

**KING/BEAUREGARD INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT
CITIZEN INFORMATION MEETING
MAY 31, 2007
COMMENT/RESPONSE**

Have you conducted any noise level studies? Can they be made available to the public?

The VDOT Air and Noise Section has determined that a noise study is not required for this project.

Can sound reducing materials be used in the resurfacing of King Street to reduce traffic noise for side residential communities?

No noise impacts are expected from the project. We will investigate the different types of sound reducing road surfaces to see the feasibility of incorporating them into the project.

Why not extend the sidewalk from South 28th Street to 30th Street?

The City is exploring the possibility of extending the sidewalk on King Street, but it is not currently part of the proposed project scope and outside the proposed project budget.

Can King Street between I-395 and Beauregard/Walter Reed Drive be made a "no thru truck" zone? Have truck traffic on Seminary/Beauregard use the left turn lanes installed on Beauregard & King.

King Street is designated as a major arterial roadway connecting to an interstate highway. Restricting truck traffic would force trucks onto smaller, less appropriate roadways.

Upgraded traffic signals on mast arms and new pedestrian signals can be installed now and improve safety immediately.

If installed now, new traffic signal poles and pedestrian signals would only be in use for approximately two years before being relocated or removed as part of the project construction. This would add considerable cost and additional disruption to the project.

Signal timing plans can be implemented now and ease traffic considerably. Timing technology is available and has been available to install not only along that stretch of King Street but all the main arteries in Alexandria. Between the intersection of King Street and Beauregard and the entrance ramp onto I-395 there are six traffic signals all unsynchronized.

Signal timing only helps manage the existing traffic congestion and does not achieve the improved roadway capacity necessary for the intersection. These traffic signals are already synchronized by the City's traffic signal computer. Unfortunately, synchronizing traffic signals has limitations. When the traffic volume on a roadway exceeds that roadways capacity, improving signal timing cannot eliminate the resulting congestion. The problem at the King/Beauregard intersection is that there is simply too much traffic for the existing intersection to accommodate.

Signal synchronization from George Mason thru to 395 would probably be the single most effective traffic management tool.

The traffic signals have already been synchronized from George Mason thru to 395. Unfortunately, the roadway is too saturated for traffic signal synchronization to be effective at eliminating the resulting congestion.

Upgrades and signal timing plans would be far more economically feasible than an \$11 million project.

Many of the improvements and costs for the project are pedestrian, bicycle and safety related. The traffic signals along King Street are already synchronized through the City's traffic control computer. This area has already reached the limitations of what can be accomplished through synchronization alone.

How do you plan to reroute traffic during the construction phase?

As with most infrastructure projects, the Maintenance of Traffic Plan for construction is under development. The traffic will remain on King Street, Beauregard Street and Walter Reed Drive. No traffic lanes will be shut down during morning and evening rush hour.

Have you studied using drought tolerant or native landscaping that requires little or no water? If it is not drought tolerant, or native, it could be money wasted as the trees and vegetation die and replanting is required.

The project will use a variety of native/indigenous plantings that are horticulturally acclimatized to the Mid-Atlantic and Washington, DC National Capital Region. Use of indigenous plants reduces the necessity for application of chemical fertilizers and potable water once established, and reduces long-term maintenance requirements. Analysis of plant species, location, design and life-cycle maintenance are being integrated into the project development process in coordination with the City's Arborist and Landscape Architects.

Your web site refers to 10 foot wide multi use sidewalks, but the handout at the recent meeting refers to "6-ft. wide ADA-compliant sidewalks".

The project includes both 10-foot wide shared use paths and 6-foot wide sidewalks in different locations and for different reasons.

Wider "shared use paths" serve a transportation function by providing ample space for both pedestrians and bicyclists. Though occasionally confused with recreational trails such as the Mount Vernon Trail, a shared-use path in an urban environment such as the King-Beauregard intersection is intended to serve pedestrian and utilitarian bicycle travel (commuters and less-experienced bicyclists such as student bicyclists to schools who seek added separation from vehicular traffic). The added width of a shared use path provides ample space for different user groups. Shared use paths are not always intended solely as recreational facilities, although the paths at this intersection will connect to existing trails in Arlington County. Shared use paths may be asphalt, concrete, pavers or some combination. Although shared-use paths are intended to provide an off-street connection for bicyclists, more experienced bicyclists may continue to ride in the street as they legally have the right to do. A 6-foot wide sidewalk is a minimum standard in the City of Alexandria. A sidewalk of this width accomplishes the goals of the Americans with Disabilities Act by providing ample space for users with mobility impairments but it does

not provide ample space for other users such as bicyclists. In these locations, bicyclists are expected to ride on street.

