

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Draft Summary of Comments and Responses; January 12, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting

Name	Organization	Comment	FHWA Response
Martha Catlin and Judy Riffin	Alexandria Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends	<p>In re: Correct Legal Names. Please use the following in all future documents: National-Register listed property: Woodlawn Quaker Meetinghouse. Legal name of the owner of the property: Alexandria Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends (Friends).</p>	Comment noted for future use.
Martha Catlin and Judy Riffin	Alexandria Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends	<p>In re: Meeting Materials/Discussion Points Handout. Discussion points handout should be rewritten based on comments received at the meeting and should also specifically include these corrections/additions:</p> <p>Further effort is needed to evaluate the Gray's Hill (Thomas Wright's farm) site and the Woodlawn Community House site. Friends will soon provide documentation to assist further evaluation of the sites, including these: Map of Thomas Wright farm to show Phase II Gray's Hill evaluation done for National Museum of the U.S. Army (NMUSA) did not cover the entire Gray's Hill site. Plat map of the Woodlawn Community House to show that site is likely to be in the area of potential effect for the project (maps provided separately).</p>	<p>Supplementary documentation on Gray's Hill (Thomas Wright's farm) and Woodlawn Community House was received from Riffin January 27, 2012.</p> <p>Additional archaeological work was conducted recently as part of this study to supplement previous surveys and provide full consideration of the Gray's Hill site. One new site or site component was identified, a 20th C. trash deposit, but it is not considered to be significant. (SHPO concurrence pending).</p> <p>The discussion points were used to provide an overview of various resources to the CPs. In the future, this type of information will be found in the Draft Section 106 Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) and the Draft Architectural Survey report.</p>
Martha Catlin and Judy Riffin	Alexandria Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends	<p>In re: Meeting Materials/Discussion Points Handout revision. Clear and documented identification of the Woodlawn Historic District is needed. FHWA should provide documentation evidencing that it has identified a geographic area that constitutes all or part of a Woodlawn HD, and has evaluated the HD for NR eligibility in consultation with the SHPO, and has received the SHPO's concurrence in its determination of NR eligibility.</p>	<p>Documentation is being gathered to confirm the boundaries of the Woodlawn Historic District.</p> <p>FHWA proposes to prepare an updated Woodlawn HD nomination package for consideration by the Virginia Landmarks Register and/or National Register of Historic Places as mitigation.</p>
Martha Catlin and Judy Riffin	Alexandria Monthly Meeting of the Religious	<p>In re: Meeting Materials/Discussion Points Handout revision. The "primary concerns" section under Woodlawn Historic District should be broadened. The concerns given are those of</p>	All consulting parties have been able and will continue to be able to express concerns.

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Draft Summary of Comments and Responses; January 12, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting

Name	Organization	Comment	FHWA Response
	Society of Friends	the National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP, the owners of Woodlawn Plantation), not the District as a whole.	STIPULATION I of the MOA will address Treatment of the National Register-Eligible Woodlawn Historic District, and will include provisions to allow the Friends, and other CPs, to participate in Design Charette(s).
Martha Catlin and Judy Rigglin	Alexandria Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends	In re: Meeting Materials/Discussion Points Handout revision. The Friends' cemetery (44FX1211) should be identified as part of our property.	Future documents will contain the requested reference where appropriate.
Martha Catlin and Judy Rigglin	Alexandria Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends	In re: Meeting Materials/Discussion Points Handout revision. The "significance" statement for Woodlawn Quaker Meetinghouse should be taken from our final National Register Nomination, not the Preliminary Information Form (PIF) review.	Future documents will contain the requested reference where appropriate.
Martha Catlin and Judy Rigglin	Alexandria Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends	In re: Meeting Materials/Discussion Points Handout revision. The "primary concerns" given for Woodlawn Quaker Meetinghouse are not adequate. While Friends agree with those "primary concerns" given, they are incomplete, and they should be expressed in National Register terms so that it is clear that it is the NR characteristics – including our setting as a whole, not just the wooded part – that are worthy of preservation. Also, please add as "primary concerns" that our property be provided safe and sensitively designed access road(s) and preservation of enough visibility from Route One to satisfy the terms of our VDHR historic preservation easement.	<p>Comment noted. Preservation easement document received February 2, 2012. The relevant portion of the easement pertaining to visibility reads as follows: "The parties hereby acknowledge that the Property is visible from U.S. Route I, also known as Richmond Highway, a public right-of-way, and members of the general public may view the Property from said right-of-way.</p> <p>If the Southern Bypass alternative is selected, STIPULATION V of the MOA will contain FHWA's determination of "no adverse effect" and contain provisions to provide safe and context -sensitive access compatible with the meetinghouse setting.</p>
Martha Catlin and Judy Rigglin	Alexandria Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends	In re: Alternatives. <u>Red line "widening" alternative:</u> Friends do not find this design alternative acceptable for the widening of Route One adjacent to our property. As shown in the drawing, at this location all widening occurs to our side of Route One, moving the traffic lanes and right of way to touch one part of our property boundary and to be within feet of its front entrance area and	Concerns acknowledged. A preferred alternative has not been selected at this time. As noted in the comment, the referenced alternative would require an acquisition of land from the meetinghouse property. FHWA recognizes the need to try to avoid such acquisitions.

