

COMMENTS ON DOCKET ITEM #6 - proposed new TMP Ordinance
CITY COUNCIL PUBLIC HEARING
February 22, 2014

From Stonegate Foundation HOA, located at Kirkpatrick, Kell, and Kinsey Lanes, off of N. Hampton Rd. Alexandria, VA.

I spoke at the last Public Hearing on this in December 4, 2013, on behalf of the Stonegate Foundation HOA and resubmitted some of these comments to the Planning Commission in writing in early February. I am out of the state for medical reasons and wish these comments to be taken into consideration for the Feb. 22, 2014 public hearing on this matter.

We are opposed to the new ordinance for the TMP only to the extent that it is overly broad and is now intending to encompass any size community, no matter how small (12 units) and imposing what is in effect a tax to attempt to force people to use public transportation. Not everybody is located in areas where they can use it effectively and this Ordinance has not and cannot change that. Moreover, some communities, like ours, have had a TMP for 19 years and even if we give away passes for metro, the TMP PROGRAM HAS NOT CHANGED A SINGLE PERSON'S DRIVING HABITS.

Our recommendation is that the new Ordinance include an "out" for communities that repeatedly demonstrate that the TMP Funds are incapable of changing driving habits in that particular community due to its demographics, its size, and its location relative to public transportation hubs.

How the TMP Program can adversely affect smaller communities not located near a Metro.

Stonegate Foundation is only 76 units, and yet, because of our SUP, granted by the City in the 1980's before we were even built, our tiny community was included in a Transportation Management Plan. The developer, Pulte, originally owned a huge tract that ultimately was subdivided into five separately owned and developed properties, under the one SUP, prior to construction. Despite this subdivision, we were never taken out of the requirement for a TMP. Had the SUP anticipated the future subdivision, we would never have been subject to the requirement because the current ordinance only applies to developments with 250+ units.

In other words, developers forced us into the TMP without knowing how their acreage would ultimately be subdivided before they began to build (in 1994), and without knowing the demographics of the people who ultimately would live there. This will continue to be an issue for new SUPs under the proposed Ordinance.

Nevertheless, we do have a TMP and we actively sell discounted Metrofare tickets to our residents. But hardly any choose to participate. The TMP does not work for us, although we put money into the plan each year. Even when we gave out Metropasses for free, it never changed even one person's commuting habits. Only 4 of our residents regularly use public transportation for commuting. Two of those received benefits from their employers and don't need our plan. One doesn't drive and has always ridden the bus, whether we have a TMP plan or not. One of them is a tenant who regularly uses the program, because they save \$100's per year, all paid for by their neighbors. These residents would have taken bus/subway to work anyway.

In essence, 76 homes are paying for two neighbors to go to work, year after year. A few of us use the TMP funds to subsidize our use of Metro for occasional trips downtown, but we would have used metro anyway, and each home is required to pay \$90 a year into this fund. Most can't even USE the TMP discounts because of where and when they travel. Stonegate Foundation's tiny budget is now required to spend over 8% a year on a TMP that does not accomplish the goals intended. Our studies have proven this and we report it to the City TMP manager each year.

Throwing more money into this program is a waste and becomes an unfair tax on our residents, half of whom either are retired, work from home, or regularly travel to places not served by public transportation. We are not near a Metro stop. The busses do not run to our neighborhood with frequency. Only 5 for each rush hour. A commute to our neighborhood using metro and bus from downtown after 7 pm (when most of our workers are still working) takes 1 hour or more, when you can drive it safely in ten minutes. Many of our residents are professionals with irregular hours, with offices not near a metro, or who need their cars for work because they travel to multiple locations each day. The rest of us work from home or are retired.

Response to the City's Argument that we can "pool" our money with other communities or turn it over to the City.

At the last hearing I attended on Dec 4, Sandra Marks commented that if we pooled our money with other small TMPs, or turned it over to the City, our needs would be served. This is simply WRONG. There is no "shuttle" that can take people in 76 different directions at 76 different times. The City's assumption in making this statement misunderstands the needs of our west end residents, many of whom don't even commute.