The 10-foot-wide shared use paths will be located between Walter Reed Drive and 28th Street on King Street, along Beauregard Street and on the west side of Walter Reed Drive. The paths are proposed for these locations because they provide important regional connections for pedestrians and bicyclists to activity centers such as Northern Virginia Community College and fill in "missing links" to major shared use facilities such as Four Mile Run and the W&OD Trail.

The 6-foot wide sidewalks will be located on King Street between Chesterfield Drive and Beauregard Street. In these locations, sidewalks are intended for pedestrians only and bicyclists will be accommodated in the vehicular travelways with wider outside lanes.

In the project planning phase, planners consulted existing documents such as the Northern Virginia Regional Bikeways Plan and the City of Alexandria Bicycle Plan. Each of these plans recommends shared use paths in the locations shown to improve cross-jurisdictional, multimodal transportation connections in the region.

Why is the median barrier being placed in the roadway? Why does it get widened as it gets to the entrance to the Beauregard Medical center?

The median barrier provides improved safety and traffic flow. The median is minimized in width and only widened at the beginning to provide a taper for the double left turn lanes, to align the thru traffic lanes and to provide a barrier between the left turn lane from southbound Beauregard Street to the Beauregard Medical Center.

I have seen very few bicycles at this intersection, and I feel the bicycle trail is really unnecessary.

The 10-foot wide shared use paths on King Street and Beauregard Street are intended for utilitarian (transportation) use by pedestrians and bicycles. Although the technical term for such a facility is a "shared use path," it should not be confused with a recreational bicycle facility such as the Mount Vernon Trail. The paths are intended for utilitarian use by less experienced bicyclists and provide an important alternative to on-road (in mixed traffic) bicycle facilities. The shared use paths will provide immediate connection to the W&OD Trail in Arlington and are part of the City's long-term plans to improve pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure citywide.

Explain how the new construction would lead to increased traffic capacity on Beauregard St. or anywhere else.

The proposed medians would allow left turns and u-turns only at signalized and unsignalized left turn lanes. Cars accessing the businesses and residences by left turn movements would not block thru traffic as they do today, allowing increased thru traffic flow. This project will lead to increased capacity on Beauregard by allowing the signal to give more green light time to Beauregard. The additional King Street left turn lanes will allow the signal to shorten the green time for the turns and give that extra time to the thru movements on Beauregard, thus, improving the capacity on Beauregard St.

If a longer left turn lane is needed in this vicinity it is at Braddock Rd. One could wait for 3 or 4 light cycles to turn here. In the meantime traffic backs up on southbound Beauregard.

Braddock Road is outside the scope of this project. However, staff will evaluate the Braddock Road left turns to see if signal timing adjustments can eliminate this problem.

Rush hour traffic is backed up on King St in both directions, because drivers are interested in continuing either east or west, not because they cannot turn onto Beauregard or Walter Reed.

The added left turn lanes onto Beauregard Street and Walter Reed Drive will reduce the left turn signal cycle length, thus providing a longer cycle for thru traffic.

Is a traffic signal proposed for Larchmont apartments?

No signal is proposed at the entrance because it doesn't meet warrants. Any new trees will be placed to not interfere with sight distances along the project entirety.

Overall, we felt that your plan was an incredible improvement to the original overpass plan. As the owner of a home on the corner of Walter Reed and King, I would love to see the whole intersection beautified with trees and other natural materials. But with regards to congestion on King and the impact your plan could have for Dinwiddie, we do have a few concerns that we would like to share:

The elimination of the slip lane connecting King and Walter Reed may actually increase congestion. Currently, people driving in the right lane move efficiently because those who are behind cars making a right turn do not have to stop to wait for the car to finish its turn. Your proposal would effectively create a “start/stop” situation in the right hand lane. This could cause a decrease in the number of cars traveling during the green light, hence increase congestion. I understand your desire to increase pedestrian safety, and eliminating the slip lane would do just that. But is there another way to do it that would eliminate the potential increase in congestion? I would suggest that you keep the slip lane, but you make it a “No Turn on Red” lane, there by providing pedestrian a 30 second window to cross the street.