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Draft Summary of Comments and Responses; January 12, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting

Name	Organization	Comment	FHWA Response
		meetinghouse. The construction limits appear to cross into our property. The threats presented by this design alternative are clear: it would adversely affect the integrity of our history property, the safe ingress-egress of those coming to our property, and our historic practice of silent worship. We also support the objections to such a design as voiced by our neighboring historic properties that will experience serious adverse affects.	
Martha Catlin and Judy Riffin	Alexandria Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends	In re: Alternatives. <u>Yellow line "Southern Bypass" alternative:</u> Friends recognize this alternative may offer many advantages for the historic properties of the Woodlawn Historic District, but ask for careful attention to the concerns voiced about it... Overall, Friends look forward to future presentation of more informative designs of alternative alignments for this portion of the widening through the historic district.	Comment noted.
Martha Catlin and Judy Riffin	Alexandria Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends	In re: Draft MOA. The draft Memorandum of Agreement presents inadequate and conflicting information concerning the project proposal and its effects to historic properties. This very preliminary draft memorandum of agreement lacks adequate information about the affected historic properties, the nature of the undertaking's effects to those properties, and the proposed alternative for the project. Friends and other consulting parties were requested to provide comments on two alternative proposals for the alignment and widening of Route One, yet the draft agreement appears to assume that the southern alignment will be the selected alternative. Consequently, the draft agreement does not provide any "treatment" provisions for protection of the Woodlawn Quaker Meetinghouse, and states that a "no adverse effect" determination could result if the widened highway is relocated farther from the Meetinghouse than the existing highway at its current width and traffic capacity. We support the goal of avoidance of adverse effects to the Meetinghouse.	The Draft MOA presented at the meeting was a preliminary draft, intended to initiate discussions and solicit comments. There was no intent to pre-judge or speculate on any conclusions. The revised MOA will contain preliminary effect determinations and treatment proposals for all alternatives currently under consideration.

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Draft Summary of Comments and Responses; January 12, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting

Name	Organization	Comment	FHWA Response
Martha Catlin and Judy Riffin	Alexandria Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends	<p>However, at this time, such a conclusion would be speculative.</p> <p>In re: Draft MOA. Adverse effects to the Woodlawn Quaker Meetinghouse should be acknowledged. The Route One widening undertaking as a whole will adversely affect the National Register-eligible Woodlawn Historic District and its component historic properties, which include the Meetinghouse as an individually listed National Register property. Because either alternative, as presented, would result in a change to the setting of the Meetinghouse, the proposed undertaking presents the potential for adverse effects to the Meetinghouse property. There is not, at this time, a design and alignment for the approach to the Meetinghouse that can be considered and judged to avoid adverse effects to the Meetinghouse setting. This potential adverse effect should be acknowledged in Whereas clause #11.</p>	<p>Comment noted for future use.</p> <p>A determination of effect will be provided in Stipulation V for the two alternatives under consideration. FHWA currently believes the Southern Bypass would have “no adverse affect” assuming that the provisions in STIPULATION V are followed. If widening of the existing road is selected as the preferred alternative, the adverse affect will be noted in WHEREAS 11 or where appropriate.</p>
Martha Catlin and Judy Riffin	Alexandria Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends	<p>In re: Draft MOA. Adverse effects to the Woodlawn Quaker Meetinghouse should be resolved. Friends appreciate the possibility that noise effects from a relocated highway could be reduced by comparison to widening in place. We also believe that if the southern alignment is selected, it is possible to design the realigned highway and its connection to the Meetinghouse in a manner that would be compatible with the historic open space character of the Meetinghouse setting. The openness of the surrounding landscape to the east and south of the Meetinghouse site is an important historic characteristic that has survived despite changes that have in other ways altered the historic agricultural uses and rural appearance of that open space. Stipulation V of the agreement should incorporate appropriate consultative and mitigative measures to ensure that the character of the Meetinghouse property’s setting is preserved.</p>	<p>Comment noted for future use.</p> <p>STIPULATIONS I and V will include appropriate consultative measures to ensure that the Meetinghouse setting is preserved as much as possible.</p>
Martha Catlin and Judy Riffin	Alexandria Monthly Meeting of the Religious	<p>In re: Draft MOA. Mitigation of adverse effects to the Woodlawn Historic District should address relationships among the component historic</p>	<p>Comment noted for future use.</p> <p>STIPULATION I of the MOA will be modified to</p>

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Draft Summary of Comments and Responses; January 12, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting

