

**Docket Item: City Council Special Public Hearing
October 29, 2002—Item 2
Public Hearing on the Recommendations on the
Eisenhower Avenue-to-Duke Street Connector**

Submitted by
Thomas M. Parry
317 Skyhill Road
Alexandria, Virginia
(703) 212-0982

October 19, 2002

**Questions Related to the
Eisenhower Avenue-to-Duke Street Connector**

Disclosure of Conflicts

1. Have all City Council members publicly disclosed all professional, business and financial relationships, both present and future expectations, between, on the one hand, themselves, their immediate family and their employers and, on the other hand, all landowners and leaseholders whose real property or leasehold interests may increase in value with any of the connector build alternatives under consideration?

Purpose of a Connector

2. What is the purpose of a connector? Logically, the goal is not to build a road, the goal is to meet demand for certain services and functionality (and building a road is one way to achieve that goal). What are those services and functionality that are sought? To put the same concept in different words, what is the problem that the City is trying to solve?

3. Don't the B1 and D alternates solve two different problems? One end of Eisenhower Valley has a single non-Beltway access route to Duke (Van Dorn); the other end of the Valley has 5 non-Beltway access routes to Duke (Holland, George, John Carlyle, Dulany and Telegraph). Can there be any version of the answers to the questions posed by Item 2 above that includes both B1 and D as equally plausible solutions?

4. Is not D a solution to a problem that before October 2001 no one even knew existed?

a. Isn't it true that until October 2001, when the initial West End connector task force identified Roth as a potential connector route, no public body or advisory group had identified a transportation problem near Telegraph that needed to be solved by a connector in that vicinity?

b. Isn't it true that during the PTO facility siting process there was no discussion of routing a connector near Telegraph?

c. Isn't it true that the congestion at Telegraph and Duke is expected to be addressed by the Wilson Bridge Project? In a City document, dated November 15, 2001, titled "Workshop No. 1 Eisenhower East Plan," at p. 46, staff stated: "By the year 2010 the improvements to the new Wilson Bridge and the improvements to I-95/495 will substantially mitigate the traffic congestion on Duke St. and Telegraph Road."

Public Safety

5. What are the nationally promulgated standards for fire, emergency medical services (EMS) and police response times? Is Alexandria currently in compliance with such standards?

a. With the no-build option, at what level of development and increased traffic in Eisenhower Valley does Alexandria no longer comply with such standards?

b. Does or would Alexandria approve developments which can not be adequately served by existing fire, EMS and police services?

6. Does a connector at B1, a connector at D or improvements to existing intersections better serve public safety purposes?

a. To what extent does a connector at B1 impact fire/EMS equipment response times in comparison to the impact on fire/EMS equipment response times by a connector at D?

b. To what extent does a connector at B1 impact police response times in comparison to the impact on police response times by a connector at D?

c. To what extent do improvements to existing intersections impact fire, EMS and police response times in comparison to the impact on fire, EMS and police response times by a connector at B1 or D?

d. What are the assumptions, including projected Eisenhower Valley development, underlying such response time projections?

7. What is the status of the City's planning for a fire station in Eisenhower Valley?

a. What is the projected time frame for building a fire station in Eisenhower Valley?

b. Have any sites been identified preliminarily for a fire station in Eisenhower Valley?

8. How is Eisenhower Valley served by adjacent fire stations? And to what extent would an Eisenhower Valley fire station provide secondary coverage for areas primarily served by other Alexandria and Fairfax fire stations?

a. What Alexandria fire stations have equipment that can reasonably access Eisenhower Valley? What parts of Alexandria are reasonably accessible by equipment located at an Eisenhower Valley fire station?

b. What Fairfax fire stations have equipment that can reasonably access Eisenhower Valley? What parts of Fairfax are reasonably accessible by equipment located at an Eisenhower Valley fire station?

(each Item 8 question for no build, B1, D and no build with improvements to existing intersections)

9. Given that Holland, George, John Carlyle, Dulany and Telegraph provide access from Eisenhower East to Duke, why is a connector needed near Telegraph (at Roth/Cambridge) for public safety purposes?

a. Would the design of the Roth/Cambridge intersection allow fire/EMS/police vehicles to (i) use Cambridge and then head south on the Roth connector, and (ii) use the Roth connector and then head north on Cambridge?

