

7

COMMENTS AND COORDINATION

Federal, State and local agencies were contacted to inform them about the project, to identify issues of concern, and obtain information about environmental resources within the project area. The general public was notified about the scope of the proposed improvements and was provided numerous opportunities to provide comments about the proposed alternatives and environmental concerns. These agency and public comments helped in the development of alternatives that meet the project's purpose and need while minimizing adverse effects on the environment and adjacent communities.

7.1 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

An extensive public involvement program was developed to ensure that concerned citizens, interest groups, civic organizations, and businesses had adequate opportunities to express their views throughout the environmental review process. Following are the objectives of the public involvement program:

- Educate the public regarding the existence, purpose, and scope of the project;
- Encourage and provide opportunities for public participation throughout the study process;
- Report findings of technical analyses at key project milestones; and
- Document how public suggestions and concerns have been considered and incorporated into the project's planning.

Various communication media, including newsletters, brochures, comment sheets, the Internet, and citizen workshops were used to provide information about the project and gather input from citizens and other interested parties. In addition, project representatives met personally with numerous interested groups, civic associations, and businesses to discuss the project and answer questions about the proposed improvements and the environmental review process.

7.1.1 Outreach Program

A variety of outreach techniques and materials were used to inform citizens and other interested parties about the details of the proposed project and to solicit their comments and concerns. In addition, key project staff were identified and made available to respond to any public comments. Specific tools used to notify the public and engage them in the study process are described below.

Project Website and E-mail. An Internet web site was developed to provide information to the public concerning the status of the EIS process. The web site was updated several times throughout the study process. The website (www.battlefieldbypass.com) includes information on the project's background, the environmental review process, project alternatives being considered, traffic and transportation issues, and a set of Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs). The project web site also includes electronic versions of project newsletters, public meeting displays, conceptual plans, and other project documents. An email address was also established to provide an additional means for citizens to comment.

Newsletters. Four project newsletters were prepared during the course of the study to keep interested parties informed about the status and progress of the project. Topics discussed in these newsletters included: the

project's history, the study process, opportunities for public participation, the purpose and need for the project, project concepts and alternatives, and results of the initial environmental screening. Each newsletter also provided an address for written comments and the telephone number for questions, comments and information requests. The newsletters were mailed to all individuals, organizations, and Federal, State and local agencies on the project mailing list, and were made available at public meetings.

Public Meeting Brochures. Informational brochures describing project details were prepared for citizen workshops. These brochures were distributed to workshop attendees, citizens or groups that requested copies and attendees at informal meetings with NPS and FHWA representatives. The brochures supplemented the information being presented at the workshops and presented an overview of the project in a concise easy to read format.

Public Meeting Displays. Display boards were developed for each meeting to illustrate the study process and outcome, purpose and need, public participation process, schedule environmental constraints, conceptual and candidate build alternative(s), and potential impacts in an easily understood format. Display boards were developed to summarize various areas of technical evaluation (e.g., traffic, environmental, engineering, and cost) and future opportunities for participation, as appropriate.

7.1.2 Citizen Workshops

Four public workshops were held between December of 2001 and March 2004. These "open house" workshops offered an opportunity for interested citizens and nearby residents to learn more about the proposed project and participate in the environmental review process. NPS and FHWA staff as well as project consultants were present at the workshops to answer questions and explain the study process and technical issues. A description of each workshop purpose and summary of public comments follows.

Public Workshop #1 - December 6, 2001. The first public meeting was held at the Best Western Hotel in Manassas, Virginia on Thursday, December 6, 2001 from 5 p.m. to 7 p.m. An open forum format was used to establish a mechanism for the public to both receive information and provide feedback. The first meeting served as the public scoping meeting so that citizens could learn about the study and identify potential alternatives, impacts and other significant issues to be addressed in the EIS.

