

**VRE Crystal City Station Improvements Project**

Summary of Comments Received after June 7, 2017 Public Meetings

<i>Station Access (Connections)</i>		
1	Concern that the tunnel assumed for the north end of Option 1 connecting to Gateway Park wouldn't be clean	VRE intends to make sure that the system is well maintained and clean for their customers and the neighborhood. Agreements will be developed to establish responsibilities for regular maintenance and cleaning of the facilities.
2	Would the green space and gardens at Gateway Park be impacted from the tunnel connection at the north end of Option 1?	The pedestrian walkway shown at the northern end of Option 1 is intended to connect with the entrance to Long Bridge Park, avoiding Gateway Park.
3	Concerns with conflicts at the Water Park (peds, bikes, VRE riders) from either Options 1 or 2	We agree that there is a lot of activity at the access points to the Water Park. If Options 1 or 2 are selected, additional attention will be paid for properly designing this connection to maximize safety.
4	Can someone explain why you would provide a tunnel from Option 1? The tunnel provide protection from the weather, but then they still have to deal with weather once they reach 12th St.	A grade-separated access is needed to cross the rail lines to meet safety requirements. A tunnel would provide the most weather protection, a bridge would provide a covering but would be open to the weather on the sides. The tunnel would avoid impacting the open space of Gateway Park.
<i>Evaluation Methods</i>		
5	There is no clarity regarding the factors evaluated	The evaluation methods were briefly described during the presentation and will be described in more detail in the Alternatives Analysis report, currently underway.
6	Separate the community impact from the environmental impact	The assessment that has been developed is consistent with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and includes assessment of natural, cultural, and human environment.
7	Residents within a 1/2 mile should not be assessed because so few Crystal City residents use VRE, or will ever. Most of the residents work locally or are retired, and this measure misleads people into thinking there is an untapped market of VRE riders	We know that potential riders currently live in Crystal City. During Metro's SafeTrack on the Blue and Yellow lines, VRE saw a jump in ridership. VRE service provides a faster trip from Crystal City to L'Enfant and Union Station compared to Metro. Future VRE service changes could include a modified fare for inner stations to be more competitive with Metro as well as bi-directional service. Both changes are seen as opportunities to attract more riders from Crystal City.
8	The location of a station should not be based on the location of a bicycle rack.	The assessment of this factor was not based on the location of bicycle racks or Capital Bikeshare stations because as you infer both can easily be incorporated into the design of a new station. The assessment was intended to identify the distance to the closest bicycle infrastructure (bike lane or cycletrack). This was selected as a consideration because some VRE riders do bike, and we wanted to identify how far they would need to travel to access the closest cycling infrastructure to complete their trip in Crystal City.
9	The distance to Metro entrance factor should measure the distance from platform to platform, not just Metrorail station entrance.	While the platform to platform distance is important, there is benefit to as short and clear a connection between station entrances as possible. This is demonstrated in the literature. The benefit comes from a combination of weather protection, a feeling of progress being made, and reduced conflict.
10	The community impacts measure should include: light pollution, community acceptance/support, local business acceptance/support.	The evaluation matrix is developed to link with natural, cultural and human environment topics consistent with NEPA. These items will be addressed in the alternatives evaluation document, but no additional analysis is anticipated at this stage of the project.
11	I believe you failed to adequately consider and factor in the easy and convenient connections provided by the shuttles used by the commuters and by the new Metroway buses to connecting transportation.	The Metroway service and proximity to the Crystal City-Potomac Yard Transitway was assessed as a factor. This was considered an important connection due to the investment the County has made in constructing the stations and the connections it provides to Pentagon City and Potomac Yard. The distance from the VRE platform to the closest Metroway station (along the local street network) was determined. Shuttle buses and other local transit options were given consideration as well. Many currently stop at the Crystal City Multimodal Center at 18th Street S and S Bell Street near the Crystal City Metro. Privately operated shuttle routes can usually be adjusted to provide service to major generators, therefore, the current location of shuttles were not given a specific factor.
12	The residence numbers you provide speak for themselves, there is obvious less impact to the residences resulting from train noise with option 3 yet this factor does not appear to be adequately evaluated and considered.	The assessment of the number of residents within a 1/2 mile of each option was not related to noise impacts. Option 2 had the fewest residents within a 1/2 mile of the station. However, it is important to note that an assessment of noise is focused on the change in noise levels from the current condition and does not weight or factor those changes based on number of residents.
13	I was surprised to see that the impacts to the residential community were not taken into consideration. VRE decided to focus its impact study on nonresidents (the GW Parkway).	The evaluation considered views of the station from the Parkway in addition to several other views, including from the Water Park, the pool area for the condominiums, and from Crystal Park Drive. The evaluation framework also included criteria for property impacts, noise, and environmental justice.
14	It is unclear how each criteria was rated. There are no clear thresholds noted. The color scheme seems arbitrary.	The ratings were based on a consumer reports style rating where a full circle indicated that the option met the objective of the criteria category, a half circle indicated that the option partially, but not fully, met the objective of the criteria category, and an empty circle indicated that the option did not meet the objective of the criteria category. The color scheme followed a traffic light theme of rating where a green color indicated a high rating, a red color indicated a poor rating, and a yellow color indicated a moderate or fair rating.
15	There is current construction of high rise buildings (south edge of Crystal City) between Jeff Davis Highway, 29 <sup>th</sup> Street, S Potomac Ave and 35 <sup>th</sup> Street that will be the work site of thousands. Plus, plans have been approved for a new high rise at 23 <sup>rd</sup> Street and Crystal Drive. Neither site was factored into the information presented June 7 <sup>th</sup> at the outreach meeting. These additional workers could be easily shuttled from the Option 3 site with has two plaza areas with circular driveways which could handle shuttle buses and drop offs.	Outreach to Arlington County was conducted to determine the future developments that were likely to occur. This was considered as part of the land use and was reported but not explicitly as a part of the evaluation.

