are borne by the project and not by private property owners such as the Greenway. (0257, 0268-M –3)

Public Comment: In conclusion, we would like to make it clear that the Dulles Greenway will cooperate in a businesslike manner with WMATA and the DRPT in negotiating a detailed agreement that would address these impacts, but will expect to have all impacts of the project on the greenway addressed and dealt with by the project sponsors. (0257,0257-T –10)

Public Comment: The greenway sent its position statement to WMATA in early June so that everyone involved with the sponsorship and promotion of this project would understand that the greenway had serious concerns. We requested and had a separate meeting several weeks ago at which we further discussed these concerns. We want to reiterate that the greenway's cooperation over and above the existing median cannot be taken for granted. (0257, 0257-T –3)

Public Comment: First, the negotiation and completion of a comprehensive agreement between the Greenway and the project's sponsors, whether WMATA, Department of Rail and Public Transit or others, to cover such things, as redesigning this project to eliminate or eliminate or reduce the impacts of the greenway outside of the existing median. In a nutshell, make it work within the existing median. (0257, 0257-T –4)

Public Comment: The agreement should address detailed construction standards and mitigation measures to ensure that construction is performed at night, off peak hour, and in a way that will minimize the impact on the Greenway's customers. (0257, 0257-T –6)

Response: *The Comprehensive Agreement between TRIP II and the State Commission of the Commonwealth of Virginia requires that TRIP II dedicate the median of the Dulles Greenway to rail. As stated by the Project Team in a separate meeting referenced above, this dedication of the median of the Dulles Greenway has attendant effects, some of which TRIP II must bear. These effects will be considered as the DRPT continues its coordination with TRIP II on the LPA's overall effects to this private Toll Road and on the development of a comprehensive agreement for the Metrorail Extension to Route 772. The Project Team can clearly respond that the Project cannot be solely within the existing median and therefore will require the relocation of Greenway lanes at the Route 772 Station, Route 606 Station, and the junction of the revenue tracks with the yard lead tracks.*

During the construction of the Metrorail Extension, it would be necessary to permanently relocate the lanes on the Dulles Greenway around the Route 606 and Route 772 stations and around the yard leads for the Metrorail Service and Inspection Yard. DRPT and its technical manager, WMATA, will coordinate with TRIP II on the application of best management practices to minimize the disruption of traffic. These practices would be modeled after TRIP II's recent experience during the widening of the Dulles Greenway from four to six lanes. With respect to construction of the Metrorail line, yard leads, and stations in the median of the Greenway, again best management practices would be used for construction methods, access, haul routes, etc., to minimize disruption of traffic. Installation of the three pedestrian bridges over the Dulles Greenway will have minimal impacts, because any lane closures will be during the off-peak hours, when traffic volumes are lowest.

Compliance with Americans with Disabilities Act

Public Comment: I do appreciate the informative open house that you held. I understand that ADA specifications will be followed to enable access for persons with disabilities under the current ADA requirements. (0259, 0259-T –1)

Public Comment: We need to make sure that the intermodal -- that there is an intermodal transportation system that is accessible for persons with disabilities, its facilities and its vehicles, and that para-transit is provided throughout the corridor, including Loudoun County, and that needs to be taken into account. (0157, 0157-T –4)

Response : *All of the facilities and vehicles of the Metrorail Extension fully comply with the ADA Accessibility Guidelines.*

Public Comment: We also would like to request that you include persons with disabilities at the table when you are making these transit decisions. (0259, 0259-T –5)

Response: *The selection and revision of the Locally Preferred Alternative was made by the Commonwealth Transportation Board and the WMATA Board of Directors. Public input on the alternatives considered and selected was obtained throughout the length of the study process at the Public Scoping Meetings (July 2000), Public Information Meetings (January 2001), the Public Hearings for the Draft EIS (July 2002), and the Public Hearings for the Supplemental Draft EIS (December 2003) as well as many meetings held with community groups, civic associations, stakeholders, businesses, and public agencies. All of these meetings were open to the general public, including members of the public with disabilities. In addition, the facilities and vehicles of the Metrorail Extension fully comply with the ADA Accessibility Guidelines.*

Public Comment: And lastly, Madam Chair, persons with disabilities need to be a part of the process, and they need to be consulted in the design of this process. We stand ready to help you with this and we look forward to providing written comment, but we want to be assured that accessible formats are going to be available. They were not available here tonight, and we only have until August 28th, and I understand that accessible formats might not be readily available at this time. (0157, 0157-T –5)

Response: *In response to this comment at a public hearing on the Draft EIS in July 2002, the Project Team contacted the commenter after learning that the presentation materials were needed in an alternate format. The information requested was mailed to the commenter in several formats and additional help for answering questions was also offered.*

Freedom of Information Act Requests

Public Comment: We request that information collected by the study be available on demand to any interested member of the general public, as if the study were governed by the Freedom of Information Act. (0162, 0162-M –19)

Public Comment: We request that information collected by the study be available pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act. (0184, 0184-T –16)

Response: *DRPT has responded to requests for information under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act. WMATA has responded to requests for information under its Public Access to Records Policy. The Project Team does not administer or respond to requests under the federal Freedom of Information Act. Such requests should be made to the Federal Transit Administration. To view information collected by the study team or obtain copies (for the price of the copies), contact the INFO Line at 888-566-7245.*

Quality of Work

Public Comment: The first thing I'd like to do is thank our leadership here for bringing us to this point. Win, lose or draw, it's been a horrendous task, and I for one appreciate it. (0156, 0156-T –1)

Public Comment: The Sierra Club will be submitting more extensive written comments, but I will conclude by saying we are encouraged by the quality of the work we have seen so far on this project and the professionalism of the various parties involved. We look forward to continuing to work for completion of rail in the Dulles corridor. (0158, 0223-M –6)