Small communities should not be forced to give up tens of thousands of dollars by turning it over to the City to use for Bike events and other "transportation" related purposes by Pooling it. Most of us at Stonegate are over 50. While we do have a few folks biking to work, overall, we don't care about bike parking or going to a neighborhood ½ mile away to share a shuttle that might go to a metro stop that still puts us 45 minutes from our destination. It doesn't serve us because we are not near Metro and have no reason to go where Metro goes for the most part. Even if we wished to bike to a Metro station, like Braddock, there are no lock-up bike parking facilities there. Why doesn't the City focus on things like that?

Policy Considerations for your Consideration.

The way the TMP Ordinance is going to be rewritten, if passed without some consideration for exceptions, is blatantly unfair. It requires HOAs created with less than 100 units, to donate over \$6000 a year to fund a program that DOES NOT MINIMIZE TRAFFIC CONGESTION for our tiny neighborhood. The ordinance, as it operates for certain communities, does not further its policy goals.

Please understand, we are not against public transportation. We are against being required to put money into a fund and turn it over to the City if our money can't be used to accomplish the purposes intended. That becomes an unfair tax if we have to turn over unused funds to the City because the ordinance cannot achieve the goals intended.

Why not change the ordinance to include many other larger homeowner's associations, such as Fairlington and Park Fairfax, who are not required to be in a TMP, but are otherwise well served by frequent busses to the Metro at Pentagon? Do you realize that they are not required to be in a TMP because the ordinance did not get created until 1988?

Our tiny community does not create "congestion" that required this TMP. But these larger communities certainly do and they are exempt. The City council keeps approving overdevelopment of these other areas without first creating a transportation infrastructure. That is not our fault, nor should we be required to pay for it.

We are in an unusual situation due to our location and demographics, for which the policies behind the TMP ordinance simply do not work. We are not saying it is a bad idea for everybody, but we don't want to see the same problem imposed on future small communities in Alexandria.

Instead, we are communicating to you that if an HOA can demonstrate repeatedly, that throwing money into metropasses does not and cannot change people's commuting habits, when they are not served by an

adequate commuting infrastructure, then those communities should be given an exemption from the program. We do not want future small communities to be burdened by this program as we have.

Changing the ordinance to make it mandatory for nearly all associations, regardless of their size, without providing a release of some sort if the program can't work for them, must be considered before finalizing this Ordinance.

So, our recommendation is to consider the possibility that due to location, demographics, and small size (less than 100 units) a development should not be required to participate in the TMP programs because it operates instead as an unfair tax on the residents and does not accomplish the legislative intent of the ordinance. Some Exception should be crafted into the ordinance.

Thank you for your time.

Dina L. Biblin
President, Stonegate Foundation
Alexandria, VA
February 21, 2014

6
2-22-14

Jackie Henderson

From: Poul Hertel <poulh@erols.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 23, 2014 8:44 PM
To: Jackie Henderson
Subject: RE: item for docket item #6

RE: Text Amendment #2013-0009 Transportation Management Plans Public Hearing and Consideration of a text amendment to Section 11-700 of the Zoning Ordinance to establish new regulations regarding Transportation Management Plan Special Use Permits.

Dear Honorable Mayor and members of the City Council

This text amendment is proposing that resources from different TMP's be pooled and be placed at the disposition of City Staff. In order that the disposition of these funds are subject to public scrutiny in a manner similar to how individual TMP'S are currently reviewed. I request that the approval of the Transportation and Planning Commissions and the City Council be required prior to dispensing the pooled resources. The proposal will insure that public input and transparency are employed in the disposition of these funds.

Sincerely
Poul Hertel

From: Jackie Henderson [<mailto:Jackie.Henderson@alexandriava.gov>]
Sent: Saturday, February 22, 2014 10:43 AM
To: Poulh@erols.com
Subject: item for docket item #6

Hi Poul—

Could you please email me what you passed out for this docket item? There evidently weren't enough copies to make it down to me, and I'll need it for the record.

