

Appendix D2:

Response to State and Local Agency Comments

Arlington County Board	1
District of Columbia Councilmember Silverman	1
District Department of Energy and Environment.....	1
DC Water	2
North Carolina Department of Transportation	3

ID	Comment	Response	Reference
Arlington County Board			
1A	Additionally, Arlington strongly supports including the parallel bicycle/pedestrian bridge as a required mitigating feature of the full project. Bicycle/pedestrian trips are growing in importance as part of our region’s transportation network, and this connection will provide a critical link. We are pleased to see it included and expect it to be constructed as an integral component of the larger project—funded simultaneously and not as a separate project. Given the inherent challenges of implementing Potomac crossings, we would have significant concerns with any potential future proposal to separate the bicycle/pedestrian component as an independent project.	Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT) has committed to funding and construction of the bike-pedestrian bridge as mitigation for impacts to Section 4(f)-protected resources. See Table 2-2 in FEIS/ROD Section 2.3, Measures to Minimize Harm.	Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS)/Record of Decision (ROD) Section 2.3, Measures to Minimize Harm Commitment/Mitigation ID: B60
District Councilmember Silverman			
2A	I hope the bike-pedestrian crossing will remain part of the Long Bridge Project and be completed contemporaneously. This is a once-in-a-generation opportunity to improve the connectivity between our jurisdictions, and I look forward to continuing to be a partner in advancing the District and Virginia’s shared transportation goals as the project moves forward.	DRPT has committed to funding and construction of the bike-pedestrian bridge as mitigation for impacts to Section 4(f)-protected resources. See Table 2-2 in FEIS/ROD Section 2.3, Measures to Minimize Harm.	FEIS/ROD Section 2.3, Measures to Minimize Harm Commitment/Mitigation ID: B60
District Department of Energy and Environment			
3A	DOEE is very supportive of the proposed bike-pedestrian crossing and strongly prefers that the crossing remain in the final project plan. The bike-pedestrian crossing would align with important goals and targets within the District of Columbia’s sustainability plan known as Sustainable DC 2.0, as well as support the goals of the District’s comprehensive energy plan/climate action plan, Clean Energy DC.	DRPT has committed to funding and construction of the bike-pedestrian bridge as mitigation for impacts to Section 4(f)-protected resources. See Table 2-2 in FEIS/ROD Section 2.3, Measures to Minimize Harm.	FEIS/ROD Section 2.3, Measures to Minimize Harm Commitment/Mitigation ID: B60

ID	Comment	Response	Reference
DC Water			
4A	<p>The Long Bridge Project team shall be aware of water mains along the corridor and within the footprint of the Project that will likely be affected by the construction of the Long Bridge. These include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. 12-inch water main along Maine Ave SW - will potentially be affected as the Project intends to expand the current two-track bridge to a four-track bridge over Maine Ave SW. b. Other 8-inch and 12-inch water mains that run parallel or perpendicular to the existing tracks along Maryland Ave SW - these mains, either underground or hanging from existing bridges, will likely be affected by construction activities. c. 20-inch water main along the 12th St Expy - will likely be affected by construction activities. 	<p>Comments noted. DRPT would continue to coordinate with DC Water during final design to ensure the project avoids or minimizes impacts to existing and planned water infrastructure.</p>	<p>FEIS/ROD Section 2.3, Measures to Minimize Harm</p> <p>Commitment/Mitigation ID: A02, A03</p>
4B	<p>To avoid / minimize potential disruption of water service due to construction activities associated with the expansion of Long Bridge, DDOT and FRA shall engage DC Water in the review process of the design documents.</p>	<p>Comments noted. DRPT would continue to coordinate with DC Water during final design to ensure the project avoids or minimizes impacts to existing and planned water infrastructure.</p>	<p>FEIS/ROD Section 2.3, Measures to Minimize Harm</p> <p>Commitment/Mitigation ID: A02, A03</p>
4C	<p>Water utilities along the Corridor may need to be relocated such that existing water utilities are not compromised and service to the customers is not disrupted. FRA and DDOT shall be responsible for the relocation, protection and water service continuity during the length of the Project. The Project team is responsible for obtaining the latest information on all DC Water' assets that may be affected by the Project. This assessment does not provide an analysis of the potential construction impacts to the water infrastructure as construction details for the Long Bridge have not been provided.</p>	<p>Comments noted. DRPT would continue to coordinate with DC Water during final design to ensure the project avoids or minimizes impacts to existing and planned water infrastructure. Should utility relocation be necessary, DRPT would be responsible for the cost and would coordinate with DC Water to determine the appropriate entity to manage the work.</p>	<p>FEIS/ROD Section 2.3, Measures to Minimize Harm</p> <p>Commitment/Mitigation ID: A02, A03</p>
4D	<p>In addition, this review does not evaluate the impact of increased water demands associated to the Long Bridge Project as the environmental impact assessment document</p>	<p>No increase in water demand in anticipated as part of the Long Bridge Project. The Preferred Alternative consists of</p>	<p>n/a</p>

