

Appendix H:
Scoping Comments

This page intentionally left blank

Comments Received During Scoping

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Abalos	Cynthia McKay	67	3/15/2011	I am a resident of the Potomac Greens neighborhood and am disturbed by the possibility of a Metro station being built in our neighborhood, especially at the alternative of building one east of the tracks. I am shocked that anyone would even propose building a station in this park and wetlands area, which is home to much wildlife and has a short run-off to the Potomac River. I hope that wiser minds will prevail and remove this alternative from consideration before this ecologically sensitive area is destroyed.
Anderson	Mark	31	2/4/2011	Good Afternoon- My name is Mark Anderson and I am a resident of Alexandria, VA. For now, I have one question regarding the EIS for the proposed Potomac Yard Metro Station. Why is there not a D3 locations, that would put the proposed station to the right of the existing Regal Movie theater location, which I know will not be there when the Potomac Yards project is completed? Based on all of the sites being examined, this might make the most sense. The adjustment to the existing metro track would be less than the other proposals, plus the site would be on land that has already had an EIS completed, and holds an existing commercial structure. I welcome your comments. Thank you.

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Anderson	Mark	14	2/10/2011	<p>Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Thank you, other officials. My name is Mark Anderson, and I'm a resident of Potomac Greens as well. 705 Rose Square is my address.</p> <p>And I think that what I was concerned about when the EIS came forward, the proposed scoping meeting, that there were only going to be a few options available, but I'm encouraged to see that Metro has taken it upon itself to look at options in the categories of C and D, which make total sense, rather than options A and B, because you've already got developed land that's going to be changed over and stuff, so a lot of the environmental stuff's already been taken care of, removal of heavy contaminated dirt and stuff has also been taken care of. So that makes, far as I'm concerned, much more sense than going through the whole process for A and B to figure out if any of those options are good.</p> <p>I'm stating here a concern also is a -- just recently elected as one of the board members of the Potomac Greens Homeowner Association. A lot of our residents have come to me concerning just things like particulate matter, especially when Potomac Greens Drive looks like it's going to be the construction route should either Options A and B be considered for the Metro station, going back in for two plus years.</p> <p>We have a growing, young community with a lot of children. Concerned about heavy equipment moving up and down, a lot of diesel emissions, sound, vibrations, host of other things we're concerned about.</p> <p>Also, in disturbing wetlands, now that that park is back there, a very nice, pristine park, we're also concerned about the release of greenhouse gases. As we know, methane is a much heavier greenhouse gas than CO2 and even water vapor, for that matter, and those wetlands, if disturbed, will release lots of methane into the air, thus contributing to greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>So I'm encouraged to see that Options C and D are on the table for consideration, and I hope those will be given strong consideration. Thank you.</p>
Anonymous		10	2/10/2011	Detail the nature and history of land ownership and rights of way and scenic easements.
Anonymous		16	2/10/2011	Accommodate long-term bike parking with a bike hotel like at Union Station.
Anonymous		15	2/10/2011	Enhance and ensure pedestrian connections to neighborhoods.
Anonymous		11	2/10/2011	Research prior legal decisions
Anonymous		17	2/10/2011	You need to show in the alternatives the alignments, as they cross Four Mile Run, and where they are aligned in Arlington
Anonymous		9	2/10/2011	Stormwater management should be an issue

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Anonymous		3	2/10/2011	If tracks move, what happens to land where existign tracks are? Will revert to NPS?
Anonymous		2	2/10/2011	Need to define parking needs and impacts
Anonymous		1	2/10/2011	Maps should show NPS boundary
Anonymous		12	2/10/2011	Operation and maintenance costs?
Bhaduri	Moushumi	68	3/15/2011	As a resident of Potomac Greens, I'm opposed to the current plan for building Metro at Sites A,B1,B2 and B3. I have experienced the New York Ave Metro construction. The vibrations from the pounding pylons cause cracks in my previous home located on 3rd and G streets N.E. This construction at Sites A,B1,B2 and B3 have potential for worse damage. Secondly, a Metro on eastern side of WMATA and CSX tracks (sites A,B1,B2 and B3) will destroy the Wetlands. There is a bird sanctuary in the Wetlands. I have witnessed multiple sightings of bald eagles, owls, foxes and beavers. Also, the function of the Wetlands to provide a natural filtration system for water flowing into the Potomac River and eventually, the Chesapeake Bay will be compromised. Construction will cause residents of Potomac Greens to be exposed to noise pollution, diesel fuel emissions and compromised pedestrian safety along Potomac Greens Drive. Lastly, the history of industrial use in Potomac Railway Yard has left the soil contaminated with heavy Metals and hydrocarbons. Wonder why none of the homes in Potomac Greens have basements. So, responsible plan should be to eliminate Alternative Metro Sites A,B1,B2, and B3 if the environment is of true concern.

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Cannady	Katy	23	2/10/2011	<p>I am Katy Cannady. I live in Alexandria, in the Rosemont neighborhood. I suggest to you that ultimately the best solution here is the no- build alternative.</p> <p>I think probably very few people here understand the transit corridor which is already approved and being planned which would connect Crystal City to the Braddock Road Metro. The route has been laid out. It was designed in part to be accessible to people who live on the opposite side of Route 1 from Potomac Yard. It could be put into place much more quickly than a Metro.</p> <p>All you need for bus rapid transit and at some time in the future a rail line, but in the beginning all you need for rapid is a dedicated lane so that the bus doesn't have to fight with the cars for space and time. This is a quicker, easier solution. It does not require any of the controversial tax increment financing that the City of Alexandria would have to use for a Metro.</p> <p>It would serve people very well. And it would not degrade the Metro system because it would increase its ridership because people would go either to Crystal City, if that was more convenient, or to the Braddock Road Metro station, and people like me could get on at the Braddock Road Metro station and use it to go a lesser distance than Crystal City.</p> <p>We have to remember, when I worked, which I don't anymore, I was a regular Metro rider, and when you add stations there's a little bit of incremental degradation of the system. People want to go fast, especially when they're going to work, and the more stops you put the less fast it goes and the less attractive it is.</p> <p>I think a no-build alternative with a transit corridor would feed riders into Metro, is a very good thing. It'd come quicker. It'd be cheaper. It's a better thing. Thank you.</p>
Cannady	Katy	35	2/10/2011	<p>Please add me to your e-mail list. This new Metro is an unneeded, over priced "improvement" that can in no way relieve congestion on Route 1, already at a very high level. The plan includes adding seven million square feet of development to the Alexandria portion of the Yard. This amount has already been approved by the Alexandria City Council contingent on the development of the Metro station. This level of development has to take place to afford the project some tax increment financing. Even with that the taxpayers of Alexandria will still be liable for an enormous payment. The Alexandria planning department, at the time of the approval of this small area plan, stated that at seven million square feet, only half of the trips generated would be on the Metro system. The other half will be driving on Route 1. That means increased traffic with the Metro, not less, as many people doubtless assume. In addition Arlington is building a BRT route on its portion of the Yard. There is also an approved plan for this BRT to run from the Crystal City Metro to the Braddock Road Metro. So we can create a useful mass transit option for all of Potomac Yard without a Metro. There appears to be no funding source for the BRT if the Metro plan moves forward.</p>

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
carafri@aol.com		28	1/31/2011	I'm outraged that this is even being considered when the western half of the City of Alexandria has NO Metro rail at all. The Potomac Yard area is conveniently close to Reagan National, Crystal City & Braddock road. It isn't gridlocked like other parts of the city and has plenty of parking. Why on earth would you put another stop in that area before doing something about areas in far greater need of a metro stop? How about a metro station near Seminary & Beauregard?
Chiblow	Lisa	76	3/14/2011	I was wondering if you could tell me when the next community meeting will be regarding the Potomac Yard metro and EIS. Thank you for your time.
Colon	Alfredo E.	69	3/15/2011	<p>In response to the guidelines set forth in the Potomac Yard Metrorail Station EIS Scoping Booklet dated January 2011, the following comments are being submitted for consideration with regards to the overall Potomac Yard Metrorail Station EIS Scoping effort.</p> <p>Concerns:</p> <p>1) There needs to be a comprehensive traffic study conducted on all the roads leading into each of the Potomac Yard Metrorail Station Alternatives, with particular consideration to (a) the safety of children in nearby neighborhoods and using parks adjacent to the Metrorail Station Alternatives, and (b) access into and out of the Metrorail Station in case of emergencies.</p> <p>2) In addition to the toxic pollutants currently in the ground and introduced or released during construction of the Metrorail Station Alternatives, the environmental impact study needs to consider the impact of all the construction debris and the trash generated once the Station is operational, and the Potomac Yards developed. As it is the wetland east of the existing metrorail tracks are full of empty plastic water bottles and other trash carried by the runoff from near and not so nearby neighborhoods.</p> <p>3) There needs to be a comprehensive traffic study conducted of the impact that each Potomac Yard Metrorail Station Alternative and a developed Potomac Yards will have not just on the traffic and commuting on Alexandria, but its impact to nearby Crystal City, Arlington, and to commuters originating or commuting to points in Fairfax.</p> <p>I thank you in advance for studying and evaluating the foregoing in the EIS.</p>
Der	Chris	18	2/10/2011	Station must provide the best balance of accessibility to planned commercial and residential space
Der	Chris	18	2/10/2011	Walkability to resources near Metro station.
Der	Chris	18	2/10/2011	Station design must attract high levels of ridership and high use of CCPY Transitway.
Der	Chris	18	2/10/2011	Please avoid alternatives that inhibit Metro use, walkability, sustainable development, and use of public transportation.

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Der	Chris	25	2/10/2011	<p>My name is Christopher Der, and I live on the west end of Alexandria, but I feel like this is an important issue for all the residents of Alexandria to take note of since it's in our city, and input from every resident of Alexandria is crucial to this development.</p> <p>And my comments as far as the proposed Potomac Yard Metro is that I feel like there should be a very high level of effective and constant community involvement throughout the process and that there's also a high level of cooperation between the FTA, the City of Alexandria and Arlington County throughout the entire process.</p> <p>The station, wherever it will be, should provide the best balance of accessibility to any sort of planned commercial and residential space in the Potomac Yard area. The walkability to different types of resources near the proposed Metro is crucial, as well. The station design and location should try to attract as much Metro ridership as possible and also encourage high usage of the Crystal City/Potomac Yard Transitway.</p> <p>And the most important thing, I feel, is that any alternative that would inhibit Metro usage or inhibit walkability or go against sustainable development and the use of public transit should be alternatives that should not be considered. Thank you.</p>
Der	Chris	18	2/10/2011	<p>Constant community involvement and effective cooperation between the FTA, Alexandria, and Arlington on a high level is crucial for success</p>

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Dickey	Laura	22	2/10/2011	<p>These are prescription. I'm not trying to hide or anything. I've lost my second pair of glasses in a month. I didn't sign up right away. I should've known better. So I'm going to just throw some things out.</p> <p>You talk about C, 2, 1, 3, B. It means nothing to myself. I'm an art teacher. Where is it on the existing track? Why aren't we using the existing track? Why aren't we sticking it where the movie theater is?</p> <p>Why aren't we protecting the wildlife and protecting the people? We've had over a decade of pile driving, light pollution, sound pollution, dump trucks, et cetera, runoff. I live down the street, and I work right behind Braddock Metro at the school, and I've been involved in construction in my life.</p> <p>And so when I went and asked the big Potomac Yard LLC that we held at my school, and I said, "What happens to the runoff, and what about the wildlife," they said, "We're taking care of it." Well, they did. I walk over about an inch of ice, water, sewage, dirt, because they drained it right over the teacher's parking lot. That is no joke. Okay?</p> <p>So I really -- you've got a small parcel of land. We really do want a Metro. It should've been done, as you know and I know, a long time ago, so now we have to do all this malarkey.</p> <p>So I'm asking you, I put my email on, if you'd make it clearer, where do all these fall? And I see the nice pictures, and again I'm going to say, we really need you to protect the wildlife because I've got -- I live down the street in these weird little row houses, and I've got hawks sitting in my tree because they're being run out of their lands, and that's, quite frankly, why a lot of us live here.</p> <p>I didn't live here for highrises like Gateway. I lived here because it used to be called the City of Trees, and you could get coffee and meet people., but you could still go for a run or a bike ride or rollerblading or something and get some peace and quiet.</p> <p>So I know that's a lot. You've got a lot of people. But if you could email some stuff, in particular, about the runoff, about the noise, the light, et cetera.</p> <p>I appreciate when you said about vibrations because when they did Four Mile Run they cracked all our streets and houses. And I called a cousin who deals with this stuff in Colorado, and he gave me all the physics and everything, and then they told me it didn't exist.</p> <p>So I'd appreciate you all just keep funneling this information for us. We appreciate that a great deal. Thank you. And I –</p>

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
DiValentin	Lynda	51	3/14/2011	<p>I am a resident of the Alexandria neighborhood of Del Ray. I attended the Public Scoping Meeting on February 10, 2011. I would like to provide my comments about the project. I do not see purpose or need for adding another Metrorail Station in the vicinity of Potomac Yard and support the NO BUILD ALTERNATIVE in full.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I work in DC on NY Ave 2 blocks from the White House. It is 7.2 miles from my house. When I take the Metro, it takes me 1 hour each way if I walk to Braddock Road station and it costs \$6.70 round trip. If I take the bus to Braddock Road station, it saves 5-10 minutes and costs \$4.85 round trip. I have stopped taking the Metro because it costs too much and takes too long. Adding a new station on this route will probably add another 5 minutes to everyone's commute. That is way too much for a 7 mile commute. I currently commute to work by bicycle and it takes me 25 minutes. On days that are inclement I drive and it takes 15 minutes and pay \$5.00 to park in my building. Unless you can speed up the Metro and lower the cost of using it, a new Metrorail station will not benefit the residents here. • The Metrorail Stations proposed locations will not benefit the residents on the West side of Route 1. All of the proposed locations are too far to walk. Why walk all of the way over to the train tracks if you can catch a bus on Route 1? What is needed is an express bus that connects Crystal City and Braddock Road Metrorail stations of which the cost is free, included with what you pay to ride the Metrorail. <p>- The locations of the Metrorail Stations proposed will only benefit the new developments planned for Potomac Yards.</p> <p>- Traffic is a HUGE problem in between Crystal City and Monroe Avenue on Route 1. And, when the new neighborhoods are built as they are planned in Potomac Yard it is only going to get worse. The people that live here will not give up their cars to ride the Metrorail. A new Metrorail station is not going to solve the traffic problem. The roads need to be improved to facilitate the new neighborhoods. What has become of the new road that was promised in the development that is supposed to run parallel to Route 1 from the new Monroe street bridge?</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
dnugent@trave		29	2/1/2011	Please add me to your project email list: dnugent@travesky.com (2/1/11)
Feldman	Deborah	5	2/10/2011	Was the alternative utilizing the reservation site show?

