A

City Council approved the Planning Commission recommendation.
Council
Action:_____

12. HIGH CAPACITY TRANSIT CORRIDOR -C
Public Hearing and Consideration of the first stage of implementation for High Capacity Transit Corridor - C (Van Dorn/Beauregard). Staff: Departments of Transportation and Environmental Services and Planning and Zoning

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION: Planning Commission reaffirmed support for transit in Corridor C on an expedited basis and believes that there should be bus rapid transit running in dedicated lanes. The Commission had insufficient information on the non-transportation planning elements to form any further judgment. 7-0
ALEXANDRIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION ACTION: Recommend the City Council adopt the recommendation of the CWG for Corridor C, with two caveats: 1) The alignment be optimized to better serve the Northern Virginia Community College (NVCC), and 2) Recommend that the Transportation Commission be tasked to identify decision criteria, evaluate and monitor the transition from Alternative D (Bus Rapid Transit in dedicated lanes) to Alternative G (Streetcar in dedicated lanes), and periodically report the progress to the City Council. 7-0

City Council adopted the recommendation of the High Capacity Corridor Work Group, with the addition that the alignment be optimized to better serve the Northern Virginia Community College.
Council
Action:_____

EXHIBIT NO. 1

12B
9-17-11

City of Alexandria, Virginia

MEMORANDUM

DATE: SEPTEMBER 12, 2011

TO: THE HONORABLE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF CITY COUNCIL

FROM: BRUCE JOHNSON, ACTING CITY MANAGER

SUBJECT: RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE HIGH CAPACITY TRANSIT CORRIDOR WORK GROUP, TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION AND PLANNING COMMISSION ON HIGH CAPACITY TRANSIT CORRIDOR C (VAN DORN/BEAUREGUARD)

ISSUE: Consideration of the High Capacity Transit Corridor C (Van Dorn / Beauregard) and the High Capacity Transit Corridor Work Group (CWG) recommendation for the corridor.

High Capacity Transit Corridor Work Group:	May 19, 2011
Transportation Commission Hearing:	September 7, 2011
Planning Commission Hearing:	September 8, 2011
City Council Hearing:	September 17, 2011

RECOMMENDATION BY HIGH CAPACITY TRANSIT CORRIDOR WORK GROUP, MAY 19, 2011

The following motion was passed by the High Capacity Transit Corridor Work Group (CWG) at its May 19, 2011 meeting, regarding high capacity transit in Corridor C:

Alternative D is the preferred alternative for phased implementation of transit in dedicated lanes in Corridor C until such time as Alternative G becomes feasible and can be implemented. This course of action is consistent with the Council's recent decision to provide dedicated lane transit along the segment of Corridor A that is north of Braddock Road. Evaluation and analysis will continue of Alternative D in preparation for future implementation of Alternative G. Construction of transit in Corridor C shall be the first priority of Alexandria's transportation projects. Each subsequent corridor shall be evaluated separately regarding the need to acquire additional right-of-way for dedicated lanes as discussed in the Transportation Master Plan.

The vote was approved 4-2 (three members of the Corridor Working Group were not present when the vote was taken).

RECOMMENDATION BY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, SEPTEMBER 7, 2011

At the September 7, 2011 Transportation Commission meeting, a public hearing was held on the recommendation made by the CWG for the implementation of Corridor C. The following motion was unanimously approved 7-0 by the Transportation Commission:

The Transportation Commission recommends that the City Council adopt the recommendation of the CWG for Corridor C, with two caveats. The Commission recommends that:

1) *The alignment be optimized to better serve the Northern Virginia Community College (NVCC), and;*
2) *The Transportation Commission be tasked to identify decision criteria, evaluate and monitor the transition from Alternative D (Bus Rapid Transit in dedicated lanes) to Alternative G (Streetcar in dedicated lanes), and periodically report the progress to the City Council.*

Speakers:

Dana Kauffman, 4001 Wakefield Chapel Road, Annandale, VA - Represent NVCC – NVCC is a major employment center. Ideally, Alternative G should be constructed, but generally support Alternative D. Wants to ensure that transit service is provided within the campus rather than just a stop on Beauregard.

Dak Hardwick, 5181 Brawner Place, representing the Budget and Fiscal Affairs Advisory Committee. On west end, 12.5 million sq. ft. of development is coming to Landmark. Alternative D is the most cost effective alternative that also has decent ridership.

Jack Sullivan, 4300 Ivanhoe Place, Concerned about Alternative D impact to the Winkler preserve, and there are no plans to improve Sanger Avenue under I-395. The proposed alternative does not provide a seamless transit option.

Poul Hertel, 1217 Michigan Court, We should not allow for traffic to dictate good planning. The Transportation Master Plan calls for using existing lanes to provide for transitways. This is needed to provide a comparative travel time saving against the private automobile.

Agnes Artemel, 120 Madison Place, Representing the Streetcar Coalition. Streetcars provide more ridership than the study estimated. The speaker was supportive of regional connectivity. The rating criteria have too much weight applied to the capital cost, and should have looked more at the long term costs.

Adam Froehlig – In accordance with the City's Complete Streets policy, we need to ensure that pedestrians and bicycles are accommodated when the streets are reconstructed. Prefer streetcar but understand need to start with BRT. The speaker felt that the transitway needs to connect to NVCC and the Columbia Pike Streetcar.

RECOMMENDATION BY PLANNING COMMISSION, SEPTEMBER 8, 2011

At the September 8, 2011 Planning Commission meeting, a public hearing was held on the recommendation made by the CWG for the implementation of Corridor C. The following motion was unanimously approved 7-0 by the Planning Commission:

The Planning Commission reaffirmed support for transit in Corridor C on an expedited basis and believes that there should be Bus Rapid Transit running in dedicated lanes. The Commission had insufficient information on the non-transportation planning elements to form any further judgment.

Planning Commission Speakers:
M. Catherine Puskar representing Duke Realty, JBG, Home Properties, Southern Towers, Hekemian spoke in favor of the CWG recommendation for high capacity transit in Corridor C.

Katy Cannady, 20 East Oak Street, spoke in favor of transit in Corridor C but wants it implemented by taking away one of the existing lanes from the vehicular traffic.

Jack Sullivan, 4300 Ivanhoe Place, stated that the proposal is about development in the corridor not about transit. Rejects proposal to widen Beauregard to provide transit.

Annabelle Fisher, 5001 Seminary Road would like to see Beauregard north and south included in the project to see what transit is appropriate for Beauregard. Feels that this project is being pushed through and the recommendation should be deferred.

Poul Hertel, 1217 Michigan Court, stated Transportation Master Plan assumed dedicated lanes for transit in existing lanes. Recommends dedicated transit lanes within existing Right-of-Way. Commissioner Fossum clarified that the Transportation Master Plan included language that acknowledged that other considerations would need to be studied in the implementation of a transit corridor. Rich Baier clarified that the transit concept proposes coordination with City planning efforts and that the road would need to be widened regardless of whether the transitway is in existing or new lanes to accommodate transit vehicles, stations, sidewalks and bicycle facilities.

Kathy Hart, 4302 Bushie Court, representing Lincolnia Hills/Heywood Glen Civic Association, strongly supports CWG and Transportation Commission for Corridor C options that include an additional dedicated transit lane for BRT.

Shirley Downs, 1007 North Vail Street, speaker is a strong supporter of mass transit. She is concerned about the recommendation for this corridor and the impacts on trees and parking. Ms. Downs would like additional information on transitway alignment on Van Dorn Street.

Kathleen Burns, 1036 N. Pelham Street, opposed to transit plan as currently configured and asks that the Planning Commission and City Council defer consideration. Ms. Burns voiced concern about removal of trees. Supports transit and development but feels this plan is not there yet.

Carol James, 1000 N. Vail Street, recommends deferral on action on Corridor C, stated that additional information on other projects in the study area is needed prior to making a decision.

Tim Lovain, 2606 Davis Avenue, representing the Northern Virginia Streetcar Coalition. The speaker stated that streetcar systems induce development and smart growth that would reduce traffic and help finance a streetcar system. Streetcars will better connect to regional streetcar systems in neighboring jurisdictions.

Carolyn Griglione, 1416 N. Ivanhoe Street, strongly supports the Corridor C proposed BRT transit system to improve transit in the West End and in the Beauregard Corridor. Widening Beauregard for BRT makes common sense to ensure that vehicular traffic still functions in the corridor.

Dak Hardwick, 5181 Brawner Place, representing the Budget and Fiscal Affairs Advisory Committee stated the City should be consistent with the Transportation Master Plan that recommends regional transit connectivity. Plan should be consistent with Landmark/Van Dorn Small Area Plan that recommends dedicated transit lanes. Mr. Hardwick supports BRT as the most cost-effective transit system for Beauregard Street.

Boyd Walker, 1307 King Street, stated that streetcar will get higher ridership in the corridor and the streetcars last longer than BRT vehicles and have better regional connectivity. He also stated that the implementation of streetcar would bring about higher quality of development. Commissioner Robinson questioned how streetcars in mixed traffic are able to increase transit travel times.

All the background information relating to this project can be found at:
www.alexandriava.gov/highcapacitytransit

Alexandria City Council remarks on Corridor C, September 17. 2011

12

9-17-11

My name is Carol James. I live at 1000 North Vail Street, my residence of 30 years. It is one block from the intersection of Van Dorn at Sanger/ Richenbacher, where the proposed "Corridor C" will make a 90-degree turn, forming 8 to 9 lanes from the current 4. My house is 1-1/2 blocks from where the proposed ramp on 395 will begin to rise up 30 ft. to Seminary Road, with the prospect of an even taller concrete sound wall. My house is 2 blocks east of where developers propose to more than triple current population density to house 10% of Alexandria's total population in a 1/2-mile by 4-block-wide area. My house is 3 blocks west of where yet another developer proposes to clear-cut trees to build a new 42-unit condominium where there now is forest. My house is 8 blocks from BRAC-133, the no-way-in/no-way-out, Ft. Belvoir beachhead.

Which is why I'm here. Corridor C will: suck traffic down Beauregard from Braddock and Seminary on 8 lanes; then, funnel it around a 90-degree bend at Ramsay School at Sanger; then, constrict that mass down to 4 lanes (and I'm being generous) through the underpass under 395; then, turn the mass at 90 degrees again at Van Dorn onto another 8 or 9-lane thoroughfare. BRT buses in the underpass lanes will be able to bleat out a **"Me! Me first!"** signal to the traffic light to trump adjacent traffic sitting under the underpass. When I tell my neighbors about this plan - which virtually no one has heard about - they are aghast. We all know there is no way this will work.