A variety of methods were used to advertise the workshop. More than 250 newsletters summarizing the purpose of the meeting and announcing the workshop were mailed to citizens, interest and civic groups, businesses, local elected officials, and all Federal, State and local agencies. The newsletters were mailed to targeted households in and around the proposed study area. Advertisements for the workshop appeared in *The Washington Post*, *The Fauquier Times Democrat*, and *The Prince William Times* prior to the workshop.

A total of 107 citizens attended the scoping meeting. After signing in, citizens were provided with comment sheets, the project newsletter, copies of the presentation boards and the text of the Manassas National Battlefield Park Amendments Act of 1988 that initiated the study, and a Manassas National Battlefield Park Visitors guide.

A total of 47 comment forms were received from the meeting attendees. The following are among the key findings:

- Transportation problems were identified along US Route 29 and VA Route 234 (45 people).
- Bypass preferred to eliminate some of the Park traffic (13 people).

- Extending the VA Route 234 Bypass, improving existing roads and widening US Route 29 and VA Route 234 were also mentioned frequently.
- Concerned citizens identified a total of 24 community resources/concerns. Access to homes inside the Park and opposition to closing the roads through the Park were cited as concerns. Concern about fire and rescue availability, access to I-66 through the Park and opposition to more development in the area were also mentioned.
- Numerous citizens and groups suggested options for possible alternatives and alignments associated with the Manassas National Battlefield Bypass Study. Many citizens suggested improving and using existing roadways as a possible alternative for the study. Other citizens suggested that a No-Action alternative would provide the best result.
- One of the most frequent comments regarding the Manassas National Battlefield Park Bypass study was the need to have continued access if the roads are removed from the Park. Three citizens mentioned access to homes inside the Park and another three citizens mentioned access to I-66 as a major concern.

Workshop #2 - December 12, 2002. The second public workshop for the Manassas National Battlefield Park Bypass Study was held on December 12, 2002 at the Holiday Inn in Manassas, Virginia. The workshop was held between 6:00 p.m. and 8:00 p.m. Two brief presentations were made during the workshop, one at 6:30 p.m. and another at 7:30 p.m. The workshop was designed to provide an informal, but informative opportunity for citizens to participate in the study.

Several methods were used to provide advance notice and information to the public about the workshop. The second volume of the project newsletter, the Bypass Newsletter, was sent to people who attended the first public workshop, as well as appropriate agency contacts, elected representatives, and members of the Citizen Advisory Board. The project website was also updated to include information about the workshop.

Advertisements for the workshop were placed in several area newspapers. An advertisement was placed in the Northern Virginia section of the Washington Post, which covers Prince William County, Loudoun County, Fairfax County, Arlington County, and the City of Alexandria. The same advertisement also appeared in several local newspapers, including the Bull Run Observer, the Fauquier Times-Democrat, and the Prince William Times.

Approximately 118 citizens attended the workshop. Several members of the project staff, including the Project Director, Jack Van Dop of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Robert Sutton, the Superintendent of the Manassas National Battlefield Park, were present at the workshop to meet with citizens and answer questions regarding the study. Other project staff, including natural and cultural resource specialists, traffic engineers, and representatives from FHWA, the National Park Service, the Virginia Department of Transportation and localities were also available to assist citizens.

The goal of the workshop was to present the purpose and need statement and the preliminary concepts that were developed. Comment forms were provided to citizens who attended the workshop. Study team representatives were available to assist citizens and answer questions about any of the concepts. Typical comments received are summarized below:

- The majority of respondents preferred the No-Action or Corridor 3 alternatives (co-location of Route 29 onto I-66).

- The majority of respondents preferred the widening/improving I-66 elements of alternatives (contained Corridor 3 alternative).
- The largest group of respondents were concerned with impacts to Heritage Hunt, a neighborhood located to the west of Conway Robinson Memorial State Forest associated with Corridors 2B, 2C, or 5C.

