

Errata Sheet

Comment #	Section	Comment	Comment By	Response to Comment
1	General	Eads Street interchange (on/off ramps) with I-395 needs special attention due to major bus artery, existing HOV lanes, and proposed northern terminus of I-95/I-395 HOT lanes. DoD shuttle bus platforms may be relocated from North Rotary to lower platform of Pentagon Metrobus terminal.	Brian Higgins, WHS-DFD-DO Alexis Olmstead, DFD-MSD Phyllis Kaplan, DFD-ETSD	Comment noted.
2	Cover	Show whole Study Area	Brian Higgins, WHS-DFD-DO Alexis Olmstead, DFD-MSD Phyllis Kaplan, DFD-ETSD	Modified as requested.
3	Pg 38-42, Sec. 3.4.3 Bus Service	Include DoD Bus Routes that use the Corridor, including Routes 3 (Crystal City), 6 (Ft. McNair-Navy Yard), 7 (Capitol Hill-GAO), 8 (Navy Yard-Crystal City), and 15 (Bolling AFB)	Brian Higgins, WHS-DFD-DO Alexis Olmstead, DFD-MSD Phyllis Kaplan, DFD-ETSD	This information cannot be provided by DoD for security reasons, therefore, it cannot be included in the document.
4	Pg 66 Section 4.3 Federal Agencies & Figure 4.2	Federal interests include DoD and other agency tenants and contractors in leased facilities in Crystal City and Pentagon City	Brian Higgins, WHS-DFD-DO Alexis Olmstead, DFD-MSD Phyllis Kaplan, DFD-ETSD	Sentence in section modified to say “The 14 th Street Bridge Corridor study area encompasses one of the largest concentrations of federal agencies in the Washington, DC Metropolitan Area as it includes the Pentagon, the Southwest Federal District, and other agency tenants and contractors in leased facilities in Crystal City and Pentagon City”
5	Figure 4.2, #37	On the map, Pentagon Parking is shown on top of I-395. Instead show North Parking, South Parking, and 3 lots between I-395 and Army Navy Drive. PFPA (Pentagon Force Protection Agency) Parking Office calls them Hayes, Fern, and Eads lots.	Brian Higgins, WHS-DFD-DO Alexis Olmstead, DFD-MSD Phyllis Kaplan, DFD-ETSD	Modified as requested.
6	Pg 67, Figure 4.2, #34	Arlington Columbarium or Arlington Cemetery Columbarium?	Brian Higgins, WHS-DFD-DO Alexis Olmstead, DFD-MSD Phyllis Kaplan, DFD-ETSD	Section and Figure modified as requested.
7	Pg 104-108 Sec. 5.9 Hazardous Waste	We are unaware of any LUST (sic) (leaking underground storage tanks) on the Pentagon Reservation. Contaminated soils were cleaned up when the Pentagon Heating & Refrigeration Plant (H&RP) and the Pentagon Citgo Quarters K Gas Station were replaced in the 1990s. There are 90-day	Brian Higgins, WHS-DFD-DO Alexis Olmstead, DFD-MSD	The third paragraph of section 5.9 states: ” The most recent data available for hazardous waste review was obtained from Fidelity: National Information Solutions, formerly VISTAinfo. This data is from 2002 and showed information from 19 databases for the District of Columbia and 12 databases for Arlington, Virginia. Of

Comment #	Section	Comment	Comment By	Response to Comment
		hazardous waste accumulation sites at the northern end of the Remote Delivery Facility and between Wings 1&2 of the Navy Annex (FB2)	Phyllis Kaplan, DFD-ETSD	these databases, points in the study area existed for 11 databases. These sites may or may not be in operation currently or they may have been relocated, but due to the nature of hazardous waste, it is still important to review these locations.”
8	Chapter 3	All mention of Appendix D should read Appendix C	Khalid Gandhi, VDOT	Chapter modified as requested.
9	Appendix C, Photo 10	Can’t see any concrete parapet (Page 57 of 108 under L’Enfant Promenade)	Khalid Gandhi, VDOT	Comment noted.
10	Chapter 3	The term “(bridge) currently qualifies for federal funding for rehabilitation”. I am aware there is a complicated equation that correlates Bridge Sufficiency Rating and Structural Inventory & Appraisal ratings and determines the qualification for this funding. A lay person reading the Existing Condition Report might construe that the bridges are unsafe and need to be rehabilitated. You might consider clarifying the rating. You also might consider reproducing the equation used for assessing as you have done for Accident Analysis (Appendix B, Page 19).	Khalid Gandhi, VDOT	Section modified as requested.
11	Pg 72 of 108, Sec. 4.4.5 Community and Recreation Center	“These community/recreation centers will be affected by traffic patterns, as parents need to be able to reach and leave the facility”. This will impact not just visitors to the Community and Recreation Center but also visitors to schools and libraries. In fact there are more frequent trips to/from schools (in most cases twice a day) than to Community and Recreation Center.	Khalid Gandhi, VDOT	Section 4.4.5 modified to read “These community/recreation centers will be affected by traffic patterns, as do the other facilities, as parents need to be able to reach the facility and leave the facility.” Similar language added to Section 4.4.4 Educational facilities.
12	Table 3.4, Second note at the bottom	In light of my telecon with your office last week I was told that accident data for I-395 had been received but not incorporated at the time of printing this (draft) report. Please do include the data in the final Existing Conditions Report or change the Note to reflect that data has been received but not incorporated at the time of printing report.	Khalid Gandhi, VDOT	Accident data from Arlington County has been received but was not incorporated at the time of publishing. Note at the bottom of 3.4 has been changed to reflect this information.
13	Pg 18 of 108	The HOV lanes are within the I-95 corridor in the south and in the I-395 corridor in the north. In Table 3.2 you might consider changing Northbound I-395 to Northbound I-95/I-395 and in Table 3.3 you might consider changing Southbound I-395 to Southbound I-395/I-95. If you are pressed for cell/row space in the table heading, you could use VA instead of Virginia.	Khalid Gandhi, VDOT	Page 18 modified as requested.
14	Pg 18 of 108, Tables 3.2 and 3.3	Please verify the times. Information attached for you perusal and reference.	Khalid Gandhi, VDOT	Times changed to be correct.
15		The report indicates the accident rate at Army Navy Drive and Hayes Street to be over 5.0. The ADT used for this rate calculation was 8,000 vehicles/day. A mid-2005 turning movement count of the intersection indicates over 21,000 vehicles in 7.5 hours on a weekday. We do not have the ADT information for this intersection, which would be close to 35-40 k. This in turn will bring the rate down to 1.0 or close. ADT numbers for all other Arlington intersections with accident rates higher than 1.0 should be checked also.	Arlington County	Modified as requested.

