

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Summary of Comments and Responses Related to March 27, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting (Distributed May 14, 2012)

Name	Organization	Comment	Response <i>[These are FHWA's responses, and are subject to concurrence by other Signatories to the MOA]</i>
Martha Catlin and Judy Rigglin	Alexandria Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends	<p>Friends' General Comment about all documentation provided to Consulting Parties for review:</p> <p>It seems clear from the Preamble of the draft Programmatic Agreement that many issues that are essential to the Section 106 consultation process remain unresolved at this time. This is a cause for concern in light of FHWA's expedited project schedule and its announcement at the meeting of March 27, 2012 that the consultation process will be concluded after only one additional opportunity to comment on the Draft Programmatic Agreement. Without resolution of the issues of compliance with 36 CFR 800.4 (Identification and evaluation of properties in accordance with the criteria of the National Register of Historic Places) and 36 CFR 800.5 (Assessment of effect on National Register listed and eligible historic properties), it is difficult to judge the appropriateness or adequacy of the Draft Programmatic Agreement's stipulations, particularly with regard to mitigation of adverse effects (which, as yet, are not fully defined or understood) to historic properties (which, as yet, are not fully defined or understood).</p>	<p>The FHWA acknowledges the concerns of the consulting parties, and has scheduled a 6th Consulting Parties Meeting for May 14th. The FHWA will continue to work with the consulting parties to resolve issues affecting historic resources, and will not preclude future meetings if they become necessary.</p>
Martha Catlin and Judy Rigglin	Alexandria Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends	<p>Friends recognize that a programmatic agreement provides flexibility in meeting Section 106 responsibilities. However, until it is clear what can and cannot be resolved prior to executing the Programmatic Agreement, it cannot be determined whether provisions in the agreement are adequate to address items not resolved prior to its execution. Friends appreciate that consultation with the Virginia SHPO is ongoing. However, to comment effectively, Friends and other Consulting Parties need clear information on the results of FHWA's consultation with the Virginia SHPO on all determinations of National Register eligibility and determinations of effect. Consulting Parties need clear information about items that FHWA and the Virginia SHPO agree may be deferred for later consideration pursuant to the executed Programmatic Agreement, and when and how such items would be addressed. Friends welcome the opportunity to comment; however, we wish to emphasize that our ability to comment</p>	<p>The revised drafts of the Architectural Survey Report and Archaeological Survey Report were distributed to the consulting parties on April 23, 2012.</p> <p>Maps depicting the APE and the Woodlawn Historic District boundaries were sent to the consulting parties with a Determination of Eligibility letter that was sent to the SHPO on April 17, 2012.</p>

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Summary of Comments and Responses Related to March 27, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting (Distributed May 14, 2012)

Name	Organization	Comment	Response <i>[These are FHWA's responses, and are subject to concurrence by other Signatories to the MOA]</i>
		meaningfully is seriously constrained by the inadequacy of information provided to date.	
Martha Catlin and Judy Rigglin	Alexandria Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends	<p>Among the important elements for which insufficient information limits our ability to comment are the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Architectural Survey Report and recommendations - Archaeological Survey Report and recommendations - All indicated Attachments for the Draft Programmatic Agreement (including Project MOA, APE and the Woodlawn Historic District boundaries for purposes of Section 106 review of this Undertaking) - Determinations of eligibility and effect subject to the Virginia SHPO's concurrence. 	<p>Final Architectural and Archaeological Survey Reports were distributed to the consulting parties on April 23, 2012.</p> <p>A determination of eligibility letter was sent to the SHPO, with copies to the consulting parties, on April 17, 2012. Maps depicting the APE and Woodlawn Historic District boundaries were included as attachments.</p> <p>The FHWA is currently working on Determinations of Effect which will be reviewed by the CPs and transmitted to the SHPO for concurrence.</p>
Martha Catlin and Judy Rigglin	Alexandria Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends	<p>The following are comments for the Plans and Profiles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Friends would like more information on the plan for the new Fort Belvoir ACP indicated on sheets 4 and 5, in order to comment appropriately. - Friends would like more information on the indicated SWM areas, in order to comment appropriately. - Friends would like more information on the design indicated on sheet 5 of the intersection and access road that will provide access to our property from the Southern Alignment alternative for Route One, in order to comment appropriately. - Friends would like more information on the shared use path indicated on sheets 4, 5, and 6, in order to comment appropriately. 	<p>The Friends should contact the Army directly to obtain information about the ACP.</p> <p>The locations and exact dimensions of SWM areas are preliminary.</p> <p>Current designs for the intersection, access road and shared use path are conceptual. Details will be worked out in part through the design workshops, in which the Friends will be involved.</p>
Martha Catlin and Judy Rigglin	Alexandria Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends	<p>The following are comments for the DRAFT Programmatic Agreement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Whereas #1: To our knowledge, FHWA's steps toward meeting NEPA responsibilities have not been advanced to represent the proposed preferred alternative. It is unclear 	<p>#1: NEPA and NHPA compliance are concurrent and are being coordinated by FHWA. A public meeting and public review of the NEPA/ Environmental Assessment is scheduled for June 5.</p>

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Summary of Comments and Responses Related to March 27, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting (Distributed May 14, 2012)

Name	Organization	Comment	Response <i>[These are FHWA's responses, and are subject to concurrence by other Signatories to the MOA]</i>
		<p>how NEPA and Section 106 and any other authorities that apply to this Undertaking are being coordinated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Whereas #2, #3, #9, and #11: Attachments referenced in the PA have not been provided. - Whereas #3: The Project Memorandum of Agreement has not been provided. - Whereas #9: The Area of Potential Effect presented for review by Consulting Parties has not yet been developed adequately to warrant concurrence by the Virginia SHPO. - Whereas #12 and #16: Architectural and Archaeological surveys are incomplete and inadequate at this time. Therefore, it is unclear how Friends may comment on the surveys and have our comments considered by FHWA. - Whereas #17: FHWA's Determination of No Adverse Effect to the Woodlawn Quaker Meetinghouse is inadequately supported. Friends object to the determination of No Adverse Effect at this point, when so many elements of design and the Undertaking's potential effects to the Meetinghouse and its setting are unknown. If FHWA is unwilling to acknowledge the potential for the Undertaking to adversely affect the Meetinghouse property in light of unknowns at this time, we request that the PA incorporate language: (1) to defer an effect determination until more is known about how the final design may successfully avoid any potential adverse effects, (2) to provide opportunities for Friends to participate in consultation regarding a proposed effect determination and measures to avoid adverse effect, and (3) to ensure that the Virginia SHPO is provided its appropriate opportunity for review and concurrence consistent with the provisions of 36 CFR 800.5. - Whereas #22 (and references elsewhere): Friends request reconsideration of the need to move the Otis T. Mason House, in light of its historic importance to the interrelationship of properties in the Woodlawn Historic District. All feasible alternatives to avoid, minimize, and 	<p>#, 2,3,9,11: The referenced attachments will be included with the next draft of the PA.</p> <p>#3 The Project MOA has not yet been signed. However, a draft copy will be included as an attachment with the next draft of the PA.</p> <p>#9: A determination of eligibility letter was sent to the SHPO, with copies to the consulting parties, for concurrence on April 17, 2012. The letter included a request for concurrence with the APE.</p> <p>#12 and #16 Final Architectural and Archaeological Survey Reports were distributed to the consulting parties on April 23, 2012.</p> <p>#17: FHWA supports the original determination of No Adverse Effect. Although many of the design elements have not been finalized, the proposed realignment will result in improved conditions for the Meetinghouse property. The undertaking will not require any physical take from the Friends, and will reduce visual and auditory impacts caused by the current roadway proximity.</p> <p>#22 The question of whether or not to relocate the Otis Tufton Mason house has been revisited several times during the course of the consultation process. Early on, the Trust asked the FHWA to develop and consider adjustments to the Southern Bypass alternative alignment that would take the roadway further south, and further from the house. The FHWA developed several such alternatives, but was unable to provide a sufficient buffer</p>

