

2

2-12-11

City Council of Alexandria, Virginia
Public Hearing Meeting
Saturday, February 12, 2011

Open Mike

Comments of Nancy Jennings

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

My name is Nancy Jennings, and I live at 2115 Marlboro Drive. I am President of Seminary Hill Association, Inc., a member of the BRAC Advisory Group, a member of the High Capacity Transitway Work Group, and regularly attend the Beauregard Small Area Plan meetings that now average two a month. I was also active in START, a coalition of residents in Alexandria and Arlington who were opposed to the HOT lanes inside the Beltway on I-395. I have more than 30 years' experience as a citizen working on residential traffic management solutions. I speak today on my own behalf.

Seminary Hill Association, Inc., has enjoyed the City Council's support of our efforts to preserve our neighborhoods from cut through traffic. Since 2002, the City and Seminary Hill have objected to the addition of any new traffic onto Seminary Road from I-395, such as a ramp from the HOV lanes. That interchange cannot handle the amount of traffic it has today and adding another lane of traffic will not improve the gridlock on Seminary Road.

Seminary Road is a residential street that runs right through the heart of Seminary Hill and connects with other residential streets including Jordan, Howard, Braddock, Fort Williams, Quaker and Janney's, all of which could and would likely be used as cut-through routes through our neighborhoods.

- ***Please reaffirm your support for the protection of our neighborhoods as you did in Resolution 2366 when you opposed HOV off-ramps at Seminary Road.***
- ***Rather than spend more time and money studying a new ramp at Seminary Road, I urge you to consider other options, such as a redesign of the interchange as an urban diamond or putting an HOV off-ramp onto another better functioning interchange that has fewer topographical challenges, such as King or Duke Street.***

Thank you.

2
2-12-11

Statement of Michael E. Hobbs
for the Alexandria City Council
February 12, 2011

The Waterfront Plan and the Settlement Agreements

Thank you, Mayor Euille and members of the Council. I am Michael Hobbs, residing at 419 Cameron Street.

I would like to speak today to some of the legal implications of the Waterfront Plan that you heard a presentation on at your work session this past Tuesday, and that is scheduled for your consideration as early as April.

Land use on at least three of the four principal sites proposed for redevelopment in the draft Plan is governed in part by the Settlement Agreements of the early 1980s.

Those agreements as they stand would apparently not permit the hotels proposed for the Robinson Terminal sites, or the parking facility and restaurant building in Waterfront Park. There has been little focus or public discussion of this until very recently; but it was acknowledged in the materials for the work sessions for the Planning Commission last week and for you this week.

That presentation notes that implementation of the plan would require amendment of the Settlement Agreements governing the Robinson Terminal sites and Waterfront Park.

I pretend to no expertise on matters of land use law. But I would urge you to consider that this is far more than an incidental matter, a legal technicality that can or should be easily disposed of.

Forty years ago—before I came to Alexandria, and before most of you did—there was a profound debate about the proposed and future uses of the waterfront in Alexandria. It was not the subject just for discussion at community meetings, or even for resolution by the Alexandria City Council. It became the subject of dueling legislation and public hearings in the United States Congress, and its public policy conclusions were recorded, ultimately, in those Settlement Agreements and in the City's existing Waterfront Plan.

Among those conclusions was that Waterfront Park "shall be used as an open space public park area." Explicitly precluded were any permanent buildings over fifteen feet high, and any parking facility beyond the 16 spaces that were already there.

This is not a simple contract between two private parties, such as those that Pat Troy presumably has for the purchase of provisions for his restaurant. This was a public policy compact to govern the use of Waterfront Park, reflected in a solemn agreement between the United States and the City of Alexandria.

Of course, any agreement between two parties can be changed, if they both ultimately agree, and in some cases if a court with jurisdiction of a settlement approves. But this is not a casual or collateral matter, certainly not a technicality to be disposed of at the staff level.