Comment #	Section	Comment	Comment By	Response to Comment
16		This report should identify major existing studies/initiatives that will impact this EIS. Both BRAC and the I-95/395 HOT Lanes come to mind.	Arlington County	Section will be included in next version of Existing Conditions Report.
17		Please be specific when discussing ridership at a rail station. Metro provides numbers in the form of “entries” and “exits”. The boarding at the Virginia Metrorail stations seem particularly low; this may be due to misunderstanding in reporting.	Arlington County	Information in Table 3.5 reflects information provided by WMATA (Larry Levin, Rail Operations Specialist, llevin@wmata.com). He indicated that these are “Boardings” only. Information in Table 3.6 reflects information provided by VRE (Christine Hoeffner, choeffner@vre.org). She indicated that these are “Boardings” only.
18		In the Snapshot document, please list all the Metrorail Stations that are considered part of the study corridor, so that readers have some context for the statistics reported.	Arlington County	Snapshot modified as requested.
19	Pg. 43	On p. 43 of the larger document, one sentence that says, “... Area 5 includes bike signs..., but no route is indicated on Virginia’s bike map.” While it may be true that this route is not on Virginia’s map, it is on Arlington County’s bike map. We would be happy to provide you with a copy. This should also be reflected on the map on the adjacent page.	Arlington County	Section modified to change phrase “on Virginia’s bike map” to “on Figure 3.11”
20	Bicycle Activity Map	Also on the Bicycle Activity map, it should be noted that Arlington has funding to study numbers 4 and 8.	Arlington County	Modified as requested.
21	Maps	On several of the maps, the north-south streets (Eads, Fern, Hayes) are mislabeled; not a substantive problem but might help with credibility.	Arlington County	Modified as requested.
22		Problems seemed focused on the I-395 regular lanes, and on motorists. While several of the weave/merge areas that were designed 40 years ago don’t meet today’s standards, because they seem to experience few crashes, they probably are not as big of a problem as the report leads one to believe.	Arlington County	Please note that accident data recorded to date does not include data from Arlington County along I-395 between Glebe Rd and the GWMP. In any case, our analysis of weave/merge areas not only focused on safety, but also travel speeds/times throughout the study area. We identified four critical weave areas: 2 in Arlington Co along I-395 (northbound and southbound) between GWMP and US Route/VA Route 110 interchanges and two in the southwest quadrant of Washington, DC, along I-395 (NB and SB) between Maine Avenue and the SE Freeway split that (Figures 3,5 and 3.6) and a high number of accidents (Figure 3.3). Travel speeds were as low as 4.9 mph in some cases. Consequently, we believe that the weave areas are a significant concern.
23		On the other hand, in the morning, the Eads Street off-ramp (and/or downstream, perhaps the Pentagon roadway and/or Eads/Army-Navy intersection) is a major bottleneck, sometimes backing up the express lanes as far south as Landmark. This should be emphasized more strongly in the existing conditions, as it is a problem for all modes.	Arlington County	We include a brief write-up in the next version of the Existing Conditions report under General Queuing Observations on page 35.
24		In the evening, it is a problem for HOVs from Crystal City to reach the southbound express lanes, because the lack of access from northbound Eads forces them to use Fern and the Pentagon roadway – this should be noted in the report.	Arlington County	We will note this condition in the next version of the Existing Conditions Report.
25		It should also be pointed out that a longstanding problem for Arlington has been the difficulty for pedestrians and bicyclists to access the Potomac waterfront. The new connections to be built in conjunction with the Humpback Bridge will be a big help, but for some areas such as the North Tract, the waterfront is so close but will still be so far away.	Arlington County	Map modified to show disconnected sections.

Comment #	Section	Comment	Comment By	Response to Comment
26		Another problem area that should be noted in the report is that the express lanes between the Pentagon and D.C. are congested – both in the peak and contraflow directions – with HOVs needing to wait in queues behind LOVs.	Arlington County	We will include a brief write-up in the next version of the Existing Conditions Report under General Queuing Observations or page 35. We would prefer to use the terms HOVs and non-HOVs in our discussion to minimize or avoid any unnecessary confusion that might be created by using LOVs.
27	Chapter 3	Under the heading Transit Activities, it states in the fourth bullet that “The interlinking of the Green and Yellow Lines between L’Enfant Plaza and the Convention Center limits capacity improvements.” WMATA (aka METRO) changed that in December 2006 and implemented it on 1 January 2007. The new METRO system maps are already in all of the system cars and stations showing the Green and Yellow Lines running concurrently between Convention center and Fort Totten. The Yellow Line now runs from Huntington to Fort Totten, it used to stop at the Convention Center. KCI should discuss further with WMATA for more information	FHWA-DC Edward Sheldahl	Section modified as requested.
28	Section 4.5 Cultural Features	In general, the section on Cultural Resources provides a good description of the previously documented within the study area. The suggested recommendation with regard to working with the various historic preservation offices is standard practice in this situation given the monumentality of the known historic properties	VDOT- Steve Lemont	Comment noted.
29	Section 5.7 Air Quality	Page 101, second full paragraph- Please change the wording of the first sentence to “Arlington County and the District of Columbia are located in the Washington, DC-Maryland Virginia 8-hour Ozone Moderate Non-attainment Area.”	VDOT- Steve Lemont	Section modified as requested.
30	Section 5.7 Air Quality	Page 101, second full paragraph- Please make reference to the fact that both Arlington County and DC are in the Washington, DC-Maryland-Virginia CO Maintenance Area.	VDOT- Steve Lemont	Section modified as requested.
31	Section 5.7 Air Quality	Page 101, third full paragraph- Please change the wording of the last to: “The attainment plan for the Washington, DC-Maryland-Virginia 8-hour Ozone Non-attainment Area requires the reduction of VOC and NOx emissions from transportation sources.”	VDOT- Steve Lemont	Section modified as requested.
32	Section 5.7 Air Quality	Page 101, last paragraph- Please insert: “The attainment plan for the Washington, DC-Maryland-Virginia PM2.5 Non-attainment Area is currently under development.”	VDOT- Steve Lemont	Section modified as requested.
33	Section 5.7 Air Quality	Table 5.5 Effective December 18, 2006, the Primary Standard for PM2.5 is 35µg/m ³	VDOT- Steve Lemont	Section modified as requested.
34	Section 5.7 Air Quality	Page 102, last paragraph- Please change the wording of the last sentence to: “ Every regionally significant change to the Regional Constrained Long Range Transportation Plan (CLRP) and/or the Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) for the DC-Maryland-Virginia Non-attainment and Maintenance Areas is reviewed for it compliance with regional conformity requirements for Ozone, PM2.5 and CO.”	VDOT- Steve Lemont	Section modified as requested.
35	Section 5.7 Air Quality	Page 103, second to last sentence before Noise Section- This should read: “The IAQC is composed OF (not is) six cabinet level...”	VDOT- Steve Lemont	Section modified as requested.