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Summary of Comments and Responses Related to March 27, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting (Distributed May 14, 2012)

Name	Organization	Comment	Response <i>[These are FHWA's responses, and are subject to concurrence by other Signatories to the MOA]</i>
		<p>mitigate the adverse effects that would result from removal of the property from its historic location should be considered. The documentation provided states that the Otis Mason House is eligible as a contributing property to the Woodlawn Historic District, but not individually eligible. This determination should support preservation of the building in its historic location, because, as part of an ensemble of historic structures within a distinctive setting, the building's key National Register characteristics derive from its situation on the landscape, and from the building's physical and associative relationships with other contributing elements of the Otis Mason Farm complex portion of the Woodlawn Historic District. FHWA's responses to questions about the necessity of relocating the farmhouse have given an impression that FHWA considers the building's status as "not individually eligible for the National Register" to make a decision to relocate it acceptable. In fact, such a decision would adversely affect not only the Otis Mason House but all of the other National Register eligible and listed properties in its vicinity, and the National Register-eligible Woodlawn Historic District as a whole.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Whereas #25: This clause raises questions that have not been addressed adequately in the consultation process to enable Friends to comment meaningfully. There are no stipulations in the PA to describe how actions associated with the Potomac Heritage Trail and the Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route National Historic Trail are to be implemented. The Whereas clause states that the Trails "will be established as part of the Undertaking." Will this be represented in the Project MOA? Are there Section 106 responsibilities associated with the establishment of the Trails? If so, is FHWA assuming lead agency Section 106 responsibility on behalf of another entity? What are the opportunities for Consulting Party input on this aspect of the Undertaking? 	<p>between the house and Rt. 1. The alternative alignments were driven by constraints imposed by the presence of wetlands further to the south, as well as the topography in that area, engineering considerations, and the need to tie into the existing roadway. At one of the consulting parties meetings, the Trust also stated that increasing the distance of the Southern Bypass from the existing Route 1 beyond that which is currently proposed would make it more visible from Grand View and Woodlawn Plantation, which would increase the adverse impacts to those historic properties. It is because the FHWA appreciates the historic importance of the Otis Mason House and its setting that every attempt is being made to preserve the house and relocate it, in consultation with the Trust, SHPO, and CPs, to a site on NTHP property that will provide the house with an appropriate setting, which could not be maintained if the house were to remain where it is.</p> <p>#25 The purpose of this whereas clause is to document FHWA, the Army, and VDOT's intention to accommodate the trail within the ROW. FHWA will ensure that any trail segments developed as part of this project are subject to NEPA/NHPA analysis, however FHWA is not involved with NEPA/NHPA compliance for the trail system as a whole. CPs are welcome to provide input about the trail, however the alignment, width, surface treatment, and other details are constrained by budget and engineering factors.</p>

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Summary of Comments and Responses Related to March 27, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting (Distributed May 14, 2012)

Name	Organization	Comment	Response <i>[These are FHWA's responses, and are subject to concurrence by other Signatories to the MOA]</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stipulations for Design Workshops: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Stipulation 1(a) states that there will be a process but does not identify or outline such a process. Friends request that the “design review process” and the “minimum of two design workshops” be clarified. Friends request language be added to indicate how and by whom plans will be developed, reviewed, and modified, including reasonable timeframes for each stage. ▪ Stipulation 1(a): No treatments are specified for the access drive that will serve the Woodlawn Baptist Church, the Woodlawn Quaker Meetinghouse, and the Woodlawn Estate. Information has not been provided regarding the ownership and maintenance of the access drive component of the Undertaking. Friends request that an item be added to the “Features to be discussed” to cover the design of the access road and driveways for Woodlawn Baptist Church, Woodlawn Quaker Meetinghouse, and NHTP properties. ▪ Stipulation 1(a)(ii): The stipulation states, “Landscaping, including plants in the central median . . .” Is this wording intended to limit landscaping to the central median? This should be clarified. To appropriately mitigate adverse effects of the Undertaking, it is critical that landscape treatments not be limited to roadway areas alone. They should be incorporated into the Woodlawn Historic District as part of the definition or re-definition of relationships among the historic district properties that will be altered or affected by the new alignment. Friends 	<p>Design Workshops:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The design review process has been clarified. - Access drive language added - Landscaping language clarified

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Summary of Comments and Responses Related to March 27, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting (Distributed May 14, 2012)

Name	Organization	Comment	Response <i>[These are FHWA's responses, and are subject to concurrence by other Signatories to the MOA]</i>
		<p>request that "Features" specify landscaping needed to maintain viewsheds for all Woodlawn Historic District properties, including attention to the potential adverse visual effects that may be caused by removal of vegetation associated with the Route One widening in areas other than the Southern Bypass segment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Friends request a new stipulation be added stating FHWA will facilitate an agreement among parties to determine who will maintain the access road(s) from the signalized intersection to Woodlawn Baptist Church, Woodlawn Quaker Meetinghouse, and the NTHP properties. - Stipulation 1(c): As stated by the Virginia SHPO, the Chicora Foundation Report validation and updating should be completed and results shared before execution of the PA. - Stipulation 1(e): The stipulation for submitting a National Register nomination should provide for FHWA to develop the nomination in consultation with the Consulting Parties. A schedule for its development should be specified, and time allowed for adequate research to tell the full story of this complex and rich historic area. The nomination should include more than "information obtained" if that phrase is meant to refer to information obtained only for purposes of developing the PA. Understanding that the nomination cannot become final until the project activities within the historic district have been completed, there should be ample time to conduct the level of historical and archaeological investigation needed. A National Register nomination could be a successful mitigative measure, but only if it is comprehensively researched, well presented, and can be used as a tool for development of interpretive programs that would benefit the component historic properties and the visiting public. A plan for involvement of scholars and those with specialized knowledge of the history associated with the Woodlawn Historic District historic properties should be stipulated in the Programmatic Agreement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Access drive ownership language added - 1(c) This additional work will not be conducted prior to the execution of the MOA, but will be deferred. - 1(e) language has been modified

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir
Summary of Comments and Responses Related to March 27, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting (Distributed May 14, 2012)

