



Together we make a difference

Founded in 1969

Mount Vernon Council of Citizens' Associations

Record

Volume LVI, No. 9, October 2023

October General Council is canceled Please attend VDOT in-person meeting

FROM THE CO-CHAIRS

1. The **October General Council is canceled**. In lieu of that meeting, please attend the VDOT meeting about the 495 Express Lanes from Van Dorn over the WW Bridge. This is an in person meeting only.

Sherwood Hall Library
Oct 25, 2023, 6:00 pm-7:30 PM

2. If you live on the Potomac River or a creek in the MV district please read the Presentation in the RECORD that was given by the Chair of the Fairfax County Wetlands Board regarding living shorelines

3. Remember that our GC meetings in November and December shift earlier due to the holidays - November 15, 2023 and December 20, 2023

MVCCA General Council Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, 26 Sept 2023, 7:00pm Virtual via Zoom

MVCCA GENERAL COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

Virtual Meeting/Zoom Convened and called to order at 7:06pm
Presiding Co-Chair Katherine Ward

Attending

Co-Chair - Lynn Pascoe, Secretary - Tamara Srader, Treasurer - Bill Kane, Environment and Recreation - Larry Zaragoza, Planning and Zoning - Bindu Mathur, Southeast Fairfax Development Corporation - Ellen Young, Storm Water Management Special Committee - Leo Milanowski, Transportation - Jason Zaragoza

Elected and Appointed Officials and Staff:

Supervisor Dan Storck, Mount Vernon District, Nick Rinehart, Mount Vernon District
Katie Hermann - Dept of Planning and Development, Fairfax County Wetland Board staff person
Clyde Wilber – Chairman, Fairfax County Wetlands Board

COMMUNITY MEMBERS

Associations Present:

- Belle Haven Terrace Civic Association
- Belle Haven Citizens Association
- Civic Association of Hollin Hills
- Holland Court POA
- Hollin Hall Village Citizens Association
- Huntington Community Association
- Montebello Condominium Unit Owners Association
- Mount Vee Manor
- Mount Vernon Civic Association
- Mount Zephyr Citizens Association
- Wessynton Homes Association
- Gum Springs Homeowners Association
- Riverside Estate Community Association
- Waynewood Citizens Association
- Pavillions at Huntington Metro

MVCCA BOARD

Co-Chairs	Katherine Ward	co.chair1@mvcca.org
	Lynn Pascoe	co.chair2@mvcca.org
	open	co.chair3@mvcca.org
Secretary	Tamera Srader	secretary@mvcca.org
Treasurer	Bill Kane	treasurer@mvcca.org
Membership	open	membership@mvcca.org
Editor	Karen Keefer	editor@mvcca.org
BUDG	open	chair.bf@mvcca.org
EDUC	Cathy Hosek	chair.edu@mvcca.org
E&R	Larry Zaragoza	chair.er@mvcca.org
PL/Z	Bindu Mathur	chair.pz@mvcca.org
PS	open	chair.ps@mvcca.org
TRAN	Jason Zaragoza	chair.tran@mvcca.org
SFDC	Ellen Young	rep.sfdc@mvcca.org
FCFCA	Larry Green, Jr.	rep.fairfaxfederation@mvcca.org
Stormwater	Leo Milanowski	specialcommittee@mvcca.org

----- Council Minutes -----

----- Council Minutes -----

- Hybla Valley Farms Civic Association
- Riverside Estates Civic Association
- Wellington Civic Association

Community Members Present - Mark Rogers, Christine Morin

Previous Minutes:

The July 2023 General Council Meeting minutes were unanimously approved.

Guest Speaker - Clyde Wilber – Chairman, Fairfax County Wetlands Board

Gave detailed overview of living shoreline policy and procedures and answered questions about the Wetlands Board

Co-Chairs Report:

Welcome a new association to our group - Gum Springs Homeowners Association. Queenie Cox was elected as their President.

Committee Reports

Planning and Zoning: During the last meeting County staff attended and talked about stormwater; discussion continues about the Unitarian Church wanting to increase the size of their preschool; Brookside motel project has been canceled; design of the Penn Daw fire station and supportive housing was presented by our representative to the task force ; other items as published in the record

Environment and Recreation: As published in the record.

Budget and Finance: Looking for a chairperson.