The elimination of the right turn slip lane will minimally effect thru traffic. The proposed right turn radius is similar to the existing right turn radius and thus a vehicle can negotiate the turn at the same speed. The improvements at this intersection are designed to strike a balance between improvements to vehicular traffic flow and pedestrian safety improvements.

Another reason to reconsider the slip lane, yesterday I witnessed an accident on King as I was making a left turn onto Walter Reed. A truck stopped at the Red Light on King and a red car smashed into the back of it. The accident shut down the right hand lane of King for 40 min. Because there was a slip lane, those who wanted to make a right onto Walter Reed could. The rest had to make their way around the accident using the left lane. Now if that accident happened without the slip lane, all cars would merge left and those who wanted to make a right would have to do so around the damaged cars – which isn't safe to do.

That is a special situation that could have easily been further back and blocked the slip lane.

Currently, motorists who want to make a left turn onto Walter Reed and see back-up make a left turn on Chesterfield and proceed down Dinwiddie to reach Walter Reed. Some motorists are doing this even if there isn't back-up as they like the short cut. Chesterfield and Dinwiddie are residential streets with 25MPH speed limits. These "short-cutters" are moving fast down our neighborhood streets causing congestion and a huge safety hazard for our children. Your proposal to have two left turn lanes on King is great, but your people have suggested that by increasing the lanes by one, you would decrease the time of the left turn signal. Based on the number of people making a left, and I am one of those people, this will do little to ease congestion on King. I would recommend increasing the time of the left signal to over lap with the green light and making the inner left turn lane a left/straight lane. This should make traffic run smoother and produce less congestion. Also, I would recommend reducing the time of the left signal light on Chesterfield. This should influence more people to use the King/Walter Reed intersection.

The decrease in the left turn cycle would happen by vehicles using both lanes and moving thru the King / Walter Reed intersection quicker. More cars will actually be able to get thru the left turn cycle. These proposed improvements should minimize the cut-through traffic on residential streets.

There is a concern that the three foot walk ways that you are proposing will be too small, especially for the Sr. Citizens living in the neighborhood. Also, who will ensure that these walkways are free of debris and snow?

The sidewalks will be 6 feet wide and the shared use trails will be 10 feet wide.

The City Code states that each property owner must keep the sidewalk clean along the frontage of their property.

Claremont currently experiences an increase of non-residents parking in our neighborhood streets. 25th Street is packed on the weekends. By taking away parts of Wachovia and 5 Guys, we are concerned that Claremont will become over burdened with non-resident parking.

No parking spots will be removed from the Wachovia lot. The Five Guys lot will be reconfigured and is far enough away from 25th Street that it should not impact parking along 25th Street.

There are 2-3 major construction projects in the vicinity of King/Beauregard that will have a negative impact on traffic flow. We are concerned that your project, if performed at the same time, will only make matters worse. We encourage you to review the construction in Arlington, Fairfax, and Alexandria and push back your schedule if needed. Claremont would suffer during construction.

We will take this under consideration.

We are concerned that Claremont would suffer during the King Street reconstruction. Can you present to us your plan for construction that will ensure that Dinwiddie won't

experience an increase burden? We have talked to Jeff Sikes of Arlington about this as well.

The Maintenance of Traffic Plan is under development. It is being proposed that the traffic will remain on King Street, Beauregard Street and Walter Reed Drive during construction. No traffic lanes will be closed during morning and evening rush hour. All bus routes will remain as they are.

We recommend that you coordinate your efforts with METRO Bus and VA Bus and work with them to install a few more bus stops around the intersection and coordinate schedules to better fit the needs of travelers. IF your goal is to decrease congestion one way to do it is to push more people to public transportation.

Additional bus stops or relocated bus stops will be evaluated to better serve the residents. The City is coordinating with Metro and DASH.

Finally, please reconsider some of the raised medians as they will create more congestion and could potentially create a negative situation for Claremont. For example, if you are traveling from Skyline and want to go to Taco Bell or Wachovia, you would need to turn left on Walter Reed and make an illegal U-turn or make a left on Dinwiddie and left on 25th Street (only to find there is no way to cut through...so now I can watch a succession of cars making a 3-point turn in front of my house – or even worse double parking on my street to run their errands). The same goes for Beauregard.

