Comments
to
Public Review Draft – 6/2/10
Of
US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)
Transportation Management Plan for BRAC 133 at Mark Center

1, **Inaccurate determination of peak hour trips.**

a. The Plan identified "2,022 trips in the morning peak hour and 1,910 trips in the evening peak hours." (pg ES-3 and pg 94). However, Table 2-4, "Trip Projection of BRA 133 Employees with Proposed Mode Split" (pg 18) shows (assuming 90% employees being present) 3,288 single occupant vehicle trips, with another 208 trips for Carpool, Vanpool, and Slug personnel, for a total of 3,496 total

b. Table 2-4 also shows a total of 3,743 Employee Parking Spaces, of which 3,530 are available for BRAC 133 Employees, leaving 34 (less than 1%) parking spaces available.

c. This means there should be 3,496 vehicle trips in the morning….and a similar number in the evening.

d. It appears the report erroneously took the Table 2-4 Trip Projections as "Round-Trip" rather than "Each Way"…..resulting in a peak hour flow 50% of actual reality. This miscomputation has significant adverse ramifications.

2. Inadequate Peak Hour Processing. Pg 30 says "…each proposed ID check point will process 350 vehicles per hour, a maximum of 700 vehicles during the highest peak hour demand." If 90% of traffic arrives during the peak hours of 0600-0900, then 90% of 3,496 equals 3,146, which equates to 1,049/hour. The TMP needs to address how this peak flow will be addressed and how to prevent additional traffic (and safety) issues from traffic queue build-up.

3. Slugging.

a. The plan refers to a "pedestrian refuge area to promote slugging." (pg ES-2). Recommend the Plan flesh out this refuge area to better analyze projected traffic flow and impact. In particular, recommend it review the Pentagon refuge area to determine how to best organize and understand projected traffic flow. The Pentagon slugging area encompasses a significant amount of land and various allocation of slugging locations to maximize thru-put and matching of vehicle slug-lines and individual slugees. In particular they try differentiate between slugees heading west (I-66); those to the Springfield area ((-395) and those further south toward Prince William County/Fredericksburg (I-95).

b. It is highly questionable whether the flow of slug lines within the constricted space available within the Mark Center will be conducive to efficient and effective slugging. A deeper analysis and understanding of this process is highly recommended. (Slugging is also addressed in para 5.6.3 on pg 112…but our comments remain valid).

4. Walking & Biking Employees. Table 2-4 projects 4% of BRAC Employees (231 total) as either walking or biking. Recommend further study on the feasibility and safety for these personnel with the limited number of sidewalks and biking lanes available….especially with the very significant increase in vehicular traffic projected. Bikelanes, sidewalks, and pedestrian/bike walkways need to be considered and planned for. Pedestrian walkways should be reviewed within 2 mile radius. Bikelanes should be reviewed within a 10 mile radius.

5. Broader Regional Traffic Intersection Impact. The impact of BRAC 133 will extend far beyond the immediate intersections next to the Mark Center (pg ES-3). There will be additional traffic coming from the West (from Columbia Pike and Route 7….as well as Seminary Road and George Mason) as well as from the South (people exiting I-395 at Rt 235, or coming north on Van Dorn to cut over at Sanger Blvd to Beauregard) and from the East (from Maryland exiting Telegraph road to Rt 236, then North on Quaker Lane to Seminary Road West). These are just some examples of the regional impact BRAC 133 will have. The broader regional impact on traffic patterns should be studied and addressed.

6. Mid-Day Traffic Impact. What is capacity of the Mark Center Cafeteria? If inadequate to meet the needs of the Mark Center population, how will that impact mid-Day traffic?