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Fennell	Anne-Marie	64	3/14/2011	<p>I am a homeowner in Potomac Greens and will be impacted by the construction of a proposed metro station at Potomac Yards. I am concerned about the noise, traffic, and environmental impacts of placing a station in our backyard. I, therefore, request that a detailed Environmental Impact Study be performed to cover at a minimum the following matters:</p> <p>(1) Noise pollution on the surrounding homes and area. The noise from passing metros is a nuisance and needs to be cumulatively measured with freight rail train traffic, vehicular traffic, and air traffic from Reagan National airport. The screeching sound of metros stopping at a station, coupled with announcements also needs to be factored. Decibel measurements need to be made given the current noise and future noise that would come from the construction and maintenance of a new station.</p> <p>(2) Impact of increased traffic on the community and Route 1. Specifically, traffic problems need to be assessed with respect to the roads in the Potomac Greens community and nearby major roadways. Factors to consider include the costs associated with repairing damaged roads due to increased usage, safety of pedestrians and children playing in neighboring parks as more cars come to access the metro, and quality of air from increased emissions. Problems with parking should be taken into consideration.</p> <p>(3) Environmental impact on the wetlands and neighboring parks. The wetlands and parks both serve a critical function to the community and environment. Air, water, and noise pollution could have short term and long term implications for the vegetation and wildlife that makeup these beautiful areas. Construction could damage the vital function the wetlands serve to store floodwaters and protect the neighborhood. A full assessment of the erosion of the environment due to construction and proposed project needs to be done.</p> <p>The study also fundamentally has to address the need for another metro stop and the basis for its location. Various alternatives should be studied such as the impact of constructing an underground metro rail station as opposed to an above ground station; the movement of a potential future station away from Potomac Greens to a site not visible to the residents or the parkway; establishment of sound barriers and increased vegetation to abate noise pollution.</p> <p>Thank you for taking into consideration these matters at a minimum in your study. I look forward to a detailed, thorough, and complete evaluation of the environmental impact of a proposed Potomac Yards metro station in Alexandria.</p>
Feske	David	32	2/8/2011	<p>Please add me to the mailing list. Thank you. David Feske, PE, RA, AICP; Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc., North America Infrastructure, 1100 N. Glebe Road, Suite 500, Arlington, VA 22201 (David.Feske@jacobs.com, 2/8/11)</p>
Foster	Anthony	7	2/10/2011	<p>Does the plan include surface parking and bus (DASH) facilities?</p>

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Froehlig	Adam	19	2/10/2011	<p>Good evening. My name is Adam Froehlig. I am a member of Alexandria Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee, although my comments tonight are going to be my own, although I do -- I'm pretty sure I speak with my fellow committee members that we would -- we appreciate the focus on pedestrian and bicycle combinations, all five of the project goals in particular, although I would like to see not just enhance transportation and pedestrian safety but also a mention of bicycles in there, as well, especially since one of your bullets mentions possible impacts to bicycle facilities.</p> <p>As far as the station itself, I know it's a little early in the process for specific design parameters, but I would like WMATA, city staff, FTA to take into consideration bicycle and pedestrian impacts, not just impacts to adjacent facilities like the planned bike path on Potomac Avenue, but also bicycle and pedestrian access to and from the station, not just from Potomac Greens but also potentially some sort of connecting path over to the Mount Vernon Trail, and especially bicycle and pedestrian access to the station from Potomac Yard and adjacent neighborhoods.</p> <p>Lastly, sorry --</p> <p>...</p> <p>I forgot what I was going to say. That's all. I'm sure I'll have plenty of written comments -- as well. That's just the main thing -- especially in light of WMATA's recent study that they did on bicycle and pedestrian access to the -- to the Metrorail stations.</p> <p>You have a very good opportunity here to do things right the first time, get those design considerations and good pedestrian access, bicycle lockers, perhaps even a Capital Bikeshare station, as well, at the Metrorail station.</p> <p>Just that sort of thing needs to be considered. That sort of thing needs to be studied, especially given the potentially -- especially as Potomac Yard develops the potentially high level of pedestrian activity that would be going to and from the station.</p> <p>And on the bicycle side, bicycle represents that extra, the quote unquote last mile which basically extends the reach of that station within a relatively decent time frame that doesn't involve sitting in traffic or waiting for a bus. That's all I have. Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to comment</p>
Garner	PL	27	1/29/2011	Please add my email address to your Project Mailing List for updates on the EIS. Thank You. My email is Twaingrp@aol.com PLGarner (1/29/11)
Gittins	Captain Dianne	8	2/10/2011	Alexandria Police Department concurs its role as a participating agency; signed Captain Dianne Gittins

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Griffin	Vincent P.	62	3/14/2011	<p>As a resident of Potomac Greens, I am deeply concerned by several aspects of the proposed metro station at Potomac Yard. The following comments are hereby submitted with respect to the Potomac Yard Metrorail Station EIS Scoping effort.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental: As I am sure the EIS Team is aware, there potentially are contaminant/hazardous materials located in and around the 33 acre parcel of Potomac Greens and the Potomac Yard development resulting from the area's former use as a railway yard. Construction of any of the proposed A, B1, B2 and B3 sites could disturb any of these of contaminants, posing a significant environmental and health threat to the community. Before any decision is made on those locations, a full and exhaustive environmental study (Phase I and Phase II assessments) MUST be performed. It would seem more practical, environmentally sound, and feasible from a common sense perspective, to focus on the C and D Alternatives, as they are located on land which has already been tested, abated and/or deemed environmentally safe. • No Build Alternative: Full and concerted examination of the No Build Alternative must be completed, despite the City Council's determination to construct a metro station. "No build" does not mean "no solution." The construction of the CCPY would be completed in the No Build alternative. Statistics show that the metro ridership at Potomac Yards will total only 9,800 riders by the year 2030. The EIS process should study an enhanced version of the dedicated bus system in the CCPY as this seems an adequate means (and much less costly) of solving connectivity to the existing Metro stations and providing access to the regional network. Dedicated bus lanes could amply transport commuters or consumers to and from the King Street or Braddock Road to and through the Potomac Yard development. In the current state of the economy, we should not be undertaking a "build it and they will come" approach to this metro station. An expanded bus alternative would allow for demand to drive supply, rather than this "Field of Dreams" approach. Metro today is facing decreased ridership and will likely have to reduce service hours due to the enormous backlog of maintenance projects the system must undertake. I also believe careful consideration must be given to Metro's capacity to take on management of another station. It is no secret the issues, accidents, and safety concerns prevalent in the Metro system today. The system is capital-constrained today and will continue to face funding headwinds in the future. Metro must produce tangible evidence that it has the capital, management capacity, and safety competence to operate this station. • Neighborhood Impact: To build at any of the locations east of the existing tracks (A or B) would appear to require night construction since building would occur on and adjacent to existing track. This is an unacceptable nuisance for residents of Potomac Green who will have to endure noise from construction, equipment traffic, light pollution, etc. Sites west of the current track would not have such construction limitations and result in more reasonable times for construction. Construction of a metro site on the eastern side of the tracks would introduce more traffic, safety issues, crime, and destruction of property resulting from necessary drop-off circulation, kiss and ride, and the likely institution of city bus traffic. The long term effects of this activity needs to be studied and incorporated into

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Griffin	Vincent P.	62	3/14/2011	<p>the decision-making process, including the impact of increased pollution directly impacting the neighborhood. An eastern location would also appear to pose a scenic eyesore to the George Washington Memorial Parkway. The reduced buffer between the Parkway and the tracks and the height requirements of the station would make the structure easily visible from the Parkway which is not only aesthetically unattractive, but could pose a danger to traffic due to lights and activity at the station. Vibrations from construction of east-located stations could potentially damage the foundations and other structural elements of the townhomes closest to the tracks. Given all these issues (and others I'm sure not listed here) negatively impacting the Potomac Greens neighborhood, the C and D locations should be prioritized as potential locations.</p> <p>In summary, I believe that there are serious negative elements of the proposed metro station that need to be thoroughly evaluated. I request that you incorporate all of the above issues in the EIS process and evaluation of the proposed metro station.</p>
Hahn	Linda	71	3/15/2011	<p>I am writing today to request that the city conduct an Environmental Impact Survey on several items as they relate to the location of the Potomac Yard Metro. I am a resident of Potomac Greens. They include:</p> <p>If the station resides East of the train tracks</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) What is the impact to Old Town Greens and Potomac Greens residents if Potomac Greens Drive is used for construction. We have many children in the area and there is a lot of concern about the traffic, dust, debri and noise. 2) What is the impact to parking for Potomac Greens residents? Will our neighborhood go to a sticker permit type of system? What will the nanny/guest parking policy entail? There was no parking restrictions when we signed our contract with EYA. 3) What is the impact to the wetlands north of Potomac Greens? Will the construction mean we will lose our wonderful trails and park, just north of the neighborhood? 4) Will people living or shopping in Potomac Yard have easy access to our now-quiet neighborhood? <p>Also, if the metro is built West of the tracks, will Metro be responsible for constructing and maintaining the pedestrian bridge from Potomac Greens to the Metro station?</p> <p>Thank you for addressing these issues before a location is chosen for the metro stop. I would love to see a metro go West of the current tracks, but I have serious concerns about quality of life if the Metro is built East of the tracks.</p>

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Hale	Duane	58	3/14/2011	The location of the proposed Potomac Yards metro station must be WEST of the current CSX tracks. There is simply no legitimate reason for the proposed station to be built where the current wetlands are. Moreover, there is ample space in Potomac Yards to accommodate a station and Potomac Yards would benefit from the station more than any other business district in Old Town. Finally, the neighborhoods east of the CSX tracks would be devastated by the amount of traffic that would be created by a metro station at the north end of Potomac Greens Drive.
Hamre	Andrea	55		I would like to express my support for bicycling and pedestrian accommodations in and around any new Potomac Yard Metro Station. Infrastructure to make the storage of bicycles at the metro station practical and safe will be a cost effective investment to increase ridership and improve the safety and well-being of the surrounding community. Consideration of a facility such as the bicycle storage program available at Union Station in Washington, DC, may be valuable at this time. Such a facility is an efficient use of space and resources.

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Henderson	Foster J.	66	3/15/2011	<p>I'm vehemently opposed to any metro construction due to SEVERAL key components that have not been properly thought through or addressed by the city to date. The city appears to be in overdrive trying to ram this metro through without listening to its constituents! For example, in accordance to the Clean Water (1972) section 401 & 404 which addresses wetland issues, and the Comprehensive Environment Response Compensation and Liability Act (CERLA) aka Superfund established by Congress December 11, 1980, I have indicated to the city Potomac Yards' railroad history and the associated environmental cleans I have performed in the past (related to rail yards clean ups). Specifically, (high arsenic levels, and the associated metals) volatile organic compounds (e.g. benzene, petroleum fuel based chemicals etc) that have leached from creosote wood preservative and associated compounds used in rail yard operations back at that time. I've stated to city members that during the construction of the last lot of Potomac Green homes I noticed the builder treating the disturbed soil with a chemical, aerating the soil, and removed from the soil for disposal (hazardous). I know because I asked a worker. I also stated my insurance company has paper work submitted by the builder related to getting a waiver from the government about Potomac Green homes not being in a flood plan zone due to the large amount of certified clean soil used, which raised the homes' elevation situated along Potomac Greens drive elevation. Is the city prepared to pay for this too and it's probably not in the current cost estimate either. We have questioned the city in open forums and on record about the wetlands issue as related to the building the associated walking bridge from Potomac Greens and that the cost estimate for the walking bridge that was too low! How did the city respond? It let the builder off the hook in 3 million dollars allocated to build the bridge and on provided the homeowners the council's intent is to build the walking brige (not to fence the funds) and took a lesser fund of 2 million when your own Comptroller stated the fund was low. This did not take into consideration the beavers, noise disturbance to even build the walking bridge on the expected contaminated underlying soil around the park. Nor has the Corps of Engineers been consulted (wetland oversight per Clean Water act) by the city yet. Vice Mayor Donley stated that that present city council can't oblige future city councils in funding (related to fencing funds for the walking bridge) but yet it can impose a special tax for building a 270 million Metro facility on some 270 homes until the bond is paid?! Congress fences money all the time. Seriously?! We were not born yesterday. Since when does someone plan to due major construction BEFORE an environmental impact study (EIS) is completed? Apparently only the city of Alexandria. This is placing the cart before the horse. Numerous home owners stated this to the council on record. An EIS is done to mitigate risk, selected viable sites, and to strengthen cost estimates. Has the city petitioned Richmond for additional funds as I've requested numerous times? What are the operational cost to operate said metro stop? And please remember that Potomac Greens is responsible for maintaining Potomac Greens drive road. If said trucks to build the metro enter our development, I'll do everything in my power to ensure fish and wildlife is involved to include soil erosion, dust suppression, and paying for the damages to our street and flower bed circle since the City continues to overlook even the basic fundamental cost estimates we keep raising before it. The city has yet to consider the high density of all these new homes in Potomac Yards that it will require the construction</p>

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Henderson	Foster J.	66	3/15/2011	of a new school that is still not formally designate in the PY plan nor has it included the cost of that new school. Yet it's mentioned as tentative within the current PY plans. In have brought up this issue twice on record before the council. In my opinion, the city's budget for this project is so far under budget, lack of planning with "rosy" property taxes scenario - oh did I mention my property value declined for the second year in a row?! Am I missing something? I can't and won't support building a Metro station until the city provides a more realistic estimate that has engaged all stakeholders' concerns besides the council's own interests. Nor will I bail out the city for the expected cost overruns related to all the issues mentioned earlier. Finally, the council's staff still owes us the alternative taxation consideration to the special property tax we requested as the council promised, which hasn't occurred yet. Respectfully, irritated.

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Hertel	Poul	21	2/10/2011	<p>Thank you. I'm Paul Hertel, representing myself. I have three issues of concern regarding this proposal. The first deals with the environmental impact of the proposal on water runoff into the wetlands.</p> <p>The trees in the wetlands look under obvious distress, and numerous bare patches are appearing as the trees disappear at an alarming rate. We have been told about the beaver activity. This damage seems far in excess of what they could accomplish and is happening on both sides of the George Washington Memorial Parkway.</p> <p>This was once a very active railroad yard, and with the buildout has come the issue of possible contaminants in the water runoff, some of which is being directed into the wetland area, an area that some believe was limited too much in order to accommodate development.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the heavy construction and impervious surface being built will add to the problem. Therefore, I ask that this be studied to ensure that no harm is done to the wetlands, including a study of the water runoff, both current and future.</p> <p>The second issue is the determination of need. The City of Alexandria and Arlington County are currently committed to putting a bus rapid transit system on the Yard between the Crystal City and Braddock Metro. Furthermore, they are now studying the feasibility of changing to a light rail system instead. Since the system and Metro station all have significant monetary and environmental cost, a review to ensure elimination of duplicative services is warranted.</p> <p>The third but definitely not least deals with the infringement into the view along the George Washington Memorial Parkway. I have included here a brief history of the George Washington Memorial Parkway that describes the significant effort that our forefathers put into ensuring the establishment of the Memorial Parkway and why it is so vitally important. I request that you ensure that a Metro station not be visible from the Parkway.</p> <p>I'm submitting the paper on the history and importance, as I said. As one of the nation's premier parkways, the George Washington Memorial Parkway comprises 7,000 acres and extends 38 miles in association with the Potomac River. The initial or southern section of the Parkway extends 15.2 miles to Mount Vernon from Arlington Bridge. The Parkway commemorates the first president, preserves natural settings, and provides a quality entryway for visitors to the nation's capital.</p> <p>And if I could just finish, that parkway took a lot of effort and a lot, starting back, all the way back, to the beginning of 1800s. And I surely encourage you to read the history of it to ensure that it remains in pristine. Thank you.</p>

