



County of Fairfax, Virginia

To protect and enrich the quality of life for the people, neighborhoods and diverse communities of Fairfax County

Meeting Notes

Meeting Date: May 14, 2012

Attendees: See below

Name	Organization	Phone	E-mail
Marc Holma	Virginia Dept of Historic Resources	804-482-6090	Marc.holma@dhr.virginia.gov
Jack Van Dop	FHWA – Eastern Federal Lands	703-404-6282	Jack.vandop@dot.gov
Ryan Kimberley	FHWA – Eastern Federal Lands	703-404-6211	ryan.kimberley@dot.gov
Helen Ross	VDOT	540-899-4033	Helen.ross@vdot.virginia.gov
Doug Miller	VDOT	703-259-1793	Douglas.miller@vdot.virginia.gov
Joe Powers	Parsons Brinckerhoff	703-742-5791	powersj@pbworld.com
Christopher Daniel	Fort Belvoir DPW - ENRD	703-806-3759	Christopher.daniel9@mail.mil
Chris Landgraf	Fort Belvoir DPW - MP	703-806-4641	Christopher.landgraf.civ@mail.mil
Patrick McLaughlin	Fort Belvoir DPW – Env & NR Div	703-806-3193	Patrick.mclaughlin@us.army.mil
Elizabeth Merritt	Nat'l Trust for Historic Preservation	202-588-6026	Betsy_merritt@nthp.org
Susan Hellman	Nat'l Trust for Historic Preservation	703-780-4000	susan_hellman@nthp.org
Ross Bradford	Nat'l Trust for Historic Preservation	202-588-6252	ross_bradford@nthp.org
Laura Miller	Fairfax County DOT	703-877-5686	Laura.miller@fairfaxcounty.gov
Andrew Kolaitis	Fairfax County DOT	703-877-5754	Andrew.kolaitis@fairfaxcounty.gov
Jane Rosenbaum	Fairfax County DOT	703-877-5756	Jane.rosenbaum@fairfaxcounty.gov
Pam Rittenhouse	Fairfax County DOT	703-877-5689	Pamela.rittenhouse@fairfaxcounty.gov
Sally Lyons	Fairfax County Historian	703-550-9759	lyonshare@cox.net
Laurie Turkawski	Fairfax County DPZ	703-324-1394	Laurie.turkawski@fairfaxcounty.gov
Linda Cornish Blank	Fairfax County DPZ	703-324-1241	Linda.blank@fairfaxcounty.gov
Travis Hilton	Woodlawn Baptist Church	703-780-3440	hilton_travis@yahoo.com
Martha Catlin	Woodlawn Quaker Meetinghouse	703-799-1652	mccatlin@earthlink.net
Judy Riffin	Woodlawn Quaker Meetinghouse	703-765-3025	riffinjm@verizon.net
Mary Anne Hesch	Inlet Cove Board of Directors	703-781-0869	heschma@cox.net
Brian Russell	Inlet Cove Board of Directors	540-272-2829	brussell@sfmtcinc.com
Peggy Waterman	Inlet Cove	703-781-0301	H20man.tom@gmail.com
Rebecca Ballo	Save Woodlawn Stables	703-228-3812	rmballo@yahoo.com
Shelley Castle	Save Woodlawn Stables	703-568-0188	spottedhorselover@gmail.com

Subject: Environmental Assessment for Route 1 Improvements – Consulting Parties Meeting

Welcome & Introductions – Ryan Kimberley

Kimberley opened the meeting, had participants introduce themselves, and reported that a sign-in sheet was being circulated

Status of Design – Jack Van Dop

Van Dop presented a packet of information distributed at the meeting, including the latest version of the Programmatic Agreement (PA) and attachments. The Project MOA between FHWA, VDOT, the County and the Army is in draft form and is still being worked on.

The PA has been revised to include only the elements selected as the preferred alternative. Flyovers are not included. In the case of both Telegraph Road intersection and Fairfax County Parkway intersection, at-grade improvements are as effective as the flyovers would be.

SWM Comments – there have been several comments about the size and location of stormwater management facilities. They need to be included on the plans at the low points, they must meet today's requirements, and maintenance responsibility needs to be identified. The team continues to work toward minimizing impacts from SWM requirements.