The proposed medians would allow left turns and u-turns only at signalized and unsignalized left turn lanes. Cars accessing the businesses and residences would not block thru traffic, allowing increased thru traffic flow. Cars will be allowed to make a u-turn at the Walter Reed Drive left turn lane to access the businesses to the North of King Street and 25th Street.

There are five types of roadways within the City. The roadways are classified as: Expressways, Arterials, Primary Collectors, Residential Collectors and Local roadways. King Street, Beauregard Street and Walter Reed Drive are classified as arterial roadways. Arterials carry large traffic volumes within and through urban areas. Dinwiddie Street and 25th Street are residential collectors which carry a limited amount of local through traffic and provide access to residences, businesses and other adjoining properties.

Overall, I think the design of this project is a great improvement over the proposed overpass of 1997-1998. In my opinion, the best parts of the current design:

---- Boulevards that separate oncoming traffic. Cars really should not be allowed to turn left to get into and out of those businesses. It creates a safety nightmare. You may want to consider the option of letting people do U turns further up the road.

---- The removal of the red light at the old Jefferson Memorial Hospital building... this is something residents in our neighborhood have wanted for years. It is a traffic hazard...and it really messes up the flow of traffic.

The removal of the easy right onto Beauregard in front of the Arlington condominiums. As a pedestrian, I've always thought that it encouraged cars to drive faster. You don't need that type of highway merge on a city street. I love your proposed landscaping ideas for that area.

Areas of concern... I'm not sure that you really need two left turn lanes in each direction on King Street to turn left onto Beauregard. I drive through that intersection 4 times every day...Monday thru Friday. Even during the busiest times of day..lunch time and rush hour, I don't see that there is a big back up for left turns onto Beauregard. Maybe instead of widening King Street more to have those 2 left turn lanes.. You could simply make the left turn lane longer in each direction.... With the added boulevard separating oncoming traffic and the elimination of the Jefferson Building red light, you won't have the complications of folks turning left in and out of those businesses.

The additional left turn lanes will reduce the left turn cycle length and allow longer thru lane cycles on King Street. The left turn lanes cannot be lengthened because of the abutting left turn lanes at the Summit Center intersection and at the 28th Street intersection.

Also, though I love the trees and landscaping and the added bike/sidewalk areas. I'm not sure that they are needed on both sides of the road. Perhaps just one side of the road. This would help our neighbors at Bolling Brook Condominiums... not to have the proposed project directly on their front lawn.

Since the enlarged walks are being installed because of safety concerns for pedestrians and bicyclists, could you explain why is more important for the walks to be wider on Beauregard St. than on King St? There is certainly is more traffic on King St. than there is on Beauregard.

The 10 foot wide shared use sidewalks will be between Walter Reed Drive and 28th Street on King Street, along Beauregard Street and on the West side of Walter Reed Drive to accommodate pedestrians and bicyclists. The sidewalks on the western portion of the King Street (Chesterfield to Beauregard) are six feet wide to accommodate pedestrians.

The name of the owner of the building that is listed on all of your maps is not "Lazlo Tauber". There are three suites and three owners: Beauregard Associates, Beauregard Medical Center and Dr. Muhammad Ali.

Our records indicate Lazlo Tauber Trust owns the land. The owner of the building may be different.

You say you have been working on this project for 10 plus years. We only found out about it six weeks ago from a neighbor.

The project has been in conceptual development for over ten years. There have been a number of public meetings over the span of the project.

In the handout under "right of way" it says that no businesses will be displaced. We beg to differ with that statement. If you cut our parking lot in literally half, our 300 patients a day will have no parking facilities. It would not take very long for us to lose our

business. The strip shopping center will be out of business as the plan stands at the moment.

We strive to not displace businesses, however, the impact to properties will be determined more definitively during the right-of-way acquisition phase of the project. The property owners will be compensated for any impacts in accordance with state and federal requirements.

The actual design of Beauregard Street in your proposed plan can only be described as a deathtrap”. With the half of Larchmont Village resident to go south on Beauregard Street and then make a u-turn where our patients would be entering and exiting and also where the other Larchmont exit would also be entering on to Beauregard.

