

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Draft Summary of Comments and Responses; November 3, 2011 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting

Name	Organization	Comment	FHWA Response
Martha Catlin and Judy Rigglin	Alexandria Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends	<p>In re: Conceptual Design dated October 2011, section five of six.</p> <p>--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 meetinghouse. The construction limits appear to cross into our property.</p> <p>--The threats presented by this design alternative are clear: it would adversely affect the integrity of our historic property, the safe ingress-egress of those coming to our property, and our historic practice of silent worship.</p> <p>--We also support the objections to such a design as voiced by our neighboring historic properties that will experience serious adverse affects.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Conceptual designs are still undergoing modifications. Impacts of the alternatives are being assessed in the ongoing Environmental Assessment (EA). The most recent graphics show 0.002 acres of land acquisition from the property under this alternative. See land take graphic dated 1/30/2012.</p>
Martha Catlin and Judy Rigglin	Alexandria Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends	<p>In re: Alternative Routing design, "Scenic Route".</p> <p>--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 at the November 3 meeting which are not included in the minutes. Those in attendance raised questions about access roads to their properties, about the function of the current path of Route one, about attention to the historic road patterns, about all facets of the alignment design.</p> <p>--Overall, Friends look forward to future presentation of more informative designs of alternative alignments for this portion of the widening through the historic district.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Conceptual designs are still undergoing modifications. Preliminary design plans 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.</p>
Martha Catlin and Judy Rigglin	Alexandria Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends	<p>In re: Current Proposed 148-foot Typical Section:</p> <p>This design does not adequately meet the "need" for safe bicycle facilities and access. Adding two feet for bicycle traffic to a lane already being used for car traffic does not provide a place for a person to ride a bicycle. That is obviously not enough space to accommodate a person on a bike. Given that the car traffic could be traveling at 45 miles an hour, a cyclist's life would clearly be at</p>	<p>Design standards for bicycle facilities (e.g., shared road designation) are being taken into consideration as a part of alternatives development. Further, cyclists could choose to travel on the multi-use path that would be provided adjacent to the roadway as part of the project.</p>

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Draft Summary of Comments and Responses; November 3, 2011 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting

Name	Organization	Comment	FHWA Response
Martha Catlin and Judy Rigglin	Alexandria Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends	<p>risk in such a situation.</p> <p>In re: Graph of Suggested Historic Resources --Gray's Hill/Thomas Wright farm should be evaluated under Archaeological Resources. Judy Rigglin will provide what information she has by separate email, but we note that Susan Hellman, Deputy Director for Woodlawn (NTHP), stated she could show FHWA exactly where the Thomas Wright farm was located. The minutes of the meeting did not record this valuable information. --The Woodlawn Community House should be evaluated under Archaeological Resources.</p>	<p>Susan Hellman provided information on Gray's Hill and Woodlawn Community House on January 4, 2012. Martha Catlin provided information via Judy Rigglin on January 5, 2012. Archaeological surveys conducted as part of this study as well as surveys conducted by the Army revealed no extant physical remains of the Community House. The Army conducted Phase II archaeological investigations at the Thomas Wright farm site (VDHR #44FX1918). The site was found not eligible for the National Register.</p>
Martha Catlin and Judy Rigglin	Alexandria Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends	<p>In re: Meeting Minutes Inaccuracies --Friends find the minutes imprecise in recording what, if any, discussion took place concerning project alternatives. --Under the first bullet, the minutes state a purpose of the meeting was to "discuss project alternatives that have been developed so far." Only one concept was presented in a "developed" format. Its design was not discussed per se. --Under the last heading, "Next Steps," first bullet, the minutes state, "Alternatives that were proposed by Woodlawn Baptist Church to realign Route 1 in that area were reviewed and discussed." This is inaccurate. A version of an alternative alignment in that area as proposed by a representative of Fairfax County was distributed and discussed. Woodlawn Baptist Church representatives expressed strong concerns about the design of such an alternative. --Under "Area of Potential Effect," third bullet, the spelling should be Kicos, not Kikos. --Under "Resolution of Adverse Effect," third bullet, the phrase in the second sentence, "which is created by paving roads with hot mix asphalt," was not stated by Martha Catlin. It should be removed as part of the record of her remarks. (There may be other methods of achieving quiet pavement; see resources</p>	<p>Comments noted. Minutes were revised as appropriate.</p> <p>A memorandum regarding the use of quiet pavement and noise abatement is attached to this comment/response summary. Noise analyses will be conducted as part of the ongoing EA development.</p>

