

5

10-14-06

Rich Baier/Alex
10/10/2006 10:44 AM

To alexvamayor@aol.com, macdonaldcouncil@msn.com,
timothylovain@aol.com, councilmangaines@aol.com,
council@krupicka.com, delpepper@aol.com,
cc Jim Hartmann/Alex@Alex, William Skrabak/Alex@Alex, Lalit
Sharma, Ignacio Pessoa/Alex@Alex, Richard
Josephson/Alex@ALEX, Michele Evans/Alex@Alex, Christopher
bcc

Subject Fw: Request for review of Low Wind Speed Conclusions

All...Pls be advised that this has come in to staff from David Sullivan who is the consultant working on the air modeling at the request of Cameron Station. I send this to you as TES has received many emails from Mr. Ward and I am getting several calls as to his issues. I have asked my staff and our consultants not to respond to him as was indicated by Mindy Lyle's email earlier last week to staff that he does not represent Cameron Station's Board and staff (and our own consultant force) is not able to focus on the issues at hand as they are responding to his many emails. I have asked my staff to share this email with the consultants ...Rich...

Richard J. Baier, P.E.
Director
Transportation and Environmental Services
City of Alexandria
301 King Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
(703) 838.4966
Fax: (703) 519.3356

----- Forwarded by Rich Baier/Alex on 10/10/2006 10:13 AM -----



David Sullivan
<sull_env@ix.netcom.com>

10/09/2006 10:00 AM

Please respond to
David Sullivan
<sull_env@ix.netcom.com>

To <aimpastato@earthlink.net>, <skrabak@alexandriava.gov>,
<Lalit.Sharma@alexandriava.gov>,
<green@cambridgeenvironmental.com>,
<mcg.hcgk@verizon.net>, <maureen@aeroengineering.com>,
<Ames@CambridgeEnvironmental.com>, <lylema@comcast.net>,
<Rich.Baier@alexandriava.gov>

cc

Subject Re: Request for review of Low Wind Speed Conclusions

I have informed Rick Ward that unless directed to respond to his emails by representatives of Camerson Station that I was not longer going to engage in responding to ongoing emails from him because in my judgment it was no longer productive. His questions have been taken seriously, addressed based on careful deliberation. His comments in this note are clearly incorrect and confusing many issues. For example, the only issue identified by EPA where there was a difference approach followed than recently recommended in EPA guidance is the treatment of surface roughness. First, as Maureen has shown, this results in only a 3 to 10 percent difference in the results, and has no bearing at all

on compliance status. Second, there is debate among the modeling community as to the wisdom of using the surface roughness for the airport rather than surface roughness associated with the source. To imply that this is a major issue is simply false. Also, to suggest that the standard processing of meteorological data that

was performed by Maureen was in conflict with guidance, also is not true. It has been observed that there is a limitation in the standard processing of meteorological data by the National Climatic Data Center that is a general limitation for AERMOD - not an error on her part. Finally, his comments about 40 percent increases in formaldehyde do not properly represent that this was based on conservative screening review, which demonstrated that the air toxic guidelines still were met even based on conservative screening.

We have suggested that some additional steps be taken to document the low wind speed issue (or another resolution would be to run one year with the wind speeds replaced by raw data). We do not anticipate a change in conclusions, but have simply suggested this to improve the documentation. Mr. Ward obviously is within his rights to raise whatever objections he chooses to raise. In fact, some of his comments have been helpful, such as to better clarify with low wind speed issues. At this point, however, I repeat that the repetitive review of the same points over and over again will not change the conclusions of this review.

-----Original Message-----

>From: Richard Ward <rickward@hotmail.com>

>Sent: Oct 6, 2006 6:03 PM

>To: Lohman.Denny@epamail.epa.gov, Wilkie.Walter@epamail.epa.gov, Flores.Patricia@epamail.epa.gov, mfkiss@deq.virginia.gov, klmcbec@deq.virginia.gov, skrabak@alexandriava.gov, Lalit.Sharma@alexandriava.gov, green@cambridgeenvironmental.com, Rich.Baier@alexandriava.gov

>Cc: maureen@aeroengineering.com, mcg.hcgk@verizon.net, sull_env@ix.netcom.com, aimpastato@earthlink.net, Ames@CambridgeEnvironmental.com, mindylyle@comcast.net