Name	Organization	Comment	Response [These are FHWA's responses, and are subject to concurrence by other Signatories to the MOA]
Christopher Daniel	Fort Belvoir DPW - ENRD	In re: Draft PA Consulting Parties Where As clauses need to be cleaned up in regards to documentation of parties asked to consult and documentation of their responses.	- Suggestion implemented
Christopher Daniel	Fort Belvoir DPW - ENRD	In re: Draft PA Stipulation I.b.i. The purpose of granting an easement from the Army to Woodlawn Baptist Church, should be defined and clarified.	- Language has been clarified
Christopher Daniel	Fort Belvoir DPW - ENRD	In re: Draft PA Signature Block Garrison Commander signature block needs to be updated to COL Strycula. This may change again if the document is signed after the July command change.	The change has been incorporated on the PA.
Christopher Daniel	Fort Belvoir DPW - ENRD	In re: Draft PA Stipulation IV.c. The selling of the rail bridge should be more clearly stated. The current text does not make that clear.	A more detailed description of the requirements for the sale and/or demolition of the rail bridge has been developed in PA.
Christopher Daniel	Fort Belvoir DPW - ENRD	In re: Draft PA Stipulation IV Mitigation options suggested during the 3-26-2012 consulting parties meeting and those submitted by DPW Environmental Natural Resources Division & the Master Planning Division should be added to the PA as mitigations for the demolition of the bridge and track bed.	- This section has been revised
Christopher Daniel	Fort Belvoir DPW - ENRD	In re: Draft PA Stipulation I.a. Garrison should be listed as participating in Design Workshop. All signatories should be involved in the workshop.	- Comment has been incorporated
Christopher Daniel	Fort Belvoir DPW - ENRD	In re: Draft PA Stipulation I.a.iii. Change R3W to W3R.	- Change made
Christopher Daniel	Fort Belvoir DPW - ENRD	In re: Draft PA Stipulation VI.a.ii. Need to add more detailed information concerning obtaining an ARPA permit from the Garrison.	- Language has been added to ensure that the permitting protocol is contained in all FHWA contract documents.
Christopher Daniel	Fort Belvoir DPW - ENRD	In re: Draft PA Stipulation VI.C. Section needs to be changed to reflect the Garrisons agreement with Fairfax County concerning curation of artifacts.	- Language has been changed; final curation protocol shall be stipulated by Army in Cultural Resource Use Permit.

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Summary of Comments and Responses Related to March 27, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting (Distributed May 14, 2012)

Name	Organization	Comment	Response <i>[These are FHWA's responses, and are subject to concurrence by other Signatories to the MOA]</i>
Christopher Daniel	Fort Belvoir DPW - ENRD	In re: Draft PA Stipulation XI.D. Recommend "business" be inserted between "two" and "days."	- Change made
Christopher Daniel	Fort Belvoir DPW - ENRD	In re: Draft PA Stipulation XI.D. Concerned that the time table set in this stipulation is too short.	- Three additional days have been added to the time table
Christopher Daniel	Fort Belvoir DPW - ENRD	Archaeological Site Segmenting in Archaeology Report Installation has a concern that site evaluations are segmenting sites. If eligibility is going to be accessed then shouldn't the entirety of the site be evaluated and not just the portion being impacted by the proposed project. What will happen to the section of the site that has not be evaluated?	- Portions of sites that have not been evaluated will need to be assessed on an as-needed basis if those portions may be effected by future undertakings.
Christopher Daniel		Previous Comments Installation has not seen all comments from 2-9-12 consulting parties meeting addressed.	- Responses to previous comments have been addressed to the extent possible
Laurie Turkawski and Linda Blank	Fairfax County	General comment: Meeting attendees are sometimes referred to in the notes by their first and last name, first name only, or last name only. Consistency is recommended, and at least list first and last names when it is the first appearance of the attendee's name (for example, on page 3, Laurie Turkawski is only referred to as Laurie).	- Comment noted
Laurie Turkawski and Linda Blank	Fairfax County	Page 3 of 7. First paragraph regarding the county's position on the Village of Accotink. The county studied Accotink for a local historic overlay district and for listing in the county Inventory of Historic Sites only. The county study was not detailed enough for making a determination of National Register eligibility, and county staff made no such determination.	- Comment noted
Laurie Turkawski and Linda Blank	Fairfax County	Page 3 of 7. Laurie Turkawski's question specifically referred to the SWM ponds at the Village of Accotink.	- Clarification noted
Laurie Turkawski and Linda	Fairfax County	Page 6 of 7. Patrick McLaughlin's comments about cumulative effects on Pohick Church. When will the ongoing transit studies be completed?	Transit study has been completed

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Summary of Comments and Responses Related to March 27, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting (Distributed May 14, 2012)

Name	Organization	Comment	Response <i>[These are FHWA's responses, and are subject to concurrence by other Signatories to the MOA]</i>
Blank			
Laurie Turkawski and Linda Blank	Fairfax County	Page 7 of 7. NMUSA. Army suggested documenting and <i>nominating</i> the railbed, not monumenting.	- Comment noted
Laurie Turkawski and Linda Blank	Fairfax County	<u>Comments on US 1 Plans and Profiles</u> Sheet 1. Proposed construction limits and easements need to be added for the area west of Telegraph Road (RTL depicted). Sheets 7 & 8. Are these overpass options off the table or are they still being considered? It is unclear since they were again included in the documents for review.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The requested information will be added to future plans - Overpasses are not the preferred alternative, but are still being analyzed as part of the NEPA/NHPA process
Laurie Turkawski and Linda Blank	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Delete Memorandum of Agreement and change to Programmatic Agreement in header.	- Change made
Laurie Turkawski and Linda Blank	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Whereas #9 As I understand it, there has not been final concurrence on the APE.	- Request for concurrence has been submitted
Laurie Turkawski and Linda Blank	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Whereas #11 Agree with the Trust, that Pope Leighey is contributing for reasons discussed at the 3/27/12 consulting parties mtg. Shouldn't Otis T. Mason house & Mtghouse cemetery be included here?	- yes, change made
Laurie Turkawski and Linda Blank	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Whereas #17 As I understand it, there has not been final concurrence on the no adverse effects. Trust stated at 3/2/27 not agree with no adverse re: PL; DPZ agreed at mtg. Also raise questions re: Pump Station, Pohick church (flyover), Bap. Cemetery, Meetinghouse re: SWM.	FHWA's determinations of effect have been issued;
Laurie Turkawski and Linda Blank	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Whereas #25 Delete "Management" in second to last sentence.	-changed

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Summary of Comments and Responses Related to March 27, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting (Distributed May 14, 2012)

Name	Organization	Comment	Response <i>[These are FHWA's responses, and are subject to concurrence by other Signatories to the MOA]</i>
Laurie Turkawski and Linda Blank	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA After Whereas #25 Suggest a WHEREAS clause be added regarding coordination with the Army re: the North Post ACP so that the Woodlawn historic district is protected? Not suggesting FHWA commit to do anything more than coordinate to help ensure that work done by is coordinated with work undertaken by FHWA.	- Army/ACP coordination is ongoing but will not be addressed in this PA. Coordination is limited to making sure that the curb lines, utilities, and other design elements are compatible.
Laurie Turkawski and Linda Blank	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Whereas #26 Delete Fairfax County History Commission. Regarding Fairfax County Department of Planning and Zoning, comment was: Likely to have only County of Fairfax, Virginia rather than individual agency here, still to confirm.	- Please provide confirmation or clarification
Laurie Turkawski and Linda Blank	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Whereas #27 Add Fairfax County Historical Commission.	- Sallie Lyons is representing the Commission and they are noted as a participant in #26
Laurie Turkawski and Linda Blank	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Stipulation I.a.ii. How will this work if used to reduce visual impacts and then later used for transit?	- Median landscaping is an interim measure but the stipulation has been modified to clarify that vegetation will be placed elsewhere.
Laurie Turkawski and Linda Blank	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Stipulation I.b.i. What is DA land?	DA land is Department of the Army land
Laurie Turkawski and Linda Blank	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Stipulation I.e. A commitment needs to be made to take the nomination through the process. Perhaps VDHR has wording to reflect this. Nomination submission completed within 2 years of the signing of the PA.	FHWA has committed to preparing and submitting the nomination to DHR for consideration.
Laurie Turkawski and Linda Blank	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Stipulation II.a. Trust should have say as to sufficient service, capacity, et al.	-comment noted

