Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/Section 106 Public Meeting

Proposed Alternatives

December 14, 2017
Today’s Agenda

• Project Overview
• Project Schedule
• Purpose and Need
• Concept Screening Process
• Level 2 Concept Screening Results
• Proposed Action Alternatives for Draft EIS
• Bike-Pedestrian Crossing Options
• Next Steps
What is NEPA?

- The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) requires Federal agencies to assess the environmental effects of their proposed actions prior to making decisions.

- NEPA encourages integrated compliance with other environmental laws so that a proposed project’s impacts are comprehensively evaluated before implementation.

- To comply with NEPA, FRA and DDOT are preparing an EIS that will be made available for public review and comment.
What is Section 106?

- Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA) requires Federal agencies to:
  - Consider and determine the direct AND indirect effects of a proposed undertaking on historic properties
  - Consult with State Historic Preservation Offices, Tribes, and other consulting parties
  - Avoid, resolve or mitigate adverse effects to historic properties
  - See: 36 CFR Part 800 (Protection of Historic Properties)
The Long Bridge

- Two-track steel truss railroad bridge constructed in 1904
- Owned by CSX Transportation (CSXT)
- Serves freight (CSXT), intercity passenger (Amtrak), and commuter rail (VRE)
- Only railroad bridge connecting Virginia to the District – next closest crossing is at Harpers Ferry, WV
- Typically serves 76 weekday trains
- Three tracks approaching the bridge from the north and south
- Contributing element to the East and West Potomac Parks Historic District
Project Area Limits Update

Previous Project Area Limits

Updated Project Area Limits
Section 106 and NEPA Coordination

Public Meeting #1
Pre-NEPA (Feb 2016)

Public Meeting #2
Public Scoping Meeting

Public Meeting #3
Level 1 Concept Screening

TODAY
Public Meeting #4
Alternatives to be Evaluated in Draft EIS

Public Meeting #5
Recommend Preferred Alternative

Public Meeting #6
Draft EIS Review and Public Hearing

Section 106

- Define Undertaking
- Initiate Consultation

- Identify and Invite Consulting Parties

- Define Area of Potential Effects (APE)
- Identify & Evaluate Historic Properties

- Determine Effects to Historic Properties

- Draft Memorandum of Agreement or Programmatic Agreement to Resolve Adverse Effects if necessary

- Execute Memorandum of Agreement or Programmatic Agreement if necessary

NEPA

Notice of Intent
Scoping
Purpose and Need
Project Alternatives
Environmental Studies and Evaluation
Draft EIS
Final EIS/ROD
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Purpose and Need

Railroad Capacity

Network Connectivity

Railroad Resiliency and Redundancy
### Current and Future Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Train Operator</th>
<th>Current # Trains per Day</th>
<th>2040 # Trains per Day</th>
<th>Percent Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VRE</td>
<td>34*</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>171%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amtrak/DC2RVA</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSXT</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>133%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk Southern</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On-Time Performance*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercity Long Distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercity Regional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The Fall 2016 public meeting materials reported different on-time performance from what is reported here for two reasons:
(1) The Current percentage is now based on observed performance, while previously the percentage was based on modeling results; and
(2) The No Action (2040) on-time performance has changed due to revisions in the model related to the tracks around L’Enfant Plaza Station.

* The Fall 2016 public meeting materials stated that 32 VRE trains travel Long Bridge per day. This number did not account for one non-revenue round-trip, which brings the total to 34 trains per day.
*Feasibility of bike-pedestrian crossing opportunities continue to be evaluated, but were not screened as part of the Level 2 Screening using Purpose and Need.
Level 2 Concept Screening Considerations

• All concepts could be implemented and allow for safe railroad operations
• Environmental issues were considered during Level 2 Concept Screening, however they did not substantially differentiate among the concepts because they all occur within the same corridor
  – For example: all concepts would have an impact to water resources and wildlife habitat (Potomac River, Roaches Run), 4(f) properties (NPS land, Roaches Run), traffic impacts (corridor crosses highways)
  – Engineering will progress on the DEIS Alternatives and help inform environmental impact analysis
  – Environmental impacts of the DEIS Alternatives will be documented in the Draft EIS which will be made available for public comment.
Level 2 Concept Screening Criteria

• Purpose and Need
  — **Capacity:** Eliminates operational bottleneck and prevents development of future bottleneck
  — **Network Connectivity and Resiliency & Redundancy:** Improves ability to maintain normal railroad operations and network connectivity during planned maintenance and unanticipated outages

• Feasibility
  — Provides 25 feet clearance between bridges over the river
  — Does not preclude future replacement or rehabilitation of existing bridge
  — Does not require interlocking infrastructure over the river
  — Avoids DoD Facility
Level 2, Step 1
Concept Screening Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Concept 3</th>
<th>Concept 5</th>
<th>Concept 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose and Need</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminates/prevents operational bottleneck</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves ability to maintain normal railroad operations and network connectivity during planned maintenance and unanticipated outages</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feasibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides 25 feet clearance between bridges over the river</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not preclude future replacement or rehabilitation of existing bridge</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not require interlocking infrastructure over the river</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoids DoD Facility</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates fatal flaw

Retained for further analysis

*Feasibility of bike-pedestrian crossing opportunities continue to be evaluated, but were not screened as part of the Level 2 Screening using Purpose and Need.
Proposed Action Alternatives for Draft EIS

Alternative A
- New 2-track bridge upstream of existing bridge
- Retain existing bridge
- Allows for safe railroad operations