**VRE Crystal City Station Improvements Project**

Summary of Comments Received after June 7, 2017 Public Meetings

16	The current evaluation does not provide meaningful differences between options because the qualitative factors appear to be almost the same for all three options. There appear to be hidden factors that are biasing the solution such as construction issues or constraints.	Qualitative frameworks consider several factors when summarizing the performance of an option into a low, medium, or high ranking. The rationale behind all summary scores is available, as are the raw data on which they are based.
17	There appears to be considerable overlap for the jobs/VRE riders assessed within a 1/2 mile of each option	Yes there is overlap for each Option. The assessment is focused on identifying the differences between each Option.
18	Using the center of the platform to measure the distance to destinations and other transportation options does not seem appropriate	The center of the platform was used when assessing the number of jobs, VRE riders, or residents within a 1/2 mile of each Option. This decision was made to provide consistency. When assessing the distances to Metro, Metroway, or bicycle infrastructure the closest end of the platform was used to measure the distance using the sidewalk network.
19	New subfactor—percentage distribution of rider destinations—might add considerable clarity to the evaluation. Specifically, I’m thinking of a graph or pie chart showing the percentage of riders who walk to jobs south of the current station, the percentage who walk to jobs north of the station, and the percentage who change to Metrorail, bus, or bike to reach their jobs. It’s not all about Crystal City, after all. Your scatter chart shows a lot of destinations that are in places other than Crystal City, so presumably it would be relatively easy to develop such a chart.	Thank you for your suggestion. Field work showed that on exiting the current station, 25% of riders turned towards the north, 30% turned towards the south, and 45% crossed Crystal Dr. and entered the Underground. Maps based on survey data are being developed to further analyze this topic.
<b>Weighting</b>		
20	There should be weighting applied to the factors. This would provide more clarity.	None of the factors considered were given priority over another. Each factor was considered equally.
21	Less weight should be given to the regional transportation connections because the majority of VRE riders in Crystal City walk to their destination	None of the factors considered were given priority over another. Each factor was considered equally.
22	It is unclear whether the factors are weighted	None of the factors considered were given priority over another. Each factor was considered equally.
23	Community and Environmental Impacts should be weighted higher	Evaluation criteria were weighted equally.
<b>Data Used</b>		
24	The data used (2015) is outdated	2015 American Community Survey data was used because it is the most currently available data on population and jobs. These data tend to change relatively little from year-to-year.
25	The data (2015) does not take into account the new Boeing building, new office building at 1400 Crystal Drive, or the USAID employees near Option 3	The data used to count jobs in Crystal City should include employment figures for most of these given the date of the data and the completion of the office space mentioned. The USAID may be recent enough to not be included, although its important to note that 500 employees would not change the overall result when counting tens of thousands of jobs.
26	We are unable to assess the Major Cost Elements factor without data. This should have an independent cost assessment.	A cost estimate will be prepared once a concept design is developed. At this stage, only anticipated major cost elements were taken into account.
27	In no place did VRE list the number of commercial businesses in the north and south end, nor was this pertinent information plotted out on a map. The number of "workers" is a poor/misleading number given the number of people who telecommute/work from home offices.	People served is the metric most critical to ridership, not the number of businesses.
28	VRE decided to study the number of workers in each zone rather than the number of commercial businesses versus residential businesses. The second zone is listed as having the largest share of "workers" but this is a misleading number because the share of workers in each zone is affected by the number of telecommuters and home offices, etc. The more relevant information is commercial vs. residential permitting. The third option easily has a greater share of commercial businesses.	People served is the metric most critical to ridership, not the number of businesses.
29	With respect to noise, I am not entirely familiar with the FTA regulations and find it interesting that you note that overall noise levels in the neighborhood are 76 db DNL, but then provide a series of graphs that do not use DNL at all.	The noise analysis was conducted to be consistent with the FTA analysis methods, which do rely on Db both from the perspective of existing noise and changes between existing and future noise with each of the options. All data points were based on noise levels (in Db). This will be further described in the report.
30	VRE rider destinations within ½ mile. It’s not clear to me exactly what you’re measuring, but it looks like you are telling me that only 530 to 555 VRE riders get off the train to work at a job within ½ mile of the exit.	This figure is the number of VRE rider destinations within a 1/2 mile of each Option. The data comes from a VRE rider survey, so it does not capture every destination but a sample. The intent is to identify the option that best serves existing VRE riders.
<b>Results</b>		
31	Local Transportation Connections for Option 1 should be higher	Thank you for your comment.
32	Local Transportation Connections for Option 2 should be lower	Thank you for your comment.
33	Option 2 is a longer walk to the Metro	Thank you for your comment.
34	Overemphasis on commuters/jobs and an underemphasis on residents	The goal of the project is to best serve the needs of VRE riders, but we are also striving to minimize impacts on residents.
35	Option 2 requires track relocation	It does require some track relocation, as indicated in the evaluation matrix.
36	Option 3 does not work because of the higher cost	Thank you for your comment. We have noted the higher cost of Option 3, but did not consider cost as a screening criteria nor did we establish a threshold value under which all options needed to be in order to work.
37	VRE rider destinations indicate more riders are located closer to Option 3	VRE rider destinations, based on the most recent survey available, were used in the evaluation process. The figures were reported for each option.
38	Option 3 is the best because it is near commercial properties	Jobs were considered in the evaluation process.
39	The evaluation ignored the businesses along 23rd Street for Option 3	Jobs within 1/2 mile were considered in the evaluation process.
40	The scoring for cost should be equal until proven otherwise	A cost estimate will be prepared once a concept design is developed. At this stage, only anticipated major cost elements were taken into account.