10. Does a connector at D provide any substantial public safety benefit?

a. Isn't it true that Barry Shiftic of the Police Department has stated that a connector at D is not useful from a public safety perspective? The minutes of the public hearing convened by the connector task force on March 27, 2002, state that Barry Shiftic of the Alexandria Police made the following statement: "Need connector to get emergency vehicles out of the valley. The police facility is choked off. A connector is needed. Alternates A1, A2 & D are not useful. He wants something in the middle of the study area."

b. Isn't it true that the statements of police unable to exit Eisenhower Valley are primarily, if not exclusively, examples at the West End of the valley? Isn't that why police acknowledge using the multipurpose trail to get to Duke? Would a connector at D solve the police force's West End access problem and result in police not using the multipurpose trail to get to Duke?

11. Is it feasible to route, design and construct an alternative to the Jenkins St. multipurpose trail as a dedicated emergency fire/EMS/police vehicles route in the West End?

a. How much would it cost to route, design and construct such an alternative emergency fire/EMS/police vehicles route?

b. In what time frame could such an alternative emergency fire/EMS/police vehicles road be routed, designed and built?

12. Isn't it true that none of the proposed connector street layouts provide a lane dedicated for use by emergency vehicles or are otherwise designed to ensure that emergency vehicles have access to a lane (see Technical Report, at p. 26)? If serving public safety purposes were actually a key reason for a connector, would not the connectors have been designed and costed out to serve this purpose?

Economic Development

13. Why, in Resolution No. 1995, dated March 13, 2001, did the City Council direct the task force to analyze each route from an "economic development standpoint" (and, by implication, the impact on real estate tax revenues)?

14. Did the City staff and/or consultant conduct any analysis of the impact of each alternate on economic development (and real estate tax revenues)?

15. If yes to the above question, why has the analysis not been released to the task force, the City Council or the public?

16. Alexandria is one of the most dense cities in the U.S. The Technical Report, at pp. 6-9 and 27, properly devotes over four pages to environmental impact on, for example, rare, threatened and endangered species, farmlands, wetlands, trout streams and wild and scenic rivers. But since the 1970s, Eisenhower Valley has been characterized as the "economic engine" of Alexandria, not a nature preserve. Why does the Technical Report make not a single reference to the impact of a connector or specific routes on economic development in Eisenhower Valley?

17. What is the impact of a connector on economic development in Alexandria (and, consequently, on real estate tax revenues)?

a. To what extent does a connector at B1 likely result in any additional development and increased property values in Eisenhower Valley?

b. To what extent does a connector at D likely result in any additional development and increased property values in Eisenhower Valley?

c. To what extent does a connector at a particular location change development patterns and to what extent does it just increase the value of existing and future development that will occur regardless of whether a connector is built?

18. To what extent does the presence or absence of a connector affect (a) the nature of the build out in Eisenhower Valley, and (b) the density of such build out? In particular, could the absence of a connector have a minimal impact on the square footage of the eventual build out but have a substantial effect on the nature of the build out, i.e., requiring a build out that demands high usage of Metrorail, buses, bicycles and pedestrian modes of transportation and low usage of vehicles?

19. Is the Fuller study methodologically sound?
- a. Do City staff concur with the analysis in the Fuller study?
 - b. Using the same methodology as the Fuller study, what would be the impact of a connector at D on property values and real estate tax revenue?
20. What is the identity of the landowners in Eisenhower Valley that are most likely going to see an increase in the value of their property?
- a. With a connector at B1?
 - b. With a connector at D?
 - c. By each such landowner, what is the projected increase in value for their holdings in Eisenhower Valley?

Model Assumptions

21. What assumptions and projections is the 2020 traffic flow model used by the City and its consultants based upon?
- a. Where do the "No Build Alternative" traffic projections on the map at p. 19 come from?
 - b. Does the model account for the Wilson Bridge Project and Beltway/Telegraph improvements?
 - c. Does the model account for the Beltway/Mill Road interchange?
 - d. How did the consultant use the WASH COG model and what changes did the consultant make to the WASH COG model?
22. For the year 2020 projections, what build out was projected for Eisenhower Valley?
- a. The Technical Report, p. 4, states that "detail was added to the WASH COG model by adding . . . updated Eisenhower Valley land uses." How was the model updated?

b. Further, the Technical Report, p. 6, states "[f]or travel demand forecasting purposes 10 million SF was assumed for East Eisenhower." What build out is projected for Eisenhower East? [Footnote 1]

	Low Projection	Projection Used in Model	Maximum Projection
office sq. feet:		[10 million SF,	
retail sq. feet:		all classes]	
residential sq. feet:			
no. of parking spaces:			

c. What build out is projected for Eisenhower West? And why was no information on this topic provide in the Technical Report?