Public Comment: I wish to express my thanks for the great presentation this afternoon to Centennial Contractors' staff about the Dulles Corridor Rapid Transit Project. You obviously were well prepared and knew the project intimately. The information you provided was well received and answered many

questions about the impact to Tysons Corner. Every person who attended have provided me positive feedback about the presentation. I hope our feedback was also of benefit. Your efforts are evidence of WMATA's commitment to customer service and your professionalism. Thanks again. (0292, 0292-L -1)

Public Comment: Thank you for once again pointing out by planning such ugly commercial facilities for our property that times have changed and a new development pattern needs to be implemented if we are going to maximize the public benefit from the Dulles Corridor Rapid Transit Project. (0464, 0464-L -7)

Public Comment: On behalf of the Claude Moore Charitable Foundation (CMCF) Trustees, the owners of 600+- acres in Loudoun County, Virginia west of the Dulles Greenway and north of the Loudoun County Parkway, we wish to summarize the comments with regards to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement in the vicinity of the Moorefield Station project. We have appreciated the time provided by your staff and WMATA to provide us overview of the DEIS process in the context of our on-going rezoning application with Loudoun County (ZMAP 2001-0003) for mixed use development at the planned transit node at the Route 772 interchange. (0451, 0451-L -1)

Public Comment: I would like to first say that I think while there have been a -- there is a lot of criticism of the EIS process, I think there is a tremendous amount of good work here, and people have worked very, very hard to make it available to the public, and I commend everyone who is involved for what they have done. If you really cared to track it, you could track it all along the review process. (088, 0172-T -1)

Public Comment: All things considered, though, I think this has been a very positive process, and I would urge the, where we have some questions to answer, let's answer them, but let's get on with the work. Let's build a rail system to Dulles and Loudoun County. (088, 0172-T -11)

Public Comment: I want to start by thanking the panel for indulging me at the last two public hearings for the last two evenings, and I will be brief tonight. But I also want to take a moment to thank you for the very professional manner in which these hearings have been conducted, the support that you have given to the public to understand what the questions are before us, the accommodations, aside from the air conditioning last evening, which no one had planned on. We have had, I think, a very successful series of hearings. Again, my thanks and my compliments to you for that. (0131, 0239-T -1)

Public Comment: I am very pleased with the preliminary design alternatives as shown in the draft Environmental Impact Statement and attachments, and commend those who have contributed to the design effort thus far. (0194, 0194-T -1) (0194, 0216-M -1)

Public Comment: This was great. You have done a wonderful job. Thank you for your time and efforts on behalf of Fairfax County Residents, like myself. (0032, 0032-CC-1)

Public Comment: Excellent exhibit area. (0042, 0042-CC-1)

Response: *Comments noted.*

Public Comment: We request that if the selection of the Locally Preferred Alternative is rail, that this choice be placed on the ballot. For example, we could ask the voters in Fairfax and Loudoun if they wish a permanent 5% property tax surcharge and double the rate on the Access Road in exchange for rail rather than BRT. The largest public works project in history for this area deserves a real up and down popular vote. As a comparison, Seattle is asking its voters to approve a much less expensive project than Amtrak to Dulles, their monorail extension, and is being honest about the cost by coupling a dedicated tax with it as part of the referendum. (0162, 0162-M -23)

Public Comment: We request that money spent beyond this point be done pursuant to the provisions of the Virginia Public Procurement Act, so that we know that all transactions are being done in the open and subject to a competitive process. (0162, 0162-M -21)

Public Comment: We request Public Procurement Act status for this. And we think if the Locally

Preferred Alternative is to be rail, that this be placed on the ballot, as Seattle is doing for a less expensive project, along with a dedicated tax. (0184, 0184-T –19)

Response: *All work on the project is subject to procurement procedures of Federal Transit Administration and the Commonwealth of Virginia, including its Public-Private Transportation Act of 1995.*

Public Comment: I need three documents: 1. Page 45 of 67 on Acquisition List; 2. GPN-R-046, Sheet No. 059; and 3.) GPN-A-219-TW, Sheet No. 766 (0044, 0044-CC-1)

Response: *The Project Team responded to this request.*

Concerns Regarding the Public Review Period

Public Comment: Additional time needs to be extended for more adequate review of the report. (0150, 0150-T –8)

Public Comment: Comment period should be extended to a true 45-day period. Public meetings in July were the first meaningful public notice of the availability of the Final EIS. (0510 11-1)

Public Comment: Unfortunately, the citizens directly impacted by this potential project have had less than one month to review the thousands of pages of documents that were almost inaccessible. I still haven't been able to read the noise technical report. You told us at a meeting in McLean that you couldn't figure out how to put the EIS documents on the web. If you can't figure that out, how are you going to build this project? (0145, 0145-T –2)

Public Comment: My biggest worry is that we are rushing to get this study through without giving enough time for the community to critically review and to analyze this important document. (0147, 0177-T –5)

Public Comment: First, I believe that this hearing should be continued to a later time, say September or October, because of the short amount of time given most of us to analyze the information presented in the massive documents comprising the draft EIS. (0203, 0203-L –1)

Public Comment: The Hunter Mill Defense League will submit a report prior to the August deadline. Although the Hunter Mill Defense League appreciates the extension of the comment period to August the 28th, we still remain concerned that many citizens will not have sufficient time to review the extensive and complicated EIS reports. (0147, 0177-T –1)

Public Comment: We ask that the review period be extended into the fall. We would like the ability to have our comments be more substantive. It would be nice to have this project gather support based on knowledge rather than the result becoming yet another project to remedy its disruption. The time limitation on review of this project is unofficial. There is time to review and comment on it in depth and respond to community concerns. (0179, 1079-T-11)