Comment #	Section	Comment	Comment By	Response to Comment
36	Section 5.8-Noise	As noted, there are noise sensitive activities within the area. These sites will need to be studied in detail as part of the EIS.	VDOT- Steve Lemont	Comment noted.
37	Section 5.8-Noise	A noise level range is given, but there is no discussion of how these noise levels were determined. Is it from measurements or from modeling? A brief discussion is needed as to how these results were achieved.	VDOT- Steve Lemont	It is acknowledged that there are noise sensitive locations in the study area. Further description of modeling techniques will be given in the DEIS if a proposed alternative would create more noise.
38	Section 5.9-Hazardous Waste	Line 1 under Section 5.9 on page 104 reads: <i>“Hazardous waste is defined as any material that has a harmful effect or poses a deleterious threat to human health and/or the natural environment when mismanaged.”</i> This definition of hazardous waste is too broad and loose, and is inconsistent with the U.S. EPA regulatory definition of Hazardous Waste in 40 CFR 261.3. Hazardous waste is NOT ANY MATERIAL. Hazardous waste is a subset of solid wastes. The author should access the link, http://www.epa.gov/epaoswer/osw/laws-reg.htm#regs and revise the definition of hazardous waste. If the major reason for a NEPA document is regulatory compliance, then adherence to the regulatory definition of hazardous waste is important.	VDOT- Steve Lemont	Language modified to reflect comment.
39	Section 5.9-Hazardous Waste	The first sentence of paragraph 2 on page 104 is in error. Hazardous waste is regulated by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). Neither CERCLA nor SARA regulates hazardous waste. For the sake of clarity, please access the following link and ascertain the applicability of CERCLA and SARA: http://www.epa.gov/superfund/action/law/index.htm . Also, the author should put a period after RCRA, and delete the two dependent clause in line one of paragraph 2 under Section 5.9.	VDOT- Steve Lemont	Sentence deleted regarding CERCLA and SARA.
40	Section 5.9-Hazardous Waste	The second line in paragraph 1 on page 108, and the second line in paragraph two on the same page are used to argue that there is no pattern in the distribution of underground storage tanks (USTs) and leaking underground storage tanks (LUSTs). This argument is incorrect. Consider Figure 5.4 and start at the intersection of 4 th Street and Virginia Avenue; then proceed from this intersection and go directly south on 4 th Street. There is a generally linear pattern of blue dots (UST sites). Similar patterns are clearly visible and parallel to Main Street, 7 th Street, and 6 th Street. A cluster of blue dots is visible at the southeastern corner of Figure 5.4. A line enclosing this cluster of blue dots form a an elliptical pattern. Finally, Figure 5.5 shows a linear pattern of LUST sites (red dots) along the G.W. Parkway, and linear blue dots (UST sites) along Jefferson Davis Highway.	VDOT- Steve Lemont	After reviewing the maps and the locations of the LUST and UST sites, our GIS and map interpretation specialists still do not see any significant spatial distribution pattern of those sites; though as a whole, the point do fall along infrastructure lines.
41	General	Is it too early/late to discuss the existing status (e.g. decaying, rusting, intact, leaded, etc.) of paint on the steel structures of the bridges?	VDOT- Steve Lemont	The overall condition of the bridges presented in the Existing Conditions Report takes the condition of the paint system into consideration; therefore, specific comments regarding the condition of the paint are not warranted at this time. As alternatives are investigated and developed for the project, bridge maintenance and rehabilitation items, such as paint condition, will be considered.
42	General	For such an urban area, how about non-point sources of pollution in the	VDOT- Steve	Will be evaluated if a studied alternative creates a significant change in impervious

Comment #	Section	Comment	Comment By	Response to Comment
		study area and their impacts (if any) on existing water quality?	Lemont	surface or a non-point source.
43	Cover	Remove consultant name/logo from cover.	FHWA-EFLHD – Lisa Landers	Cover modified as requested.
44	General	The SOW identifies the need to look at the economic base and employment patterns. I saw on economics, but I didn't see anything identifying the major employers and any details regarding their employees	FHWA-EFLHD – Lisa Landers	A section regarding employment in the region has been added to Section 4.
45	General	The SOW also specified the existing conditions report identify a list of agencies with jurisdictional approval and other public and private entities. KCI already has this information, so it wouldn't be hard to add in.	FHWA-EFLHD – Lisa Landers	Section 4.4.2 has been added to address comment.
46	Section 3.5.2	Carpooling (Slugging) should be expanded. They have a website with a list of pick-up points and routes. This information should be added to the report.	FHWA-EFLHD – Lisa Landers	Section modified as requested.
47	Table 5.2- Vascular Plants in Study Area	Some the last year observed dates seem to point to the fact that the plants are no longer around. I would hope that after 100 years of it not being seen that we could take it off the list. One year dates back to 1888...	FHWA-EFLHD – Lisa Landers	Species last seen over one hundred years ago have been removed from Table 5.2.
48	Figure 3.13	While the Mount Vernon Trail (MVT) is correctly shown as a bicycle facility in Figure 3.11, it should also be shown as a pedestrian pathway in Figure 3.13 with connectivity to the path across the George Mason Memorial Bridge.	NPS-GWMP – Garth Shull	Figure modified as requested.
49	Figure 3.13	As the nation's most heavily-used, the MVT alone should be noted on Figure 3.13 as a "common destination" for pedestrians.	NPS-GWMP – Garth Shull	Section modified as requested.
50	Figure 3.13	Show the route via the pedestrian bridge connecting Columbia Island to the Pentagon parking lot as a "pedestrian pathway."	NPS-GWMP – Garth Shull	Figure modified as requested.
51		It would make more sense to report the number of passengers crossing the bridge, rather than just the entries and exits at Metrorail stations in the study area.	Arlington County	This is stated in section 3.4.1 as the average peak hour load of the Yellow line leaving the Pentagon station traveling to L'Enfant Plaza.
52		When reporting bus transit data, it would make sense to report not only the number of buses crossing the bridge, but also the capacity of those buses, as well as the actual ridership.	Arlington County	We have contacted the affected transit agencies regarding this comment and will include this information in an addendum when the data becomes available.
53		One of the problem locations that should be listed in the Bicycle section is that there is no connection over the GW Parkway from the Mt. Vernon Trail to the trail that will be constructed as part of Arlington's North Tract project.	Arlington County	This comment will be addressed in Section 4.8 under North Tract.
54	General	The one photo of the parkway that was included in the report did not adequately represent the site and activities that are located in the vicinity of George Washington Memorial Parkway (GWMP) and the 14 th Street Bridge. Therefore, we will send you several digital photos in an e-mail that you may choose from, including Lyndon Baines Johnson Memorial, the Mount Vernon Trail where it connects to the 14 th Street Bridge, the view from GWMP to DC and the view from GWMP to the 14 th Street Bridge	NPS-GWMP Debbie Feldman	Section modified as requested.
55	General	Columbia Island, Lady Bird Johnson Park, Roaches Run Waterfowl Sanctuary are all located in Washington, D.C., not in Arlington County	NPS-GWMP Debbie Feldman	Modified as requested.