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Summary of Comments and Responses Related to March 27, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting (Distributed May 14, 2012)

Name	Organization	Comment	Response <i>[These are FHWA's responses, and are subject to concurrence by other Signatories to the MOA]</i>
Laurie Turkawski and Linda Blank	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Stipulation IV.b. Understand from 3/27/12 mtg minutes that new language will be added re: coordination with Army & NR nomination coordination with NMUSA.	- Language has been added
Laurie Turkawski and Linda Blank	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Stipulation IV.c. Assume this is rough and that specific directive language for who will do what re: mitigation will be added.	- Language has been added
Laurie Turkawski and Linda Blank	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Stipulation VI.A.1. Insert parallel language for architectural professional qualification.	- Language added
Laurie Turkawski and Linda Blank	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Stipulation X.A. Support comment at 3/27/12 mtg re: History Comm. & Accotink. FCPA to provide wording to insert.	-additional testing at Accotink added to this section
Laurie Turkawski and Linda Blank	Fairfax County	In re: Execution County of Fairfax, deleted Anthony Griffin and added Ed Long, but need to check on his full name.	- Name modified
Christopher Sperling	Fairfax County Park Authority	The Cultural Resource Management and Protection Branch (CRMPB), Resource Management Division, Fairfax County Park Authority concurs with the recommendations of the archaeology report. Comments on the report are relatively minimal, and often typographic in nature. Please address the attached review comments prior to submission of a final report copy. The CRMPB requests two spiral bound, double-sided copies of the report for our library as well a CD containing an electronic version preferably in .pdf format. 1. Page i, 2 nd Paragraph refers to the APE as presented in November 2011. Has this changed? 2. Page 1-1, 2 nd Paragraph. "This [These] archaeological investigations were conducted for Parsons	Comments 1-25 will be addressed in the final revision

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Summary of Comments and Responses Related to March 27, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting (Distributed May 14, 2012)

Name	Organization	Comment	Response <i>[These are FHWA's responses, and are subject to concurrence by other Signatories to the MOA]</i>
		<p>Transportation Group..."</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Page 3-5, 2nd Paragraph. This paragraph places the temporal origin of triangle points during the Middle Woodland period. Data from Virginia and Maryland suggest the development of triangle point during the Archaic/Woodland transition. The results of excavations at the Pig Point Site (18AN50) in Anne Arundel County, MD identified the presence of triangle points in the transitional and Late Woodland periods with an absence of the artifact from Middle Woodland context. 4. Page 3-7, 2nd-3rd Paragraphs. Extra hard return 5. Page 3-8, 1st Paragraph, 1st Sentence, Delete comma at end of sentence. 6. Page 3-8, 1st Paragraph, ...and later as. Route 1..." Delete period after "as". 7. Page 3-9, 1st Paragraph. The term "planter" is as much a social designation as an occupational one. So, to say that, "The majority of the residents of Fairfax County and the Northern Neck were planters..." is somewhat misleading. Consider rewording to state that most freemen were economically dependent on tobacco cultivation. 8. Page 3-9, 3rd Paragraph. These data are true for the Tidewater region of Southern Virginia in the Lower Chesapeake. Current and ongoing research by Patricia Samford, et. al, at the Maryland Archaeological Conservation – Laboratory has demonstrated that for the Upper Chesapeake, including Fairfax County, sub-floor pits are considerably fewer, averaging less than one per quarters, and larger. 9. Page 3-11, 4th Paragraph. George Mason authored the Virginia Declaration of Rights which served as the basis for the Bill of Rights in the United States 	

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Summary of Comments and Responses Related to March 27, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting (Distributed May 14, 2012)

Name	Organization	Comment	Response <i>[These are FHWA's responses, and are subject to concurrence by other Signatories to the MOA]</i>
		<p>Constitution. Madison is largely credited for the inclusion and authorship of the Bill of Rights into the constitution.</p> <p>10. Page 3-19, 2nd Paragraph, 1st Sentence. Awkward, consider rewording.</p> <p>11. Page 3-19, 3rd-4th Paragraphs. Insert hard return.</p> <p>12. Page 3-20, 3rd Paragraph. Check justification.</p> <p>13. Page 3-20, 4th Paragraph, 1st Sentence. Insert “(“ before “Catlin.”</p> <p>14. Page 3-21, Last Word. Delete “Figure”</p> <p>15. Page 3-23, Last Sentence, check justification.</p> <p>16. Page 3-26, 1st Sentence, delete “.” after Washington, D.C.,</p> <p>17. Page 3-26, 2nd Paragraph. Union Forces occupied Union Mills located at the western edge of Fairfax County along the Orange and Alexandria Railroad after March 1862.</p> <p>18. Page 3-28, Last Sentence, check justification.</p> <p>19. Section 4.0, check justification.</p> <p>20. Page 4-1, 3rd Paragraph. Saying, “Shovel test were 38 x 38 cm (15 inches) in diameter...” is confusing, suggesting both square and round tests, simultaneously. Consider clarifying.</p> <p>21. Page 4-2, First Paragraph, insert hard return.</p> <p>22. Page 4-3, Last Paragraph. Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section (CRMPS) should be changed to Cultural Resource Management and Protection Branch (CRMPB).</p> <p>23. Page 5-16, Recommendation, insert hard return for consistent formatting.</p> <p>24. Page 5-16, Recommendation, insert hard return for consistent formatting.</p> <p>25. Page 5-22, Recommendation, insert hard return for consistent formatting.</p>	
Elizabeth	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Whereas #9	-concurrence will be required prior to execution

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Summary of Comments and Responses Related to March 27, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting (Distributed May 14, 2012)

Name	Organization	Comment	Response <i>[These are FHWA's responses, and are subject to concurrence by other Signatories to the MOA]</i>
Crowell and Chris Sperling		Has DHR concurred?	
Elizabeth Crowell and Chris Sperling	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Whereas #13 a, f, j, k No information on DSS	- All information was obtained from DHR and/or DSS
Elizabeth Crowell and Chris Sperling	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Whereas #13 g DHR concurs with not eligible, but a lot of diagnostic material, 15 points, etc. Need we be concerned with local significance?	- Additional testing for site 44FX1904 is not being recommended by FHWA
Elizabeth Crowell and Chris Sperling	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Whereas #13 l, n The DSS form does not indicate SHPO concurrence with NRHP ineligibility	- See archaeological report; concurrence pending
Elizabeth Crowell and Chris Sperling	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Whereas #15 a, b Potentially Eligible	- These two sites have been found not eligible
Elizabeth Crowell and Chris Sperling	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Whereas #15 c In District	Site 44FX1146 will be evaluated for consideration as a contributing feature of the HD
Elizabeth Crowell and Chris Sperling	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA After Whereas #17 This depends on the selected alternative.	- Comment noted
Elizabeth Crowell and Chris Sperling	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Whereas #17 e There could be a visual effect from roadway expansion.	A determination of Effect for Pohick Ch. has been deferred
Elizabeth Crowell	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Whereas #17 f No record in DSS	All information was obtained from DHR and/or DSS

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Summary of Comments and Responses Related to March 27, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting (Distributed May 14, 2012)

