

CC2DCA Public Meeting 3

Tuesday, October 25, 2022 7:00 PM – 8:05 PM (1:05:53)

Nate Graham, Arlington County -

All right. Good evening, everyone. Once again, my name is Nate Graham. I'm a Public Engagement Specialist for transportation projects here with the Department of Environmental Services. And we're going to get today's CC2DCA Fall 2022 Community Meeting underway.

Go ahead to the next slide. All right, very quickly tonight, we're going to cover how things work on this Zoom webinar. Tonight, you will be able to enter questions or comments using the Q&A option on your menu screen. Questions or comments entered during the presentation will be addressed during the comment period (the Q&A) at the end of tonight's session. And then your comments as they are entered in the Q&A will be added to the public record for feedback at this public engagement milestone. And as a reminder to folks, this public engagement opportunity is open through November 6, 2022 using the online feedback form, as well as via email to info@cc2dca.us. And I'd also like to encourage everyone to make sure they are signed up for Pentagon City-Crystal City transportation update emails to be notified of future public engagement opportunities, meetings and events like this one.

Before we begin in earnest, I'd like to briefly describe how this meeting is going to work. We'll start with a brief presentation to give you an overview of the work the study team has done since the last public engagement period this past January. This presentation is not intended to repeat or replace the detailed information that's currently available online using the online feedback form and the other resources posted to the project page. Which we've hope you've at least had some time to look at. If not, you have until November 6th, as mentioned previously, to review those materials and provide your input on this phase of the project. The major part of this meeting will be dedicated to the live Question and Answer session and comment session at the end. You may enter your questions or comments at any time using the live event Q&A. Tonight we also have interpretation available in Spanish and Mandarin Chinese. So, you may enter questions in either of those languages if you prefer. Our interpreters will translate the question for the study team. We will respond and then they will translate the response back into the original language.

Spanish Interpreter -

(In Spanish) After a brief presentation, the meeting will be dedicated to a live Question/Answer and comment session. You may enter your questions or comments at any time into the Live Event Q&A box. The project team will respond to your questions as they are entered. You may enter questions in Spanish or Chinese if you prefer. We will translate the question for the study team, then we'll translate the response. Thank you.

Mandarin Interpreter -

(In Mandarin) After a brief presentation, the meeting will be dedicated to a live Question/Answer and comment session. You may enter your questions or comments at any time into the Live Event Q&A

box. The project team will respond to your questions as they are entered. You may enter questions in Spanish or Chinese if you prefer. We will translate the question for the study team, then we'll translate the response. Thank you.

[Nate Graham, Arlington County](#) -

All right, so this evening, I'm joined by our County Project Manager Kyle Kling; our colleagues from the VDOT Richmond office in their environmental study program, Angel Reed is with us; and our consultant team from VHB including the Laurent Cartayrade, Drew Morrison and Sonali Soneji. So tonight's agenda, before we get into the substantive portion of the meeting, we will cover the purpose and need and concept development and screening in a brief recap of the previous phases of this NEPA study. We will go over briefly the range of alternatives that have been considered through this study process. We'll cover the alignment, structure, and conceptual renderings. We'll highlight the Recommended Preferred Alternative that has been put forth by the study team for consideration at this public engagement. And we'll cover the next steps for this process to conclude the study in the coming months and into 2023. Finally, we'll move on to questions and comments, which will be the substantive portion of today's meeting. So, with that covered, I'm going to hand things over to Drew Morrison from VHB to take us through our agenda.

[Drew Morrison, VHB](#) -

Thanks so much, Nate. And good night, everyone. And so, this is the third time that we're seeking feedback on the study. Back in spring of 2021, we asked for input to help us develop the study's purpose and need. And then last winter, we asked for feedback on the various concepts we developed and the concepts we screened as we worked towards developing a reasonable range of alternatives that met the Purpose and Need. Since then, the study team has identified the alternatives that will be evaluated in the rest of the NEPA process, and has developed conceptual plans and renderings to illustrate those alternatives. VDOT and Arlington County have also identified a Recommended Preferred Alternative based on an evaluation and comparison of benefits, impacts and costs. This presentation will give a brief overview of how we got there.

So, we defined the study's Purpose and Need at the very beginning of the study. It's really the roadmap for the entire process. We presented it to the public last winter during our second public engagement period. And in November 2021, the CC2DCA Study concurring agencies concurred with this Purpose and Need, and those agencies are the US Army Corps of Engineers, the US Environmental Protection Agency and the National Park Service. And the Purpose and Need is the 'why' of a proposed project. The Purpose describes what the project is aiming to achieve. The Need explains what issues the project is intended to address. And the Purpose and Need for the CC2DCA study was defined in coordination with local, state and federal agencies after reviewing existing conditions, relevant local plans and policies, the potential demand for such a connection, and public input. And so, if we look at the Purpose and Need, we can see, you know, that the fundamental purpose is to enhance connectivity for non-vehicular travel between Crystal City and Washington National Airport, and that the following needs have been identified: supporting active transportation travel choice; facilitating intermodal connectivity; and advancing the goals of local and regional plans. And these Purpose and Need elements come along with the stipulation that any selected build alternative will be designed and

implemented in a context-sensitive manner, especially with consideration to the George Washington Memorial Parkway, a unit of the National Park Service.