Three traffic constrictions will occur along a four-block stretch of Sanger. Now, I gotta tell you from observing my 12-year-old dog, "Mo-Mo," who has inoperable cancerous masses constricting her colon and rectum, that before and after the Sanger underpass - immovable poop is going to clog up the system. It's going to take four or five sessions of hard straining to move traffic through the light at Van Dorn. And then getting it out where Van Dorn and Beauregard terminate will take even more contortions. Complete clogging is a very real prospect. The only difference between Corridor C and Mo-Mo's colon is that: she has terminal, inoperable cancer. You are choosing to design Corridor C to be inoperable and an interminable pain at either end of the Beauregard/Van Dorn corridor. **This plan is no way to achieve a "flow state."**

While the Transportation Commission supports this plan and wants to charge full speed ahead, take time to listen to other voices. For example, what about the community impacts the Planning Commission still wants to study when it chose to defer action last week on Corridor C?

Should you chose to ignore the Planning Commission's judgment, it is my humble request that you name the route "Mo-Mo Run." There is not enough laxative in all of Alexandria to help you with this one.

Thank you for this opportunity to speak.

Jack Sullivan

Item #12
9-17-11

THE ARITHMETIC ON THE 5 BRACS STATEMENT:

1. The BRAC-133 Complex is 1.3 million net square feet. That figure does not include above ground garages.

2. Including BRAC, there currently is 5.61 million square feet of existing development in the Beauregard Small Area Plan area

3. The developers are seeking to increase that figure to 12.48 million square feet.

4. That works out to 6.87 million square feet more than currently exists on the ground.

5. By dividing the BRAC 1.3 million sq. ft. into the 6.87 million figure, the amount of development requested is the equivalent of 5 BRACs and a little more.

6. It should be noted that under their current CDD zoning JBG and Duke Realty theoretically could put in place another 4.61 million square feet of development without zoning changes. That is the equivalent of 3 plus BRAC complexes.

7. However, even existing development rights need to be realized through a Special Use Permit process in which the public has a right to make views known, and the Planning Commission and Council must give approval. It is not automatic.

#12
Posey

(Sw, br)

Ladies and gentlemen, Mayor Euille, members of Council,

I'd like to begin by reading you the resolution adopted by the Transportation Commission during its meeting on September 7th:

The Transportation Commission recommends that the City Council adopt the recommendation of the Corridor Work Group for Corridor C, with two caveats. The Commission recommends that:

I The alignment be optimized to better serve the Northern Virginia Community College (NVCC), and;
Ii The Transportation Commission be tasked to identify decision criteria, evaluate, and monitor the transition from Alternative D (Bus Rapid Transit in dedicated lanes) to Alternative G (Streetcar in dedicated lanes), and periodically report the progress to City Council.

Now, I'd like to explain who we are on the Transportation Commission and what our intentions are with this resolution.

We are a group of volunteer, citizen representatives tasked by Council with providing advice and guidance on implementation of the Transportation Master Plan. Our membership consists of City residents, some of whom are recent arrivals and some whose roots in Alexandria go back to its founding. All of our members have knowledge and/or professional experience in the field of transportation planning. Several members are actually representatives of other volunteer, citizen-staffed boards and commissions. These include members representing the Planning Commission, the Environmental Policy Commission, the Alexandria Transit Company Board, and the Traffic and Parking Board. We have two, at-large citizen members who bring a professional transportation background into our mix. The Mayor and Councilman Krupicka sit on the Commission as non-voting members.

All of our members share a common desire to preserve and protect both the vitality and, especially, the quality of life in ALL parts of the City. We recognize the challenges faced by the West End as it grapples with the impact of BRAC-133 on traffic congestion, especially since three of our members are West End Residents (and one of them served as our representative on the Corridor Work Group).
By our unanimous vote, we have indicated our belief that the proposed alternative, namely a dedicated right-of-way, bus rapid transit system engineered to accommodate a future conversion to a streetcar when financial conditions allow, is the best alternative available to us at the present time.

Let me clarify this a bit further. We did **not** endorse adding more general purpose lanes anywhere along this corridor that could be used for single occupant vehicles, as one rumor insists. We did **not** endorse removing general purpose lanes to accommodate the transitway, as City staff's modeling indicated that this would increase congestion to levels worse than a no-build option. And, most importantly of all, we did **not** recommend adding further delay on implementation of a transitway that, in one form or another, has been discussed in the City since ~~the early days of the Clinton Administration.~~ for years.

We **did** confirm with staff, prior to our action, that the rebuilt corridor would conform with the City's Complete Streets resolution, written by the Transportation Commission and vetted by Council. The Complete Streets resolution requires sidewalks, bike facilities, and greenscaping. This would include the intensive planting of trees along the corridor, using varieties more capable of thriving along a busy thoroughfare than what was planted decades ago.

We **did** note that projected ridership numbers for a streetcar would be relatively higher than those for bus rapid transit. However, we also noted that the expected revenue from the dedicated portion of the property tax would **not** be sufficient to allow for immediate construction of a rail-based system. That revenue flow **is** sufficient to allow us to engineer this corridor so that conversion is possible, should the City desire to do so at a future date.

We **did** note the effect on the West End of a no-build option. To be blunt, the effect was gridlock. The primary streets in the area are already over-capacity at rush hour, so it should come as no surprise that the addition of several thousand new commuters would cause this effect.

The transitway will enable both residents and commuters to bypass this gridlock, as they will be able to travel past the stopped cars via buses that have the lane all to themselves. If you were going somewhere, wouldn't you want to do so in a way that was the fastest possible? That is what the transitway will be. It will allow residents in West End to access Metro at Van Dorn quickly and easily. It will link up to express buses running in the HOV lanes to the Pentagon. In short, it will make life easier for residents. Surely, that's worth giving a try.

Thank you.

12
9-17-11

September 16, 2011 Dave Cavanaugh

My name is Dave Cavanaugh and I live at 4008 Fort Worth Avenue, Alexandria, Virginia. I have been a resident of the west end since 1974.

I attended several of the Corridor Work Group meetings and have been active in BRAC issues and efforts to draft a Beauregard Small Area Plan. I believe the City Council is on the threshold of wasting money on a 4.5 mile Corridor C within the City limits, a Bus Rapid Transit corridor that extends from Van Dorn Station to currently an unknown destination; either Shirlington, Columbia Pike or the Pentagon.

Adopting the recommended preferred alternative chosen by the High Capacity Transit Corridor Work Group is the Trojan horse that will dramatically open the door for even more traffic, increase development pressures in the area of Mark Center and the BRAC Office Complex.

The Work Group failed to provide written support for their conclusions, failed to consider potential impacts on adjacent communities, ridership, and severely underestimated costs, much of which will likely be borne (directly or indirectly) by City taxpayers. City tax payers are now confronting the aftershocks of locating BRAC at Mark Center.

With due respect, adoption of the recommended preferred option makes little sense.

Background

In a September 6, 2011 Memorandum, the Acting City Manager recommended adoption of the Corridor Working Group (CWG) report regarding Corridor "C", an alignment identified in the 2008 Transportation Management Plan for consideration as a high capacity transit corridor. Based on six meetings, the CWG recommend the City move forward with Alternative D (Bus Rapid Transit in Dedicated Lanes from Van Dorn Metro to the Pentagon) in dedicated lanes and that the transit way be designed in a manner not to preclude future conversion to a streetcar as described in Corridor G (Long Term Street streetcar Van Dorn Metro to Pentagon via Columbia Pike).

City Council approval would allow the project to move forward into development of the an Alternatives Analysis/Environmental Assessment. The Alternative Analysis alone is estimated to cost $1.0 million. "Following the National Environment Protect Act, the project will move into design, right-of-way acquisition and construction". The question becomes whether the analysis and consideration of impacts sufficiently support the recommendation and funding of an Alternatives/NEPA analysis leading to design, right-of-way acquisition and construction.

Recommendation

I ask the City Council not support recommendations of the Corridor Work Group's regarding Corridor C for the following reasons.

1. **The cost of the project is grossly understated.** Part of the justification is to conform with funding limits under "new starts/small starts" application requirements. **The planning level costs is not just $48 million.** As stated in the September 7 Memorandum from Rich Baier to the Chairman and members of the Planning and Transportation Commissions, these costs do not include right of way costs, maintenance facility, rolling stock or on-going operating costs. **Adoption of the Corridor Work Group recommendation would potentially authorize funding of right of way, design and construction. A more realistic and refined estimate of costs is needed before beginning the Alternatives Analysis/Environmental Assessment and incurring project related costs.**

2. **The plan does not bring together land use and regional transportation planning in a constructive manner.** Arlington County and Fairfax County are proposing a streetcar line in the Columbia Pike corridor linking residential and commercial areas along Columbia Pike to major activity centers and regional connections in Bailey's Crossroads/Skyline and Pentagon City.

The two counties have engaged the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (also known as "Metro"), to prepare a combined Environmental Assessment/Alternatives Analysis and are in coordination with the Federal Transit Administration for Federal environmental procedures and capital funding. The process entails evaluation of multiple alternatives and comparison of the proposed "streetcar build" alternative to a "no build" alternative and a bus improvements alternative. The recommendation adopted by the High Capacity Transit Corridor Work Group does not provide operational connectivity to proposed projects in Arlington and Fairfax Counties.

3. **The Bus Rapid Transit being touted in the report is not rapid.** It will not provide fast, efficient, or reliable transportation. **The grades on Van Dorn, Beauregard, constriction points at Sanger-Van Dorn, Sanger Beauregard and a route connecting the BRAC transit center to Southern Towers makes this an expensive, glorified local bus system.** (Even with Queue Jumping and Signal Priority). In addition, the September 6, 2011 letter to the Mayor and City Council clarified the language regarding dedicated lanes to mean "where and when feasible."

