

Appendix A2:

Agency and Public Coordination Plan



Long Bridge Project

Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Agency and Public Coordination Plan

June 29, 2018

Long Bridge Project EIS

Agency and Public Coordination Plan

Table of Contents

1.0	Project Description.....	1
2.0	Purpose of the Agency and Public Coordination Plan	4
3.0	Agencies, Roles, and Responsibilities	5
3.1.	Lead Agencies.....	5
3.2.	Cooperating Agencies	5
3.3.	Participating Agencies.....	6
4.0	Coordination Points and Anticipated Completion Dates.....	11
4.1.	Notice of Intent	11
4.2.	Scoping	11
4.3.	Invitation to Cooperating and Participating Agencies	11
4.4.	Coordination Plan	11
4.5.	Ongoing Coordination with Agencies	12
4.6.	Section 106 Coordination.....	12
4.7.	Permitting	12
5.0	Agencies and Coordination	16
5.1.	Cooperating and Participating Agencies	16
5.1.1.	Interagency Coordination Meetings	16
5.1.2.	Technical Advisory Committee	16
5.2.	National Park Service Lands	17
5.3.	River and Harbors Act, Section 9	17
5.4.	National Capital Planning Act of 1952	19

5.5.	FAA, Notice of Construction or Alteration (14 CFR 77.9).....	19
5.6.	Clean Water Act, Sections 401 and 404 and Rivers and Harbors Act, Section 10	19
5.7.	National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106	19
5.8.	Section 4(f) Coordination	20
5.9.	Environmental Justice Outreach	20
5.10.	Limited English Proficiency Outreach	21
5.11.	Americans with Disabilities Act Compliance	21
6.0	Stakeholders and Public Involvement Activities	22
6.1.	Private Railroad Stakeholders	22
6.2.	Project Management Team	22
6.3.	Communicating with the Public	23
6.3.1.	Public Meetings.....	24
6.3.2.	Project Document Repositories	25
7.0	Revision History	26

Tables

Table 3-1 Summary of Agency Project Roles and Jurisdiction	7
Table 4-1 Proposed Long Bridge Environmental Review Summary Schedule.....	13
Table 5-1 Resource Areas and Agencies to Review Methodologies	17

Figure

Figure 1-1 Long Bridge Corridor	2
---	---

Attachments

Attachment A: Agency Contacts

Attachment B: Section 106 Contacts

Acronyms

ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
ANC	Advisory Neighborhood Commission
BID	Business Improvement District
CAA	Clean Air Act
CAJO	Captain John Smith Chesapeake National Historic Trail
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
CFA	Commission of Fine Arts
CLRP	Constrained Long Range Plan
CP	Coordination Plan
CSXT	CSX Transportation
CWA	Clean Water Act
CZMA	Coastal Zone Management Act
DC Water	District of Columbia Water
DCA	Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport
DCOP	District of Columbia Office of Planning
DDOT	District Department of Transportation
DO-12	NPS's Director's Order 12
DOD	Department of Defense
DOEE	Department of Environment and Energy
DOI	Department of the Interior
DRPT	Department of Rail and Public Transportation
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EJ	Environmental Justice
EO	Executive Order
ESA	Endangered Species Act
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration
FAST Act	Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act
FEIS	Final Environmental Impact Statement
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FRA	Federal Railroad Administration
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
GSA	General Services Administration
GWMP	George Washington Memorial Parkway
HSPR	High Speed Passenger Rail
HUD	Housing and Urban Development
ICM	Interagency Coordination Meeting
LEDPA	Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative
LEP	Limited English Proficiency
MDOT-MTA	Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT-MTA)
MOA	Memorandum of Agreement
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding

MWAA	Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority
MWCOG	Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments
NAMA	National Mall and Memorial Parks
NCPC	National Capital Planning Commission
NCR	National Capital Region
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NOI	Notice of Intent
NPS	National Park Service
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NS	Norfolk Southern
OE/AAA	Obstruction Evaluation / Airport Airspace Analysis
PA	Programmatic Agreement
PE	Preliminary Engineering
PIR	Project Initiation Request
PMT	Project Management Team
POHE	Potomac Heritage National Scenic Trail
ROD	Record of Decision
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Officer
STSP	Star-Spangled Banner National Historic Trail
TAC	Technical Advisory Committee
TIP	Transportation Improvement Program
US DOT	United States Department of Transportation
USACE	US Army Corps of Engineers
USCG	United States Coast Guard
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
VDEQ	Virginia Department of Environmental Quality
VDGIF	Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries
VDHR	Virginia Department of Historic Resources
VDOT	Virginia Department of Transportation
VMRC	Virginia Marine Resources Commission
VRE	Virginia Railway Express
W3R	Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route National Historic Trail
WMATA	Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority

1.0 Project Description

As announced in a Notice of Intent (NOI) published in the *Federal Register* on August 26, 2016, the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) has initiated the development of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Long Bridge Project jointly with the District Department of Transportation (DDOT). The Long Bridge Project consists of potential improvements to the bridge and related railroad infrastructure located between Rosslyn (RO) Interlocking near Long Bridge Park in Arlington, Virginia and L'Enfant (LE) Interlocking near 10th Street SW in Washington, DC (see **Figure 1-1**). The Long Bridge Project connects logical termini, has independent utility even if no additional transportation improvements in the area are made; and does not restrict consideration of alternatives for other reasonably foreseeable transportation improvements in the area. FRA and DDOT will develop the EIS in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. § 4321 *et seq.* The Long Bridge is owned and operated by CSX Transportation (CSXT), a Class I freight railroad, which also operates the Long Bridge Corridor. In addition to CSXT freight, the bridge is currently utilized by Amtrak and VRE.

FRA is the lead Federal agency under NEPA. DDOT, as project sponsor, is a joint lead agency. FRA and DDOT will prepare the EIS consistent with NEPA; the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA in 40 CFR 1500–1508; FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts in 64 FR 28545, dated May 26, 1999; and 23 U.S.C. § 139. After release and circulation of a Draft EIS for public comment, FRA plans to issue a single document consisting of the Final EIS and a Record of Decision (FEIS/ROD) pursuant to the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (Pub. L. 114–94, section 1304(n)(2)) (FAST Act) unless statutory criteria or practicability considerations preclude issuing a combined document.

The EIS will document compliance with other applicable Federal, state, and local environmental laws and regulations, including but not limited to: Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA); the Clean Water Act (CWA); Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966; the Endangered Species Act (ESA); Executive Order (EO) 11988 and USDOT Order 5650.2 on Floodplain Management; EO 11990 on Protection of Wetlands; the Magnuson-Stevens Act related to Essential Fish Habitat; the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA); and EO 12898 on Environmental Justice (EJ).

Figure 1-1 | Long Bridge Corridor



The EIS for the Long Bridge Project was preceded by several years of preliminary project development activities. In 2011, DDOT received a High Speed Intercity Passenger Rail (HSR) grant from FRA to complete a two-phase feasibility study of the rehabilitation or replacement of the Long Bridge. Phase I of the Long Bridge Study included a preliminary operations plan; visual inspection of the corridor; initial evaluation of existing and future capacity needs; and preliminary development of conceptual alternatives. Phase II of the Long Bridge Study included development of the Draft Purpose and Need; Environmental Data Collection Report; Long Range Service Plan¹; further refinement of engineering concepts; and development of evaluation criteria to identify and screen concepts which will be carried forward for analysis.