And so, with the Purpose and Need in hand, we moved to identify concepts. And, as we explained during the last public engagement period, the study team explored a wide range of concepts that could meet the Purpose and Need. First, we defined a set of 14 potential corridors. Corridors are two dimensional paths along which a potential CC2DCA connection could be built. Using criteria derived from the Purpose and Need, we determined which of those corridors could meet the Purpose and Need, and which couldn't. We found that five of the 14 potential corridors pass that test. They were retained for the next step of the process. Then the team developed a set of 16 potential connection concepts that could be built along the retain corridors, concepts or types of connections, such as a bridge, tunnel, or a hybrid of both. And these concepts were screened using another set of criteria - also coming from the Purpose and Need - to determine which one of these concepts could meet the Purpose and Need. And we found that six of the 16 concepts met those criteria and, therefore, the Purpose and Need. I shall show these concepts on the next slide to remind us of where we were. So, these six concepts are the ones that we shared with you last winter. And you can see that they include bridge, tunnel, and hybrid options for connecting between Crystal City and DCA.

And so, following the conclusion of the concept development and screening process, and after reviewing the comments that we received from the public, from government agencies, and from stakeholders, we continued our planning process according to the steps that are shown here. First, we looked at which of the six retained concepts should be included in a reasonable range of alternatives. Then we checked if the remaining concepts could actually be constructed. And then those two steps took us from six concepts down to two alternatives. And then we compared the two alternatives with respect to benefits, impacts and cost to identify a Recommended Preferred Alternative. The Recommended Preferred Alternative is the alternative that VDOT and Arlington County believe best balances those benefits, those impacts, and those costs.

And so, this slide shows the results of the first two steps that I just mentioned. Because concept 8D - which you can see right in the middle of the screen - was so close to concept 7D, it was not necessary to retain it to have a reasonable range of alternatives. NEPA doesn't require agencies to consider all possible alternatives. But when there's a large number of potential alternatives, only a representative number of the most reasonable examples covering the full range of possible alternatives actually need to be studied.

Then we looked at that constructability analysis, and that showed that alternatives that include a tunnel - 8A, 8B, and 9A - could not be constructed. That is because constructing and using a tunnel requires building an access shaft at each end to take equipment and people in and out of the tunnel, both during construction and afterward. And the analysis showed that for each of those alternatives involving a tunnel, existing and planned infrastructure could not physically accommodate the construction of even a minimally sized shaft at one or both ends of that tunnel. So therefore, those tunnel alternatives - even though they would meet the purpose in need - they were eliminated from further consideration along with 8D. So therefore, only two of the alternatives were retained for further development and evaluation: alternative 7D and 9D, which you can see on the screen here.

So, the next step in the process: Arlington County and VDOT then carried alternative 7D and 9D into conceptual design. The purpose of the conceptual design step was to further define the alternatives in order to determine the limits of disturbance associated with each. These limits of disturbance are the basis for the evaluation of impacts. And during conceptual design, the study team confirmed planning constraints, identified potential structural options, incorporated options for a Mount Vernon Trail link, and developed conceptual renderings and plans. But it's important to remember that the primary purpose of the conceptual design effort is to establish this overall alignment and massing of the proposed connection. The renderings you'll see in a moment are for illustration only, and are not necessarily representative of what a final connection might look like. This is because most of the design elements will be determined at a later stage.

And so, we can look at the alignment of alternative 7D. A reminder that in this alternative, the CC2DCA connection would be a bridge. The bridge would start at the east side of the south entrance to the future VRE Crystal City station in the rail corridor. And Arlington County is coordinating with VRE to ensure a seamless integration of both of these important projects. Alternative 7D will then cross the George Washington Parkway at an angle and connect to level two of the airport's existing terminal two parking garage. Within the parking garage CC2DCA would consist of a dedicated walkway that would lead users to the existing bridge connection from the garage to the terminal.

And so now we can take a little overview of alternative 7D working from west to east. You can see the bridge going over the rail corridor and meeting rail criteria there. You can see an arch bridge connecting over the George Washington Memorial Parkway. And this arch would require a local realignment of the Mount Vernon trail around its east landing area. But we'll note as we'll discuss more that the structure type (you see the arch here) is interchangeable with the other build alternative where we'll show a different structural type. You can see the future condition in the airport and the bridge crossing over current and planned airport roadways.

We've mentioned a little bit about a Mount Vernon Trail link. And here you can see two potential options for a link between the CC2DCA bridge and the Mount Vernon trail in alternative 7D. Option one is longer and would largely sit outside the boundary of the Parkway. You can see the line for the parkway denoted in red. Option two is shorter and would sit entirely within the Parkway. Both of these options also show a local realignment of the Mount Vernon Trail that would be needed to accommodate the arch bridge across the Parkway. Now the drawing show the intersection with the trail as a roundabout for illustrative purposes only. No decision has been made on the type of intersection however, and it could be different from this. For example, it could be a simple T intersection.

And so now having looked at alternative 7D we turn to alternative 9D. Also, a bridge, this connection would start farther south at 2231 Crystal Drive. There would be an entrance similar to what's being planned for the VRE Crystal City station that would be built on the Crystal City side. The CC2DCA bridge would connect to the future Amtrak platform that is currently being planned south of the VRE platform, and then it would continue across the parkway to level three of the terminal two parking garage. Within the parking garage - as with 7D -, alternative 9D would consist of a dedicated walkway that would lead users to the existing bridge connection from the garage to the terminal on level two.