Public Comment: While I support the expansion of rail to Dulles, I have a number of concerns. The massive DEIS report, after being delayed six to eight months, was only made available to the public in late June, early July. It is cost-prohibitive to obtain a copy and simply viewing it at one of the locations is impractical and unrealistic. There has been insufficient time to review and absorb the vast amount of information presented, particularly with the project of this magnitude that will affect our entire region for years to come. (0150, 0150-T –1)

Public Comment: I am concerned that the public review of the draft EIS has been shortchanged. The late June release of the EIS is the first time that there has been a wide advertisement of the recommended proposals, but with limited access to the report. Many communities have asked that these

hearings be postponed into the fall in order to give us time we need to adequately review the data. This is an extremely complicated report. These requests have been ignored. (0179, 0179-T -2)

Public Comment: Until the release of this report, the information was held close to the chest when we approached officials and consultants regarding the details of the contents. To have limited availability of this report at libraries with static hour for two summer months when many residents are on vacation and only two weeks before holding public hearings does not constitute wide distribution into the general public nor adequate time to discuss this EIS. (0179, 0179-T -3)

Public Comment: The incredibly short period of thirty days to digest and respond to this study provides just another obstacle to surfacing the concerns of people who live along the roadway. Rather than provide material on the web, only hard copies were made available at libraries. (0087, 0087-L -11)

Public Comment: The incredibly short period of thirty days to digest and respond to this study provides just another obstacle to surfacing the concerns of people who live along the roadway. Rather than provide material on the web, only hard copies were made available at libraries. Is it any wonder that the sincerity of this study is in question? (0087, 0227-E -9)

Public Comment: THE PROCESS FAILED TO PROVIDE ADEQUATE TIME FOR LOCAL REVIEW: After issuing so many calls for more time, we find there has NOT been adequate time to convene meetings of interested parties and groups. Efforts to obtain approvals of boards of directors of community organizations have been almost impossible. Numerous civic and business groups have asked for but have been refused more time, including the Hallcrest Heights Homeowners Association, the Hunter Mill Defense League, and MoveIt.org. By our count, there have been only 54 days during which the EIS has been available, and then only under circumstances that made it extremely difficult for working people to view the material. In contrast, other project managers such as Maryland's Department of Transportation recently granted stakeholders an extension of the comment deadline on the Corridor Cities Transitway proposal, which also is looking at either BRT or rail in the upper I-270 area. The MDOT also provided free CD-ROMs of Parts I and II of their EIS. That process builds local support and understanding. We call again today on WMATA and VDRPT to grant an extension of the comment period. (0138, 0476-L -2)

Public Comment: The general public was not given a fair opportunity to review the data presented in the DEIS. Distribution of the information during the summer tends to indicate community input was to be limited. Was this process put in place to discourage effective public participation? We feel that the process did not consider us to be active stakeholders in making decisions. The timing of the material distribution and the volume of material did not empower us to participate in the decision making process. (0147, 0459-L -2)

Public Comment: The comment period must be reopened, to Sept. 30 or later. I would argue that the Project Team only really gave the public 30 days to comment, instead of the federally required 45 days. While the notice of availability of the EIS was issued June 28, the public did not get a real chance to review the documents and alignments until the July 29-31 public hearings. Furthermore, the Project Team forced the public to purchase the most essential documents, such as Parts I and II on CD-ROM for \$10 each and forced the public to purchase the technical documentation for as much as \$875 for a complete set. (See Exhibit 7). In contrast, in Maryland DOT's "Corridor Cities Transitway" DEIS, the hearings were held a full 45 days before the Aug. 16 comment deadline, and MDOT has since allowed comments to trickle in after Aug. 16. MDOT provided Parts I and II of their EIS on CD-ROM and handled those out for free. The Dulles Project Team went out of its way to make it as difficult as possible for average members of the public to review the technical documents. Its release of the documents in the dead of summer for a project that will cost nearly three times the cost of the Corridor Cities project in Maryland is a violation of the spirit of the National Environmental Policy Act. (0112, 0462-L -48)

Public Comment: How can you say you're giving a 45-day deadline for comments when the notices for the meetings and EIS review arrived in late July? Why not extend the deadline til September 15 or September 30? (0112, 0382-L -1)

Response: *The time made available to review the Draft EIS was 60 days, which exceeds the 45 days required under the Federal Transit Administration and USDOT regulations implementing the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Following publication of notices in the Washington Post, regional newspapers, the project website, and project newsletter on June 27, 2002, the Draft EIS was made available in the following locations: libraries and community centers located throughout Fairfax and Loudoun counties, the project outreach center in Reston, at the project office in Rosslyn, WMATA's headquarters, VDOT's Northern Virginia Office, DRPT's Northern Virginia Office, and by request (for the cost of the copies or CD). The public comment period closed at 5:00 p.m. on August 28, 2002.*

In addition, as required by NEPA and its implementing regulations, a Notice of Availability was published on July 12, 2002 in the Federal Register. As required, the publication was at least 45 days prior to the close of the public comment period.

Public Hearings on the Draft EIS were held during the formal public comment period to provide the public with an opportunity to consult with project staff, learn more about the studies conducted, and provide comments at a public meeting.

It is standard practice to make documents available at public libraries, public offices, and at locations such as project offices and information centers. Copies of the Draft EIS, General Plans and Technical Reports were made available for review at no charge in multiple public places throughout the comment period. As a convenience, copies of the documents cited were also offered to the general public for the cost of producing the documents.

The Supplemental Draft EIS and Final EIS have been placed on the project's web site.