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Draft Summary of Comments and Responses; November 3, 2011 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting

Name	Organization	Comment	FHWA Response
		provided by Catlin in her comments following the first CP meeting.)	
Christopher Daniel	Fort Belvoir DPW - ENRD	In re: Rail Bridge 029-5424 The rail bridge is a contributing resource to the Fort Belvoir Military Railroad (FBMRR). The resource was identified as part of Section 110 2006 Historic Resources Survey (VDHR# 2007-0971) as a part of a multi property listing.	Comment noted.
Christopher Daniel	Fort Belvoir DPW - ENRD	In re: Davison Army Airfield Historic District 029-5623-0009 Resource was determined ineligible for listing by the Keeper of the National Register. Please change listing on table.	Listing has been changed in table.
Christopher Daniel	Fort Belvoir DPW - ENRD	In re: Fort Belvoir Resources All resources associated with Fort Belvoir should not only have their VDHR property numbers but also the Section 106/110 numbers associated with their determinations. This will help with any difficulties concerning eligibility or consultation with the SHPO.	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	Fort Belvoir DPW - ENRD	In re: All Other Pipes, Culverts & Bridges These items need to be identified and cannot be listed in lump. Fort Belvoir can provide facility numbers and ages for any structures located on Belvoir property.	Pipes, culverts, and bridges are identified as Individual structures within the Architectural Report prepared for the project. [C. Daniel later indicated that Fort Belvoir cannot provide facility numbers and ages for the structures.]
Christopher Daniel	Fort Belvoir DPW - ENRD	In re: Grays Hill This should be located in the archaeological resources section listed as 44FX1918. A Phase II Archeological Investigation of 44FX1918 was conducted for the National Museum of the U.S. Army and found the site ineligible for listing in the National Register. VDHR# 2003-1374 Fort Belvoir has copies of the report on file as should VDHR.	The Phase II report and determination letter for 44FX1918 has been obtained and included in the documentation catalog. In order to provide full consideration of the site's integrity, additional survey was performed as part of this project. Survey results are still pending. However, preliminary results suggest that no significant deposits were documented.
Christopher Daniel	Fort Belvoir DPW - ENRD	In re: Alternate Routing Option The historic properties list and APE should be updated to include the road relocation option presented during the last meeting.	The list and APE have been expanded to include the area covered by the "Southern Bypass" Alignment.

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Draft Summary of Comments and Responses; November 3, 2011 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting

Name	Organization	Comment	FHWA Response
Christopher Daniel	Fort Belvoir DPW - ENRD	In re: MOA FHWA should consider a Programmatic Agreement in place of a Memorandum of Agreement due to the complexity of the work, staging requirements, and lay down and construction support area requirements.	Comment noted.
Christopher Daniel	Fort Belvoir DPW - ENRD	In re: Audio APE Has the APE for audible effects related to construction been considered? If so this should be documented and may play credence to the necessity of a PA instead of a MOA.	Comment noted. The APE for architectural resources extends to 500 feet from the existing edge of pavement, plus resources that are visible from the road, and including the boundaries of known historic properties (such as the Woodlawn Historic District). This APE is sufficient to account for potential audible effects from the project. Noise studies are being conducted as part of the ongoing EA.
Christopher Daniel	Fort Belvoir DPW - ENRD	In re: Fort Belvoir Military Railroad The Fort Belvoir Military Railroad (FBMRR) needs to be added to the historic properties list. DHR ID#: 029-5648. The resource was identified as part of the Section 106 for the NMUSA construction.	The FBMRR has been added to the historic properties list.
Christopher Daniel	Fort Belvoir DPW - ENRD	In re: Site 44FX1810 Site was evaluated during Phase I Survey of Fort Belvoir conducted by MAI in 1993 and was determined as eligible for listing on the National Register and a Phase II would be required. The period for this site is the Late Archaic & 20th Century.	Comment noted. Site 44FX1810 is well outside of the archaeology APE for this project.
Christopher Daniel	Fort Belvoir DPW - ENRD	In re: Site Locations I think it would be helpful to designate archeological sites located on Fort Belvoir from those in Fairfax County.	Fort Belvoir sites have been designated in the documentation catalog being prepared for the project.
Christopher Daniel	Fort Belvoir DPW - ENRD	In re: Site 44FX1657 & 44FX1679 Both these sites have been recommended for Phase II studies.	Comment noted. Both sites will undergo additional research as part of this project if they are affected by an alternative. The current alternative that has been developed to avoid Inlet Cove has prioritized the recommended additional studies.
Christopher Daniel		In re: Site 44FX1680 All my records show that Sites 44FX1657 & 44FX1679 were determined potentially eligible in the Improvements to Route 1	Agreed.