Following the meeting several petitions were received. One petition requested that impacts to the Buckland historic district be considered and that a new alternative along I-66 be studied that would include a new road on new location west of Haymarket that would provide a bypass around the community of Buckland. This concept was evaluated as Corridor 3B. A petition was also received from the Heritage Hunt Civic Association that identified concerns with Concepts 2B, 2C and 5C. A petition was received from Fairfax National Estates that expressed concern about impacts of Corridors 2 and 5 to their community. A petition was also received from residents in the Sudley Springs area that were concerned about impacts of all northern bypass alternatives on residents and historic preservation.

Workshop #3 - July 16, 2003. The third public workshop for the Manassas National Battlefield Park Bypass Study was held on July 16, 2003 at the Comfort Suites Hotel in Manassas, Virginia. The workshop was held between 5:00 p.m. and 8:00 p.m. The purpose of the workshop was to present the set of Candidate Alternatives that were to be carried forward for further study in the Draft EIS. Interested citizens and organizations were invited to comment on the Alternatives.

Several methods were used to provide advance notice and information to the public about the workshop. A postcard was sent to people who attended either of the first two public workshops, as well as appropriate agency contacts, elected representatives, and members of the Citizen Advisory Board. The project website was also updated to include information about the workshop. Advertisements for the workshop were placed in several area newspapers, including the Northern Virginia section of the Washington Post and several local newspapers. Each of the advertisements appeared approximately three weeks in advance of the workshop.

Several materials were prepared in advance of the workshop to provide citizens with an effective method for participating in the study and providing useful comments. As citizens arrived at the workshop, they were provided with an informative brochure and directed to several display boards that presented information about the study. The display boards included information about the candidate build alternatives, including screening matrices, maps of the locations, and some preliminary design information. Other displays included information about the purpose and need for the study, the study schedule, and the Park's General Management Plan update, which was under study at the time.

Comment forms were provided to citizens who attended the workshop. Study team representatives were available to assist citizens and answer questions about any of the concepts. Typical comments received and the numbers of persons commenting are summarized below:

- Prefer Alternative C (24 people).
- Prefer Alternative E (24 people).
- Adverse impacts to Fairfax National Estates are anticipated under Alternatives A and B (19 people).
- Prefer 4-lanes for new facility (12 people).
- Support additional bike trails (17 people).
- Support additional equestrian trails (16 people).

- Support landscaped buffers and plantings (14 people).
- Concerns were expressed regarding the potential for a Battlefield Bypass to be linked to other larger projects, particularly as a part of an outer beltway.

At this workshop the study team recommended dropping Alternative F, which was located along Balls Ford Road, due to a high level of displacements that would result. Alternative G was subsequently developed to provide a southern alternative as a result of the public comments in support of a southern alternative at this workshop and throughout the process. Details of the alternatives development process are discussed in more detail in Chapter 2.

Workshop #4, March 2004. The fourth public workshop for the Manassas National Battlefield Park Bypass Study was held on Tuesday, March 16, 2004 at Stonewall Jackson Senior High School in Manassas, Virginia. The workshop was held between 5:00 p.m. and 8:00 p.m. The purpose of the workshop was to present the preliminary results of the environmental impact analysis prior to the publication of the Draft EIS.

Several methods were used to provide advance notice and information to the public about the workshop. A postcard was sent to people who attended any of the first three public workshops, as well as appropriate agency contacts, elected representatives, and members of the Citizen Advisory Board. The project website was also updated to include details about the workshop.

Advertisements for the workshop were placed in several area newspapers. An advertisement was placed in the Northern Virginia section of the *Washington Post*, and appeared in several local newspapers. Each of the advertisements appeared approximately three weeks in advance of the workshop. Copies of the advertisements, postcards, and materials provided to the public at the workshop are included in the appendices of this report.

Citizens who attended the workshop were asked to submit questions in writing so that the study team could address them after a brief presentation on the project. Key comments are summarized below:

- Preference for alternatives under consideration was as follows:
 - No action (17 people)
 - Alternative A (4 people)
 - Alternative B (5 people)
 - Alternative C (4 people)
 - Alternative D (7 people)
 - Alternative G (18 people)
 - Alternative G w/ Design Option (10 people)
 - Combinations:
 - Alternative A and Improvements to I-66
 - Alternatives C (without 234 Bypass portion) and G
 - Alternatives A, D, and G w/ Design Option.
 - Alternatives B and G
- Concerns were expressed for impacts to homes and neighborhoods under Alternative G.
- Concerns were expressed for impacts to rural areas, natural resources and cultural resources.