And so here again, we can look at some of the renderings that show, from west to east, how the bridge would connect across. And you can see the covered section over the rail corridor to meet requirements there. You can see a haunched or long span girder system over the Parkway. And then you can see that connection into the airport and the parking garage there.

And again, with 9D we have potential Mount Vernon trail link options. As before, option one is longer, but with largely sit outside of the boundary of the parkway, while option two is more compact, but would sit entirely within the parkway. And as before, the drawing showing the intersection as a roundabout are illustrative. No decision has been made about the type of intersection. That could be different. It could be a T intersection. We want to emphasize an interest in making sure that there's a connection that manages conflicts between the different users.

So, looking at 7D and 9D and based on a review and balancing of benefits impacts and costs, alternative 7D provides a better solution than alternative 9D. You can see this comparison against the different elements shown with the checkmarks here. And the impact of alternative 7D on the Mount Vernon Trail could be avoided by using a girder system across the George Washington Memorial Parkway rather than a structural arch. As I just mentioned, the arch and the girder structural systems are interchangeable between the two alternatives.

Therefore, based on that analysis, and that consideration Arlington County and VDOT have identified alternative 7D with a girder system instead of a structural arch across the parkway as the Preferred Alternative. And you can see in the blue box that long span haunch girder system over the Parkway in the Preferred Alternative. And the benefit of that for the Preferred Alternative is that, in contrast to 7D, there is no need to locally realign the Mount Vernon Trail. And here again you can see some potential connections to the Mount Vernon trail that would link CC2DCA to the trail but don't have that local realignment of the Mount Vernon Trail itself.

So, what comes next in the process? So, it's important to remember that as the NEPA process continues, further impact analysis, as well as agency and public feedback may lead to additional refinements to the preferred alternative that we just reviewed, as that's needed to avoid or minimize impacts. And really, what do the next steps of that process look like? Getting feedback from agencies and the public on the Recommended Preferred Alternative, like we're doing tonight; receiving concurrence from the concurring agencies on the Recommended Preferred Alternative; then completing an environmental assessment to look at those impacts that I just mentioned (and that will be provided for public availability and comment); and identifying potential refinements or modifications to the Preferred Alternative to avoid or minimize impacts that are evaluated and understood as part of the environmental assessment.

So, in terms of engaging further, there are materials available at the project website, www.cc2dca.us, that provide more information about the process and the alternatives. We're actively taking comments using the online feedback form at www.cc2dca.us. And the deadline there is November 6. And in addition to the feedback form, we also have an email: info@cc2dca.us. And we are accepting comments by November 6th to that email address as well. So really important to note that these comments, the feedback we received tonight and through November 6, will really help inform the next

steps and how these alternatives proceed. So, Nate, I think I'll pass over to you now to start the question and comments period.

Nate Graham, Arlington County -

Hello, I'm back. Thank you, Drew, for that very informative walk-through of what has been a going-on three-year process. As a reminder, there's substantially more information about not only this phase of the public engagement, but also the past phases of public engagement, if you would like additional information. I also see in our webinar messaging system that Kyle Kling, our project manager here at the County, has shared a direct link to the online feedback form, which is hosted through Survey Monkey. So, you can find that there within this meeting ecosystem. And I would like to point out that while the chat function is communicating from us to you, the way to share your questions and comments in this meeting is to use the Q&A function, which you can see highlighted here at the bottom of your screen in green. We'd also like to point out that there is an auto-generated closed captioning system that is available in this meeting, simply by pressing the live transcript option for the best approximation of closed-captioning that we can manage through technology. So once again, a reminder this meeting is being recorded. So that it can be shared with folks who are not able to join us at this time period. But with that, we now invite your questions, your comments through the Q&A here.

And we'll start with a question from Gerry, which is, *"Why is the preferred option less costly than the alternative?"* So, Drew, can you talk to us a little bit more about the Recommended Preferred Alternative and how it achieves the difference in cost between the two finalists?

Drew Morrison, VHB -

Yeah, happy to and thanks so much for that question. I think that if we actually go to alternative 9D here, which is not the preferred alternative, that can help us tell some of that story. So, one of the main benefits of alternative 7D is that it ties into the planned south entrance and stair tower of the VRE Crystal City Station project. So that's an ongoing project in planning and design that VRE is pursuing to relocate the station in Crystal City to facilitate additional train travel in the future. Whereas, in alternative 9D, in order to provide that connection to a rail service - and that's one of the fundamental elements of that Purpose and Need: to be able to provide that rail to air connectivity - we have to create that connection, both to Crystal Drive Crystal City itself, which you can see is that blue box on the left side there, as well as provide those connections down to the future Amtrak platform which is farther south here. So, in alternative 7D, one of the major drivers is the ability to leverage that connectivity with an existing planned project and reduce the overall amount of infrastructure that's needed in the area.

Nate Graham, Arlington County -

Thanks, Drew. And again, we invite your questions, comments, and other input at this time in the Q&A segment. But while we are waiting for you to type your thoughtful questions and comments into the Q&A, Drew, why not you and I talk through a little bit more about the concurrence process and the sort of end of the NEPA study. What is that going to look like? We could also hear from Angel here as well, just to help folks set expectations for a process like this, which has been going on for some time.