Education: Did not meet - next meeting in October

Transportation: As published in the record; Parking Reimagined went to the Board of Supervisors with Cochair Ward testifying for MVCCA and Tamara Shrader on behalf of Huntington Civic Association. The County Planning Commission recommended changes to the BOS. The very last speaker was the Chairman of the Planning Commission, their recommendations were approved by the BOS. This public hearing also identified issues related to enforcement. The BOS will have a conversation about enforcement with the police chief.

Stormwater: As published in the record

Public Safety: Looking for a chairperson.

Treasurer's Report: Treasure's Report for September was unanimously approved.

SFDC: October 14th there will be an arts fair and a local author John Wasowicz who has written six mysteries set in Alexandria, mostly around Old Town, will be doing book readings and signing with books to purchase. There will be other activities for kids from 11a to 2p October 14th at the parklet at Mount Vernon Plaza. Art along the highway has two more murals that will be coming. Unsure when it will be ready as it takes a while to get them completed. We are also working with the county trying to get permits to put up some art banners on construction fencing which are going to be needed once they get going and tearing places down for widening the road. The chain link fences will look awful so we're going to get funding. The Board of Supervisors and/or county staff is interested in murals and so I believe they are considering a program where areas can request grants and put in their own neighborhoods.

Resolutions:

MOUNT VERNON COUNCIL OF CITIZENS' ASSOCIATIONS (MVCCA) E&R 2023-02
TREE PLANTINGS SURROUNDING THE PROPOSED FIRE STATION/AFFORDABLE HOUSING/SHELTER/SUPPORTIVE HOUSING COMPLEX - unanimously approved.

MOUNT VERNON COUNCIL OF CITIZENS' ASSOCIATIONS (MVCCA) E&R 2023-03
MEETING NOTICE AND AVAILABILITY OF MEETING INFORMATION – unanimously approved.
PROPOSED LETTER REGARDING THE 495 SOUTHSIDE EXPRESS LANES FROM VANDORN OVER THE WW BRIDGE - unanimously approved. Letter included in this RECORD.

Letter – to Ms. Karen Corbett Sanders in support of naming the baseball field at Fort Hunt Elementary School as PETER WEBSTER FIELD – passed with one abstention.

Report from Supervisor Storck:

Sent standard materials for the meeting as well as reminders about the newsletters sent out and spreadsheets on the different projects happening in the area.

Shred event at Whitman middle school on September 30th from 9am to 12pm.

Early voting has started.

Infill Task Force -has been working and talking to colleagues and reported good support. He is addressing a couple of concerns and is working with Jeff McKay and Kathy Smith who is the land development chair. He hopes to have the concluding meeting next month. He believes the project to be moving in the right direction to get a significant number of improvements to stormwater, tree preservation and a few other things and he hopes to bring it to the board sometime in October.

SSPA is reviewing Cityside and Days Inn properties and has put together a task force to review these two proposed developments. The Planning Commission meeting is open to the public so if you're not sure what it is or if you need information just send a note to his office and they will make to get the information out - it will also be in the newsletter. Fort Belvoir changed the opened gates due to staffing issues. They're trying to figure out how best handle the situation - people can call 703-806-4277. Discussed the proposed VDOT 495 express lanes from Van Dorn over the WWBridge to Maryland 210. - he is generally supportive if they're willing to do what we need them to do. First and foremost, need to make sure we protect the designated mass transit lane going across the bridge. There are a couple other projects on the Richmond Highway interchange and obviously getting money to fix that up. Also interested in funding the connecting path or trail to connect the sidewalk that comes over from the Parkway to Washington street. No commitment has been made but there is a lot of studies that they're doing right now and ultimately, they will be coming back to us with questions. There is an EV charging pilot program for HOA's and Condos that the county office of energy and environmental coordination is working on.

Member time - Question about the Sunoco station and the fence that has been knocked down; brief discussion about commercial vehicle parking on Route 1 along private property – the community is concerned that when they contact the police, they are told they can do nothing about it. Supervisor Storck advised the community President to contact Peyton Smith in his office. More concerns were brought up about the VDOT discussion on express lanes over the bridge.

Meeting adjourned at 9:01 PM

Respectfully submitted by Tamara Srader

----- Committee Reports -----

Budget & Finance

We are looking for a chair for this committee. If you are interested, please contact a co-chair.

Education

MVCCA Education Meeting – October 4, 2023

4 Members present

Jessica Gillis, Executive Director, Capital Improvements & Planning, was our invited speaker. Our topic was the 2023 Bond on the November Election Ballot. Jessica spoke about how the bond process works. We discussed the past renovations in the Mount Vernon Region as well as the plan for adding security vestibules to all the schools.