Comment #	Section	Comment	Comment By	Response to Comment
56	General	The project limits that are outlined on several of the maps of the area seem to be more narrowly defined than they should be, if they are supposed to capture overall project impacts. Are the outlined limits reflecting just actual construction related locales? Or is the boundary line trying to capture the area of potential effect for the project? For impacts to the GWMP, I would suggest extending the northern limit for GWMP up through Memorial Avenue, Memorial Circle, Memorial Bridge, and the exit for Route 50 north of Memorial Circle. For a southern limit for the GWMP, I would suggest extending the boundary through GWMP land south to the Route 233 entrance to Reagan National Airport.	NPS-GWMP Debbie Feldman	The Study Area boundary focuses on the area most likely to include any proposed improvements as well as their primary physical and travel impacts. There are specific impacts that are more broadly experienced (for example, air quality and visual impacts) for which the assessment of impacts will include larger geographic areas.
57	General	One of the maps handed out during the field trip had the “Navy and Marine Memorial” mis-identified as the “Navy – Marine Terminal.” The congressionally legislated name is the “Navy and Marine Memorial Dedicated to Americans Lost at Sea” and has been commonly referred to in a shortened form as the “Navy and Marine Memorial.”	NPS-GWMP Debbie Feldman	The label on the tour map was an error and the map will not appear in the Existing Conditions Report.
58	Section 4.5.2 Historic Resources	The discussion of historic resources within and adjacent to the project area (depending on how the project area is defined) is incomplete for the properties under the administration of the GWMP. Lyndon Baines Johnson Memorial Grove on the Potomac (LBJ Grove) is an individually listed National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) property located within Lady Bird Johnson Park (Columbia Island) and is in the currently outlined boundaries. This would make 11 historic properties in the “study area” (versus the 10 cited in the text and listed in Table 4.11).	NPS-GWMP Debbie Feldman	LBJ Grove added to list of historic resources. The study area includes 20 known NRHP eligible and listed properties and DC Historic Landmarks. These properties are discussed individually and summarized in Table 4.11.
59	Section 4.5.2 Historic Resources	Other GWMP-administered properties should be considered and mentioned, and possibly included within the project limits “study area,” thereby increasing the historic properties number for the “study area.” Just outside the currently outlined project boundaries is Arlington Memorial Bridge (and Memorial Avenue Corridor), also an individually listed NRHP property. And somewhat further outside of the currently outlined project boundaries (but within viewshed impacts) are Theodore Roosevelt Island and Arlington House, the Robert E. Lee Memorial, both individually listed NRHP properties	NPS-GWMP Debbie Feldman	As noted above, 20 historic properties are located within the boundaries of the project study area. A “Secondary Evaluation Area”, which surrounds the project study area, was delineated to consider NRHP listed or eligible properties and local landmark historic properties with views of the 14 th Street Bridge corridor. The Arlington Memorial Bridge, Theodore Roosevelt Island and the Robert E. Lee Memorial are noted in this section of the text.
60	Section 4.5.2 Historic Resources	The bulleted <i>Historic Properties in Washington, DC</i> should include a separate entry for LBJ Grove (within Lady Bird Johnson Park on Columbia Island). And if Theodore Roosevelt Island is included in the study area, it could be discussed as a separate NRHP property entry.	NPS-GWMP Debbie Feldman	A separate entry for LBJ Grove has been added to the bulleted list and Table 4.11. Theodore Roosevelt Island is included in the Secondary Evaluation Area discussion.
61	Section 4.5.2 Historic Resources	The bulleted <i>Historic Properties in Washington, DC and Virginia</i> should have the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway and GWMP section rewritten for clarity, perhaps having the heading Mount Vernon Memorial Highway and GWMP . Suggest the first sentence to be rewritten as “The Mount Vernon Memorial Highway <i>portion of the GWMP</i> extends across Columbia Island (in Washington, DC) along... ..Mount Vernon and <i>the</i>	NPS-GWMP Debbie Feldman	Section modified to have two bullets in the section: Mount Vernon Memorial Highway and George Washington Memorial Parkway. The language in the section has been modified as requested. The title has not been changed because the properties are in Washington, DC and Virginia and the title matches the other titles in the section.