Phase II also included the issuance of the NOI in the *Federal Register* (August 26, 2016), informing the public of the upcoming EIS and describing how they can become involved in the EIS process. The NOI formally began the agency and public scoping process. Comments received during scoping (August 26 through October 14, 2016) from agencies and other stakeholders regarding recommended or required coordination have been incorporated into this plan. In 2016, DDOT received a Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) grant from FRA for the preparation of the Long Bridge EIS, which will be completed in Phase III.

¹ The Long Range Service Plan is the maximum potential service scenario based on long-range service proposals for this corridor and adjacent corridors.

2.0 Purpose of the Agency and Public Coordination Plan

The FAST Act of 2015 requires FRA to apply the environmental review process outlined in 23 U.S.C. § 139 to railroad projects to the greatest extent feasible. This Coordination Plan (CP) has been prepared to comply with the requirements of 23 U.S.C. § 139, which established procedures for efficient environmental reviews. The purpose of this CP is to identify Federal, District, state, regional, and local agencies that have a role in the Long Bridge Project EIS and describe their responsibilities. The CP includes a schedule for completing the environmental review process which will be in effect throughout the NEPA process. It outlines the approach FRA and DDOT, as joint lead agencies, will follow to provide the public and other stakeholders opportunities for input on the environmental review process, in accordance with applicable laws, regulations, and policies. Concurrent with the EIS development, FRA and DDOT will advance work to identify and obtain required permits, as outlined in this CP. Throughout the NEPA process, the CP will be amended as needed to include updates to engagement plans for agencies and the public. The initial draft was finalized on November 2, 2016. The CP was revised on November 23, 2016 to reflect agency comments. This version of the CP, revised on October 24, 2017, was updated to add more detail to the overall schedule, Section 106 contacts, and public communications. Changes and updates to the plan are documented in the “Revision History” section.

FRA and DDOT intend to achieve the following through the environmental review process:

- Conduct a transparent environmental review process that provides ongoing, inclusive, and meaningful two-way communication between FRA/DDOT and the public.
- Meet the regulatory requirements associated with the NEPA review process
- Encourage active participation of stakeholders (such as, agencies, organizations, and individuals with interests in the outcome of the Project).
- Maintain a record of public input into the decision-making process.

3.0 Agencies, Roles, and Responsibilities

There are many Federal, District, state, regional, and local agencies with varied interests in the Long Bridge Project. In accordance with 40 CFR 1501.5 and 23 U.S.C. § 139, agency roles and responsibilities are defined below.

3.1. Lead Agencies

Lead agencies include the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT), or any operating administration thereof designated by the Secretary, and any project sponsor that is a state or local governmental entity receiving Federal funds for the purpose of preparing any environmental document under NEPA. Lead agencies are responsible for providing an opportunity for public, cooperating, and participating agency involvement. It is the responsibility of the lead agencies to identify, invite, and involve cooperating and participating agencies.

Lead agencies are responsible for ensuring that the environmental review process is conducted properly and in accordance with all applicable environmental regulations. Lead agencies have the authority and responsibility to take proper and necessary actions to facilitate the expeditious resolution of the environmental review process for the project; and to prepare or ensure that any required EIS or other NEPA document is completed in accordance with applicable Federal laws (23 U.S.C. § 139 (c)(6)).

3.2. Cooperating Agencies

Cooperating agencies are Federal agencies other than the lead Federal agency that have jurisdiction by law, or special expertise with respect to a particular environmental issue involved in a particular project (40 CFR 1501.5). Cooperating agencies may also be state or local agencies of similar qualifications or Indian tribal governments (40 CFR 1508.5), if agreed upon by the lead agencies. Federal agencies that are required to make an approval or take an action for a project must cooperate with the lead agencies to ensure that the cooperating Federal agency can reference the Long Bridge Project EIS to make their own NEPA determination for project actions within their jurisdiction (23 U.S.C. § 139(d)(8)).

Cooperating agencies have the responsibility to:

- Provide input on defining the Project's Purpose and Need, the range of alternatives to be considered, and the methodologies and level of detail required in the alternatives analysis;
- Identify issues that could substantially delay or prevent granting of permits or approvals;
- Participate in coordination meetings and joint field reviews;
- Provide timely review and comments on pre-draft or pre-final environmental documents; and
- Prepare mitigation recommendations.

Cooperating agencies are participating agencies, but not all participating agencies are cooperating agencies; therefore, cooperating agencies share the responsibilities of participating agencies.

3.3. Participating Agencies

Participating agencies are Federal, District, state or local agencies, or Federally recognized tribal governmental organizations with an interest in the Project. Nongovernmental organizations and private entities cannot serve as participating agencies.

The role of participating agencies is to:

- Provide input on defining the Project's Purpose and Need, the range of alternatives to be considered, and the methodologies and level of detail required in the alternatives analysis;
- Participate in coordination meetings and joint field reviews, as appropriate;
- As requested by FRA, provide timely review and comments on certain pre-draft or pre-final environmental documents; and
- Provide timely comments on unresolved issues.

On August 15, 2016, FRA sent scoping initiation letters that included invitations to appropriate agencies to become cooperating or participating agencies. The letters notified agencies of the EIS scoping period, which was also advertised in the *Federal Register* in a NOI filed August 26, 2016. The deadline for submitting scoping comments was September 26, 2016, which was later extended to October 14, 2016. The summary of agency roles presented in **Table 3-1** are based on responses and information received at the conclusion of the scoping comment period (with exception of the Department of Defense which was added in July 2017). **Attachment A** includes points of contact for each of these agencies.

Table 3-1 | Summary of Agency Project Roles and Jurisdiction

AGENCY	PROJECT ROLE AND JURISDICTION
LEAD AGENCIES	
Federal Railroad Administration (FRA)	Lead Federal agency responsible for NEPA compliance as well as compliance with other Federal laws. Federal grantor for the Long Bridge Project Preliminary Engineering (PE)/NEPA effort.
District Department of Transportation (DDOT)	Joint lead agency and local project sponsor, responsible for NEPA compliance, and recipient of the Federal grant for Long Bridge Project PE/NEPA effort. DDOT is providing local funding for the Project.
COOPERATING AGENCIES¹	
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Cooperating Federal agency providing expertise regarding commuter railroad facilities and a potential source of funding for project construction.
National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC)	Cooperating agency with approval authority over Federal projects within the District, including all land transfers and physical alterations to Federal property, pursuant to the National Capital Planning Act of 1952. Federal properties noted within the Study Area include: the George Washington Memorial Parkway (GWMP), Potomac River bottom, National Mall and Memorial Parks (NAMA), and Reservation 113.
National Park Service (NPS)	Cooperating Federal agency responsible for managing the National Park System, including permitting on NPS land. The NPS has jurisdiction over Federal park land in the Study Area, including: GWMP, NAMA, Captain John Smith Chesapeake National Historic Trail (CAJO), the Star-Spangled Banner National Historic Trail (STSP), Potomac Heritage National Scenic Trail (POHE), the Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route National Historic Trail (W3R), and the Potomac River bottom. Actions that would require an NPS decision will require that NEPA compliance for this Project be easily adoptable by NPS (43 CFR 46.120) and should meet the policies set forth in NPS’s Director’s Order 12: Conservation, Planning, Environmental Impact Analysis, and Decision-Making (DO-12) and the NPS Compliance Handbook (2015).
U.S. Coast Guard (USCG)	Cooperating Federal agency responsible for permitting bridge projects in or over navigable waterways, pursuant to Section 9 of the River and Harbors Act.
Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT)	Cooperating state railroad agency which oversees railroad and transit planning and funding, and is a contributor of local funding for the PE/NEPA study.
Virginia Railway Express (VRE)	Cooperating state commuter railroad agency which operates on the existing bridge and is a contributor of local funding for the PE/NEPA study.