Changes to the public policy agreement governing Waterfront Park should be undertaken only with the most careful advice of your Planning Department and your City Attorney, and with your own most serious consideration not just of the technical, legal possibility, but of the wisdom or necessity of so fundamental a change to this solemn undertaking, thirty years ago, between the governments of the United States and of the City of Alexandria.

The Settlement Agreements need not be frozen in time in every detail. The 1992 zoning law, for example, strengthened their protections in several respects. But the broad public policy principles reflected in those agreements should be respected, and preserved.

Thank you for your consideration.

2
2-12-11

City of Alexandria, Virginia – City Council Meeting of February 12, 2011
Public Discussion Period
Comments of Donald N. Buch (389 Livermore Lane)

I appeared before you on Saturday, December 18, 2010 to request that the public be provided a “cost/benefit” analysis of the BRAC-133 project which our City Government encouraged to locate at Mark Center. I understood that such a cost/benefit analysis would be forthcoming. As costs to our community appear to continue to escalate, I am here today to ask how the cost/benefit analysis is progressing.

I would also mention that I asked that this matter be placed on the agenda for next week’s BRAC Advisory Group meeting. While it did make the draft agenda it was removed prior to the final agenda being published by the City. I was subsequently advised that “the City” had determined it is not an appropriate topic to be pursued by the Advisory Group. I find it rather odd that the BRAC Advisory Group should not inquire as to the impact costs of BRAC. In turn, as a member of the Advisory Group, I would appreciate Council’s guidance as to what BRAC-related matters you believe are and are not appropriate for the Advisory Group to pursue.

Thank you.

2
2-12-11

A statement by Bert Ely to the Alexandria City Council
February 12, 2010

Comments on the finances of the City's waterfront plan

Mr. Mayor and members of Council, I am Bert Ely, an Old Town resident since 1981. I am here to express concern about the financial aspects of the proposed waterfront plan. I speak only for myself and not any organization.

The waterfront plan is scheduled for vetting by the Planning Commission in just 52 days and approval by Council just nine weeks from today, yet crucial aspects of the plan are unknown or highly questionable as to completeness or reasonableness.

Recently, I have focused on the plan's finances, working with tax revenue forecasts and capital outlay estimates from the Planning Department. Mr. Mayor and members of Council, the numbers do not work!

The waterfront plan now on the table does not make sense economically. The forecasted revenues are too high, the capital-cost estimates too low, and operating and maintenance expenses have not been included in the plan's financial forecast. Before adopting any waterfront plan, Council should direct that financial aspects of the plan be reviewed by independent experts.

The first attached spreadsheet sets out revenue estimates. These revenue estimates are way too high because of excessively optimistic assumptions. For example, the plan assumes 625 hotel rooms will be built – a 62% increase in rooms east of Washington Street – yet under the 1983 settlement agreement, hotels cannot be built on the Robinson Terminal properties.

The plan assumes that restaurant space equal to fourteen restaurants, each the size of the Virtue restaurant now being built on South Union, will operate in the area. At \$30 per person, that will equate to almost more 3,000 diners a day in the area, with many more on weekend days. Leaving aside parking issues, the already jammed streets and sidewalks in the area simply lack the capacity to handle that additional traffic.

Land values in the area are projected to more than double. How realistic is that?

The second spreadsheet sets out the cost of initial capital outlays for components of the waterfront plan. A marine engineering expert who cannot be here today has told me that the cost estimates for the piers, bulkheads, dredging, and other water-related components of the plan are way too low.

Far worse, City staff has told me that they are still developing operating cost estimates for the proposed facilities. The numbers you have been given so far are grossly incomplete, for they leave out such costs as utilities, ongoing clean-up expenses, routine repairs, and replacements over the forecast period. While impossible to predict, the next Isabel will impose additional costs on the City to replace docks and other infrastructure not insured for flood damage.

Today's waterfront embarrasses the City because of poor maintenance, such as clearing out debris along the water's edge. Will that be the waterfront of the future – one which looks worse than what we have today?

