



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: January 12, 2012

Attendees: See below.

Name	Organization	Phone	E-mail
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
Lana Lau	FHWA – Eastern Federal Lands	703-404-6314	Lana.lau@dot.gov
Stuart Tyler	Parsons	202-469-6481	Stuart.tyler@parsons.com
Surbhi Ashton	Parsons	202-469-6567	Surbhi.ashton@parsons.com
Joe Powers	Parsons Brinckerhoff	703-742-5791	powersj@pbworld.com
Marsha Kicos	Fort Belvoir DPW - ENRD	703-806-0020	Marcia.g.kicos.civ@mail.mil
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
Travis B. Hilton	Woodlawn Baptist Church	703-780-3440	Hilton_travis@yahoo.com
Russell E. Watts	Woodlawn Baptist Church	703-780-3440	woodlawchurch@vacoxmail.com
Earl Flanagan	Mount Vernon Planning Commissioner	703-780-4709	earlflanagan@verizon.net
Elizabeth Merritt	National Trust for Historic Preservation	202-588-6026	Betsy_merritt@nthp.org
Susan Hellman	National Trust for Historic Preservation	703-780-4000	susan_hellman@nthp.org
Ross Bradford	National Trust for Historic Preservation	202-588-6252	ross_bradford@nthp.org
Mike Albright	Christopher Consultants	703-273-6820	Mike.albright@ccl-eng.com
Laura Miller	Fairfax County Dept of Transportation	703-877-5686	Laura.miller@fairfaxcounty.gov
W. Todd Minnix	Fairfax County Dept of Transportation	703-877-5749	Wesley.minnix@fairfaxcounty.gov
Jane Rosenbaum	Fairfax County Dept of Transportation	703-877-5756	Jane.rosenbaum@fairfaxcounty.gov
Andrew M. Kolaitis	Fairfax County Dept of Transportation – ROW	703-877-5754	Andrew.kolaitis@fairfaxcounty.gov
Christopher Sperling	Fairfax County CRMPB	301-832-7672	christopher.sperling@fairfaxcounty.gov
Laurie Turkawski	Fairfax County Department of Planning and Zoning	703-324-1394	Laurie.turkawski@fairfaxcounty.gov
Linda Cornish Blank	Fairfax County Dept of Zoning	703-324-1241	Linda.blank@fairfaxcounty.gov
Michele Aubry	Fairfax County Architectural Review Board	703-619-5101	mcaubry@aol.com
Sallie Lyons	Fairfax County History Commission	703-550-9759	lyonshare@cox.net
Judy Riggan	Woodlawn Quaker Meetinghouse	703-765-3025	riginjm@verizon.net
Martha Claire Catlin	Woodlawn Quaker Meetinghouse	703-799-1652	mccatlin@earthlink.net
Tom Waterman	Inlet Cove Homeowner's Association	703-625-7555	H2oman.tom@gmail.com
Bryan Russell	Inlet Cove Homeowner's Association	540-272-2829	brussel@sfmtcinc.com

Fairfax County Department of Transportation

4050 Legato Road, Suite 400
 Fairfax, VA 22033-2895
 Phone: (703) 877-5600 TTY: 711
 Fax: (703) 877-5723
www.fairfaxcounty.gov/fcdot



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

Welcome & Introductions

Jack Van Dop opened the meeting with introductions. Next meeting is scheduled for February 9, 2012 at the same location at 1pm.

Update on Design and Alternatives

Ryan Kimberley discussed objective and described the project from west to east, using a work-in-progress map that displayed project information that he said was subject to confirmation. Expand existing footprint to 148' corridor, with some variations at several locations. Telegraph Road has an on-grade and grade-separated option. Plans now include more information on storm water management facilities. At Fairfax County Parkway, there's an on-grade and a grade-separated option. At north end, there's widening in place and the Southern Bypass Alignment.