	Low Projection	Projection Used in Model	Maximum Projection
office sq. feet:			
retail sq. feet:			
residential sq. feet:			
no. of parking spaces:			

23. The Metro and the railroads' tracks are the primary physical barriers to crossing the valley (and thereby connecting its flanks), and each own substantial land in the Valley. It would seem that the input of these organizations should be central to the discussion. Furthermore, their input is critical to the Eisenhower West land use planning process in the years ahead. A critical question is whether the City wants to encourage or discourage different or additional land uses in the vicinity of the tracks (such as leasing air rights for buildings) and what impact such development would have on infrastructure needs and traffic projections. To what extent have WMATA and the railroad been involved in the discussions of possible connector alternatives and the development of the land use projections for Eisenhower Valley?

24. What is the projection for traffic with origination or destination in Eisenhower East and Eisenhower West under each of the above build out projections? And how does the traffic flow?

Specifically, under each of the projections above, what is the ADT for vehicles headed to/from the Eisenhower Valley vicinity, by route:

- i. Holland?
- ii. Other Eisenhower East streets:
 - A. George?
 - B. John Carlyle?
 - C. Dulany?
- iii. Telegraph?
 - A. to the Beltway and points south
 - B. to the north
- iv. Each Connector Alternative?
- v. Van Dorn?
- vi. Beltway interchanges?
 - A. Mill Road?
 - B. Telegraph?
 - C. Eisenhower?
 - D. Van Dorn?

Study Area

25. Why are no traffic counts, intersection delay statistics or any other information for critical intersections available, including:

- a. N. Quaker, King and Braddock?
- b. The study included both the Duke and Seminary/Janneys ends of Cambridge, Yale and N. Quaker. Why did it not include both ends of
 - i. Jordan and Duke to Howard and Seminary?
 - ii. Jordan and Duke to Jordan and Seminary?
 - iii. W. Taylor Run and Duke to Janneys and W. Taylor Run?
 - iv. N. Pickett and Duke to Holmes Run Parkway and Van Dorn
 - v. N. Paxton and Duke to N. Paxton and Van Dorn
 - vi. N. Ripley and Duke to N. Paxton and Van Dorn

The 2020 Traffic Analysis

26. **Inconsistent Data Regarding Connector Impact on Van Dorn.** The Staff Report, at p.10, asserts that "on Van Dorn, intersection delays are reduced . . . approximately 30 percent by Alternate D and less than 10 percent by Alternate . . . C." Why would D help Van Dorn more than C?

a. And isn't the above p. 10 assertion inconsistent with the Table 1, p. 7, assertion that Alternate C and Alternate D both reduce the Average Daily Traffic (ADT) on Van Dorn by an identical amount of 4,300? In other words, how can two identical ADT impacts on Van Dorn have differing impacts on Van Dorn intersection delays?

b. Similarly, isn't the above p. 10 assertion inconsistent with the Table 5, p. 11, assertion that Alternate C reduces queue lengths at Van Dorn at Edsall and at Van Dorn at South Picket more than Alternate D?

27. **Lack of North of Duke Cut-Through Traffic Data.** Why does the Staff Report, Table 6, not report data for Yale, North Quaker and Howard? This data would be needed to evaluate the cut-through traffic north of Duke for each connector route.

28. **N. Quaker Lane Traffic.** The Technical Report, pp. 18 and map after p. 19, asserts that the N. Quaker ADT in 2020 (No Build) is 41,100. Why, then, does the Technical Report, at p. 34, assert that the N. Quaker ADT in 2020 (No Build) is only 28,500? Which figure is wrong? It appears that when the north of Duke cut-through analysis was conducted, the N. Quaker baseline traffic projection was drastically reduced. Why?

a. What is the practical maximum ADT for N. Quaker?

b. Why, despite requests of task force members, was the Quaker/King/Braddock intersection excluded from the study area?

29. **Impact of C and D on Telegraph.** A handout entitled "Traffic Analysis Results" provided at the task force's January 23, 2002 meeting states, at p. 2, that Alternate C will provide an 18% reduction in Telegraph volumes and, at p. 5, that Alternate C will provide a 12% reduction in Telegraph volumes. Why would C reduce Telegraph volumes more than D?