I close by referring to the third spreadsheet, which shows my rough estimate of the negative cash flows, and therefore the negative budget impact, of the proposed plan for many years to come, without adding the substantial costs of operating and maintaining these new facilities.

Council needs to put the brakes on this so-call plan until it has much more complete and realistic revenue and cost estimates. You will not have that by April 16. Don't act until you have all the numbers.

Thank you for your time. I welcome your questions.

Calculation of Net Tax Revenues from Waterfront Plan Redevelopment

Old Town area hotels, per ACVA website

Line #

Ely comments and calculations

Real Property Tax		
1	Redevelopment parcels: square feet of land	317,352
2	Value of Land, per square foot	\$180
3	Redevelopment parcels: square feet of planned improvements	773,384
4	Value of Improvements, per square foot	\$265
5	Upon Redevelopment, Total Value of Land and Improvements	\$262,070,120
6	Real property tax rate (per \$100 value)	\$0.978
7	Real property tax revenues	\$2,563,046
8	Minus current tax revenues from redevelopment parcels	-\$462,889
9	Net increase in real property tax revenues	\$2,100,157

7.29 acres.
This is projected **increase** in land values. Present tax values along S. Union \$150-\$183/SF; S. Robinson Terminal \$131/SF.
17.75 additional acres of floor space.

554% increase in property-tax collections in the waterfront area.

Name	Address	Number of rooms
East of Washington:		
Best Western Old Colony	1101 North Washington	49
Crowne Plaza	901 North Fairfax	254
Holiday Inn	625 First Street	178
Hotel Monaco	480 King Street	241
Morrison House	116 South Alfred	45
Sheraton Suites	801 North St. Asaph Street	247
	Total rooms	<u>1,014</u>

Meals Tax		
10	Amount of total development anticipated to be restaurant (sf)	109,941
11	Annual revenues per square foot	\$275
12	Total annual restaurant revenues	\$30,233,775
13	Meals tax rate	\$0.04
14	Meals tax revenues	\$1,209,351

The equivalent of **14** restaurants the size of the new Virgin at 106 South Union, which will have 300 indoor seats.

At \$30 per person, 1,007,793 diners per year, or a daily average of **2,761**.

King Street Metro area:		
Embassy Suites	1900 Diagonal Road	268
Hampton Inn	1616 King Street	80
Hilton Alexanria	1767 King Street	263
Lorien Hotel and Spa	1600 King Street	107
Residence Inn	1456 Duke Street	240
	Total rooms	<u>958</u>

Sales Tax and BPOL from Restaurants		
15	Total annual restaurant revenues	\$30,233,775
16	BPOL rate (per \$100 value)	\$0.20
17	BPOL tax revenues	\$60,468
18	Sales tax rate	1%
19	Sales tax revenues from restaurants	\$302,338
20	Total of sales and BPOL tax revenues from restaurants	\$362,805

Total hotel rooms in Old Town area 1,972

Transient Lodging Tax		
21	Amount of total development anticipated to be hotel (rooms)	625
22	Room rate	\$151
23	Occupancy rate	65%
24	Revenues	\$22,390,469
25	Transient lodging tax rate	\$0.065
26	Transient lodging tax revenues	\$1,455,380
27	Room nights	148,281
28	Room night tax rate (per room night)	\$1
29	Room night tax revenues	\$148,281
30	Total transient lodging tax revenues	\$1,603,662

A **62%** increase in hotel rooms east of Washington Street -- see list to left of Old Town hotels.

An average of **406** occupied rooms per night in new hotels along the waterfront.

Transient lodging tax plus \$1 room tax projected for FY 11 at \$11.1 million. New hotels increase tax take by **14.5%**.