Name	Organization	Comment	Response <i>[These are FHWA's responses, and are subject to concurrence by other Signatories to the MOA]</i>
and Chris Sperling			
Elizabeth Crowell and Chris Sperling	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Whereas #26 j Shouldn't CRMPB be included here separately since we are not P&Z?	See below
Elizabeth Crowell and Chris Sperling	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Whereas #26 Add Fairfax County Park Authority	FCPA added (which includes CRMPB)
Elizabeth Crowell and Chris Sperling	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA After Whereas #27 a Please individually contact the state-recognized tribes or notify the Governor's office. The VCI and liaison position in the Governor's office are in transition and slated to be abolished.	Correspondence was sent to VCI which is part of the Governor's Office; no response has been received; VCI is still our point of contact until officially disbanded and a new guidance is issued by the Governor's Office.
Elizabeth Crowell and Chris Sperling	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Stipulation I.b.iii. Consider the impact to archaeological resources.	All areas proposed for landscaping will be, or have already been, subject to archaeological survey
Elizabeth Crowell and Chris Sperling	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Stipulation I.b.vi. Should conduct remote sensing survey with ground-truthing to determine if burials extend beyond modern cemetery boundaries or in any area that could be subject to ground disturbance.	- Survey has been completed and a report is expected in June
Elizabeth Crowell and Chris Sperling	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Stipulation I.c. Fairfax County Cultural Resource Management and Protection Branch would like a copy [of Chicora report].	- The report will be provided when the additional work described in the PA has been completed. The report is not currently available for distribution.
Elizabeth Crowell and Chris Sperling	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Stipulation I.d. Will house relocation result in additional disturbance. Has this been/will it be surveyed? There should be archaeology done in the vicinity of the existing	- Additional survey/monitoring will be specified

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Summary of Comments and Responses Related to March 27, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting (Distributed May 14, 2012)

Name	Organization	Comment	Response <i>[These are FHWA's responses, and are subject to concurrence by other Signatories to the MOA]</i>
		house to determine the existence of a builders' trench or other associated features. Archaeology should be done for the location where the building is being moved to ascertain that no resources will be impacted.	
Elizabeth Crowell and Chris Sperling	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Stipulation II.a. All of these will need to be surveyed.	- Chicora will provide full coverage for NTHP property
Elizabeth Crowell and Chris Sperling	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Stipulation II.d. Where ground disturbance will occur, it should be ascertained that archaeological resources will not be impacted.]	- Chicora will provide full coverage for NTHP property
Elizabeth Crowell and Chris Sperling	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Stipulation IV.a. Which portions? It is a resource that occurs in and out of the APE yet the disturbance may impact the significance of the resource outside the APE. The entire resource should be evaluated as to its NR eligibility; any adverse effects to the resource by the disturbance should be assessed; and mitigation measures should be developed.	- Comment noted; see revised text
Elizabeth Crowell and Chris Sperling	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Stipulation IV.b. This should be done in consultation with DHR and the County/Park Authority.	- Comment noted; see revised text
Elizabeth Crowell and Chris Sperling	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Stipulation IV.c.i. Correct "marketing plan marketing".	Comment noted; see revised text
Elizabeth Crowell and Chris Sperling	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Stipulation V.A. Also visual effects to the church should be considered.	- Visual effects addressed in V.B, Design Workshop

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Summary of Comments and Responses Related to March 27, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting (Distributed May 14, 2012)

Name	Organization	Comment	Response <i>[These are FHWA's responses, and are subject to concurrence by other Signatories to the MOA]</i>
Elizabeth Crowell and Chris Sperling	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Stipulation VI.C.4. Rewrite as follows (changes highlighted): The curator of artifacts potentially discovered as a result of the Project shall be dependent upon the owner of the lands where the artifacts are found. If the artifacts are found on Federal land, the Garrison has an agreement in place with the County to curate artifacts at the Cultural Resource curation facility at the James Lee Center in Falls Church, VA. If the artifacts are found on Commonwealth land or within Commonwealth owned/maintained right of way, the artifacts also shall be curated by the County, pursuant to Federal regulation at 36 CFR Part 79.	- Changes incorporated
Elizabeth Crowell and Chris Sperling	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Stipulation VIII.A., IX, and XII Add a in "archaeological".	- Change made, however both spellings are acceptable
Elizabeth Crowell and Chris Sperling	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Stipulation VIII.A.4. Add highlighted to text: If a Federally or state -recognized Indian tribe or Indian organization that attaches religious and cultural significance to a property off tribal lands and does not agree with an FHWA determination regarding eligibility, it may ask the ACHP to request the FHWA to obtain a determination of eligibility. Comment: Although there are no federally recognized tribes in Virginia, shouldn't VCI be included here as good faith, even though not technically required?	- State recognized tribes have not been added to this section
Elizabeth Crowell and Chris Sperling	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Stipulation IX.A. This is why I think the CRMPB should be included individually as a consulting. As is, we could be eliminated (either intentionally or accidentally) from consultation.	- Comment noted

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Summary of Comments and Responses Related to March 27, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting (Distributed May 14, 2012)

Name	Organization	Comment	Response [These are FHWA's responses, and are subject to concurrence by other Signatories to the MOA]
Elizabeth Crowell and Chris Sperling	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Stipulation IX.D. Rewrite first sentence as follows (change highlighted): With respect to archaeological sites associated with Native American occupation and use of the area, regardless of age, the Treatment Plan shall be developed in full consultation with the CIN THPO and the state-recognized tribes .	This change was not made
Elizabeth Crowell and Chris Sperling	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Stipulation X Several buildings and associated parking lots along Route 1 and Backlick Road that would have been within the historic boundaries of the village of Accotink are slated for demolition. This area should be investigated to determine if archaeological evidence of deep features (such as cellars, wells, privies, etc.) might remain. Should these be present, these archaeological features should be evaluated as to their National Register eligibility.	Additional survey will occur in this area.
Elizabeth Crowell and Chris Sperling	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Stipulation XI.A. Another reason to be specified as a CP.	-Comment noted
Elizabeth Crowell and Chris Sperling	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Stipulation XI.C. Change "working" to "business".	- Change was made
Elizabeth Crowell and Chris Sperling	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Stipulation XII.A. Add highlighted in following sentence: FHWA shall immediately notify the SHPO, CIN-THPO, the state-recognized tribes and all other Signatories and consulting parties, of the discovery.	- Change was not made
Elizabeth Crowell and Chris Sperling	Fairfax County	In re: Draft PA Stipulation XII.B. Modify end of sentence as follows: and if applicable, the <i>Catawba Indian Nation THPO Burial Policy and Procedures</i> , and guidance from the state-	- Change was not made

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Summary of Comments and Responses Related to March 27, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting (Distributed May 14, 2012)