Update on Historic Property Identification

Team is in the process of obtaining letters verifying which properties are historic. Trying to obtain all documentation from SHPO and Army and confirmation letters from SHPO. Martha Catlin asked if documentation will be made available. Team responded that files are voluminous and that SHPO letters will be made available. If there is specific information requested, FHWA will help groups obtain that information.

Question - Has the Washington Rochambeau Trail been included?

Answer – Yes, along with the Potomac Heritage Trail.

Sites on Army property –

Equestrian Caisson Trail will be moved to the dismissed list – it has been determined to be non-historic. Army will provide documentation confirming this for the record. FHWA will forward that information to SHPO for their concurrence.

Camp AA Humphreys Pump Station (Homeless Shelter) – Road would be widening to the north in this area to have less impact on that resource. A grade-separated interchange would impact this facility, possibly requiring discussion of removal or relocation. In coming weeks we should be able to determine which option will survive (at-grade or interchange), so defer discussion about that until that

decision is made. In either case, maintaining safe and reasonable access to the facility is the main concern.

Question – Is a grade-separated interchange at the Parkway part of the EA?

Answer – Yes, here and at Telegraph Road, both options were presented at the October public meeting and are being evaluated in the EA. Interchanges could be completed as a future phase.

The Southern Bypass Alignment has been developed since last public meeting to avoid/minimize impacts to historic properties at north end of the project.

Railroad Bridge – Was found eligible for National Register. Have not been able to determine alternatives to avoid the bridge – it will probably need to be removed. A similar bridge is located further north on Beulah Road, so an example of the structure would still remain. Also, adjacent military railroad bed will be impacted. Need to do more research into what the specific impacts will be before mitigations can be developed.

Question - Will rationale for demolition be made public?

Answer - Yes, that's part of this EA.

Question - There was discussion about the MOA written for the Army Museum, which proposes some mitigation for the Fort Belvoir Military Railroad. Will this project analysis be combined with the Museum?

Answer – No, each project will do its own analysis and impacts.

There are two sites associated with the Railroad within the Route 1 APE – one for the bridge, one for the bed. Need to address each; however, it is considered one resource with multiple components. Elements of the rail system will have sub-numbers of an overall number for the resource. Mitigation could be discussed in connection with the Museum, but that might require a modification to the existing MOA for the Museum project.

Archaeological Sites – For sites that are ineligible for the National Register, Team will track down documentation and provide SHPO concurrence letters.

Question - Some items listed in the handouts are listed in red text – what is the significance?

Answer – They have been recommended for Phase 2 surveys. Old documentation is inadequate, so Phase 2 surveys will be conducted. They are on the north side of the road and are likely to be impacted under any alternative, so FHWA will go ahead and survey these sites as soon as possible. The other ones will be surveyed as needed, when more details of the design are confirmed. Everything is still subject to confirmation.

Question - Should Team discuss looking at impacts collectively rather than individually - determining the integrity and NRHP eligibility of entire archaeological sites, rather than just the portion within the LOD? Fairfax likes to see sites reviewed as an entire entity because although the portion of the site within the APE may not contain anything that is eligible for the National Register, the remainder of the site may.

Answer - Focus of this Project is to look at the impacts in the APE and FHWA will take their cue from the SHPO on whether additional survey is required. A broader analysis of some sites might be warranted, especially if a determination of ineligibility is made. Army has made previous mitigation commitments in the Museum MOA. Question was also asked about whether this project could fund the Army study for the Fort Belvoir Military Railroad, since they have not been able to secure funding.

Comment - The boundaries of Woodlawn Historic District need to be confirmed. Need enough information to understand what else might be included.

Response – The research being done by this Project will help add to the available information.

Comment – Gray’s Hill was determined to be ineligible. Study wasn’t detailed enough. No one has determined the information about the tunnel.

Response - Team will defer to SHPO for confirmation. DHR is responsible for concurring with or objecting to determinations. FHWA and Army currently believe the existing data is adequate. Entire base was surveyed at Phase I level and there was a Phase 2 survey in the area of the Southern Bypass Alignment. So, there have been two levels of survey. The tunnel, if it exists, should also be outside the APE.