Sales Tax and BPOL from Hotels		
31	Transient Lodging revenues	\$22,390,469
32	BPOL rate (per \$100 value)	\$0.35
33	BPOL tax revenues	\$78,367
34	Sales tax rate	1%
35	Sales tax revenues from transient lodging	\$223,905

Totals		
36	Net increase in real property tax revenues	\$2,100,157
37	Meals tax revenues	\$1,209,351
38	Total of sales and BPOL tax revenues from restaurants	\$362,805
39	Total transient lodging tax revenues	\$1,603,662
40	Sales tax revenues from transient lodging	\$223,905
41	Grand Total	\$5,499,879
42	Assume 15% for general city services	-\$824,982
43	Net Tax Revenues	\$4,674,898

Citywide meals-tax revenues FY 11 projected at \$15.4 million. New restaurants increase tax take by **7.9%**.

Not specified what City expenses this covers, and does not cover.

Per Alexandria City Planning Department
Dollars in millions

Year	Cumulative net revenue	Calculated annual net revenue	Calculated annual gross revenue, with 15% add-back
1	0.25	0.25	0.29
2	0.74	0.49	0.58
3	1.48	0.74	0.87
4	2.97	1.50	1.76
5	5.23	2.26	2.65
6	8.24	3.02	3.55
7	11.47	3.23	3.80
8	14.92	3.44	4.05
9	18.57	3.66	4.30
10	22.44	3.87	4.55
11	26.53	4.09	4.81
12	30.83	4.30	5.06
13	35.34	4.51	5.31
14	40.07	4.73	5.56
15	44.80	4.73	5.56
16	49.53	4.73	5.56
17	54.26	4.73	5.56
18	58.99	4.73	5.56
19	63.72	4.73	5.56
20	68.45	4.73	5.56
21	73.18	4.73	5.56
22	77.91	4.73	5.56
23	82.64	4.73	5.56
24	87.37	4.73	5.56
25	92.10	4.73	5.56
26	96.83	4.73	5.56
27	101.56	4.73	5.56
28	106.29	4.73	5.56
29	111.02	4.73	5.56
30	115.75	4.73	5.56
31	120.48	4.73	5.56

City of Alexandria

Waterfront Plan

Financial forecast -- without annual operating costs

Dollars in millions

Year	Annual cash flows -- before operating costs			Cumulative cash flow	Annual operating costs	True cumulative cash flow
	Capital Outlays (1)	Net Revenues (2)	Net cash flows			
Totals =	41.6	120.4	78.8		?	?
1	2.0	0.2	(1.8)	(1.8)	?	?
2	2.5	0.5	(2.0)	(3.8)	?	?
3	3.0	0.7	(2.3)	(6.0)	?	?
4	3.5	1.5	(2.0)	(8.0)	?	?
5	4.0	2.3	(1.7)	(9.8)	?	?
6	4.5	3.0	(1.5)	(11.3)	?	?
7	4.5	3.2	(1.3)	(12.5)	?	?
8	4.5	3.4	(1.1)	(13.6)	?	?
9	4.0	3.7	(0.3)	(13.9)	?	?
10	3.5	3.9	0.4	(13.6)	?	?
11	3.0	4.1	1.1	(12.5)	?	?
12	2.6	4.3	1.7	(10.8)	?	?
13	0.0	4.5	4.5	(6.3)	?	?
14	0.0	4.7	4.7	(1.5)	?	?
15	0.0	4.7	4.7	3.2	?	?
16	0.0	4.7	4.7	7.9	?	?
17	0.0	4.7	4.7	12.7	?	?
18	0.0	4.7	4.7	17.4	?	?
19	0.0	4.7	4.7	22.1	?	?
20	0.0	4.7	4.7	26.8	?	?
21	0.0	4.7	4.7	31.6	?	?
22	0.0	4.7	4.7	36.3	?	?
23	0.0	4.7	4.7	41.0	?	?
24	0.0	4.7	4.7	45.8	?	?
25	0.0	4.7	4.7	50.5	?	?
26	0.0	4.7	4.7	55.2	?	?
27	0.0	4.7	4.7	60.0	?	?
28	0.0	4.7	4.7	64.7	?	?
29	0.0	4.7	4.7	69.4	?	?
30	0.0	4.7	4.7	74.1	?	?
31	0.0	4.7	4.7	78.8	?	?

