I-395 Southbound Express Lanes Project

City of Alexandria, and Arlington, and Fairfax Counties, Virginia

NOISE TECHNICAL REPORT ADDENDUM BARRIER SURVEY SUMMARY

UPC: 108313

State Project: 0395-969-205

Prepared for:



May 2018

This addendum report documents the results of the barrier surveys conducted as part of the Noise Technical Report for the I-395 Southbound Express Lanes Project (UPC 108313) in Alexandria, Arlington, and Fairfax Counties, Virginia. The sections below should replace the corresponding sections of the Noise Technical Report for the project mentioned above. Additional figures showing the survey results are attached and labeled as Appendix A.

10.0 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROCESS

10.1 Public Involvement Efforts

For noise barriers determined to be feasible and reasonable, the affected public that will be benefited by the proposed mitigation will be given an opportunity to decide whether they are in favor of construction of the noise barrier. A final determination as to the construction of barriers will be made after the public hearing process. As part of the Final Design Noise Analysis, for barriers that are determined to be feasible and reasonable, input from the owners and residents of those receptor units that will be benefited by the proposed mitigation may vote by completing and returning the citizen survey that they receive in the mail. Typically, the initial citizen survey is sent out as certified mail. However, with VDOT approval due to the vast number of benefits in the I-395 Express Lanes Project, first round ballots were sent regular mail and second round ballots were sent via certified mail. Second round certified mail was tracked so the disposition of the letters could be allotted and a footprint of the votes could be mapped. Of the votes tallied, 50% or more must be in favor of a proposed noise barrier for the barrier to be considered further. Upon completion of the citizen survey, the VDOT Noise Abatement staff will make recommendations to the Chief Engineer for approval. Approved barriers will be incorporated into the road project plans. A technical memorandum (noise barrier survey addendum report) will be prepared after the voting process has finished, which documents the voting results and summary of public comments of the noise barrier public survey process. This report is then submitted to the FHWA.

10.2 Public Preference Surveys

This section documents the administration and results of the public preference surveys conducted for the recommended noise barriers. Table 8 found at the end of this addendum shows the summary of the barrier voting.

Property owners and residents, including tenants, of all properties that would be benefited by the recommended noise barrier were sent survey letters by regular mail, initially. Twenty-one (21) calendar days from the anticipated delivery date is required to provide the recipients ample time to review and respond to the survey. The letters and surveys, from McCormick Taylor, Inc. asked the respondents to indicate whether they wished to have the proposed noise barriers constructed. In these mailings, barrier details, contact information, a survey form and return envelope were provided to homeowners and residents. The mailings gave the affected property owners/residents an understanding of the proposed barrier and its implications, an opportunity to ask questions, and a formal survey form for expressing their views. Only the

owners and residents of those receptor units that will be benefited by the proposed mitigation may vote on whether the proposed noise barrier should be constructed. The owner/resident of each benefited receptor unit shall be entitled to one weighted vote, regardless of the number of owners of that receptor unit unless they are the owners of a rental facility or the developer of lands. Survey recipients were informed that to register a vote in favor of the barrier, a "YES" survey form would have to be returned. In addition, a non-response does not assume that the survey recipient is in favor of the barrier's construction.

Votes will be tallied on a noise barrier by noise barrier basis, so it is recommended that the project team tally the votes and summarize the results on a project map showing votes by location. Final interpretation of the voting results will be made by VDOT and its consultants, considering all feedback gained during the public involvement process.

The weighting system is provided in tabular format below (Table 7).

Table 7							
Public Opinion Survey Weighting System ⁵							
Impact and benefit category	Activity Category ⁴	Owner and Resident	Non- Resident Owner	Renter			
Impacted and Benefited	Α Α	See note below					
Not Impacted and Benefited	A						
Impacted and Benefited	B ¹	5	3	2			
Not Impacted and Benefited	B ¹	3	2	1			
Impacted and Benefited	C ²		5				
Not Impacted and Benefited	C ²		3				
Impacted and Benefited	D		2				
Not Impacted and Benefited	D		1				
Impacted and Benefited	E		2				
Not Impacted and Benefited	E		1				

¹ For activity Category B Receptors only one vote per single family unit will be counted. However, the owner of a multiple-family dwelling unit will be granted one vote per benefited unit. Additionally, the developer of permitted lands will be granted one vote per benefited lot of the permitted phase where construction has not occurred.