FCPS has received \$7.5 M from the state to add vestibules, but there are still around 100 schools that need them, so more funding will be needed to accomplish this.

Our schools are currently on a 37 year renovation cycle, although the industry standard is 25 years.

If the bond is not approved, no new items requiring funding can be continued or started until funding can be acquired. This adds years the queue wait list and pauses all the current projects from previous bonds.

FCPS is beginning work on a new queue to begin after the current bond runs out in 7-8 years. A consultant will be hired to determine what the ranking criteria should be for placement on the new queue.

The new queue will also reflect the new Strategic Plan.

The pass rate of the bond is usually around 70% for the bond.

High school renovations usually run around 100 Million, but Centreville is pricing out at around \$200M, which will be the majority of the next bond.

Approving the bond does not directly raise your taxes, due to the debt ratio staying below 10%. The amount is already figured in and does not directly raise property taxes

The bond fund is the only revenue for renovating and building new schools.

We are considering inviting the At Large School Board members to our December meeting after the election so we can inform them on the Mount Vernon issues we hope they will work on while in office.

Links:

Queue Link: <https://www.fcps.edu/sites/default/files/media/pdf/Adopted-CIP-2024-28.pdf> (Page 54)

----- Committee Reports ----- Committee Reports -----

Bond History Information <https://www.fcps.edu/historical-bond-referendum-information>

Link to Bond Information <https://www.fcps.edu/Bond2023>

Strategic Plan <https://www.fcps.edu/strategic-plan>

We also learned that the Region map has been updated from 5 Regions to 6. <https://www.fcps.edu/resources/maps>

Meeting adjourned at 8:45 pm

Environment & Recreation

The meeting was called to order at 7:02pm by the Chair Larry Zaragoza. MVCCA Cochair Katherine Ward and E&R Recorder Christina Curley were in attendance.

Associations represented: Spring Bank Community Association, Hollin Hall Village Citizens Association, Belle Haven Terrace Civic Association, Wessynton Homes Association, Mount Vernon Civic Association, Wellington Civic Association, Pavilions at Huntington Metro Community Association, Potomac Valley-River Bend Civic Association, and Belle View Condominium Unit Owners Association.

Sara Mariska (Attorney) and Charlie and Matthew Jones (Mt. Vernon area Property Owners) and Nate Ribyat (RC Fields consultant) briefed the Committee on the Jones' brothers site development plans for three parcels of land on Lukens Lane, which they inherited from their late father. The contiguous lots are ~4 acres combined, have one habitable structure, and are not within Resource Protection Area (RPA) nor flood plain restrictions. The Jones brothers' site plan includes native tree retention and plantings, an extensive storm water retention system, drafted language to establish an HOA to gather funds and manage property and storm water retention system. It requires the County to approve rezoning the lots to R3 from R2, which would allow for building of 12 homes (~10,500-11,500 sq. ft lots each) vice 8 homes. Additionally, it requires the Co. to grant a waiver to its 57% tree canopy retention requirement. Thus far, the Co. has given two rounds of feedback and the Co. and Jones' brothers are scheduled to discuss the project further Nov 20th. Chair Zaragoza requested the current development plans and the FFX Co. comments for the E&R Committee to review. Once materials are reviewed, if warranted, he intends to work with P&Z Committee to draft a letter and/or a resolution in support of the project's R3 rezoning and tree canopy waiver requests.

Brian Pagels (Belle Haven Terrace) led discussion on increasing the number of glass recycling Purple Bins in the area to empower citizens to recycle their glass vice throwing it

out with their trash. Multiple constraints were discussed: need to place them on public property or incur private property costs (Insurance liability, wear and tear on asphalt, property damage). Chair Zaragoza stated that a new environmental zero waste recycling report at the beginning of 2024 from Director Herrington would be comprehensively assessing the County's recycling program and ways to increase participation throughout the community.

E&R Chair presented a Living Shorelines draft resolution discussed during the SEP E&R at the OCT P&Z Committee meetings. E&R Committee refined the language to reaffirm MVCCA support for HB 739 and advise the Wetlands Board to issue clarifying guidance to the community, coordinated with Sen. Surovell and Del. Krizek, on when the community must engage the Board and seek a Wetlands Board permit for living shoreline projects. Anita Kerr called for a vote; Kevin Knappmiller seconded. The Committee approved the draft resolution unanimously without abstentions.

A motion to adjourn was made, seconded, and passed at 8:45pm. The next E&R Committee will be on 01 NOV 2023 via Zoom.