>Subject: Request for review of Low Wind Speed Conclusions

>

>To officials at the EPA, VA DEQ, and the City of Alexandria,

>

>Thank you for your prior comments regarding modeling methods used in the
>Virginia Paving site study in Alexandria, VA. It is noted that earlier
>comments by officials from the EPA have indicated that the modeling methods
>do not appear to be in conformance with EPA modeling guidelines. Despite
>such opinions, the matter was presented to the Planning Commission of the
>City of Alexandria and was approved by a 6-1 vote on October 3rd. The
>City's report to the Planning Commission reflected modeling studies which
>were not in compliance with EPA guidelines, yet it was represented that such
>studies were in compliance with such guidelines. As the matter is to be
>finally decided by the City Council on October 14, your assistance and
>opinion is formally requested as to the additional conclusion(s) made by
>David Sullivan earlier today. It is my understanding that modeling
>resources at the EPA and the VA DEQ are available to both full-time
>professionals and private citizens alike.

>

>The conclusions discussed below relate primarily to the failure of conducted
>models to consider wind speed conditions lower than 3 mph, owing to the
>processing of a NWS wind data set from National Airport (which included wind
>speeds as low as 0.75 m/s) by setting wind speeds lower than 1.5 m/s to 0
>m/s so that these hours would not be considered by the AERMOD model. From
>conversations with officials at the EPA, it is my understanding that this
>manipulation of data is not in accordance with EPA guidelines. Upon review
>of the attached memo and David Sullivan's comments below, it is also my
>understanding that remedial efforts to date have not brought the modeling
>studies to within EPA guidelines. Comments on the remedial efforts are
>respectfully requested.

>

>Here is a restatement of some of the issues:

>

>1) It is the opinion of David Sullivan that the study regarding PM10 was incomplete.

>

>2) David Sullivan believes the study regarding formaldehyde was correct. It is noted that the attached memo found up to 40% increases in maximum concentrations at lower wind speeds as compared to the data provided to the Planning Commission and City Council. (Note: To my knowledge and belief, no efforts have been made to indicate this impact to the Planning Commission or the Council, including the correction of comparative tables on the City report.)

>

>3) David Sullivan has appeared by his silence to indicate that there is no impact on other criteria pollutants such as SO_x, NO_x, and CO, even though violations of SO_x air quality standards (at least) are predicted by the AERO report prior to the consideration of low wind speed conditions. (It is noted that adding 40% to criteria pollutant levels which are predicted to already exceed NAAQS or SAAC standards is a fact which should be conveyed to the decision making bodies.)

>

>4) David Sullivan has not commented on the EPA's observation that it was not adequately proved that National Airport wind speed data (near an open field and large body of water with a low surface roughness) was adequately representative of the wind speeds at the Virginia Paving location (located near surface terrain features which exceed stack height, e.g., near buildings exceeding 20 meters in height and hills exceeding 100 feet in height, and where surface roughness is correspondingly higher).

>

>5) David Sullivan has also not commented on the other low wind speed issues raised by the EPA in its brief review of the AERO Engineering report. It is especially noted that he has not indicated whether the consideration of diurnal characteristics (e.g., the tendency to produce pollutants at certain times of the day) will have an adverse effect on air quality if the new SUP is adopted.

>

>The failure to comment on #5 appears to represent a departure from the prior practice of Sullivan Environmental. It is noted that the company website indicates: "Locations in close proximity to key sources need to be modeled with as much specificity as possible in terms of the release characteristics of nearby sources...The diurnal features of the sources are critically important in all cases. Operations that are concentrated in the daytime, e.g., 7:30 A.M. through 3:30 P.M. shift, need to be modeled accordingly because of the strong bias towards restrictive dispersion conditions that produce worst-case conditions for near-ground sources during many nighttime periods." See <http://www.sullivan-environmental.com/> under the "Exposure" tab. By implication, operations which occur predominantly during nighttime should also be "modeled accordingly", because of the "strong bias towards restrictive dispersion conditions that produce worst-case conditions for near ground sources during many nighttime periods."