AGENCY PROJECT ROLE AND JURISDICTION

PARTICIPATING AGENCIES¹

Arlington County	Local jurisdiction in Virginia responsible for land use, development, and neighborhood planning within the County limits.
City of Alexandria	Local jurisdiction in Virginia responsible for land use, development, and neighborhood planning within the City limits.
DC Department of Energy and the Environment (DOEE)	Divisions within DOEE include: Fisheries and Wildlife, responsible for wildlife and habitat review; Water Quality Division, responsible for oversight of compliance with the CWA; Watershed Protection Division, Sediment and Storm Water Technical Services Branch, responsible for regulatory review of stormwater management, sediment and erosion control, and floodplain management; and Toxic Substances Division, responsible for oversight of compliance with District Underground Storage Tank regulations (Risk Based Corrective Action process) as well as the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERLCA).
DC Office of Planning (DCOP)	Lead District agency for all land use, development, and neighborhood planning.
DC State Historic Preservation Office (DC-SHPO)	District of Columbia (District) Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) responsible for NHPA Section 106 compliance in the District. The DC-SHPO is responsible for reviewing the identification of historic properties eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), the effects of Federal actions on historic properties, and measures to resolve adverse effects to historic properties.
DC Water and Sewer Authority (DC Water)	Provides utility clearances and controls stormwater outfalls in the District.
Department of Defense (DOD)	Federal agency that coordinates and supervises all agencies and functions of the government concerned directly with national security and the United States Armed Forces. Numerous DOD properties are in the vicinity of Long Bridge, including the Pentagon.
Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)	Federal transportation agency with regulatory authority over Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport (DCA). Proximity and potential height of project elements, including construction equipment, mandate that FAA form 7460-1, Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration, must be filed with the FAA as required by 14 CFR 77.9.
Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)	Federal agency that coordinates government-wide disaster relief efforts, consultation related to global warming, sea level rise, resiliency, and floodplain issues.
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) – DC Division	Federal agency division that provides leadership, guidance, and direction to DDOT for the planning, construction, and maintenance of roadways within the District.

AGENCY	PROJECT ROLE AND JURISDICTION
FHWA – Eastern Federal Lands Highways Division	Federal agency division that assists NPS in the maintenance of and improvement to NPS roadway facilities, including the GWMP.
Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT-MTA)	Existing commuter railroad service provider in Maryland with a potential interest to provide future run-through service to Virginia via Union Station and the Long Bridge.
Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority (MWAA)	Regional airport authority over DCA, responsible for review of proximity and potential height of project elements, including construction equipment.
Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOG)	Regional agency that administers the region’s Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), Constrained Long Range Transportation Plan (CLRP), and Clean Air Act (CAA) compliance. MWCOG provides oversight for the regional transportation network and programming.
National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)	Federal agency responsible for administration of ESA. NMFS has primary responsibility for marine species and administration of the Magnusson-Stevenson Fishery Conservation and Management Act.
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) – Baltimore District and Norfolk District	Federal permitting agency for impacts to rivers (including the Potomac River), streams, and wetlands under Rivers and Harbors Act, Section 10, and CWA Sections 401 and 404. Oversees selection of the <i>Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative</i> (LEDPA) pursuant to CWA Section 404 before the NEPA process is finished. During scoping, the USACE agreed to serve as a participating agency; the Baltimore District will serve as the lead Corps District for the Project and has retained permission to become a cooperating agency later in EIS development.
U.S. Commission of Fine Arts (CFA)	Independent Federal agency charged with giving expert advice to the President, Congress, and the Federal and District governments on matters of design and aesthetics, as they affect the Federal interest and preserve the dignity of the nation’s capital.
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)	Federal agency responsible for the formal notice and publication of the EIS and authority to review and comment on Federally proposed actions under the CAA and CWA.
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)	Federal agency responsible for administration of the ESA. The USFWS has primary responsibility for terrestrial and freshwater organisms.
U.S. General Services Administration, National Capital Region (GSA NCR)	Federal agency responsible for administration of many government buildings and real estate near the Long Bridge Corridor.

AGENCY	PROJECT ROLE AND JURISDICTION
Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (VDEQ)	State environmental agency responsible for compliance with the CWA including Section 401 and 404 permits for non-tidal wetlands, rivers and streams.
Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries (VDGIF)²	State regulatory agency responsible for wildlife and inland fish habitat in Virginia.
Virginia Department of Historic Resources (VDHR)	SHPO responsible for NHPA Section 106 compliance in Virginia. The VDHR is responsible for reviewing the identification of historic properties eligible for listing in the NRHP, the effects of Federal actions on historic properties, and measures to resolve adverse effects to historic properties.
Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT)	State transportation agency responsible for roadways on southern approach to bridge and western side of the Study Area in Virginia.
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA)	Transit agency serving the region. WMATA owns and operates the Metrorail bridge north of the Long Bridge.

NOTES:

¹. Cooperating agencies are participating agencies, but not all participating agencies are cooperating agencies.

². Non-Federal agencies where a signed agreement to act as participating agency in the NEPA process has not been received, as of November 21, 2016. Per 23 U.S.C. § 139, any Federal agency that is invited by the lead agency to participate in the environmental review process for a project shall be designated as a participating agency by the lead agency unless it declines in writing. Local and state agencies must accept their participating agency role in writing or may be removed from future agency outreach efforts; however, VDGIF remains listed here because continued coordination is required pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act.

4.0 Coordination Points and Anticipated Completion Dates

Timeframes and review periods for the Project's NEPA review process have been established in accordance with the CEQ regulations 40 CFR 1500-1508, the FRA Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts (FRA's Environmental Procedures) (64 FR 28545, May 26, 1999, as updated in 78 FR 2713, January 14, 2013), and 23 U.S.C. § 139. The key coordination points are summarized below, and **Table 4-1** provides a proposed schedule for completion of environmental review, in accordance with 23 U.S.C. § 139(g)(1)(B).

4.1. Notice of Intent

The NOI was published in the Federal Register on August 26, 2016.

4.2. Scoping

Scoping began on August 15, 2016, with FRA's distribution of scoping initiation letters. Agencies were notified of the EIS scoping period, which was also advertised in the *Federal Register* in the NOI, and on the Project website (www.longbridgeproject.com). The deadline for submitting scoping comments was September 26, 2016, which was later extended to October 14, 2016.

An agency scoping meeting was held September 14, 2016 at DDOT headquarters. The Draft Purpose and Need and Environmental Data Collection Report were emailed to the agencies on September 9, 2016, prior to the meeting. The meeting included a presentation and discussion of the Draft Purpose and Need and Environmental Data Collection Report.

A public scoping open house meeting was also held September 14, 2016. Materials presented at the meeting, included displays, a Fact Sheet, and the Draft Purpose and Need were made available on the project website. Stakeholders, elected officials, and the public were notified of the meeting through issuance of the NOI and email notification. Flyers were also mailed to adjacent property owners. Advertisements were published in the *Washington Post* and the *Washington Post Express*.