Name	Organization	Comment	Response [These are FHWA's responses, and are subject to concurrence by other Signatories to the MOA]
		<p>recognized tribes provided as Attachment H.</p> <p>Comment: And VCI?</p>	
Elizabeth Crowell and Chris Sperling	Fairfax County	<p>In re: Draft PA Stipulation XII.C.1. Add highlighted to end of second to last sentence: <i>Catawba Indian Nation THPO Burial Policy and Procedures</i>, and state-recognized tribes as applicable, provided as Attachment F.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change was not made
Elizabeth Crowell and Chris Sperling	Fairfax County	<p>In re: Draft PA Stipulation XII.C.2 & 4. Replace VCI with "state-recognized tribes."</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change was not made
Elizabeth Crowell and Chris Sperling	Fairfax County	<p>In re: Execution County of Fairfax, deleted Anthony Griffin and added Edward L. Long, Jr.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change was made
Elizabeth Crowell and Chris Sperling	Fairfax County	<p>In re: References Cited 1st reference: Add a in "Archaeological".</p>	<p>The suggested revision is not correct.</p> <p>http://www.achp.gov/archguide.html</p>
Michael J. Elston	Pohick Episcopal Church	<p>While we appreciate your willingness to take the fly-over at Route 1 and Telegraph Road out of the plans, we are opposed to a third left turn lane at the intersection of Route 1 and Telegraph Road. At that point, Route 1 is already 9-lanes wide -- 7 lanes of through traffic and the existing left turn lanes. The addition of two dedicated right turn lanes from Telegraph Road, which we do not oppose and which will likely help alleviate existing traffic issues at certain times, will increase the width to 11 lanes. In other words, Route 1 at this point is already wider than most Interstate highways and will be even wider with the two dedicated right</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Comments noted; no changes made

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Summary of Comments and Responses Related to March 27, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting (Distributed May 14, 2012)

Name	Organization	Comment	Response <i>[These are FHWA's responses, and are subject to concurrence by other Signatories to the MOA]</i>
		<p>turn lanes. Enough is enough. At 11 lanes, it will be wider than the Champs-Élysées at L'Arc de Triomphe in Paris, even counting the two lanes that go underground there!</p> <p>We do not believe a three-lane turn lane is justified by current traffic, nor is it likely to be required by future traffic needs. Fort Belvoir's expansion has proceeded in a way that actually alleviates traffic from this intersection -- traffic that was expected when the last expansion was planned, which was less than a decade ago. Moreover, unless Telegraph is widened to three through lanes from Route 1 to the Fairfax County Parkway, it really cannot handle three lanes turning left onto it from Route 1.</p> <p>Quite frankly, there isn't a congestion problem at this point, and the two existing left-turn lanes should be sufficient for years to come. Moreover, if the traffic projections come to pass and you want to direct more traffic to Telegraph Road during the morning rush hour, all that needs to be done (assuming the issues on Telegraph Road such as its width and the proximity of the next light are addressed) is to leave the left turn light green longer; there is very little south-bound traffic on Route 1 at that time of day, and I don't believe the projections show a substantial increase in that traffic. Thus, south-bound traffic can wait while the two left turn lanes are cleared out.</p> <p>In short, the three left-turn lanes at Telegraph Road are not necessary and will not be necessary in the future. That plan is certainly not the answer to the congestion problem in the Route 1 corridor.</p> <p>As we discussed, we would welcome you to make a presentation to Pohick's Vestry should you want to convince us of the merit of the current plan of adding a third left turn lane. I would be happy to make the necessary arrangements on our end.</p>	

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir
Summary of Comments and Responses Related to March 27, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting (Distributed May 14, 2012)

Name	Organization	Comment	Response [These are FHWA's responses, and are subject to concurrence by other Signatories to the MOA]
Tom Waterman	Inlet Cove HOA	Mr. Waterman contacted FHWA on May 10, 2012 and commented that Inlet Cove had been left off of the CP list on the PA draft circulated that day.	FHWA omitted Inlet Cove accidentally but has corrected the error in the most recent draft. FHWA acknowledges that Inlet Cove is a CP.
Marc Holma	VDHR	Mr. Holma submitted extensive comments related to the MOA; Responses to the comments are reflected in the revised PA, but not individually listed in this spreadsheet.	- Comments addressed in revised PA
Helen Ross	VDOT	Generally speaking the MOA could be written better by consolidating several sections when the same processes are being applied to different properties or sets of properties. Please note some VDOT-specific concerns about Stips I – III, but more generally these three stipulations cause concern because FHWA seems to be deferring consultation on a lot of major issues until later in the design process. The decision to do so may not directly affect VDOT, but it may cause FHWA some problems if you find it hard to reach agreement with the owners of affected properties when this detailed consultation finally occurs.	Comments noted
Helen Ross	VDOT	The VDOT would expect to see at least one more draft for review and comment before being asked to sign. The next draft will be reviewed by VDOT's representative in the Attorney General's Office.	A final draft will be provided.
Helen Ross	VDOT	Whereas # 25 (PHNTC/WR3) The subject of this clause doesn't appear subject to Section 106 so perhaps it should not be included here.	The clause will be kept in order to document PHNTC/W3R's role, clarification has been provided regarding Sec 106
Helen Ross	VDOT	Whereas #26 (VDOT role) Suggest you model the WHEREAS clauses regarding invited signatory and concurring parties off the Mulligan Rd MOA.	The Mulligan Road MOA was one of several formats used to help create the current MOA. For various reasons, certain aspects of the Mulligan Road MOA will not be used as a template.
Helen Ross	VDOT	Stip I.a) Woodlawn Design Workshop: It needs to be understood here and in Stips II and III that roadway design, signage, landscaping, etc. that will be accepted into the state	This language has been adopted. It has been placed in Section VI Continuing Review Process

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir
Summary of Comments and Responses Related to March 27, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting (Distributed May 14, 2012)

Name	Organization	Comment	Response [These are FHWA's responses, and are subject to concurrence by other Signatories to the MOA]
		highways system must meet VDOT's standards and requirements and is subject to VDOT approval.	
Helen Ross	VDOT	Stip I.b) Woodlawn Baptist Church and Cemetery It should be made clear in Items ii through vi below who (FHWA?) is the party responsible for implementing these actions.	The requested clarification has been made.
Helen Ross	VDOT	Stip I.d) Otis Mason House The responsible party needs to be identified: FHWA?	The requested clarification has been made.
Helen Ross	VDOT	Stip II) Woodlawn NHL The responsible party needs to be identified: FHWA?	The requested clarification has been made.
Helen Ross	VDOT	Stip II.c) Vegetative Plantings On Woodlawn property or within highway ROW?	Potentially both, however if in highway ROW, they would be subject to VDOT standards, requirements and approval.
Helen Ross	VDOT	Stip V.a) If there is a reasonable concern about vibration damage, we might suggest that <u>prior</u> to construction the existing levels of ambient vibration at the church, the rate of attenuation of near surface ground vibration waves, and the sensitivity of the structure be assessed as a basis for evaluating the potential for vibration-induced damage and recommending avoidance actions as necessary.	These recommendations have been incorporated.
Helen Ross	VDOT	Stip V.b) Design Workshop (vegetation) On Church property or in highway ROW. If in highway ROW, would be subject to VDOT standards and requirements and approval.	The requested clarification has been made.
Helen Ross	VDOT	Stip VI.A.1 Preservation Standards Suggest you also add standards for the review of documents: FHWA provide 30 days from receipt for review and comment by signatory and consulting or concurring parties; FHWA may assume concurrence if no comments received within 30 days.	The requested change has been made in the "Continuing Review Process" section.