Drew Morrison, VHB -

Sure, I'm happy to start, Nate and then happy to pass over to Angel from VDOT, who's leading the environmental process. Really, as this slide lays out, our key goals at every step of the process, as we've alluded to, we go out to the public, we seek feedback from the public, from stakeholders, from agencies, to inform our next steps to take a consideration of what issues we should be looking at next. And I think a good example of that in this process is, one of the things we heard last time around was Mount Vernon Trail link; how can we get that connection for that really important north-south pedestrian and bicycle asset to what we hope will be a really important east-west pedestrian and bicycle asset. And that's something that's been developed more as part of this stage of the process.

So, we have this period of getting feedback from a variety of stakeholders, using that to inform you know, what are the impacts? What are the considerations? What can be addressed now? What is something that we're sort of putting in our back pocket for design considerations as things get more detailed, in advance? And then we'll go and ask the agencies to concur with our approach to the Recommended Preferred Alternative and formed by the feedback we've received from them and from the stakeholders that have commented in the process that will proceed us to evaluate the impacts of the alternatives. That's the environmental assessment document, where we look at, you know, what are the impacts both positive and negative of the alternatives. And based on those impacts, what sort of mitigation, minimization efforts to address those impacts might be needed. And you know, as we move through the environmental process that then will set us up for further design to really dive into some of the details of you know, what these alternatives may look and feel like, you know, as the process continues. Angel, is there more that you would add there?

Angel Reed, VDOT-

Sure, I'll just add, maybe, with respect to the next time that we'll come to the public for their feedback, as Drew kind of walked us through how this public engagement period will inform the process and agency concurrence on a Preferred Alternative. Next year, we will look to finalize the environmental assessment, which will be all of the analyses for resource impacts for the two alternatives that were discussed earlier, as well as the Recommended Preferred that was presented. That will all be documented in this environmental assessment in this NEPA document. And we will have that approved for public availability next year, and then look for an additional public engagement opportunity so that the public can be updated on all of that analysis and the results of the study. And then that will allow, as Drew mentioned, for the study to advance to the more detailed design considerations where we might refine or modify the Preferred Alternative to avoid or minimize impacts.

Nate Graham, Arlington County -

Thanks to you both. Really appreciate that. And we've got some thoughtful questions as we shared that information as well. So, we're going to start with Edward, who is asking, "*When is the project scheduled to open? Could you overview the design to construction and opening timeline?*" And I'm actually going to hand this to Kyle. So, Kyle, if you could join us briefly and help walk through the project's medium- and long-term timeline, having just covered the short-term timeline?

Kyle Kling, Arlington County -

Yeah, thanks Nate. Good evening, everybody. I'm Kyle Kling. I'm the project manager for Arlington County. So as Angel and Drew just touched on, we are hopeful to have NEPA wrapped up sometime in

mid to late 2023. Shortly thereafter, we will move ahead with preliminary engineering and design for the project between preliminary engineering and detailed design, we are looking at that process as taking approximately three years. So, from mid 2023, to around, I would say late 2026, will be the engineering phase of the project. At that point in time in late '26 and early '27, we will hopefully begin construction on the project with hopes of having a future connection open by late 2028. That's the schedule that we have laid out in front of us now. And that's the path that we hopefully will take moving forward.

Nate Graham, Arlington County -

Kyle, can I ask you to add a little bit more context to the engineering timeline? Can we talk a little bit more about why it will take three years to do with a design on this?

Kyle Kling, Arlington County-

Absolutely, Nate. So, we're aiming for three years now, simply based off of the amount of coordination that's going to be needed with outside projects or other projects that tie directly into this connection, and those entities who are administering those projects. So just off the top of my head, there are five or six separate projects that will interface with CC2DCA on some level. And so, the stakeholders we need to coordinate with involve VRT, CSX, National Park Service, and then you obviously have MWA and FAA at the airport. So, it is going to be pretty substantial lift in terms of not only coordination, but also integrating our project with those various projects that are ongoing, that are hopefully going to be delivered, you know, in a similar timeline as well.

Nate Graham, Arlington County -

Thanks very much, Kyle, really appreciate that. So, we're going to move on to the next one. We've got a question here from Steve. And I'm going to interpret this a couple different ways, Steve. If you'd like to clarify a little bit more once I get into this, please go ahead and chime in. The question is, *"It may be too early in the process to ask this question, but here goes. With the direct connection to the Mount Vernon Trail, are there any thoughts as to how pedestrian and bicycle traffic will be managed or segregated?"* And I'm choosing to interpret this question as to how that management and balance between pedestrian and bicycle traffic will be achieved on CC2DCA. But we can also chime in and chip in to see if some of the connections between CC2DCA and the Mount Vernon Trail and those intersections might be addressed here as well. Drew, I think I'm going to send this question your way. And we can talk a little bit about the facility itself. And then as you mentioned, with the purely conceptual renderings of a trail roundabout, other basic ideas or thoughts that the project team has had about managing the future connection between CC2DCA and the trail?