Comment – Team didn’t know about the community house when other surveys were done. When you have more information, it’s valid to go back and do additional investigation. Include documentary research in mitigation. Use terminology “recommended for exclusion”, rather than saying a site is “no longer considered because it’s ineligible”.

Response - Team assumes level of survey is adequate subject to confirmation from SHPO.

Comment – Shift alignment to the south to avoid impact to Inlet Cove, there are no historic sites there.

Response - It is a wetland, so concern there is an impact to natural resources rather than historic resources. There may be an archaeological resource that would be impacted on the south side.

Current map shows points on the map – once limits are determined, the sites may be larger. There’s also a wildlife refuge on that side that is subject to Section 4(f) laws. Note: Project Team is currently analyzing ways to minimize impacts to Inlet Cove.

Comment – The map shown today shows a bigger limit of disturbance than the map shown at Inlet Cove meeting the other night.

Response – The map shown at the Inlet Cove HOA meeting is more current for that area than what

was shown at this meeting.

Comment – Army noted that there are active ranges and contaminated soils on the south side of Route 1 across from Inlet Cove.

Question – Was the new Gunston Road bridge crossing Route 1 constructed wide enough to accommodate the widened roadway?

Answer – It was. The analysis of that bridge project included negotiations that resulted in compressing the County's Comprehensive Plan recommended section of 176' to a narrower 148' section.

Woodlawn Historic District - There will be impacts to the district under either alternative: widening on existing alignment or the Southern Bypass Alignment. Impacts are different depending on which alternative is selected – handouts describe both alternatives.

Question was asked if there is a letter from SHPO determining the limits of the District. Team confirmed that there is confirmation from the 2003 Location Study and more recently with the conveyance of the transfer parcel. Martha requested a copy of that documentation. Team went on to say that this project may result in contributions to the district. This will involve the evaluation of additional resources (stables, barns, Otis Mason House, and NTHP-owned archaeological sites) to determine Historic District eligibility status. Martha requested input into the process and questioned how the limits could be established but additional contributions would be added. Team clarified that additions would be features within the existing boundaries.

Woodlawn Mansion – A National Historic Landmark, has the highest priority. Team will be doing a visualization study that will look at the visual impacts of both alternatives. A comment was made that the viewshed has changed over many years. Team noted the study would look at impacts directly attributable to the project. Comment was made that the field in front of the mansion is now becoming reforested. Trust responded that there is an effort underway to reclaim that as agricultural land. Trees had been planted to screen from previous widening of Route 1. Grist Mill Woods is pretty visible. Primary concerns – access in general is a concern throughout the property. Need to have a separate design charrette to discuss access. This also affects the Baptist Church. Access discussion would include the abandoned piece of Route 1 if the southern alignment is selected. Existing driveway would be extended to new Route 1 if the southern alignment is selected – intersection would be signalized. Woodlawn and the Baptist Church both need to review current land use and access. At the north end, the section will need to match the existing Route 1 section outside the project limits.

Grand View House – widening along the existing alignment will directly impact the Grand View House. Southern Bypass Alignment impacts the Otis Mason house, the relocation of which may be possible. Trust asked if a slight shift further south would result in the ability to save the house. Team explained that there are wetlands immediately to the south of the Southern Bypass Alignment that we want to

avoid, and that moving further south would introduce tighter curves and lower speeds.

Stables – are being evaluated to see if they will be treated as historic resources.

Woodlawn Quaker Meetinghouse – under widen-in-place option – road would be closer to the Meetinghouse. Intersection would be closer to the facility resulting in considerable auditory impacts, and visual impacts as well. Southern Bypass Alignment moves road and intersection farther away. Based on preliminary engineering, road starts to go downhill near the church, which would put it lower than it is now in addition to farther away. Services are generally from 9am-1pm Sunday, first Sunday of the month services are longer – until 3 or 4pm. Wednesday afternoons, there are services from 11-12. There are some afternoon, evening and some unscheduled activities. They use the outside sometimes for picnics, etc.