4.3. Invitation to Cooperating and Participating Agencies

23 U.S.C. § 139 requires that within 45 days of the NOI (such as, by October 12, 2016), FRA invite any other Federal and non-Federal agencies that may have an interest in the Project to become participating agencies. Letters were distributed to the agencies listed in **Table 3-1** on August 15, 2016 informing them about the initiation of NEPA and inviting them to attend the scoping meeting and to serve as cooperating or participating agencies for the Project. In addition, the Department of Defense (DoD) was included as a participating agency on July 24, 2017.

4.4. Coordination Plan

23 U.S.C. § 139 requires that within 90 days of the NOI (such as, by November 23, 2016), a CP for public and agency participation and comment on the environmental review process for the Project be established by the lead agency. This CP details the plan for agency and public involvement for the Project and includes a proposed schedule for completion of the environmental review (see **Table 4-1**). Upon finalization, this CP will have been established in consultation with each of the participating agencies for the Project. Once established, this environmental review schedule, and any subsequent

updates, will be made available to the public and the participating agencies via the Project website and the Federal infrastructure projects Permitting Dashboard (<https://www.permits.performance.gov/>).

4.5. Ongoing Coordination with Agencies

Following establishment of the CP, regular outreach will be conducted with the Project's cooperating and participating agencies through DDOT's established Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meetings and Interagency Coordination Meetings (ICMs), as described in Section 5.1. Cooperating and participating agency briefings will be coordinated through the ICMs at key milestones, as indicated in **Table 4-1**.

Cooperating and participating agencies will be provided an opportunity to comment on the following Project documents:

- the Draft Purpose and Need as developed for the scoping process;
- the Environmental Data Collection Report;
- the CP²;
- Environmental Analysis Methodology Memoranda pertaining to their area of expertise;
- Alternatives Report; and
- Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS).

Additionally, cooperating agencies will be able to comment on the Administrative DEIS and Administrative FEIS/ROD prior to public review. Lead agencies may request that cooperating and participating agencies review additional reports as the EIS process progresses. 23 U.S.C. § 139(g)(2)(B) requires the lead agency to establish comment deadlines for agency comments at a maximum of 30 days from the date of availability, unless otherwise agreed to by the agencies.

4.6. Section 106 Coordination

For this Project, outreach and consultation required under Section 106 of the NHPA will be conducted concurrently with the NEPA process in accordance with 36 CFR 800.8. The approach for Section 106 coordination is discussed in Section 5.

4.7. Permitting

There is currently no funding for construction for the Project. FRA and DDOT will coordinate permitting applications and requirements throughout the NEPA process wherever possible.

² The opportunity for participating and cooperating agencies to review and comment on the Draft Purpose and Need, Environmental Data Collection Report, and CP was completed prior to finalization of this plan.

4.8. Coordination Milestones

Agency and public input will be requested at key coordination points corresponding with the proposed schedule, as shown in **Table 4-1**.

Table 4-1 | Proposed Long Bridge Environmental Review Summary Schedule

MILESTONE	COORDINATION POINTS	ACTUAL OR PLANNED COMPLETION
Public Meeting #1: Overview (Pre-NEPA initiation)	Phase II overview	February 10, 2016
Cooperating and Participating Agencies Invited		August 15, 2016
Section 106 Consultation Initiated with VADHR and DC SHPO		August 22, 2016
Notice of Intent to Prepare an EIS Published, with draft Purpose and Need Statement		August 26, 2016
Scoping Comment Period		August 26, 2016 – October 14, 2016
Interagency Meeting: Scoping	Introduced Phase III, provided Preliminary Environmental Data Collection Report and draft Purpose and Need for review, received feedback on draft Purpose and Need.	September 14, 2016
Public Meeting #2: Scoping	Introduced Phase III, provided draft Purpose and Need for review, received feedback on draft Purpose and Need, and shared criteria for screening concepts.	September 14, 2016
Draft Agency and Public CP Provided for Interagency Review	Provided Draft Coordination Plan for Agency review.	November 2, 2016
Final CP	Provided Final CP to Agencies and public via project website.	November 23, 2016
Final Scoping Report	Provided Scoping Report to Agencies and public via project website.	January 2017
Section 106 Consulting Party Meeting #1	Introduced the Project, shared Section 106 schedule and preliminary list of historic properties in the vicinity of the	April 25, 2017

MILESTONE	COORDINATION POINTS	ACTUAL OR PLANNED COMPLETION
Interagency Meeting: Preliminary Concepts Screening	Project area, requested comments on the identification of historic properties. Discussed development of the Area of Potential Effects (APE). Provided the Final Purpose and Need statement, and presented and received comments on Level 1 Concept Screening results. Sought comments on proposed Level 2 Concept Screening Criteria that will help evaluate concepts to be advanced as alternatives in the EIS.	May 16, 2017
Public Meeting #3: Preliminary Concepts Screening	Provided the Final Purpose and Need, and presented and received comments on Level 1 Concept Screening results. Sought comments on proposed Level 2 Concept Screening Criteria.	May 16, 2017
Interagency Review of Draft Environmental Methodology Technical Memorandum	Shared draft methodologies with agencies for comment on resource areas in which they have subject matter expertise or jurisdiction by law.	November 10 – December 4, 2017
Section 106 Consulting Party Meeting #2	Presented Draft APE and identification of historic properties. Comments will be requested.	November 15, 2017
Alternatives Identified (Interagency and Public Information Meetings)	Requested feedback on the Level 2 Concept Screening results that identify the Action Alternatives to be evaluated in the DEIS.	December 12 and 14, 2018
Draft Navigation Study	Shared draft Navigation Study with USCG for comment.	March 14, 2018
Section 106 Consulting Party Meeting #3	Reviewed methodology and schedule for assessing effects, reviewed Action Alternatives.	May 30, 2018
Alternatives Development and Analysis Report	Report that identifies the alternatives to be analyzed in the DEIS published on the website as a public information item.	June 19, 2018
Final Navigation Study	Provided Final Navigation Study to USCG.	June 23, 2018

MILESTONE	COORDINATION POINTS	ACTUAL OR PLANNED COMPLETION
Section 106 Consulting Party Meeting #4	Identify potential effects to historic properties within the APE associated with all Action Alternatives and request comments.	Planned Fall 2018
Preferred Alternative Identification (Interagency and Public Meeting)	Present the recommended Preferred Alternative and request comments.	Planned Fall 2018
Administrative DEIS Provided for Cooperating Agency Review	Request feedback from agencies and incorporate relevant comments.	Planned Winter 2019
Section 106 Consulting Party Meeting #5	If necessary: Discuss and request feedback on avoidance, minimization, and mitigation strategies for the Preferred Alternative.	Planned Winter 2019
DEIS Public Review	Notify public of DEIS availability. Comment period assumed to be 45 days following notice of availability. If necessary: the DEIS will include a draft Section 106 Agreement Document for public and consulting party review.	Planned Summer 2019
DEIS Public Hearing	Convene a public hearing to provide the public with opportunity to express their comments on the content of the DEIS for the record.	Planned Summer 2019
Administrative Final EIS/Record of Decision (FEIS/ROD) provided for Cooperating Agency Review	Request feedback from agencies and incorporate relevant comments.	Planned Winter 2020
Finalize Section 106 Agreement Document (if necessary)	Circulate Final Agreement Document to Signatories.	Planned Winter 2020
FEIS/ROD Publication	Notify public of the FEIS/ROD availability.	Planned Summer 2020

NOTE: The CP, including this schedule, may be amended to include more detailed engagement strategy plans for agencies and the public. (23 U.S.C. § 139(g)).