Accessibility of Project Information

Public Comment: We are quite disappointed that in all the years the county had to put this report together, by its own admission there was not enough time to figure out a way to place the data on the web for us to access at times when it is convenient to us, when we will be paying costs for this extension. As Delegate Plum has indicated, if we have waited 25 years for this report, another two-month extension to get it right will be a mere blip on the radar screen. (0179, 0179-T -4)

Response: *The time made available to review the Draft EIS was 60 days, which exceeded the 45 days required under the Federal Transit Administration and the USDOT regulations implementing the National Environmental Policy Act. The Draft EIS was available at more than 20 libraries and community centers located throughout Fairfax and Loudoun counties, the project outreach center in Reston, at the project office in Rosslyn, WMATA's headquarters, VDOT's Northern Virginia Offices, DRPT's Northern Virginia Offices, and by request (for the cost of the copies or CD).*

Public Comment: Why is your address in Arlington since this is NOT involved with that county, so far as I can determine? (0006, 0236-L -4)

Response: *During the NEPA phase, the project office for the Dulles Corridor Rapid Transit Project were located in Arlington (Rosslyn). This location was selected based on its proximity to a Metrorail stop, WMATA's headquarters, and because of the desire to have the offices for the Project in the Commonwealth of Virginia. For the preliminary engineering phase, DRPT has established a new project office in Tysons Corner.*

B. Supplemental Draft EIS Comments

Local Agency Comments

Need for Adequate Public Participation

Local Comment: ...while it is very useful to consider alternatives that the public needs to be part of this processes, too. It shouldn't be left relegated solely to land owners and I trust that we will in some fashion be consulted if there's any further development of other alternatives. (0034 11-1)

Response: *The McLean Citizens Association was invited and participated in the May 2004 post-hearing conference on the Tysons West Station entrance and facilities.*

Public Comments

Concerns Regarding Project Refinements Since the DEIS

Public Comment: Your reply to my statement ignores the fact that the project was broken into two phases AFTER the decision was made to divert the rail THROUGH Tysons Corner with 4 stops. That decision substantially boosted the cost of the entire project (which you also fail to recognize), forcing it to be broken into two phases and seriously jeopardizing the remaining unfinished leg. If all federal, state and local funds are used up through engineering and construction of the first half (West Falls Church through Tysons Corner to Wiehle), there is NO GUARANTEE that the second half will ever be finished. Why would you ask for comment, if you are not prepared to reconsider some of the earlier erroneous decisions? The "locally preferred alternative" you cite obviously is not cost effective and is undermining the entire project. The decision makers in this process NEED to be asking whether or not the diversion of the track from the toll road median strip through Tysons Corner makes sense - economically or otherwise. There is an obvious immediate need for rapid mass transit (i.e. rail) from Dulles airport all the way to the District - not just from the District to Wiehle Ave. Please reconsider the decision to divert the track from the median strip through Tysons Corner. If you don't know the cost for engineering and construction to perform the loop through Tysons Corner, then forget it. It is much easier for the Tysons Corner business interests to run buses to stops on the Dulles Toll Road median strip, than for people from Dulles airport and all over western Fairfax and Loudoun Counties to have to take the buses to an interim rail-head. (0082 11-1)

Response: *The purpose of the Supplemental Draft EIS is to provide additional opportunities for the public and agencies to comment on refinements that have been made to the LPA since the publication of the Draft EIS Public Hearings Report. A number of alternatives, including various Tysons Corner alignments, were evaluated in detail in the June 2002 Draft EIS and Section 4(f) Evaluation. Additional information on the alternatives considered, and the screening process used to evaluate the alternatives is included in the Final Alternatives Analysis Report (May 2001).*

Coordinate Plans with WEST*GROUP Master Plans at Tyson's East

Public Comment: WEST*GROUP has contracted a major national design firm to do a schematic master plan of the entire area around Tysons East. As soon as FFGA is consummated, we will be filing rezoning applications, annual plan review nominations to implement the "with rail" aspects of the Tysons Plan. 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 dedicating 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. (0123 0158-28)

Response: *DRPT and WMATA look forward to ongoing coordination with WEST*GROUP and other stakeholders in order to ensure that the Tysons East Station best meets the needs of all parties involved.*

Need More and Continuing Public Involvement

Public Comment: The public has consistently and dangerously been short-changed and refused meaningful evaluation and input into the nation's biggest mass-transit proposal. This must change going forward. We need, I respectfully submit and must insist, on public participation throughout by frequent public meetings, by a public task force, et cetera. (0068 0076-1)

Response: *Public outreach during the circulation of the Draft EIS and Supplemental Draft EIS was conducted in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), as amended, and with the WMATA Compact requirements. Public Hearings were held during the formal public comment period for both the Draft EIS and Supplemental Draft EIS to provide the public with an opportunity to consult with project staff, learn more about the studies conducted, and provide comments in a public forum. In addition to these public hearings, DRPT and WMATA had presentations to various community groups and stakeholders during the public comment period. Please see Chapter 11 of the Final EIS for a summary of these hearings and meetings. The Project Team invites members of the public to call the INFO line (1-800-566-7245) or email (dullescorridor@aol.com) at any time to schedule additional meetings or to ask project related questions.*

Public Comment: There be continued dialogue between the engineering design team and adjacent communities throughout the final design process on project impacts and mitigation. (0026 0027-15)

Response: *DRPT and WMATA have analyzed and documented reasonable alternatives that would avoid or reduce adverse impacts. Overall, the impacts of the LPA are anticipated to be minor, especially given the project's length and complexity. In response to comments in the public hearing record, DRPT and WMATA are recommending mitigation measures that are detailed in the Final EIS. Moreover, DRPT will maintain thorough and continuous communication among all public and private stakeholders throughout the implementation of the project in order to minimize impacts and implement the mitigation commitments in the Record of Decision.*

Public Comment: In closing, I urge the relevant agencies and political officials to open this process up to the affected communities, rather than only hold a public forum when federal or state law requires that it be done. To date, there has been far too little community input into such a large project that would have such a disproportionate impact on residents, drivers, transit users and taxpayers. (0068 0173-39)