Footnotes:

(1) Ely estimate as to the timing of the capital outlays.

(2) Planning Department projection as to the timing of the net revenues.

2
2-12-11

**RECOMMENDATIONS RELATING TO THE VDOT OFF-RAMP &
OTHER POLICY CHANGES NEEDED TO REDUCE TRAFFIC AROUND
BRAC**

Testimony of Shirley Downs
1007 North Vail Street
Alexandria, VA 22304
Phone: 703-845-7958
E-mail: shirleydowns@verizon.net

The proposal to build an off ramp into BRAC from the south while important for the 40% to 48% of the BRAC tenants expected to come from the south addresses only a portion of the people coming to work at the site. While important this ramp is not going to solve the problems relating to traffic conjection associated with this site.

The Access Ramp at Seminary From 395

People who live on Van Dorn and the surrounding area are going to be concerned about the impact of the access ramp coming along 395 going north. In the summary of the proposal put forward by VDOT they state that this ramp will start at Sanger. People in this area are concerned that this will result in the hillock of land between 395 and Van Dorn being removed and all the trees taken down.

People in the West End really love their trees and the removal of all of the trees on the BRAC site is one of the things they do not like. It provides no screening or visual enhancement of the view of the BRAC site from 395 or from Van Dorn and Seminary. From any direction you look at the BRAC Building it is just plain ugly. It looms over and brutally dominates the local landscape. That is why it has been called the Behemoth on Beauregard and the Darth Vader building by local West End citizens. If this same approach is employed on the Van Dorn side our residents will be left with:

- An ugly eyesore. Our view will be of traffic streaming up to Seminary Road
- Further this will result in additional noise pollution and air pollution.

The traffic on 395 and Van Dorn has gotten worse and worse and worse, so has the noise from those roads. We and other neighbors have installed windows on our homes to deal, not only with making our homes more comfortable with regard to heat loss, but also because we are trying to deaden the sound of the traffic on 395. Even with the installation of such windows my family also has to employ a white noise generator to screen the sound of the traffic. In addition to their value as visual screening trees also reduce air pollution. They actually eat up CO2 and thus help to keep our air cleaner. Trees also reduce the intensity of heat on roads during the summer months. Eliminating the hillock and trees for the ramp will do great harm to our neighborhood. It will affect our view, increase the traffic noise, provide no visual screening, and lower our property values.

Living next to an off ramp is not a positive value if you are trying to sell, or rent your house, condo, or apartment. If that ramp is wide, ugly and destroys what little noise and visual traffic screening we currently have we will have really serious problems in the neighborhood. Some of this could be resolved with a high, but attractive, barrier wall. But we would still like to have a line of trees on our side to screen such a wall and make it more attractive. We hope you will do everything you can to see that these concerns are part of the solutions that are employed as we address the building of an off ramp.

Fixing and Improving other Intersections Leading to BRAC

Faced with a back up from the ramp at Seminary people are going to take other routes and they will be trying to get to the site using the surrounding intersections: via Van Dorn and Duke; Van Dorn and Seminary; Little River and Beaugard; Braddock and Little River (coming off the Beltway); from Route 7 coming east turning in at Skyline and connecting to Seminary from the east; up Janey's Lane and Seminary; via Duke and Quaker Lane to Seminary; and or Duke to Van Dorn; coming off the beltway at the Van Dorn exit and traveling up Van Dorn; coming from the north via 395 south and getting off at Shirlington and coming via Four Mile Run to George Mason Drive and up to BRAC; off on Glebe Road on the east side and up to Route 7, and over to Beaugard and Route 7.