Drew Morrison, VHB -

It's an important question and appreciate it, Steve. And Thanks, Nate for speaking to it and broadening it so we can have this important discussion. So, within the connection itself, where we know we want to try to manage that relationship. That's something we heard a lot in earlier phases of public engagement. There are different ways that can be done in terms of separation, whether that's in terms of paint or other materials within the bridge, in terms of physical separation, or there are some times when a connection, you know you're going to have these different types of users but you ultimately conclude not to have any of those types of separations to create an open environment, interior to the bridge. And we've seen those be successful in different contexts in similar types of projects around the

country. So, it's something that we would expect to get more feedback on. As the process continues. It's not something that we have a definitive answer on at this point. But it's definitely something that we welcome continued feedback on, on how best to manage those different types of users, who may have different goals, different speeds, a different familiarity with the area, particularly given that we expect a lot of first-time visitors to Crystal City and DC to make use of the connection.

In terms of the connection to the trail itself. As you saw, we did have these renderings that showed a potential bicycle around about but as we noted, that is really to signal we want to make sure we're paying attention to that connection to manage potential conflicts. There are other locations where similar connections are managed through T intersections. There's also, if folks know where Four Mile Run and the Mount Vernon Trail come together, there are some different approaches to sort of weave different movements in that location. So, things are on the table there nothing definitive. Our overall goal is to try to address this issue raised by this question. And we will welcome feedback from users of the trail, from users of similar infrastructure on some of the things that they see in terms of how to best manage these conflicts and these confluences.

Nate Graham, Arlington County -

Thanks, Drew. And I'm going to come right back to you, so don't go far. We've got another question here, about 7D. And from Jeffrey: *"Alternative 7D collect connects to the VRE platform. but does it also provide for a link to the future Amtrak platform?"* Can we talk more about that interface?

Drew Morrison, VHB -

Yeah, thanks for the question, Jeffrey. So, as you can see, on this slide, you see the blue, that's where 7D is coming in. And then the sort of solid gray, that's the VRE platform. And then you can see the hash the black hashing, that's the future Amtrak platform. And so VRE, and Amtrak are coordinating on the ultimate integration of the project. But in the finished condition, when all of those elements are built, 7D would be able to connect both to the VRE platform, as well as to the Amtrak platform. It's our understanding that when service begins initially, Amtrak may begin from the VRE platform itself, while coordination and construction continue to the south. So that connectivity to Amtrak service is envisioned as part of alternative 7D.

Nate Graham, Arlington County -

Awesome, let's stay right on this screen too, because we're coming back to 7D. as well. A question from Poul. *"Since 7D is skewed over the GW Parkway, it appears to be longer than alternative 9D. What is the difference in length infringing the GW Parkway between the two options?"*

Drew Morrison, VHB -

Sure, thanks for the question. So basically, 7D is about 75 feet longer within the Parkway itself. But the question about Parkway impacts raises an important policy question about how we look at impacts to the Parkway. And it's not just that sort of physical, but it's looking at the user experience. That's an important fundamental piece when looking at any National Park Service Park, is understanding how a project would affect the users of that park themselves understand how the larger historical and visual context would be affected by the project. So, when it comes to potential impacts to the Parkway integration with elements of the parkway, we're trying to look at that holistically in terms of how this

project can fit in, where there are areas of impact and how the overall process can work to integrate and create a project that's context sensitive with the section of the George Washington Memorial Parkway.

Nate Graham, Arlington County -

Thanks very much, Drew. One last quick clarifying question, and this screen is perfect for the upcoming question. *"Does VRE have a timeline yet for its platform expansion?"* Kyle and Drew, I know at least one of you will know the answer to this question. We'll give Drew a break and let Kyle answer.

Kyle Kling, Arlington County -

Yeah, so I do not have specifics. I do know that they are in the back half or the back quarter of their design phase right now. I don't I don't know if Drew has any more specifics, since you may have a little more knowledge on that project. But I would suspect sometime within the next two and a half to three years.

Drew Morrison, VHB -

Yeah, Kyle, I think that's a that's a good summary. The project is moving into final design. And we're going to continue to coordinate with the VRE team to understand timelines and integration of construction timelines and coordination to see how the projects can move forward in a complementary fashion.

Nate Graham, Arlington County -

Fantastic, thanks to both for that. I've got a clarifying comment from Steve who asked the question earlier about balancing users and modes between people walking and people biking. He says, *"Thank you that answer my question,"* So thank you Drew. *"I ride a tandem frequently on the Mount Vernon Trail, and the Gravelly Point area is very dangerous with the mixture of families with strollers, dogs tied to strollers, competitive runners, and high-speed bicycles. I would imagine the same mix of users combined with travelers dragging suitcases can be a real issue with CC2DCA. Appreciate you having this conversation."* Certainly, and it's definitely an important one.