Name	Organization	Comment	FHWA Response
	Society of Friends	<p>properties. 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. However, the realignment also presents an opportunity to restore pedestrian access and relationships among other properties, consistent with conditions before increased volume and speed of traffic on Route One created a barrier among the properties. Mitigation should not be limited to piecemeal property-by-property measures. Consultation to address effects beyond the individual properties and affecting the Woodlawn Historic District as an entity should include all Consulting Parties. As currently drafted, Stipulation I, "Treatment for Woodlawn Historic District" appears to include items specific to Woodlawn, and accordingly, limits consultation to the National Trust, as owner of Woodlawn. Those items pertaining to Woodlawn exclusively should be moved to Stipulation II, "Treatment for Woodlawn Plantation" and Stipulation I should be re-crafted to include all Consulting Parties who are stakeholders in the Woodlawn Historic District in a consultation process for aspects of the undertaking that will affect the district as an entity.</p>	<p>address the relationships between the various stakeholders. Appropriate consultative measures, including design charettes, will be stipulated.</p>
Martha Catlin and Judy Riffin	Alexandria Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends	<p>In re: Draft MOA. The Woodlawn Quaker Meetinghouse Preservation Easement should be cited in the agreement. The Meetinghouse property is subject to easement protections administered by the Virginia Board of Historic Resources. Our Preservation Easement should be referenced in the preamble and in the body of the agreement, in Stipulations I and V at a minimum. In addition to issues of compatibility of the project with the historic character of the Meetinghouse setting, the easement's requirement for preserving the protected property's visibility from the public way could also be a factor relevant to the design of a new highway</p>	<p>Preservation Easement received from Riffin February 2, 2012; it will be referenced as appropriate in the MOA. The relevant portion of the easement pertaining to visibility reads as follows: "The parties hereby acknowledge that the Property is visible from U.S. Route 1, also known as Richmond Highway, a public right-of-way, and members of the general public may view the Property from said right-of-way. The preservation easement was placed based on the</p>

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Draft Summary of Comments and Responses; January 12, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting

Name	Organization	Comment	FHWA Response
		alignment. At the time of Friends' easement donation, Fairfax County's plans for widening Route One through Ft. Belvoir, as then proposed, were evaluated by Virginia's easement program and acknowledged as a future condition. However, those plans did not anticipate relocation of the highway	conditions at the time. If the southern bypass is selected the meeting house will still be visible from portions of the public right of way. The easement description could be modified in the future to reflect the most recent site conditions.
Martha Catlin and Judy Rigglin	Alexandria Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends	In re: Draft MOA. The Memorandum of Agreement should provide for involvement of Consulting Parties. The administrative provisions of the draft agreement do not explicitly acknowledge rights of any party other than the agreement's signatories. As written, any of the terms of the agreement could be changed without the knowledge of concurring parties. Friends do not request the rights of a signatory, just the right to be informed of actions pursuant to the final Memorandum of Agreement – including if its terms are voided or changed. Provisions for appropriate involvement of, or notice to, Consulting Parties should be added to Stipulations I, IX, X, XI, and XII.	Comment noted for future use. Provisions for consultation with, or notification of, the Friends and/or other CPs will be included in STIPULATIONS I, V, IX, X, XI, and XII, as appropriate.
Linda Blank	Fairfax County - Department of Planning and Zoning - Heritage Resources Staff	What is the defined APE? Does it cover all project alternatives, including proposed flyovers and bridges? Has typography (sic) been taken into account in defining APE for all project alternatives? (Meeting minutes Nov. 3, 2011, p. 3, bullet 2 indicates typography (sic) may have been taken into account.) Please clarify what is being used and how it was arrived at. The APE should be measured from the edge of the projected pavement, not current pavement. All construction staging areas should be included in the APE.	The defined APE covers all project alternatives, including proposed flyovers and bridges. As described in the Nov 3, 2011 meeting minutes, staging areas are usually not designated at this phase of the study, but the current APE does include much of the area that may be used for staging and access points for construction along the roadway and within the temporary construction easement. A provision will be included in the final agreement that states the need to investigate additional areas if they fall outside of the APE. The APE will be clarified at the February 9, 2012 meeting.
Linda Blank	Fairfax County - Department of Planning and Zoning - Heritage Resources Staff	Are there defined project alternatives and a project extent? The new maps from the January meeting show a red line which does not seem to cover the extent of all project alternatives previously discussed.	Fairfax County's design consultant is preparing defined project alternatives that will be used to assess environmental impacts in the EA. All historic properties located within the areas covered by the project alternatives are being evaluated.

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Draft Summary of Comments and Responses; January 12, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting

Name	Organization	Comment	FHWA Response
Linda Blank	Fairfax County - Department of Planning and Zoning - Heritage Resources Staff	The impact on the Camp Humphreys Pump Station is unclear. The January 2012 maps do not reflect a flyover alternative that would impact the building (red line). In the document titled "Route 1 Improvements...Consulting Parties Meeting Discussion Points 1/12/2012" on page 3 under the heading Primary Concerns, concern for saving the historic resource is not addressed. Preserving the building should be the primary concern stated here.	Revised project alternatives do not impact the Camp Humphreys Pump Station building; however, access to the site may require modifications depending on the final design of the selected alternative, i.e., at-grade or flyover option at the Fairfax County Parkway intersection. The determination of impacts to the site are still ongoing since the design at this location is still evolving.
Linda Blank	Fairfax County - Department of Planning and Zoning - Heritage Resources Staff	The evaluation of Historic Route 1 should be completed prior to the start of any construction so it can be taken into consideration in the project design (see the document "Route 1 Improvements..." page 14, Proposed A/M/M Strategy).	Comment noted for future use. Much of this documentation is included in the Draft Architectural Survey Report; the revised report will include a full consideration of the project area.
Linda Blank	Fairfax County - Department of Planning and Zoning - Heritage Resources Staff	Fort Belvoir Military RR; (document "Route 1 Improvements..." p. 4, heading Primary Concerns, impact to the continuity of the FBMRR adverse effect require mitigation.) Strongly recommend that this multi-component site be looked at in its entirety. Mitigation is for a NR nomination to be prepared that would include all components of this resource—both within and outside the APE so that comprehensive documentation is recorded. For example, NR-eligible components have been identified in the MOA for the Army Museum.	Fort Belvoir has already committed to complete a National Register Nomination of all the components of the FBMRR as a multi-component property; this commitment is a stipulation in the NMUSA MOA. As such, this project will take that commitment into consideration in its mitigation recommendations.
Linda Blank	Fairfax County - Department of Planning and Zoning - Heritage Resources Staff	Agree with point raised by Ms. Martha Catlin at the Jan. 12 meeting that all consulting parties should have access to review and comment on eligibility determination. Is this a requirement of Section 106? Defer to VDHR.	A catalog of documentation and eligibility determinations of historic properties within the APE is being developed and will be made available upon completion. Section 106 regulations provide that input from consulting parties be sought and used as appropriate in identifying and evaluating properties for National Register eligibility.
Linda Blank	Fairfax County - Department of Planning and Zoning - Heritage Resources Staff	Please date all graphics for easy reference and to aide in discussion.	Comment noted for future use.

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Draft Summary of Comments and Responses; January 12, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting

Name	Organization	Comment	FHWA Response
Linda Blank	Fairfax County - Department of Planning and Zoning - Heritage Resources Staff	In re: MOA. Title page should read County of Fairfax, Virginia (in place of county DOT) for consistency with all other recent Section 106 MOAs, i.e. Mulligan Rd.	Comment noted for future use. NOTE: may want to discuss this further; would "County of Fairfax, Virginia" be assumed to include all Fairfax County entities participating as consulting parties (e.g., DOT, Planning and Zoning, Architectural Review Board, and Planning Commission?)
Linda Blank	Fairfax County - Department of Planning and Zoning - Heritage Resources Staff	In re: MOA. What does the highlighting in the MOA draft refer to?	Highlighted sections identify text that is subject to change or is incomplete as of the date of the draft.
Linda Blank	Fairfax County - Department of Planning and Zoning - Heritage Resources Staff	In re: MOA. p. 2, #4: County of Fairfax, Virginia (in place of county DOT) as a signatory for consistency with all other recent Section 106 MOAs, i.e. Mulligan Rd.	Comment noted for future use.
Linda Blank	Fairfax County - Department of Planning and Zoning - Heritage Resources Staff	In re: MOA. p. 2, #4: How does the Project MOA interface with the Section 106 MOA?	The project MOA between FHWA, VDOT, FFXDOT, and the Army, as described in WHEREAS 4, defines the scope of the project and responsibilities, including NHPA and NEPA compliance, for the partners. The Section 106 MOA pertains to resolution of adverse effects pursuant to regulations implementing the NHPA.
Linda Blank	Fairfax County - Department of Planning and Zoning - Heritage Resources Staff	In re: MOA. p. 3-4 #16: The Fairfax County History Commission and Fairfax County Architectural Review Board should be given the option of consulting party status. Eliminate the Historical Society; this is a non-profit organization, not a county entity.	Consulting parties are not limited to government entities and historical societies can be and often are legitimate consulting parties if they choose to participate as such.
Linda Blank	Fairfax County - Department of Planning and Zoning - Heritage Resources Staff	In re: MOA Stipulations. Will a specific design already be chosen before the MOA is completed? It is unclear.	Yes, a specific design will be chosen before the MOA is completed. However, some design details will not be known until later in the design process. Such details may be subject to further review by consulting parties during the final design process.

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Draft Summary of Comments and Responses; January 12, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting

Name	Organization	Comment	FHWA Response
			Specifications for such review will be included in the MOA.
Linda Blank	Fairfax County - Department of Planning and Zoning - Heritage Resources Staff	In re: MOA Stipulations. p. 5-6, If there are different design alternatives proposed, address each design under stipulations for each resource. If a resource is not affected by a design, state it under that design heading. For example: VI. Treatment for Pohick Episcopal Church --Current Alignment with widening: xyz treatment specific to current alignment --Southern Alignment: will not affect resource, not evaluated	Comment noted for future use.
Linda Blank	Fairfax County - Department of Planning and Zoning - Heritage Resources Staff	In re: MOA Stipulations. #I: should read Woodlawn National Register Eligible Historic District. All parties should have access to review and comment on plans; not just the National Trust in this case since this is for the entire district.	Comment noted and incorporated in MOA.
Linda Blank	Fairfax County - Department of Planning and Zoning - Heritage Resources Staff	In re: MOA Stipulations. #II: NTHP plan review since it is their property.	Comment noted.
Ross Bradford	National Trust for Historic Preservation	In re: General Comments. The National Trust requests that the FHWA prepare responses to outstanding comments. To our knowledge, the FHWA has not prepared or distributed responses to any comments from previous consultation meetings, specifically the June 16, 2011 and November 3, 2011 meetings. The FHWA has an obligation to consider and address the comments of the consulting parties in a timely manner.	Most comments generally have been addressed at subsequent meetings. However, formal comment/response summaries have been prepared and will be made available at the Feb. 9 meeting.
Ross Bradford	National Trust for Historic Preservation	In re: General Comments. The National Trust is reviewing the existing alternatives proposed by the FHWA for the widening of Route 1. Currently materials produced by FHWA do not illustrate or describe how storm water management will impact the National Trust's	Preliminary design plans, which include information on stormwater management, utility, and drainage easements, are being prepared and will be completed on or around February 15, 2012 for purposes of assessing environmental impacts in the