**VRE Crystal City Station Improvements Project**

Summary of Comments Received after June 7, 2017 Public Meetings

41	The evaluation is skewed away from Option 3 and toward Option 2	Option 2 appears to perform better in relation to local and regional connectivity than Options 1 and 3, but all options have some pros and cons which are described in the evaluation framework.
42	Option 2 places the station near the transportation hub of Crystal City (Crystal Dr and 18th St) with the Metro and recently installed bus stops	This was considered as part of regional transportation connections.
43	The distance between all the options and the bicycle infrastructure is the same	This is generally correct for Options 2 and 3, and less so for Option 1 due to the close proximity to Crystal Drive. The closest bicycle infrastructure was deemed to be along Crystal Drive.
44	Most of the rider destinations are south of both Option 1 and Option 2. For the majority of VRE commuters who actually walk to work from the VRE, Option 3 is their nearest station.	The number of jobs within 1/2 mile, and the number of VRE rider destinations (as reported by VRE riders) was included in the evaluations.
45	By including an entire 1/2 mile radius, you are including many of those whose final destination is reached by Metrorail or Metroway rather than walking	1/2 mile was used as it is a standard distance that people are reported in the literature to be willing to walk to access rail transit.
46	The noise impacts for each option cannot be equal.	There are some minor differences between the three options, but all are under 1 Db and not considered significant differences by FTA analysis standards.
47	It is absurd to suggest that a 400 ft walk would amount to a major obstacle for VRE passengers and discourage them from continuing to be riders, especially as the VRE presentation indicated that a preponderance of the disembarking passengers tend to move to areas south of 18th Street.	The analysis did consider the number of jobs and destinations in a 1/2 mile vicinity of each of the three options as an indicator of the distance people are expected to be willing to walk to access the rail station. In addition, the distance (along the existing street network) from each option to the Metro entrance (existing and expected future locations) was considered.
48	The alternatives appeared to be almost identical in the comparison of cost, with the exception of the need for a bridge in Alt 3 compared to a tunnel in Alts 1 and 2. I did not see any clear indication of what made Alt 1 green vs. Alt 2 as yellow, and find it difficult to understand how a bridge vs. tunnel could make Alt 3 red.	The difference between major cost elements for the three options were that Option 1 had the least amount of track reconstruction required, and although both options 2 and 3 connected to the 2nd level of a building, Option 3 connected to the 2nd level of a building at both ends. A cost was assumed to reflect the complexity of doing this.
49	Rating appear to be subjective	The summary ratings were described in the evaluation framework. A more detailed report is being prepared that will describe the justifications for the results.
50	You provided no data to form a basis for commenting about the ranking. But if you accept that the other three evaluation factors have no strong differentiators to allow for ranking, then on cost alone, the clear choice is Option 1.	Option 1 did score highest on cost.
51	Local transportation options for all three should be equal because of the relative proximity of each option.	The difference in ratings for local transportation connections was based on differences in the number of jobs within 1/2 mile of the station and the number of self-reported VRE rider destinations within 1/2 mile of the station.
52	The ratings for Option 1 and 2 for Community and Environmental impacts should be red. They do not account for the direct effects on people.	The ratings are based on the individual criteria within each evaluation category. For Community and Environmental impacts this includes visual, recreational, population, noise, vibration, water resources, and environmental justice.