Linda Blank asked about the flyover at the Parkway and Route 1 – Van Dop confirmed it is not necessarily cost effective and that a similar level of service can be achieved with at-grade improvements.

Team has received preliminary information on noise barriers. There are locations where sound walls have been identified as meeting requirements. Meetings will be arranged with individual owners where sound walls are required.

- Betsy Merritt asked when noise walls would be looked at. Van Dop confirmed it will be before the EA is completed
- Question was asked whether barriers affect viewshed studies already done and whether there are natural barriers that can be used instead of man-made barriers. Response was that sound barriers would impact viewsheds, and may not be appropriate within the historic district. Natural earthen barriers can be used for sound abatement, however vegetative barriers are not an accepted measure
- Question was asked about whether there is a decibel level and a cost level that you have to meet. Van Dop confirmed there are thresholds
- Merritt asked when calculating cost benefit, if it's based on visitors or occupants. Trust would like to have the information about thresholds as soon as possible.

Section 106 Agreement (Programmatic Agreement) – Ryan Kimberley

Kimberley said the PA has undergone significant restructuring.

Notable changes to the WHEREAS clauses include:

- Clarified the legal foundation and the role of FHWA with respect to the Potomac Heritage National Scenic Trail
- Changes shown in the letter to the SHPO. FHWA is deferring effect determination on Pohick Episcopal Church and the archaeological deposits on Woodlawn Plantation. For Pohick Church, need sound studies first to be able to determine impacts. For Woodlawn, archaeological deposits are all around the plantation – some may be disturbed during construction of utilities, for example.
- Conditional no adverse effect determination on Old Colchester Road
- Native American and Federal tribes – Catawba wants to be a signatory. Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians doesn't want to sign. United Keetowah Band of Cherokees also deferred. The Tuscarora Nation was also contacted, but no response has been received. Marc Holma suggested the PA should clarify what 'deferred' means. Chris Daniel said on Fort Belvoir actions, Cherokees have previously deferred when they know the Catawba are participating. County Historian said deferred means they want to be notified if remains are found.
- Save Woodlawn Stables has been added as a Consulting Party. They said FHWA invited them to participate, but that Scanlin Farms, Inc. was never invited to participate. SWS stated that it is the responsibility of the Federal Agency in charge of the project. NTHP pointed out that there are several

tenants at Woodlawn Plantation. Van Dop questioned whether other tenants (from Accotink Village) should be invited – Holma said FHWA does not have to invite every tenant in the project area to participate as a consulting party. Stable owner attorney has been in contact with FHWA, the design team and NTHP.

- Whereas clauses address direct impacts, deferring two for determination later.
- There is a revised archaeology report – for sites on Fort Belvoir across from Inlet Cove, the two sites were evaluated and found not eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, but two others were identified as being impacted by the SWM ponds. Now need to go do a bit more work on those. There is other follow on work that needs to be done along Telegraph Road. Around Accotink Village, sites may be under pavement, so more study will be done concurrent with start of construction.
- Need to get Chicora back on board to have them complete the work that was done in 1999 but never sent through the SHPO. That will result in a complete survey of the Trust property.

Stipulations – p. 7.

Woodlawn National Register Eligible Historic District will have several types of mitigation – some for the district, and some for individual properties within the district. There will be design charrettes to work out details on individual properties within six months. Ross Bradford asked if it should be a shorter duration because the project is moving so quickly. Ryan said the Chicora survey would need to be done first to inform the on-site design, so this time is required.

Save Woodlawn Stables asked whether FHWA has plans to bring this to the ARB. SWS added that they find it insufficient that the plans and design charrettes will not be brought to the ARB. SWS noted that Mulligan Road received at least some full ARB involvement, and they maintain the project would benefit from the involvement of the full ARB at a public hearing. Van Dop replied that the federal government is not subject to the ARB. ARB is participating in the project development process as a consulting party.

Merritt said stormwater management should be an issue for the design charrette. Merritt further stated that there should be some focus on the ‘Gateways’ to the historic district.

Martha Catlin said the National Register character of the historic landscape has not been addressed. The landscape component of the historic district should be evaluated. Based on that evaluation, the historic landscape would likely be recognized as a foundational feature of the historic district that should be a primary topic of the design charrette.