Following this meeting, two petitions were received, one from the residents in the vicinity of Bull Run Estates and the Western Fairfax Civic Associations that expressed concern about the impacts of Alternative G, and endorsing either Alternatives C or D. A petition was also received from Fairfax National Estates that endorsed Alternatives C and D.

7.1.3 Citizen Advisory Board Activities

In addition to the previously discussed agency and general public involvement activities a Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) was established to provide additional opportunities for the public to be intimately involved in the project development process.

The CAB assisted the team in making informed decisions that best served the project Purpose and Need and public interest. The purpose of the CAB was to work in a cooperatively with the project team. The CAB was tasked with developing a consensus on issues and advisory recommendations to the project team. The CAB served as a vital link between the project team, citizens and local governing boards and commissions. CAB members attended meetings, reviewed project information, participated in open discussions, and provided advisory recommendations on project issues.

A total five CAB meetings were held at the Park's headquarters office located within the Manassas National Battlefield Park. Meeting dates, agendas, and accomplishments are described below.

CAB Meeting #1 - February 21, 2002. The first CAB meeting was held on February 21, 2002 to outline the project work plan. A presentation was made to CAB members about the study purpose and process. The CAB roles and responsibilities for the study were also discussed. A question and answer session followed in which the following topics were discussed:

- Length of study.
- How final alternative is chosen.
- Economic considerations.
- Public safety and terrorism considerations.
- Importance of data collection.
- Park visitation figures.

CAB Meeting #2 - June 27, 2002. The focus of this meeting was to present the findings from the Draft Existing Conditions Report to the Citizen's Advisory Board and to discuss the sources and methodology that was used. All CAB members were provided with a copy of the report for review and comment. Technical areas discussed included land use, socioeconomic, natural and cultural resources, and traffic in the study area. In addition, preliminary concepts for alternatives were presented. Key CAB comments included:

- Address regional transportation/environmental problems.
- Concerns for historic areas in Buckland neighborhoods.
- CAB alternative suggestions including roadways within the Park boundaries including elevated roadways, and lowered grade roadways.
- The need for a 234 Bypass separate and in addition to the Tri-County Parkway.

CAB Meeting #3 - August 15, 2002. CAB members were advised on the project schedule, the purpose and need for the project, legal aspects of the study mandate relating to the closure of roads within the Park and the legislation affecting the Study. The study team also discussed recent changes being incorporated into the Existing Conditions Report as a result of comments from NPS, other agencies, and CAB members. The study team explained the process of developing preliminary concepts and provided some preliminary results of the environmental analysis. Representatives from VDOT discussed some of the other ongoing studies in the same area as this study including the I-66 EIS, Tri-County Parkway EIS, Western Transportation Corridor EIS, Gainesville Intersection, I-66 Widening, and the Route 234 Bypass.

CAB comments were as follows:

- Recommended adding community facilities and cemeteries to environmental screening matrix.
- Recommended scheduling next meeting in early December.

CAB Meeting #4 - April 24, 2003. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the public summary report and the analysis and screening results of the concepts. Public comments from the previous public workshop held on December 12th 2002 were summarized in draft report form and distributed. A general overview of the comments was provided. It is noted in the report that several citizens cited concerns about specific concepts and potential impacts to neighborhoods in the study area, particularly Heritage Hunt and Fairfax National Estates. Results of a travel demand analysis performed for this study were presented. Results of analysis of Concept 3B (bypass west of Buckland from Route 29 to I-66 in combination with improvements to I-66) suggested at the Dec. 12th public meeting, were discussed. Analysis of this concept found problems both with meeting Purpose and Need and with lower traffic numbers than other concepts under consideration.