Response: *As documented in Chapter 11 of Final EIS, the Project Team has conducted a comprehensive public involvement program. A variety of methods were used to encourage citizens to participate in the project since initiation of the Dulles Corridor Rapid Transit Project, including: public meetings, project displays at shopping centers and fairs, project documents at libraries and community centers, and print, radio, and electronic media, project newsletters and updates, and stakeholder meetings with private citizens, community groups, civic associations, and businesses. In addition, prior to public hearings of the Draft EIS and Supplemental Draft EIS, all residents and property owners within 500 feet of the proposed improvements were notified about the hearings.*

Need More Information

Public Comment: There doesn't seem to be any user friendly way to get any specific information or people who have any idea of what you are talking about. (0003 0003-2)

Response: *All Project documents have been made available at libraries and community centers throughout Fairfax and Loudoun counties, at the project office in Rosslyn, at WMATA's headquarters, and at VDOT's Northern Virginia Office. Information can also be found on the project website: www.dullestransit.com or by calling the Project INFO Line at 1-800-566-7245.*

Appreciate the Public Outreach Provided

Public Comment: Thank you very much for your attention and I do appreciate the meetings, the briefings and the field trips that we have been accorded and that is much appreciated. (0036 0062-6)

Public Comment: I would like to thank Ick Thong, Neil Nott, and other members of the WMATA & VA Dept. of Rail and Public Transportation teams for their eagerness to work with our firm and all the parties involved in this process. This public-private partnership will greatly benefit the process. I would also like to thank the Transportation and Planning Offices of Fairfax and Loudoun Counties, and Airport's Authority for their work to help solidify this much needed project. (0052 0053-2)

Response: Comment noted. Your participation in the public hearings and your opinions regarding what you believe would best serve the needs of the Dulles Corridor and region are important to us and were considered by decision-makers in selecting the LPA.

Pleased with Noise and Visual Impact Mitigation at WFC Rail Yard

Public Comment: Our community is pleased with the track enclosure at the WFC rail yard and lower Metrorail alignment proposed to mitigate noise and visual impacts. Thank you for hearing us. (0026 0027-1)

Public Comment: Our community is pleased with the proposals to cover the tracks at the West Falls Church (WFC) rail yard and the lower profile of the Metrorail alignment. Thank you for hearing us. (0087 0102-1) (0089 0104-1) (0099 0115-1) (0104 0121-1)

Response: Comment noted. Your participation in the public hearings and your opinions regarding what you believe would best serve the needs of the Dulles Corridor and region are important to us and were considered by decision-makers in selecting the LPA.

Would like to participate in Upcoming Hearing or Other Activities

Public Comment: I think it's egregious to require me to type up a letter and put it in an envelope and mail it in order to arrange time to testify at the Dec. 11 hearing! In this day and age, a simple phone call or email should work and I request that you sign me up to speak at the Dec. 11 hearing in ashburn. (0016 0017-1)

Public Comment: We respectfully request that, going forward, we be involved in a significant and meaningful way in the planning for a project that has the potential for a significant positive - or negative - impact on the community in which we live. (0039 0040-11)

Response: As part of its procedures, WMATA requested that all parties wishing to speak at the Project's hearings formally do so in writing, in order to have a record of the registration to speak.

Your participation in the public hearings and your opinions regarding what you believe would best serve the needs of the Dulles Corridor and region are important to us and were considered by decision-makers in revising the LPA in March and April 2004.

As the NEPA process ends and the preliminary engineering starts, DRPT, the project sponsor, will continue an active community outreach program.

11.2 Agency Coordination

A. Draft EIS Comments

Federal Agency Comments

Federal Aviation Administration Involvement

Federal Comment: If it is determined through the EIS process that this site meets your operational needs and receives environmental approval, land will have to be acquired from the airport. The land on which Site 15 is located is dedicated airport property. The Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority (the Authority) is required to seek FAA approval for the release of any property dedicated for airport purposes as identified on the Exhibit "A" Property Map for the airport. Also, under the **Federal Revenue Diversion Policy**, FAA will be required to publish the intent to release this property in the Federal Register for 30 days to solicit public comments. The Authority would be required to obtain the fair market value in compensation for the property. (0485, 0485 – A –2)

Response: *As indicated in Section 3.3 of the Final EIS, the Project Team recognizes the process that it will have to follow for the Project's use of Airport property for the Metrorail S&I Yard. The costs for the acquisition of the necessary property interest for the S&I Yard at fair market value was factored into the capital cost estimate presented in Chapter 8 of the Final EIS.*

Federal Comment: In order for FAA to write a favorable Record of Decision (ROD) for the project, first FTA must issue their ROD. MWAA must show the project on their Airport Layout Plan and obtain FAA approval. (0485 11-1)

Response: *Comment noted. FAA role and responsibility is described in Section 1.3 of the Final EIS. The LPA is included in the Airport Layout Plan approved by FAA in March 2004.*

State Agency Comments

Consideration of Public Input

State Comment: I am a strong supporter of public transit for Northern Virginia, including the Dulles Corridor Rapid Transit Project. I also think a major project such as this one requires the serious consideration of citizens' concerns. (0012, 0012-A –1)

Response: *All comments received during the public hearings on the Draft EIS and proposed General Plans and on the Supplemental Draft EIS and revised General Plans were considered in the selection and revision of the Locally Preferred Alternative by WMATA's Board of Directors and the Commonwealth Transportation Board. Before and after the hearings and between the hearings there have been extensive public involvement activities.*

The Final EIS is being circulated to inform decision-makers and the public on the selection of the Metrorail extension as the LPA and on the potential consequences of implementing the proposed extension in the corridor. Overall, the potential adverse impacts of the extension on the human and natural environment are expected to be minor given the extent of the extension project. Coordination with the public, stakeholders, resource agencies, and local governments has confirmed these findings.

