

APPENDIX J ADDENDUM

This addendum to Appendix J in Volume III of the Final EIS contains comments that the Project Team had previously published in Public Hearing Reports and Report Supplements but did not appear in Appendix J.

A. Draft EIS Comments

Chapter 2 – Alternatives Considered

BRT Under Study in Other Corridors

Public Comment: I want to conclude by saying I just received this bulletin. It came from "Don't Miss the Bus." It came from Metro. On selected high-rise routes, a new type of service called rapid bus is proposed and it could be comparable to rail transit. (0147, 0147-T –10)

Response: *As part of its Regional Bus Study and in alternatives analysis of other corridors in the region, WMATA and other transit agencies have considered bus rapid transit as a mode. Also, the Project Team has acknowledged that BRT systems could carry the same level of demand as rail systems. However, within the Dulles Corridor, BRT could not satisfy the long-term travel demand of the corridor. Therefore, the Project Team recommended and the decision-makers selected the Metrorail Extension with Alignment T6 in Tysons Corner as the Locally Preferred Alternative. BRT was eliminated from further consideration after the public and interagency review and comment on the Draft EIS.*

Miscellaneous Draft EIS Comments

Public Comment: General -- The information presented in a DEIS should be presented in a manner that facilitates review by the public and government officials who might not be all that familiar with transit facility plans and analyses. The presentation of the alignment plans is sadly deficient in information that might be valuable to the reviewer of this document. Information on curve radii (which affects acoustical impacts) and design speeds (which affects operations) should be shown on each of the drawings. To have to go back to pages near the back of the set of the drawings is cumbersome and seems to be designed to discourage a thorough review. One possible accommodation which is incorporated in contract drawings is to use the Reference Drawing Box at the bottom of each sheet to indicate the sheet numbers of the pages where all of the alignment data as well structural, systems, traction power facilities may be found. (0387, 0387-L –20)

Response: *The layout of the General Plans for presenting alignment data was developed to minimize the amount of re-work required during the development and evolution of multiple alignment alternatives. Detailed alignment data (including curve radii and design speeds) will be added to the plans developed during preliminary engineering phase.*

Chapter 4 – Environmental Effects

Local Comment: The first concern is about the impact of 26 additional rail cars at the WMATA Service and Inspection Yard at the West Falls Church Metrorail Station on homes in the Lemon Road community. Rail cars entering and leaving the yard at late night and early morning hours are a source of increased noise, loud horns and squealing brakes. The Project Team has identified this impact, but has not specifically proposed any mitigation strategies. (0479, 0479-L –10)

Response: *With respect to the concerns of communities on the noise of the Metrorail West Falls Church Yard, the Project Team recommended and the decision-makers approved the enclosure of 1) a portion of the existing loop track at the yard's eastern end and 2) the new yard lead in box structures. These noise mitigation measures by the Project will reduce the wheel squeal noise of the train movements within the Yard. The Project Team notes, however, that new residences*

have been recently constructed and occupied adjacent to the West Falls Church S&I Yard without any noise mitigation provided by the residential developer. As during the past ten-year effort to address yard noise, there will be coordination among DRPT, WMATA, Fairfax County officials and staff, and representatives of the communities during preliminary engineering and final design.

The number of additional cars at West Falls Church Yard has increased from 26 in the Draft EIS to 42 in the Supplemental Draft EIS and Final EIS in order to support the Metrorail fleet of the Wiehle Avenue Extension. Wheel squeal from the new yard lead (for Metrorail trains to and from the Dulles Corridor Line) at the east end of the yard was included in the modeling analysis. Based on measured noise levels from the current wheel squeal along a similar radius curve at the yard, exceedances of the FTA impact criteria are predicted at nearby residences. No exceedances are predicted from the Project's aerial guideway in the median of the Dulles Connector Road.

Other sources, such as horns, were not included in the modeling analysis. Brake squeal was not determined to be a major problem. Based on the current operating schedule at the yard, the increase in the overall yard noise due to the cleaning and general operation of 42 additional Metrorail cars needed for the Project is expected to be minimal.

Chapter 6 – Transportation Effects

Local Comment: What about just-in-time riding sharing (works great in Fall Church where I used to live and Dale City for the ability to use HOV lanes - have you planned for that process to happen at the rail stations...are you promoting that to ease congestion??? (0233, 0426-M –21)

Response: *The issues associated with implementing just-in-time ridesharing zones in the Dulles Corridor and the possible benefits of increased HOV were explored as part of the Project Team's review of Dulles Plan B. Neither the Project Team nor VDOT could develop facilities with the express purpose of encouraging just-in-time ridesharing (also known as "slugging" or casual carpooling) because of the tremendous liability risk associated with such activities. While these agencies recognize the benefits that have been gained in the I-95/I-395 corridor through this informal ridesharing arrangement, the random pairing of drivers and passengers inherent in this form of commuting presents risks that most public agencies are not prepared to assume.*