5.0 Agencies and Coordination

Throughout the NEPA process, agency coordination will occur in compliance with NEPA and other applicable regulatory requirements. There is currently no funding for construction for the Project. Concurrent with the EIS, whenever possible, FRA and DDOT will work toward obtaining permits and approvals pursuant to, but not limited to: Section 106 of the NHPA, Sections 9 and 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act; the CWA, Sections 401 and 404; Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966; the National Capital Planning Act of 1952; FAA's 14 CFR 77.9; and EO 12898.

5.1. Cooperating and Participating Agencies

Consensus among the lead, cooperating, and participating agencies is not required in the development of the Project's Purpose and Need, range of alternatives, and methodologies for documenting environmental conditions and assessing impacts. However, FRA and DDOT must consider the views of agencies with relevant interests before making a decision on a particular methodology. Additional regulatory compliance and permitting actions will be included in the NEPA environmental review process to the extent practicable. ICMs and TACs are proposed meetings and forums for engaging agency participation.

5.1.1. Interagency Coordination Meetings

ICMs will be held at key coordination points (**Table 4-1**). The intention of these meetings is to facilitate agency engagement on the Long Bridge Project during development of the EIS, and ensure each agency's ability to address their specific responsibilities, as outlined in Section 3 of this CP. These meetings will provide a mechanism for agencies to:

1. Provide comments, responses, or methodologies on areas relevant to the special expertise or jurisdiction of the agency;
2. Identify, as early as practicable, any issues of concern regarding the Long Bridge Project's potential environmental or socioeconomic impact;
3. Provide meaningful input at project milestones (Purpose and Need, range of alternatives, environmental analysis, and preferred alternative); and
4. Provide timely review and comment on environmental documentation.

ICMs will include all lead, cooperating, and participating agencies identified in **Table 3-1**. ICMs will occur at specific project milestones and ICM attendees would be notified (via email) of important project events, including public meetings and technical document availability, as shown in **Table 3-1**.

5.1.2. Technical Advisory Committee

DDOT will establish and facilitate a TAC, wherein members will be comprised of technical staff representatives from the lead, cooperating, and participating agencies, and stakeholders. TAC meetings would be focused on the identification and resolution of specific technical issues and will include topics such as railroad operations, conceptual alternatives development, navigational requirements, NEPA requirements, historic properties, water resources, potential mitigation strategies, and advance permitting requirements. The purpose of the TAC meetings will be to address these issues in a timely manner using the relevant expertise of each agency, ensuring that the Long Bridge Project NEPA requirements for each agency are met. The TAC will meet as needed. Regular TAC members are listed

below. Additional agencies or stakeholders will be invited to attend TAC meetings should specific technical issues requiring distinct expertise be identified during the NEPA process.

- FRA – Amanda Murphy, Environmental Protection Specialist
- DDOT—Anna Chamberlin, Project Review Manager; Katherine Youngbluth, Strategic Planner
- VRE—Oscar Gonzalez, Project Manager
- DRPT—Randy Selleck, Railroad Planning Project Manager
- NPS – Tammy Stidham, Chief of Planning
- FTA – Daniel Koenig, Environmental Protection Specialist
- USACE – Kathy Anderson, Chief, MD Section Southern (If USACE becomes a cooperating agency)
- NCPC – Michael Weil, Urban Planner
- CSXT – Chuck Gullakson, Assistant Vice President, National Gateway
- USCG – Mickey Sanders, Bridge Administration Branch Fifth District

As part of developing methodologies for analysis of impacts in the EIS, an opportunity for review and feedback are planned by major topic areas to focus the agencies and stakeholder’s involvement around the appropriate topics. These activities will occur during the development of the methodologies and analysis of impacts as appropriate. **Table 5-1** includes a comprehensive list of the resource topic areas to be covered in the EIS, and the agencies that have an interest or technical expertise in each topic. Agencies will be given 10 business days to review draft methodologies and provide their comments in writing to DDOT and FRA. NCPC and NPS are each anticipated to have actions related to the Long Bridge Project, and will therefore be invited to review all resource methodologies.

5.2. National Park Service Lands

Actions that would require an NPS decision to be made will require that NEPA compliance be easily adoptable by NPS (43 CFR 46.120). Additionally, NPS will be invited to serve as a consulting party pursuant to NHPA, Section 106 for the consultation process. Therefore, the Project team will coordinate closely with NPS, including but not necessarily limited to the TAC, to ensure that NEPA compliance will meet the policies set forth in DO-12 and the NPS Compliance Handbook (2015).

5.3. River and Harbors Act, Section 9

Pursuant to Section 9 of the River and Harbors Act and the January 2014 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the USCG and FRA, FRA invited USCG to be a cooperating agency on August 15, 2016. The MOU requires that a project plan be developed that serves as a framework for successful completion of the NEPA and Bridge Permit processes. The Project team will coordinate public meetings and the EIS hearing with USCG to ensure that the needs of both agencies are met. The Project team submitted a project Initiation Request (PIR) on June 14, 2017, and received a response from USCG on August 31, 2017. In accordance with the MOU and the USCG response to the PIR, the Project team completed a Navigation Study and submitted it to USCG on June 23, 2018. FRA will act as the lead Federal agency on behalf of USCG, as appropriate, for coordination regarding applicable environmental laws, such as Section 106.

Table 5-1 | Resource Areas and Cooperating Agencies to Review Methodologies

RESOURCE AREAS	REVIEWING AGENCIES
Natural Ecological Systems and Endangered Species	NPS, NCPC, NMFS, USACE, USFWS, DOEE, VDGIF, Arlington County
Water Resources and Water Quality	NPS, NCPC, USACE, USEPA, USFWS, FEMA, DOEE, DC Water, VDEQ, VMRC, Arlington County
Geologic Resources	NPS, NCPC, DOEE, VDEQ, Arlington County
Solid Waste Disposal and Hazardous Materials	NPS, NCPC, USCG, USEPA, DOEE, VDEQ, Arlington County
Transportation	NPS, NCPC, FAA, FHWA, FTA, DRPT, VDOT, VRE, MWAA, MWCOG, MDOT-MTA, WMATA, Arlington County
Navigation	NPS, NCPC, USCG, USACE
Air Quality	NPS, NCPC, USEPA, DOEE, VDEQ, MWCOG
Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Resilience	NPS, NCPC, USEPA, DOEE, VDEQ
Energy Resources	NPS, NCPC, DOEE, VDEQ
Land Use and Property	NPS, NCPC, DCOP, MWCOG, Arlington County
Noise and Vibration	NPS, NCPC, USEPA, FTA, DOEE, DRPT, VRE, Arlington County
Aesthetics	NPS, NCPC, CFA, Arlington County
Cultural Resources	NPS, NCPC, DC SHPO, VDHR
Recreation and Parks	NPS, NCPC, DCPR, VDGIF, Arlington County
Social and Economic	NPS, NCPC, DCOP, Arlington County
Public Health, Elderly, and Persons with Disabilities	NPS, NCPC, USCG, FEMA, FHWA, FTA, MWCOG, Arlington County
Security and Safety	NPS, NCPC, USCG, FEMA, FHWA, FTA, DOD, MWCOG, Arlington County
Environmental Justice	NPS, NCPC, FTA, FHWA, MWCOG, Arlington County
Cumulative Impacts	NPS, NCPC, DCOP, Arlington County
Section 4(f) Determination	NPS, DC SHPO, VDHR, Arlington County

5.4. National Capital Planning Act of 1952

Pursuant to the National Capital Planning Act of 1952, Federal property transfers in the District require NCPC approval. Property transfers require submission of an official legal plat with line for the NCPC Chair's signature. Transfers should be addressed in the EIS with the exact area of land transfer, change in impervious surface area, number of trees to be removed, and proposed mitigation. Additionally, the FEIS/ROD should include a section addressing each transfer. If necessary, the ROD will include a separate section for each land transfer along with a signature line for NCPC's Executive Director. Changes to Federal property will be submitted for NCPC review with appropriate supporting plans, narrative, graphics, NEPA, and Section 106 documentation.