Regional Agency Comments

Disruption of Airport Operations

Regional Comment: Extensive continuing coordination is needed between the DCRTP design team and the Airports Authority throughout project design and construction to avoid potential conflicts between DCRTP and future IAD projects, and to minimize disruption during construction. (0440, 0440-A –10)

Response: *The Project Team and the MWA staff have had continuing coordination meetings throughout the environmental review phase of the project. These meetings were also used as a forum to discuss project proposals relative to alignment, stations, and other facilities. The meetings were also used to investigate and resolve potential conflicts between the proposed Metrorail facilities and proposed MWA projects. The preliminary engineering phase will continue the coordination meetings to maintain the existing working relationships and information exchange.*

Local Agency Comments

Coordination with Local Entities

Local 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)

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 Notice of Intent was published on June 26, 2000. VDOT, Fairfax County, and Loudoun County have had the opportunity to review and submit comments on the Draft EIS and Supplemental Draft EIS. DRPT, the project sponsor, will continue the coordination through preliminary engineering, final design, and construction of the Wiehle Avenue Extension.*

Local Comment: Although supportive of the project, the City [of Falls Church] has some critical issues with regard to the EIS which we feel must be addressed before the project proceeds. Generally we are concerned that although the city of Falls Church will be impacted by the project, our community overall has been overlooked in the EIS. (0122, 0164-T –1)

Local Comment: The [Falls Church] city council and I would appreciate your careful review and attention to these issues on behalf of all our citizens. (0122, 0164-T –12)

Local Comment: The impact area of the project includes the East and West Falls Church metro stations which are located on the perimeter of our city limits. We believe that the impact to the citizens and the environment of the City of Falls Church has neither been assessed nor mitigation measures considered or developed. (0122, 0164-T –2)

Local Comment: The project, while appearing to be beneficial to the region, has a significant and direct negative impact on the City [of Falls Church] in a manner not fully analyzed in the draft EIS. We have previously asked that this impact be thoroughly studied. However, we have now concluded that it has not been given full consideration. 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. (0122, 0164-T –9)

Response: *The Draft, Supplemental Draft, and Final EIS fully document the potential significant effects of the No-Build and Build Alternatives. The Project Team initiated meetings with the City of Falls Church during the course of the NEPA process to more fully understand the concerns*

and position of the City as it relates to the project. Issues ranged from parking problems at and near the existing Metro Stations to the perceived and actual noise levels at the West Falls Church Service and Inspection Yard.

Implementation of the LPA would result in increased off-peak service frequencies for eastbound trains at the East Falls Church Station. However, operating plans for the Wiehle Avenue Extension and Full LPA assume no additional feeder bus service, nor any new parking for the off-peak period for this station. Because the station's existing park-and-ride facilities are typically full by 8:00 AM on most weekdays and parking is controlled on local streets, it is not anticipated that increased off-peak Metrorail frequencies would generate additional traffic in and around the East Falls Church Metrorail Station. While the Project Team does anticipate other effects, as there would be no change from existing conditions, additional meetings with the City of Falls Church were held to discuss the issues of overflow parking and cut-through traffic due to the selected LPA, the Metrorail Extension.

Local Comment: In its resolution, the Board specifically cited four matters that need special attention by the Project Team and deserve continuing coordination with the County during the preparation of the Final EIS:

- Noise mitigation at the West Falls Church rail yard and along the Dulles Connector Road.
- Design of the intermodal bus transfer facility at the Tysons Central D Station between the two regional shopping malls.
- Mitigating the traffic impact of the 2,000 space proposed parking structure at the Tysons West Metrorail Station, including consideration of reducing the amount of parking provided at this station, or elimination or relocation of parking if no acceptable mitigation strategy is found.
- Details involved in the operational enhancement of existing express bus services operating in the Dulles Corridor. (0490 11-1)

Response: *For noise mitigation, the Project will enclose a portion of the loop track at the yard's eastern end and the new yard lead in box structures. These noise mitigation measures will reduce the wheel squeal noise of the train movements within the Yard.*

The Project Team has developed a site plan for the bus facilities at Tysons Central 123 Station that is acceptable to the stakeholders and Fairfax County.

The Project Team has reduced the capacity of the park-and-ride structure at Tysons West Station from 2,000 to 500 spaces and proposes that the 500 spaces be incorporated into the redevelopment of parcels in the vicinity of the station.

DRPT will coordinate with Fairfax and Loudoun counties on the enhancement of the Corridor express bus service.

Public Comments

Coordination with Local Entities

Public Comment: Close coordination among VDRPT, WMATA, VDOT and local planning officials is absolutely essential to ensure that the feeder bus system works effectively. Local elected officials bear the primary responsibility in being proactive in ensuring that this close coordination exists. (0088, 0211-M-12)

Public Comment: The history of transit development in this region and elsewhere proves that a business-as-usual approach will result in enormous missed opportunities. Only if all leaders in the corridor develop a coordinated plan, an effective set of implementation programs, and a viable funding mechanism, will we be able to realize the full potential of Dulles rail. (0478, 0484-E-13)

Public Comment: We strongly urge VDRPT, WMATA and VDOT to work closely with Loudoun County planning officials to give a comprehensive review to the overall parking and access questions related to both transit stations in Loudoun County. (0204, 0204-M –13) (0088, 0211-M –16)

Public Comment: We request that Fairfax County's Dept. of Transportation review the results of the Draft EIS and report their analysis of the least-cost and most cost-effective transit mix in the Dulles Corridor prior to any selection of the Locally Preferred Alternative. (0162, 0162-M –14)

Public Comment: Our overall concern is coordination. We are directing our comments to the Dulles Corridor Rapid Transit Project Team, but both the Fairfax County Government and the Virginia Department of Transportation must actively coordinate land use and roads with planning and construction of Metrorail. The Reston Association will be happy to assist in that continuing coordination. (0210, 0210-M –2) (0170, 0170-T –2)

Public Comment: We request that the Fairfax County Department of Transportation review the results of the draft EIS and report on their analysis of the least-cost and most cost-effective transit mix in the Dulles corridor. (0184, 0184-T –11)