~~4. City staff is suggesting "Full implementation of the City's Complete Streets policy would require the widening of streets like Beauregard anyway and this is an opportunity to meet that goal. in order to accommodate transit, pedestrians and bicyclists. "Complete streets" is being used as wedge to support spending taxpayer money revamping Beauregard from Seminary Road. (Complete Streets is an approved concept for streets to accommodate transit, pedestrians and bicyclists.)~~

4. **There is no written report by the CWG setting out the analysis and support for their recommendation.**

5. **The transit way group recommendations only considered one basic alignment alternative with minor modifications. All of the alternatives begin at the Van Dorn Metro Station follow Van Dorn to Sanger, Sanger to Beauregard and either end at Southern Towers, Shirlington or Columbia Pike.** Potentially less costly transit alignments or operations

were not adequately considered. The recommendations providing no immediate relief for residents going to places of employment or utilizing commercial and retail services in the City of Alexandria. **The current vision is spectacularly oversold.**

6. **The recommendation of the High Capacity Transit Corridor Work Group does not include sufficient analysis of impacts on adjacent properties and neighborhoods. BRAC and the unbridled development being fostered can only make things worse. This is placing the cart before the horse.**

7. **There is a false sense of urgency.** In the spirit of trying to solve a crisis--traffic congestion--City officials and developers are advancing expensive ideas that make things worse. **Rash decisions will potentially waste time, money and undermine public support for transit near Mark Center.** (A journey of a thousand miles begins with a step in the right direction.)

8. **The project facilitates even more regional automobile and transit traffic through an already congested area at the expense of the local residents.** City transportation funding should focus on improving local traffic and economic growth in Alexandria. This includes providing City residents accessible transportation options for travel to local commercial areas and employment centers.

9. **The vision of connecting Van Dorn Station to the Mark Center, Seminary West, Skyline area makes no sense. Who is going to ride it?** Development and growth of the Seminary West area including Mark Center is dependent on providing fast, efficient and reliable transit to and from the Pentagon and the District of Columbia. **A ridership study should be conducted first** to provide some context for trips originating at the Van Dorn Metro station going to the Mark Center or the Pentagon.

What needs to be done?

1. **Re-evaluate the scope of work, include a wider range of transportation and transit options including transit stations and circular buses from the Mark Center area.**

2. **Consolidate a Land Use and Transportation study for redevelopment of properties near Seminary Road and Beauregard. Develop alternatives for a coordinated transportation plan that addresses likely redevelopment in that area—that connects BRAC, Southern Towers, proposed development in the Shirley Gardens area. The study should include regional representatives, provide public involvement and propose alternative approaches that integrate and coordinate transportation planning in redevelopment of the Beauregard-Seminary West corridors.**

3. **Refocus transit priorities connecting the Mark Center to the major employment, education and retail centers, e.g., the Pentagon and District of Columbia, Skyline and retail shopping in Alexandria.**

4. **Ensure Alexandria transit operation is not separate, but integrated into a regional system.**

5. **Scale proposed transit plans to gradually build public support sustaining local investment in transit and redevelopment.**

Thanks

12
9-17-11

City Council of Alexandria, Virginia
Public Hearing Meeting
Saturday, September 17, 2011

12. HIGH CAPACITY TRANSIT CORRIDOR -C
Public Hearing and Consideration of the first stage of implementation for High Capacity Transit Corridor - C (Van Dorn/Beauregard).

Comments of Nancy Jennings

My name is Nancy Jennings and I live at 2115 Marlboro Drive. I am a member of the High Capacity Transit Working Group where I represent the Federation of Civic Associations. I was unable to attend the meetings of the Transportation Commission and the Planning Commission because of other meetings and send my comments to both groups, but they are not reflected in the City managers memorandum.

This proposal for Corridor C—BRT in dedicated lanes—was approved by a 4-2 vote of the few Working Group members present that evening. I voted against it because:

- The need for improved transit on Beauregard Street has yet to be verified.
    - No origin destination studies were ever done.
    - No bus currently runs on that route.
    - Transit problems on Beauregard are a result of gridlock on Seminary Road and the restrictive I-395 underpass on Sanger; neither of which will be solved by this proposal.

- The process to develop this corridor was very narrow. The route was mandated by staff and the working group was not allowed to discuss it. As a result, this transit way will never work properly.
    - It has four choke points—places where the transit will NOT be in dedicated lanes—that will make transit no more efficient than driving.
    - To build the dedicated lanes from NOVA to the Van Dorn Metro would cost at least another $300 million than is estimated:
        - Purchase land in Mark Center for the dedicated lanes.
        - Widen the I-395 underpass at Sanger Avenue
        - Build a new bridge across Duke Street
        - Build the multi-modal bridge that's in the Landmark/Van Dorn Small Area Plan from Van Dorn Street to the Metro.

I asked both the Transportation Commission and the Planning Commission to defer this proposal until the High Capacity Transit Working Group has finished its consideration of all THREE corridors in the City. I naively thought that we were charged with designing a system for

citizens to use to get around our City—a comprehensive proposal for improving local transportation movements.

- The preliminary discussions on Corridors A and B indicate different modes will be chosen, which defeats the goal of connectivity.
- Circulator busses appear to be the mode of choice in three areas: Old Town, on Eisenhower Avenue, and in the Landmark/Van Dorn Small Area Plan area.

I ask you to defer this proposal until the High Capacity Transit Working Group has finished its work and has a comprehensive proposal for all three corridors.

Thank you.

12
9-17-11

Thank you Mayor Euille and City Council for the opportunity to express public opinion on the proposed plans for the High Capacity Transit Corridor C. This effort to plan transportation in the far west end of the city needs careful and thoughtful review given the immense impact it will have on what we know as our quiet communities west of I-395.

My name is Julie Edelson. I am a member of the LH/HG Civic Association and a member of the BRAC-133 Advisory Group. Most importantly, I am a 21 year resident of Lincolnia Hills and in addition, resided an additional two years at the "Hamlets", the rental properties that align N Beauregard and now owned and renamed by Duke Realty. I regret that I am not available to attend in person, but appreciate that my comments will be read and made public record.

At various times over the years, I have regularly commuted through the Beauregard Corridor. From the Lincolnia Hills neighborhood to travel north, my access to N Beauregard Street is via N Morgan Street. In the last several years, this lighted intersection requires me to wait multiple cycles during morning rush hour to enter N Beauregard given the influx of traffic from the south (236/Little River Turnpike) and the back-up of traffic from Sanger Avenue interchange one intersection north. The need for safe school crossings at Sanger also impacts the Sanger interchange. And let's remember, BRAC-133 is not at full capacity.

From the Lincolnia Hills neighborhood to travel south, my access to N Beauregard Street is via N Chambliss Street intersecting with N Beauregard Street near Landmark Plaza. I, and many other residents, see the 236/I-395 interchange as the "back-up" option for many north bound, non-HOV BRAC-133 commuters as this allows two right hand turns from the interstate interchange into BRAC-133 instead of two left hand turns from the Seminary Road/I-395 interchange. This will place additional traffic on N Beauregard Street from the south and create absolute gridlock.

Early on, JBGs consultants to urban design reviewed community and transit needs along N Beauregard. After years of quite suburbia, we'd love to create a road that discourages through traffic but I am in agreement that it cannot happen without severely impacting our local community traffic as well. When traffic data was reviewed, the JBG consultants came to the same conclusion; two lanes of traffic movement each way were needed. We need the local traffic access for our neighbors who cannot safely take public transit, to be able to get to their medical appointments or to get their children to elementary schools (note: If zoned for Ramsey and given a waiver to attend John Adams Spanish Emersion, parents need to get the child to school) and school events and other locations on the west end efficiently. To be honest, much of Lincolnia Hills and Heywood Glen are not within a mile from the METRO 7 route nor will they be within a mile to the presently proposed high occupancy transit corridor. However, we do need our regional transportation buses (METRO 7), DASH buses and our school buses going to neighborhood and cross-city schools to move in a consistent and timely fashion on N Beauregard Street. This will maximize the number of neighbors commuting via these mass transit options routes. Therefore, **I support the Corridor C options that include a dedicated, ADDITIONAL lane for the BRT system**.

The compromise to this transportation planning is to lose the trees in the median strip along N Beauregard Street. I was one of the first people to say "no" to this transit option when taken out of context to the bigger picture. We need to keep the bigger, more regional picture in mind. We have the opportunity to impact hard and soft scaping of the far west end while we keep traffic moving to reduce the vehicle emissions. We need to build in quality green where we will lose poor/fair quality trees in the median.

I urge the Mayor and City Council to review the input from our neighbors who use N Beauregard as a local and work commuter road and support the present recommendation from the Planning Commission.

I also urge the City to follow-through with verbal assurances and demonstrate to the community in the Beauregard Corridor planning meetings that we will regain quality tree canopy along the roadway and that the high capacity dedicated lane is designed with permeable, preferably green components, in order to maintain the environmental quality, both air and effective storm water runoff on the steep terrain, here on the far west end.

Thank you.
Julie Edelson
Member - Lincolnia Hills/Heywood Glen Civic Association
Alexandria City BRAC-133 Advisory Group

12
9-17-11

FOR ITEM#12, City Council Hearing on Sept. 17, 2011.

My name is Kathleen M. Burns, 1036 N. Pelham St. and I have been a resident of the West End since 1975 and in my current house since 1980. We are not transients in our neighborhood, but long-term residents.

Based on the recent City meetings held on Sept. 8 and Sept. 12, I am here to ask you NOT for vote for the proposals for Corridor C in their current form. Transit without adequate Planning is a disaster.

In its initial publication of the resolution passed by the Planning Commission on Sept. 8, the City left out the second part of this most important vote. This was confirmed by Kendra Jacobs on Sept. 15, who then corrected the City's website, (see second part, in BOLD). But the incorrect information had already been used in some stories in the local media, confusing the public as to what had occurred. In her remarks, Ms. Jacob said:

Kathy –

The motion passed by the Planning Commission, and what is reflected on the Planning Commission action docket, is as follows:

The Planning Commission reaffirmed support for transit in Corridor C on an expedited basis and believes that there should be bus rapid transit running in dedicated lanes. ***The Commission had insufficient information on the non-transportation planning elements to form any further judgment.***

Given the Commission's unanimous statement, I would urge the Council to defer ANY vote until they have a more accurate, factual and complete report. Only 6 of the actual pages deal with the substance and 21 pages are part of the appendix. Needed analysis is woefully lacking.