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Horan	Jennifer	30	2/4/2011	<p>Hello all- I just heard of the upcoming WMATA meeting on the 10th and unfortunately cannot attend; however I am very much excited at the prospect of a Metro stop around Potomac Yard and the shopping and living spaces surrounding the area. It has always seemed silly to me that, with the ample undeveloped space and tracks running directly behind the Potomac Yard shopping area, there is no Metro stop. We have had in the past 4 years so many more condos and apartments added to that area and the thought of being able to take the Metro home from work every day probably crosses everyone's minds as they are stuck out in traffic. I've had friends living over near the new Harris Teeter and walking all the way from the Crystal City Metro stop in the winter months especially is a real drag. I would definitely shop and visit Potomac Yards and the surrounding area more often if there was a Metro stop. Currently I have to plan to make a special trip by car after rush hour from the Hill where I have been living for about 10 years now. Otherwise, the traffic is a killer and I just opt out of shopping altogether. I also understand that the Metrobus lines that service Potomac Yards have been downsized over the past year or so. I am concerned that DC Metro residents who currently work at the businesses around Potomac Yards have been impacted, and that those who could otherwise benefit from a job at one of the businesses around the shopping area in these hard economic times are not able to consider employment due to lack of transportation options. I work at the Department of Labor HQ and am also a long-time educational docent volunteer at the National Zoo, so employment opportunities and environmental impact are always two issues in my thoughts whenever I hear about additional stations and services on Metro. I would love to see the existing line running behind the Potomac Yards shopping Center be put to better use to positively impact those who live, work and shop in the surround area, and to encourage less cars to pollute our environment when Metro travel is a viable option. Frequent traveler of the blue and orange line from my neighborhood Potomac Yards station, Jennifer Horan, 412 15th St SE Apt A, Washington DC 20003</p>

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Iudicello	Fay S.	76	3/13/2011	<p>As a resident of Potomac Greens and a voter in Alexandria City, I object strongly to the proposed Alternatives A, B-1, B-2, and B-3 for several reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - These Alternatives constitute a serious impairment ... actually, an assault ... on the George Washington Memorial Parkway scenic easement. - The location of these Alternatives on an untreated toxic waste site will result in serious threats to human health and life. - The disturbance of the contaminated soil during construction will result in highly toxic runoff into the environmentally protected Potomac Greens "Tidal Wetlands" and into the Potomac River. - The polluted waters resulting from the contaminated runoffs during construction and the increased runoff resulting from the "new hardscape" will flood the Potomac Greens "Tidal Wetlands" thereby endangering the wildlife (ehgjkh (eagles, owls, beavers, foxes, water fowl, and fish). - These Alternatives create serious health and safety risks to the residents of Potomac Greens by overloading a narrow two lane residential road with increased congestion during construction and post construction. A "one road in" access to what is to become a major public transportation venue creates a disaster waiting to happen. <p>In addition to my concerns regarding these Alternatives, I seriously question the advisability of the City of Alexandria undertaking the construction of a new Metrorail Station in the current economic climate. It is not clear to what extent Federal funding will be available to fianance an "undefined" portion of the construction of a new Metrorail Station. To pursue this venture without a better understanding and assurances of a financial partnership with Federal and State governments is irresponsible.</p>

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Keim	James R.	13	2/10/2011	<p>My name is James Keim. I am a resident of the City of Alexandria, and I live at 1820 Carpenter Road. I have some very serious concerns regarding some of the alternatives that are up for review during this EIS.</p> <p>And my concerns primarily lay in the area of environmental concerns as they relate to Potomac Greens Park and the wetlands that are associated with them. The park and the wetlands are currently -- well, always been east of the railroad tracks, and the wetlands are actually considered tidal wetlands.</p> <p>And for those of you who do not know what tidal wetlands are, those are the areas of vegetation, and in some cases nonvegetation areas, where water flows through, is essentially filtered naturally, and then goes into the Potomac River and then eventually out to the Chesapeake Bay. My concerns are that these tidal wetlands are going to be jeopardized very seriously if either Alternative A, B1, B2 or B3 is selected for the Metro Station stop.</p> <p>A little bit of background -- originally the rail yard contained lots of hazardous contaminants. At one time it was actually designated a Superfund site and had to be scrubbed. As a matter of fact, it's still being scrubbed to clean up that area.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the area east of the railroad tracks there hasn't been a whole lot of cleaning up, and the contaminants in that area really do present a strong potential for jeopardizing the sanctity of the wetlands.</p> <p>Now, the reason I say that, the particular areas that Potomac Greens Park are in used to be known as the Piggyback Yards for the rail station, and a lot of the debris associated with rail accidents were stored and maintained at that area until they could be disposed of permanently.</p> <p>If by chance those alternatives are selected, just during the construction process itself opens up the door for all kinds of contaminants to flow from the construction site down into those wetlands, and it presents a strong possibility that it could actually destroy the wetlands.</p> <p>Once the platform is actually built there'll be about maybe two acres of hard surface that will have runoff water. I do not know whether or not the wetlands can handle that. So I've got some very, very serious concerns about that.</p> <p>If anybody would like to come down and actually see the wetlands or see the park, my name will be available, and I'll be more than glad to show it to you. Thank you very much.</p>

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Keim	James R.	37	2/14/2011	<p data-bbox="961 115 1104 147">References:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="961 180 1856 212">a) Potomac Yard Metrorail Station EIS Scoping Booklet dated January 2011 <li data-bbox="961 212 1934 269">b) City of Alexandria Article XIII Environmental Management Ordinance April 2006 amendment. <li data-bbox="961 269 1581 302">c) 1988 Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act (Bay Act) <p data-bbox="961 334 1976 423">In response to the guidelines set forth in Reference a), the following comment is being submitted for consideration with regards to the overall Potomac Yard Metrorail Station EIS Scoping effort.</p> <p data-bbox="961 456 1997 643">Background: Potomac Greens Park is approximately a 17 acre track of identified green space and is part of a 33 acre parcel of land more commonly know as Landbay A of the Potomac Yards/Potomac Greens area. Situated adjacent to an existing natural and wetlands area, this park was created to serve as passive recreation area. It was developed as passive parkland with boardwalks and trails that bring visitors in close contact with this sensitive environment.</p> <p data-bbox="961 675 2024 1073">Wetlands: The Potomac Greens Park wetlands are considered “Tidal Wetlands” as defined by Reference b) and Chapter 13 Sec. 28.2-1300 of the Code of Virginia (Wetland Zoning Ordnances). “Tidal Wetlands” are those vegetated, or unvegetated, lands bordering, or lying beneath, tidal waters which are subject to regular or periodic tidal action. The Potomac Greens Park “Tidal Wetlands” play a critical part in protecting our environment and serve as a naturally occurring filtration system for water entering into the Potomac River and the Chesapeake Bay. The water that runs through the Potomac Greens Park “Tidal Wetlands” enters the Potomac River through a designated Resource Protection Area (RPA) as defined by References b) and c). RPAs are sensitive environmental corridors that should be preserved in a natural condition. The importance of the Potomac Greens Park Federally and State protected “Tidal Wetlands” have been recognized and documented by both the City of Alexandria and the developers of the Potomac Yards/Potomac Greens area for over 10 years.</p> <p data-bbox="961 1105 2024 1292">Potomac Yard Metrorail Station Alternatives A,B1,B2 and B3: Each of these metro station alternatives are located on the eastern side of the WMATA and CSX tracks and will if built encroach onto Potomac Greens Park. The impact of constructing and operating a metro station at any of these alternatives would potentially have adverse environmental effects on the Potomac Greens Park “Tidal Wetlands” and could expose the City of Alexandria to both Federal and State legal action.</p> <p data-bbox="961 1325 2024 1477">Each of these metro station alternatives is on land that was formally known as the “Piggyback Yard” when the area was under the stewardship of the Potomac Railway Yard. At decommissioning, decades of industrial use had left the Potomac Railway Yard contaminated with heavy metals, hydrocarbons, and other known hazardous contaminants including diesel. The entire facility was immediately declared a Environmental Superfund</p>

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Keim	James R.	37	2/14/2011	Site. The "Piggyback Yard" was generally used for railroad car maintenance activities and served as temporary storage site for hazardous materials created as the result of railroad accidents.

The specific environmental consequences associated with any of these metro station alternatives include but are not limited to the following:

The building site runoff water created during the construction phase of any these alternatives will flow directly into the Potomac Greens "Tidal Wetlands". Though much of the land on the western side of the WMATA and CSX tracks have been cleaned up, very little has been done to repair Alternative Site A and nothing has been done to Alternative Site B1, B2, and B3. The potential risk for highly contaminated construction related runoff water to flow through the environmentally protected Potomac Greens "Tidal Wetlands" and into Potomac River has a 100% chance of occurrence.

If any of the Alternative Metro Sites (A, B1, B2, or B3) are completed, there will be at least two acres of hard surface that will generate runoff water that will flow into the Potomac Greens "Tidal Wetlands". The Potomac Greens "Tidal Wetlands" may potentially not be capable of handling the increased flow of water and therefore be incapable of serving as a naturally occurring filtering system for water entering into the Potomac River and the Chesapeake Bay. There is a high risk that the runoff water will end up going directly into the Potomac River with out being filtered. And be assured, this runoff water will include not only rainwater, but also residual contaminates associated with normal metro rail operations.

Last of all, there is strong potential that the plethora of wildlife (beavers, foxes, owls, eagles, fish, and waterfowl) that now live in Potomac Greens Park will be lost if the "Tidal Wetlands" are lost or contaminated.

In summary, in view of all of the above, serious consideration should be given to eliminating Alternative Metro Sites A, B1, B2, or B3 for consideration as viable Potomac Yard Metro Stop Alternatives for this EIS effort.

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Keim	James R.	38	2/14/2011	<p>In response to the guidelines set forth in Reference a), the following comment is being submitted for consideration with regards to the overall Potomac Yard Metrorail Station EIS Scoping effort.</p> <p>Fire Station Proximity: I have a strong concern there is a lack of proper fire fighting resources within close proximity of Alternative Metro Sites A, B1, B2, or B3. Each of these sites are located on the eastern side of the WMATA and CSX rail tracks.</p> <p>The two closest fire stations to Alternative Metro Sites A, B1, B2, or B3 are Station No.4 in Alexandria and the Ronald Regan Airport (DCA). Currently, the only road that will have access to these sites is Potomac Greens Avenue. There are no secondary roads leading into those sites and construction of a secondary road into these sites would require a National Park Service easement from the George Washington Memorial Parkway across protected wetlands and National Park Service land.</p> <p>The other Alternative Metro Sites (C1,C2,D1, and D2) will be accessible from multiple roads and be located within two (2) minutes from the Potomac Yards Fire Station.</p> <p>In view of the above, serious consideration should be given to eliminating Alternative Metro Sites A, B1, B2, or B3 for consideration and not advance to be evaluated in the EIS as viable Potomac Yard Metro Stop Alternative.</p>
Keim	James R.	39	2/16/2011	<p>In response to the guidelines set forth in Reference a), the following comment is being submitted for consideration with regards to the overall Potomac Yard Metrorail Station EIS Scoping effort.</p> <p>Non Metro Station Alternative: On 15 June 1999 Commonwealth Atlantic Properties Inc. applied for a Special Use Permit (SUP #99-0020) for a Transportation Management Plan (TMP) for the Potomac Yard/Potomac Greens development site.</p> <p>The TMP was a very well comprehensive and designed plan that satisfied the transportation infrastructure needs and requirements for the Potomac Yard/Potomac Greens development site. A key non-provision of the TMP was that none of the Potomac Yard/Potomac Greens development site infrastructure components included a requirement for a Metro Station.</p> <p>I would like to recommend that the Potomac Yards Metro Station EIS scoping process include a review of SUP #99-0020 and inclusion of this TMP as an additional non-metro station alternative.</p> <p>Additionally, this non-metro station alternative should include a cost analysis and be used in comparison against the eight Metro Station Alternatives from a financial feasibility perspective.</p> <p>This alternative should not be considered the same as the "No Build Alternative"</p>

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Keim	James R.	40	2/18/2011	<p>Commonwealth of Virginia ltr dated 16 October 2000 (Ref PC#91-1668) Potomac Yard EPA ID# VAD02031201 Crystal City/Potomac Yards Corridor Transit Improvement Project Hazardous & Contaminated Materials Technical Memorandum (Phase 1 ESA), October 2006</p> <p>In response to the guidelines set forth in Reference a), the following comment is being submitted for consideration with regard to the overall Potomac Yard Metrorail Station EIS Scoping effort.</p> <p>Background: The Potomac Rail Yard owned by the Richmond, Fredericksburg, and Potomac Railroad (RF&P) opened on 15 October 1906 and remained operational for 83 years and was finally decommissioned 1989. In its heyday, Potomac Yards was one of the busiest rail yards in the Eastern United States, processing thousands of railcars on a daily basis. It was used primarily as a railroad switching and maintenance yard by the Norfolk Southern Corporation, Delaware and Hudson Railway, CSX Transportation, Consolidated Rail Corporation, and RF&P Railway. Locomotive engines were fueled at the Potomac Yard from four 25,000 gallon above ground storage tanks. Diesel fuel from these tanks was pumped through underground piping to a dispensing system throughout Potomac Yard. Additionally, over the course of its operational life, the Potomac Yard site was routinely subject to numerous rail way and environmental accidents that resulted in the spilling of countless amounts of unknown and potentially environmentally hazardous materials. The facility was declared a toxic waste site in 1987 and immediately became subject to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (a.k.a. an Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) "Superfund Site") . Potomac Yard was contaminated with metals - arsenic, lead and copper, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), volatile organic compounds (VOCs), and total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH). In September 1992, the EPA and RF&P signed a Consent Order requiring RF&P to study the extent of site contamination. This order also required RF&P to assess the risks that could be posed to people, plants and animals coming into contact with the site. It took nearly 8 years the study was completed before Potomac Yards was declared to be ".....not a risk to human health and the environment ". However even today, there exists an underground plume of free product (diesel fuel and oil) that continues to be recovered under the supervision of the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality .</p> <p>Potential Environmental Hazards Related to the Potomac Green Area: The 33 acre parcel of land more commonly known as Landbay A of the Potomac Yards/Potomac Greens area was not used for Potomac Yard rail operations. However, Potomac Greens did serve as a rail yard maintenance support site and contained three retention (oil/water separator) ponds , a deposition area for fly ash from a nearby power plant, and an Army Corps of Engineers dredge spoils deposition area / .</p> <p>In 2006, an Environmental Site Assessment (ESA Phase 1) was conducted in support of proposed construction activities in the Crystal City/Potomac Yard Corridor (Reference d)).</p> <p>Note: This ESA was conducted six years after Potomac Yard as a whole was removed</p>

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Keim	James R.	40	2/18/2011	<p data-bbox="961 110 1915 170">from the EPA Superfund list and declared “.....not a risk to human health and the environment”</p> <p data-bbox="961 203 2007 328">The ESA only conducted its assessment actives on land west of the CSX and WMATA rail tracks. No assessment actives were conducted on the east side of the rail tracks where the proposed Potomac Yard Alternate Metro Site locations (B-1, B-2, and B-3) are situated. Some of the specific finding of the ESA included:</p> <ol data-bbox="961 360 2026 576" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="961 360 2026 485">1. There were a large number of “Underground Storage Tanks” (UST) discovered within Potomac Yard during the ESA that were no longer in use, but at one time were used for gasoline, kerosene, diesel, and other unknown liquids storage (Largest 20,000 gallons). It is not known whether or not these USTs have been removed. <li data-bbox="961 518 2026 576">2. The majority of the assessment actives were based upon ground level surface analysis processes with some drilling. <p data-bbox="961 609 1965 669">One of the ESA I conclusions was that any proposed subsurface disturbance in these areas (Potomac Yard) should be evaluated and monitored as part of a Phase II ESA.</p> <p data-bbox="961 701 1976 761">In the conclusion statement of ESA I, it specifically states that Potomac Yard may still contain contaminated/hazardous materials.</p> <p data-bbox="961 794 1100 821">Comments:</p> <ol data-bbox="961 854 2026 1222" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="961 854 2026 979">1. Based upon the aforementioned information, it is intuitively obvious that there still remains a very distinct and high probability that there are contaminated/hazardous materials located in and around the 33 acre parcel of Potomac Greens that have yet to be discovered. <li data-bbox="961 1011 2026 1222">2. Secondly, since there has not been an EAS on the east side of the CSX and WMATA rail tracks where the proposed Potomac Yard Alternate Metro Site locations (B-1, B-2, and B-3) are located; there is also a very high probability that any subsurface disturbance related to the construction of any of these Metro Station Alternative Site locations will potentially release and spread contaminated/hazardous materials from the ground into the air as well as surrounding areas and Potomac River. The surrounding areas include protected wetlands and the townhomes of Potomac Greens. <p data-bbox="961 1255 2026 1469">Recommendation: Before Potomac Yard Alternate Metro Site locations B-1, B-2, and/or B-3 can be evaluated as viable Metro Site locations; a thorough environment assessment (Phase I and II) and a stand-a-lone in-depth Potomac Greens analytical environmental study be conducted on and around Potomac Yard Alternate Metro Site locations B-1, B-2, and B-3. It is also recommended that the in-depth analytical environmental study be conducted by the US Army Corp of Engineers. The stakes are too high from both a human safety and wetlands environmental perspective not to fully address this scoping</p>

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Keim	James R.	40	2/18/2011	comment.