53	A 7-minute walk to Metro does not warrant red. Most transportation statistics look at anything less than 10-minutes as close.	The regional transportation connections summary rating was based on all the evaluation factors in that category which included walk distance and time to the existing and proposed new metrorail station and distance to the nearest Metroway station.
<b>Impacts not adequately assessed</b>		
54	Horn noise concerns with Options 1 and 2	Horn noise was considered in the noise impact analysis
55	Foot traffic around stations near residential buildings	Passenger traffic is anticipated to occur around the station area and the connection between the station and the local roadway network. Passengers are not expected to be impacting resident access to residential buildings.
56	Impacts to property values with Options 1 and 2	Property values were not considered in the evaluation analysis. Findings in the literature are mixed in terms of extent of impact but generally research has found that property values increase in the vicinity of a rail station.
57	Why didn't you assess a tunnel for Option 3?	We assessed the feasibility of providing grade-separated access over and under the CSXT tracks. Both are possible for Option 3 at both the north and the south ends, but the bridge was considered the more feasible option at this stage.
58	Concerns with loitering	We are not aware of issues with loitering at the current VRE station.
59	Did you assess light pollution?	Light pollution was not assessed during the phase of the project. As the project advances through design there will be more information available about the type and amount of lighting proposed to be used.
60	Concerns with vibration impacting structures over time	A vibration analysis was conducted for each of the three options. Vibration was below the FTA threshold for all options.
61	No assessment of the visual impacts to residents	Visuals for each Option were developed to assess views from both the GW Parkway and the Crystal City sides of the project.
62	There should be a comparison of cost to the impact to residents	Thank you for your comment. We are not aware of an accepted standard/methodology to conduct such a comparison in this type of evaluation.
63	You indicated that you conducted vibration tests at Crystal Park Condominium. To my knowledge VRE has never had access to our property to conduct these tests.	The vibration tests were conducted in the parking lot between 1805 Crystal Drive and 2011 Crystal Drive.
64	The ability to eliminate the horns entirely should have been addressed/assessed	Thank you for your comment. To our knowledge no precedent exists for a station area quiet zone without an at grade intersection.
65	I think further evaluation of the actual train noise at more than just 1 or 2 residences is in order and for a 1 week duration.	The noise analysis undertaken for the alternatives evaluation complied with FTA methodology.
66	Did not measure noise north of 15th St.	Noise measurements were taken at key locations for each of the three options based on the location of the platform, the expected location of the locomotive, and the location where train horns would be sounded. One of the noise monitoring locations was in Gateway Park in the vicinity of 12th St.
67	Your study to date does also does not identify whether there are any sensitive receptors in the ROI, such as childcare centers or schools.	Childcare centers and schools are identified as sensitive noise receptors.
68	You also attribute most of the noise increase to the trains blowing their horns as they depart the station, but do not consider the noise related to braking as the trains approach the station and stop. A number of trains also tend to brake as they go through the curve from Longbridge to the bridge over the river.	Noise from braking was considered in the impact analysis.