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Draft Summary of Comments and Responses; January 12, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting

Name	Organization	Comment	FHWA Response
		property. In addition, the materials also do not depict the range and scope of new or additional utility easements or drainage easements. These issues must be considered by FHWA in its evaluation of impacts and alternatives to minimize harm.	EA. Updated design plans will also be presented at the February 9, 2012 CP meeting.
Ross Bradford	National Trust for Historic Preservation	In re: General Comments. While the National Trust continues to be amenable to exploring the Southern Bypass Alignment option, this option should not be categorized as “mitigation” or as an option that is “beneficial” to the National Trust ... the National Trust does not have enough information to determine whether this option is more beneficial than widening Route 1 along its existing alignment.	Comment noted.
Ross Bradford	National Trust for Historic Preservation	In re: Update on Design and Alternatives. The notes should more accurately reflect that the proposed 148-foot typical section was developed in conjunction with Fort Belvoir as a compromise to the County’s Comprehensive Plan recommendation of a 176-foot typical section.	Comment noted.
Ross Bradford	National Trust for Historic Preservation	In re: Update on Design and Alternatives. It is unclear whether the existing proposed 148-foot typical section meets the obligations of Section 4(f) and Section 110(f) or whether there are ways in which the typical section can be reduced to further minimize harm. The FHWA should consider ways in which the 148-foot typical section could be reduced in size to ensure all possible planning to minimize harm.	A Section 4(f) Evaluation is ongoing. Design modifications are also ongoing, in particular in the area of the Cook Inlet community and the Woodlawn Historic District, in order to identify ways to reduce the cross-section or realign the roadway to further minimize harm. This minimization also applies to Section 110(f) of the NHPA as it relates to minimizing impacts to National Historic Landmarks.
Ross Bradford	National Trust for Historic Preservation	In re: Update on Historic Property Identification. The Southern Bypass Alignment may reduce harm to some historic and cultural resources, but it also may create new or different impacts on other historic and cultural resources. For example, a widening of Route 1’s existing alignment may impact Grand View in the same or similar way that the Otis Mason House may be impacted by the Southern Bypass Alignment.	Comment noted.
Ross Bradford	National Trust for Historic Preservation	In re: Update on Historic Property Identification. The National Trust agrees that the FHWA should look at archaeological sites as a whole in order to determine whether	Comment noted. This methodology will be considered on a case-to-case basis in consultation with SHPO and other

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Draft Summary of Comments and Responses; January 12, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting

Name	Organization	Comment	FHWA Response
		the sites, as a collection, are eligible for listing in the National Register. In addition, as mitigation, FHWA should consider funding a study to look at these sites as a whole in order to ensure that the context of all of these archaeological sites is documented.	signatory and CPs, as appropriate.
Ross Bradford	National Trust for Historic Preservation	In re: Update on Historic Property Identification. The notes are unclear regarding Phase 1 and Phase 2 archaeological work. Phase 1 survey work has been completed on the National Trust's property. Those studies suggest that Phase II work should be completed in certain areas.	A catalog of documentation and eligibility determinations of historic properties within the APE is being developed and will be made available upon completion. Phase II work has been recommended for historic properties within the APE that have been identified as Eligible or Potentially Eligible for the NRHP. SHPO concurrence for the previous Phase I survey on NTHP cannot be located. A draft Phase I archaeological survey report for the study corridor is in preparation and will be provided for review when completed. The previous survey report will be used to help guide and substantiate the findings.
Ross Bradford	National Trust for Historic Preservation	In re: Update on Historic Property Identification. Under the Southern Bypass Alignment, the current right-of-way for Route 1 would be abandoned. It is possible that the existing roadbed might be useful for creating access to different areas of the National Trust's property; however, all options (e.g., right-in/right-out turning lanes off Route 1 and Mulligan Road) should be explored to ensure accessibility within the property.	Comment noted.
Ross Bradford	National Trust for Historic Preservation	In re: Update on Historic Property Identification. The notes indicate that the Pope-Leighey House will not be adversely affected by this project. In general, we believe this is a false assumption. There may be direct visual and auditory impacts to this resource that should be considered further. In addition, the cumulative impacts of this project, together with the Mulligan Road Project, should also be taken into account.	Noise studies will be completed as part of the EA and line-of-site cross sections are currently being prepared in the Woodlawn area to assess visual impacts. Cumulative effects will be evaluated as part of the effect determination.