Some of the glaring omissions include:

- Excluding from the summary comments of the advisory group's 2 dissenting members, Nancy Jennings and Poul Hertl. It is not appropriate to "cherry pick" the data. Why have citizens serve on a panel, if you ignored their remarks?
- A lack of a substantive Cost/Benefit Analysis submitted PRIOR to any approvals, not afterward. Do not use the disastrous BRAC project as a role model! (p.6) That lightweight report was submitted 2 weeks before the building opened, instead of 3 years ago, before the approvals were given. Too late!
- No details on profound environmental impact. Cutting down 15 blocks of trees would not only create a stark visual environment, but it would also contribute to Global Warming since trees filter out CO2.
- Soft numbers----with costs ranging from $48 to $185 million---and leaving out essential costs such as buying the vehicles, staffing and maintaining them, actual operating costs, and land acquisition costs.
- Absence of connectivity details---How will this "connect" with Corridor A and B, with totally different road plans, nor is there adequate information on tying in ridership from Landmark or the Van Dorn corridor areas or Northern VA Community College. "Trust Me" is not the way planning should occur, in a vacuum.
- "Impacts" (p.28) should be labeled "NEGATIVE Impacts" as it vaguely ticks off significant problems, without adequate solutions.
- Lack of crucial details throughout. This is a "wish list," not a substantive plan.
- Ridership---WMATA already considers Route 7 along the Beauregard Corridor as one of its most financially successful routes in their system, with an estimated one-third of current Beauregard Corridor residents taking public transit on a regular basis. Yet this report acts like the city is starting from

scratch. There are no concrete details that say any of these new plans would take potential riders to where they want to go----not just to Metro. This isn't a transit plan just for BRAC, but for all of Alexandria.

Alexandria residents support improvements to create effective, realistic and cost-effective transportation throughout the City. But many DO NOT support this weak and factually challenged draft report on Corridor C.

Today, you are not being asked to make a Transit decision, but a Development decision, without having the details you need.

You are also being asked to make a Political decision, since the Beauregard Corridor and its Transit Plan---along with the BRAC disaster and its aftermath---- will be the top issues for Alexandria voters in 2012 Council elections. The same holds true for the Council decisions that will be made on the #395 HOV Ramp and the Small Area Plan.

The outcome for Corridor C is another BRAC Decision moment----in that whatever the Council decides on this will have profound impact not just on Beauregard but on the entire West End. And not just for now, but for the duration of this City.

Do not ignore the more than 90,000 residents who live on the West End, and the ground swell of dissatisfaction with some of the City's with various Growth and Development Policies. On occasion, it is as though the Planning Department is an autonomous unit of government, steaming ahead, in spite on my residents loudly saying: This is NOT what we want!! Please listen to us!

This city dates back to 1749 and people appreciate a historical perspective.

Look no further than the City weighing the fate of the tract that is now Fort Ward---and the City supporting making it a massive residential enclave.

Dick Hobston took the City to Court and won, and that's why this Park exists, as an integral part of the community. And you can get there by bus, right now.

Please do not vote on this weak, ineffective and incomplete plan before you today. Demand the details, and air them widely. Don't let us have another BRAC disaster right on the same street.

12
9-17-11

My Name is Poul Hertel

I was the Vice Chair of the Transportation ad hoc committee and am a current member of the transit corridor group as a Citizen Representative.

The transportation Master Plan consists of two fundamental principles.

1. We as a city cannot and should not allow through traffic to direct our course of action. It is both futile in the long run and detrimental to our quality of life.

2. The master plan as a result was drawn up assuming the City would create dedicated lanes to be used for mass transit using existing travel lanes.

By widening the road, the City will in fact be creating a system that fosters the belief in car travel as usual. I.E. the transit is for other people, which will inevitable fail.

Berkley University
Their empirical research shows that "it is not transit hardware i.e. steel or wheel trains or rubber tire uses that unleash land use changes but rather the quality of service and more specifically, the comparative travel time savings of taking transit vis a vis the car".

This is very much in keeping with the latest modeling research, which seeks to find the solution that minimizes the cost of a consumer who needs to travel, minimizing the cost to the government while at the same time maximizing the social welfare function.
The solution is found by using optimal control theory (rocket science)

Bottom line

Choose the mode, frequency and the number and distance between stops such that, the time wasted walking to the station, time waiting at the station, the time it takes to travel, and yes minimizing having to stand up because that is found to be a significant consideration too. And do it so that it is less costly and time consuming than using the car.

The solution is similar across the board, **take a lane away from the cars and use it as dedicated lanes for transit**, otherwise the car becomes the preferable alternative.

Further findings.

- A tram will be a far inferior solution to BRT if they have similar headways and travel time. John Kay Financial times
- Streetscapes are important for the success of corridors. They also create a sense of place, contribute to the unique character of the block and neighborhood and are a spatial organization of people and living space. **By the way, the proposal in front of you will tear down around fifteen blocks of trees.**
- Nuisance cost associated with having to stand up is well documented.
- There is a proximity to the corridor cost, which actually diminishes property values within 1/10 mile of the corridor.

Finally

The City is certainly within its right to alter the Master Plan, but is not allowed to simply ignore it and disregard THE APPROPRIATE process.

WHY STREETSCAPES NEED TO BE PART OF THE EVALUATION CRITERIA

January 11, 2011

People sometimes talk about residences as if they are an isolated entity, when in fact they are a small piece that fits into a larger mosaic. The mosaic, which forms the fabric of community and determines the quality of life, is, in no small measure determined by the streetscape. It matters to those who made a conscious investment decision to move into a specific neighborhood. If we are going to change those very elements, we can profoundly transform their neighborhood, and not necessarily for the better. For that reason, the defining features of a local streetscape need to be part of the valuating process for the specific routes.

Patrick and Henry Street have narrow sidewalks in which the pedestrians are only protected because of the parking on the street. Powhatan Street has significant tree lined medians that are essential to creating a sense of place and tying the two sides of the community together. Portions of the median strip function as a neighborhood park. In fact, most of the East side of the railway consists of established neighborhoods with very specific identities created, in no small measure by the streetscape. While citizens in the West End specifically requested that the trees be kept. Streetscapes are important because

- They create a sense of place.
- Features can contribute to the unique character of a block or entire neighborhood.
- They are a spatial organization of population and living space.

The importance of the streetscape on the resident's quality of life can be seen from the perspective of how it affects their property value. Herein lies the problem. Because, accessibility is assumed to be good, transit is presumed to enhance the property value. However, recent studies reach a more nuanced conclusion. Depending on how and what type of transit is implemented, it might affect the environs and property values in a negative way.

In 1863, Von Thünen suggested that the value of farmland could be explained in terms of the available transportation mode. This view, called the *accessibility model*, postulated that, if all farms were equal, the ones with cheapest access to the sales center would be worth more because cost savings would translate into greater worth.

Although, some still may think in terms of the simplistic model, the economic field does not. More recent theories use *value based modeling* that is more focused on the characteristics of the property and the neighborhood. While transit access to the core business center still matters, the overall urban environment will be affected, by what and how is placed in a neighborhood. Consequently, the overall effect can be negative. That is why the literature on the effects is mixed in its finding with respect to the impact, magnitude and direction, ranging from a negative to an insignificant or a positive impact.

Poul Hertel

RE: Minority Report on transit corridor choice for corridor C

To the Honorable Mayor Euille and Members of City Council,

I am writing as part of those in the minority who were present and voting at the Transit Corridor Group to argue that The City of Alexandria cannot depart from the Transportation Master Plan without going through the appropriate process. Included is a letter signed by George Foot, Lois Walker and I clarifying what the AD-HOC Transportation Committee recommended to the community for adoption in 2008.

Revising the interpretation of the Transportation Master Plan is not an appropriate alternative to ensure transparency. Although changes to the Transportation master often take place, they do so according to a master plan process. Above all else, we should not forge ahead with a significant change to an approved plan without considering the original intent of that plan. The community has accepted the creation of dedicated lanes in large part because they would come from using existing travel lanes as described in the attached letter and Master Plan. Even so, that alternative was not presented to the Ad Hoc transit Corridor Group or community for consideration, having been deemed undesirable at the administrative level.

Poul Hertel

The report forwarded by the Ad Hoc Transportation Committee references the proposals as representing a "paradigm shift" for the City of Alexandria. Underlying this statement is a set of assumptions, one of which is currently in dispute, and that we therefore wish to clarify. Notably, what did *dedicated transit lanes* mean? To us, this means that we are going to take away traffic lanes from cars and give them to mass transit, as referenced in the cost assumptions portion of the report. The City Staff strongly disagrees with this interpretation, arguing that it only relates to the Potomac Yard BRT project.

In reviewing the timetable and e-mails of the committee, we find that the discussion and vote on the Potomac Yard project transpired in September 2005, well before the March of 2006 work session we held to explore options for a comprehensive transportation plan. What's more, internal e-mails addressing the public discussion at the Ramsey School specifically references the question relating to our proposal on March 2006: "Street space. Everyone asks about losing lanes of traffic."

Furthermore, we specifically pointed out that this was the underlying premise of the report's conclusions at numerous presentations to the public, the Planning Commission and the City Council. The report references the need to keep developments from encroaching into areas that would preclude the use of dedicated lanes. This was specifically put in because of the Potomac Yard proposal, since we and the public were told that there was no room for dedicated lanes inside the Yard as had been the preference of many Citizens, because the "streets were too narrow".

Finally, the consultant who did the cost analysis for the Task Force assumed that the dedicated lanes would be acquired from adjacent properties. This was specifically changed at the request of the committee members, who pointed out that the lanes were to be taken from existing car lanes and not acquired, because that is what we assumed in the report. The final report states correctly that cost assumes that the dedicated lanes would come from existing traffic lanes.

In conclusion, the Transportation Master Plan is about creating a transit-oriented Alexandria, which has no room to build more roads for either cars or transit. We concluded that since congestion was inevitable, the City should use the existing infrastructure, meaning handing over the existing traffic lanes, for the purpose of dedicated transit. That is the preferred option of the Transportation Master Plan.

We came to this conclusion by looking at the statistics, which showed an ever-increasing demand for a finite good by both Alexandrians and commuters who drive through the City. The effort centered on how we could assure mobility within Alexandria while discouraging through traffic. We did so by concluding that the decrease of road capacity for cars and giving this capacity exclusively for mobility within Alexandria could fill two goals if it were given to mass transit. Not only would it discourage through traffic, but also, it would significantly increase the attractiveness of using mass transit. This would not be due to a lifestyle decision, but as a result of rational economic choices made by consumers who would have a transit system that is fast, frequent and reliable.