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Keim	James R.	41	2/19/2011	<p>In response to the guidelines set forth in Reference a), the following comment is being submitted for consideration with regard to the overall Potomac Yard Metrorail Station EIS Scoping effort.</p> <p>Storm water Runoff: Stormwater runoff is unfiltered water that reaches streams, lakes, sounds, and oceans by means of flowing across impervious surfaces. These surfaces include roads, parking lots, driveways, roofs and large concrete platforms such as Metrorail platforms.</p> <p>In general once rain falls to the earth, it follows one of four paths:</p> <p>oaks to porous ground surfaces and becomes part of the groundwater, which feeds streams and wetlands and supplies much of our drinking water;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • emains in lakes or topsoil and eventually evaporates; • it is absorbed by vegetation and then transpires (evaporates from the plant tissues); or for example the Northern Virginia watershed it forms streams that eventually empty to the Potomac River and on to the Chesapeake Bay. <p>Stormwater management (SWM) in Northern Virginia typically involves ponds. A pond intercepts the runoff before it reaches a stream. The term “pond” may confuse those of us not in the business of stormwater management because the term conjures up an image of a permanent pool of water. However, a stormwater management pond can be either wet or dry. A wet pond is exactly that. It is a basin or depression that retains, or holds, water in a permanent pool. While the term “dry pond” sounds like an oxymoron, it refers to a basin or depression that detains, or slows the flow of water for short periods of time and is dry between storm events. Wet ponds are often aesthetically pleasing to the eye and may provide recreational opportunities. Dry ponds may look less attractive or go completely unnoticed in the landscape. Whether wet or dry, SWM ponds serve an important purpose. They control the volume of runoff by releasing it over time. Every pond has a pipe outlet. The outlet is generally sized to release water over a 2-3 hour period in a heavy storm and less time or none at all in light precipitation. If an increase in runoff is not controlled, it may cause downstream flooding and stream bed and wetland erosion.</p> <p>Some SWM ponds control not only the quantity of runoff but also the quality of runoff. In such cases, the SWM ponds are called BMP ponds. BMPs, or best management practices, are techniques to manage runoff in ways that reduce water pollution. In a BMP pond, a flow regulator is attached to the end of the pipe to reduce the size of the outlet. A smaller outlet forces the pond to hold the water for a longer period, allowing more time for the sediment and attached nutrients to settle out. Whereas a conventional SWM pond will release stormwater over 2-3 hours, a stormwater management BMP pond may release the water over 2-3 day days .</p> <p>Potomac Greens Park: The land north of Potomac Greens Park is situated in a designated flood plain and includes tidal wetlands that naturally filter stormwater runoff that eventually enters the Potomac River less than 300 yards away. The Potomac Yards</p>

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Keim	James R.	41	2/19/2011	<p data-bbox="961 110 2028 264">Alternative Metro Sites A, B1, B2, and B3 will all be near or actually within the confines of Potomac Greens Park. The Metrorail Platforms for each of these sites will be at least 600 feet long and 50 feet wide (not including any potential access roads that will be required to support these sites) and by design will create impervious surfaces from which stormwater run off will occur.</p> <p data-bbox="961 298 2028 483">There is no reasonably suitable land near the aforementioned Alternative Metro Sites that are above the designated flood plain where a SWM pond could be located. As such, the stormwater run off will leave each Alternative Metro Site overflowing into the existing tidal wetland, exceeding its natural filtering capabilities and flow directly to a Resource Protection Area (RPA) into the Potomac River (most likely carrying Metrorail as well as existing Potomac Yard contaminants).</p> <p data-bbox="961 485 2028 573">In contrast, Potomac Yards Alternative Metro Sites C1, C2, D1, and D2 located on the western side of the CSX and WAMATA railway tracks have no less than three SWM ponds already in place and are not associated with any designated wetlands areas.</p> <p data-bbox="961 574 2028 667">Comment and Recommendation: This issue has not been adequately addressed by any of the previous Potomac Yard Metrorail feasibility studies and presents a strong potential for introducing environmental contaminants into the Potomac River and Chesapeake Bay.</p> <p data-bbox="961 669 2028 760">In view of the above, serious consideration should be given to eliminating Alternative Metro Sites A, B1, B2, or B3 for consideration and not advance to be evaluated in the EIS as viable Potomac Yard Metro Stop Alternatives.</p>

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Keim	James R.	42	2/19/2011	<p data-bbox="961 115 2018 212">In response to the guidelines set forth in Reference a), the following comment is being submitted for consideration with regard to the overall Potomac Yard Metrorail Station EIS Scoping effort.</p> <p data-bbox="961 240 2018 396">Virginia Railway Express Alternative: The Virginia Railway Express (VRE) is a joint project of the Northern Virginia Transportation Commission and the Potomac and Rappahannock Transportation Commission. It provides safe, cost-effective, accessible, customer-responsive, reliable, rail passenger service as an integral part of a balanced, intermodal regional transportation system.</p> <p data-bbox="961 423 2018 548">There is approximately 1.3 miles of VRE track that runs along Potomac Yards in a north-south direction on the west side of the WAMATA and CSX rail tracks. There is one VRE station in north of Potomac Yard in Crystal City and one to the South in Alexandria just off of King Street.</p> <p data-bbox="961 576 2018 732">Comment and Recommendation: Considering that the initial cost estimates for the Potomac Yards Metro Station is nearly half a billion dollars, it would seem to be a very prudent and a just idea to conduct a feasibility and cost analysis comparing what the benefits would be of constructing a VRE station in lieu of a Metro Station at Potomac Yards.</p> <p data-bbox="961 760 2018 828">Strongly recommend that a VRE Alternative be included as part of the Potomac Yards Metrostation EIS.</p>

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Keim	James R.	43	2/19/2011	<p data-bbox="961 115 2018 212">In response to the guidelines set forth in Reference a), the following comment is being submitted for consideration with regard to the overall Potomac Yard Metrorail Station EIS Scoping effort.</p> <p data-bbox="961 245 2018 391">Clean Water Act: The primary federal law in the United States governing water pollution. Commonly abbreviated as the CWA, the act established the goals of eliminating releases of high amounts of toxic substances into water, eliminating additional water pollution by 1985, and ensuring that surface waters would meet standards necessary for human sports and recreation by 1983.</p> <p data-bbox="961 399 2018 578">The principal body of law currently in effect is based on the Federal Water Pollution Control Amendments of 1972 and was significantly expanded from the Federal Water Pollution Control Amendments of 1948. Major amendments were enacted in the Clean Water Act of 1977 and the Water Quality Act of 1987. There is an extremely high probability that toxic will be released during the construction of Potomac Yard Metro Station Alternatives B-1, B-2, and B-3.</p> <p data-bbox="961 586 2018 829">CWA Section 404 Compliance and Permit: Section 404 of the CWA regulates the discharge of dredged, excavated, or fill material in wetlands, streams, rivers, and other U.S. waters. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is the federal agency authorized to issue Section 404 Permits for certain activities conducted in wetlands or other U.S. waters. Depending on the scope of the project and method of construction, certain activities (e.g. infrastructure development projects) may require this permit. Examples include ponds, embankments, and stream channelization which will for Potomac Yard Metro Station Alternatives B-1, B-2, and B-3 be a mitigating factor.</p> <p data-bbox="961 862 2018 951">Comment and Recommendation: The CWA will have a definite impact Potomac Yard Metro Station Alternatives B-1, B-2, and B-3 and should be addressed during the EIS evaluation process.</p> <p data-bbox="961 984 2018 1045">Additionally, the FTA as the lead agency should immediately consider contacting and bringing in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for the Potomac Yards Metro Station EIS.</p>

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Keim	James R.	50	2/21/2011	<p>In response to the guidelines set forth in Reference a), the following comment is being submitted for consideration with regard to the overall Potomac Yard Metrorail Station EIS Scoping effort.</p> <p>US Department of Transportation (DOT) Act of 1966 Section 4(f) Compliance: Section 4(f) applies to any significant publicly owned public park, recreation area, or wildlife and waterfowl refuge and any land from an historic site of national, state or local significance. "It is hereby declared to be the national policy that special effort should be made to preserve the natural beauty of the countryside and public park and recreation lands, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, and historic sites. The Secretary of Transportation shall cooperate and consult with the Secretaries of the Interior, Housing and Urban Development, and Agriculture, and with the States in developing transportation plans and programs that include measures to maintain or enhance the natural beauty of the lands traversed"</p> <p>23 U.S.C. 138</p> <p>Potomac Greens Park: The "North Potomac Yard Small Area Development Plan" as well as earlier Potomac Yard Concept Plans specifically state that Potomac Greens Park will be turned over to the City of Alexandria upon completion of the Potomac Greens Townhouse Development project. The goal is to designate the Potomac Greens Park as publicly owned land for use by all Alexandria residents as a passive recreation area, wildlife and waterfowl refuge area, and a designated protected wetlands area that borders the National Park Service's scenic George Washington Parkway.</p> <p>Comment and Recommendation: The land on which Potomac Greens sits was part of a former EPA Superfund Site that was declared not a risk to humans in 2000. However, based on data derived from an earlier EAS 1 conducted on Potomac Yards in 2005, there exists a high probability that toxic contaminants still remain buried in Potomac Greens Park could be potentially released during the construction and operation phase of Potomac Yard Metro Station Alternatives B-1, B-2, and B-3. Release of these toxic contaminants would be potentially devastating to the natural beauty of Potomac Greens Park. Therefore it is highly recommended that a DOT Act of 1966 Section 4(f) compliance review be included as part of the Potomac Yard Metrorail station EIS evaluation process.</p> <p>Additionally, the FTA as the lead agency should immediately consider contacting and bringing in the U.S. Department of Transportation in on this EIS as a collaborative agency.</p>
Keim	James R.	44	3/7/2011	<p>Now this is what I'm talking about. Way to go Mark, let's keep up the pressure!</p> <p>Taking on More Debt Over the next six years, cost of servicing city's debt will more than double. By Michael Lee Pope Wednesday, February 23, 2011</p>

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Keim	James R.	45	3/11/2011	<p>In response to the guidelines set forth in Reference a), the following comment is being submitted for consideration with regards to the overall Potomac Yard Metrorail Station EIS Scoping effort.</p> <p>Concern: There needs to be a comprehensive traffic study conducted on all the roads leading into each of the Potomac Yard Metrorail Station Alternatives. The current traffic studies conducted by the City of Alexandria appear to be overly optimistic with regards ease of access and do not fully address the traffic environments for each metrorail station alternatives.</p> <p>Alternatives A, B-1,B-2, or B-3: The only road leading into these alternatives is Potomac Greens Drive (See Attachment 1). In the event one of these alternatives is selected, the traffic pattern and density for Potomac Greens Drive will be impacted during both during the construction and eventual operations once the metrorail station is open. In particular, it appears the intersection of Potomac Greens Drive and Slaters Lane will be subject to potentially devastating congestion issues if any of these alternatives are selected. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently, motorized traffic going north on Route 1 during the earlier morning weekday rush hour (6:00 – 9:00 AM) begins to bleed off Route 1 to Slaters Lane once the northbound Monroe Street Bridge traffic begins to backup and slow down. The commuters are using Slaters Lane to get to the GW Parkway to head north. It is not unusual to see bumper to bumper traffic from the eastbound light at the GW Parkway all the way back to Route 1. Sometimes only as few as two cars can get onto Slaters Lane from Potomac Greens Drive during the morning rush. Once the new Pulte Homes are built in Potomac Yards the traffic on Route 1 will increase and the Slaters Lane congestion will get worse. - Once the construction of the any of the metrorail stations site alternatives (A, B-1,B-2, or B-3) begins, the congestion on Slaters Lane will most likely be subject to routine gridlock for a period of at least 2 to 3 years. - The City of Alexandria already has plans to start providing bus service to these potential sites once the metrorail station opens. - Once any of the alternative metrorail station sites is open, it is most likely the level of “Kiss and Ride” traffic will cause even more additional congestion to the Slaters Lane and Potomac Greens Drive intersection as well as Slaters Lane traffic. - This potential congestion issue also creates a very high risk of inaccessibility concerns in the event of a residential or metrorail fire on Potomac Greens Drive. <p>The City of Alexandria has yet to address or conduct any traffic study this issue.</p> <p>Alternatives C-1, C-2,D-1, or D-2: The traffic studies conducted by the City of Alexandria</p>

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Keim	James R.	45	3/11/2011	<p>on the Route 1 corridor between the Monroe Street Bridge and Four Mile Run Route 1 Bridge appear to be overly optimistic with regard to ease of access to any of these metrorail site alternatives and any associated Route 1 congestion issues. Though the City has posted multiple documents on its website relating to transportation planning along this Route 1 corridor, these documents offer very little transparency related to study assumptions, guidelines, and information related to basic traffic engineering principles. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City of Alexandria transportation plans includes the addition of multiple roads, restricted bus and non-motorized traffic lanes, and trolleys all in an attempt to reduce congestion within this corridor. Unfortunately, there are two realities that the City's traffic studies have failed to address with any sense of reality. <p>The North Small Area Development Plan has been modified by the City and the Potomac Yards developers multiple times since the initial traffic studies were conducted with each change bringing more and more density into the overall development plan. The Potomac Yards buildings are higher than originally planned for and the amount of open green space has been reduced thus adding more and more destiny.</p> <p>No matter how it is presented or analyzed, the Route 1 N-S corridor has only 4 lanes total and ultimately there is a high probability a bottle neck either coming in or going out of the Potomac Yards development will occur. Even if additional Route 1 traffic lane are added, the ratio of traffic to roadway will not ease traffic congestion in this corridor.</p> <p>Traffic related to the BRAC-133 issue from Potomac Yards to the western part of Alexandria also needs to be addressed as well in any related EIS initiated traffic study. □</p> <p>In summary, in view of all of the above, serious consideration should be given to initiating an EIS related traffic study on the above issues for at least a three year period before any Potomac Yard Metrorail Alternative can be selected.</p>
Keim	James R.	46	3/14/2011	<p>I'm not quite sure how to interpret what happened on Saturday, but Mr Mcdoneld sure did.</p> <p>Reference to Alexandria News Article: City Council Creates Commercial Property 'Add On' Tax Tax rate hearing scheduled for Apr. 16 By Drew Hansen, March 13, 2011</p>