The new ramp will not address these issues. We already know that many of the critical intersections in and around BRAC are at failed levels of service (LOS) with ratings of D and F currently. Additional traffic is going to make all of these intersections worse. We will need money to retune these lights, and make fixes and adjustments to make them more useful and facilitate the flow of traffic. We need state and federal funds for these problems as well.

More Funding For Mass Transit

Nor does this proposal, as it stands, provide for the increased city, state and federal funds that will be necessary for funding mass transit. We need to get additional people on to mass transit as soon as possible. That means additional new or refurbished buses coming from Alexandria, Arlington and Fairfax and coordination of the plans and routes by all three jurisdictions so that people can get to work, not only at BRAC but other destinations that will be affected by the increasing gridlock on our streets and roads.

There are many researchers who focus on development and transportation trends and policies. Among them, Christopher Leinberger of Brookings, who recently addressed our Stakeholders Group. In his presentation he noted that while the capital cost of additional mass transit is significant, the life cycle cost of providing mass transit rather than road construction and maintenance is far and away more cost effective. We need to pursue solutions that are efficient, and cost effective over the long run or we shall be revisiting this issue frequently with more

expensive solutions on down the road.

For this reason it is important for citizens, businesses, and elected officials at the local, state and federal level to pursue, work for, and lobby for, solutions that allow and facilitate the expenditure of state, local and federal transportation funds to be applied to mass transit as well as roads. In some cases this will require changes to the laws and regulations that govern the expenditure of local, state and federal transportation programs. For example, federal transportation formulas historically favor road building rather than mass transit. While there has been some improvement in funding it still disadvantages urban and suburban areas. If such funding sources both allow and encourage the expenditure of funds on mass transit and other traffic mitigation solutions they will cost the taxpayers less money, encourage the more efficient and faster resolution of traffic problems and a more pleasant trip to the office for commuters who are now sitting in traffic.

It would also provide for a more efficient use of the commuters time as they could read a newspaper or book or do work if they can travel to work using mass transit. It will also save money on gas, reduce pollution and reduce road rage. This will also reduce gas, and insurance costs for current drivers and reduce pollution and its attendant health costs to individuals and communities.

Push For Changes in Federal and State Transportation Laws to Provide More Funds For and Flexibility In Resource Allocation To Improve The Flow of Traffic.

We encourage our elected officials to use their experience with these problems to advocate for, and lobby for such changes with the Federal and State Agencies, the appropriate Congressional Committees and organizations such as the National Association of Counties, the National League of Cities and the National Governors Association and the Chamber of Commerce. These organizations need to advocate for more resources for mass transit and other policy changes, which make money spent for transportation improvements more flexible, efficient and cost effective.

The City of Alexandria is going to be a poster child for policies that have frustrated efforts to address modern transportation problems in urban, and dense suburban areas that so often provide the lions share of the taxes used to support state programs and services but have a difficult time getting the fiscal resources they need to fund needed transportation improvements. The business that benefit from better transportation policies are much better served and more productive if their people can get to work as rapidly and efficiently as possible.

Telecommuting

We also need to push the military on other low cost solutions that do not impact our budgets. That is to greatly increase the number of people telecommuting to BRAC and other worksites next door. In a previous BRAC Advisory Committee Meeting Donna Fossum, Chair of our Stakeholders Group and a long time Commissioner of Planning, noted that when faced with similar problems related to traffic when the Patent Trade Office (PTO) was opened half of the people coming to the site were able to telecommute. She asked what DOD was doing to push for and implement such solutions. The military responded that currently about 2% of their employees could telecommute and that the Obama Administration has signed directives to encourage telecommuting but they did not outline any special efforts they had advanced to encourage telecommuting.

This is a very cost effective way to ease traffic congestion and it enjoys strong bipartisan support. The leading champion of telecommuting is in fact Republican Congressman Frank Wolf. And this is a solution that is popular with the workers themselves. Many employees would prefer to work from home and or work partly from home and partly from the office. It would be very productive, from a fiscal stand point, if the elected officials and all other stakeholders would press the Department of Defense to do all that it can to expand the number of people who telecommute as quickly as possible.