George Foot, Lois Walker and Poul Hertel

12
9-17-11

City of Alexandria - Public Hearing re High Capacity Transit Corridor C
9:30 a.m., Saturday, September 17, 2012 - Council Chambers

Comments of Donald N. Buch
389 Livermore Lane, Alexandria, VA

I have two comments with respect to Transit Corridor C.

Mitigation of congestion in Corridor C is long overdue. A central focus of the Landmark/Van Dorn Small Area Plan was addressing that congestion by providing dedicated transit lanes along Van Dorn. We now have ever-increasing frustrations with congestion along Beauregard and Seminary as well as I-395. Last fall VDOT studied seven of those intersections, addressing both AM and PM peak hours. The worst levels of service were (or are) 5 at LOS "D" – and those frustrate us. How will we react if, come 2015 - which is only 3½ years away – we are faced with what VDOT projects will be 4 at LOS "E" and 7 at LOS "F"? I should note that if all VDOT-recommended improvements are in place, they project we'll have 2 LOS "E" and 2 LOS "F" come 2015 – congestion still far worse than we have today.

This Council needs to actively and aggressively support moving forward with the implementation of high capacity transit in Corridor C. It is an integral part of the City's Transportation Master Plan – a plan that took four years to develop and was approved by Council more than three years ago. The Work Group has now met for the better part of a year and considered extensive public input. They have concluded it is time to move forward. Please don't delay the process any longer.

(Attached: LOS levels per VDOT's Mark Center Access Study, October 2010)

"LOS" Results of VDOT's October 2010 Mark Center (BRAC-133) Access Study(*)

		AM PEAK			PM PEAK		
		Existing Operations	Post BRAC Traffic Operations		Existing Operations	Post BRAC Traffic Operations	
		2009	2015 With COA Required Improvements From Permitting Process	2015 With VDOT Recommended mprovements	2009	2015 With COA Required Improvements From Permitting Process	2015 With VDOT Recommended Improvements
1	Beauregard & Mark Center Drive	A	D	D	C	F	C
2	Beauregard & Seminary Road	D	F	E	D	F	D
3	Seminary Road & Mark Center Drive	C	E	D	D	F	F
4	Seminary Road & I-395 NB Entrance Ramp	A	D	C	B	D	C
5	Seminary Road & I-395 NB Exit Ramp	D	F	C	C	E	C
6	Seminary Road & I 395 SB Exit Ramp	B	F	B	D	E	E
7	Seminary Road & I-395 SB Entrance Ramp	C	E	C	C	F	F
	# of As	2	0	0	0	0	0
	# of Bs	1	0	1	1	0	0
	# of Cs	2	0	3	3	0	3
	# of Ds	2	2	2	3	1	1
	# of Es	0	2	1	0	2	1
	# of Fs	0	3	0	0	4	2

(*) As presented to the Mayor's BRAC-133 Advisory Committee on October 20, 2010

12
9-17-11

I have attended the meetings regarding Corridor "C" that were held in the West End along with last week's Planning Commission mtg. to discuss the high capacity transit corridor "C". Planning commissioners struggled with how to handle this matter as the presentation by Abi Lerner, TES, focused only on the transit options and did not include anything about land use in this corridor. It is my understanding that council wanted this matter to come in front of the planning commission and any vote to defer by commissioners really didn't matter. The motion/vote by the planning commission was very confusing and although they approved to generally support the concept of a dedicated transit lane, they also voted to withhold comment on the impact on land use due to a lack of information from TES and their presentation/written document that planning commissioners received. City staffs' report from TES/P&Z to mayor/council from acting city mgr bruce johnson reflected the planning commissoners' difficulty and confusion in formulating a motion/vote that could include information related to land use issues for corridor "C" for all to understand.

As this will need to go through the NEPA process, I would like to make the following suggestions/comments regarding this issue. Beauregard N/S, Duke to King Street must now be included in the planning process. You cannot stop the corridor at Seminary/Beauregard without including all of Beauregard to King Street. I have talked several times to Rich Baier about the plan for Beauregard to King street wherein there will be 2 left hand turn lanes from King to Beauregard. My question is why can't we extend Beauregard from Duke to King Street and look at this issue as part of the NEPA process.? It makes absolutely no sense to not include all of Beauregard now and understand that when this section of Beauregard was discussed about 6-7 yrs. Ago, BRAC and Beauregard area development were not part of the mix. Also, why is there any discussion about including Shirlington/Pentagon in this plan? There already are transit options in place now to get to these sites. I know everyone likes the "buzz word connectivity", but some areas being discussed for this corridor might not allow "connectivity". And no, I am not a transportation expert. However, Arlington/Fairfax are years ahead of Alexandria when it comes to transportation and I have noticed this since I moved to Alex. In 1999. The push for a streetcar in the future should be taken out. The topography, street grid, etc. do not lend itself for a streetcar along the proposed routes along with the extremely high costs to put in street cars. I believe that a connector bus could be implemented as was suggested by the transportation task force several years ago, but was never implemented. Its cheap, can run frequently and get citizens to the various metro stops in Alex. Its working so well in D.C. that they have now expanded it to Anacostia. Fairfax has connector buses that go to the Van Dorn Metro and are now adding 4 connector buses to deal with the transportation issues related to BRAC at

Ft. Belvoir.

I am concerned, although legal in Virginia, that officials, be they elected or otherwise who are appointed to citizen groups that will make recommendations to the planning commission and city council are those bodies that give the APPEARANCE OF A CONFLICT OF INTEREST.

I hope that in your rush to catch up with Arlington and Fairfax transportation's systems, that this process for corridor "C" be done well, efficiently and that all issues to be reviewed and discussed via the NEPA process are fully reviewed and vetted prior to the implementation process.

Annabelle Fisher
5081 Seminary Rd
Alexandria, VA 22311

12
9-17-11

Comments to the City Council—Public Hearing--on Docket Item #12—High Capacity Transit Corridor C: September 17, 2011

Thank you for the opportunity to provide my views on the proposed plans for High Capacity Transit Corridor C.

My name is Kathy Hart, and I am a member of the Lincolnia Hills/ Heywood Glen Civic Association, the Beauregard Corridor Stakeholders Group, the Mason District BRAC-133 Task Force, and a frequent attendee at the BRAC Advisory Group and High Capacity Transit Workgroup meetings. I'm also a daily commuter on Beauregard St. to my place of employment in the District. **I urge the City Council to support the plan approved by the High Capacity Transit Corridor C Workgroup, which recommends adding a dedicated lane in each direction on Beauregard and Van Dorn to accommodate the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system.**

Because my neighborhood is just south of Holmes Run, the only way to travel north out of my area is to come out onto Beauregard at N. Morgan St. With the start of the new school year, traffic is back to "normal" on Beauregard, which means it is filled to capacity heading north. In fact, the Beauregard and Morgan intersection if often gridlocked by people pulling into the intersection on a green light, joining the queue that extends all the way back from Sanger St. This prevents anyone from turning left onto Beauregard from N. Morgan, and it can take several light cycles to successfully make the turn.

I mention this to illustrate the current conditions during the morning and evening peak hours on Beauregard, which will become increasingly worse now that the Mark Center BRAC building is becoming fully occupied. In addition to the 7,000 new employees coming to the Mark Center buildings, the development of the JBG property and others in the Beauregard Corridor are expected to result in a doubling of the current resident density—and additional office space will bring more new workers. All of this new growth and development is bringing additional traffic to the Beauregard Corridor, which is why I support the High Capacity Corridor C plans for that area, including the BRT system. Some—and I hope many--of the current and additional residents and workers in the area will make use of the mass transit options that are available now and in the future. But we know that a lot of them will not, including those planning to use the 3,000+ parking spaces at the BRAC building. Because of distance, walking to transit is not an option for me. And since I understand there are no plans to build any parking capacity for the new BRT system, I must drive to work.

I came today to express my strong support for the Corridor C option approved by the Transit Corridor Workgroup, which includes a dedicated, ADDITIONAL lane for the BRT system. I understand there are some who would prefer that the BRT system instead take over one of the existing lanes, leaving only one lane in each direction for the rest of the traffic on Beauregard, in order to preserve the trees in the median. I understand the desire to maintain the character of the area, and in the Beauregard Stakeholder meetings, I have consistently advocated for retaining significant landscaping with as many trees as possible. However, because of the extreme demands for traffic capacity on the Beauregard Corridor that exists now and will increase in the future, I believe it would **defy common sense** to consider any option that would cut the current traffic capacity in half. It would make no more sense than reducing Duke St. or King St. to one lane in each direction, or any other major street in Alexandria.

I understand the City has been in negotiations with the developers about building landscaped buffers along the outside of the street that will have more mature trees, which is promising, and will help to maintain the character of the area. I also support the inclusion of bicycle and pedestrian facilities along the transit way, and the creation of links to transportation hubs and transit facilities. As a member of the Mason District BRAC-133 Task Force, working in collaboration with the Fairfax County Department of Transportation and BRAC staff, **I urge the City Council to support the plan approved by the High Capacity Transit Corridor C Workgroup, which recommends adding a dedicated lane in each direction on Beauregard and Van Dorn to accommodate the BRT system.**

Thank you.

Kathy Hart
Lincolnia Hills/Heywood Glen Civic Association
Beauregard Corridor Stakeholders Group
Mason District BRAC-133 Task Force

12
9-17-11

Jackie Henderson

From: Geoffrey Goodale <geoff.goodale@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 17, 2011 3:03 AM
To: William Euille; Kerry Donley; Frank Fannon; Alicia Hughes; Rob Krupicka; Del Pepper; Paul Smedberg
Cc: Jackie Henderson
Subject: Docket Item No. 12: Comments of the BSVCA Board of Directors
Attachments: BSVCA Board Comments to Commission (09-08-2011).pdf

Dear Mayor Euille and Members of the City Council:

The Board of Directors of Brookville-Seminary Valley Civic Association, Inc. (BSVCA) respectfully submits the attached comments that we previously filed with Planning Commission (Commission) for consideration by the City Council (Council) with respect to Docket Item No. 12 on the agenda for the public hearing of September 17, 2011. As discussed in our comments, we requested that the matter be deferred until further analysis is done relating to, among other things, the projected monetary cost and estimated environmental impacts of using Alternative D (Bus Rapid Transit connecting to the Pentagon and Shirlington) for High Capacity Transit Corridor C (Van Dorn/Beauregard).