5.5. FAA, Notice of Construction or Alteration (14 CFR 77.9)

The lead agencies will file FAA form 7460-1, Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration, with the FAA as required 14 CFR 77.9. Notice will be filed using the FAA's Obstruction Evaluation / Airport Airspace Analysis (OE/AAA) web portal at www.oaaaa.faa.gov. The Project team will coordinate with MWAA and FAA via the TAC to determine the appropriate timing of this Notice.

5.6. Clean Water Act, Sections 401 and 404 and Rivers and Harbors Act, Section 10

Waters of the U.S., including wetlands, are protected under Section 401 and 404 of the CWA of 1972 and Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899. In order to permit improvements, USACE requires that the preferred alternative for the Project is the LEDPA pursuant to Section 404(b)(1) guidance. 33 U.S.C. § 408 (commonly referred to as "Section 408") authorizes the USACE, to grant permission for the alteration or occupation or use of a USACE civil works project. Section 408 applicability would be assessed and addressed as required through consultation with USACE. Through the TAC, the lead agencies will work with USACE to ensure that the preferred alternative is also the LEDPA.

5.7. National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106

Section 106 of the NHPA (36 CFR 800) requires Federal agencies to account for undertaking effects on historic properties that are listed or meet the eligibility criteria for listing in the NRHP. The Section 106 process has a specific public involvement component. In particular, Section 106 regulations require that the lead Federal agency (FRA), in consultation with the SHPOs (the District and Virginia), identify appropriate points for seeking public input and notification of the proposed actions associated with the Project. The regulations require that the Federal agency seek and consider the views of the SHPOs and the public in a manner that reflects the nature and complexity of the project and its effects on historic properties.

Public outreach for the purposes of NEPA can be used to satisfy the public involvement requirements under NHPA Section 106, as long as the NEPA document contains adequate information about the Project's effects on historic properties and provides the degree of thorough, consultative outreach that is required for the Section 106 process. FRA plans to pursue this coordinated NHPA Section 106 and NEPA approach for the Long Bridge Project EIS. Specifically, all public meetings for the Long Bridge

Project will be advertised as a NHPA Section 106 meeting to satisfy public engagement requirements set forth in 36 CFR 800. Members of the public with a demonstrated interest in the Project (due to the nature of their legal or economic relation to the undertaking or affected properties, or their concern with the undertaking's effects on historic properties) may make a request to FRA to be designated as a Section 106 Consulting Party.

On September 22, 2016, FRA initiated consultation with the District and Virginia SHPOs. In addition, FRA sent a scoping letter to the Federally recognized Pamunkey Native American tribe to initiate Government-to-Government consultation and provide notice of the public scoping meetings. Section 106 Consulting Party invitations were sent March 31, 2017 to agencies listed in **Attachment B**. Those that declined to participate in writing, did not attend the first Section 106 Consulting Party meeting, or provided no response by April 28, 2017 are not included in the list. FRA will continue to coordinate to identify, accept, and notify stakeholders of their status as Section 106 Consulting Parties. At key milestones in the Section 106 process, Consulting Party meetings will be held, as shown in **Table 4-1**. Information presented to the Consulting Parties will include the results of the historic and archaeological studies, as well as any potential effects to historic resources within the Study Area. The Consulting Parties will have the opportunity to comment on the APE, identification of historic properties, effects to these historic properties and if necessary, measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects on identified historic properties. Specific steps include: defining the APE, identification of historic properties, determination of effects, and development of a Programmatic Agreement (PA) or Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) if there is an adverse effect.

5.8. Section 4(f) Coordination

FRA must provide opportunities for coordination and comment to the official(s) with jurisdiction over any Section 4(f) resource that may be affected by the Project as well as to the U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI), and as appropriate, the Department of Agriculture (USDA) and the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Section 4(f) resources include public parks, wildlife refuges, and historic resources. Section 4(f) historic sites, parks, and wildlife refuge properties will be identified through the Section 106 process and NEPA process, in consultation with NPS, VDHR, the DC-SHPO, Arlington County and other resource agencies, as appropriate. The public will be provided an opportunity to review and comment on the Project's Section 4(f) evaluation in coordination with the NEPA public review periods.

5.9. Environmental Justice Outreach

EO 12898, *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations* requires consideration of whether a proposed action would disproportionately affect minority or low-income groups (59 Fed Reg. 7629 [1994]). Federal concerns for nondiscrimination under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 are applicable under the EJ process. Recipients of Federal aid must certify nondiscrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin. Title VI specifically states that "no person in the United States shall on the ground of race, color, or national origin be excluded from participation in, denied benefits of, or subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." Additionally, EO 12898 requires Federal agencies to ensure public participation from communities with substantial minority or low-income populations. Each Federal agency has developed a strategy to address EJ, with CEQ responsible for oversight and coordination. The EJ analysis for the Long Bridge Project EIS will follow the guidance and methodologies recommended in

CEQ's EJ Guidelines under NEPA (December 1997), and the USDOT's Final Order 5610.2(a) on EJ (April 1997 and updated May 2012).

An EJ analysis will be prepared for the Project to identify and address potential disproportionate adverse impacts to EJ populations and to ensure that EJ populations are targeted in public outreach efforts throughout the life of the Project (during and after the NEPA process).

It is the intent of the EIS process for this Project to ensure that all members of the public are provided opportunities to be heard and to participate meaningfully from the outset of the Project and throughout all phases of Project development. Preliminary research completed during Phase II of the Long Bridge Project identified no low-income households within the Study Area. Per Census data, approximately 52.2 percent of the population surrounding the Study Area is minority by race and 6.5 percent of the population is Hispanic (ethnicity). Further EJ analysis during the NEPA study will include identifying low-income and minority populations, in coordination with DDOT, and Arlington County. EJ communities identified within the Study Area will be included in the public outreach process to ensure that they can participate meaningfully in review of the Project. As a general rule, the following principles will be adopted to support involvement of these local EJ communities in the Study Area:

- Documents, notices, and meetings will be made concise, understandable, and readily accessible to the public;
- Informational material will be made available through a variety of outlets;
- All public events will be scheduled at convenient and accessible locations and times; and
- Various community leaders and groups will be contacted to increase public participation of constituent communities.