**VRE Crystal City Station Improvements Project**

Summary of Comments Received after June 7, 2017 Public Meetings

69	More importantly, beyond taking measurements of existing conditions, you have not projected noise levels for the year when this construction is completed and the new station in operation.	We have conducted future noise impact analysis for each of the three station location options.
70	I find it very curious that neither your presentation nor website talk about the Longbridge EIS effort. Not only will you need to address that effort in your cumulative effects discussion, but also VRE's choice of where to locate and how to configure the station will have some design impacts on the Longbridge effort. The Longbridge team public meetings referenced your effort for exactly that reason.	The Long Bridge project does not require a specific station location in Crystal City. The Crystal City project does consider Long Bridge in terms of its operational considerations.
71	Concerns with noise associated with the VRE riders on the platform.	The noise analysis monitoring was done to assess all noises associated with the tracks, trains, station and other background noises.
72	Include new technology built into the station for meeting safety requirements: Explore methods to eliminate horns.	Thank you for your comment. We will take this into consideration.
73	I noticed when the trains (VRE and most likely CSX) pass the back of our condo there is a strong odor of engine exhaust gas that is noxious. Many unhealthy gases are being exhausted from the diesels because the nature of the fuel and perhaps lower than desired maintenance.	This project does not change the number of trains passing through the area. Air quality assessments are typically performed as part of the NEPA process, and assess the overall change in air quality as a result of the project.
74	No assessment of construction impacts to community	Construction impacts will be considered as the project moves into the environmental and design phases.
75	No assessment of health impacts	Although a specific Health Impact Assessment was not conducted for the study many of the elements (local and regional connections, connections to bicycle infrastructure) were considered.
76	No information about elevations was provided to assess platforms to buildings	The visualizations were intended to provide a better understanding of the pedestrian bridges in relation to nearby land uses.
<i>Other</i>		
77	Option 3 is the best for the airport connection	The airport connection is not part of this project and was not considered to be a rating factor because of this.
78	Option 3 provides the greatest space for tracks and a station	Necessary track relocation was considered as part of Major Cost Elements.
79	Please make this a transparent process and public all materials (reports, notes, and comments) online	Thank you for your comment. We strive to make the process transparent and open. We will update the website when additional technical information is available.
80	In the meetings it was implied that JBG might see Option 3 as an imposition, and that the passenger access had not really been fully examined.	The specific connections to the buildings have not been determined at this phase of the project. It was noted that the southern connection from Option 3 into the building could prove more challenging because of the internal layout of the building.
81	I would also urge you to ensure that this project belatedly benefit from a community planning and community relations perspective. The siting of an infrastructure item as major as a railway station is not a simply matter of traffic engineering. If anything, it is a matter that is too important and multi-faceted to be left to transportation staff with a far too narrow perspective.	Thank you for your comment. That is the intent of the extensive community outreach process, as well as our Working Group which includes representatives from Arlington County, National Parks Service, MWAA, DoD, the Crystal City BID, and JBG Smith.
82	View that the County is giving Crystal City a "lower priority" due to a lack of attention and consideration.	VRE has been proactive in engaging Arlington County staff on this project because of their detailed knowledge and experience related to Crystal City. Staff have been responsive, and this engagement has been helpful in understanding the challenges and developing solutions.