>

>It is indisputable that more nighttime operation will occur during the new SUP than during the 1960 SUP, yet no effort whatsoever has been made to determine the impacts of such increased night time operations on the

>surrounding community. In the most egregious instances: 1) the baseline
>condition was modeled as involving 24 hour production, when only very
>limited production is possible at night under the 1960 SUP owing to a
>prohibition on nighttime vehicle traffic; and 2) the baseline condition was
>modeled as 900,000 tons per year, when that level of production occurred only
>once, in violation of both the 1960 SUP and the existing VA DEQ air permit
>in 2004. (VA DEQ is requested to comment on this permit violation) In
>combination, these modeling errors place too much bias on nighttime
>conditions for the baseline condition. Conversely, the analysis of the
>proposed SUP conditions spread 10,000 tons of production throughout a 24
>hour period, when in actuality, operations may be concentrated at night,
>e.g., when "strong bias towards restrictive dispersion conditions" occurs.

>

>In short:

>

>1) Under the existing SUP, yearly production would be on the order of
>600,000 tons/year or less, based upon historical daytime production (as
>opposed to illegal night time operations), and because asphalt delivery is
>restricted by heavy traffic conditions during the daytime. Almost all
>production will be during the day, when higher dispersion of pollutants
>typically occur.

>

>2) Under the proposed SUP, yearly production could easily reach the
>permitted limit of 1,200,000 tons/year, especially because low traffic
>conditions will permit delivery of asphalt to distant locations at
>nighttime. Much production will be at nighttime, which is known to be
>associated with lower dispersion conditions. Some operational changes are
>proposed which could reduce concentrations of some HAPs and criteria
>pollutants on a per ton basis, however, such improvements do not appear
>to affect the volume of the largest source of such pollutants, i.e., the drum
>dryer mixer stacks, to any great extent.

>

>3) The modeling performed to date is not representative of these
>conditions. See especially the "Ambient Air Quality Analysis" at
>http://alexandriava.gov/planningandzoning/vapaving_sup.php

>

>It is notable that all modeled compounds were presented as representing less
>of a danger to the entire community, i.e., not a single chart or graph was
>presented to indicate that any person or location would be exposed to higher
>concentrations of pollutants on an annual or short-term basis, despite the
>fact that production would be in effect doubled, and the fact that new
>environmental controls would not greatly affect many of the produced
>pollutants (e.g., CO, SO_x, NO_x, HAPs -- in addition, control of PM appears
>to be much less than 50% of existing rate/ton of production). Such a result
>could be explained by numerous and significant errors made in the modeling
>studies.

>

>Despite flaws identified by Cambridge Engineering, David Sullivan, and the
>EPA which could greatly affect modeling results, and could possibly even
>reverse the comparative conclusions of the modeling studies, this matter has
>already been approved by the Planning Commission, and is scheduled to go
>before the City Council next week.

>

>Reconsideration of this course of action is respectfully requested from the
>City of Alexandria. In addition, assistance from the EPA and Virginia DEQ

>is formally requested in this matter.

>

>Richard W. Ward
>5247 Tancreti Lane
>Alexandria, VA 22304
>(202) 220-4268 (W)

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>-----Original Message Follows-----

>From: David Sullivan <sull_env@ix.netcom.com>
>Reply-To: David Sullivan <sull_env@ix.netcom.com>
>To: aimpastato@earthlink.net, Ames@CambridgeEnvironmental.com,
>mindyllyle@comcast.net, rickwward@hotmail.com, skrabak@alexandriava.gov,
>Lalit.Sharma@alexandriava.gov, green@cambridgeenvironmental.com,
>mcg.hcgk@verizon.net, Rich.Baier@alexandriava.gov,
>maureen@aeroengineering.com
>Subject: Low wind speed
>Date: Fri, 6 Oct 2006 11:49:23 -0400 (GMT-04:00)

>

>We reviewed the modeling files and summary report of the modeling analysis
>of the wind speed issue regarding Virginia Paving. Based on our review the
>basic modeling logic and conclusions appear to be valid, however, there are
>two caveats regarding completeness that would need to be documented to fully
>address the low wind speed concern:

>

>1) The PM10 results are presented for the worst-case day from the five years
>of modeling (e.g., Dec 31, 2003) with the conclusion that the minimum wind
>speeds from that day being generally around 2.1 m/sec. However, other
>maximum concentration days from the years 2000 and 2001 should have been
>analyzed even though the maximum concentrations for those days are below the
>overall 2003 maximum. Initial review of the meteorological data for the
>maximum concentration days in 2000 and 2001 showed wind speeds closer to the
>critical 1.5 m/sec level and may alter the conclusion about the maximums
>occurring during slightly higher wind speeds. This probably will not change
>the fact that Dec. 31, 2003 produced the highest concentration, but for
>completeness it should be noted in the modeling analysis based on a closer
>review.