You have taken one of our entrances away, so our patients that went in the first entrance would now be added to the traffic going south where the u-turn is suggested. Also don't forget the residents of Larchmont that are coming home from places. If they are coming from the south, it was suggested by one of your people at the meeting that they continue north and make a u turn at the light at King Street.

I got the definite impression that this plan was to take care of the pedestrians and cyclist. Most of the people at the bus stop come from Larchmont Village which is across the street. The multi use path is not going to do anything for them. They actually will be crossing where the u-turn is proposed. The only other residents that walk to the bus stop come down an existing walkway to reach the bus stop. The new multiuse path will not benefit them. So the only people it will help is the cyclists. In my 25 years working at Beauregard Medical Center, I can count on one hand the number of cyclists that pass by our building. Since the pathway only starts there, I don't think it will attract any new cyclists in the future. Can the City afford to take on liability for all the accidents that this design could cause both to autos and pedestrians and new cyclists?

Solution:

Leave Beauregard Street alone. Go ahead with your project on King Street. Other than people objecting to planting trees, I did not hear much objection to that part of the project.

I would like to know when did the so called improvements to Beauregard Street get added to your study.

The Virginia Department of Transportation initiates all highway construction projects with the presumption that projects will accommodate pedestrians and bicyclists. The shared use paths on King Street and Beauregard are intended for utilitarian (transportation) use by pedestrians and bicycles. Although the technical term for such a facility is a “shared use path,” it should not be confused with a recreational facility such as the Mount Vernon Trail.

Beauregard is in the City's existing Bicycle Master Plan and the VDOT Regional Bikeways plan because it provides an important connection between the Northern Virginia Community College and the nearby W&OD Trail. The improvements in this project are a balance between vehicular traffic flow and pedestrian safety improvements.

I am a physician in the Beauregard Medical Center. I have been looking out at the King Street/Beauregard Street intersection from my office window every day for the past

twenty-five years. From my observation, I feel that the proposed changes will reduce safety, increase traffic, and increase congestion, (i.e., pedestrian and bicycle.)

Under the new design there will be a median barrier which will cut off left turns to and from the Beauregard Medical Center's main entrance and the Larchmont Village Apartment's main entrance. That would affect a large number of patients and residents who will not be able to make left turns, and which will necessitate U-turns. I might add that most patients who come to our office must make left turns to leave, and most residents in Larchmont Village across the street must make left turns to go toward Washington, DC to work. The only left turn into our office will be a secondary entrance, which is a much more difficult left turn because the visibility is limited due to a curve in the road and a line of trees. It would seem to me that these conditions make safety worse and also slow down traffic, making it more congested rather than less.

The main entrance to Larchmont Village Apartments will be re-evaluated to see if a median opening and left turn lane would better serve the entrance. The main entrance to the Beauregard Medical Center is too close to the King Street intersection to provide a left turn from southbound Beauregard Street. The median closure on Beauregard Street across from the Beauregard Medical Center is being proposed to improve traffic flow and safety. Although closing the median will inconvenience some of the Medical Center's patients, these patients will still have options. From King Street they will be able to either use North Hampton Street or Dawes Avenue to travel west back towards Seminary Road. Overall, the benefits of closing the median outweigh the inconveniences.

The addition of bicycle trails on both sides of Beauregard will likewise result in hampering traffic flow. Presently very few bicycles travel down Beauregard on sidewalks or in the street. However, a few folks walk down either side of Beauregard, some of whom are elderly and come from the nursing home further up the street. The bicycle traffic will increase on both sides of the street and be an additional hazard to the folks now walking there. The bicycle trails continue over Route 7 on to Walter Reed Drive on both sides of the street. The bicycles will have to cross this busy intersection plus the newly constructed turn lane, making for additional congestion and hazard. As far as the bicycle trails are concerned, they start at the middle of Beauregard and go to the middle of Walter Reed Drive, not continuing to any other bicycle path. Hence, they feed into the intersection in question from both sides. This will increase the numbers of pedestrians on the street, where walkers and bicycles are presently few and far between.

To summarize, at the present time I believe the plan in question will aggravate the traffic problems at the intersection of Route 7 and Beauregard, while at the same time making life much more difficult for the local residential and commercial properties.