And compare these statements to Table IV-4, at p. 33, of the Technical Report: C diverts 13,200 ADT from Telegraph and D diverts 12,000 from Telegraph. These numbers are inconsistent with the January 23, 2002 percentages.

30. Duke St. Traffic. What are the impacts of B1 and D on Duke St. traffic?

a. How much traffic does B1 add to Duke? Once on Duke, where does this traffic go?

b. How much traffic does D add to Duke? Once on Duke, where does this traffic go?

c. Every vehicle on Telegraph north of Stovall and on D must travel on Duke for some distance, as W. Taylor Run and Cambridge (the roads directly opposite where Telegraph and D intersect Duke) can handle relatively little traffic or will be obstructed. Is the traffic added to Duke with building D fully offset by a corresponding reduction in traffic to/from Telegraph at D? Because, if not, how can adding cars to an approximately 1,500 foot stretch of Duke decrease congestion on Duke St.?

31. Induced Traffic. What is the induced traffic (presumably from the Beltway and Fairfax Co.) as a result of each connector? Has the concept of induced traffic been considered in the connector capacity projections?

a. Mr. Murphy states: "The taxonomy of neighborhood streets as Feeders/Collectors/Arterials and Connectors unfortunately betrays a bias that disengages land use planning from transportation planning. When we think about Alexandria's most desired, beautiful and functional neighborhoods, it is impossible to separate the character of the neighborhood street from the character of the neighborhood. A connector that is designed for the one-dimensional purpose of moving cars is not only expensive and potentially destructive to City neighborhoods, there are many indications that it will exacerbate and not relieve traffic. There are any number of studies that indicate that building more roads of this type, simply by their presence, increases traffic use beyond projected capacities. Donald Chen's seminal article "If You Build It, They Will Come: Why We Can't Build Ourselves Out of Congestion" is a great place to start to understand the concept of induced traffic."

b. Mr. Cunningham concurs: "The Neighborhood Traffic Trends subsection at B II-7 of the Technical Report indicates "a large portion, in some

cases over 50%, traveled through the cordoned area. However, the total number of trips is low." Through traffic needs to be analyzed in terms of the induced traffic growth that would result from implementing the connectors."

c. Section IV-4.1 of the Technical Report, at p. 33, discusses the "Sources of Connector Traffic." The Report states: "An east-west 'cut line' was drawn to determine sources of traffic. This 'cut line' analysis assumes that total north south traffic across the cut line is the same for the No Build and each connector." Why was there no consideration of induced traffic in determining the "Total Connector ADT" for each route?

32. Reliability. To what extent are the traffic projections as set forth in the Technical Report reliable, i.e., accurate forecasts of the future? What is the track record of such forecasting? What is the track record for such forecasting in Alexandria? Statistically, what certainty level attaches to the projections? The model is trying to predict traffic patterns 18 years in the future about which there is great uncertainty. Why no information as to how sensitive the results are if the key parameters and assumptions are varied?

Route Questions

33. B2 (east of Cameron Station). B2 increases the ADT at the Clermont Interchange by about 18,000. Presumably all of this traffic heads to Duke. And where does it go once on Duke? There has been no data presented regarding cut-through traffic on streets heading north from Duke in that vicinity. (see Item 25.b above)

34. D (Roth Street/Cambridge Road route). To what extent do the planned improvements to the Telegraph Interchange improve access to Eisenhower Valley and make D unnecessary?

a. A City document, dated November 15, 2001, titled "Workshop No. 1 Eisenhower East Plan," at p. 46, states: "By the year 2010 the improvements to the new Wilson Bridge and the improvements to I-95/495 will substantially mitigate the traffic congestion on Duke St. and Telegraph Road." Is this accurate?

b. Mr. Cunningham states: "In addressing Alternative D, B IV-4.7 of the Technical Report indicates that "[t]his alternative provides the best service to East Eisenhower." This is misleading as the planned improvements to the Telegraph Interchange will provide improved service to East Eisenhower. With

these Telegraph Interchange improvements in mind, Alternative D is redundant and should be eliminated from any further consideration."

c. The Staff Report states that a "large portion of Alternate D traffic is bound to or from east Eisenhower." Practically speaking, isn't the effect of D essentially to widen Telegraph to eight lanes-four lanes for local Eisenhower Valley traffic to/from Duke and four lanes for traffic to/from Duke to (a) the Beltway and (b) Fairfax? Does not diverting the local Eisenhower Valley traffic off of Telegraph and onto D have the effect of allowing Telegraph to serve more Beltway traffic and more Fairfax traffic (a significant portion of which is headed to points north through Alexandria)?

d. Why does the report assume no induced traffic on Telegraph caused by a connector at D? Wouldn't shifting 12,000 ADT from Telegraph to Duke (Staff Report, Table 1) result in "new" traffic (the "induced" traffic) choosing to travel the now less crowded Telegraph route-and then head north through Alexandria? But Table 2 says no induced traffic-rather, D takes 12,000 from Telegraph and Telegraph goes down 12,000. Does this make sense?