>

>2) Mike Ames noted that the upper air data for Dec. 31, 2003 was missing for
>the afternoon hours resulting in predicted concentrations of 0 ug/m3 for
>that period. His conclusion that the higher wind speeds noted during that
>time would have produced lower concentrations both due to the higher winds
>and greater dispersion and that if concentrations actually were produced,
>Dec 31 would still be the maximum concentration day. This is highly
>probable but cannot be stated with certainty since there was not any
>indication of a review of all days that were missing upper air data and how
>this may have affected the maximum concentrations for those days.
>Documentation of surface wind speed, wind direction, and stability (e.g. a
>summary table) of all days of missing upper air data should be provided to

- >clarify this issue, especially indicating periods with missing upper air
- >data during light wind speed, nocturnal conditions.
- >

5

10-14-06



<Doug.Fagen@labschool.org>

10/12/2006 01:32 PM

Please respond to
<Doug.Fagen@labschool.org>

To <alexvamayor@aol.com>, <macdonaldcouncil@msn.com>, <timothylovain@aol.com>, <councilmangaines@aol.com>, <council@krupicka.com>, <delpepper@aol.com>

cc

bcc

Subject COA Contact Us: Vote NO to Virginia Paving's SUP

COA Contact Us: Vote NO to Virginia Paving's SUP

Time: [Thu Oct 12, 2006 13:32:15] IP Address: [147.9.86.11]

Response requested:

First Name: Douglas
Last Name: Fagen
Street Address: 250 Medlock Lane
City: Alexandria
State: VA
Zip: 22304
Phone: 703 566 4999
Email Address: Doug.Fagen@labschool.org
Subject: Vote NO to Virginia Paving's SUP
Dear Mr. Mayor, Vice Mayor, and Council Members,

I am a resident of Cameron Station, and am writing to express my significant concerns regarding the proposed SUP for Virginia Paving to increase their hours of operation.

I am the father of two young boys. We love living in Cameron Station; our children play in the neighborhood and the parks, we walk to the library, we use the bicycle paths and playgrounds. One of the most important factors that enticed us to live in Cameron Station, however, was the construction of Samuel Tucker School. We have closely watched the school grow and succeed, and plan to send our children to Tucker.

However, the proposed SUP for the Virginia Paving plant has forced us to reconsider all of these choices. We do not plan to send our children to a school downwind of a paving plant producing emissions nearly around the clock, and have recently begun

talking about whether we should consider leaving the city that we have come to enjoy so much.

Comments:

The City Council, over the past decade, has repeatedly voted to transform the West End into a thriving residential area. Cameron Station, the Eisenhower redevelopment, and the planned Landmark development are just the largest of these projects. Taken together, they represent a transformed West End, which thousands of residents call their home. It is incumbent upon the city council to seriously consider the long-term health, environmental, and quality of life issues that are now tied up in any expansion of production at the paving plant. In any contest between industry and children, the children are bound to lose.

Please vote to deny the SUP to increase the hours of the Virginia Paving plant. There is a delicate balance at work in the West End. We already contend with a paving plant next to an elementary school, a situation that nobody is entirely satisfied with. To increase production, and emissions, at the plant, will only serve to harm the children and the neighborhoods in the adjacent communities, and will reduce the quality of life for the citizens of west Alexandria.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Doug Fagen
250 Medlock Lane

5
10-14-06



<anamvk@comcast.net>

10/12/2006 01:55 PM

Please respond to
<anamvk@comcast.net>

To <alexvamayor@aol.com>, <macdonaldcouncil@msn.com>,
<timothylovain@aol.com>, <councilmangaines@aol.com>,
<council@krupicka.com>, <delpepper@aol.com>,

cc

bcc

Subject COA Contact Us: Virginia Paving

COA Contact Us: Virginia Paving

Time: [Thu Oct 12, 2006 13:55:55] IP Address: [69.140.84.222]

Response requested:

First Name: Ana

Last Name: Kelly

Street Address: 4911 John Ticer Drive

City: Alexandria

State: VA

Zip: 22304

Phone: 703-567-6052

Email Address: anamvk@comcast.net

Subject: Virginia Paving

I watched the Planning Commission meeting on TV last week when the Virginia Paving SUP was discussed. I was appalled at what happened. If you did not see it, I suggest you view the video.