The 10-foot wide shared use paths will be designed to minimize conflict between pedestrians and bicyclists. Bicyclists may legally cross at roadway intersections in pedestrian crosswalks. The shared use path on the west side of Beauregard will connect to a shared use path on Walter Reed Street in Arlington which continues to Four Mile Run Park and the W&OD Trail. The proposed pedestrian improvements at the King/Beauregard intersection will make crossing this intersection much safer for both pedestrians and bicyclists.

Would you be kind enough to inform me of the various sources of the eleven million dollars?

The project funding is through Federal, State and City dollars.

On page 1 of your handout, you state that the King St. Beauregard intersection operates at an unacceptable level of service. You also go on to state that the improvements will result in a more operationally efficient and safer intersection for pedestrians and motorists. Nowhere do you explain how any of your proposals are going to move 20,000 more cars a day through your proposed maze.

The future traffic projections are for 3,000 to 5,000 more vehicles by 2020 depending on the approach to the intersection. The proposed medians will reduce delays by prohibiting left turns on thru lanes. The roadways leading to this intersection are, at this time, too constricted to permit a 20,000 vehicle per day increase in traffic. This scale of increase would require considerable roadway improvements that are not likely to happen because of right-of-way constraints.

The proposed additional left turn lanes will increase the capacity of this intersection so that it can better accommodate future traffic increases. Providing the extra turn lanes will allow left turning traffic to flow through the intersection at a faster rate.

Consequently, the traffic signal will be able to give more green time to the through movements. Thus, increasing the capacity of the intersection.

You propose a raised median and two left hand turn lanes on King Street that will lead traffic into Beauregard St and Walter Reed Drive. Where will all of this increased traffic go? The answer is “nowhere”. It will continue to pile up at Braddock Rd. and Seminary Rd. The only difference may be that there will be more cars sitting at traffic lights on Beauregard than before, which can lead to more rear end collisions and road rage.

Most of the increased traffic will remain on King Street. Traffic on Beauregard Street and Walter Reed Drive will increase slightly with or without the proposed improvements because of the overall growth of the area.

You talk about new traffic lights on mast arms and new pedestrian signals as well as upgraded street lighting, which can all be done at the present intersection with hardly lifting a spade. You fail to tell us how this will promote a better flow of cars and trucks.

The new traffic and pedestrian signals will be more visible and include countdown pedestrian signals, these items are for safety improvements. The proposed medians would allow left turns and u-turns only at signalized and unsignalized left turn lanes. Cars accessing the businesses and residences would not block thru traffic, allowing increased thru traffic flow.

When representatives at the meeting were asked about the proposed-median-on Beauregard St. and its subsequent blocking of the ability of the resident of the Larchmont Apartment resident to make a left turn to go north toward Arlington, we were told that hey could turn right, go south and then make a U- turn. Can you call this traffic safety? When asked about how diners at TGIF would get to the restaurant I was told that they would have to find another entrance.

Even more interesting to me is the question of how fire trucks and other emergency vehicles going north on Beauregard St. would gain access into Larchmont apartments and TGIF. The way I see it they would have to make a left turn onto King St., go up to Wendy's restaurant, then make a left into the shopping mall and try to negotiate the narrow path through the mall. Has the Alexandria Fire Chief and EMS signed off on these plans. Your representatives also suggested that the residents of Larchmont who are driving north on Beauregard and who would now be blocked from turning left into their homes could go to the corner of Beauregard and King and make a U-turn to come back south. Will that help promote pedestrian and motorist safety?

The median closure on northbound Beauregard Street across from Larchmont is being proposed to improve traffic flow and safety. Although closing the median will inconvenience some of the Larchmont residents and restaurant patrons, this closure will benefit tens of thousands of motorists everyday by improving the operational efficiency of the intersection. Larchmont residents have other options to access this parking lot. From Seminary Road they can either take Dawes Avenue or North Hampton Drive to King Street and approach the driveway from the north. This project should not appreciably affect Emergency vehicle access to Larchmont Apartments. There are a number of emergency response routes that can be used depending on where they originate from. Project staff is coordinating with the Fire Department to ensure that there is good emergency access.