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Draft Summary of Comments and Responses; January 12, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting

Name	Organization	Comment	FHWA Response
Ross Bradford	National Trust for Historic Preservation	In re: Update on Historic Property Identification. None of the materials provided by FHWA have accurately depicted storm water management issues on the National Trust’s property. In order for the FHWA to adequately evaluate the impact of this project, the storm water management issues must be considered, including potential location and size of retention ponds or other storm water management infrastructure. These issues should also be depicted on materials distributed by FHWA.	Preliminary design plans, which include information on stormwater management, utility, and drainage easements, are being prepared and will be completed on or around February 15, 2012 for purposes of assessing environmental impacts in the EA. Updated design plans will also be presented at the February 9, 2012 CP meeting.
Ross Bradford	National Trust for Historic Preservation	In re: Draft MOA. 16. Whereas. Add the National Trust for Historic Preservation.	Comment noted for future use.
Ross Bradford	National Trust for Historic Preservation	In re: Draft MOA. I. Treatment for Woodlawn Historic District. The first sentence of this section is not correct. Landscaping will not “ensure that the project does not have adverse visual impacts.” Landscaping will not remove or avoid the visual impacts of this project; landscaping can only reduce them. This paragraph should be edited to reflect this point.	Comment noted for future use.
Ross Bradford	National Trust for Historic Preservation	In re: Draft MOA. II. Treatment for Woodlawn Plantation. --Internal access within the property should be added to this section to address accessibility and circulation patterns. --Design charrettes should also be added to look at the overall design of the project through Woodlawn and the Woodlawn Historic District. --A tapered median near Mulligan Road is not a treatment option or “mitigation” since the road would need to be tapered in any event to align with the existing road infrastructure.	Comment noted for future use.
Ross Bradford	National Trust for Historic Preservation	In re: Draft MOA. IV. Treatment for Otis Tufton Mason House. FHWA should consider shifting the Southern Bypass Alignment slightly (as little as 30 feet) away from the Otis Mason House as an additional treatment alternative.	Design modifications to the Southern Bypass Alignment are currently ongoing to minimize impacts to the Otis Tufton Mason House.

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Draft Summary of Comments and Responses; January 12, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting

Name	Organization	Comment	FHWA Response
Ross Bradford	National Trust for Historic Preservation	In re: Draft MOA. X. Dispute Resolution. This section should be edited to provide the National Trust with a process for triggering dispute resolution.	Provisions for consultation with, or notification of, the Friends and/or other CPs will be included in STIPULATIONS I, V, IX, X, XI, and XII, as appropriate.
Ross Bradford	National Trust for Historic Preservation	In re: January 12, 2012 Meeting Materials. The discussion of potential impacts on Woodlawn Plantation (Page 8) is inadequate and should be expanded to include cumulative impacts.	The discussion points were used to provide an overview of various resources to the CPs. In the future, this type of information will be found in the Draft MOA and the Draft Architectural report. Future documentation will be updated as additional information is gathered and recorded.
Ross Bradford	National Trust for Historic Preservation	In re: January 12, 2012 Meeting Materials. The chart labeled "Potential Impacts" (Page 7) is incorrect. The National Trust would not be responsible for buying out any leasehold. The purchase of the leasehold would be the responsibility of the county or state, not the National Trust.	The discussion points were used to provide an overview of various resources to the CPs. In the future, this type of information will be found in the Draft MOA and the Draft Architectural report. Future documentation will be modified accordingly.
Christopher Daniel	US Army Garrison Fort Belvoir	In re: Camp A. A. Humphreys Pump Station; Fort Belvoir Architectural Resources. The oldest structure related to the station was constructed in 1918 not 1936. Please change the date to 1918. The copy of the National Register Nomination should rectify any other discrepancies.	The National Register Nomination will be reviewed to rectify discrepancies.
Christopher Daniel	US Army Garrison Fort Belvoir	In re: Fort Belvoir Military Railroad; Fort Belvoir Architectural Resources. SHPO has also concurred on Track Bed eligibility through the NMUSA MOA. (VDHR# 2003-1374)	Comment noted.
Christopher Daniel	US Army Garrison Fort Belvoir	In re: Fort Belvoir Military Railroad - Bridge 1433; Fort Belvoir Architectural Resources. Has FHWA considered leaving the bridge in place and running one direction of lanes through the existing arch and extending the bridge with an addition and running the remaining lanes under that span? This would allow the bridge to remain in place and be used by Fort Belvoir if the installation chooses to use the structure in the future.	In order to minimize impacts to the surrounding area, FHWA is currently only considering the removal of the railroad bridge. The bridge measures 194 feet and 8 inches in length by 14 feet in width. The existing arch does not provide adequate horizontal clearance. A similar bridge is located farther north on Beulah Road, so an example of the structure would still remain. An existing MOA between VDOT and the ARMY