And then finally, I think this is an opportunity for us to talk a little bit more about process. We had a follow up comment from Poul whose question about GW Parkway infringement and the difference in lengths between these two alternatives. He said, *"But you have already chosen 7D. What is the meaning of the Recommended Preferred Alternative? And what? What are we? What are we seeking to do with this public engagement? And a little bit more about some of the environmental assessment steps?"*

Drew Morrison, VHB -

Nate, I'm happy to start and then maybe Angel, if you'd like to speak more to the to the process piece. So, I think very importantly, the language we use in the NEPA context is very specific for a reason. And we have identified, and you can see it here, a Recommended Preferred Alternative. And this is based on looking at the benefits, the costs, the impacts, and we provided that comparison as one element of that overall assessment a few slides ago. Arlington County and VDOT have identified that this is the Preferred Alternative. And this process of going out to the public and the agencies is a next step, in

terms of evaluating and considering that this at this point is the Preferred Alternative. The ultimate selection of the alternative - the determination of, you know, this is the alternative - that happens later in the process, as the environmental assessment and its conclusion of finding of no significant impact comes. So, there's still steps in the process on that front. And as we note here, refinements or modifications to the Preferred Alternative to avoid or minimize impacts, issues of design that will be fundamental to what this alternative ultimately looks and feels like, those things will proceed, as well. So, the policy questions and issues associated with the alternatives will continue to be the subject of comment and coordination with agencies as the process continues. Angel. I don't know if there's anything more you would add there.

Angel Reed, VDOT -

Yeah, maybe just a finer point on what this public engagement period is intended to do and what input we're seeking. So, the Recommended Preferred Alternative, is essentially: we've identified 7D as what we believe should be advanced as the Preferred Alternative. Now, this public engagement period, the input that we receive from the public from the agencies will further inform that recommendation. So we are by no means, you know, endorsing that 7D, as has been presented, is going to be what is selected. As Drew mentioned, that will ultimately be determined when Federal Highways issued their decision on the National Environmental Policy Act process. And the National Park Service would issue their own decision on that same documentation. So, we do, I would say we have made this preliminary determination, this recommendation that this appears to be the Preferred Alternative. But there are several steps left to formalize this Preferred Alternative before we can talk about advancing it further.

Nate Graham, Arlington County -

Thanks, Angel. Thanks, Drew. I think that helps clarify this process a little bit more for everyone. I've got a question for those of you who have been coordinating with the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority. So, Drew, and Kyle, one of you. A question from Gerry here. *"Has the idea of secure bicycle storage at DCA been considered as part of the overall project? What have we heard about the interface between the project and the parking garage? And have there been any considerations about parking things other than vehicles there?"*

Drew Morrison, VHB -

So, Nate - Oh, go ahead, Kyle.

Kyle Kling, Arlington County -

Yeah, sure. I'll take a stab at it. And then you can just piggyback on anything I missed, or if you have anything additional to add. So, from the studies team perspective, that is certainly something that we feel would be a benefit to have at the DCA landing side of any future connection. We have had some conversations with MWAA date, and voiced, you know, in passing, that we believe some type of bike storage within the airport lobby or where this connection ends could be beneficial to this project. So that's something that they're certainly aware of as well. However, just given the level that we're at in terms of NEPA, that's something that will likely get deferred to the design phase for this project. So, no commitment to it yet. We're aware of it and think it would be a great benefit to things, but it's something that will shake out in the design phase in a year or two.

Nate Graham, Arlington County -

Yeah, but it definitely a great question. So, thank you very much for that. One just came in very quickly from Y Norton. *“Will you mention again the funding sources for this project. From an earlier meeting, I recall the federal contribution of 30 million. Is that number the same? Raw materials have significantly increased. Thank you for hosting, presenting and answering questions.”* So, can we talk a little bit more about funding sources, Kyle?

Kyle Kling, Arlington County -

Yeah, so currently, the county has roughly \$38 million allocated to this project. \$9 million of that is federal funds, CMAQ funds to be specific. So, those are what we are using to get us through the NEPA phase.

Nate Graham, Arlington County -

Very quickly, can you define CMAQ please?

Kyle Kling, Arlington County -

CMAQ is Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality. So, they are funds that address reducing things such as vehicle congestion, or really focused on alternative means of transportation, such as transit projects, or bicycle and pedestrian projects, which, you know, this project definitely fits the bill for. So, we have \$9 million dollars in CMAQ funds. We have \$18 million in regional funds through NVTA (Northern Virginia Transportation Authority). So that takes us to roughly \$27 million. And the rest of the funds that we currently have on the books are allocated in the county CIP as local funds. So, through those three main funding sources, that takes us to the total of, you know, around \$38 million for this project.

Nate Graham, Arlington County -

Alright, so that's a little bit more background on funding. And then I think the Recommended Preferred Alternative included cost estimates. Can you cover, just for summary here to close out the topic, the cost estimates for the two alternatives?

Kyle Kling, Arlington County -

Yeah, so for, for alternative 7D, our latest cost estimate is coming in at \$43 million dollars. For 9D, that estimate goes up to \$65 million. And I think, you know, what Drew hit on earlier is the addition of that stair tower to 9D really causes the cost to go up rather significantly between the two alternatives. One thing I'll add is, is those estimates did include a rather significant amount of contingency in them. So, for the time being, we believe that we are within the ballpark to deliver this project on budget, or at least with the funds we have now. But if something arises, you know, we have already begun discussions with other agencies who may be able to support this project in terms of funding if needed.

Nate Graham, Arlington County -

All right. Thanks, Kyle. And thanks for the question. Another question just came in from John. *“Could the need to deconflict movement by mobile and pedestrian users be resolved by simply requiring mobile users to dismount?”* Drew, I think we'll go here. Can we talk about the bicycle or scooter connections versus pedestrian connection within the context of the Purpose and Need and think a little

bit more about how regulating user behavior through design can help us achieve the intent of this project?