Now let us discuss the new buffer and mixed use sidewalks that are proposed for both sides of Beauregard St. How safe are the present sidewalks? Have there been any accidents on these that could or would have been prevented by this buffer and wide walk. No one could give me an answer, because there are no recorded statistics on this matter. In fact, no one in your group has any idea how many pedestrians or bicycles a day use this sidewalk. They have no idea how many people a day cross either Beauregard St. or King St. at the corner. Your advisors are also unable to explain how eliminating the slip lanes will lessen congestion on King St. It will only add to the back up of traffic wanting to make right hand turns onto Beauregard and Walter Reed.

The buffer area between the sidewalk and the road are for landscaping as well as pedestrian safety. The shared use paths are part of a long term plan to provide for bicycle travel along Beauregard Street. The right turn slip lanes are being eliminated because they present a hazard to pedestrians crossing them. Drivers negotiating the slip lanes are traveling at higher speeds and turning their heads far to the left to look for oncoming traffic. These conditions make it more difficult for drivers to see pedestrians crossing the slip lanes.

I am a physician employed by the medical center and part owner of the-Beauregard Medical Center also a partner in the Beauregard Associates. The proposed median strip and the widened sidewalks would present great hardship to the two thousand patients a week that are seen in this building The temporary and permanent loss of level parking would force handicapped and elderly people to use stairs and/or climb hills, all of this being the result of the proposed construction of a useless and hazardous landscaped median strip.

We feel that you have failed to evaluate the fate of these people, while at the same time you express concern about the safety and convenience of an unknown number of pedestrians and bike riders.

I suggest that you put the well-being and access to medical care of the citizens of the surrounding area ahead of landscaping, buffer zones, bicycle paths and a useless median strip.

The Virginia Department of Transportation initiates all highway construction projects with the presumption that each project will accommodate pedestrians and bicyclists. The 10-foot-wide shared use paths on King Street and Beauregard are intended for utilitarian (transportation) use by pedestrians and bicycles. They are, in fact, not as wide as some sidewalks on other streets in the City.

Although the technical term for such a facility is a “shared use path” and the facility will be designed for use by pedestrians and bicyclists, it should not be confused with a recreational bicycle facility such as the Mount Vernon Trail. The paths will provide an important alternative to on-road (in mixed traffic) bicycle facilities. The City believes that through proper design, the negative impacts to the medical center can be minimized. The median closure on Beauregard Street across from the Beauregard Medical Center is being proposed to improve traffic flow and safety. Although closing the median will inconvenience some of the medical center's patients, these patients will still have options. From King Street they will be able to either use North Hampton Street or Dawes Avenue to travel west back towards Seminary Road. Overall, the benefits of closing the median outweigh the inconveniences.

The recently proposed Project, at least insofar as it involves modifications to North Beauregard Street, will materially disrupt the operation of the Medical Center and bears the real potential of forcing the closure of my clients' medical practices as a result of (i) the proposed temporary and permanent parking loss at the Medical Center and (ii) the significant impairment of vehicular ingress and egress to and from the Medical Center. It should also be noted that the Project construction activities in the immediate vicinity of the Medical Center are likely to affect my clients' respiratory allergy patients (e.g. dust, air borne debris).

With respect to parking, the Project plans reflect a construction easement involving all of the parking at the front entrance to the Medical Center. Following completion of the Project, the Project plans appear to reflect the loss of approximately one-half of the parking spaces in front of the Medical Center. The parking in front of the Medical Center is used by my clients' patients as well as the patients of another medical practice that operates in the building. Loss of parking at the front of the Medical Center will impose a significant burden on patients due to either no or reduced access to the main entrance to the Medical Center which is at the front of the building. While the building does contain parking spaces on the second and third floors, the parking in the building is serviced only by stairs and hence is not accessible to many patients and is therefore used exclusively by my clients' staff and the staff of the other medical practice which owns a condominium unit in the building. The parking along the south side of the Medical Center is not available to and is not used by the medical practices within the Medical Center.

With respect to vehicular access, the proposed new median on North Beauregard will eliminate one of the Medical Center's two left turn in / left turn out access points for

southbound Beauregard traffic. Additionally, the elimination of left turn egress for the Larchmont Apartments' residents will no doubt result in significant "U-turn" activity at the Beauregard median cut across from the south driveway entrance to the Medical Center for residents seeking to proceed northbound on Beauregard.