After a lot of praises for staff and VA Paving by many members, one brave member stood up and said that this was the worst report she had ever received (after two said it was the best.) She pointed out that unlike normal reports which have pro's and con's, this report had only pro's and no con's. It was clearly a sales pitch she said and did not have a balanced analysis at all. How could a project have no negatives when it proposes to increase industrial work 24/7 with residential areas all around it??? Clearly, there is something going on here and she was the only one brave enough to point it out.

Comments: I have always been proud of the way this city is run and have often commented that to visitors. However, the city's handling of this SUP is outrageous. In my understanding, there are still violations which the city never corrected nor monitored. Disturbingly, the city has a sole source contract with Virginia Paving. And even more

disturbingly, the city has delayed the hearing of this SUP for over a year while still buying services from the company under this sole source arrangement. The city has been clearly enabling Virginia Paving to violate its existing SUP.

For the sake of the integrity of your positions, please review things very carefully at the meeting this Saturday. Listen to the many residents who do not want to increase industry operations to be 24/7 with a school and residential areas nearby. And ask unbiased, honest questions about why most of the staff is blind to one side of the argument. Something is very wrong with the way the city is currently operating.

5
10-14-06



<bjscott36@yahoo.com>

10/12/2006 02:41 PM

Please respond to
<bjscott36@yahoo.com>

To <alexvamayor@aol.com>, <macdonaldcouncil@msn.com>,
<timothylovain@aol.com>, <councilmangaines@aol.com>,
<council@krupicka.com>, <delpepper@aol.com>,

cc

bcc

Subject COA Contact Us: Virginia Paving SUP Amendment Opposition

COA Contact Us: Virginia Paving SUP Amendment Opposition

Time: [Thu Oct 12, 2006 14:41:23] IP Address: [69.143.60.117]

Response requested:

First Name: Brian
Last Name: Scott
Street Address: 1036 Harrison Circle
City: Alexandria
State: VA
Zip: 22304
Phone: 703-823-2133
Email Address: bjscott36@yahoo.com
Subject: Virginia Paving SUP Amendment Opposition
Greetings Mr. Mayor and City Council Members,

I am a resident of Summers Grove (SG) in the West End of Alexandria. Due to a prior doctor's appointment, I will not be able to attend the Council meeting and speak, so I wanted to voice my opposition to the above VA Paving (VAPC) SUP Amendment.

I request that you DISAPPROVE this SUP Amendment request. My specific concerns are:

1. VAPC's inability to enforce the SUP conditions;
2. Whether such an intensification of an industrial use is compatible with the City's burgeoning plans to redevelop the Van Dorn Street and Eisenhower West areas; and,
3. The impact on the health of children at Tucker School and the health of neighbors living near the plant (having moved to SG two years ago, I have had bronchitis 3 times in the last year, after having never had it at all during my 18 years living at 36 S. Ingram Street, near Foxchase).

If you feel compelled to approve this SUP

amendment:

1. At a minimum, I request that you include a sunset provision in the SUP of no later than 2 years hence, after which VAPC must renew/reapply for the SUP based upon the actual results of the SUP conditions.

Comments:

2. At a maximum, I request that hardscape noise abatement measures (noise wall) be included in the SUP as an immediate requirement.

Further, even though the Planning Commission might assert that we at SG were all "made aware of the industrial uses surrounding our neighborhood," I believe that this is a substantial intensification of an industrial use, which we were not anticipating. Also, while we appreciate VAPC's attempts over the summer to discuss this issue with community representatives, we have not reached an adequate compromise that protects the interests of all parties concerned. Given VAPC's spotty record of enforcing provision similar to the SUP conditions during this interim period, we are dubious at best that they can and will adhere to the 74 SUP conditions. I have personally called VAPC at several times in the past 3 months to report odors coming across their property line, noise from beeping backup horns at night (including use of the Van Dorn street RAP pile), and noise from tailgate banging. I am aware that other SG residents have recently complained about excessive light shining the! ir property line.