Comment #	Section	Comment	Comment By	Response to Comment
		<i>GWMP also extends north of DC on both sides... ..Capital Beltway.” The second, third, fourth, and fifth sentences could be rewritten as “The Mount Vernon Memorial Highway portion of the GWMP was the first parkway to be constructed and maintained by the US government, incorporating the latest in modern roadway design and establishing standards for later parkways constructed by the NPS. The Mount Vernon Memorial Highway also serves a significant commemorative function, explicit in the name and alignment. The Mount Vernon Memorial Highway portion of GWMP is a DC Historic... .. in May 1981.” Then continue with the rest of the paragraph</i>		
62	Section 4.5.2 Historic Resources	This paragraph should also include a note on the Navy and Marine Memorial, included under the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway NRHP nomination. Also, a brief discussion of Lady Bird Johnson Park would be in order.	NPS-GWMP Debbie Feldman	This paragraph has been revised to include mention of the Navy-Marine Memorial and Lady Bird Johnson Park
63	Section 4.5.2 Historic Resources	In this paragraph the Arlington Memorial Bridge (and Memorial Avenue Corridor) could be discussed as a separate NRHP property entry if included in the study area	NPS-GWMP Debbie Feldman	See response to comment 59.
64	Section 4.5.2 Historic Resources	The bulleted <i>Historic Properties in Arlington County, Virginia</i> should separate the Arlington National Cemetery description and the Arlington House, the Robert E. Lee Memorial description into two entries. The Arlington House text should be rewritten for clarity: “ <i>Arlington House, the Robert E. Lee Memorial, listed on the NRHP in April 1980, was constructed by Washington’s adopted grandson George Washington Parke Custis from 1802 - 1817 and was later the home of Robert E. Lee. The site, located within Arlington National Cemetery, is a NPS property and is managed by the George Washington Memorial Parkway.</i> ”	NPS-GWMP Debbie Feldman	See response to comment 59.
65	Section 4.5.3 Archeological Resources	The statement regarding the high archeological potential for the project area is a good one, despite the apparent large scale disturbance by modern construction. Much fill was brought in for construction and sites may be more deeply buried, as what occurred at 44AR37	NPS-GWMP Debbie Feldman	Comment noted.
66	Section 4.6.1 National Parks	The Lady Bird Johnson Park entry should be more appropriately listed as a sub-entry under George Washington Memorial Parkway. In the GWMP entry, mention should be made of Arlington Memorial Bridge and Memorial Avenue with the Women in Military Service to America Memorial and other memorials along the Avenue. Correct the mistaken name of <i>Navy-Merchant Marine Memorial</i> to “ <i>Navy and Marine Memorial.</i> ”	NPS-GWMP Debbie Feldman	Section modified as requested.
67	Page 2, 1.3	The corridor provides access to George Washington Memorial Parkway, as well as the mall, etc. Landmarks that should be added are Arlington House, The Robert E. Lee Memorial, Women in Military Service for America Memorial (WIMSA), Mount Vernon Trail, Lyndon Baines Memorial Grove.	NPS-GWMP Debbie Feldman	Section 1.3 is meant to provide a brief overview of the study area. More detail is provided in later sections, specifically in Section 4 Existing Social and Cultural Features.

Comment #	Section	Comment	Comment By	Response to Comment
68	Page 6, 2.1.2	Include sites along GWMP: Mount Vernon Trail, Waves and Gulls Navy.	NPS-GWMP Debbie Feldman	Section modified to now include a paragraph in the Arlington Land Use section depicting the GWMP sites.
69	Page 10, Table 3.1, Row 3	Check to see if GWMP is being classified as an evacuation route. Recent meetings seem to indicate it would at least be a (2).	NPS-GWMP Debbie Feldman	Following additional reviews of roadway maps, we have determined that the GWMP is not a marked evacuation map.
70	Page 43, 3.6	Suggest adding (GWMP) after Mount Vernon Trail and removing Potomac Heritage Trail, which is from TRI to the American Legion Bridge.	NPS-GWMP Debbie Feldman	Section modified as requested.
71	Page 43, 3.6	Last paragraph: Suggest providing brief description of proposed improvements to Humpback Bridge.	NPS-GWMP Debbie Feldman	Section modified as requested.
72	Page 49, first paragraph	Add “Mount Vernon Trail.” Lady Bird Johnson Memorial Park, Columbia Island Marina, Lyndon Baines Johnson Memorial Grove and the Navy and Marine Memorial are located in Washington D.C. not Arlington County	NPS-GWMP Debbie Feldman	Section modified as requested.
73	Page 69, Table 4.7	Suggest adding Columbia Island Marina, Mount Vernon Trail, and Lady Bird Johnson Park	NPS-GWMP Debbie Feldman	This table is meant to show buildings and other facilities occupied by federal agencies. Descriptions of suggested places can be found elsewhere in the document.
74	Page 69/79, 4.4	Suggest adding North Tract Proposal, Arlington County	NPS-GWMP Debbie Feldman	Comment addressed in Section 4.8.
75	Page 70, 4.4.1	Add U.S. Park Police headquarted located at Haines Point, Washington D.C.	NPS-GWMP Debbie Feldman	Section modified as requested.
76	Page 72, Table 4.9	Add Columbia Island Marina, Gravelly Point free boat ramp, and athletic fields.	NPS-GWMP Debbie Feldman	Section modified as requested.
77	Page 74, 4.5.2	State that GWMP is a Historic Designated Landscape listed on the NRHP.	NPS-GWMP Debbie Feldman	We are unfamiliar with the term “Historic Designated Landscape” as related to NRHP listing. Do you mean Historic <i>Designed</i> Landscape?
78	Page 75, Table 4.11	Under GWMP, column four says “05/18/81 (Mt Vernon)” and “06/02/95 (GW)” - Suggest spelling out GW and Mount Vernon	NPS-GWMP Debbie Feldman	Section modified as requested.
79	Page 78	Add “in Oct 1966” for listing of Arlington House.	NPS-GWMP Debbie Feldman	Section modified as requested.
80	Page 80, 4.6	Add GWMP sites, Mount Vernon Trail, Waves and Gulls Navy and Marine Memorial, Gravelly Point, Columbia Island Marina, LBJ Grove, Roaches Run Wildlife Sanctuary.	NPS-GWMP Debbie Feldman	Section 4.6 is intended to serve as a brief introduction. More detail can be found in section 4.6.1 George Washington Memorial Parkway.
81	Page 80, 4.6	Include something about North Tract proposal.	NPS-GWMP Debbie Feldman	North Tract Park has been added to section 4.8.
82	Page 80, 4.6.1	Intro is somewhat random and doesn’t connect well with parks within and adjacent to the project area. Rewrite to describe the parks along the Potomac, VA and DC shoreline, etc. It is not NPS headquarters, it is National Capital Regional headquarters, not the National Park Service headquarters, can also include U.S. Park Police headquarters.	NPS-GWMP Debbie Feldman	Section modified as requested.
83	Page 83	GWMP photo reference incorrect. Provide better photos of GWMP, MVT and sites in project area	NPS-GWMP Debbie Feldman	Correct photographs inserted into the appendices.
84	Page 83	GWMP – add text that describes use of the Mount Vernon Trail.	NPS-GWMP Debbie Feldman	Section modified as requested.
85	Page 83	“Waterfowl Sanctuary” give full name, Roaches Run Waterfowl Sanctuary	NPS-GWMP Debbie Feldman	Section modified as requested.
86	Page 83	GWMP, sentence “visitors to Lady Bird Johnson...” is confusing, making it	NPS-GWMP	Section modified as requested.

