

J PUBLIC AND AGENCY COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

This appendix documents the extensive collection of comments from public agencies, elected officials, business, civic association representatives, interest groups, and the general public received during and after the formal public comment periods that followed publication of the Dulles Corridor Rapid Transit Project's *Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIS) and Section 4(f) Evaluation* in June 2002 and *Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Supplemental Draft EIS) and Section 4(f) Evaluation* in October 2003. Comments and responses are organized by chapter in accordance with the structure of the Final EIS. The outline of this Appendix J is therefore as follows:

Executive Summary

Chapter 1	Purpose and Need
Chapter 2	Alternatives Considered
Chapter 3	Social Effects
Chapter 4	Environmental Effects
Chapter 5	Economic Effects
Chapter 6	Transportation Effects
Chapter 7	Section 4(f) Evaluation
Chapter 8	Financial Analysis
Chapter 9	Secondary and Cumulative Effects
Chapter 10	Evaluation of Alternatives Carried Forward
Chapter 11	Comments, Consultations, and Coordination
Chapter 12	Draft EIS/Supplemental Draft EIS Process
Chapter 13	Project Implementation
General Plans	
Indices	Last Name, Identification Number and Organization

Comments are placed within the chapter to which they pertain. Within each chapter, the Draft EIS comments are placed first, and are followed by the Supplemental Draft EIS comments. Within the sets of Draft EIS and the Supplemental Draft EIS comments, the comments from government agencies are placed first in the order of Federal, State, Regional and Local. In the case of elected officials, comments are included in the appropriate level of government agency (e.g., Virginia elected officials are included with the other State Agency comments). These agency comments are followed by comments from the general public, organizations, and stakeholder groups. Similar comments are grouped together and answered by a single response.

The comments are identified by a numbering system that includes the commenter, the means of communicating the comment, and the sequence in which the comment was received. The means of communicating the comment may be through letter, public hearing testimony, comment card, e-mail, written statements, miscellaneous or a combination thereof.

The individual comments were entered into a comment database and tracked by both a unique number given to each commenter and by subject matter. The numbering system is as follows:

1. First, the commenter is identified with a unique commenter identification number, which was used for all comments that were received from that commenter.
2. Second, added to the commenter number is a unique number that was given to each piece of communication, or statement, received from the commenter (these were consecutive numbers assigned as statements were received).
3. Third, a letter follows these two numbers, indicating what type of statement was received. Designations are: letter (L), testimony (T), comment card (CC), a statement from an agency (A), email (E), or miscellaneous (M)).
4. Then, a number indicates the individual comment that came from the commenter's statement.

For example, a comment that is labeled 0204, 0247-T-4, indicates that the comment came from commenter number 0204, the comment was the 247th statement received, the statement was in the form of a testimony at one of the public hearings, and the comment is the fourth comment entered from that testimony. In this example, the commenter 0204 has submitted more than one statement for the record. Not shown in the numbering system of this Appendix J is the database code of the subject matter according to topic or sections of the Draft EIS or Supplemental Draft EIS.

Comments may be tracked by referring to the accompanying index tables for the Draft EIS and the Supplemental Draft EIS. These tables identify the commenter by name, organization (if any), government agency or jurisdiction, interest group, company, or general public; the commenter's identifier number; and the specific location and subject area of the individual comments.

The responses to the comments in this Appendix have been updated to reflect the selection and revision of the Locally Preferred Alternative; the consequential elimination of other alternatives; the results of re-analyses in support of the Final EIS; progress in the capital funding plan; and the start of the project's next phase, preliminary engineering. Thus, for many comments, the responses differ from those in the Public Hearings Reports of October 2002 and February 2004.

Within the responses, the terms *decision-makers* and *Project Team* refer to the following:

Decision-makers – The Virginia Commonwealth Transportation Board and the Board of Directors of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, which, in similar actions, selected and revised the Locally Preferred Alternative.

Project Team – The staffs of the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation and of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, which together made recommendations to the decision-makers, the Commonwealth Transportation Board and WMATA Board of Directors.