35. D/Cut Through Traffic. To what extent will D result in more cut through traffic on W. Taylor Run, Cambridge, Yale, Quaker and Ft. Williams?

a. The Staff Report, at 14, states that "[f]or the six build alternatives, the potential for cut-through traffic on residential neighborhood streets in not increased, except for Fort Williams Drive under Alternates A1, A2, B1 and B2." Why has staff not allowed access to the underlying traffic study documents that supposedly support this conclusion?

b. When asked to explain how the traffic flows with connector at D result in decreased cut-through traffic, staff has repeatedly stated that it is "counterintuitive" and offer no further explanation. Why, with D, do the traffic flows result in less cut-through traffic north of Duke?

36. D/Bridge Implications. Will the D/Roth route, which is a bridge for almost its entire distance, be unsafe in the winter?

a. With the D/Roth St. alternative, how tall will the bridge be over the elevated Metrorail tracks? Isn't it true that the bridge will be over 40 feet tall?

- b. What will be the incline (steepness) on the Eisenhower Ave. side?
- c. What will be the incline (steepness) on the Duke St. side?
- d. For both incline rates, what existing road in Alexandria has a similar rate of incline?
- e. Isn't it true that Dayton Cook, former Director of the Alexandria Department of Transportation and Environmental Services, ruled out a connector at D (Roth St.) partly because it would be unsafe in the winter due to the steepness of the bridge and the icy conditions on such a bridge in the winter? (This is based on the recollection of citizens active on the connector issue in the 1980s.)
- f. Isn't it true that the lead consultant to the task force, Dave Metcalf, as reported in the task force's January 23, 2002 meeting minutes, stated that any "super-elevated bridge could ice up".

Environmental, Planning and Other Considerations

37. Does the Technical Report properly take into account a connector's impact on air quality?

a. Mr. Cunningham's comment: "While it is appropriate that the Technical Report in B II-5 references VDEQ concerning air quality, it would be more appropriate if the Technical Report referenced WASH COG and its efforts to address the region's severe ozone non-attainment status. Note: Mayor Donley and Councilwoman Pepper are the City's representatives to WASH COG; Councilwoman Pepper is on WASH COG's Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee (MWAQC)."

b. Further, "since the Washington metropolitan region is in severe non-attainment for ozone, the Technical Report needs to reference the requirements associated with the U.S. EPA's Clean Air Act General Conformity Rule.

38. How has the connector study been integrated and coordinated with the City's comprehensive transportation planning efforts currently underway?

a. Why is the connector study proceeding independent of the City-wide transportation planning process?

b. To what extent have staff examined how Arlington has managed its congestion by relying on transit (Metro and bus), biking and walking and evaluated how these lessons could be applied to Alexandria and, specifically, Eisenhower Valley?

39. How has the connector study been integrated and coordinated with the City's Eisenhower East planning efforts currently underway?

40. How has the connector study been integrated and coordinated with the City's preliminary planning efforts for Eisenhower West?

Process—The Political Road

41. Why was a connector not definitively planned for the Cameron Station vicinity at the time of the land use planning for Cameron Station?

42. What was the communication from VDOT that initiated the connector issue being on the agenda at the 2000 City Council retreat (which initiated the process culminating in adoption of Resolution 1995, dated March 13, 2001, establishing the initial task force)?

a. If a letter, date, author and contents?

b. If verbal, date, individual and contents of communication?

43. What is the status of the City formally applying for a waiver of any obligation to repay any amounts related to the Eisenhower Interchange?

44. Did VDOT anticipate any minimum distances between the connector and the new interchange? Staff's own data on the capacity of different connector alternatives indicates that the further away an alternative is from the Clermont interchange, the less likely it is to encourage greater use of this interchange. Why then is one of the recommended options-D-2 miles away from the interchange, and would this even meet the letter or the spirit of VDOT's connector expectations?