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Draft Summary of Comments and Responses; November 3, 2011 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting

Name	Organization	Comment	FHWA Response
		Project C, 2001 Letter from VDHR (2001-0007).	
Christopher Daniel	Fort Belvoir DPW - ENRD	In re: Site 44FX1811 Please provide the Army with records that support the no longer extant condition. Current documentation shows that the site still exists and requires additional study/Phase II.	Documentation for this site is included in the catalog of cultural resources being developed and in the Archeology Report currently in preparation for this project.
Christopher Daniel	Fort Belvoir DPW - ENRD	In re: Site 44FX0627 Site 44FX0627 was identified as ineligible for the National Register as part of the 1993 Phase I Survey of Fort Belvoir, Virginia conducted by MAAR Associates (VDHR# 92-2348-F). What information provided a different determination for this site?	The determination for this site is still that it is ineligible.
Christopher Daniel	Fort Belvoir DPW - ENRD	In re: Site 44FX1936 All my records show that Site 44FX1936 was determined potentially eligible in the Improvements to Route 1 Project C, 2001 Letter from VDHR (2001-0007) and that a Phase II is recommended.	Agreed. However, preliminary results from the surveys conducted for this study indicate that there is no potential for intact deposits and that the site was heavily disturbed due to earthmoving. These findings will be documented in the Archeology Report for the project.
Christopher Daniel	Fort Belvoir DPW - ENRD	In re: Sites 44FX0627, 44FX1936 & 44FX2230 Please contact the Fort Belvoir GIS office to resolve this overlay issue. The DSS data for these sites does not match the locations provided in Fort Belvoir's GIS data.	FHWA will obtain Fort Belvoir's GIS data and will use them for future maps and planning.
Christopher Daniel	Fort Belvoir DPW - ENRD	In re: Site 44FX1937 All my records show that Site 44FX1937 was determined potentially eligible in the Improvements to Route 1 Project C, 2001 Letter from VDHR (2001-0007) and that a Phase II is recommended.	Agreed. However, preliminary results from the surveys conducted for this study are that there is no indication of potential for intact deposits and the site yielded only a few artifacts.
Christopher Daniel	Fort Belvoir DPW - ENRD	In re: Site 44FX1708 As stated with other sites. Please provide determination information with each site.	This site is ineligible. Determination information is included in the documentation catalog currently being developed.
Christopher Daniel	Fort Belvoir DPW - ENRD	In re: Site 44FX1904 Fort Belvoir can confirm this Determination of Ineligibility. SHPO Letter 07DEC09 VDHR File #: 2006-0820.	The determination letter has been obtained and included in the documentation catalog currently being developed.
Christopher Daniel	Fort Belvoir DPW - ENRD	In re: Site 44FX1905 Fort Belvoir can confirm this Determination of Ineligibility. SHPO Letter 01APR11 VDHR File No. 2009-1796.	The determination letter has been obtained and included in the documentation catalog currently being developed.

US Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir

Draft Summary of Comments and Responses; November 3, 2011 Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting

Name	Organization	Comment	FHWA Response
Christopher Daniel	Fort Belvoir DPW - ENRD	In re: Site 44FX1918 Site 44FX1918 should be added as a site within the APE considering the proposed Alternate Routing Option. Fort Belvoir has determined this site is ineligible for the National Register based on a Phase II Archeological Investigation for the National Museum of the U.S. Army.	This site has been added and the Phase II report and determination letter have been obtained and included in the documentation catalog currently being developed.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 9, 2012
TO: File
FROM: Surbhi Ashton, Senior Transportation Planner
SUBJECT: Environmental Assessment for Route 1 Improvements at Fort Belvoir
For Federal Highway Administration Eastern Federal Lands Highway Division
Quiet Pavement Research Summary

cc: 646846-08003

The following is a summary of current Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) policies regarding the use of quiet pavement and their implications for the Route 1 improvements.