SWS stated that in the cover letter to Marc Holma, there is no impact to the Gristmill. What work has been done to study the viewshed as it relates to the Gristmill? Response was that FHWA will coordinate with the County to request a cross-section line of site diagram from the Gristmill perspective.

Trust is not comfortable with the determination that the Pope-Leighey house is not adversely affected. Van Dop responded that the house has been relocated and there is substantial vegetation between the Pope-Leighey house and the road. FHWA does not intend to change their determination, however the Trust has the opportunity to address perceived impacts through the design charrette process.

The group discussed Storm Water Management (SWM) at length

- Question was asked whether the viewshed studies address SWM pond. Also asked what factors determine what they will look like and the range of possibilities. Response was that some Low Impact measures that may be available in other applications are not appropriate for VDOT right-of-way. The plans currently show worst case scenarios and the team will work to reduce impacts as design progresses.
- Question was asked by SWS whether renderings had been prepared. Answer was that none had been requested to date. SWS asked if they would be prepared. FHWA responded that they did not intend to.
- On Route 3, VDOT worked with SHPO to prepare a design that was not visually obtrusive through Culpeper County.
- Kimberley stated SWM provides water quality and quantity benefits. It is required
- Question was asked whether the pond would be required under either scenario – widen in place or southern bypass. Team confirmed that SWM would be required in either case
- There was discussion that SWM would need to be increased later to accommodate transit.
- Question was asked, if you were putting houses and building, where would you put the SWM? Response was that, as in Accotink Village, we would have to purchase property to locate it. SWM ponds have to go where the water goes (to low points). A comment was made about the SWM pond across from the Pohick Church. Mary Ann Hesch commented that Inlet Cove does not want their pond increased in size (however, project team has met with Inlet Cove residents and several indicated occasional flooding. The team committed to expand the pond to ensure proper function and discussed that it may take runoff from the road. Team will meet with Inlet Cove to resolve this issue).
- Question was asked if temporary SWM would be permitted in the median. Team responded that the median was reserved for future transit, but that it could be considered
- Blank asked if there is SWM on the south side of Route 1, can it be a farm pond? Response was that team wouldn't want to encourage livestock to use the SWM pond, but it's possible to design for that appearance
- Catlin expressed that, without information about the visual appearance of the SWM ponds, Friends are unable to determine if there would be adverse effects to the Woodlawn Quaker Meetinghouse and the Woodlawn Baptist Church historic property from SWM ponds. Friends may have to accept adverse effects such as a change in the Meetinghouse viewsheds, but depending on what the pond looks like, its introduction into the landscape could be an adverse effect to the setting of the Meetinghouse.

Woodlawn Baptist Church – Cemetery survey has been started. This needs to be completed in advance to be sure we don't impact graves with driveways. There are 179 stones and 177 graves. A few, 20 graves, are in a slightly different spot than the markers. It's all in a searchable database. The data lines up pretty nicely with the stones/markers. The draft report will be available in June. Follow-up Note: The survey included areas outside of the known boundaries of the cemetery, including an area on NTHP property across Rt. 1.

Not all project mitigation is related to Section 106 compliance. Some mitigation is so that properties are still functional (like driveway relocations). Mitigation that is not related to Section 106 is not included in the PA -

separate agreements will be required with the Baptists and NTHP to document other mitigation.

Travis Hilton from Woodlawn Baptist Church said there are lots of loved ones that would be affected by an impact to the cemetery. There are people visiting the graves of their loved ones weekly in the cemetery.

It's important to be sure the conversation and media coverage is fair in the way it represents the current situation.

Otis Mason House – Bradford asked about an uncommon reference and whether it is available. Holma confirmed he has a copy. SWS asked about the statement that the house, after relocation, will be brought to livable condition. SWS also asked whether or not the work to connect Otis Mason to utilities and other work on non-federal land will require county permits. FHWA responded that non-compliant construction will not be upgraded (a staircase, for example). Intention is not necessarily to bring it to code, but to make it livable by connecting to sewer, water and electricity. FHWA will determine the appropriate permits that will be obtained.

National Register Nomination for District. HABS-HAER. – Holma said the document should specify to what level the HABS-HAER will be done. Level three is least intensive. Level one is most intensive. Level One is what will be done unless as-built drawings can be located.

Judy Riggin asked about listed and eligible properties in the district and said it makes sense to do all to the same level.