Drew Morrison, VHB -

Yeah, I think certainly our goal in terms of being a multi-use connection - and that was, again, to sort of go back to how the process has been informed by the things we heard. In the first round of public feedback, we really asked a question, 'do people want this to be a multi-use connection, in terms of pedestrians, bicyclists, micromobility users?' And we heard strong support for making this for a variety of users. And really, from the comments and the feedback that we've seen and from our work planning these sorts of spaces, that's really a context where people are going to want to be able to ride as far as they can for it to really be a useful connection, particularly if we're capturing people who may be riding to the airport, they have their bags on the back of the bike, and trying to use that that bike to, you know, to get to their destination. So, we would expect that we would have people riding, rolling, and walking on the connection. So, it is a consideration that we'll have to make. There may be spaces when different mixing comes together that might require people when they're coming to the end, you know, to dismount and to find potential places for parking and storage as we were discussing a moment ago, but we really want to try to make it work for the different user base. And so that continued conversation about the ways to deal with the intermingling will continue. But we expect most bicycle and micromobility users will be on that bicycle, on that scooter, when they're on the majority of the connection itself.

Nate Graham, Arlington County -

And to connect with that a little bit more Drew, that is the vision through which design will be undertaken, right? It's not that the idea here is we're just going to throw everybody into the same space and say, "you figure it out". We're going to try and address this goal as stated in the Purpose and Need and this planned use through good design that helps people do what they want to do without making other people, other users in different modes uncomfortable.

Drew Morrison, VHB -

Yeah, so I think that that goes to the sorts of issues that will come to the fore in design and thinking through how do we manage use? How can design, wayfinding, and intuitive information provide a way to manage that? So, we've definitely heard that in this meeting and in previous meetings as an issue that people are paying attention to. And so, I expect, you know, Arlington County will continue to look at that and evaluate that as design continues.

Nate Graham, Arlington County -

Thanks Drew. All right, we have reached the end of our current question queue. So, I will once again invite our attendees to submit further questions, comments for the project team. You have our undivided attention for the near future, at the very least the next six minutes. And we will certainly stay longer if you all have more that you'd like to discuss and you'd like us to discuss. But I want to speak on behalf of the project team here and say we're very grateful for all of the thoughtful questions and for spending a little bit of time with us this evening as we covered this public engagement opportunity in this phase of public involvement in the CC2DCA Study. We have been out in the community as well. We've done a number of pop-up engagement events in support of this meeting and this public

engagement opportunity in locations around Crystal City, Pentagon City, including at the VRE station, the Longbridge Aquatic Center, Gravelly Point Park, which was previously mentioned this evening, and at a number of housing/residential buildings to reach a broad swath of the Crystal City and Pentagon City community. So, we're very grateful for everyone's feedback, be it in person at pop ups, in the comments here today, and via email, and on the online feedback form as well.

Quick question here from Jaime. *"Has a roof been considered over the bridge? It is a long walk to drag bags in the rain."* Let's see. Let's talk a little bit more about roofs. Drew, would you like to weigh in?

Drew Morrison, VHB -

Yeah, so just pulling up 7D as an example. And so, you can see that, in the rail corridor, you can see that that section has a roof. And you can then see in the rest that we don't show a roof. Because of the number of agencies engaged from a landowning perspective, you have the Virginia Passenger Rail Authority will be owning part of the rail corridor; CSX, the existing owner; VRE, the commuter rail; you have National Park Service; you have the Airports Authority; where we've started with, because more design will come, is to start with standards and requirements based on those different contexts. So, within the rail realm, you're required to provide a covering, as you see here, and to have this enclosed space based on rail requirements. So that's what we've shown throughout. We appreciate feedback on elements like roof and other design elements to help inform the process as it moves forward. But right now, what we're showing across the connection is what's required by the different requirements and standards that govern in that piece of this connection. And we appreciate feedback on you know the usefulness, the nature of a roof as the process continues.

Nate Graham, Arlington County -

Thanks, Drew. All right. And that also covers a comment we got from Susan: *"Weather-proofing the portion of the bridge over the Parkway would be helpful for airport travelers."* So, we appreciate your comments. We've added them to the record, and you are not alone in suggesting that. We've heard that at other events as well, so thank you very much for that feedback.

I am going to move on to a comment and follow up question from Steve. Steve says, *"Thank you! 100% spot on about not requiring a dismount. If dismounting, micro scooters or bicycles is required, CC2DCA then becomes nothing more than a pedestrian bridge."* He follows up with a question which is somewhat related to the roof question we just discussed. *"Has there been any discussion about winter treatment or snow removal?"* So, we're getting in into operations here? A number of years down the line. Kyle, could you talk to us a little bit more about operational considerations, such as they exist today?

Kyle Kling, Arlington County -

Yeah, at this point in time, Nate, we really haven't dived into any type of maintenance requirements or treatment options for those elements that are exposed more directly to you know, the elements. As I indicated previously, a lot of the more specifics associated with the structure were really shake out once we're into the design phase of things. So, at this point in time, it's something we're aware of, but not something we've really taken a significant look at.

Nate Graham, Arlington County -

Thanks, Drew. Appreciate it, and it certainly will become a much more important part of the conversation as we get into design, as well. So, thank you, Steve, for that comment.