FHWA Policy

“... FHWA policy **does not allow the use of pavement type or surface texture as a noise abatement measure**. If policy change is to occur, results of the Quiet Pavement Pilot Programs* (QPPP) and/or additional research must demonstrate the safety and durability of each "quiet pavement," as well as its noise reduction capability. The safety and noise reduction of the pavement must last in perpetuity. **In the short term, any policy change will be State specific, i.e., the change will only apply to a given State DOT(s) for a specified pavement type and/or texture**. If warranted, changes in national policy may be considered in the future. The FHWA will disseminate information regarding QPPP and Tire/Pavement Noise Research as they are developed and as deemed appropriate.

Source: http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/regulations_and_guidance/qpppmem.cfm

*QPPP has been implemented in California, Arizona, Colorado, Kansas, **and Virginia**
<http://www.govtech.com/technology/Quiet-Pavement-Tested-by-State-DOTs.html>

VDOT Policy and QPPP Implementation

- Noise reducing design and quiet pavement should be considered pursuant to Virginia Code in 2009 (see below).
- The code was amended in 2011 to create a QPPP that will determine the effectiveness of quiet pavement on five roads over the next two winters. A summary report will be issued by June 30, 2013. The report will contain recommendations for the future use of quiet pavement.

§ [33.1-223.2:21](#). Noise abatement practices and technologies.

A. Whenever the Commonwealth Transportation Board or the Department plan for or undertake any highway construction or improvement project and such project includes or may include the requirement for the mitigation of traffic noise impacts, first consideration should be given to the use of noise reducing design and low noise pavement materials and techniques in

lieu of construction of noise walls or sound barriers. Vegetative screening, such as the planting of appropriate conifers, in such a design would be utilized to act as a visual screen if visual screening is required.

B. The Department shall expedite the development of quiet pavement technology such that applicable contract solicitations for paving shall include specifications for quiet pavement technology and other sound mitigation alternatives in any case in which sound mitigation is a consideration. To that end, the Department shall construct demonstration projects sufficient in number and scope to assess applicable technologies. The assessment shall include evaluation of the functionality and public safety of these technologies in Virginia's climate and shall be evaluated over two full winters. The Department shall provide an interim report to the Governor and the General Assembly by June 30, 2012, and a final report by June 30, 2013. The report shall include results of demonstration projects in Virginia, results of the use of quiet pavement in other states, a plan for routine implementation of quiet pavement, and any safety, cost, or performance issues that have been identified by the demonstration projects.

Implications for the Route 1 Improvements Project

- Commitments related to the use of quiet pavement cannot be made until the summary report is issued by VDOT in 2013.
- The possible use of Quiet Pavement could be placed into our Memorandum of Agreement or Programmatic Agreement. The use of this technology would depend on the outcome of the report, the issuance of new guidance based on the report, the timing of the design/construction, and other factors.

Other Noise Abatement Measures Approved by FHWA and their Suitability for Route 1

- Noise barrier (wall/berm): could be considered if noise impacts are identified
- Traffic management:
 - Lower speed limit may reduce tire noise slightly
 - Timing traffic light to achieve smoother traffic flow may marginally reduce acceleration, braking, and idling noises
- Alteration of horizontal and vertical alignment: to create a buffer zone; under consideration as the Woodlawn Bypass Realignment Option
- Noise insulation: FHWA has approved the installation of noise insulation on public access buildings, including churches
- Vegetative screening: not effective as noise mitigation unless wide and dense strip of vegetation; however, visual blockage of noise source may psychologically reduce perception of noise
- Privacy fencing: not likely to be effective for noise mitigation unless designed for such (i.e., length and height and materials suitable for reducing noise levels)

Source:

http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/regulations_and_guidance/analysis_and_abatement_guidance/polguide05.cfm