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Draft Summary of Comments and Responses; January 12, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting

Name	Organization	Comment	FHWA Response
			stipulates that VDOT will provide a design for replacement abutments.
Christopher Daniel	US Army Garrison Fort Belvoir	In re: Fort Belvoir Military Railroad; Fort Belvoir Architectural Resources. It should be noted that Fort Belvoir has committed to complete a National Register Nomination of all the components of the FBMRR as a multiple property list district. This commitment is a stipulation in the NMUSA MOA.	Comment noted.
Christopher Daniel	US Army Garrison Fort Belvoir	In re: Archaeological Site Table; Fort Belvoir Archaeological Sites. Please provide VDHR# for all site determinations on the table. This data should be organized as cleaning (sic) as possible. Categories should include: Site #, Eligibility Status with VDHR Number, Associated Surveys & Reports, Potential Impacts, and Mitigation Options (If Required).	A catalog of documentation and eligibility determinations of historic properties within the APE is being developed and will be made available upon completion.
Christopher Daniel	US Army Garrison Fort Belvoir	In re: Archaeological Site Table; Fort Belvoir Archaeological Sites. Provide VDHR#s for all sites missing them. See comment above.	See response above.
Christopher Daniel	US Army Garrison Fort Belvoir	In re: Archaeological Data Collection; Fort Belvoir Archaeological Sites. It would be prudent to show a record of the data exchanges between Fort Belvoir and FHWA concerning site files, VDHR letter, and field reports.	A record of data exchanges between Fort Belvoir and FHWA is currently being prepared and will be made available upon completion.
Christopher Daniel	US Army Garrison Fort Belvoir	In re: Comment Responses; General. Recommend that FHWA provide consulting parties with record of comment responses. This will help consulting parties understand how their questions are being answered by the agencies. These comments with responses should be released to consulting parties before the next meeting.	Formal comment/response summaries are being prepared and will be made available at the Feb. 9 consulting parties meeting.

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Draft Summary of Comments and Responses; January 12, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting

Name	Organization	Comment	FHWA Response
Christopher Daniel	US Army Garrison Fort Belvoir	In re: Resources Identification; Area of Potential Effect. Recommend that APE be shown on all maps provided with historic properties. Based on conversations during meeting there will be at least two APEs: Land Disturbance and Visual. Both of these APEs should be shown on the property identification maps to help consulting parties understand impacts to historic properties.	The APE will be shown on future maps and discussed further at the February 9, 2012 CP meeting.
Christopher Daniel	US Army Garrison Fort Belvoir	In re: Auditory Effects; Area of Potential Effect. As stated previously, have auditory effects been considered during the construction process and will there be restrictions in the MOA to limit the effects on historic properties when required.	Noise studies are being completed as part of the EA. The results will be used in assessing the auditory effects on historic properties.
Christopher Daniel	US Army Garrison Fort Belvoir	In re: Tribal Consultation; Draft PA. I don't see any record of Tribal Consultation. Please provide documentation that all relevant THPOs have been/will be contacted.	Initial coordination letters were sent to Catawba Indian Nation and the Virginia Council on Indians. These two entities have also been invited to all of the CP meetings. Correspondence with C. Daniel following receipt of this comment confirmed that he was mainly referring to the PA where there didn't seem to be any mention of the parties or their responses. He asked that this omission be corrected in the draft PA.
Christopher Daniel	US Army Garrison Fort Belvoir	In re: Consulting Parties; Draft PA. Where As clauses need to be cleaned up in regards to documentation of parties asked to consult and documentation of their responses.	Comment noted for future use.
Christopher Daniel	US Army Garrison Fort Belvoir	In re: Woodlawn Community House; Architectural Properties. Please provide comments on information submitted by Martha Catlin in regards to Woodlawn Community House. Fort Belvoir will provide all documentation available to assist FHWA in this task.	Additional information on Woodlawn Community House was received January 27, 2012. While the information was useful and interesting in terms of the overall historic context of the area, archaeological investigations have revealed no extant physical remains of the Community House (i.e., there is nothing there that would constitute a "historic property" as defined under Section 106). The approximate location of the building was

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Draft Summary of Comments and Responses; January 12, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting