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Summary of Comments and Responses Related to March 27, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting (Distributed May 14, 2012)

Name	Organization	Comment	Response <i>[These are FHWA's responses, and are subject to concurrence by other Signatories to the MOA]</i>
Helen Ross	VDOT	Stip VI.A.1 Isn't this (paragraph 1) redundant to Stip VI.B.1?	Yes, the redundant text has been omitted.
Helen Ross	VDOT	VI.C.4 Curation Standards Change "project" to "Undertaking"	Ok
Helen Ross	VDOT	VI.C.4 Curation Standards If DHR does not object to the County being the repository, VDOT has no objections, but it must be understood that VDOT has no responsibility for the future curation of these collections should the County ever close its facilities. Perhaps the agreement needs to specify that the SHPO (DHR) execute a loan agreement to the County for the collections.	Language ensuring the transfer of materials back to SHPO has been added; if a formal loan agreement is required, please notify FHWA.
Helen Ross	VDOT	VII.B Testing of Archaeological Properties at Woodlawn "The NR eligibility of the sites will be determined..." All sites or just sites within the project APE?	All of the sites documented in the Chicora study will be evaluated. This information will be needed to help avoid impacts to significant sites during the design of mitigation components (utility lines, access roads, vegetation screening, etc.)
Helen Ross	VDOT	VIII.B Change Determination of Effects to "Assessment of Adverse Effects"	This change will be considered.
Helen Ross	VDOT	Stip IX.A Arch Property Treatment Plan Change "avoidance, protection, and/or recovery" to "avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects"	This recommendation will be incorporated.
Helen Ross	VDOT	Stip IX.B When adverse effects to archeological properties cannot be avoided, a Treatment Plan shall provide specific treatment measures that could include, but shall not be limited to.. Perhaps you mean to say "not necessarily be limited to"	This language will be modified.

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir
Summary of Comments and Responses Related to March 27, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting (Distributed May 14, 2012)

Name	Organization	Comment	Response [These are FHWA's responses, and are subject to concurrence by other Signatories to the MOA]
Helen Ross	VDOT	IX.C If effects to archaeological sites are to be avoided, VDOT would prefer that this be accomplished by restricting the proposed right of way to exclude the site. It is difficult for us to monitor and manage archaeological sites in our ROW.	Language expressing this preference has been incorporated.
Helen Ross	VDOT	IX.D. Arch Treatment, Tribal "their artifacts shall be given deference in the Treatment Plan" What does this mean	This language has been modified.
Helen Ross	VDOT	Stip X Suggest you combine Stips VII, VIII, IX, and X into one integrated process for the identification, assessment of effect, and treatment of archaeological historic properties?	The sections have been consolidated to the greatest extent possible, but each section has a unique function.
Helen Ross	VDOT	XIII.D Amendments (dispute) Do you mean an <u>executed</u> amendment?	Yes, language has been clarified
Helen Ross	VDOT	XIII.E (sunset provision) Isn't this covered under Stip XVI.3?	Yes, redundant reference omitted.
Helen Ross	VDOT	XV.A Termination Any agreement other than agreement to proceed under the original MOA would need to result in a formal amendment signed by all signatories.	Yes, language has been modified.
Rebecca Ballo, et al.	Save Woodlawn Stables	FHWA has received numerous comments from individuals associated with the Woodlawn Stables. Each comment was	- No changes to the PA or associated documentation have been made at this

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Summary of Comments and Responses Related to March 27, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting (Distributed May 14, 2012)

Name	Organization	Comment	Response <i>[These are FHWA's responses, and are subject to concurrence by other Signatories to the MOA]</i>
		submitted by people who ascribe a great deal of personal and historic significance to the stables and adjacent pasture land.	time based on the comments received from this organization
Laurie Turkawski and Linda Blank	Fairfax County	<p><u>Comments on FHWA letter stamp-dated April 17, 2012</u></p> <p>Page 2 of 3. Second paragraph regarding FHWA's statement and the county's former request for re-wording on evaluation of the Odd Fellows Hall (029-5691). As raised in the March 2, 2012 county comments, we remain concerned that the evaluation of the Odd Fellows Hall for architecture only and entry into DSS that the property is not NR eligible could result in inaccurate assessment with future projects unless assessment of Criteria A and B at local or state levels is made. Recommend that Odd Fellows Hall (029-5691) be treated the same as the Accotink Methodist Church. Both properties are outside the FHWA recommended APE; county concurs with that and also agrees that FHWA should not be required to conduct further studies. The county believes that the DSS records should reflect: the FHWA recommends that additional studies be done before a determination of eligibility is made for the property.</p>	- FHWA agrees with this comment
Laurie Turkawski and Linda Blank	Fairfax County	<p><u>Comments on FHWA letter stamp-dated April 17, 2012</u></p> <p>Page 2 of 3. Fourth paragraph, 1. Otis T. Mason. Recommend that evaluation for historic significance be completed to determine if the property is individually eligible for the NR. Recommend that until this evaluation is completed, that no recommendation on its individual eligibility be made. If acceptable to VDHR and the Trust, stipulation could be made that evaluation will be done as part of the NR nomination package that FHWA will prepare for the Woodlawn Historic District. OR if individual eligibility for the NR is required at this point, that the evaluation be undertaken.</p>	- The evaluation is included in the Architectural Report; The structure was recommended as contributing to the HD but not individually eligible; FHWA concurs with this recommendation
Laurie Turkawski	Fairfax County	<p><u>Comments on FHWA letter stamp-dated April 17, 2012</u></p> <p>Page 3 of 3. List, 6. Sharpe Stable complex, et al. Please clarify,</p>	- yes

**US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir
Summary of Comments and Responses Related to March 27, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting (Distributed May 14, 2012)**

Name	Organization	Comment	Response <i>[These are FHWA's responses, and are subject to concurrence by other Signatories to the MOA]</i>
and Linda Blank		are the dairy building and corncrib contributing to the district?	
Laurie Turkawski and Linda Blank	Fairfax County	<u>Comments on Attachment 1 APE and Aerials</u> Architectural APE. Direct effects needs to be added to and addressed in the text. The text description needs to be rectified with the visuals on the aerials. It doesn't appear that all the lines of the proposed construction limits are shown on the aerials and the aerials appear to show the architectural APE further than 500' on either side of existing pavement when compared to the proposed construction limits.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The graphic is intended to reflect the narrative description but is for informational purposes only.
Laurie Turkawski and Linda Blank	Fairfax County	<u>Comments on Attachment 1 APE and Aerials</u> Aerials sheets 2, 4 & 5. SWM ponds proposed placement in relationship to NR properties remains of concern. Underground retention needs to be considered. County has consistently provided this comment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is limited flexibility regarding SWM pond locations. - <i>Underground retention is not under consideration due to VDOT requirements.</i>
Laurie Turkawski and Linda Blank	Fairfax County	<u>Comments on Attachment 1 APE and Aerials</u> Aerials sheets 3 & 4. Camp Humphreys Pump station & filter building labeled on the north side of Rt. 1 need to be removed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Will revise on future distributions
Laurie Turkawski and Linda Blank	Fairfax County	<u>Comments on Attachment 2: Properties Recommended as Not Eligible. . .</u> The list includes properties both within and outside the proposed APE. The list includes most of the properties on one side of Backlick Road in Accotink Village, but not on the other side. Please re-title the attachment so it describes what the list includes and make the list all inclusive for what you are trying to show. It is not clear what his list is intended to show.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The list will be revised if any of the inconsistencies identified impact project decisions.
Martha Catlin and	Alexandria Monthly Meeting of the	<u>April 17 SHPO Letter of Eligibility</u> Friends still maintain, as stated twice before in comments (sent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Comment noted

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Summary of Comments and Responses Related to March 27, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting (Distributed May 14, 2012)