83	Aren't there design solutions (signaling, barriers, etc.) to provide adequate safety and eliminate the need for the horns?	Thank you for your comment. We are unaware of any design solutions that would allow this.
84	One request... the VRE trains engineers appear to enjoy their horns/whistles because many blow them excessively long for the need and at times more than the prerequisite two times. Of course Amtrak and CSX are just as if not more guilty of this inconsideration. Perhaps you could prevail upon both your engineers AND Amtrak and CSX to be significantly more considerate by restricting their horns the absolute bare necessity, a short blast or two is more than adequate for warning those at the station.	We will take this comment under advisement. Train engineers are allowed to sound the horn at their discretion to ensure safety.
85	Recommend Arlington County add a covered pedestrian bridge between DCA and Crystal City VRE station to their Comp Plan, Sector Plan, and TransAction Plan.	We believe that Arlington County and others are beginning to consider this pedestrian connection to DCA. It is outside the scope of the VRE Crystal City Station Expansion effort.
86	Cost is not a criterion appropriate for a NEPA analysis.	We are not doing NEPA analysis at this phase of the project, but are trying to account for cost in the decision-making process for selection of a preferred station location.
87	Federal agencies, like FAA and DOD use a level of 65 db DNL in NEPA documents as a threshold for determining significance impacts.	Noise analysis was conducted in accordance with FTA standards.
88	I would also wonder why the increase of trains (I think VRE trains more than double by 2040?) has not been subject to NEPA.	The VRE System Plan 2040 is a long-range plan that includes many different projects needed to realize the Plan's vision. The Crystal City Station Improvements will not directly result in more trains since there are other constraints along the corridor. The environmental impacts of each project recommended in the 2040 Plan will be assessed as each project is moved from the long-range plan into an alternatives study and environmental assessment. The environmental assessments for the DC2RVA and Long Bridge projects add capacity and will account for the additional trains that can be accommodated.
89	Units facing east already deal with significant noise, vibration and air pollution from passing trains and from trains that decide to park along our property during "time off" from service. This has caused more than just an issue of cleaning windows and balconies. It causes more deterioration to bricks and mortar and window seals than are suffered by units on the opposite side of the building, facing west.	Thank you for your comment.
90	Some reports are that one VRE goal is to encourage air travelers to use VRE transportation from points south (that is, from Richmond and beyond, north to Crystal City) to reach air transportation at Reagan National Airport. Surely Option 3 would serve that purpose by having a station platform exit near 23rd Street, in much closer proximity to the airport.	Connections to the airport are being reported but are not part of the evaluation process, as this is a separate process from the Crystal City station and being led by others. Any of the station options could be linked to the airport with a pedestrian connection.
91	Where will shuttle and other PU/DO activities occur for Option 2?	These details will be established as the project moves forward into design with the County, who determines stop locations, accounting for parking, Metroway, and other transportation activities. Pick up and drop off is not currently a part of the Crystal City Station.
92	The pictures of the options should include the clearly delineated railway easement/right away.	Good point. We will take your comment into consideration.
93	You have failed to grasp the economic advantages of Option 3	Economic development impacts were not assessed as part of the project because the NVTA, who is funding this phase of the study, does not consider it to be a factor when rating transportation projects.