CAB comments were as follows:

- Request that the same GIS impact analysis be performed on the No-Action concept for comparison purposes.
- Request a change to the screening matrix to reflect the impact to Bull Run Estates under concepts 4A and 4B.
- CAB member stated that it would be nice to be able to have a combination of concepts for the final alternative.
- Concern expressed about the potential for creating congestion around the perimeter of the Park.

CAB Meeting #5 - January 13, 2004. The study team presented an overview of the progress of detailed field evaluations for areas located within 500-feet of the candidate build alternatives. The detailed evaluations include wetland delineations, floodplain and stream crossing identification, visual assessments, and identification of habitats, socioeconomic features, historic resources, and more. Following the completion of field studies information was used to populate the project's Geographic Information System.

The results from the last public workshop held in July 2003 were reviewed. Concerns were expressed about an email campaign that was sent to the study team. The email campaign consisted of 246 emails of identical content that were received by the comment deadline (more emails were received after the deadline) that stated opposition to all alternatives being studied due to sprawl concerns and construction of roads located north and west of the Park. CAB members expressed concern that the messages might not be based on accurate information and that the proposed solutions contained in the email did not present a viable solution that would support the basic premise of the study. Changes made to the set of Candidate Build Alternatives were discussed.

The study team has decided to analyze a four-lane facility for each of the alternatives based on the existing traffic demand and in order to provide seamless connections with existing roadways.

Advance copies of the Bypass Newsletter #4 were provided to those in attendance. The newsletter highlighted the decision to revise the southern alternative, as well as other decisions made since the last public workshop.

CAB comments included:

- Requested that future mapping show multiple boundaries and the designations for each, so that people could see the legislative boundary and the existing property boundaries of the Manassas NBP.
- Concern expressed regarding Alternative G related to problems at the existing intersection of I-66 and VA Route 234 Business.
- Suggestion to add more steps to the process chart shown on the back page of the newsletter and include that on the web site.

7.1.4 Meetings with Interest Groups, Homeowners Associations, Community Organizations, and Property Owners

In addition to formal meetings for the project, NPS and FHWA representatives met with several interest groups, civic and homeowners associations, community organizations, and individual property owners to discuss the proposed project, outline the environmental review process and answer specific questions about the alternatives and potential environmental impacts. Groups met with during the course of the study include:

- Buckland Area Residents
- Coalition for Smarter Growth, Piedmont Environmental Coalition, and Southern Environmental Law Center
- Civil War Preservation Trust
- Fairfax National Estates Homeowners Association
- Fairfax National Golf Club
- Friends Of the Manassas National Battlefield
- Heritage Hunt Neighborhood Association
- Luck Stone Corporation
- Pageland Lane Area Residents
- PW Conservation Alliance/FMB/NOVA Community College sponsored Transportation Forum
- Sudley United Methodist Church
- Transportation Town Hall Meeting with Prince William County Supervisors J. Stirrup and W. Covington

7.1.5 Location of Public Hearing

A Public Hearing will be held for the project within 45 days from the publication of this Draft EIS. Information about the study process, alternatives being considered, and potential environmental impacts will be presented, and attendees will be able to provide formal testimony for the record. Copies of the Draft EIS and all supporting

technical reports will be made available for public review at the hearing. A summary of the Location of the Public Hearing and substantive comments received will be included and addressed in the Final EIS.

7.2 AGENCY COORDINATION

7.2.1 Early Agency Coordination

Coordination with appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies was initiated in November 6, 2001, when FHWA formally notified these agencies of its intent to prepare an EA for the proposed bypass. Each agency listed in **Table 7-1** was given information regarding the scope of the project. This information included maps of the study area, a description of the study area, a discussion of the necessity for the project. In a scoping letter each agency was asked to identify concerns about the project and provide information regarding any potentially sensitive environmental resources in the study area. This early notification and coordination allowed for the timely identification, evaluation, and resolution of environmental and regulatory issues. Coordination with interested agencies continued throughout the remainder of the study.