Name	Organization	Comment	FHWA Response
			estimated from an old aerial photo and was depicted on mapping presented at the last CP meeting. This information will be used as background information for the HD record update in STIPULATION I of the MOA.
Christopher Daniel	US Army Garrison Fort Belvoir	In re: Signature Block; Draft PA. Garrison Commander signature block needs to be updated.	Comment noted for future use.
Christopher Daniel	US Army Garrison Fort Belvoir	In re: Stipulations; Draft PA. Please add stipulations for archaeological site mitigation	Comment noted for future use.
Christopher Daniel	US Army Garrison Fort Belvoir	In re: Culverts, Pipes and Bridges; Miscellaneous Resources. Recommend FHWA contact Fort Belvoir GIS to obtain more information of resources on Belvoir.	All Route 1 stream and bridge crossings were reviewed and historic bridges and culverts were recorded in the APE. Information provided by VDOT served as the starting point, and Fort Belvoir GIS layers (culverts, bridges, inlets, and headwalls) were also reviewed. One culvert not on VDOT's list was recorded (see the project architectural survey report).
Michele C Aubry	Fairfax County Architectural Review Board	In re: General Comments. There is great concern that the Southern Bypass Alternative would cause unacceptable and substantial physical and visual destruction to the terrain, landscape, and character of the Woodlawn Historic Overlay District and the National Historic Landmark itself.	Comment noted.
Michele C Aubry	Fairfax County Architectural Review Board	In re: General Comments. There is concern that the proposed routing of the Southern Bypass Alternative would cut too deeply into the hill south of the Woodlawn Baptist Church and swing too sharply across the Woodlawn Stables. This routing would not only create unsafe driving conditions but also damage historic and archaeological properties and make the stables and fields unusable. One solution would be to create a flatter and more gently swinging alignment by shifting the road south and east. Under this scenario, Route 1 would begin its gentle southwestern swing at	The roadway would be designed and built according to prescribed design standards; therefore, the routing would not create unsafe driving conditions. Design modifications to the Southern Bypass Alignment are currently ongoing and will be presented at the February 9, 2012 CP meeting. The Southern Bypass would not make the stables and fields unusable. On the contrary, the alternative has the potential to restore equestrian access to the

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Draft Summary of Comments and Responses; January 12, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting

Name	Organization	Comment	FHWA Response
		perhaps the eastern end of the proposed storm water management pond east of the IMP Building, cross land presently zoned commercial, intersect with Mount Vernon Memorial Highway at perhaps the northern edge of the Grist Mill Woods development, and cross the southernmost field associated with Woodlawn Stables.	<p>NHL portion of the property and retain access to the stables portions of the property. The southern field would also be accessible, either with an underpass near Otis Mason House, or a driveway off of Mount Vernon Memorial Highway. These circulation patterns are being analyzed by NTHP and FHWA currently.</p> <p>A Bypass alternative similar to the one described here was considered and dismissed due to environmental impacts, engineering infeasibility, and other factors.</p>
Michele C Aubry	Fairfax County Architectural Review Board	<p>In re: General Comments.</p> <p>There is concern that the Widening Alternative would impact the Woodlawn Baptist Church Cemetery (44FX1212). The cemetery contains at least 173 interments including those of the church's founders, John and Rachel Mason (died in 1888 and 1889, respectively). Twenty percent of the burials occurred in the nineteenth century with the earliest in 1873, one year after Otis T. Mason (John and Rachel's son) gave land for construction of the first Baptist church on the site. The cemetery contains six Troth burials and seven Mason burials, both families being important to the history of Woodlawn Plantation, the Friends Meeting House, and the Woodlawn Baptist Church. The preferred treatment policy of the Virginia Department of Historic Resources regarding cemeteries and human burials is preservation in place.</p>	The widen-in-place alternative would require the relocation or reconfiguration of graves in the Woodlawn Baptist Church Cemetery. A grave survey will be conducted to identify grave locations and better assess potential impacts.
Michele C Aubry	Fairfax County Architectural Review Board	<p>In re: General Comments.</p> <p>There is concern that the Southern Bypass Alternative would go through or too close to the Otis T. Mason House and its archaeological deposits (44FX2461). This structure is listed in the Fairfax County Inventory of Historic Sites and is a contributing</p>	Design modifications to the Southern Bypass Alignment are currently ongoing to minimize impacts to the Otis Tufton Mason House and will be presented at the February 9, 2012 CP meeting. The Woodlawn Historic Overlay District is a Fairfax

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Draft Summary of Comments and Responses; January 12, 2012 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting

Name	Organization	Comment	FHWA Response
		<p>property in the Woodlawn Historic Overlay District. Potential adverse impacts to the house could be addressed by shifting the road further to the south. A less desirable mitigation would be relocating the house on the National Trust's property to maintain its wooded setting, if the structure could withstand a move. The archaeological deposits would need to be evaluated and, if found eligible, any adverse effects mitigated.</p>	<p>County zoning entity and is distinct from the Woodlawn Historic District under Section 106.</p>
Michele C Aubry	Fairfax County Architectural Review Board	<p>In re: General Comments. There is concern that the Widening Alternative would go through or too close to the house known as Grand View. This structure is listed in the Fairfax County Inventory of Historic Sites and is a contributing property in the Woodlawn Historic Overlay District. Potential adverse impacts to the house could be addressed by shifting the road further to the south. A less desirable mitigation would be relocating the house on the National Trust's property to maintain its rural setting, if the structure could withstand a move. Archaeological deposits associated with Grand View would need to be identified, documented and evaluated and, if found eligible, any adverse effects mitigated.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
Michele C Aubry	Fairfax County Architectural Review Board	<p>In re: General Comments. Overall, we encourage you to consider alternatives that would avoid or minimize physical damage and visual, atmospheric, and auditory impacts to historic and contributing properties and crucial features of topography and vegetation in the Woodlawn Historic Overlay District. This would include but is not limited to properties listed or eligible for the National Register, the Virginia Landmarks Register, and the Fairfax County Inventory of Historic Sites.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>