ID	Comment	Response	Reference
	does not provide information on water demand requirements.	railroad infrastructure that does not use municipal water supplies.	
4E	The Long Bridge Project EIS and subsequent design should consider how any proposed foundations will be coordinated with the Potomac River Tunnel alignment, potentially including providing piers and piles aligned with those beneath the existing bridges upstream. This includes the bike-pedestrian crossing. The proposed Long Bridge Project and bike-pedestrian crossing alternatives presented in the EIS warrant close and early technical coordination with DC Water to determine any possible impacts as both projects continue into design.	<p>Comments noted. DRPT would continue to coordinate with DC Water during final design to ensure the project avoids or minimizes impacts to existing and planned water infrastructure.</p> <p>As shown in the graphics attached to the letter from DC Water (see Appendix F, Agency and Organization Comments Received), the Potomac River Tunnel alignment has been designed to pass between the piers of the sequence of bridges making up the 14th Street Bridge Complex. Note that the piers of the new railroad bridge and bike-pedestrian crossing will be designed to line up with the existing bridges as described in Chapter 3, Alternatives of the DEIS.</p> <p>The Potomac River Tunnel has been added to the list of projects in the No Action Alternative.</p>	<p>FEIS/ROD Section 1.4, DEIS Errata Sheets and Other Changes</p> <p>Errata ID: 05, 06, 07, 08</p> <p>FEIS/ROD Section 2.3, Measures to Minimize Harm</p> <p>Commitment/Mitigation ID: A02, A03</p> <p>DEIS Chapter 3, Alternatives Lines 295-296</p>
4F	In addition to the relocation and/or protection of DC Water assets, this project needs to ensure DC Water has full access to the DC Water assets during and after construction.	Comments noted. DRPT would coordinate with DC Water during final design and construction to ensure DC Water has full access to DC Water assets during and after construction.	<p>FEIS/ROD Section 2.3, Measures to Minimize Harm</p> <p>Commitment/Mitigation ID: A02, A03</p>
North Carolina Department of Transportation			
5A	We recommend the FEIS/ROD clearly state whether the proposed improvements will accommodate the future Southeast Corridor trains coming from North Carolina that were contemplated in NCDOT's Raleigh to Richmond High Speed Rail Corridor EIS. The Long Bridge DEIS mentions the Tier I EIS for the Southeast High-Speed Railroad Corridor from Washington D.C. to Charlotte, and it refers to the DC2RVA Tier II EIS, but it does not refer to the Raleigh to	The future Southeast Corridor trains contemplated in the Raleigh to Richmond Tier II EIS (four round trips per day between Washington, DC and Charlotte, NC) are incorporated into the DC2RVA Build Alternative. The train volumes for the Long Bridge Preferred Alternative are consistent with the DC2RVA Build Alternative – therefore, they also incorporate the future Southeast Corridor trains from the Raleigh to Richmond Tier II EIS.	DEIS Chapter 3.4, Train Volumes

ID	Comment	Response	Reference
	Richmond Tier II EIS. The Tier II FEIS for the Raleigh to Richmond corridor was approved in August 2015, and the ROD was issued in March 2017.		
5B	The Raleigh to Richmond Tier II EIS looked at developing high performance rail service from Charlotte-Raleigh to Richmond with continuing service to Washington, DC and the Northeast Corridor. Does the new bridge accommodate the existing Carolinian, existing long-distance trains (Palmetto, Silver Star, Silver Meteor, Crescent, Auto Train), and the four new Southeast Corridor trains in NC in addition to the Virginia trains?	The future Southeast Corridor trains contemplated in the Raleigh to Richmond Tier II EIS (four round trips per day between Washington, DC and Charlotte, NC) are incorporated into the DC2RVA Build Alternative. The train volumes for the Long Bridge Preferred Alternative are consistent with the DC2RVA Build Alternative – therefore, they also incorporate the future Southeast Corridor trains. The existing long-distance trains are also included in the Preferred Alternative.	DEIS Chapter 3.4, Train Volumes
5C	The consequences of the no action alternative and the action alternative for the Virginia Railway Express (VRE) is well-documented as the VRE System Plan 2040 is referenced as a basis for 2040 VRE train volumes (Section 9.4.2.1). We recommend having a similar discussion in the FEIS/ROD for the benefits of the action alternative separately for CSXT, Amtrak and NS in section 9.4.1.1, where master plans, planning documents, etc. are cited, if applicable. We recommend referencing any documents in this section that can be cited as a basis for 2040 volumes. Currently table 9-4 says the action alternative 2040 volumes for Amtrak, CSXT, and NS are simply based on stakeholder input.	<p>Chapter 9.4.1, Railroad Infrastructure and Operations of the DEIS provides a similar level of detail for the impacts of the No Action Alternative and the Action Alternatives on CSXT, Norfolk Southern, and Amtrak service as described in Chapter 9.4.2.1, VRE Commuter Service. No additional detail is necessary to understand the impacts of the alternatives.</p> <p>As noted in the footnotes to Table 9-4, the volumes for Amtrak were based on the DC2RVA EIS as well as on stakeholder input. The DC2RVA EIS can be used as the planning document for long distance passenger railroad service in the corridor. The development of the train volumes for the analysis is described in more detail in Chapter 3.4, Train Volumes.</p>	DEIS Chapter 3.4, Train Volumes; Chapter 9.4.1, Railroad Infrastructure and Operations; and Chapter 9.4.2.1, VRE Commuter Service.
5D	We recommend the FEIS/ROD include a broad, albeit brief, discussion regarding indirect impacts to the Southeast Corridor. In addition to this project increasing the train traffic capacity in the corridor, the implementation of this project is also anticipated to improve travel-time reliability for trains that utilize this corridor. These improvements	Chapter 9.4.1, Railroad Infrastructure and Operations of the DEIS addresses the benefits to rail network operations. For each Action Alternative, it states that the additional tracks would have major beneficial effects on railroad operational flexibility and would reduce delays under normal operating conditions. It can be assumed that these benefits would be felt south of the Project Area, but such a	DEIS Chapter 9.4.1, Railroad Infrastructure and Operations

ID	Comment	Response	Reference
	may have the potential to have general indirect effects to the rail network south of the project area.	statement is not necessary to the EIS analysis and has therefore not been added in the FEIS/ROD.	