Public Comment: Need for early coordination among government entities to "calm" potentially dangerous cut-through traffic. (0432, 0432-E –3)

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 Notice of Intent to prepare and EIS was published on June 26, 2000. VDOT, Fairfax County, and Loudoun County have had the opportunity to review and submit comments on the Draft EIS and Supplemental Draft EIS. DRPT, the project sponsor, will continue the coordination through preliminary engineering, final design, and construction of the Wiehle Avenue Extension.*

Public Comment: Probably the most significant thing, I think local officials must in this case be more proactive than they were either able to be or at least than they ultimately were with respect to designing the urban center of Tysons Corner or the station such as Nutley and Dunn Loring and Huntington and others. (088, 0172-T –9)

Public Comment: Local officials must take a more proactive approach to urban design considerations and the planning of internal circulation systems associated with the very urban development anticipated within transit station impact areas. Reacting to private sector proposals is not sufficient. It is already apparent that at several of the transit stations, especially the Reston Town Center and Route 772 stations, exclusive busways, light rail systems, or similar methods must supplement a greatly improved pedestrian circulation system in order for these important activity centers to function effectively. (0204, 0204-M –14)

Response: *The Project Team forwarded the Public Hearings Report to Fairfax and Loudoun Counties and the Town of Herndon, which had the opportunity to review the above comments.*

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 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. The Supervisor and her committee will conduct special meetings for the community, property owners, and developers to discuss the RFP process, status, and developments to ensure all concerns and issues are identified and addressed accordingly.

Public Comment: Designate a managing entity to coordinate implementation of the mitigation plan and ensure compliance and reports to stakeholders. In the mitigation plan, designate the specific responsibilities of each agency, along with cost share, timeline, and monitoring. (0388 11-1)

Public Comment: Would like the Project Team to develop a joint mitigation plan that would involve all affected communities. (0388 11-2)

***Response:** DRPT, the project sponsor, will prepare, implement and monitor a mitigation plan, based on the mitigation commitments and in the FTA Record of Decision.*

B. Supplemental Draft EIS Comments

Federal Agency Comments

Transit-Oriented Development

Federal Comment: The Public Hearings Report indicates that the Project Team will work with local governments to support and implement the Fairfax County and Loudoun County comprehensive plans, which contain guidelines to support transit, higher densities, mixed-use development, and pedestrian and bicycle friendly fostering transit-oriented development along the Dulles Corridor in order to ensure that future transit ridership is maximized. The comment responses contained in the Public Hearings Report show that the Project Team has been adequately responsive to our concerns regarding implementation of supportive station area transit-oriented development as part of the project.(0141 11-1)

***Response:** The Project Team will continue to coordinate with various agencies to ensure that station area transit-oriented development is implemented to best serve the needs of the Dulles Corridor and region.*

Federal Comment: Concerning FAA's issuance of a Decision for the Environmental Impact Statement.

We understand that Phase 1 of the project would provide rail access to a station at Wiehle Avenue with Executive Bus Service providing access from that station to the airport terminal. This phase also provides for an expansion of the Dulles North Transit Center primarily to provide parking for increased ridership over the existing bus service to points east and to Washington, D.C. Phase 2 of the project would extend the rail service to the airport and construct the rail service yard. Subject to satisfactory completion of the EIS, and after the Federal Transit Administration issues their Record of Decision, we would anticipate issuing an FAA Decision on the entire ultimate project.

Concerning the release of the Dulles Access Highway right-of-way for the Rapid Transit Project:

We believe that the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority (the Authority), which operates the airport under a lease agreement from the United States of America, can provide a right-of-way on airport property, specifically along and within the median of the Dulles Airport Access Highway, provided that it provides a means for passengers to access the airport. Our office would have to review and approve the proposed Right of Way agreement before it is executed by the Authority. However, our office cannot authorize a "fee simple" release of this Right of Way or of any airport property. We can only concur with the Authority releasing their interest in the land for the remaining life of their lease. We believe that release of a "fee simple" interest in the property would require approval action at the U.S. Department of Transportation level or possibly higher.

Furthermore, we believe that the Authority can release its interest in the Right of Way at no cost to the rail operating authority, provided the rail system accesses and benefits the airport. Executive bus service from the proposed Wiehle Avenue station to the airport would be considered as providing airport access for the purposes of this no-cost land interest transfer. However, if passenger service is not provided from the rail station to the airport then the Authority's interest in the land could not be conveyed at no-cost, and the rail authority would have to pay the fair market value for the land interest.

Concerning the release of airport property for a rail maintenance yard.

While we can concur with the Authority's release of its interest in airport property for the rail maintenance yard, the Authority must receive the fair market value for this land. We could consider a reduction in the fair market value proportional to the airport passengers' share of the use of the rail extension compared to the total passengers. A release of "fee interest" in the land for the rail maintenance yard would require the same approval level as for the access road right-of-way discussed above. (0146 11-1)

Response: *These issues will be the subject of continuing coordination among DRPT, WMATA, FAA, FTA, and MWAA. As discussed in Section 3.3 of the Final EIS, the Full LPA requires the acquisition of property interest in the median and other parts of the Dulles International Airport Access Highway and Dulles Connector Road, and in parts of the Dulles Airport property itself, including the site of the S&I Yard and portions of eight parcels that are currently leased to commercial entities. The Access Highway, Connector Road and Dulles Airport property are owned by the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT). MWAA has leased the property from the USDOT through the year 2067 and has sublet certain commercial parcels to businesses. DRPT will seek conveyance of the Access Highway, Connector Road and Airport property interest needed for the Project from the USDOT and MWAA. The acquired property interests will be adequate to assure DRPT's or WMATA's continuing control of the project property throughout the useful life of the project.'*