5.10. Limited English Proficiency Outreach

Individuals who do not speak English as their primary language and who have a limited ability to read, speak, write, or understand English are considered "limited English proficient," or LEP. LEP populations are protected by Federal laws concerning language access rights, including Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and EO 13166, *Improving Access to Services for Persons with Limited English Proficiency* (signed on August 11, 2000). EO 13166 states that LEP people should have meaningful access to Federally conducted and funded programs and activities. EO 13166 requires Federal agencies to examine the services they provide, identify any need for services to those with LEP, and develop and implement a system to provide meaningful access to those services for LEP persons.

The Long Bridge Project is taking steps to provide meaningful access to those LEP individuals expected to be most-regularly encountered. For example, translation services are available at public meetings upon advance request, as advertised in meeting notification materials.

5.11. Americans with Disabilities Act Compliance

Public meetings will be held in locations that comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) to assure that stakeholders who are disabled or elderly have access to meetings. Sign language interpreters will be available upon request at formal public meetings and other meetings. Public notices announcing public meetings will provide instructions for requesting other special accommodations. The Project website has been designed to accommodate people with visual impairments (such as, adjustable text size, compatibility with screen readers).

6.0 Stakeholders and Public Involvement Activities

FRA and DDOT will provide information to the public early and solicit continued public feedback throughout the NEPA process to encourage an open discussion of Project details and issues, and provide opportunities for comments and questions.

The goals for public involvement in the Project are:

- To provide an opportunity and a mechanism for public participants to engage in the development of the EIS and give relevant input to the Project.
- To focus public input in a structured manner that will allow decisions to be made with the maximum benefit from public involvement.
- To ensure that elected officials, agencies, stakeholders, and the general public are adequately informed about the Project and its implications for their communities, and to identify potential issues so that they can be addressed and resolved before the completion of the EIS process.

6.1. Private Railroad Stakeholders

Private Railroad Stakeholders include the following:

- **CSXT:** Bridge Owner and operator of the Long Bridge Corridor. The design of any railroad bridge that carries CSXT freight traffic must conform to, and be informed by, CSXT safety requirements and standards.
- **Amtrak:** Intercity and interstate passenger railroad service operator using the bridge.
- **Norfolk Southern (NS):** Class I freight railroad operator with track rights on Long Bridge and to connecting CSXT tracks, though NS does not currently exercise those rights.

6.2. Project Management Team

The Project Management Team (PMT) will be convened to facilitate coordination between lead agencies, cooperating agencies that are providing funding for the Long Bridge Project, and private railroad stakeholders that are bridge owners or major users of the bridge. The PMT will be comprised of senior technical staff providing technical guidance on the development and execution of project approach, conclusions, recommendations, and other key decisions or findings. Decision making and project management authority regarding the Project is solely with the Lead Agencies.

PMT meetings will be held every other week, or as needed. PMT participants and their primary points of contact include:³

- FRA – Amanda Murphy, Environmental Protection Specialist
- DDOT—Anna Chamberlin, Project Review Manager; Katherine Youngbluth, Strategic Transportation Planner
- VRE—Oscar Gonzalez, Project Manager
- DRPT – Randy Selleck, Railroad Planning Project Manager
- CSXT—Randy Marcus, Resident Vice President - Virginia
- Amtrak – Amrita Hill, Infrastructure Planning Manager

6.3. Communicating with the Public

Public involvement will include a number of different outreach tools and activities. These will include the following:

- **Website:** A website has been developed for the Project (www.longbridgeproject.com). This website includes the Project description, project schedule, public involvement, related studies and resources, and contact information. The website will be kept up to date with information on the Project alternatives, environmental review, and current and previous Project documentation, and will provide a link to allow people to sign up for the mailing list and submit comments electronically. The website has been designed to include a section where visitors can sign up for the Project mailing list (to be included in future email blasts and meeting notifications) and a web form to submit their comments and questions. Information about the Project is also available on DDOT’s website at: <http://ddot.dc.gov/page/long-bridge-study-phases-i-and-ii>.
- **Contact Information:** The public will also be encouraged to submit comments directly to the Project team. The Project website includes the following contact information:
 - Email: info@longbridgeproject.com
 - Mail: Katherine Youngbluth, AICP, Long Bridge Project, 55 M Street, SE, Suite 400, Washington, DC 20003
- **Mailing List:** DDOT has developed an electronic mailing list of elected officials, public agency contacts, property owners adjacent to the Study Area, stakeholders and community groups, and members of the public with an interest in the Project. The mailing list will be used to distribute meeting announcements and information about the Project. The mailing list will be updated throughout the life of the Project to include new contacts obtained from meetings and from the Project website.

³ Norfolk Southern was invited to the Project Management Team, but they did not accept the offer to participate.

- **Local Government and Stakeholder Briefings:** Upon request or at key coordination points, or as needed, the lead agencies will brief the appropriate local government entities and stakeholders to provide information, answer questions, and receive feedback. Community briefings may include Advisory Neighborhood Commission (ANC) 2A, ANC 6D, Southwest Business Improvement District (BID), Southwest Neighborhood Assembly, Crystal City Civic Association, and the Crystal City BID.
- **Public Information Meetings:** The lead agencies will hold public meetings to provide information about the status of the Project and solicit feedback at key milestones. For more information, see Section 6.3.1.
- **Public Comment Periods:** NEPA requires public comment periods to provide an opportunity for public input at two critical points during the environmental review: during the scoping period and when the Draft EIS is complete.

The NEPA scoping comment period officially began on August 26, 2016 and concluded on October 14, 2016. The comment period was initially scheduled to end on September 26, 2016 but was extended for 18 days to October 14, 2016. During the scoping period, the public was encouraged to submit comments by mail, electronically to the Project email address (info@longbridgeproject.com), via the Project website, or by attending the public open house.

Upon publication of the DEIS, FRA will hold a Public Hearing as detailed below. In accordance with NEPA, the DEIS will be published for public review and comment for a minimum 45-day period, not to exceed 60 days. Upon close of the comment period all substantive comments will be considered and addressed in the FEIS.

6.3.1. Public Meetings

Opportunities for public input throughout the Project will include the following:

- **Public Scoping Meeting:** FRA and DDOT conducted a Public Scoping Meeting on Wednesday, September 14, 2016, from 3:00 pm to 6:00 pm. The Meeting was held in the Club Room of L'Enfant Plaza on the Promenade Level, 470 L'Enfant Plaza, SW, Washington, DC. Fifty-two attendees signed in. The purpose of the meeting was to gather input and feedback on project scoping, including: the Project's Purpose and Need; alternatives development and screening process; preliminary concepts; and environmental considerations to be addressed in the environmental review. The meeting was organized in an open-house format and attendees were encouraged to share comments and questions with representatives from FRA and DDOT. The representatives were available to converse with attendees and to notify the public of the Project commenting options and availability of materials on the Project website.
- **Public Hearings:** Following publication of the Draft EIS, FRA and DDOT will hold a public hearing. The public hearing will include an opportunity for oral testimony, to be recorded by a stenographer. Comments and testimony provided at the public hearing will be addressed in the FEIS.
- **Public Information Meetings:** In between the public scoping and the Draft EIS comment periods the Lead Agencies plan to hold two meetings to keep the public informed about the progress of

the Project. The public information meeting format may include display boards, presentations, and informal discussions between project team members and meeting attendees.