Public Comment: The DEIS has listed a specific set of goals for all of the alternatives. By moving the planned parking garage to the Route 772 station, and by doing so create a true terminus station, the following stated goals could be achieved:

1. Goal 1: Improve Transportation Service - Travel time within the corridor and region could be improved. The forecasted LOS at the critical intersection of Route 789 and Route 606 and the Dulles Greenway links clearly illustrate this fact.
2. Goal 2: Increase Transit Ridership - The Route 772 station would capture the traffic from the populations of the massive Moorefield Station project in addition to the aforementioned Ashburn Village, Ashburn Farms, Belmont, Broadlands and Brambleton communities.
3. Goal 3 - Support Future Development - Common planning guidelines define that transit type stations should be integrated into mixed use developments such as the Moorefield Station plan. The current Director of Planning for Loudoun County, Julie Pastor, stated at the July 11th Seminar and Reception at the Center for Innovative Technology that the Route 606 station would be "challenged" because there are no residential opportunities within the Route 606 station area. Future developments would be choked at the development surrounding the Route 606 station with the planned LOS's of F. This would suffocate developments surrounding the Dulles Airport including the AOL Time Warner and MCI WorldCom campuses.
4. Goal 4: Support Environmental Quality - Should the Route 606 station be developed with the 4,000 car parking garage, the overall majority of cars will pass the Route 772 station resulting in increased commuting times, increased commuting costs and increased pollution. (0003, 0003-L –4)

Response: As evaluated in the Supplemental Draft EIS as a revision to the selected LPA and further documented in the Final EIS and final General Plans, the Project Team in cooperation with Loudoun County reconfigured the park-and-ride program in Loudoun County. Route 772 Station increased from no park-and-ride facility to two structures of 3,300 spaces combined. Route 606 Station decreased from 4,750 spaces to 2,750 spaces. Loudoun County arranged with two owner/developers for the location of the two park-and-ride structures at Route 772 Station.

The current station facility plans for the Route 772 Station are designed to integrate the station access points with proposed transit-oriented developments. They also include Kiss & Ride facilities and feeder bus facilities, and would capture a portion of travelers from the station service area and from the transit-oriented developments. Loudoun County recognizes that the Route 772 Station will function as a major intermodal facility for transit bus, shuttle bus, and Metrorail. In fact, WMATA terms the bus-to-rail interface as the heart of the Metrorail system.

As indicated in the General Plans (Final EIS Volume V), construction of the proposed Dulles Greenway overpass is assumed to be carried out by others. Although the Route 772 Station of the revised LPA includes station facilities on both sides of the Dulles Greenway, the Project has determined that transit-related use of this overpass would be limited. Other roadways shown are included in the phased implementation of adjacent developments as approved by Loudoun County. Station access will be the subject of continuing coordination with Loudoun County, property owners, and developers in station area.

The Project Team notes that the morning peak hour for access to the Route 606 Station with its 2,750 park-and-ride spaces will precede any peak traffic for access to adjoining and nearby developments. Based on the evidence of Metrorail system, the park-and-ride facility of Route 606 Station will be full by 7:30 a.m. and more likely earlier. Moreover, the two-hour peak periods of station ingress and egress will have an even distribution of vehicles without a defined surge, at times called the peak of the peak. Therefore, there should be no concerns of traffic congestion due to the Route 606 Station.

Public Comment: The number of Blue Line trains going to D.C. from Rosslyn needs to be decreased to allow better headway on the Orange Line. (0043, 0276-T –5)

Response: Re-routing of one-half of the Blue Line trains along the Yellow Line rather than through Rosslyn has been identified in the WMATA Core Capacity Study and Capital Improvement Plan as a possible means of increasing Orange Line service reliability but not frequency. This Blue Line reconfiguration was incorporated into the Metrorail operating plans used to prepare the Final EIS.

Chapter 8 – Financial Analysis

Public Comment: Financing part of the costs with excess toll revenue is not news. The proposal to start raising the tolls in January 2003 is unwise. If tolls must be raised, they should not be raised until at least ground has been broken to begin the project. In no case should the impression be left that they will go up soon go unchallenged. (0208, 0208-M –6)

Response: As described in Chapter 8 of the Final EIS, the Commonwealth of Virginia will be responsible for 25 percent of the Project's capital costs. For the Wiehle Avenue Extension, the Commonwealth will use revenues from the Virginia Transportation Act of 2000 and Dulles Toll Road revenues. A planned toll increase would raise tolls at the main toll plaza to \$0.75 and at each ramp toll plaza to \$0.50. For the Full LPA, in addition to the two sources of the Wiehle Avenue Extension, the Commonwealth may consider other sources, including future transportation appropriations.