Comment #	Section	Comment	Comment By	Response to Comment
		sound like 7 million visitors to that site. In 2006, GWMP recorded 6, 872, 213 site visits. There was not a decrease of 7,000 visitors. The paragraph is not clear on what information is trying to be conveyed. Reword.	Debbie Feldman	
87	Page 84, 4.6.3	Include proposed North Tract	NPS-GWMP Debbie Feldman	North Tract Park description added to section 4.8.
88	Page 90, 5.3.5	Change to Roaches Run Waterfowl Sanctuary, and be consistent throughout document.	NPS-GWMP Debbie Feldman	Section modified as requested.
89	Page 93	“gigantean” should be “gigantean.”	NPS-GWMP Debbie Feldman	Changed to “gigantea”
90	Pages 93 & 94	Boykinia aconitifolia has never been reported from Fairfax or Arlington Counties or any other nearby county. Carex torta is very rare around here, highly unlikely to be present in the project area, compared to the dozens of other Carex sps. that abound in Fairfax and Arlington Counties.	NPS-GWMP Debbie Feldman	<i>Boykinia aconitifolia</i> and <i>Carex torta</i> deleted from section and <i>Carex pensylcanica</i> and <i>Carex vulpinoidea</i> have been added.
91	Page 94	Add Schoenoplectus fluviatilis (S2) to the list of State-listed species known from the project area. It was seen at Roaches Run in 2006.	NPS-GWMP Debbie Feldman	Section modified as requested.
92	Page 96	Glyptemys insculpta is not on the list of Federally Endangered species so it should be removed from that list. It is a State-listed species in Virginia so it should be added to the list on p. 94	NPS-GWMP Debbie Feldman	Table 5.2 is for Vascular Plants only. Glyptemys insculpta was removed from Federally Endangered species list and more information on the species can be found in Appendix F.
93	Page 99	Aesthetic and Viewsheds, first paragraph – Add touring the GWMP offers views of the Potomac River and DC – refer to Capper Crampton Act to describe this park value. Clarify what is meant by representing the “US.”	NPS-GWMP Debbie Feldman	Section modified as requested.
94	Page 100	East Potomac Park is the headquarters for the National Capital Region of the NPS and the U.S. Park Police. The parkway is the gateway into the nation’s capital.	NPS-GWMP Debbie Feldman	Section modified as requested.
95	Section 2.1.1	Please clarify park organizational hierarchy. East and West Potomac Parks are part of the National Mall & Memorial Parks. Similarly, Lady Bird Johnson Park and parklands along the VA side of the river are part of the George Washington Memorial Parkway.	NPS-NAMA Jennifer Talken-Spaulding and Alexa Viets	The Parklands section has been modified to reflect changes suggested by comment.
96	Section 2.1.1	The Martin Luther King Jr. Memorials is only planned at this stage, not yet built.	NPS-NAMA Jennifer Talken-Spaulding and Alexa Viets	Section modified as requested.
97	Section 2.1.1	Note, 14 th Street bridges are the boundary between East and West Potomac Parks; therefore, the Thomas Jefferson Memorial is part of West Potomac Park, not East.	NPS-NAMA Jennifer Talken-Spaulding and Alexa Viets	Section modified as requested.
98	Section 3.4.1	Please also list Federal Center SW and Smithsonian Metro stops in the study area – there is a station exit at 12 th & Independence Ave. for Smithsonian	NPS-NAMA Jennifer Talken-Spaulding and Alexa Viets	Section modified as requested.
99	Section 3.4.2	I believe VRE L’Enfant station has an exit within the study area on 7 th & Maryland Ave. SW. This is at the L’Enfant Metro station – which should	NPS-NAMA Jennifer Talken-	Section modified to include additional VRE stations.

Comment #	Section	Comment	Comment By	Response to Comment
		also be included in other sections as appropriate (where Metro access to the Mall is mentioned).	Spaulding and Alexa Viets	
100	Section 3.6	What is the Washington Wall? Did you mean National Mall?	NPS-NAMA Jennifer Talken-Spaulding and Alexa Viets	Section modified as requested.
101	Figure 3.14	Double check letter label and line for A) Arland D. Williams Bridge – points to wrong bridge.	NPS-NAMA Jennifer Talken-Spaulding and Alexa Viets	Modified as requested.
102	Figure 4.3 and Table 4.9	#10 NPS National Capital Region (not “Area Park”) Headquarters is not a community bldg. All administrative function. Move to Federal Bldg. list.	NPS-NAMA Jennifer Talken-Spaulding and Alexa Viets	Section modified as requested.
103	Figure 4.4	Jefferson Memorial, West Potomac Park and East Potomac Park should all be red stars as they are on the National Register. There are many other spots that could have red stars in your project area, so not sure what criteria you used to place them. (The yellow star to the left of “West” in West Potomac Park might not actually be for the park? It looks like it’s on the Ericsson statue.) Are St. Dominic’s Church, Friendship Baptist Church and the Potomac Place Apartments on the National Register (they have red stars)? Maybe they got mixed on the map (given description on Table 4.11).	NPS-NAMA Jennifer Talken-Spaulding and Alexa Viets	The legend has been revised to note that the blue stars refer to National Historic Landmarks (The Pentagon), the red stars refer to NRHP listed or eligible properties and the yellow stars refer to DC Historic Landmarks.
104	4.5.2 Historic Resources	There are more than 10 historic properties within the study area. For example, the Tidal Basin and Fountain 4 (now part of George Mason Memorial) are listed on the National Register as contributing to the East and West Potomac Parks Historic District. The Washington Monument Grounds is a cultural landscape which is eligible for listing on the National Register (the Washington Monument is listed as is the Mall). IT would be good to clarify this since the APE extends up 14 th Street, which is the boundary between the Washington Monument grounds and the Mall.	NPS-NAMA Jennifer Talken-Spaulding and Alexa Viets	See response to comment 58.
105	4.5.2 Historic Resources	To clarify your list, which includes structures and historic districts, it might be good to note that the National Register listing for both the East and West Potomac Parks Historic District and the L’Enfant Plan include several individual historic structures which contribute to the listing.	NPS-NAMA Jennifer Talken-Spaulding and Alexa Viets	The individual discussions for both the East and West Potomac Parks and the L’Enfant Plan have been revised to reference individual resources that contribute to the property.
106	4.5.2 Historic Resources	Pg 74, 1 st paragraph, 3 rd sentence: rephrase to “including the National Mall and Smithsonian buildings on the northern edge of the study area...”	NPS-NAMA Jennifer Talken-Spaulding and Alexa Viets	Section modified as requested.
107	4.5.2 Historic Resources	Page 74, 2 nd paragraph – the DC government does not own or maintain everything that is listed on its inventory of historic sites. (For example the parklands and memorials owned/ maintained by the NPS, and privately-owned structures in the District.) See the DC SHPO website for more	NPS-NAMA Jennifer Talken-Spaulding and Alexa Viets	Language of the first sentence changed to clarify paragraph. The DC government only maintains the <i>list</i> of properties, not the properties themselves.