7. Allocation of Parking Passes. Para 2.2 (pg 8) mentions federal employees account for 69% of the total employees. We assume the remaining 31% are Contractor employees? Will the be treated equally with the federal employees in allocating parking passes? If not, how will they be accounted for and what will their impact be to the surrounding communities as they struggle to find parking places? (Also addressed in para 5.4 on page 105)

8. Traffic Impact of Looking for Parking Places. Pg 17 says "Based on the projected mode split employee trips for a typical day (90 percent occupancy), it is estimated that a buffer of 34 additional parking spaces would be available to satisfy unexpected parking demand." This is less than 1% of the total number of available parking places which is a very marginal buffer. The TMP needs to address how these 34 spaces will be allocated between the North and South garages. It also needs to address the traffic delays associated with people looking for the last one or two spaces in a garage. And finally, it needs to address those times when the buffer is exhausted…..how will this overflow impact the local communities?

9. Mission Impact due to Parking Constraints. Pg 26 says "Every visitor will be required to register in advance and receive approval from PFPA, at least one day prior to visiting the site." As someone who has had multiple tours at the Pentagon, I can assure you issues pop-up without giving that lead-time specified. The TMP needs to address adverse impact to the mission of personnel being unable to attend a meeting or give necessary input due to this administrative limitation.

10. Additional Bus Support. An April 2009 study is referenced (pg 49) that concludes "… The analysist projects that the Mark Center Transportation Center could potentially be served by 69 buses including public transit vehicles and DoD shuttles during both the AM and PM peak hour."

a. Have there been any discussions (and agreements) with the activities who would be buying these buses

b. Has money been identified for these buses

c. There is a time lag between identifying a need and providing the resource. Has this timeframe been determined and planned for?

d. There is time required to integrate these buses into existing bus routes and adjust bus-stop schedules accordingly. Has this been considered and integrated into the plan?

e. Has the environmental (both pollution and traffic) impact of these additional buses been considered?

f. Has the scheduled usage of these buses at the Mark Center Transportation Center been considered and integrated into the overall schedule?

g. If the above have been considered…it needs to be made visible to the public. If it has not been studied and considered, it needs to be.

11. DoD Shuttles. Para 3.5.3 (pg 39) discusses DoD shuttles picking passengers up at the Orange, Yellow, and Blue Line Metro Stations.

a. Has DoD coordinated these proposed pick-ups with the Washington Metro?
b. Has consideration (especially by Washington Metro) been given to the probability of WHS personnel driving to a Metro Stop and parking there and catching a DoD Shuttle so that they don't have to fight the traffic and hassle of parking at the Mark Center? These persons would take parking capacity away from the Metro and deprive the Metro of revenue from people riding the Metro.

12. Unacceptable Levels of Service (LOS). Pg 73 (and Tables 4-12 and 4-13) show many intersections and lane grup movements operating at an unacceptable LOS currently. This will only get worse with the severe stress caused by BRAC 133. Pg 85 says "…These degrading operations at the individual intersection approaches will eventually lead to the failure of the overall intersection. In addition, the overall intersection at the Seminary Road and North Beauregard Street intersection operated at unacceptable levels under the projected morning and evening peak hour demands, with all the intersection approaches and lane group movements experiencing severed delay. …" Since the BRAC improvements for traffic flow are minimal compared to the increase in traffic flow….catastrophic traffic impact is almost a certainty. The regional impact of this traffic must be considered.

13. Existing Mark Center Transportation Management Plan (pg 97)

Para 5.1 says "…the BRAC 133 TMP will consider the TDM strtegies detailed in the existing Mark Center Plaza 1A and 1B TMP (developed March 31, 2003)…" Using a 2003 document is absolutely unacceptable. Most of the previous studies were flawed, biased, superficial…or a combination of the above. Plus, traffic conditions have changed significantly since 2003. The final TMP must:

a. Take into account current conditions
b. Have accurate data
c. Consider existing and planned infrastructure capacity
d. Consider future development plans and
e. Allow time for public review and comment

Submitted by the Palisade Homeowners' Association
Alexandria, VA
Jennifer M. Porter, President