Name	Organization	Comment	Response <i>[These are FHWA's responses, and are subject to concurrence by other Signatories to the MOA]</i>
Judy Riggan	Religious Society of Friends	February 9 and February 29) that “the determinations of eligibility [for Accotink properties] are based on inadequate research.” It is illogical and premature to rule out the possibility of a National Register eligible historic district at Accotink, or to rule out the possibility that Accotink historic properties could contribute to the as-yet undefined Woodlawn (or Woodlawn-Accotink) Historic District when it is acknowledged that further study is needed to determine the National Register eligibility of some of the Accotink properties.	
Martha Catlin and Judy Riggan	Alexandria Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends	<p><u>April 17 Attachment 1: Areas of Potential Effect – figures on pp. 4-5</u></p> <p>These maps show two storm water management ponds, one bordering/overlapping the Woodlawn Historic District and one within the Woodlawn Historic District. These features will adversely affect the historic landscape of the WHD. No description or justification for them has been provided to Consulting Parties. Even before seeing these maps, Friends’ comments sent April 12 stated: “Friends would like more information on the indicated SWM areas, in order to comment appropriately.”</p> <p>No evaluation of the historic landscape has been done at this point. Recognition of the historic landscape as a foundational component of the Woodlawn Historic District is necessary if mitigation measures are to be designed to adequately address concerns communicated by Friends and other Consulting Parties, as in our January 26 comments: “The terms of the agreement should ensure that the relationships among the adjacent or closely situated historic properties within the Woodlawn Historic District are re-established in a manner that is sensitive to their historical relationships. It appears that adverse effects of the southern alignment could include loss of integrity of location and setting for some parts of the district.”</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The SWM ponds are justified by State and Federal regulations and the impacts that they will cause to the HD are acknowledged. - The historic landscape has been evaluated and is mentioned in the existing HD and NHL documentation.

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Summary of Comments and Responses Related to March 27, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting (Distributed May 14, 2012)

Name	Organization	Comment	Response <i>[These are FHWA's responses, and are subject to concurrence by other Signatories to the MOA]</i>
		<p>While Stipulation II.a. of the PA proposes design workshops “with the purpose of protecting the historic character of the district,” it does not identify effects to the historic landscape or present a coherent process for addressing them. It certainly does not recognize the significant adverse effects that would result from introduction of two artificially constructed ponds.</p> <p>Friends object to the introduction of these ponds into the historic landscape and the setting of adjacent historic properties. We again ask that the historic landscape be evaluated and effects to it be identified and addressed.</p>	<p>- Comment noted</p> <p>- Comment noted</p>
Martha Catlin and Judy Rigglin	Alexandria Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends	At this time, notwithstanding FHWA’s promise to reflect Friends’ comments in the final version of the report, Friends see no revisions in this Report in response to our earlier (February 9 and February 29) comments. Therefore, we state for a third time that “the determinations of eligibility [for Accotink properties] are based on inadequate research.”	- Additional information was added to the reports based on the Friends comments. See Accotink village section.
Martha Catlin and Judy Rigglin	Alexandria Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends	<p><u>Archaeological Report</u></p> <p>At this time, Friends see no revisions in this Report in response to our earlier (February 29) comments. Therefore, we reiterate our two points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Friends find the information given in Chapter 3, Cultural Overview, to be focused too broadly to suit the project area, making meaningful comment difficult at this stage.” To elaborate, for all periods from the Civil War forward, most of the history deals with Fairfax County and/or Fort Belvoir, not the project area. • “Inaccurate statements are also present, notably the statement on p.30 that our meetinghouse was built in Accotink.” This error now appears on p. 3-21 of the Report. It reads, “. . . the Friends constructed their 	- Comments regarding reports are being forwarded to CCR for consideration

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Summary of Comments and Responses Related to March 27, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting (Distributed May 14, 2012)

Name	Organization	Comment	Response <i>[These are FHWA's responses, and are subject to concurrence by other Signatories to the MOA]</i>
		<p>Meetinghouse (VDHR#029-0172) in 1853 at Accotink” The Meetinghouse was constructed on farmland donated by Chalkley Gillingham, from his holdings at Woodlawn. It is not in Accotink. See the Woodlawn Quaker Meetinghouse NR nomination or Fairfax County Deed records.</p>	
<p>Martha Catlin and Judy Rigglin</p>	<p>Alexandria Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends</p>	<p><u>OTHER: Coordination with other reviews pursuant to 36 CFR 800.3(b)</u> Friends question the sequence of steps being taken to fulfill requirements of Section 106 in relation to other authorities. We see no evidence that FHWA has responded to the request of June 16, 2011 by the Meeting’s Historian to “consult with the Virginia SHPO, Fairfax County, and others, as appropriate, to ensure that the schedule for the Section 106 process takes into consideration, and coordinates with, any related ongoing federal, state, or county review processes.”</p> <p>Even as FHWA states that the Section 106 process is coming to a close in the near future, it still remains unclear what outcomes will result from FHWA’s compliance with NEPA and Section 4(f). Some understanding of how these processes will unfold is important for adequate consideration of effects to historic properties, just as an understanding of the effects to historic properties is necessary for meaningful coordination with the public pursuant to NEPA. FHWA has indicated that its intended course of action is as follows:</p> <p align="center">Information on historic properties and impacts on them will be presented in the EA, which will be made available for review and comment by the public. Section 4(f) is a separate requirement; however, it will utilize much of the information developed through the Section 106 process. A Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation will be included as an appendix to the EA.</p>	<p>- Comment noted; Draft NEPA and 4(f) documents will be available soon; a public meeting is scheduled for June 5, 2012.</p>

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Summary of Comments and Responses Related to March 27, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting (Distributed May 14, 2012)

Name	Organization	Comment	Response <i>[These are FHWA's responses, and are subject to concurrence by other Signatories to the MOA]</i>
		<p>Friends interpret this response as FHWA's intent to defer NEPA and Section 4(f) compliance until after Consulting Parties' participation in the Section 106 process is brought to a close. Such an approach defeats the purpose of coordination and would present a <i>fait accompli</i> to the public via the EA and 4(f) documents. Assigning a tentative status to the Southern Bypass as the proposed preferred alternative, while failing to meaningfully assess the effects of the other alternatives, does not change the fact or appearance of both limiting public input under NEPA and limiting the consideration of alternatives to avoid, minimize, and mitigate adverse effects to historic properties under Section 106.</p> <p>Especially in light of the expedited nature of this Undertaking, and the delays that can be caused by inadequate coordination, Friends have been concerned that potential positive outcomes for historic properties could be compromised. Friends have raised this issue a number of times, most recently in our comments of April 12 (on March 26 meeting) regarding the DRAFT Programmatic Agreement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whereas #1: To our knowledge, FHWA's steps toward meeting NEPA responsibilities have not been advanced to represent the proposed preferred alternative. It is unclear how NEPA and Section 106 and any other authorities that apply to this Undertaking are being coordinated. <p>Friends note that the PA is clearly based upon the Southern Bypass alternative alone. As such, it does not consider the adverse effects to the Woodlawn Quaker Meetinghouse and other historic properties in the event that another alternative is selected as a consequence of public input under NEPA, or the "feasible and prudent" test under Section 4(f). Because of this</p>	

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Summary of Comments and Responses Related to March 27, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting (Distributed May 14, 2012)

Name	Organization	Comment	Response <i>[These are FHWA's responses, and are subject to concurrence by other Signatories to the MOA]</i>
		unresolved issue, and the importance of coordination of all applicable reviews, Friends recommend that further development of the PA be resumed only after adequate progress is made pursuant to NEPA and Section 4(f).	