Thank you very much for your consideration in this matter.

Respectfully,

Brian Scott
1036 Harrison Circle

5
10-14-06



<George_Huff@ao.uscourts.gov
>
10/12/2006 02:51 PM
Please respond to
<George_Huff@ao.uscourts.gov>

To <alexvamayor@aol.com>, <macdonaldcouncil@msn.com>,
<timothylovain@aol.com>, <councilmangaines@aol.com>,
<council@krupicka.com>, <delperpe@aol.com>,
cc
bcc
Subject COA Contact Us: STOP VA Paving Asphalt Plant

COA Contact Us: STOP VA Paving Asphalt Plant

Time: [Thu Oct 12, 2006 14:51:01] IP Address: [208.27.111.132]

Response requested:

First Name: Vesna and George
Last Name: Huff
Street Address: 4931 Kilburn Street
City: Alexandria
State: VA
Zip: 22304
Phone: 703 751-3692
Email Address: George_Huff@ao.uscourts.gov
Subject: STOP VA Paving Asphalt Plant
Dear Political Representatives,

We're reminded to ask you again to stop the Alexandria City Council from allowing the VA paving Asphalt Plant from operating 24/7.

Comments: We live at Cameron Station and want you to stop our neighborhood from being spoiled forever by the noise, waste and pollution of a heavy industry and trucks from operating in our community at all hours. We don't ask you for anything but to stop taxing and spending too much of our money and stop damaging our environment.

We've written to you on this topic via e-mail before, but our messages have been generally ignored.

Vesna and George Huff

5
10-14-06



"Stacy E. Costello"
<sec@sacklaw.com>
10/12/2006 05:47 PM

To <jackie.henderson@alexandriava.gov>
cc <alexvamayor@aol.com>
bcc
Subject Virginia Paving

Dear Mayor Euille and City Council Members,

My name is Stacy Costello. My husband and I are homeowner/residents in the Cameron Station community in the West End of Alexandria. We have lived in Cameron Station since 1999. Cameron Station, as you know, is now a residential community. We have an elementary school and some retail shops. We are surrounded by apartment buildings, city parks and green spaces and retail. Directly behind us - directly behind the elementary school and Boothe Park - is Virginia Paving. On the other side of Virginia Paving is the Van Dorn open air Metro stop.

I understand that Virginia Paving has asked for permission to change its Special Use Permit to permit it to double production of asphalt and to operate its plant 24 hours per day and 7 days per week. I further understand that the City staff is recommending approval.

I simply cannot believe that. This area is heavily residential now. I cannot believe that I have to write to you to tell you that permitting an industrial operator to double/triple its operations and production so close to a residential area, school, parks and the Metro is wrong. I presume that the members of the City Council are reasonable people with common sense. This action does not sound like common sense to me. I'm very disappointed to know that you need testimonials in order to make your decision. You shouldn't. The correct choice should really be obvious to you.

The application should be denied. I understand that the City purchases roughly 20,000 tons of asphalt per year. Under the new SUP application, Virginia Paving wants to produce 10,000 tons per day!! Clearly, the City's needs are being met by the current SUP.

There is no reason to risk the health and safety of homeowners and children by 24/7 operations. Virginia Paving, I understand, is already operating at night in violation of the current SUP. I've read that asphalt plants release harmful components into the air and water. I've also read the harmful effect of these toxins is more pronounced at night.

I also understand that Virginia Paving has not remedied its numerous outstanding violations. The City cited them for 22 violations in October 2004: two for water pollution, three relating to the SUP, 15 on the fire code and 2 on property rights. I also understand that Virginia Paving has been twice cited by the EPA for water pollution - violations of the Clean Water Act in 2004. What message are you sending if you approve an unrepentant violator's request?

There are important policy considerations at stake here.

The current SUP should be enforced. Virginia Paving's application should be denied.

Thank you for your time.