The Project website, newspaper advertisements (*Washington Express*, *El Tiempo Latino*), press releases, email blasts, local distribution of meeting flyers (nearby public facilities, community groups), and social media (FRA and DDOT Facebook and Twitter) will be used to publicize all public meetings.

The public meetings and hearings will be accessible to persons with disabilities and persons with LEP. Special services, such as an interpreter or sign language services, will be available upon request. Public notices announcing these meetings will provide instructions for requesting these services.

6.3.2. Project Document Repositories

Local document repositories enable members of the public to examine Project documents, including EIS documents, and other informational materials. Document repositories for the Long Bridge Project EIS will be identified later in the NEPA Process.

7.0 Revision History

Revisions to this plan are documented in the table below:

REVISION NUMBER	DATE	SUMMARY OF REVISIONS
0	11/2/2016	
1	11/23/2016	Revised to address agency comments; issued
2	11/09/2017	Revised to add more detail to sections on the proposed schedule, Section 106 contacts, and communicating with the public; reissued
3	3/30/2018	Revised to incorporate updated schedule
4	6/29/2018	Revised to incorporate updated schedule

Attachment A: EIS Agency Contacts

AGENCY	POINT OF CONTACT	TITLE
LEAD AGENCIES		
Federal Railroad Administration	Amanda Murphy	Environmental Protection Specialist
	Shreyas Bhatnagar	Regional Manager
District Department of Transportation	Anna Chamberlin	Manager, Project Review
	Katherine Youngbluth	Strategic Transportation Planner
COOPERATING AGENCIES¹		
Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation	Randy Selleck	Rail Planning Project Manager
Virginia Railway Express	Oscar Gonzalez	Project Manager
	Tom Hickey	Chief Development Officer
National Park Service	Tammy Stidham	Chief of Planning
	Laurel Hammig	National Capital Region
	Joel Gorder	Regional Environmental Coordinator
Federal Transit Administration	Daniel Koenig	Environmental Protection Specialist
U.S. Coast Guard	Mickey Sanders	Bridge Administration Branch Fifth District
National Capital Planning Commission	Michael Weil	Urban Planner
PARTICIPATING AGENCIES¹		
Department of Defense	Cameron Delancey	Chief Master Planner
	Martin Mamawal	Engineering Branch Manager
Federal Emergency Management Agency	MaryAnn E. Tierney (no response)	Regional Administrator
Federal Highway Administration – Eastern Federal Lands Highways Division	Lisa Landers (no response)	Environmental Protection Specialist
Federal Highway Administration – DC Division	Michael Hicks (no response)	Environmental Engineer
Federal Aviation Administration	Susan Stafford	Environmental Protection Specialist

AGENCY	POINT OF CONTACT	TITLE
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers – Baltimore District and Norfolk District	Kathy Anderson (Baltimore) William Walker (Norfolk)	Project Manager Chief, Regulatory Branch
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	Barbara Rudnick Kevin Magerr	NEPA Team Leader Environmental Engineer
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	Genevieve LaRouche (no response)	Field Supervisor
U.S. General Services Administration, NCR	Mina Wright (no response)	Director, Office of Planning and Design Quality
National Marine Fisheries Service	Kristy Beard	Marine Habitat Resource Specialist
U.S. Commission of Fine Arts	Frederick Lindstrom	Assistant Secretary
DC Office of Planning	Dan Emerine	Senior Transportation Planner
DC State Historic Preservation Office	Andrew Lewis	Senior Historic Preservation Specialist
DC Department of Energy and the Environment	Raymond Montero	Remedial Project Manager
DC Water and Sewer Authority	Moussa Wone	Design Manager, DC Clean Rivers Project
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority	Jonathan Parker	Senior Planner
Maryland Department of Transportation (MTA/MARC)	Bradley Smith	Director, Office of Freight and Multimodalism
Virginia Department of Transportation	Nicholas Roper	Assistant District Engineer
Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries²	Robert W. Duncan (no response)	Executive Director
Virginia Department of Historic Resources	Ethel Eaton	Senior Policy Analyst
Virginia Department of Environmental Quality	Daniel Burstein	Regional Enforcement Specialist

AGENCY	POINT OF CONTACT	TITLE
Arlington County	Daniel Malouff	Regional Transportation Planner
City of Alexandria	Allan Fye	Division Chief, Transit Services
Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments	Jon Schermann	Transportation Planner III
Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority	Erik Schwenke	Environmental Planner

NOTES:

- ¹ Cooperating agencies are participating agencies, but not all participating agencies are cooperating agencies.
- ² Non-Federal Agencies where a signed agreement to act as participating agency in the NEPA process has not been received, as of November 21, 2016, 2016. VDGIF remains listed here because continued coordination is required pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act.

Attachment B:
NHPA Section 106 Contacts

AGENCY	POINT OF CONTACT	TITLE
LEAD AGENCIES		
Federal Railroad Administration	Amanda Murphy	Environmental Protection Specialist
District Department of Transportation	Anna Chamberlin Katherine Youngbluth	Manager, Project Review Strategic Transportation Planner
SHPO		
DC State Historic Preservation Office	Andrew Lewis	Senior Historic Preservation Specialist
Virginia Department of Historic Resources	Ethel Eaton	Senior Policy Analyst
THPO		
Catawba Indian Nation	Wenonah Haire	Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
Delaware Nation	Kim Penrod	Director of Cultural Resources
OTHER CONSULTING PARTIES		
District of Columbia	Muriel Bowser	Mayor
Arlington County	Mark Schwartz	County Manager
Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation	Randy Selleck	Rail Planning Project Manager
Virginia Railway Express	Oscar Gonzalez	Project Manager
National Park Service, National Capital Region	Tammy Stidham	Chief, Planning, Compliance & GIS
Federal Transit Administration	Daniel Koenig	Environmental Protection Specialist
National Capital Planning Commission	Lee Webb	Historic Preservation Specialist
ANC 6D	Andy Litskey	Chair
Amtrak	Johnette Davies	Senior Historic Preservation Specialist
Architect of the Capitol	Mary Ohrlein	Historic Preservation Officer

AGENCY	POINT OF CONTACT	TITLE
Pentagon Reservation	Cameron DeLancey Martin Mamawal	Chief Master Planner Engineering Branch Manager
Arlington County Historic Preservation Program	Rebecca Ballo	Preservation Planner
Crystal City Civic Association	Dave Salmon, Carol Fuller, Eric Cassel	
Arlington County Historical Society	Karl VanNewkirk	President
Committee of 100 on the Federal City	Stephen Hansen	Chair
CSXT	Randy Marcus	Resident Vice President
DC Preservation League	Rebecca Miller	Executive Director
National Park Service, GW Memorial Parkway	Alexcy Romero	Superintendent
National Park Service, National Mall & Memorial Parks	Catherine Dewey	Chief of Resource Management
National Park Service, Captain John Smith Trail	Chuck Hunt	Superintendent
Southwest BID	Lexie Albe	Director of Planning and Placemaking
U.S. Commission of Fine Arts	Thomas Luebke	Federal Preservation Officer
U.S. General Services Administration, NCR	Nancy Witherell	Regional Preservation Officer
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Steve Harman	Project Manager
Washington DC Chapter of National Railway Historical Society	Jim Lilly	President
National Mall Coalition	Judy Scott Feldman	Chair
Trust for the National Mall	Catherine Townsend	President and CEO
Department of Defense	Cameron DeLancey Martin Mamawal	Chief Master Planner