Although most of the responding agencies did not have any comments or concerns about the scope of the project, some agencies requested that specific issues be discussed in the NEPA document. Comments received during agency coordination are summarized on the next page (see Table 7-1).

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service

- Consider impacts to prime and unique farmland.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service

- In response to the project scoping letter and Federal Register notice, the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) provided lists of federally listed, proposed, and candidate species for Loudoun, Fairfax, Fauquier, and Prince William Counties, Virginia. FWS recommended that a survey be conducted for the small whorled pogonia between June 1st through July 20th.
- FWS also recommended that the study adhere to the FWS wetland Mitigation Policy, specifically that wetland impacts should be avoided or minimized to the maximum extent practicable and should be addressed in a sequential fashion as listed below:
 1. Avoid the impact altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action,
 2. Minimizing the impact by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action and its implementation,
 3. Rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the affected environment,
 4. Reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action,
 5. Compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments.
- FWS recommended that in accordance with Executive Order 11988 (Protection of Floodplains), floodplain impacts should be mitigated to the maximum extent possible, including compensation for any unavoidable floodplain impacts. FWS recommends the mitigation of floodplain impacts following the recommendations listed above for wetland mitigation.
- FWS is also concerned about impacts to forested habitat that are likely to occur if this project is constructed. Forested habitat in this portion of Virginia improves water quality, ameliorates

flooding, and serves as habitat for many wildlife species. The FWS recommends some type of restoration/enhancement of forested habitat to at least partially offset such impacts to natural resources.

TABLE 7-1: AGENCIES AND OFFICIALS CONTACTED DURING AGENCY COORDINATION

FEDERAL AGENCIES	REGIONAL AGENCIES
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation	Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments
National Capital Planning Commission	National Capital Planning Commission
National Marine Fisheries Service, Northeast Region	Northern Virginia Regional Commission
National Park Service/Denver Service Center	Northern Virginia Regional Park Authority
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Northern Virginia Soil and Water Conservation District
U.S. Congress	Northern Virginia Transportation Authority
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	Potomac and Rappahannock Transportation Commission
U.S. Department Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service	
U.S. Federal Highway Administration Eastern Federal Lands Highway Division	LOCAL AGENCIES
U.S. Federal Transit Administration	City of Manassas, Mayor's Office
U.S. Federal Highway Administration	City of Manassas, City Manager's Office
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	City of Manassas Park, Mayor's Office
	City of Manassas Park, City Manager's Office
	Fairfax County Department of Planning and Zoning
	Fairfax County Department of Transportation
VIRGINIA AGENCIES	Fauquier County Board of Supervisors
Virginia Department of Aviation	Fauquier County Administrator's Office
Virginia Department of Environmental Quality	Loudoun County Administrator's Office
Virginia Department of Forestry	Loudoun County Department of Planning
Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries	Loudoun County Transportation Planning Program
Virginia Department of Historic Resources, State Historic Preservation Officer	Loudoun County Board of Supervisors
Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation	Prince William County Board of Supervisors
Virginia Department of Transportation, Environmental Division	Prince William County Transportation Division
Virginia Marine Resources Commission	Prince William County Department of Public Works
Virginia Outdoors Foundation	Town of Haymarket, Mayor's Office
	Town of Haymarket, Planning Commission

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

- EPA recommended a thorough analysis of the purpose and need for this project and the development of a wide range of alternatives to meet the need. Because of the importance of the historical landscape in and around Manassas Battlefield a fully developed cumulative effects analysis should be developed.
- Recommend also considering additional alternatives, such as:

- Closing the road(s) without providing additional access.
- Closing the road(s) with additional access alternatives.
- Charging a toll as a method to control traffic volumes.
- Requiring passes or permits as a method to control traffic volumes.
- Restricting how many vehicles can use the road(s) and at what hours.
- Improving intersections and other minor improvements to improve LOS and safety.