Respectfully submitted,

Stacy E. Costello

(h) 246 Murtha Street
Alexandria, Va 22304

(w) Sack Harris & Martin, P.C.
8270 Greensboro Drive
Suite 810
McLean, Virginia 22102
Telephone: 703.883.0102

5
10-14-06



"arthur impastato"
<aimpastato@earthlink.net>

10/12/2006 09:48 PM

Please respond to
<aimpastato@earthlink.net>

To <alexvamayor@aol.com>, <ahmacdonald@his.com>,
<timothylovain@aol.com>, <council@krupicka.com>,
<councilmangaines@aol.com>, <delpepper@aol.com>,
cc <vmgthehill@aol.com>, <jb900@yahoo.com>,
<mindyllyle@comcast.net>, <jackie.henderson@alexandriava.gov>
bcc

Subject FW: Re: VA Paving Petition & Staff Report is Available

At the request of Mr. Van Fleet who is out of town and cannot attend the hearing this Saturday on Virginia Paving Company, I attach his statement below for the record.

Mr. Mayor and City Council:

The real question before the Council is not whether to approve the SUP to continue operating the Virginia Paving Plant but it should be how soon can we close the plant! Unfortunately that is not the case.

It is totally egregious when the City continues to allow this plant to operate so they can continue to pave our streets day and night. By sitting on the SUP process over the past year, the quality of life of those in Cameron Station and the surrounding area has continued to deteriorate. Nighttime noise, traffic punctuated by 500 entries and exits to the plant daily, poor air quality and the contamination of Braddock Run Creek are but a few of the hardships suffered in the immediate neighborhood.

This is a health and safety issue endangering the life and health of our citizens and the children attending Samuel Tucker School. Until monitors capable of measuring 2.5 particulate matter are installed at the school and in the housing area, we will not know how bad the plant is contaminating the air quality of the surrounding area.

I have said it before and I will say it again, it is very easy to move asphalt plants. If Virginia Paving wants to be a good neighbor, they should move their plant to a less invasive area.

Townsend A. "Van" Van Fleet



<collierd@gmail.com>

10/12/2006 09:50 PM

Please respond to
<collierd@gmail.com>

To <alexvamayor@aol.com>, <macdonaldcouncil@msn.com>,
<timothylovain@aol.com>, <councilmangaines@aol.com>,
<council@krupicka.com>, <delpepper@aol.com>,

cc

bcc

Subject COA Contact Us: Va Paving SUP

5
10-14-06

COA Contact Us: Va Paving SUP

Time: [Thu Oct 12, 2006 21:50:09] IP Address: [65.193.99.4]

Response requested:

First Name: Doug
Last Name: Collier
Street Address: 5860 Summers Grove Road
City: Alexandria
State: VA
Zip: 22304
Phone: 703-370-5333
Email Address: collierd@gmail.com
Subject: Va Paving SUP

Greetings Mr. Mayor and City Council Members,

I am a resident of Summers Grove in the West End of Alexandria. I will not be able to attend the Council meeting and speak, so I wanted to voice my total opposition to the Va Paving SUP Amendment. I request that you DISAPPROVE the Va Paving SUP Amendment request.

My specific concerns are:

1. The impact on the health of all neighbors living near this plant and the children at Tucker School. As a resident on Summers Grove, I have problems with particles and black soot both outside and inside my home, along with frequent odors from Va Paving.
2. The inability to properly enforce all of the SUP conditions.
3. Is the intensification of industrial use compatible with the City's plans to redevelop the Van Dorn Street and Eisenhower West areas? Decisions are already being made for much greater industrial use, before Alexandria has a complete redevelopment plan for Eisenhower West.

Comments:

If you feel compelled to approve this SUP amendment:

1. At a minimum, I request that you include a provision that limits the SUP for no longer than 2 years, after which Va Paving must renew/reapply for the SUP based upon the actual results of the SUP conditions and based on the redevelopment plans for the West End.
2. Also I request that noise abatement measures (noise wall) be included in the SUP as a requirement. The Summers Grove Board mistakenly assumed a noise abatement wall would be built as part of this SUP.

While residents were aware of the industrial uses surrounding our neighborhood, VA Paving with this SUP would be far, far, greater industrial use than ever existed before, and in an area of Alexandria now with a significant number of close residences and the Tucker School!

Thank you very much for your consideration in this matter.

