

Public Comments on Potomac Yard DEIS

P&RC Special Meeting – May 7, 2015, Lee Center, 1108 Jefferson Street

Date Received	Name	Comment
5/5/15 via email	<p>From: Jennifer Gibbons [mailto:jennifer_l_gibbons@yahoo.com] Sent: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 12:59 PM To: ginabaum@aol.com; wm.cromley@mindspring.com; catherine@cgpadvisors.biz Cc: Lee Farmer Subject: Potomac Greens Park - Impact of Proposed Metro Station</p>	<p>Dear Commissioners Baum, Cromley, and Poulin,</p> <p>I live in the Potomac Greens neighborhood. I write to you today as a supporter of the planned Potomac Yards metro station but also as a concerned parent of a young child. My daughter and many other children in the neighborhood play each day at the playground located on the north end of our neighborhood. Once construction on the new metro station begins we will have heavy construction traffic on the main street in our neighborhood. Traffic that will then access the construction staging area via a new road that will cross over the current park and playground area.</p> <p>It is critical that the Alexandria Parks and Recreation Commission take steps now to ensure the safety of our children during what will likely be a two to three year construction period. In particular, I would like to see the Commission preserve as much of the park and playground as possible during the construction period. In addition, I ask that the Commission work with the City to erect fencing to enclose the park area so that our children can play without out risk from the construction traffic on Potomac Greens Drive and Carpenter Road. This will have the added benefit of protecting our children even after construction is completed, particularly in light of the increased traffic that will very likely accompany the new metro station. A playground without a fence so close to such traffic is an unnecessary risk for the City and its residents. Moreover, the Potomac Greens Park playground is one of only a very few playgrounds in the City that are not enclosed.</p> <p>If the Commission and City are unable to preserve the current playground during the construction of the new metro station, I ask that the playground equipment be relocated to the grass field adjacent to the tot lot near the Potomac Greens Drive traffic circle and that those playground areas be enclosed to protect young children from the construction traffic that will use the traffic circle area to access the construction staging area. I would be happy to discuss further my concerns and suggestions with you.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration. Regards, Jennifer Gibbons</p>
5/6/15 by email	Gina Baum, Commissioner, PRC	<p>Option B is not the best option for Open Space and the Park. Option A is preferred for the lower impact to Open Space and the park.</p> <p>If Option B is the final decision, Council needs to allocate funds to replace lost play areas and relocate them nearby. In addition, as a result of the construction there, there will be increased maintenance costs to the park. Funds must be allocated for those increased costs.</p> <p>Council needs to ask staff to: provide a budget for additional maintenance funds during construction, find suitable locations to relocate PY play areas, and replace any lost (Alexandria) Open space at a ratio greater than the amount of</p>

		<p>lost park land/open space. In other words, make Alexandria "more than whole." G Gina Baum, Park and Recreation Commissioner</p>
<p>5/6/15 by email</p>	<p>Poul Hertel, 3716 Carriage House Court Alexandria, VA, 22309 703 780 1909</p>	<p>Dear Ms. Deshield and Ms. Znidersic Please find attached my comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. They do include the History of the George Washington Memorial Parkway because of the important role it played in the History of Alexandria.</p> <p>Dear Co-Chair Akins and members of the Park and Recreation Commission The George Washington Memorial Parkway, is not a neglected stepchild, but rather the impetus for the entire Historic District, and by inference, it is responsible for Alexandria's place on the tourist maps. It inculcates a heritage that warrants sharing with the world, as people from all over the globe make a pilgrimage from Washington D.C. to Mount Vernon to pay their respects to the Father of this Country. The Parkway also represents a trust placed on the City by the Federal Government that it would maintain the highway for the purpose and dignity it was envisioned to convey.</p> <p>The George Washington Memorial Parkway is one of the finest federal parks in the Unites States, it uniquely intersperses the beauty of DC with the marvels of nature. It is also the reason we have the Old Town historic district, which was created in 1946 to protect the integrity and purpose of the parkway. Furthermore, the designers wanted to create a magnificent entranceway into the City, and put in easements to achieve it. Every guest who has visited us has remarked on the beauty of this entranceway into Alexandria.</p> <p>Option B is clearly visible from the Parkway, and it will largely extinguish the special entrance, especially with the 500 ft. very high bridge that runs practically parallel to the Parkway. The Park Service entered into an agreement (under significant political pressure) and while Fixing up Dangerfield Island is laudable, it is not part of the purpose of the George Washington Memorial Highway, and in no way compensates for the degradation of the parkway that will transpire. Furthermore, the notion that option A is as visible and obtrusive to the parkway is absurd.</p> <p>The argument for option B, (that because of its enhanced proximity it will create density) is tautological, since the density is allowed only if they get option b. From the Target store, the difference between stations A and B is only 500ft. Option B is actually more than ½-mile from the center of the area of the additional density that is provided if you choose option B. Then suddenly, the ¼-mile rule is no longer as weighty.</p> <p>Option B is currently expected to cost the City \$13.9 million a year, or \$5.1 million more than option A. However, the studies did not incorporate any value for the loss of scenic vistas.. Also (and more acutely), the EIS should have included the cost of losing the Potomac Yard Shopping Center, which is approximately \$14 Million in sales revenue every year. Taking this cost into consideration raises the</p>

		<p>annual costs of option B to over \$28 million per year. Finally, the developer has expressed not only the desire to redo the whole plan, but also to pay a lot less than expected if he does get option B. Therefore, does it make sense for Alexandria to incur greater risk, pay higher debt servicing costs, and to destroy its cultural and scenic heritage? And to do so for a distance that is less than a short walk across the street to the Alexandria Courthouse from City Hall?No.</p> <p>Sincerely Poul Hertel</p>