It appears from the current Project plans that the primary reason for the loss of parking at the Medical Center is a result of the inclusion of two ten foot wide shared use paths on both sides of Beauregard. The reason for the inclusion of these paths on both sides of Beauregard is not clear and certainly not understood. Bicycle traffic along Beauregard is negligible, at best, and there appear to be no known vehicular accidents involving pedestrians on the Beauregard sidewalks. Indeed, the inclusion of shared use paths involving pedestrians and bicycles, when coupled with construction of a new median limiting left turns and forcing "U-turns", may well increase the danger to pedestrians, cyclists and motorists as a result of the concentrated ingress and egress activity at the Medical Center's south driveway entrance.

In short, the perceived benefits of the Project improvements to Beauregard appear to be based on theory and assumptions concerning bicycle usage, pedestrian safety and traffic flow, while the negative impact on the Medical Center will be tangible, measurable and significant.

The Virginia Department of Transportation initiates all highway construction projects with the presumption that each project will accommodate pedestrians and bicyclists. The 10-foot-wide paths on King Street and Beauregard are intended for utilitarian (transportation) use by pedestrians and bicycles. Although the technical term for such a facility is a "shared use path," it should not be confused with a recreational facility such as the Mount Vernon Trail.

Reducing the width of the shared use paths to 6 feet or less and re-classifying them as sidewalks (pedestrian use only) would require the City to add on-street bicycle facilities (5' bicycle lanes) on each side of the roadway to accommodate bicyclists. As stated above, it is VDOT policy to accommodate bicycles and pedestrians in highway projects.

The 10' side paths on both King and Beauregard are a safer and more practical solution than on-road bicycle facilities and will also improve pedestrian safety.

The side-paths also allow the overall cross section of Beauregard to be narrower than it would be with 8' sidewalks, 6' landscaping buffers and 5' bicycle lanes on both sides of the street.

Safely accommodating pedestrians and bicycles is important on Beauregard, which is in the City's existing Bicycle Master Plan and the VDOT Regional Bikeways plan. Beauregard provides an important connection between Northern Virginia Community College and the nearby W&OD Trail.

I am a geriatrician working with Beauregard Medical Center. Some of my patients are old and frail and require a lot of assistance with mobility. I am concerned about the proposed changes. The changes in traffic pattern on Beauregard Street and the construction equipment in our parking lot for the next three to four years would present quite a problem for these folks. I am opposed to the changes to the Beauregard Street part of the project.

The construction will take approximately two years and the parking lot will not be used to store construction equipment. The parking lot will remain in use and be reconstructed in phases.

To improve pedestrian and vehicular traffic safety encourage the Dutch Cleaner property owner to consider buying north Hampton condominium sliver of property (adjacent). The consolidation would permit moving the current cleaner driveway off King Street onto Northampton and further away from the intersection a much safer condition for vehicles and pedestrians. Possibly the cleaner access could be moved further (200 ft) from the King/N'hampton intersection if Alexandria granted an easement across the Health facility property.

The Dutch Cleaner entrance will remain near the current location. Moving the entrance up Northampton Drive is not within the scope of this project.

We would like to see a strong focus on pedestrian safety (it is in your plan, we just want to emphasize this);

Pedestrian safety is one of the most important aspects of this project. Pedestrian countdown signals, high visibility crosswalks, wider sidewalks, and a wider buffer area between the roadway and the sidewalk will make this section of road much safer for pedestrians and bicycles.

We would like you to review flow of traffic to make sure your plan corrects all issues.

The existing and future traffic flows at this intersection were already reviewed and incorporated into the design of this project. The proposed plan addresses the issues as best as possible considering the existing right-of-way and topographical constraints.

We would like to see an independent third party review your plan and we would like to see their comments published for public consumption.

VDOT will review these plans as well as the City of Alexandria.

We would like to see the 3rd lane be extended to Dawes.

A third westbound thru lane would severely impact the adjacent properties and is out of the scope of the project.

We are concerned that the right turn onto Walter Reed is too tight for the 7C bus.

The right turn onto Walter Reed Drive has been designed to allow a Metrobus to negotiate the turn.

We would like to see a re-sync of all lights to optimize flow of traffic.

The traffic signals from the Fairfax County line to I-395 will be re-synchronized to optimize the flow of traffic.