45. Why has the City not revised its connector web pages to reflect the September 12, 2002 VDOT letter. The description of the "No Build" option still

states "No Build . . . and Repay the Commonwealth for Funds Expended for the Eisenhower Ave/Beltway Connector." The description of the "No Build with Improvements on Existing Roadway" also continues to make that statement.

46. Even though Resolution 1995, dated March 13, 2002, stated that the connector task force should analyze each alternative from an "economic development " standpoint, why did the staff provide no information regarding the impact of a connector and specific routes on economic development?

47. Even though Resolution 1995, dated March 13, 2002, stated that the connector task force should analyze each alternative from a "neighborhood impact" standpoint, why did the staff provide no information regarding each routes' neighborhood impact prior to the initial task force vote in April 2002?

48. At the October 8, 2002, City Council meeting, Councilman Euille and Councilwomen Eberwein and Woodson expressed a desire to explore more options. Why was the expanded task force directed not to look at any options other than the six routes selected by the prior task force? Why did staff present no data, except for a 4-lane connector, for any of the six routes?

49. Why did staff study the traffic impact of two connectors (as stated by City staff at the August 8, 2002 presentation at Bishop-Ireton High School), but not present this information to the task force? What other analysis was performed but the results never shared with the task force?

50. Referring to Table 11 of the Staff Report, why did City staff recommend B2, with 1317 points, and D, with 1330 points, when C had 1336 points? Why does staff not state in their report why B1 and D are preferred to C? Did City staff, taking political, non-technical considerations into account, conclude (properly) that the Bluestone episode about 15 years ago immunized C?

51. Why has the City refused to provide the complete documentation underlying the consultant's connector study? For example, the Technical Report, which appears to be drafted by the consultant, states "[l]arger scale conceptual plans and profiles are in the Alternate Plan and Profile Appendix." To my knowledge, the City has not publicly released such Appendix. Why?

52. Why does the City's web page on the connector continue to fail to state the recommendation of the connector task force-to reject 14-0 three of the build routes and to reject 9-5 the other three build routes. The connector web page

posts the task force minutes for all meetings through September 4, 2002, but does not post either the minutes of the September 18 meeting where the task force voted to reject all build alternates or the task force report which discusses the task force recommendation that no connector be built. Why?

Acknowledgements

Except where expressly noted above, this is the work product solely of the undersigned. However, many of the insights originated with a large number of Alexandria residents over the last several months. In addition, the following technical experts have provided assistance in reviewing the City's reports and, if documents had been provided, would have assisted with the review of the consultant's analysis:

Lawrence V. (Murphy) Antoine, Jr., AIA, AICP

Mr. Antoine, currently with Torti Gallas as a Senior Planner, has 14 years experience in the fields of architecture, urban planning and neighborhood revitalization. A Registered Architect and a Certified Planner, Mr. Antoine has a Bachelor of Science in Architecture, a Masters in Architecture and a Masters in Planning degrees.

Richard D. Cunningham

Mr. Cunningham has more than 30 years of experience in policy and planning, including work in numerous transportation, neighborhood and environmental projects. He was appointed as the Urban Planning representative to the Alexandria Environmental Policy Commission and the Planning District II representative to the Alexandria Archeological Commission. He holds a Masters in Urban and Regional Planning degree.

James Wamsley

Mr. Wamsley, a resident of Alexandria since 1982, is a retired Registered Professional Engineer and U.S. Army civilian employee. He was appointed by City Council to the Northern Virginia Transportation Coordinating Council Citizens Advisory Committee. He also is the Virginia Chapter of the Sierra Club Transportation Chair.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas M. Parry

Thomas M. Parry

317 Skyhill Road
Alexandria, Virginia
(702) 212-098n2

Footnote 1: From a February 28, 2002 City document titled Workshop No. 2
Eisenhower East Plan:

"Existing Development": 3.2 million sq. ft.

Additional "Approved Development": 5.1 million sq. ft.

Range of "Potential Development": 3.0 M to 8.1 million total sq. ft.

"The Range of Total Potential Development": 11.3 to 16.4 million sq. ft.

It is interesting to note that in an April 17, 1986 memorandum to City Council, City Manager Vola Lawson (and staff Dayton L. Cook, Director, Transportation & Environmental Services) stated that Eisenhower Valley "has a potential for an additional 22 million square feet of mixed use development." Although the City decided not to proceed with either the Clermont or Bluestone connectors, no changes were initiated regarding the Valley's land use plan.