State Agency Comments

Continued Coordination with Local Entities

State Comment: VDOT is aware of the revisions proposed for the General Plans (PHR, A2). VDOT fully supports continuing, with full participation of transportation staff from Fairfax and Loudoun Counties as well as MWAA and TRIP II, a combined coordination effort with the DC RTP team to insure that the proposed rail alignments and station locations do not preclude potential future roadway improvements. (0091 11-1)

Response: *Comment noted. The Project Team has consistently designed the Project in the General Plans so not to preclude future roadway improvements. To its knowledge, there are no roadway improvements that are precluded, or any future roadway improvements that still need to be accommodated.*

State Comment: VDOT looks forward to continued coordination by the Project Team in determining how to provide complete station access during preliminary engineering. VDOT recommends that the Project consider improving pedestrian and bicycle connections in the general vicinity (within 1 mile radius) of the proposed Station locations. VDOT looks forward to continued coordination on issues of station access including bicycle/ pedestrian, taxi, bus, park and ride, kiss and ride, etc.

WMATA has listed bicycle and pedestrian accessible routes as the lowest priority for access and proximity to a station. VDOT recommends that in areas where no commuter parking is proposed, such as in Tysons Corner, these modes of transportation (bicycle and pedestrian) should be given a higher priority.

VDOT understands that an updated traffic analysis will be performed during the Final EIS and looks forward to working with the Project team during this critical stage to determine adequate mitigation measures for the project. This traffic analysis should address impacts on the existing transportation system in general.

VDOT looks forward to being part of the future business advisory team during preliminary engineering to discuss and minimize construction effects and maintenance of traffic in Tysons Corner and possibly

elsewhere within the project limits (i.e., Beltway/Route 123 interchange, Reston).VDOT anticipates coordination by the Project Team on a congestion management plan during this phase of the project. (0091 11-2)

Response: *The Project Team will continue to coordinate with Fairfax County, Loudoun County, Town of Herndon, VDOT and other stakeholders on pedestrian and bicycle access issues. As part of the Project, pedestrian, bicycle and vehicular access will be provided at each station site connecting to adjacent public rights-of-way. Comprehensive pedestrian circulation beyond the station areas may be implemented in conjunction with other planned developments, County and/or State projects. All stations would have bicycle racks and/or lockers adjacent to station entrances. Station access issues will continue to be explored in preliminary engineering. New pedestrian and bicycle facilities outside the station area would be beyond the scope of the Project, and would be the responsibility of VDOT and/or the local jurisdictions.*

Continued Coordination on Permitting and Master Agreement

State Comment: VDOT looks forward to continued coordination regarding permitting requirements and possible development of a master agreement between VDRPT and VDOT. (0091 0106-21)

Response: *Comment noted.*

Regional Agency Comments

Mitigate Any Adverse Effects on Dulles Airport Property

Regional Comment: The establishment of construction staging areas on Airport property will need to be coordinated with the Airports Authority to ensure that adequate provisions are made to mitigate potential adverse effects on existing and planned uses of candidate sites. (0131 0166-3)

Response: *During preliminary engineering, DRPT and WMATA will coordinate with the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority in order to establish the most suitable construction staging areas.*

Local Agency Comments

Procurement Policies

Local Comment: WMATA and VDRPT should consider whether and how such an contractual arrangement for provision of construction services for a public sector project could trigger “disciplines” under GATS and other service agreements.... subject to international trade rules.... (0164 11-1)

Response: *Comments noted. The project will conform to appropriate procurement practices in accordance with federal and Commonwealth guidelines.*

Public Comments

Potential Station Facility Impacts

Public Comment: The proposed Route 28 station facilities north of the Dulles Toll Road may encroach slightly into a new RPA. Project designers should coordinate with the Office of Site Development Services on this issue. (0093 0109-20)

Response: *RPA stands for Resource Protection Area. This issue will be addressed during preliminary engineering in coordination with Fairfax County and VDOT.*

Address Traffic Impacts in Station Areas

Public Comment: I would suggest that the County take the lead in finalizing the design of access to the rail stations and the design of the parking facility. Well-planned, frequent bus feeder service can help reduce the impact of traffic on nearby roadways and neighborhoods in Loudoun County. (0060 0169-14)

Response: *During preliminary engineering, DRPT and WMATA will oversee the design of the station facilities. Station access will be via planned roadways that new developments will likely design and construct. Feeder bus services for the two stations could be instituted by Loudoun County once the Full LPA is operational.*

Public Comment: To address concerns about increased congestion at the transit station areas, Fairfax and Loudoun counties need to make greater use of transportation demand management measures and work with developers and employers to provide incentives for carpooling, vanpooling, bicycling, walking, and using transit. Well-planned feeder bus service could help reduce the demand for expensive commuter parking. (060 0169-11)

Response: *Comment Noted. Your participation in the public hearings and your opinions regarding what you believe would best serve the needs of the Dulles Corridor and region are important to us and have been considered by decision-makers in selecting the LPA.*

State and Local Coordination Needed for Mitigation and Funding

Public Comment: Where there is shared responsibility for mitigation, like for sound barriers and traffic calming, that state and local transit and transportation agencies: 1) coordinate on evaluating noise and traffic impacts and identifying the division of responsibility for undertaking and funding mitigation measures for the final EIS; and 2) seek their accelerated programming in the Commonwealth and regional transportation plans and budgets. (0026 0027-16)

Response: *Proposed mitigation measures for the Project's unavoidable are summarized in Table 2.4-3 of the Final EIS. In each chapter on project effects, these impacts are identified and proposed mitigation measures are discussed. The FTA Record of Decision will include all final mitigation commitments.*

Public Comment: There should be better accountability for coordination between transit and transportation agencies on funding and implementing mitigation. (0087 0102-4) (0089 0104-4) (0099 0115-4)

Response: *Comment noted. DRPT and WMATA will continue to coordinate with various agencies to ensure that all funding and mitigation issues are resolved.*