Poul, I have your comment. I would love to get into a... So, the question here... I think you have a lot of history for us about the GW Parkway, and the nature of the National Park. But I want to, because I think what you're getting at is how this project interfaces with the historic nature of the National Park, and how we intend to integrate this project into it, so I'd like to invite Drew here, just because I think it would be helpful. And certainly, Poul, if you would like to submit full or, pardon me, a full and complete set of your commentary and questions via email shown here on the screen, I think that would be very helpful. But Drew, can we talk a little bit more about what it means to be a concurring agency on a NEPA study like this, and what the National Park Service's role, and specifically the GW Memorial Parkway's role has been in this project thus far?

Drew Morrison, VHB -

Yeah, so, Nate, happy to start and then also pass on to Angel to speak more, given VDOT's key role here. And I think to sort of set the conversation about how we work with the Park Service, it's important that, as Nate mentioned, Park Service is a concurring agency. They play a key role as we move from these different milestones; as we identify the Purpose and Need as we discussed; and we saw on that Purpose and Need the stipulation related to context sensitivity associated with the Park Service. As we looked at the range of alternatives to advance forward, that was another area where we engaged with the Park Service and achieved concurrence related to alignments to further evaluate the alternatives and move toward this step. And so through the NEPA process, we look at impacts to the park. We also have other processes that are tied along with this. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act is how we look at the effects of a project like this on historic property like the George Washington Memorial Parkway. And so, we look at both physical considerations, but also things that have to do with setting, with integrity, with how a project relates to the things that make this a fundamental historic property and resource.

We also have section of 4F of the Department of Transportation Act, which applies a substantive set of criteria on transportation projects when they have impacts and interactions with park property like we have here. So, it requires us to take a look at these range of different policy issues as it relates to the park and to think through - as we were talking about further - the different types of issues. Whether that's visitor use and experience. How does this benefit or what are some of the impacts for a user of the Mount Vernon Trail associated with this connection? How does this affect the scenic roadway experience? That's a fundamental part of the Parkway. So those are pieces that we are evaluating, as part of this process, to understand impacts, understand the alternative, to inform future design decisions. You know, as we mentioned, these renderings don't represent design. They represent understanding where those limits of disturbance may be. So, all along this process, we'll be continuing to engage with the Park Service and continuing to work with them at these different concurrence points as the process moves forward, and as we get more information, you know about how we engage this project with the historic, the cultural resources at play in the parkway. Angel, is there anything more that you would add?

Angel Reed, VDOT -

I might just add that we've been coordinating with the Park Service, specifically, the George Washington Memorial Parkway, for the better part of almost three years now. I think the County and VDOT were coordinating with the park service back in December 2019 before we began NEPA for this, this project, and just wanted to highlight that. To maybe reiterate some of your comments Drew, the Park Service and the Parkway more specifically, are very much at the table here through this NEPA process, through the 106 process. And our study team, as a whole recognizes the primacy, the importance of the parkway, and its interfacing with this project. So just wanted to highlight that. Thanks, Drew.

Nate Graham, Arlington County -

And thanks to you both for adding some of that context to this conversation. I think that's helpful. Poul, I appreciate your comments, your history, and I know that you will share the remainder of it with us via email. So, thank you very much for following up. We'll look forward to corresponding with you soon. We've got one more from Pam VanHein with some comments that I think are appropriate for setting the table for the future design discussion. Pam says, *"Could the bridges also have walls for wind and weather protection? If so, could they be transparent? And can we have bump outs where people can rest and or enjoy the views?"* So, Drew, let's talk a little bit more about the facility as a place.

Drew Morrison, VHB -

No, appreciate that that comment. And I think that Nate, as you said, that's the sort of feedback to help inform some of the considerations related to design in terms of what does the program of that bridge look like? What are some of the design elements that are related to how a user would experience it? As well as, very importantly, then also the context of the bridge, as it's working through those different areas with different requirements, whether that's in the you know, the parkway, as we were just talking about in terms of that context, whether it's in the rail corridor, whether it's on the airport property, there are plenty of things that each of those properties are considering in terms of their requirements that may inform, you know, what's the range of possibilities. But certainly, we welcome the feedback on what are some of the design elements that people are interested in, they want to understand if they can be pursued. So, we appreciate this question. And appreciate, you know, any, any comments or feedback on that front. And it will be that balance of, you know, what folks are looking for in this experience and what also matches with what can be achieved in the different elements of the bridge.

Nate Graham, Arlington County -

Thanks, Drew. That wraps up my active question queue. It is now 8:06. So, we're just a little over time. I - certainly we can respond to a couple more questions, if there are any burning thoughts left amongst our attendees tonight. But if not, I'll just start the sort of wrap up process here by saying that again, we're very grateful for you spending a little bit of time in your evening tonight with us to talk more about this project, this public engagement opportunity and to share your thoughts, your concerns, questions about the project and the Recommended Preferred Alternative with us. I think I can speak for all of us when I say that this has been really substantive conversation. We really appreciate all the thoughtful questions we got today, and the depth of knowledge that each of you has brought to this public process. So, on behalf of our project team, thank you very much for that.

Seeing no additional questions. Alan, I think we can wrap up today. So, thank you again on behalf of the County, VDOT, and our project team. We very much appreciate all of your time tonight and are looking forward to continuing to work with you and your neighbors and fellow Crystal City-Pentagon City residents on this project to the next public engagement milestone.