Recommendation was made to include a cultural landscape survey. That led to the question of what period of significance would be used. The request will be considered. A Historic American Landscape Survey (HALS) will be conducted, along with the HABS/HAER of the District and Fort Belvoir Military Railroad.

Blank stated that the Consulting Parties are not doing justice to this project if we don't look at limiting improvements through this district. Is there a way to look at a limited no-build – for example, stop at Belvoir Road and do shoulder improvements between Belvoir and Mount Vernon Memorial Highway. Van Dop noted that options to limit improvements don't meet the purpose & need. Bifurcated section was thought to have a narrower impact footprint, but it does not.

Merritt asked if we know how much traffic will be diverted from Route 1 when Mulligan Road opens. Response was that the information is in the traffic report.

Trust asked to defer the acquisition of the transit corridor as mitigation now. She stated that she had made this request previously and got pushback from the County. Rosenbaum responded that the pushback is because the Comprehensive Plan requires more than what is being provided and because the project is supported by elected officials. There is a Countywide transit study happening now, and transit may come sooner than expected. In any event, it would be unwise not to reserve the right-of-way now.

Hilton stated that the Woodlawn Baptist Church is anxious for something to be done to improve the traffic situation and reduce accidents and fatalities.

Woodlawn Stables representatives noted that it doesn't matter if the process gets messy – need to look at entire range of alternatives and take the long view.

Comment was made that there are a number of roads where lanes are reversible and follow-on question whether that had been considered for this route. Answer was that it had not been considered for this project.

Chris Daniel noted that in June 2011, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) declined to participate. He recommended that team may want to reach out to them to guide the discussion through this last section. Daniel pointed out that this was his personal recommendation and not the official position of the Army. SWS concurred with Daniel's suggestion; however none of the signatories spoke in favor of this recommendation. NOTE: additional clarification about ACHP involvement was submitted to SWS by Jack VanDop on 5/21/12.

Question was asked whether there is a timeline for widening north of Mulligan. This project only moves the bottleneck. Response was that this was the determination of the logical termini for this project and that the available funding doesn't allow for widening north of Mulligan. Rosenbaum noted that widening Route 1 to six lanes has been on the county Comprehensive Plan since the 1970s. We're doing this project now - not because of additional traffic from BRAC - but because of BRAC, we were able to secure funding for the widening.

Question was asked whether it is part of the plan to remove the existing roadbed and give it back to the Trust. Response was that the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) has a process for abandoning roadways. Discussion led to statements that the Stables has an unsafe access now and that using the old roadbed for internal circulation would help clean up safety issues.

Fort Belvoir Military Railroad Bridge – A HAER Level 1 study will be completed and the bridge will be offered up if someone wants to take it and install it elsewhere. There is another MOA for a different project (NMUSA) - the NMUSA agreement has been funded. There has been mention of saving the abutments of the bridge – they will be difficult to remove. Fort Belvoir commented that they are happy with Level 1 surveys but they may provide suggestions for additional mitigation.

Pohick Church – FHWA didn't make a determination of effect for Pohick Church. Need to establish existing condition, do vibration monitoring, address problems caused by the project. VDOT is providing language from the previous work in front of the church for inclusion in this document. Holma indicated he also has language that would be helpful.

FHWA will hold two separate design charrettes – one for the south end and one for the north end.

Execution pages will be separate so they can be executed concurrently.

Susan Hellman asked why the Trust is not a signatory on the agreement. Response was because the Trust doesn't have any obligations under the agreement. NTHP was a signatory on Mulligan Road due to land transfer obligations.

General comment – summary of comments and responses - Page 25 – FHWA received numerous comments – not

enumerated. Save the Stables was concerned about the way their comments were presented. It was unclear how many comments were received, who sent them, and whether they were affiliated with Save the Stables. Kimberley responded that he wanted to capture the general content and nature of the comments for the record, and that his assessment of the comments was reasonable.

Bradford commented that in the duration clause (#23), five years seems too short – make it ten years.

Next Steps – Jack Van Dop and Ryan Kimberley

Please submit comments in the next couple of days. Want to send an electronic version of the PA for a more thorough review in a week or 10 days.

The Environmental Assessment will be released a week or so before the public meeting. Public meeting is June 5. There will be a 30-day review.

Meeting concluded.