Thanks so much,

Jackie

Jackie Henderson

6
2-22-14

From: DLBiblin@comcast.net
Sent: Friday, February 21, 2014 8:10 PM
To: City Council; City Council Aides; Jackie Henderson; Community Relations
Subject: Call.Click.Connect. #46502: Mayor, Vice Mayor City Council For City Council Public Hearing on Feb.

Dear *Call.Click.Connect.* User

A request was just created using *Call.Click.Connect.* The request ID is 46502.

Request Details:

- Name: Dina Biblin
- Approximate Address: No Address Specified
- Phone Number: (703) 298-0068
- Email: DLBiblin@comcast.net
- Service Type: Mayor, Vice Mayor City Council
- Request Description: For City Council Public Hearing on Feb. 22, 2014, Docket Item #6 -- proposed new TMP Ordinance.
Please consider attached comments from Stonegate Foundation HOA.
- Attachment: <http://request.alexandriava.gov/GeoReport/UploadedFile.ashx/pdf/ac83be01-9a78-4e7c-9f90-fb35f2640359>
- Expected Response Date: Friday, February 28

Please take the necessary actions in responding, handling and/or updating this request at the [Call.Click.Connect. staff interface](#).

If you need assistance with handling this request, please contact CommunityRelations@alexandriava.gov or call 703.746.HELP.

This is an automated email notification of a *Call.Click.Connect.* request. Please do not reply to this email.

COMMENTS ON DOCKET ITEM #6 - proposed new TMP Ordinance
CITY COUNCIL PUBLIC HEARING
February 22, 2014

From Stonegate Foundation HOA, located at Kirkpatrick, Kell, and Kinsey Lanes, off of N. Hampton Rd. Alexandria, VA.

I spoke at the last Public Hearing on this in December 4, 2013, on behalf of the Stonegate Foundation HOA and resubmitted some of these comments to the Planning Commission in writing in early February. I am out of the state for medical reasons and wish these comments to be taken into consideration for the Feb. 22, 2014 public hearing on this matter.

We are opposed to the new ordinance for the TMP only to the extent that it is overly broad and is now intending to encompass any size community, no matter how small (12 units) and imposing what is in effect a tax to attempt to force people to use public transportation. Not everybody is located in areas where they can use it effectively and this Ordinance has not and cannot change that. Moreover, some communities, like ours, have had a TMP for 19 years and even if we give away passes for metro, the TMP PROGRAM HAS NOT CHANGED A SINGLE PERSON'S DRIVING HABITS.

Our recommendation is that the new Ordinance include an "out" for communities that repeatedly demonstrate that the TMP Funds are incapable of changing driving habits in that particular community due to its demographics, its size, and its location relative to public transportation hubs.

How the TMP Program can adversely affect smaller communities not located near a Metro.

Stonegate Foundation is only 76 units, and yet, because of our SUP, granted by the City in the 1980's before we were even built, our tiny community was included in a Transportation Management Plan. The developer, Pulte, originally owned a huge tract that ultimately was subdivided into five separately owned and developed properties, under the one SUP, prior to construction. Despite this subdivision, we were never taken out of the requirement for a TMP. Had the SUP anticipated the future subdivision, we would never have been subject to the requirement because the current ordinance only applies to developments with 250+ units.

In other words, developers forced us into the TMP without knowing how their acreage would ultimately be subdivided before they began to build (in 1994), and without knowing the demographics of the people who ultimately would live there. This will continue to be an issue for new SUPs under the proposed Ordinance.

Nevertheless, we do have a TMP and we actively sell discounted Metrofare tickets to our residents. But hardly any choose to participate. The TMP does not work for us, although we put money into the plan each year. Even when we gave out Metropasses for free, it never changed even one person's commuting habits. Only 4 of our residents regularly use public transportation for commuting. Two of those received benefits from their employers and don't need our plan. One doesn't drive and has always ridden the bus, whether we have a TMP plan or not. One of them is a tenant who regularly uses the program, because they save \$100's per year, all paid for by their neighbors. These residents would have taken bus/subway to work anyway.