At its public hearing on September 8, 2011, the Commission passed a motion relating to the matter that stated, *inter alia*, "[t]he Commission had insufficient information on the non-transportation planning elements to form any further judgment." In our view, this motion is consistent with our recommendation, and as such, we urge that the Council defer action on this matter until the issues referenced in our letter and other non-transportation planning elements referred to by the Commission are further analyzed.

Since the BSVCA is holding its annual Mile Long Yard Sale on September 17, it will not be possible for us to provide oral testimony at the public hearing. Accordingly, we request that this e-mail and the attached letter be included in the record relating to this matter, and for this reason, we have copied the City Clerk on this e-mail.

Your consideration of our request is greatly appreciated. If you have any questions regarding our comments, please feel free to contact me at geoff.goodale@bsvca.net or (703) 618-6640.

Respectfully submitted,

Geoffrey M. Goodale
President, Brookville-Seminary Valley Civic Association, Inc.

= 32

BROOKVILLE-SEMINARY VALLEY CIVIC ASSOCIATION, INC.
P.O. Box 23348
Alexandria, VA 22304

September 8, 2011

Chairman John Komoroske and Members of the Planning Commission
301 King Street – City Hall
Alexandria, VA 22314

Re: Docket Item No. 11: Comments of the BSVCA Board of Directors

Dear Chairman John Komoroske and Members of the Planning Commission:

The Board of Directors of Brookville-Seminary Valley Civic Association, Inc. (BSVCA) respectfully submits these comments for your consideration in determining what action the Planning Commission (Council) should take with respect to the recommendation of the High Capacity Transit Corridor Working Group (CWG) that Alternative D (Bus Rapid Transit connecting to the Pentagon and Shirlington) be selected for High Capacity Corridor C (Van Dorn / Beauregard Corridor). As discussed below, we urge the Commission to defer consideration of the matter until further analysis is done relating to the projected monetary cost and estimated environmental impacts of Alternative D and full consideration is given as to whether Alternative D is inconsistent with the City's 2008 Transportation Master Plan.

The BSVCA, which is comprised of individuals from several hundred households in the West End of the City, is a non-profit organization that seeks to promote the best interests of Alexandrians. Given the proximity of Brookville-Seminary Valley to Van Dorn and Beauregard, issues relating to Corridor C are of great interest to our members.

While we are very grateful to the members of the CWG for the time and energy that they have devoted to this matter, we believe that additional analysis of Alternative D needs to be conducted before the Commission makes its recommendation to the City Council (Council). To begin with the estimated cost of Alternative D needs to be reconsidered, because, as pointed out by Nancy Jennings, a member of the CWG, in her correspondence of June 13, 2011 (copy attached as Exhibit 1), the consultant's original cost estimate for Alternative D may have neglected to include the costs of two new bridges that would have to be built on Van Dorn to implement Alternative D. The potential environmental impacts of Alternative D also need to be further analyzed, as has been requested by numerous individuals and groups, including Seminary West Civic Association (copy attached as Exhibit 2). In addition, in light of the points made by Poul Hertel, a member of the CWG, in his correspondence of June 14, 2011 (copy attached as Exhibit 3), further consideration of whether Alternative D is inconsistent with the City's Transportation Master Plan is necessary and warranted.

Accordingly, we urge the Commission to defer consideration of this matter until the issues raised above are further analyzed. Your consideration of our request is greatly appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,
Geoffrey M. Goodale
Geoffrey M. Goodale
President, Brookville-Seminary Valley Civic Association, Inc.

Encl.

EXHIBIT 1

Goodale, Geoffrey M.

From: Nancy Jennings [nrjennings@comcast.net]

Sent: Monday, June 13, 2011 9:44 PM

To: Alicia Hughes; Del (work) Pepper; Frank Fannon; Kerry Donley; Paul Smedberg; Rob Krupicka; William Euille

Cc: 'Donald N. Buch'; afsuper2000@yahoo.com; dacava1@yahoo.com; 'Dave Dexter'; opctiger72@aol.com; lynnbostain@yahoo.com; ahmacdonald@me.com; jns-cwest@comcast.net; dicos@verizon.net; dsomers@dc-opera.org; donaldgail@yahoo.com; Goodale, Geoffrey M.; jcooper395@aol.com; 'Kathy Burns'; katy_cannady20@comcast.net; mark.benedict@fsis.usda.gov; waudr@comcast.net; 'Sharon Annear'; shirleydowns@verizon.net; 'Rich Baier'; 'Abi Lerner'; 'PaulCSmedberg@aol.com'; 'Rob.Krupicka@alexandriava.gov'; 'Donna Fossum'; 'John Komoroske'; steve.sindiong@alexandriava.gov; sandra.marks@alexandriava.gov; 'Poul Hertel'; 'Anna Bentley'; 'Bill Denton'; Dak Hardwick

Subject: A minority report on the recommendation of the High Capacity Transit Corridor Working Group for Corridor C

Attachments: 2011-04-18 Seminary West view on High Capacity Transit.dot; 2011-06 Citizen comments re Corridor C recommendation.doc

Mayor Euille, Vice Mayor Donley, and Members of the City Council:

As a member of the High Capacity Transit Corridor Working Group (HCTCWG), I voted against the recommendation of Alternative D for Corridor C. I did so based on an analysis of costs and benefits.

- The route on Beauregard would not solve any current transportation problems.
- No origin-destination study was ever done of the Corridor C route that no bus actually runs on today.
- The gridlock on Seminary Road and in Mark Center would be exacerbated by this solution.
- Alternative D would cost at least twice as much as the consultant estimated because it would require two new bridges on Van Dorn--across Duke Street and Cameron Run--as well as a wider I-395 underpass at Sanger.
- If cutting down less than 0.5 miles of trees to build a ramp from I-395 directly into the Mark Center was undesirable, then cutting down 1.7 miles of trees to build Alternative D is unconscionable.

In addition, the HCTCWG process was flawed because it took the liberty of interpreting the 2008 Transportation Master Plan. The HCTCWG was not the appropriate body to revise the TMP or to interpret it. While changes to the TMP may often take place, they do so according to a master plan process. The City should not forge ahead with a significant change to an approved plan without considering the original intent of that plan and getting community approval. The comments (attached) from residents in the Beauregard Corridor cry out for a public process that respects previous agreements between the citizens and the City.

Nancy Jennings
Member of the HCTCWG

35

EXHIBIT 2

April 18, 2011

Dear Members of the Alexandria High CapacityTransit Corridor Working Group:

As the High Capacity Transit Corridor Working Group prepares to consider the merits of constructing dedicated lanes in Corridor C for commuters traveling the Beauregard Street corridor after the BRAC-133 buildings open for business later this summer, the Seminary West Civic Association (SWCA) would like to weigh in with our own thoughts on this matter.

Currently, Beauregard Street is well served by two bus systems, the Metropolitan Washington Area Transit Authority (WMATA) and Alexandria's DASH system. The majority of those who live along the corridor and use public transportation take WMATA buses to the Pentagon, where they work or transfer to the Metrorail system; or they take DASH buses to the King, Braddock, or Van Dorn stations as their final destinations or transfer points. Although everyone knows and expects that traffic soon will increase exponentially because of the 6,400 new BRAC workers—not to mention several other major redevelopment projects now being planned—SWCA residents and homeowners are not persuaded that dedicated lanes will alleviate congestion in any meaningful way that justifies the means and money necessary to build them.

We understand that WMATA and DASH have undertaken studies to substantiate the need for the new lanes, and that's a good start. To my knowledge, there has been no comprehensive study of ridership along the Beauregard Corridor, and several important questions need to be asked:

- Can the number of buses and shuttles be increased or run more efficiently without adding dedicated lanes?
- Who is now riding shuttles and buses, and who is using private cars?
- Where are they going?
- How and when might they (particularly those who are driving their own cars) consider changing their mode of transportation?
- Is the Van Dorn Metro station a convenient terminus for them, or is it completely out of their way?
- How can the City of Alexandria provide incentives for employers for alternative modes of transportation by using Commuter Connections programs? (administered through the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments)

It is common knowledge that we live in a car-oriented culture; even with relatively convenient and affordable mass transit options available, far too many commuters choose to drive passenger cars to work and other destinations. Before we consider sacrificing even more tree canopy and open space to dedicated lanes, we need to be absolutely certain that they would be fully funded, well used, and would serve the ultimate purpose of reducing pressure on the inadequate existing infrastructure that is being modified (e.g., triple-left turn at Seminary Road and Beauregard Street) to accommodate BRAC. Northern Virginia riders need strong, compelling reasons to give up their cars, and neighboring jurisdictions have used incentive programs such as van/car pools, guaranteed ride home, and telework among others to achieve this goal. These same incentives and more are also available to employers in the City of Alexandria through Commuter Connections.

We residents in the West End of Alexandria have been dismayed to witness the loss of tree canopy due to ongoing construction and before any decisions are made that will necessitate the removal of more trees and the loss of more open space in the interest of constructing dedicated lanes in the Beauregard Corridor, the Working Group should:

- Conduct thorough Metrobus and DASH ridership studies both now and after the BRAC complex opens to determine whether dedicated lanes would be justified.
- Consider the needs and desires of the community for a green and livable environment that preserves the mature trees that remain along the Beauregard Corridor.
- Address the question of whom the lanes would actually serve (i.e., the people or the developers?).
- Ask the City to look into employer transit incentives and commuter transportation solutions available through Commuter Connections.
- Determine exactly how far south the dedicated lanes would extend down Beauregard Street, particularly in light of proposed expansion and development of the Landmark Plaza shopping center.

Until all these issues are addressed and resolved, we think the proposal to construct dedicated lanes is premature and as such, we oppose them. The City needs to devote considerably more attention and study of our area and its needs before applying inadequately considered "fixes" to an untenable situation that is already straining the quality of life of West End communities.

Sincerely,

Lynn Bostain

President
Seminary West Civic Association

cc: Mayor and City Council
Transportation & Environmental Services
Federation of Civic Associations

EXHIBIT 3

Goodale, Geoffrey M.