Respectfully,

Doug Collier

5
10-14-06



<mcpeggy@aol.com>

10/13/2006 07:47 AM

Please respond to
<mcpeggy@aol.com>

To <jackie.henderson@alexandriava.gov>

cc

bcc

Subject COA Contact Us: VA Paving--Please distribute

COA Contact Us: VA Paving--Please distribute

Time: [Fri Oct 13, 2006 07:47:42] IP Address: [152.163.100.8]

Response requested:

First Name: Peggy
Last Name: McGrath
Street Address: [REDACTED]
City: [REDACTED]
State: [REDACTED]
Zip: [REDACTED]
Phone: [REDACTED]
Email Address: [REDACTED]

Subject: VA Paving--Please distribute
(Please distribute this to all city council members prior to the meeting on Saturday)

I have been a citizen of Alexandria for 15 years and I am vehemently against giving VA Paving this new SUP. I hope you will place more value on the health of the citizens over business interests.

Please deny Virginia Paving Company's request for a new Special Use Permit (SUP) at your Council public hearing meeting this Saturday. I am opposed to them being allowed to work 130 nights a year with a night production cap of 650,000 tons/year. This amount is equal to their typical actual daytime production. With this plant working day and night, we will have twice the amount of foul odors, noise and dirt than we do now. We will not be able to enjoy outside activities as much at night since nighttime pollution hovers close to the source.

Comments:

It is laudable that Virginia Paving is willing to add additional air pollution equipment, but it comes at the price of reducing our quality of life. We realize that we must coexist with the plant and are willing to continue to coexist under current SUP

conditions, which limit operations to daylight hours. We are not willing to coexist with a plant that doubles its heavy industrial output by working around the clock.

Please deny this SUP request.

5

10-14-06



<Mcpeggy@aol.com>
10/13/2006 08:03 AM

To <Jackie.Henderson@alexandriava.gov>
cc
bcc
Subject VA Paving

Dear Ms. Hendersen

Would you please distribute this to all the city council members prior to the meeting tomorrow. Thank you.

I have been a citizen of Alexandria for 15 years and I am vehemently against giving VA Paving this new SUP. I hope you will place more value on the health of the citizens over business interests.

Please deny Virginia Paving Company's request for a new Special Use Permit (SUP) at your Council public hearing meeting this Saturday. I am opposed to them being allowed to work 130 nights a year with a night production cap of 650,000 tons/year. This amount is equal to their typical actual daytime production. With this plant working day and night, we will have twice the amount of foul odors, noise and dirt than we do now. We will not be able to enjoy outside activities as much at night since nighttime pollution hovers close to the source.

It is laudable that Virginia Paving is willing to add additional air pollution equipment, but it comes at the price of reducing our quality of life. We realize that we must coexist with the plant and are willing to continue to coexist under current SUP conditions, which limit operations to daylight hours. We are not willing to coexist with a plant that doubles its heavy industrial output by working around the clock.

Please deny this SUP request.
Peggy McGrath
191 Somerville St
Alex. VA 22304

5
10-14-06



<tparme@fastmail.fm>

10/13/2006 08:51 AM

Please respond to
<tparme@fastmail.fm>

To <alexvamayor@aol.com>, <macdonaldcouncil@msn.com>, <timothylovain@aol.com>, <councilmangaines@aol.com>, <council@krupicka.com>, <delpepper@aol.com>

cc

bcc

Subject COA Contact Us: VA Paving

COA Contact Us: VA Paving

Time: [Fri Oct 13, 2006 08:51:03] IP Address: [65.246.20.194]

Response requested:

First Name: TJ
Last Name: Parmele
Street Address: 327 South Pickett Street
City: Alexandria
State: VA
Zip: 22304
Phone: 703-370-1523
Email Address: tparmele@fastmail.fm
Subject: VA Paving

Comments: As a resident on Alexandria's West End, I would like the City Council to curtail the use and expansion of Virginia Paving's Special Use Permit by voting "No". As it is, production of asphalt produces a wierd odor that is prevalent whenever I walk outside my townhouse, and VA Paving's assurances about pollution control are based on fallacies. Raising a smoke stack 60 feet isn't going to do any good for the air quality, nor is allowing it to operate 24 hours a day.

So, please do what's right for the City and disallow the expansion of the Special Use Permit. In fact, curtailing operations would be nicer.

v/r,

TJ Parmele