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Keim	James R.	47	3/15/2011	<p>In response to the guidelines set forth in Reference a), the following comment is being submitted for consideration with regards to the overall Potomac Yard Metrorail Station EIS Scoping effort.</p> <p>Comment: The 4.2 acres of property associated with Landbay D of the Potomac Yards Development (Figure 1) was originally intended to be designated an open space area (Rail Park). Rail Park was to be completed in conjunction with completion of Potomac Yards Metrorail Alternative Site A and was to be accessed via a pedestrian bridge. The construction of the pedestrian bridge from the east side of the CSX/WMATA tracks to Potomac Yards has now been deferred by the City of Alexandria and will tentatively become part of the final Potomac Yards Metrorail station design.</p> <p>Potential Alternative Potomac Yards Metrorail Site for Landbay D (Figure 2): Landbay D potentially offers the City of Alexandria a more cost effective and eco-friendly metrorail site solution than the existing site alternatives initially proposed by the City of Alexandria . Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unlike Alternatives A, B-1, B-2, or B-3, the Landbay D alternative will not impact the environmentally sensitive "Tidal Wetlands" nor will this site infringe on the scenic easement associated with the GW Parkway. -Unlike Alternatives A, B-1, B-2, or B-3, the Landbay D alternative will not take away designated open space land (Potomac Green Park would lose up to 3+ acres) - Unlike Alternative C-1,C-2, D-1, or D-2, the Landbay D alternative will not cost anywhere as these alternatives. Additionally there will no pedestrian bridge requirement to Potomac Greens Drive and no need to build an additional access/maintenance road to this Landbay D location. <p>There is a potential issue associated with the Landbay D alternative. The property between Potomac Greens Drive and Landbay D is currently owned by the Old Town Greens Homeowners Association. However, serious consideration should be given to the following potential solutions for remedying this situation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Renegotiate and expand on the existing easement agreement that WMATA already has in place with the Old Town Greens Homeowners Association related to WMATA's requirement to access Landbay D for maintenance of the existing power traction station. - The City of Alexandria has already formally declared that the Potomac Yards Metrorail Station is a critical and integral part of the City's overall transportation infrastructure improvement plan. As such, the loss to Old Town Greens of this property should be considered minimal (one tot lot and two tennis courts) when compared to the greater civic good this property would provide the City of Alexandria in terms of an improved transportation infrastructure. The City of Alexandria should seriously consider declaring the Old Town Greens Homeowners Association property leading into Landbay D as "Eminent Domain" and commence "condemnation" activities to formally secure this

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Keim	James R.	47	3/15/2011	<p>property for public use and economic development if the aforementioned Landbay D site alternative is deemed economically and environmentally the most viable Potomac Yards Metrorail site.</p> <p>In view of the above, recommend adding the Landbay D Potomac Yards Metrorail Alternative to those under consideration. Additionally recommend that an economic cost and feasibility analysis of this alternative be included as part of the EIS effort.</p>
Keim	James R.	48	3/15/2011	<p>In response to the guidelines set forth in Reference a), the following comment is being submitted for consideration with regards to the overall Potomac Yard Metrorail Station EIS Scoping effort.</p> <p>Comment: In the past, it was common practice for the developers of Potomac Yards at the direction of the City of Alexandria to send out registered letters when there were any changes or updates related to the development of Potomac Yard. In most cases, the recipients of these letters would be informed of either a City Council Meeting or Special Meeting that was to take place to openly discuss the change or update. As such, it would be reasonable to assume that the matter concerning the construction of a Potomac Yards Metrorail Station (Alternatives A, B-1,B-2,or B-3) in such close proximity to the residents of Potomac Greens would naturally warrant such a letter.</p> <p>Issue: Over the course of the last four years, neither the City of Alexandria nor the Developers of Potomac Yards has ever formally contacted any resident, homeowner, or homeowner association at Potomac Greens to solicit their thoughts or opinions on the potential location of a Potomac Yard Metrorail site location. I consider this a major shortfall on the part of the City to take into consideration the inputs of those who potentially would be most impacted by such a major environmental and economic decision. The City has no idea as to whether or not the residents of Potomac Greens even want a metrorail station near their homes.</p> <p>Recommendation: The City of Alexandria should be tasked as part of the ongoing EIS effort to specifically request formal inputs from either the Potomac Greens Homeowners Association or the 227 homeowners of Potomac Greens regarding the potential location of the Potomac Yards Metrorail Station. This could very easily be accomplished via a questionnaire sent via a registered letter with the results being mailed back "directly" to the EIS team for their review and consideration.</p>

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Keim	James R.	49	3/15/2011	<p>In response to the guidelines set forth in Reference a), the following comment is being submitted for consideration with regards to the overall Potomac Yard Metrorail Station EIS Scoping effort.</p> <p>Comment: Any Potomac Yard Metrorail Site Alternative that includes any type of pedestrian bridge over the CSX Tracks will have to adhere to very specific height, construction standards, and design restrictions.</p> <p>Recommendation: All Potomac Yard Metrorail Site Alternatives that includes any type of pedestrian bridge need to include some type of CSX review.</p>
Kelly	Cheryl	6	2/10/2011	<p>Would both Metro lines go to a Potomac Yard Metrorail Station, or would there be analysis of only one line or another serving the station?</p>
Kelly	Cheryl	4	2/10/2011	<p>Would each alternative be evaluated for underground, at ground and elevated scenarios?</p>
Kim	Sue	77		<p>As a resident in the Potomac Greens community located in Alexandria, VA, I wanted to take some time to express my deep concern over the proposal to construct a new Metro station at Potomac Yards.</p> <p>The construction of a new Metro station will endanger the wetlands that seem to be located right at or directly adjacent to the Metro. A new Metro and extensive construction will likely harm the wetlands and all the wildlife that currently take sanctuary within.</p> <p>Lastly, we have a Metro station less than a mile away from our neighborhood and there is one in Crystal City. It seems there is no need to erect another Metro and risk endangering the environment and species that should be protected in such an urban environment.</p> <p>I hope that your research and findings will also conclude that there it is not necessary to subject this area to more construction and harm the environment even more than the city already has.</p>

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Kramek	Niva	26	2/10/2011	<p>Good evening. My name is Niva Kramek. I'm not a resident of Alexandria. I actually live in the District but work in Potomac Yards. And I was very excited to hear about a potential new Metro Station. I commute into Crystal City. I take the shuttle bus. And I have two major questions.</p> <p>The scoping document talks a lot about the distance between the airport and Braddock Road, and as a commuter I find the airport is not a usable Metro system, other than to the airport, which is fantastic. But I think maybe you should take into account the distance between Crystal City and Braddock Road rather than using the airport, or at least assess how usable that is for servicing the area other than the airport.</p> <p>The second is that I think a Metro Station here would help commuters and people who come daily to the area but don't spend the evenings here because personally I would very much enjoy to shop at the Harris Teeter nearby, some of the clothing shops and other places. But it is very difficult to do that after work, knowing I'd have to get on the shuttle bus, which stops at a certain point, get to Crystal City, and go home.</p> <p>So I think it could be useful to increase shopping and a lot of the visitors who work here and would like to spend time in Alexandria getting to know it after hours.</p>
Lewis	Aaron	72	3/15/2011	<p>Please do not build a metro stop in positions B1 or B3 as this project may harm the wildlife and ecosystem of an already threatened wetland.</p> <p>A thorough EIS should be conducted before any region is slated for a new metro stop.</p>
Lindsey	Jason and Karen	74	3/15/2011	<p>We are writing to have on record our position that the metro should not be built on the wetlands adjacent to the Potomac Greens property but west of the existing CSX tracks.</p>
McKeon	Patricia	56	3/13/2011	<p>It is inconceivable to me that a metro stop should be considered unless it is west of the CSX railroad tracks in the Potomac Yard area. Thank you.</p>
Nisley	Rodger	61	3/14/2011	<p>It is very important that any Metro development in the area of Potomac Yards be assessed as to its environmental impact. The proposed areas (namely B1 and B3) are adjacent to Potomac River wetland areas and any planned construction must be reviewed as to its potential negative impact on the wildlife and vegetation. I submit that a new Metro station should be located away from the wetlands. Thank you for your attention to this matter.</p>
Phoenix	Joe	34	2/9/2011	<p>The location maps provided on the website are not clear. No streets in the area are readable. The ones to the west of US 1 are clear, but the location is not considered to the west of US 1. Just a personal input: While I would love to have a station near my work place in PY, it is probably not fiscally sound to spend the money for this small additional convenience when the system could use these funds for improvements in maintenance and upgrades to the present requirements.</p>

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Rath	Rick	65	3/14/2011	<p>As a resident of Potomac Greens and as a member of the Potomac Greens Homeowners Association Board, I would like to submit the following comments regarding the Potomac Yard Metrorail Station EIS, as they pertain to both safety to the residents of Alexandria, VA, and the cost of this new facility, which is projected to be at least \$500 million when completed in 2016.</p> <p>Safety: At this time, the Federal Transit Administration is preparing a scoping document on how the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) should be conducted. One key element of this document must be safety and what happens to the residents of North Old Town, should this station be constructed and where it will be located, either to the west of the existing CSX tracks or to the east, closer to the Potomac River. In my opinion, safety should be the key driver, used to determine the location of the new metro station. Should the EIS return with a recommendation of placing the metro station east of the CSX tracks and north of Potomac Greens, the safety of those residents, as well as to those living in Del Ray, Potomac Yards, and other locations will be dramatically affected. Should the recommendation be a “no build” solution, then the problem will be removed. However, if the EIS does recommend the construction of the station, then it is clear that the station should be located on the west side of the CSX tracks, and inside of the already developed, Potomac Yard project. The reason is quite simple. The railroad tracks that bisect Potomac Greens Avenue are used by CSX, to move coal and other materials to the local power plant, located in north Old Town. When a train is using these tracks, there is no access to Old Town Greens, Potomac Greens, GW Parkway, or Route 1, depending on what direction you are approaching from; thus cutting off fire and rescue from Alexandria Citizens, as well as police. Also, the new fire station, located off of Rt. 1 and assigned to serve both Potomac Yards, Old Town Greens, Potomac Greens, and the Marina located at Dangerfield Marina, will not have access to any of these areas, should the metro be located north of Potomac Greens and require police, fire or rescue. Without this access, my neighbors and their family’s safety will be put at great risk, as there will be no way to access the station in case of emergency, should the station be built east of the CSX tracks. Clearly, this is a major concern and needs to be thoroughly addressed as part of the EIS. To not do so, would be a terrible oversight and would jeopardize those individuals, who currently live, or who will choose to live north of Slaters Lane.</p> <p>Cost: It is important to keep one thing in mind when assessing whether or not this facility should be built. Is it the role of Metro to build new infrastructure, so that localities can add new tax revenue to their exploding budgets, or is it the mission of Metro to maintain and if necessary, expand its infrastructure, so that the overall public can benefit? I contend that it is the latter and not to the former. Unfortunately, the City of Alexandria, and the developers of the Potomac Yard Project, believe that it is the former, and must be done, so that Alexandria can have more tax revenue. Next to safety, the cost of both construction and maintaining of this new metro station needs to be seriously considered, and may even be the determining factor in deciding that this station should not even be built. In today’s tough economic times, there is not enough money to go around, whether it is to be used for new construction, or just to maintain the existing rail infrastructure. To</p>

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Rath	Rick	65	3/14/2011	<p>consider adding another rail station, to a system that is already financially strapped, is illogical and needs to be vetoed, immediately.</p> <p>Here are some statistics that need to be put into FTA's financial calculator, so that the right economical decision is made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Projected ridership for the new Potomac Yard Metro Station in 2030 is 9,800. - Projected ridership for the existing Braddock Metro Station in 2030 is 5,300. - Projected ridership for the Eisenhower Metro Station in 2030 is 5,400. - Total cost for the construction of the Silver Line out to Dulles International Airport is estimated to be more than \$10 billion. In 2005, the original cost of the Dulles Rail Project (Silver Line) was \$1.8 billion. - Projected ridership for the Silver Line continues to decline, which means that that segment of the Metro System will be uneconomical, and require federal assistance for the foreseeable future. To date, Metro Rail ridership has fallen from 745,715 to 721,624 (February 15, 2011) - Metro is facing an \$11 billion maintenance backlog that needs to be addressed as soon as possible. This backlog is projected to take from FY'11 to FY'20. According to Metro's General Manager message, "...it will be challenging to fully fund the program." - The proposed FY'12 budget for Metro is \$2.37 billion - The proposed FY'12 budget for Metrorail is \$813.9 million, which is down from the FY'11 budget of \$822.3 million. - The necessary operating subsidy that Metro needs for FY'12 is projected to be \$659 million, which comes from both State and Local operating funds. - All sources of Metro's revenue only account for 57% of its operating expenses. - Of the projected subsidy that Metro expects to receive in FY'12, \$148.6 million of the total will go to Metrorail. - To date, there is a shortfall of year-to-date revenues for Metrorail of \$7.8 million. - On February 18, 2011, an escalator at the Foggy Bottom Metro collapsed. Two individuals fell through the hole that was created. Fortunately, there were no injuries. According to the latest statistics, there are a total of 506 escalators operating within Metro, with 82 of them under repair; some will be out of service for almost a year. - Metro has indicated that all of the 588 escalators need to be replaced system wide. - On February 19, 2011, the United States Congress struck \$150 million from the subsidy intended for Metro. This will have a direct impact on Metro's capital program. - In FY'12, Metro will work on rehabilitating 10 miles of running rail and 5 miles of third rail; full rehabilitation of 12 metro stations and mini-rehab of another 12 stations; and purchase 188 unites of rail shop repair equipment. <p>Based on all of the information that I have outlined above, I fail to comprehend how Metro can assume the responsibility for another Metrorail station in 2016 (Potomac Yard Metro Station targeted completion date), when the current budget, as well as the projected capital budget for the next 10 years, does not allow for the new station. As you assemble all of the information that has been put forward for the EIS, I ask that you incorporate all</p>

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Rath	Rick	65	3/14/2011	of this information, so that you can make the right decisions when it comes to whether or not a new metro station should be constructed at Potomac Yards. Based on the enclosed data, the logical conclusion is NO. Thank you very much for your time and consideration.
Ray	Jason	36	2/19/2011	<p>As an educational consultant who has worked in the Del Ray area for over twenty years, I have a few short comments about the meeting (Jay Ray, hijayray@yahoo.com, 2/19/11):</p> <p>Presentations were well done and to the point. Thanks for a professional job.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As a business person who works in the area and travels to Potomac Yards for meetings, office and personal shopping, I would prefer option D1 or D2. - I disagree with some of the comments made as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lady from Rosemont area pushing the No Build Alternative apparently does not travel Route 1 during commuting and business hours. More of a "NIMBY" attitude. A Transitway between King Street or Pentagon stations would make Potomac Yard shopping more burdensome and time consuming. - Gentleman who was concerned about viewing the above ground station from the GW Parkway made some sense. The proposed station can be above ground and fit within the scenic aesthetic environment. Station design could include solar energy and useful rain water distribution. - The need to address car and pedestrian/bike-way traffic is of major importance. There will be more cars. Jefferson Davis can't handle present day traffic. Also, how will pedestrians cross the street with increase in traffic? The crosswalk at the intersection of Jefferson Davis and Reed Ave needs to be improved. Believe Bike/walkway from new Metro station to housing should be included in any plan.
Rudnick	Barbara	33	2/8/2011	<p>EPA is pleased to be included in the early stages of development of the EIS. We know from experience, that early involvement is a key component to a smooth process. We will not be able to travel to Virginia to attend this scoping meeting, though we will plan to provide some scoping comments. Would it be possible to call into the meeting? I am not certain that we have staff (I am on travel), but I will try to arrange if there is the possibility of a phone or video conference line. Thanks. Barbara Rudnick, PG NEPA Team Leader, US EPA Region III (3EA30), 1650 Arch Street, Phila, PA 19103, (215) 814-3322 (Rudnick.Barbara@epamail.epa.gov, 2/8/11)</p>