From: Poul Hertel [poulh@erols.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 14, 2011 7:09 AM
To: 'Donald N. Buch'; afsuper2000@yahoo.com; dacava1@yahoo.com; 'Dave Dexter'; opctiger72@aol.com; Joanne Lepanto; lynnbostain@yahoo.com; ahmacdonald@me.com; jns-cwest@comcast.net; dicos@verizon.net; dsomers@dc-opera.org; donaldgail@yahoo.com; Goodale, Geoffrey M.; jcooper395@aol.com; 'Kathy Burns'; katy_cannady20@comcast.net; mark.benedict@fsis.usda.gov; waudr@comcast.net; Katy Cannady; 'Sharon Annear'; shirleydowns@verizon.net
Subject: FW: Minority report on corridor c
Attachments: Transportation Master Plan Letter.docx

From: Poul Hertel [mailto:poulh@erols.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 14, 2011 7:07 AM
To: 'Alicia Hughes'; 'Del (work) Pepper'; 'Frank Fannon'; 'Kerry Donley'; 'Paul Smedberg'; 'Rob Krupicka'; 'William Euille'
Cc: 'Rich Baier'; 'Abi Lerner'; 'PaulCSmedberg@aol.com'; 'Rob.Krupicka@alexandriava.gov'; 'Donna Fossum'; 'John Komoroske'; 'steve.sindiong@alexandriava.gov'; 'sandra.marks@alexandriava.gov'; 'Poul Hertel'; 'Anna Bentley'; 'Bill Denton'; 'Dak Hardwick'
Subject: Minority report on corridor c

To the Honorable Mayor Euille and Members of City Council,

I am writing as part of those in the minority who were present and voting at the Transit Corridor Group to argue that The City of Alexandria cannot depart from the Transportation Master Plan without going through the appropriate process. Included is a letter signed by George Foot, Lois Walker and I clarifying what the AD-HOC Transportation Committee recommended to the community for adoption in 2008.

Revising the interpretation of the Transportation Master Plan is not an appropriate alternative to ensure transparency. Although changes to the Transportation master often take place, they do so according to a master plan process. Above all else, we should not forge ahead with a significant change to an approved plan without considering the original intent of that plan. The community has accepted the creation of dedicated lanes in large part because they would come from using existing travel lanes as described in the attached letter and Master Plan. Even so, that alternative was not presented to the Ad Hoc transit Corridor Group or community for consideration, having been deemed undesirable at the administrative level.

Poul Hertel

40

The report forwarded by the Ad Hoc Transportation Committee references the proposals as representing a "paradigm shift" for the City of Alexandria. Underlying this statement is a set of assumptions, one of which is currently in dispute, and that we therefore wish to clarify. Notably, what did *dedicated transit lanes* mean? To us, this means that we are going to take away traffic lanes from cars and give them to mass transit, as referenced in the cost assumptions portion of the report. The City Staff strongly disagrees with this interpretation, arguing that it only relates to the Potomac Yard BRT project.

In reviewing the timetable and e-mails of the committee, we find that the discussion and vote on the Potomac Yard project transpired in September 2005, well before the March of 2006 work session we held to explore options for a comprehensive transportation plan. What's more, internal e-mails addressing the public discussion at the Ramsey School specifically references the question relating to our proposal on March 2006: "Street space. Everyone asks about losing lanes of traffic."

Furthermore, we specifically pointed out that this was the underlying premise of the report's conclusions at numerous presentations to the public, the Planning Commission and the City Council. The report references the need to keep developments from encroaching into areas that would preclude the use of dedicated lanes. This was specifically put in because of the Potomac Yard proposal, since we and the public were told that there was no room for dedicated lanes inside the Yard as had been the preference of many Citizens, because the "streets were too narrow".

Finally, the consultant who did the cost analysis for the Task Force assumed that the dedicated lanes would be acquired from adjacent properties. This was specifically changed at the request of the committee members, who pointed out that the lanes were to be taken from existing car lanes and not acquired, because that is what we assumed in the report. The final report states correctly that cost assumes that the dedicated lanes would come from existing traffic lanes.

In conclusion, the Transportation Master Plan is about creating a transit-oriented Alexandria, which has no room to build more roads for either cars or transit. We concluded that since congestion was inevitable, the City should use the existing infrastructure, meaning handing over the existing traffic lanes, for the purpose of dedicated transit. That is the preferred option of the Transportation Master Plan.

We came to this conclusion by looking at the statistics, which showed an ever-increasing demand for a finite good by both Alexandrians and commuters who drive through the City. The effort centered on how we could assure mobility within Alexandria while discouraging through traffic. We did so by concluding that the decrease of road capacity for cars and giving this capacity exclusively for mobility within Alexandria could fill two goals if it were given to mass transit. Not only would it discourage through traffic, but also, it would significantly increase the attractiveness of using mass transit. This would not be due to a lifestyle decision, but as a result of rational economic choices made by consumers who would have a transit system that is fast, frequent and reliable.

George Foot, Lois Walker and Poul Hertel

12
9-17-11

Jackie Henderson

From: Mindy Lyle <mindylyle@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, September 15, 2011 7:41 PM
To: William Euille; Frank Fannon; Kerry Donley; Alicia Hughes; Del Pepper; Paul Smedberg; Rose Boyd; Jackie Henderson; Elaine Scott; Rob Krupicka; Linda Owens; Elizabeth Jones
Subject: COA Contact Us: Corridor C
Attachments: ATT00001..txt

COA Contact Us: Mayor, Vice Mayor, and Council Members

Time: [Thu Sep 15, 2011 19:40:59] Message ID: [33145]

Issue Type: Mayor, Vice Mayor, and Council Members
First Name: Mindy
Last Name: Lyle
Street Address: 5235 Tancreti Lane
City: Alexandria
State: VA
Zip: 22304
Phone: 7035667113
Email Address: mindylyle@comcast.net
Subject: Corridor C

Comments:

On Saturday you will consider a request to ratify the submission of an application for funding an alternatives analysis for the Beauregard/Landmark/Van Dorn area (known as Corridor C). Please support this item. Corridor C is an extremely diverse area of the City of Alexandria.

The Working Group has recommended the construction of a Bus Rapid Transit ("BRT") system in dedicated transit lanes with an eventual move to a streetcar in the future. This proposed system would serve the entire Corridor C area, including the Van Dorn Street Metro station, and provide direct connectivity to Shirlington and the Pentagon. In order to ensure Alexandria receives the highest consideration for Federal transit funding, proceeding with the Alternatives Analysis is the next logical step in further assessing the needs in Corridor C.

Corridor C is an area with many different needs that can be accomplished by building one transit system. The selection of Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) in Corridor C is

consistent with the existing vision for this part of Alexandria. The Landmark/Van Dorn Small Area Plan calls for dedicated lane transit along Van Dorn Street as well as a transit infrastructure at Landmark Mall. In addition, the selection of BRT was done keeping in mind the transit mode selected for the Potomac Yards. If Alexandria is already doing BRT with possible streetcar conversion in Corridor A, then why also not do it in Corridor C?

As usual, there are always naysayers that believe this is the wrong direction for Alexandria. I disagree with that assessment. Some have noted that the City has demonstrated no real need for transit in Corridor C. This is ridiculous. One only needs to look at the map of proposed development in Alexandria, Arlington and Fairfax County to see that a transit solution is going to be needed to accommodate both planned and existing development. There is going to be an increasing need for transit and transit infrastructure in Corridor C.

Please support the request for ratifying the submission of a grant for an alternatives analysis in Corridor C. Without that analysis, Alexandria will never know if BRT will work.

C

Kimley-Horn
and Associates, Inc.

Suite 400
13221 Woodland Park Road
Herndon, Virginia
20171

Meeting Minutes

To:	Jim Maslanka Steve Sindiong	Organization:	City of Alexandria
From:	David Whyte Erin Murphy	Organization:	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
Meeting Date:	May 19, 2011	Time:	7:00 p.m. to 9:30 p.m.
Meeting Location:	George Washington Middle School - Auditorium		
Subject:	Transitway Corridor Feasibility Study High Capacity Transit Corridor Working Group Meeting 5		
Attendees:	**Corridor Working Group:** Councilman Rob Krupicka (Co-Chair), Bill Denton, Donna Fossum, Dak Hardwick, Poul Hertel, Nancy Jennings, John Komoroske **City of Alexandria staff:** Abi Lerner (Deputy Director, T&ES), Jim Maslanka (T&ES), Steve Sindiong (T&ES), Karen Callaham (T&ES), Jeff Farner (Deputy Director, P&Z), Pat Mann (P&Z) **Kimley-Horn and Associates:** David Whyte, Erin Murphy, and Brittany Price **Members of the Public:** 21 Citizens signed in		

Agenda

1. Introduction *(3 minutes)*
    a. Opening Remarks – *Councilman Krupicka and Councilman Smedberg, CWG Co-Chairs*
    b. Meeting Objectives and Goals – *Abi Lerner, T&ES*
        i. Corridor C Review and Recommendations
        ii. Transit Overview
        iii. Input and confirmation on existing conditions (Corridors A and B)
        iv. Outline Corridors A and B needs (origins/destinations/other)
2. Background – *David Whyte, Kimley-Horn (15 minutes)*
    a. Distribution of March 17th meeting minutes
    b. General project flow and anticipated CWG meeting topics
3. Corridor C Review and Recommendation – *David Whyte, Kimley-Horn (30 minutes)*
    a. Presentation of recommended report
    b. CWG and public comment and discussion on the recommended concept
    c. CWG decision of Corridor C recommendation
4. Corridors A and B Existing Conditions Discussion – *Kimley-Horn (30 minutes)*
    a. Transit 101
    b. Multimodal overview
    c. Traffic operations summary
        i. Corridor travel time
        ii. Bottlenecks/congestion
        iii. Intersection operations
    d. CWG input and observations
    e. Public input and observations
5. Discussion of Transitway Concepts for Corridors A and B – *Kimley-Horn (40 minutes)*
    a. Activity centers: points to travel between
    b. Connection points/Origins & Destinations / Areas to stay away from
    c. CWG input and observations
    d. Public input and observations
6. Logistics and Next Steps – *Abi Lerner, T&ES (2 minutes)*
    a. Next meeting date
    b. Next meeting topic

TEL 703 674 1300
FAX 703 674 1350

Summary of Discussion

Introduction

- March 17th Meeting Minutes were unanimously approved with no changes
- Goals of the meeting include:
  - Review and approve Corridor C recommendation (not final draft but necessary step in process)
  - Start discussion on Corridors A and B
- This meeting is not the end of public process for Corridor C, but a draft recommendation is important for reasons that include the following:
  - Beauregard Corridor Plan needs input on Corridor C
  - BRAC
  - Coordination with other jurisdictions
  - Federal funding
- Next steps for Corridor C:
  - CWG, City staff, and consultant will make recommendations to City Council
  - City Council work session June 14th
  - City Council regular session in September