Alternative B
- New 2-track bridge upstream of existing bridge
- Replace existing bridge
- Allows for safe railroad operations
4-Track Alignment Options A - C

Option A
- New 2-track bridge upstream of existing bridge
- Retain existing bridge

Option B
- New 2-track bridge upstream of existing bridge
- Replace existing bridge

Option C
- New 2-track bridge downstream of existing bridge
- Retain existing bridge
4-Track Alignment Options D - F

Option D
- New 2-track bridge downstream of existing bridge
- Replace existing bridge

Option E
- New 2-track bridge upstream of existing bridge
- Demolish or rehabilitate existing bridge
- Expand new bridge to 4 tracks, overlapping footprint of previous bridge

Option F
- New 2-track bridge downstream of existing bridge
- Demolish or rehabilitate existing bridge
- Expand new bridge to 4 tracks, overlapping footprint of previous bridge
4-Track Alignment Options G - I

**Option G**
- New 1-track bridge on either side of existing bridge
- Retain or replace existing bridge

**Option H**
- New 4-track bridge upstream of existing bridge
- Demolish existing bridge

**Option I**
- New 4-track bridge downstream of existing bridge
- Demolish existing bridge
## Level 2, Step 2

### Concept Screening Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose and Need</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminates/prevents operational bottleneck</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves ability to maintain normal railroad operations and network connectivity during planned maintenance and unanticipated outages</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feasibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides 25 feet clearance between bridges over the river</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not preclude future replacement or rehabilitation of existing bridge</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not require interlocking infrastructure over the river</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoids DoD Facility</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Options advanced for evaluation as Proposed Action Alternatives for Draft EIS

*Indicates fatal flaw

*Feasibility of bike-pedestrian crossing opportunities continue to be evaluated, but were not screened as part of the Level 2 Screening using Purpose and Need.
Proposed Action Alternatives for Draft EIS

**Alternative A**
- New 2-track bridge upstream of existing bridge
- Retain existing bridge

**Alternative B**
- New 2-track bridge upstream of existing bridge
- Replace existing bridge
Pedestrian/Bicycle Connectivity

• Although not part of the Proposed Action Purpose and Need, the Project will explore the potential opportunity to accommodate connections that follow the trajectory of the Long Bridge Corridor to the pedestrian and bicycle network.
  – The feasibility of this opportunity will be assessed as the Project progresses, and will consider whether a path can be designed to be consistent with railroad operator plans and pursuant to railroad safety practices.
  – Future efforts to accommodate connections to the pedestrian and bicycle network may be advanced as part of the Project, or as part of a separate project(s) sponsored by independent entities.
Feasibility of Bike-Pedestrian Crossings

• Feasibility of bike-pedestrian crossing opportunities continues to be evaluated

• Criteria for initial identification of opportunities for bike-pedestrian crossings:
  – Provides 25 feet clearance between bridges over the river
  – Avoids DoD Facility
  – Connects to existing bike-pedestrian network
  – Ramps from crossing to existing connections cannot have more than a 5 percent slope (required by Americans with Disabilities Act regulations)

• The opportunity for a bike-pedestrian crossing could potentially be feasible with either of the Proposed Action Alternatives
Bike-Pedestrian Crossing Opportunities

Each bike-pedestrian option could work with either Proposed Action Alternative
Bike-Pedestrian Crossing Ramps
Potential Landings in Virginia

Upstream of Railroad Bridges
- Landing with ramp over land
- Landing with ramp over water

Downstream of Railroad Bridges
- Landing with ramp over land
- Landing with ramp over water

* Maximum 5 percent slope required by Americans with Disabilities Act regulations
Bike-Pedestrian Crossing Ramps
Potential Landings in the District

Upstream of Railroad Bridges

- Landing with ramp over land
- Landing with ramp over water

Downstream of Railroad Bridges

- Landing with ramp over land
- Landing with ramp over water

* Maximum 5 percent slope required by Americans with Disabilities Act regulations
Bike-Pedestrian Crossing Ramps
Potential Ramp Types

Landing with Ramp over Land

Landing with Ramp over Water

* Length of ramp dictated by maximum 5 percent slope required by Americans with Disabilities Act regulations
## No Action Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Planned Completion Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L’Enfant North and South Storage Tracks</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Avenue Tunnel (under construction)</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-395 HOT Lanes</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Track Virginia (VA) to L’Enfant (LE) Interlocking</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal City-Potomac Yard Transitway Extension</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Journey (new commuter concourse and security checkpoint at the Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport)</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Channel Drive Interchange</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal City Metro Station East Entrance</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VRE Crystal City Station Improvements</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L’Enfant Station Improvements</td>
<td>2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Track RO to AF Interlocking</td>
<td>2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Complete Streets (Army Navy Drive, Crystal Drive, Clark Bell Street, 12th Street South, 18th Street South, 23rd Street South, and 27th Street South)</td>
<td>2037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconfigure Crystal City Street Network and Circulation Patterns</td>
<td>2040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps

- Accept comments on alternatives through January 16, 2018
- Publish *Alternatives Development and Analysis Report* (Spring 2018)
- Document affected environment
- Develop engineering design for alternatives
- Evaluate environmental consequences of alternatives
- Determine effects to historic properties
- Recommend and select preferred alternative (Spring 2018)
- Develop Draft Memorandum of Agreement or Programmatic Agreement to resolve adverse effects to historic properties, if necessary (Fall 2018)
- Publish Draft EIS for public review and comment (Early 2019)
- Public Hearing on Draft EIS (Early 2019)
Thank You

For more information visit:
longbridgeproject.com

or contact us at:
info@longbridgeproject.com