Woodlawn Baptist Church – Widening existing road in place would require relocation of many graves in the cemetery. Southern Bypass Alignment avoids cemetery. Primary concerns are proximity of the church to the road. Southern Bypass Alignment would be farther away and depressed. Land use patterns will change – access will change. Some property at the southern portion may be impacted that would be offset by additional land for access. Pastor Hilton still concerned with proximity of the road and specifics of access. Need safe and reasonable access and visibility from the road to attract new members and so the community knows they are there.

Question - At the February meeting, will a summary of property impacts by acreage be presented? Need to see overall who's giving up what land.

Answer – Yes, this will be provided, but is subject to change throughout final engineering.

Question – What is the meaning of First Reviewers that appears on the meeting Discussion Points document? Why is Martha Catlin the only person listed individually?

Answer – These are usually the owners of the property. We try to discuss their concerns with them first so that we can understand what they are, before bringing the issues up at these Consulting Parties meetings. It was our previous understanding that Catlin was representing herself for these discussions. Catlin clarified that she is not acting here as an individual, but as one of the representatives for the Woodlawn Quaker Meetinghouse.

Archaeological deposits associated with Otis Mason house are being evaluated.

Pope-Leighey House will not be impacted.

Team will re-survey Southern Bypass Alignment for archaeological resources. The widen-in-place alignment was surveyed for the 2003 Location Study.

Route 1 Corridor – need to document the entire corridor within APE. There is a vestige from the original Route 1. On page 15 of the handouts there's a chart received from VDOT that shows 15 potentially historic culverts that will need to be evaluated. If one is extremely rare, it would get its own number. Otherwise, these will all be sub-elements of the overall resource.

Question – What is the timeline for surveys?

Answer – Still working on this and it depends on who does them, but agree it needs to be soon.

Comment - New storm water management ponds may be needed.

Comment - Still considering whether we have a MOA or a PA. PA will be more appropriate if there are undetermined elements.

Kings Highway, Route 611, and Pohick Church – Route 1 has already been widened through this area. Significant impacts would only be anticipated if the interchange is constructed there.

Potomac National Scenic Heritage Trail and Washington-Rochambeau Trail are included in the study.

Preliminary Discussion of Effects

Some have been discussed here. If there are others, please provide comments in the next two weeks – by January 26. Email to Jack Van Dop will be fine.

Comment - Martha commented about quality of documents and lack of responses to comments. This should be a more cumulative effort. She is frustrated. Not what 106 is supposed to be. Should be looking at this comprehensively.

Response: After the meeting, Martha and Judy Riggan were provided with additional responses to concerns that were not addressed at the meeting. A memorandum regarding the use of quiet pavement was presented. The memo concluded that quiet pavement will not be included. Another memo described changes in traffic on Mount Vernon Memorial Highway which will be used by the Superintendent of GWMP to decide whether or not to participate in the Section 106 process.

Comment – Storm water management is a big concern for Woodlawn. No pond is shown on the current plan. Is there one proposed there? If so, it should be shown.

Comment – A pond is shown where there is a hotel proposed, under review by the county.

Question - Will comments be addressed?

Answer - Comments and meeting minutes will be posted on the website. Team hasn't been formally

responding to comments. Rather, Team has been taking comments into consideration as the document moves forward. Comments will be addressed going forward as necessary.

Proposed Mitigations

Regarding the military railroad, Linda Blank suggested a complete nomination of all the sites so it can be reviewed all together. Marry up this project with the Army Museum. Comment was made that this project could help fund mitigations by the Museum project. Team responded that both projects could not get credit for the same mitigation. Team asked that parties consider mitigations that will help everyone – maybe more comprehensive, than for individual projects. The CP's agreed that this approach would be useful, but FHWA pointed out that existing MOAs must be kept in mind and/or amended as necessary to reflect any changes in mitigation commitments.

Draft MOA –

Comment - Have National Trust be a consulting party.

Answer – This is a first cut – please provide comments. Didn't mean to leave them out – there was no intent to pre-judge. The MOA is expected to be completed by the end of March.