Corridor C Review and Recommendation

- Presentation by David Whyte
- CWG discussion/questions
  - How would dedicated transit lanes work on Van Dorn Street currently? There is no room now.
    - Response: some right-of-way acquisition is needed, this is included in the cost estimation and follows the adopted Landmark/Van Dorn plan
    - Comment: Understanding of your point-of-view is that where we can get property, we do, and where we cannot, we will run transit in mixed flow
  - How will the transit get across Duke Street?
    - Response: In the short-term, the transit can run in mixed flow and be given transit signal priority. In the long-term a new bridge will be needed that may be constructed as part of redevelopment or another project

- ***Public Comment*** on Corridor C recommendation
  - The mission of the CWG is creeping. The CWG's purpose as stated by the City Manager is to review the technical and financial information. We do not need a CWG recommendation at this time. There is insufficient information at this time, the recommendations are not associated with demand. We need to set priorities within a corridor
  - There is insufficient information to make a recommendation
  - The study was undertaken with a linear approach
  - The recommendations are not associated with transit demand
  - Need to set priorities within the corridor because there is a large cost to run transit from Van Dorn Metrorail station to Arlington; we don't have to buy the whole plan; suggest the first transit segment is Mark Center to Pentagon and/or Shirlington and crate a successful program that sets a precedent; this would be more practical, feasible, and have a lower price tag
  - The West End is already being torn apart, don't want any more tearing down; any plan should be low impact; recommend low impact Alternative B; do not widen streets for any purpose; Beauregard Street is beautiful with the street trees
  - The corridor is constricted at Sanger Avenue and north of Seminary Road; the master plan says to take a lane, not to add a lane; if the City does not pay for right-of-way, the capital cost will decrease
  - Option D makes a lot of sense; like the idea of taking a lane for transit, but it is politically infeasible; prioritize transit from Van Dorn Metrorail station to BRAC
  - Remind the CWG that you get what you pay for; a low cost, low impact system will have low

effectiveness; dedicated lanes are important

- CWG comments on Corridor C recommendation
  - ***Poul Hertel***
    - There is an issue between the Ad Hoc Transportation Policy and Planning Task Force and City staff regarding interpretation of the Transportation Master Plan (TMP)
      - The Task Force wanted to create a paradigm shift by taking away traffic lanes for transit
      - A Transitway that adds new dedicated lanes rather than taking away traffic lanes to create dedicated traffic lanes is not what I spent five years fighting for
      - Want a transit system that Alexandrians would use, not a rough shot through a neighborhood
    - The route on Van Dorn Street needs to be thought out more
    - Streetcar
      - Cost would be lower if used existing travel lanes
      - Route is problematic to connect to Columbia Pike
      - Travel time savings is not there
      - Limited seating supply
    - BRT
      - Travel time savings is not great compared to the Rapid Bus
    - Prefer Alternative B
    - Would support Alternative D over Alternative G
    - Want to push away through traffic and build a transit system for the City of Alexandria
  - ***Donna Fossum***
    - BRAC is showing up in less than 90 days and needs to be accommodated
    - There is an issue of equity in the West End
      - Metrorail serves 30 percent of the City's population
      - City already has the northern part of the Corridor A Transitway on the books and an Environmental Assessment planned
      - 43 percent of the City's population lives on the West End
      - Want for the West End what Corridor A got
    - Recommend settling for Alternative D now, but want a streetcar (Alternative G) as soon as possible
  - ***Dak Hardwick***
    - Thanks for public comments
    - Budget and fiscal advisory representative
    - Cost may be the most important factor to consider
    - Alternative D is under the threshold of New Starts; appreciate the lower project and documentation costs
    - Consider the amount of federal match for Alternative D versus Alternative G
      - Can get up to 80% of the capital costs paid federally
      - Federal funding is key to moving forward
      - Want the maximum amount of federal dollars
    - Analysis to this point is very good and appropriate for this stage
    - Obviously more detail is needed going forward
    - Equity of East End versus West End of investment; one-third of the development crescent without rail is Corridor C
    - Landmark/Van Dorn plan was passed
      - 12 million square feet of development space
      - Plans for complete streets and dedicated transit lanes
      - Plans for right-of-way acquisition needed to achieve complete streets

- Troubled that the TMP is being used to say the City cannot acquire right-of-way when the Landmark/Van Dorn plan was passed after the TMP was passed

- Donna Fossum and Dak Hardwick presented a motion regarding a recommended alternative (the final motion is included below)
- ***William Denton***
  - Support Alternative D with Donna Fossum's recommendation regarding future Alternative G
  - Allows flexibility to move from Alternative B and move toward streetcar
- ***Nancy Jennings***
  - The analysis presented is honest, but no origin-destination study was conducted
  - Question Corridor C as a transit corridor because do not think people want to go from the Van Dorn Metrorail station to Mark Center
  - Question the Arlington connection because of the travel time along Columbia Pike and Shirlington is a destination in the area
  - Do not want to tear out trees along Beauregard Street for a system people will not use
  - Van Dorn Street section of Corridor C is more viable for transit
  - BRAC people are not all coming from Fairfax
  - Like Alternative B, support Alternatives D or G for Van Dorn Street only
- ***John Komoroske***
  - Like that numbers were provided in the analysis
  - Paul is correct regarding the intent of the TMP to create a paradigm street, but believe that instead of reducing capacity in one are, we could add capacity in other areas
  - Make sure the system is attractive and competitive because people are giving up some freedom to ride transit instead of driving a car
  - Understand the equity issue
  - Agree with Donna Fossum and Dak Hardwick's solution
- ***Councilman Rob Krupicka***
  - The idea of scarcity for traffic to drive people to transit is important; need to understand where there are opportunities – i.e., which corridors make sense to widen, vs. those that already have enough congestion to change modes / habits; there is an obligation to balance the goals of mode shift versus time it will take to commute
  - A recommendation to take away a traffic lane for a transit lane requires a gigantic leap of faith; need to balance practical with ideological
  - Look at how the Transitway could be built in phases, the phase through Landmark will be different that that through Mark Center
  - Continue to evaluate opportunities to use existing right-of-way
  - Include language in a recommendation that says that other parts of the City do not need new right-of-way to build transit
  - Not comfortable with building a transit system that will be stuck in traffic like Alternative B
  - Show a system that people like and use to encourage other systems; success build success; it is important that we get people from Mark Center to the Pentagon.

- ***A motion was made for the CWG to adopt the following statement regarding Corridor C:***
  - "Alternative D is the preferred alternative for phased implementation of transit in dedicated lanes in Corridor C until such time as Alternative G becomes feasible and can be implemented. This course of action is consistent with the Council's recent decision to provide dedicated lane transit along the segment of Corridor A that is north of Braddock Road. Evaluation and analysis will continue of Alternative D in preparation for future implementation of Alternative G.

Construction of transit in Corridor C shall be the first priority of Alexandria's transportation projects. Each subsequent corridor shall be evaluated separately regarding the need to acquire additional right-of-way for dedicated lanes as discussed in the Transportation Master Plan."

- CWG members Denton, Fossum, Hardwick, and Komoroske voted in favor of the Resolution and CWG members Hertel and Jennings voted against the Resolution.
- CWG member Bentley was absent from the meeting and CWG member Rob Krupika was absent during the vote

Corridors A and B

- Presentation by David Whyte
- Review of Transit 101

- CWG comments regarding Corridors A and B
  - ***Donna Fossum***
    - Circulators would be a useful option – need to add these into the mix of alternatives
    - Along Eisenhower we should do what we did at Potomac Yard to plan an infill Metrorail station – the line is already there but the demand is not, though it is coming in the future
    - Duke Street from Jordan to Quaker Lane is only four lanes with no turn lanes
    - Perhaps transit could go where roads could not - consider transit to cross the railroad tracks and creek
    - Need a combination of services on Eisenhower Street and Duke Street
  - ***Dak Hardwick***
    - Duke Street has heavy traffic east of Quaker Lane; when the Telegraph/I-495 and I-495 HOT lanes projects are completed, will traffic be alleviated?
      - Response: These projects should have a significant impact in reducing traffic, but still anticipate traffic after construction
    - In Old Town we have the beginnings of a circulator in place, but buses are inconsistent and infrequent; putting bus schedules on poles would help
    - DASH orientation in Old Town would be helpful in looking for routing
  - ***Poul Hertel***
    - Would like to see the capacity of Metrorail and Metrorail ridership projections
    - The TMP looked at people moving north-south and east-west; movement east-west in the City is a big problem
    - Would like to see the capacity of metro and metro ridership projections
    - Rebranding and enhancing circulators is the best option
    - Almost guarantee that parking on Patrick Street will not be removed
    - What happens on Washington Street? Does parking go away and come back later?
    - Notion of dedicated lanes in Old Town is difficult if not impossible
    - DASH system is currently undesirable to use

- ***Public Comment*** on Corridor A and B
  - For Corridor A, suggest recommending the no-build option because there is already Metro in the corridor
  - A large percentage (42%) of Census track 14 already uses Metro to go to work. What additional market will be gained from additional transit service? Area already saturated and metro will continue to be utilized
  - There has never been regularly scheduled transit on Route 1
  - Transit on Route 1 presents a safety issue, especially in area of Patrick and Henry

- East-west rail service over Woodrow Wilson Bridge is a more important problem
- The waterfront area is far from the Metro. Is there a plan for street car along the waterfront?
- In Corridor A, is the Arlington to Monroe Bridge issue settled? Need to define corridor limits better
- Adding transit will be good for Old Town economically
- Roads are low capacity, transit is high capacity so need to add transit and take away from roads
- Why not consider going up GW Parkway instead of Patrick Street?
- Dedicated bus lane takes away parking
- Need to work out transit with Maryland – a significant amount of traffic coming from MD
- There is already a bus line, is this not enough?

Conclusions

- Project team will take Corridor A and B alignment comments into account
- The next meeting is July 21, 2011
  - Alternatives for Corridors A and B
  - Location will be announced at a later date

Logistics and Next Steps

- The next meeting will be Thursday, July 21, 2011. The standing meeting is the third Thursday of each month at 7:00pm.
- A survey for Corridors A and B was available at the meeting and on the project website
- General comments are accepted on the project website