Public Comment: I spoke with Joan DuBois this afternoon and she suggested that I send an email to you to request some more information on the impacts of the Rail and BRT alternatives on several parcels

located near the proposed Tysons West Station. Several of my firm's clients are currently property holders in the Tysons West area and are looking for more information. In particular, I am looking for information on whether or not the following parcels will be condemned:

029-1-001-0018

029-1-001-0022A

029-1-001-0011

In speaking with Joan, she said that parcel 18 was not scheduled for relocation. Am I correct to assume that this means that there will not be a taking on this site should any of the alternatives be chosen? She also said that parcel 22A was listed as having a permanent surface easement, but was not scheduled for business relocation. What does that mean? I also understand that there is the possibility that parcel 11 may be taken depending on the alternative chosen. Which alternatives would result in this? (0296, 0296-E -1)

Response: Parcel 029-1-01-0018 had never been affected by any of the Build Alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIS.

Parcel 029-1-01-0011 had been affected by the BRT/Metrorail Build Alternative of the Draft EIS. However, the Project Team recommended and the decision-makers selected the Metrorail Extension with Alignment T6 in Tysons Corner as the Locally Preferred Alternative. The BRT/Metrorail Alternative was eliminated from further consideration after the public and interagency review and comment on the Draft EIS.

Parcel 029-1-01-0022A had been affected by property requirements of the Tysons West Station facilities as part of the Metrorail Build Alternative of the Draft EIS. However, a May 2004 post-hearing conference addressed options to the Tysons West Station entrance and facilities. The selected option, located between Tyco Road and Spring Hill Road, does not affect Parcel 029-1-01-0022A.

Public Comment: Also, has a timeline for condemnation been established? One of the property owners heard that the condemnation hearings were scheduled to occur before the end of the year. As you can imagine, the property owners that are scheduled for a future taking are interested to learn when this might occur and are concerned about the potential backlash from being listed as a property that will be taken. It can be hard to rent space in a warehouse that is set to be taken in x number of years. (0296, 0296-E -2)

Response: Right-of-way acquisition associated with the Wiehle Avenue Extension is anticipated to begin in early 2006.

B. Supplemental Draft EIS Comments

Suggestions for Alternatives

Chapter 2 – Alternatives Considered

Public Comment: The subsidy requirements of Dulles Rail are so high that it appears that a bus rapid-transit system running over congestion-free high-occupancy toll lanes will provide superior transit options at a fraction of the cost including a mix of local and express service which is not part of the rail proposal. Accordingly, BRT and HOT needs to be explored as an alternative. (0061 0069-9)

Public Comment: The subsidy requirements of Dulles Rail are so high that it appears that a Bus Rapid Transit System running over congestion free Managed Lanes (High Occupancy Toll or High Occupancy Vehicle) will provide superior transit options at a fraction of the cost, including a mix of local and express service. (0061 0117-11)

Public Comment: BRT on HOT/HOV needs to be explored as an alternative in the Environmental Impact Statements prepared for FTA review. Please calculate the fraction of the capacity of a managed lane (busway, HOT, or HOV) that would be required for the forecasted transit mode. Compare and contrast

your calculations with that of existing managed lanes such as Shirley Highway along I-395 and the El Monte Busway (I-10) in Los Angeles. (0061 0117-12)

Public Comment: Bus rapid transit on H-15 (ph) needs to be explored as an alternative. (0061 0136-10)

Public Comment: --[H]eavy rail currently costs \$3 1/2 million per mile per year in annual subsidies. HOT lanes running Bus Rapid Transit should produce a surplus. The two concepts are incompatible, however, due to limitations on the right of way-- an either/or choice. Why is the former being proposed and the latter ignored? (0061 0168-2)

Response: *Your participation in the public hearings and opinion as to which alternatives or alignments you think would best serve the needs of the Dulles Corridor and region are important to the Project Team and were considered by decision-makers in the selection of the Locally Preferred Alternative. The Project Team recommended and the decision-makers selected the Metrorail Extension with Alignment T6 in Tysons Corner as the Locally Preferred Alternative. BRT was eliminated from further consideration after the public and interagency review and comment on the Draft EIS.*

Miscellaneous Supplemental Draft EIS Comments

Chapter 4 – Environmental Effects

Public Comment: While your report on Section 4.7.3 speaks of temporary noise barriers being erected during construction, I would urge that a coordinated agency mitigation effort result in a significant barrier before construction to mitigation not only construction noise, operating noise, but the visual impact all at once. (0036 0062-4)

Response: *Construction-related noise effects are described in Section 4.7.6 of the Final EIS. Related mitigation is described in Section 4.7.7 of the Final EIS. DRPT, the project sponsor, will prepare and implement a mitigation monitoring plan, based on the mitigation commitments in the FTA Record of Decision.*