**VRE Crystal City Station Improvements Project**

Summary of Comments Received after June 7, 2017 Public Meetings

94	You have ignored the positive of an airport connection.	The airport connection has not been ignored, but is not a part of this project.
95	A barrier should be constructed between future Tracks 2 and 3 to separate freight and passenger rail.	Safety and security are a priority for VRE. We will be assessing ways to address safety and security as the project advances through design.
96	A new station should be planned to accommodate Amtrak	The new Crystal City station could accommodate Amtrak trains. At this time, Amtrak has no plans for stopping in Crystal City.
<i>Views</i>		
97	No one wants a train station in their backyard/overlooking their pool.	The train station is at a lower elevation than the pool area, and therefore not quite visible. VRE prepared visualizations from the perspective of the pool so that we could include this in our impact analysis.
<i>Project Need</i>		
98	Why relocate when you can expand the existing station	An objective of the project is to provide a platform that can be served from two tracks. This is needed to provide for operational capacity and flexibility. Extending the existing platform would not meet this objective. Option 1 provides a station platform in roughly the same location as the existing platform.
99	There are thousands of residents in Crystal City, yet you plan to implement this project to accommodate the 500-some VRE riders that travel to Crystal City Monday through Friday. This does not make sense.	Crystal City is one of VRE's busiest stations. It is accessed by 18% of total VRE ridership and serves about 900,000 trips annually. The area is an employment destination along with the District and Alexandria. The station as it currently exists is not long enough to accommodate the full length of the train, restricting the number of doors that passengers can use to enter or exit. A longer platform and one served by two tracks will improve efficiency of operations. The project would build a platform served by trains on Tracks 2 or 3.
<i>Additional Ideas to be Considered</i>		
100	Please consider placing the station north of 12th Street near Long Bridge Park	There is not adequate space to place a station in this area of the corridor due to the curvature of the tracks.
<i>Process</i>		
101	It appears that VRE has already decided on Option 2.	The purpose of the public meeting was to share evaluation results and incorporate feedback from the public and stakeholders before recommending one preferred alternative.
102	I would strongly encourage you to carry all three current alternatives forward for analysis in the NEPA analysis.	Our evaluation framework is developed to align with the topics addressed under NEPA so that the identification of a preferred alternative can be done in the planning phase. Our intent is to carry the preferred alternative as well as the no build into the NEPA phase.
103	Why were members of the community not part of the process?	The public was engaged to help VRE identify the station location options and to weigh in on the criteria that would be used to evaluate the options. Public feedback was also solicited on the technical analysis for evaluating the options.
104	Another public outreach meeting is needed	Two public meetings were scheduled as part of this initial phase of the Crystal City Station Improvements project. Additional meetings will be scheduled as part of future phases of the project. In addition, there will be other opportunities to provide feedback at upcoming VRE Operations Board meetings as well as Arlington County Board and Commission meetings.