U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Administration

To ensure transit agencies are included in the study process FTA recommended the following:

- Offer multimodal alternatives during scoping.
- Comment on and discuss any adverse impacts on transit operations or riders.
- Discuss and comment on transit-friendly features that might be readily added to highway alternatives.
- Include the Virginia Railway Express on the list of interested parties for the purposes of the public scoping meetings.
-

Northern Virginia Regional Commission

Comments of NVRC included:

- Special attention should be given to erosion and sedimentation controls during construction. For post-construction, stormwater quality management and post-development water quality requirements set forth by the Virginia Stormwater Management Regulations (VR 215-02-00 Part IV) must be adhered to.
- NVRC also advised that the counties of Arlington, Fairfax, and Prince William, the City of Alexandria, and the Town of Herndon, have all enacted RMA designation requires that all development result in a no-net increase standard for phosphorus loadings, based on the jurisdiction's average imperviousness.
- NVRC also suggested that where possible, opportunities to retrofit existing stormwater facilities to stormwater facilities through new construction activities should be explored.

Virginia Department of Transportation

VDOT recommended formation of a Technical Advisory Committee and frequent opportunities for public involvement in the study.

Virginia Outdoors Foundation

- The Virginia Outdoors Foundation expressed concern regarding impacts to the easement commonly known as "the Davis Tract", which is currently owned by the Civil War Preservation Trust. The Davis Tract was acquired through Federal Protection Funding and has historic significance associated with the Second Battle of Manassas.

County of Prince William – Board of Supervisors

Comments from Prince William County Board included:

- Study team should look at and eliminate any alternative options that are clearly unrealistic to help clarify the truly feasible options.
- Focus on combining the bypass with alignments for the 234 Bypass North and Tri-County Parkway, which are also under study.

7.2.2 Agency Coordination Meetings

Three agency coordination meetings have been conducted for the project to provide concerned agencies with project progress and to solicit input into the direction of investigations. In addition all agencies have been included on the project mailing list and have received all newsletters and invitations to all public workshops. The dates and topics covered in the coordination meetings is presented below:

Agency Coordination Meeting #1 (November 18, 2001). The purpose of the meeting was to kick-off the project, discuss the work plan, and general purpose of the study. A presentation provided overview of the legislative directive for the study, the study history, the process, preliminary study area, and other projects in the area. Measures to ensure public involvement and agency coordination, as well as coordination with other ongoing studies, were also discussed. Approximate dates of important events and points of coordination and inclusion with the public and other agencies were outlined.

Agency Coordination Meeting #2 (July 24, 2002). The purpose of the second agency coordination meeting was to present results of the first public workshop and the Existing Conditions Report, and to kick-off the alternatives development process. The purpose and need for the study, goals and objectives for the study, which included separating park and commuter traffic, accommodating freight movements, maintaining system linkage, maintaining access to park and in-holdings, minimizing environmental impacts, and coordinating results were also presented.

Agency Coordination Meeting #3 (April 30, 2003). The purpose of the third agency coordination meeting was to discuss the preliminary results of the alternative concept screening and preview the set of Candidate Build Alternatives that would be carried forward for analysis in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Comments on the screening results, concepts recommended for analysis, and the study process were invited.

7.2.3 Other Coordination Efforts

Individual meetings were held with many of the agencies listed in table 7-1 throughout the environmental review process. In addition, meetings were held with various Prince William County and Fairfax County agencies to gather additional information about the project area, review plans and policies, and to discuss specific technical issues, such as traffic modeling and forecasting efforts. Several other agencies were consulted and provided technical information or details about their facilities and services within the study area.

Because several other ongoing studies are within the same general vicinity as this project, a significant aspect of the coordination effort involved these other studies: the I-66 Multimodal Transportation & Environmental Study (I-66 MTES), the Tri-County Location Study (TCP), and the Manassas National Battlefield Park General Management Plan (GMP). Coordination efforts with these other studies have been instrumental in the development of alternatives for this study, as well as helping to share resources and reduce project costs. Chapter 2 provides more detail on the locations and nature of specific coordination between project alternatives with alternatives from other studies.