² For activity Category C Receptors only 1 vote per facility will be granted.

³ For activity Category G Receptors the votes will depend on the future land use. The example provided above assumes residential development.

⁴ For permitted land uses defer to the appropriate land use category.

⁵ Consult the VDOT external website to obtain the decision-making spreadsheet.

CNE E Barrier I

A total of 85 letters with surveys were sent out via standard postage to receptors benefited by SW I. Six (6) responses were returned voting "YES", and eight (8) responses were returned voting "NO". The VDOT voting spreadsheet said a second mailing was required. For the second round of balloting sent via certified mail a total of 71 letters with surveys were sent out. The second round of balloting produced zero (0) additional "YES" votes, nine (9) "NO" votes, thirty-one (31) letters were received by the addressee but a survey was not returned, and thirty-one (31) letters were unclaimed, returned to sender, or unknown. Based on the results of the survey, those responding within CNE E for SW I responded 79% "not in-favor" of construction of the noise barrier as part of the project. Therefore, SW I will not be recommended for construction.

A breakdown of the disposition of certified letters is listed below.

Barrier	Quantity	Comment			
NB I	1	Letters returned to sender			
	28	Unclaimed			
	2	Unknown			
	9	voted Second Round			
	31	Received- Survey not returned			

Additional comments on the survey questionnaire have been retained in the technical files in their entirety and a summary of the comments is included in the table below.

Barrier	Count	Comment			
Barrier I	10	No comments.			
	1	Wants barrier worried about aesthetics.			
	5	Does not want the view of the barrier.			
	1	Wants the barrier because it will add value to property			
		owners.			
	1	Not in favor of the barrier because is concerned about how the barrier will be paid for and the time duration it will			
		take to construct it.			
	4	Enthusiastic about building the barrier.			
	1	Do not want the barrier and requesting additional			
		information on current projected noise levels.			
	1	Wants the barrier as long as it ends at 31st street south			
		rather than 30th street south and does not extend along			
		king street behind resident on south Columbus street.			
	1	Wants the barrier since the 395 will be expanding causing			
		more noise.			
	1	Does not want the barrier due to their concerns of impact			
		on their historic neighborhood, property values,			
		landscaping, and minimal help with noise reduction.			
	1	Does not want the barrier and is concerned on whether			
		the trees and bushes will be replaced if the barrier moves			
		forward.			
	1	Not in favor of the barrier because it's a waste of time and			
		money with zero benefit.			

The barrier voting results are summarized on the following sheet.

UPC 108313							
Project Number 0395-969-205			5	2nd Maili	ng Summary		
Barrier Name							
(Include Permitted		NAC CATEGORY		Total Number of Representative Responses Sent	Total Maxiumum Number of Representative Votes		
Impacted and Benefited			В	11	. 55		
			В	71	213		
			C 2		10	10	
			C 1		3		
Impacted and Be	enefited)	0	0		
Not Impacted and	Benefited		0	0	0		
Impacted and Be	enefited	E	E	0	0		
Not Impacted and	Benefited		E	0	0		
5-65-55-55-55-55-55	I Maximum N Weighted Vot 281	200					
	of Weighted			Number of Total Outstanding Votes	% Total Vote Total Actu		
YES 18	NO 69	Total 87		194	30.96	30	
18	69	8/	10	154	30.96	30	
% of "Yes Votes (Al Votes) 6.4		% of Outstandi ng Votes 69.0					
% of "Yes	" % of "No"		Results in	the box below should o			
Votes	Votes			all of the responses ha	ve been tallied		
(Respond nts) 20.7	(Responde nts) 79.3		The Barrier Is Not Recommended for Construction and Should Not be Included in the Plans				
Ver:	sion 1.2						