Comment #	Section	Comment	Comment By	Response to Comment
		information on their list		
108	4.5.2 Historic Resources	Pg 77, 2 nd paragraph – East and West Potomac Parks created early 19 th Century.	NPS-NAMA Jennifer Talken-Spaulding and Alexa Viets	The discussion of East and West Potomac Parks has been revised to state that the parks were established by Senate Bill 3307 in 1897.
109	4.5.2 Historic Resources	It was not created to “serve as a backdrop and repository for a large portion of Washington’s commemorative monuments,” but for functional and recreational purposes. Refer to the National Register listing. Its use has evolved certainly – refer to the Commemorative Works Act.	NPS-NAMA Jennifer Talken-Spaulding and Alexa Viets	The discussion of the East and West Potomac Parks has been revised to note that the parks were established as public recreational areas.
110	4.5.2 Historic Resources	East Potomac Park was established before 1912 – not sure of your reference here.	NPS-NAMA Jennifer Talken-Spaulding and Alexa Viets	The discussion of East Potomac Park was revised to remove this statement.
111	4.5.2 Historic Resources	Better to say “Lincoln Memorial and grounds” and “Thomas Jefferson Memorial and grounds.”	NPS-NAMA Jennifer Talken-Spaulding and Alexa Viets	Section modified as requested.
112	Section 4.5.3	Archeological Resources – Under contract by the Smithsonian Institution, The Louis Berger Group, Inc. has recently undertaken a Phase I archeological survey of the portion of the Washington Monument grounds within the study area. This is part of Smithsonian’s compliance efforts related to the proposed site of the National Museum of African-American History and Culture (currently NPS lands). The park received the draft report in March. The final should be available this spring. Contact Amy Ballard with the Smithsonian for a copy – 202-633-6535	NPS-NAMA Jennifer Talken-Spaulding and Alexa Viets	Comment noted.
113	Section 4.5.3	Your final statement about the archeological potential for this area being high is good.	NPS-NAMA Jennifer Talken-Spaulding and Alexa Viets	Comment noted.
114	Figure 4.5 Parklands	Do you want to include the future sites of the new memorials within the project area? See map attachments.	NPS-NAMA Jennifer Talken-Spaulding and Alexa Viets	New memorials within the project area will be included in section 4.8 and its associated map.
115	Section 4.6	The phrasing of the second paragraph is somewhat misleading, stating that the park lands lie “adjacent to Washington, DC.” They <u>are</u> within the DC boundaries.	NPS-NAMA Jennifer Talken-Spaulding and Alexa Viets	Section modified as requested.
116	Section 4.6.1	Page 80, Replace 1 st paragraph with the following: In DC, public parkland was part of the original 1792 L’Enfant Plan for the city and were held as such by other public agencies until transferred to the National park Service by Executive Order in 1933. The National Park Service was created as a bureau of the Department of Interior in 1916. The NPS presently manages	NPS-NAMA Jennifer Talken-Spaulding and Alexa Viets	Section modified as requested.

Comment #	Section	Comment	Comment By	Response to Comment
		nearly 400 park units covering over 84 million acres throughout the US and its territories.		
117	Section 4.6.1	Page 80, The NPS HQ is NOT in East Potomac Park. Thomas Jefferson Memorial is within West Potomac Park, not East. The privately-owned sculpture “The Awakening”, in East Potomac Park is not owned by the NPS. Rephrase to: “This park contains the headquarters for the National Mall & Memorial Parks, the NPS National Capital Regional Offices, the East Potomac Golf Course, and other recreational facilities.”	NPS-NAMA Jennifer Talken-Spaulding and Alexa Viets	Section modified as requested.
118	Section 4.6.1	Page 82, Correct closest metro references – closest stations are L’Enfant and Smithsonian.	NPS-NAMA Jennifer Talken-Spaulding and Alexa Viets	Section modified as requested.
119	Section 4.6.1	Page 82, Last sentence, 2 nd Paragraph – visitors also enjoying fishing in East Potomac Park	NPS-NAMA Jennifer Talken-Spaulding and Alexa Viets	Section modified as requested.
120	Section 4.6.1, West Potomac Park	2 nd sentence – park also includes the Thomas Jefferson Memorial and the George Mason Memorial and “extends to the Washington Monument grounds.”	NPS-NAMA Jennifer Talken-Spaulding and Alexa Viets	Section modified as requested.
121	Section 4.6.1, West Potomac Park	1 st paragraph, last sentence – viewshed also includes the White House (looking north from the Thomas Jefferson Memorial)	NPS-NAMA Jennifer Talken-Spaulding and Alexa Viets	Section modified as requested.
122	Section 4.6.1, The National Mall	1 st sentence – Rephrase: The National Mall stretches from the Lincoln Memorial to the U.S. Capitol, with the Mall stretching between the grounds of the Washington Monument and the Capitol. Also – reference to Appendix E should be for photos 4 and 5. (Also Photo 5 should be replaced with a picture of visitors on the Mall walkways with the Mall in view. The existing photo does not capture the context of visitors on the Mall.)	NPS-NAMA Jennifer Talken-Spaulding and Alexa Viets	Section modified as requested.
123	Section 4.6.1, The National Mall	1 st paragraph, last sentence: Views Include the view from the Capitol to the Lincoln Memorial, Jefferson to the White House, etc. There are multiple viewshed, which include the architectural elements of the buildings lining the Mall. Consider what you are trying to portray with the last sentence and rephrase. (i.e., the buildings are part of the landscape, not “blocking” it).	NPS-NAMA Jennifer Talken-Spaulding and Alexa Viets	Section modified as requested.
124	Section 4.6.2	Page 84, Benjamin Banneker Park – this park is part of the NPS National Mall & Memorial Parks, it is not a DC Parks and Recreation park	NPS-NAMA Jennifer Talken-Spaulding and Alexa Viets	Benjamin Banneker Park description moved to NPS lands section.
125	Section 4.6.2	Page 84, The Appendix E reference should be Photo 9. You might want to recheck all of your Appendix photo reference throughout the document for accuracy.	NPS-NAMA Jennifer Talken-Spaulding and	Section modified as requested.