Many will argue that they cannot do this because of the sensitive nature of their work. It is possible to create software with strong firewalls so that communications are not breached. Presumably the military and the CIA already uses secure software when they are communicating with military personnel and field agents in Afghanistan and Iraq. The people in the BRAC offices could utilize the same high security software.

Further not every person or office that is going to the Washington Headquarters requires that their work be protected with ultra, super secret, security protocols. Some people's work is not that sensitive. Further as has been disclosed many times numerous documents labeled "top secret" are not in fact that sensitive. Often the so-called secret information has been information freely available in newspapers, magazines and other forms of public information.

We request that the elected officials do everything they can to encourage telecommuting because this is a solution that is relatively low cost and immediate, while building off ramps and improving roads and intersections and adding more buses and other forms of mass transit are not.

Set Up A Meeting Between the BRAC Agencies and Government Contractors That are making the Decisions on the Allocation of Parking Spaces and The City Elected Officials, Staff and Citizens to discuss BRAC Parking Policies.

At Thursday's February 10th Permit Parking meeting we learned that the various government agencies and private contractors who are scheduled to move into BRAC 133 will themselves establish their own criteria for who gets to park inside their garage at the building. We respectfully request that a meeting be set up between members of this community and ours. Our Elected Representatives, City Staff, and the public members of the community who have been working on these issues for the last two and a half years would welcome the opportunity to be allowed to speak directly to the people who are actually going to be making the decisions about who can park in the building. This would allow those of us who have been engaged in the policy issues related to parking and transit to speak to them and encourage them to employ some of the solutions and criteria that we have advanced in our meetings.

For example these suggestions include allocating spaces on a priority basis to those who are car-pooling. Commercial buildings that currently house federal employees and federal contractors have frequently employed this. They could also employ market centered financial incentives such as charging people who park in the building by having the parking administered by a private commercial company, as well as providing assistance to those taking mass transit by helping them pay for their mass transit costs. We also previously suggested that there be Flex cars on site so that if a person who had taken mass transit or car pooled to work they could use the Flex car to do either private or work related business that requires a car during the day.

Funding for all of this will have to come from the City, Fairfax and Arlington Counties and or the State of Virginia and or the federal government via a revised version of the Defense Access Roads Program and other sources. We must impress upon you and you must impress upon DOD, the State of Virginia and the Federal Department of Transportation that in order to fix this problem we will need more than an access ramp off 395.

In summary we will need:

- A solution to the installation of an off ramp at Seminary and 395 that takes into account the views, problems and concerns of the residents right next to the off ramp with regard to noise, air pollution and the appearance of the off ramp. And please allow us some trees to screen the off ramp and the probable barrier wall to make it less of an eyesore and source of visual pollution.
- Much more mass transit and more funding for mass transit.
- More money and resources for traffic mitigation on other surrounding roads and intersections,
- Attention to traffic coming from the east, north and west as well as from

the south.

- More and better coordination of mass transit and road improvement by Alexandria, Arlington and Fairfax providing local funds, and funding from the State of Virginia Department of Transportation and the federal government with assistance provided by the Federal Department of Transportation, and the Department of Defense utilizing resources under the Defense Access Roads program. We need letters from our elected officials to the parent agencies and policy committees to improve laws and regulations to allow and encourage money for mass transit and other forms of traffic mitigation in addition to road building.
- A much greater focus by the tenants of BRAC 133 and current and future business tenants along the Beauregard Corridor on such low cost and effective traffic mitigation techniques as telecommuting. This is the least costly
- and fastest form of traffic mitigation available.
- A meeting to facilitate joint efforts by; the local elected officials, City Staff, and citizens of the West End to work with the tenants, and tenant organizations who are going to be making the parking decisions within the BRAC Building regarding the allocation of the parking spaces within the building.