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Stern	Aletha	54	3/10/2011	<p>I was at the February meeting, where someone brought up the need to include potential pedestrian access routes to each of the alternatives. I agreed - the missing guidance is a HUGE gap. I've been watching the website over the last few weeks waiting for the update, and have not seen one. My family wishes to provide input to this project, but cannot do so without having an understanding of access. We live in Potomac Greens and our opinion of the alternatives varies dependent upon how people will access the stations. Does my street become a Kiss/Drop lot because the footbridge is across the street (Alt A)? Or will we have to get in the car and drive down and out of PG and then up Hwy 1 to Alts C or D to use the station? Taking the car defeats the purpose of taking the metro. Can someone provide the access guidance to me prior to the Mar 15 deadline? Thank you.</p>
Sternbane	Larry	20	2/10/2011	<p>Hi. My name is Larry Sternbane. I live in the Fairfax County portion of Alexandria, but I do spend a lot of time in the Del Ray and Potomac Yards area. My comments are I agree with the previous speaker. Goal No. 5 of the project goal, enhance transportation and pedestrian safety, especially minimize walking distances to the planned development, I think that's about most important.</p> <p>Metro already has too many stations that are too far to walk to anything from, especially the ones that were built in the I-66 corridor. Whatever the ultimate plans are for redevelopment of Potomac Yards, the station should be sited to be as close to the center of that development as possible to minimize everybody's walking distance.</p> <p>Route 1 is already oversubscribed in that area. Try getting through on a weekend, on a weekend afternoon. Transit should be a viable alternative to taking Route 1 to get to the stores and entertainment venues that are planned -- and the residential areas that area planned for that area. So I would just recommend to site the station as central to the planned development as possible.</p> <p>When you build the station, let's put some stairs in because the escalators break down, and when they break down there's no stairs in some of the older stations.</p> <p>And I will also put in a request like the last speaker did for some sort of link to the Mount Vernon Trail from Potomac Yards. I know there's one at Four Mile Run, but that's a little bit far, or you have to go down to Old Town to link up to the Trail.</p> <p>And I did have a question. Is there plans for a coincident VRE station? Is that part of this project at all?</p>

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Thompson	Bruce and Dee	70	3/15/2011	<p>We reside at 712 Lyles Lane, Alexandria, VA 22314. We would like to add our voices to those strenuously objecting to even the consideration of construction and operation of a Metro station east of the existing CSX/Metro tracks and north of Potomac Greens Development. The only feasible manner of accessing such a construction sight would be by extending Potomac Greens Drive and forcing all construction traffic through a residential neighborhood on a relatively narrow street. The traffic, noise, emissions, increased risk of injury, not to mention the necessary destruction of a public park at the end of the street, is not an acceptable alternative. Assuming such a Metro Station needs to be built and, if built, could be operated by Metro given its severe budget constraints and apparent inability to manage the assets currently owned, it should be built in a location that minimizes disturbance of environmentally sensitive areas and wetlands, as well as the lives of residents. There are any number of locations further north and on the west side of the CSX/Metro tracks that meet this criteria. As location on the west side of the tracks has the added and critical benefit of being accesible to emergency vehicles in the event Potomac Greens Drive is blocked.</p> <p>As you form the issues for consideration of the requisite EIS, we would ask that you give full consideration to the points we and others have raised.</p>
Tomblyn	Neal	60	3/14/2011	<p>Letter from Neal Tomblyn re: cost, safety, and environment. See Word document in folder.</p>

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Tomblyn	Neal	59	3/15/2011	<p>As a resident of Potomac Greens, which is next to the Potomac Yards Development, I have watched in amazement as the contractors have repeatedly pulled a variety of old tanks, pipes, heavy equipment and a variety of other items buried on the Potomac Yards Development's grounds. I have even asked the excavation operators about this and their responses are along the lines of we have no idea what we'll find and we are running into all sorts of things buried here. This makes me wonder how good of an EIS was actually performed on this land prior to allowing a development to be constructed. Now we find ourselves in a situation where the City of Alexandria wants to execute a 10 year old plan to construct a Metrorail Station at Potomac Yards at the cost of the residents and businesses in the immediate area, conveniently excluding some immediate residential areas while taxing their neighbors, in order to support their ill conceived plan. And where does this proposed Metrorail Station in Potomac Yards go – in one of two locations that best supports the City of Alexandria's ever changing density plan to drive access to the planned office space. I have to wonder now are there better locations for the Metrorail Station that will drive more ridership? According to the City's plans the answer is yes (example: Land Bay D). I have to wonder what the impact to the wetlands between the current Metro and CSX rail tracks and the GW Parkway will be. What excess run-offs will flow to these wetlands then to the Potomac River and on to the Chesapeake Bay – which are a far cry from being the lush and fertile grounds they were when I was a child growing up in the DC Metro area? As you assemble all of the information that has been put forward for the EIS, I ask that you incorporate all of this information so that you can make the right decisions when it comes to whether or not a new metro station should be constructed at Potomac Yards. Based on all the data and facts that I have seen from other neighbors, local politicians, the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers, the U.S. Park Services and other professionals, the logical conclusion is NO. This entire Metrorail Station, along with its funding, is a poorly thought out plan by a few power hungry City of Alexandria politicians that are forcing something that the City's Residents at-large do not want. Metro has better things to do with their time and money such as fixing the escalators, guarding against major errors such as the many incidents on the Redline, trying to keep the Silver Line's budget from soaring even larger, and providing better law enforcement in the Metro Stations and on the trains to protect the hard working public that use and depend on Metro. Thank you very much for your time and consideration.</p>

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Tomblyn	Katherine A.	73	3/15/2011	<p>I as a property owner in the Potomac Greens subdivision, I am concerned about the proposed development on the storm drainage run off. In order to handle the drainage issues of the current proposed development will mean that the new construction will have to raise the current elevation. The density has changed over the last several months to where there is very little open spaces. This also means that the proposed metro station will have to be built so high, it will be visible from the George Washington Parkway.</p> <p>I feel these changes will mean that the development of the Potomac Yards area will not be the image that the majority of Alexandria residents want. Alexandria is known as one of the most popular historical areas, that draws a number of visitors, bringing in much needed revenues. A new metro station at Potomac Yards will not bring people to the historical district. It will only add to the city's and citizens debt. I urge the city to slow down and reconsider this metro station before it is too late.</p> <p>I find it very disturbing that the transportation budget study done by the city in 2008 is being used to make current decisions. As time has gone by, the study was revised by hand, changing the page numbers. Everyone knows that economic conditions have changed over the last three years; yet the city's budget proposal has not. This is not fiscally smart on the councils part. The estimated cost of the new station is very low, everyone knows that the costs always are much greater than estimated. The drainage issues and potential flooding are only the beginning.</p>
Umayam	Lindsay	63	3/14/2011	<p>Please consider the following items when discussing placement and development of Potomac Yard Metro. Any station developed in B1 or B3 will disturb the wetlands north of Potomac Greens. This area has been well preserved in the midst of heavy development, providing opportunities for education regarding the value of wetlands to our community. A station located east of the existing tracks provides limited access for construction as well as limited access in the event of an emergency. Potomac Greens Drive is the only access road for areas B1 and B3. As such, it is an enormous dead end that is sure to be a traffic nightmare when accessing the new metro via car. Emergency vehicles would have no alternate route for access, further endangering both the metro riders and the residents of Potomac Greens in the event of a crisis. Build the metro west of the tracks in an area populated with businesses that will benefit from increased access. This does not involve disrupting wetlands and is an overall safer option for the citizens of Alexandria. Thank you for your consideration of this matter and for your service to our community.</p>

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Vitale	Deborah	24	2/10/2011	<p>Hello. My name is Deborah Vitale. I'm a resident of Potomac Greens. I live at 1866 Carpenter. So I will be directly affected by any Metro construction.</p> <p>I've been listening to you, and I did submit a letter which contains all of my concerns, but what I'd like to know tonight is, assuming arguendo that alternatives B are implemented, how would passengers get to the B station, which is on the east side of the existing track? So how would people get there?</p> <p>...</p> <p>I've looked at every graphic on this construction, and what I don't understand is people seem to be able to access the Metro stations, assuming arguendo the Bs were decided upon, from the Potomac Yard side. Would there be access by passengers from the east side of the Metro station?</p> <p>...</p> <p>It's real simple. Carpenter Road -- okay, Potomac Greens road goes straight up to the park. Then it stops. And proposal B, for example, B3, is way north of where that road stops. So how would passengers get from the end of Potomac Greens Drive into B1? In other words, how do they get over the park?</p> <p>...</p> <p>Well, then, that has to be shown, and then it has to be evaluated.</p>

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Vitale	Deborah	24	2/10/2011	<p>I am a homeowner in Potomac Greens and will be impacted by the construction, maintenance of, use of, repair of, and direct and indirect immediate, long-term and cumulative impacts to the existing environment and physical, social, economic and environmental setting in the event a metrorail station were constructed in Potomac Yards. Therefore, I request that the Environmental Impact Study (hereafter "EIS") for a Potomac Yard metrorail station in Alexandria, Virginia include, at a minimum, a detailed study and analyses of the below-listed items. I also request that the study cover the direct and indirect, immediate, interim, long-term and cumulative impacts of the items.</p> <p>I would also request that any and all aspects of the study be conducted by person(s) and entities that not only have the background, experience and expertise required to study specific matters required to be studied and analyzed, but who have no contingent interest in the outcome of the study.</p> <p>1. Need for Another Metrorail Station in Alexandria, Virginia The threshold question to be decided concerns the very need for yet another Metrorail station in the City of Alexandria, Virginia given the sheer number of already existing metro stations in and around Alexandria. The alternatives, including the "do nothing" alternative to constructing yet another metro station must be studied.</p> <p>Even assuming the City of Alexandria will get yet another Metrorail station, then the issue of precisely where it should be located must be studied. There is no Metrorail station in or about the downtown area, where parking is severely limited and where a metrorail station would do the most benefit for the entire City and its residents. This area must be considered a possible site. Other locations must be studied and compared to a Potomac Yards location.</p> <p>2. The Purpose to be Served of Constructing Yet Another Metro Station in Alexandria The purpose stated in the Notice of Intent does not withstand scrutiny. The EIS must determine the true purpose for yet another Metrorail station in Potomac Yards given the sheer number that already exist in an around Alexandria. The Potomac Yards station would be located between two pre-existing stations only 3.1 miles apart. The citizens of Alexandria have access to enough metro stations to get to and from any desired destination. Locating yet another metro station in Potomac Yards would be of negligible benefit to the people of Alexandria.</p> <p>One cannot reduce the vehicular traffic going to Potomac Yards by constructing a metrorail station in Potomac Yards. Anyone using the Potomac Yards station would have to get there first, presumably via car or bus. Those Alexandrians frequenting the stores, restaurants and entertainment facilities in Potomac Yards will simply walk to or drive to Potomac Yards. They are too close to take the Metro to Potomac Yards. Therefore, the essential question remains: who, in reality, will benefit from another Metrorail station in Potomac Yards?</p>

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Vitale	Deborah	24	2/10/2011	<p>The Project's obvious immediate, interim and long-term environmental impacts alone would not appear to justify the need for yet another metrorail station in Alexandria, Virginia.</p> <p>3. Wetland Impacts</p> <p>There are wetlands located east of the existing metrorail tracks and north of the existing park on Carpenter Road (hereinafter "the Park"). While wetlands normally serve an important function, these wetlands serve a critical function. Any construction of a metrorail park on or near the east side of the existing tracks will cause irreparable damage to these wetlands and result, sooner or later, in catastrophic and irreparable damage to the surrounding environment.</p> <p>These wetlands are vital to the preservation of the existent wildlife. They provide a place to live and food for birds, mammals, reptiles and amphibians. These wetlands are critical to the surrounding area inasmuch as they serve to store floodwaters and slowly release these waters into the surrounding environment. Any destruction of these wetlands would result in floodwaters being left uncontained. These wetlands are essential to flood mitigation and cannot be disturbed for this reason alone. These wetlands are also essential to protecting the water quality and plant life and to the removal of pesticides, heavy metals and other polluting toxins from the sediment.</p> <p>The placement of a metrorail station in or in close proximity to these wetlands would be catastrophic to the existent environment.</p> <p>4. Other Environmental Impacts to be Studied</p> <p>The EIS must study and analyze in depth the direct and indirect immediate, interim, long-term, and cumulative environmental impacts of the proposed project. These are obviously substantial and must be evaluated environmentally with respect, at a minimum, to the construction, maintenance, and long-term use of the metrorail. In addition, the direct and indirect environmental impacts of the project must also be studied with respect to, but not limited to the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) air quality 2) dust pollution 3) noise pollution specific to the project on the surrounding homes and area 4) noise pollution when measured cumulatively with vehicular traffic from the George Washington Parkway and air traffic from National Airport on the surrounding homes and area 5) water pollution 6) wetlands impacts (in addition to those mentioned above) 7) traffic problems with respect to basic ingress and egress 8) traffic problems with respect to Potomac Greens Drive and Carpenter Road 9) traffic problems with respect to damage and repair of roads 10) traffic problems with relating to basic usage, vehicular speed, heavy truck traffic to

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Vitale	Deborah	24	2/10/2011	<p>supply and service the station, etc.</p> <p>11) traffic impacts on the safety of citizens in Potomac Greens, issues raised by the presence of heavy traffic, including basic vehicular issues (i.e. emissions)</p> <p>12) traffic impacts on the safety of residents using the park on Carpenter Road</p> <p>13) light pollution</p> <p>14) There are animals, plants and various species in the wetlands and parklands in and around the park on Carpenter Road. The impact on these animals, plants and species must be studied and evaluated. The evaluation must include, but not be limited to, the impact of noise, lighting, people, traffic, vibration, grading, impacts to wetlands, on these animals, plants and species.</p> <p>15) scenic impacts The impact to the George Washington Highway and the entire Potomac Greens area must be evaluated.</p> <p>16) The effect of the lighting from the metro on vehicular traffic on George Washington Highway must be evaluated both with respect to the scenic changes it will cause to the parkway and the distraction to drivers any lighting may cause.</p> <p>17) The Potomac Greens homes are in close proximity to the rails. The vibrations from passing trains can be felt in homes on Potomac Greens and Carpenter Road. The construction of a metro station will require the placement of pilings and will result in heavy vibrations. The cumulative impacts of any construction related vibration on the surrounding homes must be studied. The cumulative vibration-related impact of any construction related and operation related use of the metro coupled with the current rail traffic must be evaluated.</p> <p>18) Park-related problems There is a park on Carpenter Drive in close proximity to certain proposed alternatives. The vehicular traffic and pedestrian traffic effects on this park will be substantial and must be studied inasmuch as construction of a metro in certain locations will require that the park be redesigned and reconstructed to accommodate same.</p> <p>19) There is a natural buffer between the park and rails now. The effects of removing this buffer must be evaluated for its impact on safety to those using the park (and their animals), animals, plants and other species in the area.</p> <p>20) Impact to Route 1 - the construction and long-term impacts to Route 1 must be studied. If a metrorail station were built in Potomac Yards, then the vehicular traffic on Route 1 would increase, not decrease, because many more vehicles would be entering and leaving Potomac Yards.</p> <p>21) Crime - The impacts to the Potomac Greens community with respect to loitering, trespass, theft, and other crimes would have to be studied. The need for additional security or police in and about the nearby communities would have to be studied.</p> <p>22) Explosion, Fire, Accidents, Terrorist Assault The proposed locations do not appear capable of servicing and handling the emergency vehicles and equipment required in the event of any explosion, fire, accident or terrorist assault on the proposed metrorail station locations.</p> <p>23) Initial and Long-Term Cost of construction, maintenance The cost of construction, maintenance and long-term repair of the project must be studied</p>