Comment #	Section	Comment	Comment By	Response to Comment
			Alexa Viets	
126	Section 5.3.3 Tidal Basin (Page 88)	The Tidal Basin is a constructed body of water (not partially man-made). It was constructed between 1882-1890s by the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers. Your figures appear in error. The Tidal Basin covers 110 acres and averages about 6 feet deep.	NPS-NAMA Jennifer Talken- Spaulding and Alexa Viets	Section modified as requested.
127	Section 5.5.1 Terrestrial Habitat (Page 93)	1 st paragraph, last sentence – Would suggest rephrasing the average time of the cherry tree blooming to months. The association with the Cherry Blossom Festival implies that the Kwanzan trees are “late” because the bloom after the festival – an arbitrary date. To see the records of the bloom dates, visit: www.nps.gov/cherry .	NPS-NAMA Jennifer Talken- Spaulding and Alexa Viets	Section modified as requested.
128	Section 5.6 (Page 99)	The viewsheds are important because they contain iconic symbols of the United States, representing a landscape of our shared democratic heritage. The Aesthetics and Viewshed section needs to be revised to reflect the significance of these cultural landscapes and their protected viewshed. Discussion implies these are just nice features rather than representing them a part of the historic design of the city/region. The cultural landscapes and viewshed are protected under Sec. 106 as cultural features, much like a memorial, particularly where they have been identified as contributing elements to a National Register designation. Please revise first 3-4 paragraphs of this section to better reflect these meanings. Most of the areas mentioned are within national historic districts, which might give some grounding for your statements.	NPS-NAMA Jennifer Talken- Spaulding and Alexa Viets	Section modified as requested.
129	Section 5.6 (Page 99)	For guidance review NCPC Legacy Plan (1997) or the DC State Historic Preservation Office’s listing of resources/districts. See also the National Register listings (CD provided 8/2006) for the L’Enfant Plan of Washington DC (listed 1997) and the East and West Potomac Parks National Historic District (1999). If you want, you can access the NPS Preservation Brief on cultural landscapes by clicking “protecting cultural landscapes” from: http://www.cr.nps.gov/hps/hli/ For the Secretary of Interior’s treatment standards, click “landscape guidelines.” We have also completed cultural landscape inventories for both the Mall and Union Square which are accessible from our Mall Plan website: http://www.nps.gov/nationalmallplan/Studies.html	NPS-NAMA Jennifer Talken- Spaulding and Alexa Viets	Language added in the Aesthetics and Viewsheds Section to reflect comment.
130	Section 5.6 (Page 99)	Also note: visitors come to Washington because it is a) the Nation’s Capital and b) to visit the museums and memorials, c) conduct business, etc. Maybe “revel over the architecture” is intended to mean the memorials? Otherwise, this is probably not a primary reason for visiting DC.	NPS-NAMA Jennifer Talken- Spaulding and Alexa Viets	Section modified as requested.
131	Section 5.6 (Page 99)	4 th paragraph, 3 rd sentence- the park lands and open spaces do not hold their primary value in “breaking up the urban atmosphere.” They are designed landscapes and open spaces held for the public for recreational and other purposes. See the L’Enfant Plan National Register nomination for a statement of significance.	NPS-NAMA Jennifer Talken- Spaulding and Alexa Viets	Section modified as requested.

Comment #	Section	Comment	Comment By	Response to Comment
132	Section 5.6 (Page 100)	Previous comment re: viewsheds applies here also. Please document and discuss the historic viewsheds within the study area, for example, the view between the Thomas Jefferson Memorial and the White House or the east-west view between the U.S. Capitol and the Washington Monument	NPS-NAMA Jennifer Talken-Spaulding and Alexa Viets	Language modified to reflect comment-historic viewsheds are discussed briefly, but not in detail, as will be modified in the Historic Resource Section.
133	Section 5.6 (Page 100)	Please revise text re: East Potomac Park to reflect that the open spaces are part of the National Park Service, therefore, congressionally designated and vital for recreational purposes. Could discuss E. Potomac Park’s creation as one of the largest-scale civil engineering projects of its time. Maintaining the open space here has nothing to do with preserving the “seat of the NPS” or the “headquarters” which, in any case, is not accurate. The enabling legislation for East Potomac Park (29 Stat 624, March 3, 1897) includes the phrase, “made and declared a public park...to be forever held and used as a park for the recreation and pleasure of the people.”	NPS-NAMA Jennifer Talken-Spaulding and Alexa Viets	Section modified as requested.
134	Purpose and Need Statement	<p>CURRENT DRAFT - The purpose of this project is to identify actions that can reduce congestion, enhance safety, and improve traffic operations, while considering the functional and aesthetic aspects of the 14th Street Bridges and the corridor.</p> <p>NCPC PROPOSED - The purpose of this project is to identify actions that can reduce congestion, enhance safety, and improve operations for all transportation modes along the corridor, while considering the use and national significance of the local setting.</p>	NCPC Staff	The Purpose and Need Statement has been finalized and cannot be changed.
135	Themes Proposed During Scoping	<p>CURRENT DRAFT <i>Themes Proposed During Scoping</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reducing vehicle trips across the Potomac River 2. Reducing vehicle traffic from within the District 3. Addressing location specific traffic issues 4. Addressing location specific pedestrian and bicycle issues 5. Improving the visual/aesthetic quality of the area 6. Protecting and improving the natural environmental <p>NCPC PROPOSED <i>Short-Term Improvement Scoping Themes</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increasing person-trips across the Potomac River 2. Reducing single-occupant vehicle traffic crossing the river between the District and Northern Virginia 3. Addressing location specific traffic issues 4. Addressing location specific pedestrian and bicycle issues 	NCPC Staff	Themes Proposed During Scoping cannot be changed as this is what was heard from the public during the Scoping process.

Comment #	Section	Comment	Comment By	Response to Comment
		<p>5. Improving the functional and visual quality of the area in a manner that is sensitive to the use and national significance of the local setting</p> <p>6. Promoting planning, design and engineering solutions that are environmentally sustainable</p> <p><i>Long-Term Improvement Scoping Themes</i></p> <p>1. Developing comprehensive, flexible, convenient connections that improve movement across the river and between the downtown and waterfront.</p> <p>2. Improving traffic distribution into the city, especially to areas in the city center projected to accommodate future growth</p> <p>3. Minimizing infrastructure barriers and improving the visual quality of the capital’s gateway commensurate with the national significance of the setting</p>		