In essence, 76 homes are paying for two neighbors to go to work, year after year. A few of us use the TMP funds to subsidize our use of Metro for occasional trips downtown, but we would have used metro anyway, and each home is required to pay \$90 a year into this fund. Most can't even USE the TMP discounts because of where and when they travel. Stonegate Foundation's tiny budget is now required to spend over 8% a year on a TMP that does not accomplish the goals intended. Our studies have proven this and we report it to the City TMP manager each year.

Throwing more money into this program is a waste and becomes an unfair tax on our residents, half of whom either are retired, work from home, or regularly travel to places not served by public transportation. We are not near a Metro stop. The busses do not run to our neighborhood with frequency. Only 5 for each rush hour. A commute to our neighborhood using metro and bus from downtown after 7 pm (when most of our workers are still working) takes 1 hour or more, when you can drive it safely in ten minutes. Many of our residents are professionals with irregular hours, with offices not near a metro, or who need their cars for work because they travel to multiple locations each day. The rest of us work from home or are retired.

Response to the City's Argument that we can "pool" our money with other communities or turn it over to the City.

At the last hearing I attended on Dec 4, Sandra Marks commented that if we pooled our money with other small TMPs, or turned it over to the City, our needs would be served. This is simply WRONG. There is no "shuttle" that can take people in 76 different directions at 76 different times. The City's assumption in making this statement misunderstands the needs of our west end residents, many of whom don't even commute.

Small communities should not be forced to give up tens of thousands of dollars by turning it over to the City to use for Bike events and other "transportation" related purposes by Pooling it. Most of us at Stonegate are over 50. While we do have a few folks biking to work, overall, we don't care about bike parking or going to a neighborhood ½ mile away to share a shuttle that might go to a metro stop that still puts us 45 minutes from our destination. It doesn't serve us because we are not near Metro and have no reason to go where Metro goes for the most part. Even if we wished to bike to a Metro station, like Braddock, there are no lock-up bike parking facilities there. Why doesn't the City focus on things like that?

Policy Considerations for your Consideration.

The way the TMP Ordinance is going to be rewritten, if passed without some consideration for exceptions, is blatantly unfair. It requires HOAs created with less than 100 units, to donate over \$6000 a year to fund a program that DOES NOT MINIMIZE TRAFFIC CONGESTION for our tiny neighborhood. The ordinance, as it operates for certain communities, does not further its policy goals.

Please understand, we are not against public transportation. We are against being required to put money into a fund and turn it over to the City if our money can't be used to accomplish the purposes intended. That becomes an unfair tax if we have to turn over unused funds to the City because the ordinance cannot achieve the goals intended.

Why not change the ordinance to include many other larger homeowner's associations, such as Fairlington and Park Fairfax, who are not required to be in a TMP, but are otherwise well served by frequent busses to the Metro at Pentagon? Do you realize that they are not required to be in a TMP because the ordinance did not get created until 1988?

Our tiny community does not create "congestion" that required this TMP. But these larger communities certainly do and they are exempt. The City council keeps approving overdevelopment of these other areas without first creating a transportation infrastructure. That is not our fault, nor should we be required to pay for it.

We are in an unusual situation due to our location and demographics, for which the policies behind the TMP ordinance simply do not work. We are not saying it is a bad idea for everybody, but we don't want to see the same problem imposed on future small communities in Alexandria.

Instead, we are communicating to you that if an HOA can demonstrate repeatedly, that throwing money into metropasses does not and cannot change people's commuting habits, when they are not served by an

adequate commuting infrastructure, then those communities should be given an exemption from the program. We do not want future small communities to be burdened by this program as we have.

Changing the ordinance to make it mandatory for nearly all associations, regardless of their size, without providing a release of some sort if the program can't work for them, must be considered before finalizing this Ordinance.

So, our recommendation is to consider the possibility that due to location, demographics, and small size (less than 100 units) a development should not be required to participate in the TMP programs because it operates instead as an unfair tax on the residents and does not accomplish the legislative intent of the ordinance. Some Exception should be crafted into the ordinance.

Thank you for your time.

Dina L. Biblin
President, Stonegate Foundation
Alexandria, VA
February 21, 2014