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Vitale	Deborah	24	2/10/2011	<p>because it makes no sense to build another metrorail station if the funds to properly maintain and service it are lacking or uncertain. The lack of funding for this purpose will result in a further diminution to the environment if the emissions, noise, air quality, water quality, cleanliness, safety and other important items cannot be properly evaluated, preserved and/or maintained.</p> <p>Alternatives to be Studied</p> <p>1. Do Nothing Given the number and location of existing metro stations in Alexandria, Virginia, this alternative will have none of the irreparable environmental and other impacts that building yet another metrorail at the Potomac Yards location will have.</p> <p>2. Confine the Metrorail Station to an area far west of the existing tracks and not visible from the George Washington Highway or Potomac Greens In the event the decision is made to build yet another metrorail station in or about Potomac Yards, it should be located far west of the existing tracks in a location that is not visible to the George Washington Parkway or residents of Potomac Greens. It should be separated from the existent tracks by the buildings to be constructed in Potomac Yards and as far from the Potomac Greens residential area as is possible. This would ensure that it were constructed in a place that has the existing infrastructure required (i.e., roads) and that it would not impact the wetlands and/or animals, mammals, birds, amphibians, plants and other species on the east side of the tracks or interfere with the residents' use and enjoyment of their properties in Potomac Greens and/or the park on Carpenter Drive. The environmental impacts would be negligible compared to those that would attach to the construction of a metrorail station on, over or in close proximity to the east side of the tracks.</p> <p>3. Construct an Underground Station in Potomac Yards The EIS should study the impact of constructing an underground metrorail station as opposed to an above-ground station.</p> <p>4. Construct a Large, Vertical Parking lot at Potomac Yards The EIS should consider the impact of constructing a vertical parking lot that is easily accessible from Route 1 in Potomac Yards. The people in Alexandria who may use Potomac Yards for shopping, food or entertainment will, for the most part, drive to Potomac Yards. It is faster, easier and cheaper to do so. They must have a place to park. Potomac Yards will need a vertical parking lot, which can be easily seen from Route 1 and easily accessed and exited. Unfortunately, that is the reality of the situation and the only way to justify a metrorail park in Potomac Yards is to pretend otherwise. The EIS should address the need for vertical parking lots at Potomac Yards so as not to compound a traffic problem that already exists on Route 1.</p> <p>The location of the metrorail station should be visible from Route 1 and easily accessible from Route 1 so that people wishing to drop users off may do so without causing major</p>

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Vitale	Deborah	24	2/10/2011	<p data-bbox="961 107 1566 139">traffic jams on Route 1 or inside of Potomac Yards.</p> <p data-bbox="961 172 1276 204">5. Bus and Trolley Service</p> <p data-bbox="961 204 2022 448">The EIS should study the impact of providing cheap and efficient bus and trolley service to Potomac Yards as opposed to the substantial impacts that will result from the construction, operation, maintenance and use of yet another metrorail station. The use of metrorail is not cheap and its popularity for numerous reasons not pertinent here, is waning. It's major problem is that it is unreliable. The breakdowns of elevators, escalators, and trains and equipment are endless. There seems to be no end to the problems in sight and less and less money to repair same. The focus should be on the reality of the situation (people use their cars) and not on what well-meaning city planners may want.</p> <p data-bbox="961 480 1850 514">I thank you in advance for studying and evaluating the foregoing in the EIS.</p>

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Vitale	Deborah	78	3/2/2011	<p>Given the Existence of Four Metrorail Stations in Alexandria, the Current Population, the Population Growth Rate and the Land Area to be Served, There is No Need for a Fifth Metrorail Station in Alexandria</p> <p>This letter will address one issue only - the need for yet another metrorail station in Alexandria, Virginia.</p> <p>Existing Metrorail Stations Alexandria currently has four (4) existing metrorail stations. These are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) King Street 2) Braddock Road 3) Eisenhower Avenue 4) Van Dorn <p>Total Area According to the United States Census Bureau, Alexandria comprises a total area of 15.4 square miles of which 15.2 square miles is land and 0.2 square miles is water. Therefore, Alexandria already has a metrorail station for every 3.8 square miles of land. A fifth metrorail station would give Alexandria a metrorail station for every 3.04 square miles of land!</p> <p>Population of Alexandria The 2010 Census shows that the total population in Alexandria is 139,966. Therefore, there is currently one metrorail station for every 34,991 Alexandrians. Thus, even assuming, arguendo, that every Alexandria, including every man, woman, and child uses the metrorail regularly, Alexandria has more than enough stations to service every Alexandrian.</p> <p>Moreover, as of the census of 2000, there were 128,283 people in Alexandria. Therefore, the population has grown by only 11,683 people in ten years. Given the rate of population growth, as shown by the 2000 and 2010 census, Alexandria has enough metrorail stations to service Alexandrians not only now, but for decades to come.</p> <p>Percentage of Alexandrians who Actually Use Metrorail Given Alexandria's close proximity to Washington, D.C., it must be assumed that many Alexandrians who commute to Washington will choose to commute to Washington by car. Likewise, it must be assumed that many Alexandrians who commute to other work places in Maryland and Virginia will choose to do so by car. This, despite the proximity of a metrorail station to their residence and despite the best intentions of city planners who believe that constructing additional metrorail stations will somehow alter this behavior. The metrorail's reputation for inconvenience, unreliability, breakdowns, lack of parking, and crime does nothing to increase ridership. Therefore, even assuming, arguendo, that as many as one-fourth of all Alexandrians use the metrorail regularly, there is already a metrorail station for every 8,747 Alexandrians. Likewise, assuming that as many as one-</p>

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Vitale	Deborah	78	3/2/2011	<p data-bbox="961 115 2018 172">fourth of all Alexandrians use the metrorail regularly, the construction of yet a fifth metrorail station would result in a metrorail station for every 6,998 Alexandrian users!</p> <p data-bbox="961 207 2018 232">The Need for Yet Another Metrorail Station</p> <p data-bbox="961 240 2018 540">The suggestion that taxpayers now need to spend an estimated \$500 million dollars on yet another metrorail station in Alexandria is unjustified. The fact that it will be located in Potomac Yards provides no support for the expenditure. Moreover, the \$500 million is yet another mere "estimate" of the construction cost and financing cost of a major transportation project. Other estimates for metrorail stations over the years have proven to be dead wrong. Like all estimates before it, it is more likely than not that this "estimate" is equally wrong. Moreover, this estimate does not include ancillary costs incident to the maintenance and operation of a metrorail station (maintenance and repair, insurance, security, increased need for police, emergency, fire, trash services, traffic problems, roads, crime, etc.)</p> <p data-bbox="961 576 2018 698">In sum, given the fact that there are now four metrorail stations in Alexandria, given the population of Alexandria, given the population growth as demonstrated by the latest 2010 census, and given the land area to be served, the expenditure of an estimated \$500 million for yet another metrorail station in Alexandria, is not justified.</p> <p data-bbox="961 734 1119 758">Scope of EIS</p> <p data-bbox="961 766 2018 912">The undersigned requests that the EIS include an analysis of the purpose and need for a fifth metrorail station to service people in Alexandria. Moreover, the undersigned requests that the EIS include a specific analysis of the need for a metrorail station in Potomac Yard with a detailed analysis of how a fifth station and, specifically, a fifth station in Potomac Yard, would benefit the citizens of Alexandria.</p> <p data-bbox="961 948 2018 1159">The undersigned requests that an analysis be conducted of all cost estimates for previously constructed metrorail stations as compared to final, actual costs of construction. The undersigned requests that an analysis be conducted of all maintenance cost estimates for previously constructed metrorail stations as compared to final, actual costs of maintenance. The undersigned requests that an analysis be conducted of all repair cost estimates for previously constructed metrorail stations as compared to final, actual costs of repair for said stations.</p> <p data-bbox="961 1195 2018 1308">The undersigned requests that a current survey be conducted to determine the number of Alexandrians who currently use metrorail regularly, including but not limited to, their demographics, the frequency of their use, the purpose of their use, and the final destinations of current users.</p> <p data-bbox="961 1344 2018 1435">Finally, the undersigned requests that a detailed cost/benefit analysis weighing the costs (direct and indirect) to Alexandrians and benefits to Alexandrians be undertaken that includes a no action alternative.</p>

Last Name	First Name	Comment ID	Comment Date	Comment
Vitale	Deborah	78	3/2/2011	<p>Conclusion</p> <p>The overwhelming evidence establishes that Alexandrians have no need for yet a fifth metrorail station in Alexandria. Therefore, there is no justification for using any federal, state, or Alexandria tax dollars to support an unnecessary expenditure of this magnitude.</p>
Vitale	Deborah	52	3/13/2011	<p>Potomac Yards EIS: Recent, Detailed, Traffic Analysis Needed. Traffic Study - Prior to determining where to place a Metrorail station might be placed in Potomac Yards, the proponents of same must conduct a recent, updated, detailed traffic analysis including, but not limited to, the following streets: 1) Potomac Greens Drive, 2) Slaters Lane, 3) Carpenter Road, 4) Route 1, 5) all streets connecting to the Monroe Bridge, 6) All streets connecting to Route 1 within several miles of the Potomac Yards development. The traffic on Slaters Lane and Route 1 is already backing up to an extent that is hazardous. The traffic has increased and is increasing without a Metrorail. The extent to which it will be impacted with a Metrorail must be studied based on recent traffic patterns and recent traffic counts.</p>
Vitale	Deborah	53	3/13/2011	<p>EIS: Potomac Yard Metrorail-Scenic Analysis. The George Washington Memorial Parkway is a national treasure and the scenery from the highway is unblemished. Any attempt to place a Metrorail station behind Potomac Yards which is visible from the highway would constitute a nuisance and an infringement on the scenic nature of the highway. Therefore, any EIS must include a study of the extent to which the George Washington Memorial Parkway will be impacted, via traffic and from a scenic perspective. Also, an analysis must be done to determine to what extent the lights and noises emanating from a Metrorail station visible from the G.W. Parkway will constitute a nuisance to the public, as well as nearby homes.</p>
Watts	Sean	75	3/16/2011	<p>As a long time (and returning) resident of Arlandria (52 Dale St) I can say that I have been waiting for this for 20 years. I sincerely hope that the station will be sited as close to JD Hwy and Reed as possible (Alternative C1). The community immediately surrounding this area deserves the revitalization that a metro station would bring.</p>
Zitz	Robert	57	3/14/2011	<p>I am a resident of Potomac Greens in Alexandria. I am concerned the impacts of the proposed Potomac Yard Metro Stop have not been adequately studied. The focus of the planning commission, driven by the City Council, has been first and foremost about revenue. I fear the proposed station is going to bring added noise to an already noisy area, added crime, more air pollution, and will damage sensitive wetlands. It will add additional safety risks for my neighborhood if it constructed on the east side of the tracks both during construction when heavy equipment roams our streets, and after completion when it will complicate the ability of fire and rescue to have assured access to us. I am very concerned this supposed revenue generator will actually cost much more than the City projects, and add even more tax burden to an over taxed jurisdiction.</p>

Appendix I:
Draft EIS Annotated Outline

This page intentionally left blank

POTOMAC YARD METRORAIL STATION ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

ANNOTATED OUTLINE OF THE DRAFT EIS

May 2011



This page intentionally left blank

PURPOSE OF THE ANNOTATED OUTLINE

The purpose of this annotated outline is to focus the content of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) so the researchers, analysts, section writers and reviewers know what information and level of detail to include in the EIS. This outline will identify where scoping comments from the public and agencies are addressed, key sources of information including fieldwork needs, and maps and other graphics.

The annotated outline serves several purposes, including:

- Documenting the results of the scoping process;
- Contributing to the transparency of the process; and
- Providing a clear roadmap for concise development of the EIS.

The EIS will be prepared in plain language in a format that the public can readily understand. Extensive use of graphics such as figures, charts, and tables will be utilized to assist decision makers and the public in the evaluation of the EIS. Clear, concise and objective language will be used throughout the EIS. Technical planning jargon will be minimized in the EIS, and a glossary and list of acronyms will be provided to assist readers when technical terms are necessary. The document layout and formatting will be clear and consistent to assist the reader in navigating the EIS.

ORGANIZATION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The EIS will be organized in the following format:

- Cover Page and Abstract
- Executive Summary
- Table of Contents
- List of Figures
- List of Tables
- List of Acronyms
- Chapter 1: Purpose and Need
- Chapter 2: Alternatives Considered
- Chapter 3: Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences
- Chapter 4: Public and Agency Involvement

- Chapter 5: Financial Analysis
- Appendix A: List of Preparers
- Appendix B: List of Cooperating and Participating Agencies (EIS Distribution)
- Appendix C: References
- Appendix D: Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluations
- Appendix E: Section 106 Coordination

The following discussion describes each chapter and section in more detail.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

[10 pages]

The Executive Summary will address the major conclusions, areas of controversy (including issues raised by agencies and the public during the scoping process), and the issues to be resolved (including the choice among alternatives).

- Background
- Purpose and Need
 - Figure ES-1: Study Area
- Alternatives Considered
 - Figure ES-2: Project Alternatives
- Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences Summary Table
- Environmental Consequences Summary Table
- Public and Agency Coordination

1.0 CHAPTER 1: PURPOSE AND NEED

[3-5 pages]

1.1 Project Background

[1-2 pages]

The EIS will be developed to assess the potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed construction and operation of the Potomac Yard Metrorail Station. The proposed project would consist of the construction of a Metrorail infill station and any necessary track realignment along the existing combined Blue and Yellow Lines between the Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport Station and the Braddock Road Station. FTA is the

lead Federal agency for the EIS. The City of Alexandria, Virginia is the joint-lead agency for the EIS. Because the proposed project may affect parklands, the National Park Service (NPS) is a cooperating agency for the EIS. WMATA will also serve as a cooperating agency, as the ultimate owner or operator if the station is constructed.

1.2 Project Purpose and Need

[2-3 pages]

The purpose of the project is to improve accessibility of the Potomac Yard area and provide more transportation choices for current and future residents, employees, and businesses by establishing a new access point to the regional Metrorail system. This additional access point is needed to address existing and future travel demand in the area resulting from the City of Alexandria's existing and planned development of a major transit-oriented mixed-use activity center in the vicinity of the proposed station.

2.0 CHAPTER 2: ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

[15-20 pages]

This chapter will describe the alternatives assessed as part of the EIS, the planning process used to identify the alternatives, and the screening process used to evaluate the feasibility of alternatives.

2.1 Local Planning Process

[1-2 pages]

Multiple planning efforts have been undertaken to assess feasible station alternatives, and the development of the Potomac Yard of Alexandria. These studies include:

- City of Alexandria, VA, *North Potomac Yard Small Area Plan*, May 2010
- City of Alexandria, VA and Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, *Potomac Yard Metrorail Station Concept Development Study*, February 2010
- City of Alexandria, VA, *Potomac Yard Multimodal Transportation Study*, December 2009
- Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, *FY2010 Constrained Long Range Transportation Plan*

This section will describe the previous planning efforts undertaken to arrive at the station alternatives being analyzed in the EIS.

2.2 Facilities and Stations

[5 pages Including Graphics]

No specific decision has been reached about the proposed station design. Three options were presented to the public during the scoping phase – any of the alternatives could be constructed as an elevated, ground-level and tunnel type station that is consistent with other WMATA station designs. The EIS will analyze the feasibility of the alternative station designs being considered and offer recommendations regarding the feasibility of each station option. Several meeting attendees asked for clarification about the type of station being proposed, as well as the use of escalators for station access. General design details for the proposed station, including the design of facilities used for passenger circulation within the station, will be provided as graphics.

General design concepts for providing access over or under the CSX freight railroad tracks will be provided in this section specific to alternatives located east of the CSX tracks. The design discussion will address how the freight rail tracks can be crossed safely, and technical considerations for the passenger crossing design, e.g. vertical clearances necessary for double-stack freight trains, etc.

2.3 Initial Screening Analysis (including Alternatives Considered)

[2 pages]

This section will present the methodology and results of an initial screening analysis which will be completed to identify fatal flaws with any of the alternatives presented during scoping, as well as alternatives proposed by members of the public or participating agencies during the scoping process. This section will note the alternatives that will move forward into the environmental impact analysis (Chapter 3). The initial screening criteria include:

- Ability of the alternative to meet the project purpose, need, goals, and objectives;
- Alternative's general consistency with land use and development plans; and
- Technical and economic feasibility.

A summary matrix will be developed to present initial screening analysis results, and recommendations will be provided identifying which station alternatives will move forward environmental impact analysis of the EIS.

2.4 No-Build Alternative

[1 page]

This section will describe the “No Build” Alternative to be analyzed as part of the EIS. The No Build Alternative will be defined as the existing transportation system that serves the study area, plus any other committed transportation improvements independent of the project affecting the study area. The other transportation system improvements will be projects identified in the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOC) Regional Constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan. Several commenters during the scoping phase emphasized that the EIS must comprehensively evaluate the No Build Alternative due to financial concerns about the project.

2.5 Build Alternatives

[2-5 pages]

The EIS will also analyze the build alternatives that are recommended for further study based on the results of the initial feasibility screening. This section will describe the alternatives being analyzed in the EIS. No alternative emerged during scoping phase as the clearly preferable option. Commenters expressed concerns about potential viewshed or land acquisition impacts to the George Washington Memorial Parkway (GWMP) if Alternatives A, B1, B2 or B3 are constructed.

2.6 Evaluation of Alternatives

[5 pages]

The objective of this section is to provide decision-makers with the information needed to select a preferred station alternative. An alternative’s ability to minimize potential adverse impacts, maximize environmental benefits, and to support the goals and objectives of the project, as well as financial feasibility, will be used to compare alternatives and select the preferred alternative.

A detailed matrix will be provided in this section that presents results of the evaluation of alternatives. This section is dependent on the completion of the technical analysis for Chapter 3 and thus will be one of the last sections written before the DEIS is

published. This section will also include a matrix evaluating the alternatives in relation to the Purpose and Need.

3.0 CHAPTER 3: AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

[40-60 pages]

Chapter 3 will summarize the existing human and natural environment for the station alternatives analyzed for the EIS well as an analysis of the No Build Alternative. The narrative will describe the methodology, relevant laws, regulations, and guidelines used to assess impacts for each resource area.

Each section will address the direct and indirect impacts, short and long term impacts, level of impact intensity, and whether the impact is adverse or beneficial along with the environmental consequences of the alternatives. In addition, a matrix will provide a summary of the environmental consequences identified for each of the resource areas in this chapter. Technical memoranda will be prepared for resource areas where appropriate, and will be included in the appendices to the EIS.

Each section of Chapter 3 will be generally organized in a similar format:

- **Introduction.** The Introduction will describe the resource being analyzed and relevant regulation.
- **Affected Environment.** The Affected Environment section will describe the existing condition in the context of the study area.
- **Methodology.** This section will describe the methodology and data sources used to analyze impacts.
- **Environmental Consequences.** This section will describe the direct and indirect impact that may result from the project.
- **Mitigation.** Recommended mitigation will be addressed where applicable.

Construction; and Secondary and Cumulative Impacts will be addressed with individual sections in Chapter 3.

The following sections describe each resource that will be analyzed in the EIS.

3.1 Introduction

[1 page]

This section will briefly describe the general methodologies (such as horizon year assumptions used in all resource analyses and common key data sources), and the content and organization of each of the resource areas.

3.2 Transportation

[10 pages]

This section will characterize the existing conditions of the multi-modal transportation system, and the effects on the transportation network if the station is constructed. Areas of analysis will include:

- Existing Transit Service
- Transit Impacts
- Existing and Future Roadway Conditions
- Roadway Impacts
- Freight, Commuter and Intercity Rail Corridors
- Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities
- Project Consistency with Local and Regional Transportation Plans

3.3 Land Acquisitions and Displacements

[2-3 pages]

This section will identify potential land acquisitions and displacements that may be needed for each alternative. Displacements will be differentiated based on the type of property being acquired, including commercial, residential, and community resources. Property information will be obtained from the City of Alexandria. Field visits and aerial photography will be used to verify the condition and location of property and structures identified for acquisition. Any land acquisition would be subject to the provisions of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 as amended. This section will include tables and figures summarizing any property that would be acquired for the project for different build alternatives.

3.4 Visual Resources

[2-3 pages]

This section will identify the existing visual characteristics of the study area and assess the potential changes in visual character resulting from each alternative. An inventory of existing visual resources will be created through site visits and photographs. The description of each alternative will include visual perspective representations of the station in perspective, plan, elevation and other graphic representations as necessary. The methodology used for the visual impact assessment will generally follow the guidance provided by the Federal Highway Administration *Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects*, which is the only guidance document provided by any agency under the USDOT for this type of analysis. The impact evaluation techniques provided are applicable to linear corridors (including transit). The NPS will be contacted to provide comment and guidance on the methodology used to assess visual impacts.

3.5 Cultural Resources

[2-4 pages]

This section will identify and assess potential adverse effects to cultural resources resulting from the project. Cultural resources include historic and prehistoric archaeological sites as well as historic districts, structures, cultural landscapes, and objects listed in or potentially eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Qualified archaeologists and architectural historians will conduct research in the field and at the Virginia Department of Historic Resources (VDHR) Archives in Richmond, VA and through VDHR Data Sharing System (DSS) on-line to identify resources within the study areas. Site visits will identify historic architectural, cultural landscapes, and archaeological resources within or in proximity to the three alternative site locations. Concurrently with the cultural resources evaluation, FTA and the City of Alexandria will coordinate with VDHR and other consulting parties through the Section 106 process. This process will be documented in Appendix E.

3.6 Parklands

[2-5 pages]

This section will identify and assess the potential impact to public parklands, recreational areas, and wildlife refuges.

A Section 4(f) resource, the GWMP has been identified within the study area as previously discussed. Other public parklands could include local, state and federally owned parklands. This project may also affect Section 6(f) resources in the study area. The Section 4(f) and 6(f) evaluations will be addressed in Appendix D.

3.7 Air Quality

[2-3 pages]

This section will summarize the project's conformity with regional air quality goals. The project is included in the Region's FY2011-2016 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) as Amendment No. 5782. The Washington, DC region is currently a non-attainment area for Ground Level Ozone (O₃) and PM_{2.5}.

Pending the results of the traffic analysis, and identification of failing intersections in the study, it is anticipated that the air quality section will include project level Carbon Monoxide (CO) Hot Spot Analysis.

3.8 Noise and Vibration

[2-3 pages]

This section will analyze existing and future cumulative noise levels (includes noise from both Metrorail and other sources, such as automobiles, planes, etc) using the methodology provided in the *FTA Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual*. The analysis will include the identification of nearby sensitive receptors (e.g. residences), and the potential impact from temporary construction and build conditions. Additional technical information will be included in an appendix.

3.9 Water Quality

[2-3 pages]

This section will identify water bodies that exist in the study area and evaluate the potential impacts resulting from the project pursuant to the Clean Water Act. Impaired waters in the study area will be identified, and proposed stormwater management techniques for each alternative will be described in this section. Concept level calculations of impervious surface will be provided in this section as well as concept descriptions of the stormwater treatment facilities that would be used to treat runoff resulting from the station and ancillary facilities.

3.10 Waters of the United States (Wetlands)

[3-5 pages]

This section will identify and assess potential impact to Waters of the U.S. within the study area. Concerns about potential wetland impacts were raised during the scoping process. Waters of the U.S. include all waters, such as intrastate rivers, streams (including intermittent streams), wetlands, and natural ponds

Potential impact to Waters of the US is regulated under *Executive Order 11990 (Protection of Wetlands)* which requires federal agencies to avoid or minimize impact to these resources. Waters of the U.S. are regulated by the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) pursuant to Section 400/401 of the Clean Water Act of 1977.

Wetlands within the study area will be delineated by qualified environmental scientists through field reviews and GIS analysis. Environmental scientists will use wetland identification guidance provided by the USACE. A technical memorandum will be developed which summarizes the results of the wetland delineation, existing data on wetlands (e.g. data sources such as the USFWS National Wetland Inventory), wetland impact calculations and potential mitigation measures (as necessary). Coordination with the USACE-Norfolk District may be necessary for a Jurisdictional Determination (JD) of Waters of the United States. The potential for wetlands within the study area is high, because of the study areas' proximity to the Potomac River and at a low elevation.

3.11 Floodplains

[1-2 pages]

This section will assess potential impact to FEMA designated 100-year flood hazard zones. Floodplains are protected under *Executive Order 11988 Floodplain Management* and *USDOT Order 5650.2 Floodplain Management and Protection*. FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM) and Digital Flood Insurance Rate Maps (DFIRM) will be used to identify 100-year flood zones in the study area and quantify potential impact.

3.12 Contaminated Materials

[3-5 pages]

Potomac Yard functioned as a high volume freight rail yard for approximately 85 years before the yard

was closed in 1990. Because of the long-term industrial activity that occurred within the study area, the potential for contamination within the project study area is high. Environmental Site Assessments (ESA) have been completed for various sites within Potomac Yard by both private developers and the City of Alexandria. The analysis will build upon any previous ESAs that have been completed within the study area. The initial assessment will include a Phase I ESA for the study area, and subsequent Phase II ESAs will be completed as necessary. The Phase I ESA will include database searches for regulated sites with the study area, review of historic aerial photography, insurance maps and site visits.

3.13 Safety and Security

[1-2 pages]

This section will assess the potential impact of the proposed station on safety and security to surrounding communities as well as the passengers and employees who will use the station. The methodology for assessing the potential safety and security impact will include an evaluation of:

- Existing safety and security facilities or programs, including general descriptions of the Metro Transit Police and City of Alexandria Police approach to security at transit stations.
- Each alternative site's ability to accommodate safety and security design requirements which may include:
 - Access Control, e.g. locations where passengers, employees and police officers may access the station from either side of the tracks
- "Set Back" Distances (Security Buffer Zones) that establish minimum separation distances of the facility and other surrounding facilities and properties including roads, residential neighborhoods and other land uses.
- Fencing
- Known safety or security risks associated with the proposed alternatives.
- Emergency Response Access

3.14 Resources of Limited or No Effect

[3-5 pages]

Some resource areas may have no effect or limited effect as a result of the project. These resource

areas will be briefly addressed within this section. The discussion of these resource areas will be much shorter in length and at more of a summary level than the discussion in the other sections. Resource areas to be potentially included in this section are:

- Land Use and Zoning;
- Consistency with Local Plans;
- Neighborhoods, Demographics, and Community Resources;
- Environmental Justice;
- Navigable Waterways and Coastal Zones;
- Wild and Scenic Rivers;
- Soils and Geologic Conditions;
- Ecosystems and Endangered Species;
- Utilities; and
- Sustainability and Conservation.

3.15 Indirect and Cumulative Impacts

[2-3 pages]

This section will identify and assess the potential indirect and cumulative impacts the proposed station could have on the surrounding social, built, and natural environment.

Indirect effects are defined as those that are caused by the action and are later in time or farther removed in distance. Indirect effects may include growth-inducing effects and other effects related to induced changes in the patterns of land use, population density or growth rate and related effects on air and water and other natural systems. A discussion of the potential transit oriented development implications will be included in this section of the EIS.

Cumulative effects are defined as the impact on the environment, which would result from the incremental impact of each alternative when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time.

3.16 Construction Impacts

[2-3 pages]

This section will assess the potential temporary construction impact that could result from the construction of each alternative. The section will also recommend methods for stakeholder outreach to relay timely information on construction activities. Specific areas which will be analyzed include construction impacts resulting from:

- Noise
- Air Quality
- Traffic and Roadways
- Water Quality
- Utilities
- Construction Site Health and Safety
- Debris Disposal
- Site Safety and Security
- Public Notification/Construction Status Updates
- Coordination with CSX Transportation

4.0 CHAPTER 4: PUBLIC AND AGENCY INVOLVEMENT

[5-10 pages]

This chapter will provide a summary of public and agency meetings for the project, including dates, methods for advertisement, and materials presented. An appendix may also complement this chapter by compiling the presentations and meeting materials provided at each meeting.

This chapter will summarize major themes that emerged through the public and agency involvement process. Public and agency comments and project team responses will be compiled in an appendix.

5.0 CHAPTER 5: FINANCIAL ANALYSIS

[5-10 pages]

This chapter will provide a summary of the financial planning for the project, including cost estimates for each alternative and potential capital and operating funding sources.

APPENDIX A: LIST OF PREPARERS

[2 pages]

The List of Preparers will provide the names, credentials, and technical qualifications of individuals who prepared sections the EIS.

APPENDIX B: LIST OF COOPERATING AND PARTICIPATING AGENCIES (EIS DISTRIBUTION)

[3-5 pages]

The List of Cooperating and Participating Agencies will summarize the agencies that chose to be cooperating and participating agencies in the NEPA process pursuant to Section 6002 of SAFETEA-LU. Agency contact information will be provided in the summary matrix.

APPENDIX C: REFERENCES

[3-5 pages]

A bibliography will be developed for the EIS.

APPENDIX D: SECTION 4(F) AND 6(F) EVALUATION

[10-15 pages]

A Section 4(f) evaluation will be prepared as part of the EIS pursuant to Section 4(f) of the US DOT Act of 1966. The evaluation will identify cultural resources, public park and recreational resources, and wildlife and waterfowl refuges within the study area. This section will evaluate the impact of each alternative on 4(f) resources and document efforts by the lead agencies to “minimize harm.” The 4(f) evaluation will document if “prudent and feasible” alternatives exist that avoid impact to 4(f) resources. Finally, the evaluation will document mitigation commitments proposed by the lead agencies if impact to 4(f) resources is unavoidable.

A Section 6(f) evaluation will also be prepared to identify recreational and parklands proposed for conversion to a transportation use that were acquired through Land and Water Conservation Fund Act (LWCFA). The LWCFA is used by the state and local agencies for the acquisition of park and recreational lands. The evaluation will identify the location of 6(f) lands and the amount of acquisition that would be required for each alternative. Mitigation commitments will also be provided in the 6(f)

evaluation if necessary. Mitigation for 6(f) land impacts would include the replacement of land that is of “equal value, location and usefulness as the impacted land.” The National Park Service is the federal agency responsible for approval of Section 6(f) land conversions.

APPENDIX E: SECTION 106 COORDINATION

Appendix E will document the Section 106 process. The FTA and City of Alexandria will coordinate with VDHR and other consulting parties through the Section 106 process to define an Area of Potential Effect (APE) for cultural resources, potential resources within the APE, potential adverse effects, and mitigation if it is determined the project will have adverse effects to cultural resources. The GWMP is a known cultural resource listed in the NRHP within the study area. The Section 106 process will thus include the NPS as a consulting party.