Planning & Zoning

Monthly Meeting 10/21/2023

Committee Attendees:
P&Z Committee Chair
MVCCA Co-Chair
Belle View Condominium
Belle Haven Terrace Civic Association
CA of Hollin Hills
Montebello Condominiums
Huntington CA
Mason Hill Citizens Association
Mt. Vernon CA
Stratford Landing CA
Hollin Hall Village CA
Riverside Gardens Citizens Association
Gum Springs
Riverwood HOA
Pavilions at Huntington Metro CA
Williamsburg Manor North Citizens' Association
Collingwood Springs
Collingwood on the Potomac

Other Attendees:
Development & Land Use Liaison, Supervisor's Office
E&R Committee Chair
Other Interested Citizens

----- Committee Reports ----- Committee Reports -----

Proceedings:

The meeting was called to order by the P&Z Committee Chair with the following agenda:

1. Senior Housing Project
2. RPA what does it mean and waivers
3. Virginia Living Shorelines
4. Consideration of E&R Resolution
5. Updates on:
 - Unitarian Church,
 - Parking Reimagined,
 - IMP Building/SSPA Process,
 - Brookside Motel,
 - SSPA process,
 - 6514 Cygnet Drive,
 - Huntington Avenue,
 - Fire Station,
 - Lukens Lane,
 - Collingwood Chase

Agenda items were discussed beginning with the Senior Property on Route 1. This discussion was led by Mark Viani of Bean Kinney & Korman. The property is zoned commercial right now and the property owner is proposing a change to residential, noting that there is currently no market for commercial real estate. The developer is proposing approximately 53 units of accessible senior housing using Federal tax credit financing, which will allow the developer to offer individual living units as affordable housing at 30-35 percent of AMI. The developer reports they have the approval of adjacent community associations.

Larry Zaragoza, the E&R Chair, reviewed the Resource Protection Area (RPA) purpose, citing EPA water standards and the Chesapeake Bay Act that promote water quality by protecting streams and avoiding disturbances in designated RPAs like development and the cutting down of trees.

Nick Rinehart, the Development & Land Use Liaison of the Supervisor's Office, gave a review of the County's Resource Protection Area (RPA) waiver process and criteria for approving exceptions that permit development in an RPA. He noted that County Staff in Land Development Service (LDS) review waiver requests for development in the RPA and that different criteria apply to properties that were platted before the October 1, 1989 Chesapeake Bay Act went into effect, where the RPA buffer would result in a loss of buildable area. LDS can administratively approve waivers for properties platted before that date that meet the criteria outlined in Section 118-5-4 of the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Ordinance. Properties platted after that date require additional review and approval by the Exception Review Committee, or BOS hearings when the RPA waiver request is in conjunction with a Re-Zoning or

Special Exception application. Also, decisions made by the Exception Review Committee on RPA exceptions can be appealed to the BOS.

Larry Zaragoza, the E&R Chair, presented a joint resolution for recommended changes to Virginia's Living Shoreline Law. He reviewed the resolution and presented concerns that requirements in the law would result in enormous expense to residents on the shoreline that needed to repair their shoreline infrastructure, that required remediations by one neighbor could negatively impact adjacent neighbors, and that certain provisions could result in the taking of homeowner property. Several friendly amendments were proposed and will be incorporated in the final resolution. The resolution was voted on and unanimously approved by the P&Z committee.

Updates were provided on several ongoing projects:

Unitarian Church is trying to host the River Farms Forest Pre-school in a building on the MVUC campus and has requested a modification to their Special Use Permit to accommodate up to 80 students and 14 teachers. The Mason Hill community is against the modification. The BOS will defer a decision until October 11th.

Concerns about Parking Reimagined were discussed. Parking reimagined is supposed to regulate off street parking in high density areas with the intent of encouraging the use of mass transit. Residents in high density areas are concerned that the reduction in parking spaces is unfair, citing the lack of mass transit alternatives and an ongoing need for multiple cars per residence to meet realistic needs of the community. The BOS met on this and citizens testified accordingly. The BOS adopted recommendations.

The IMP site on route 1 has a letter of intent for a new development. No details yet.

There are no updates on the Brookside Motel.

6514 Cygnet Drive is an infill that is being developed on a parcel that is in the RPA and on a sloped lot adjacent to a stream that empties into Dyke Marsh. The property owner has submitted a building plan and received an administrative RPA waiver from the County to proceed with building a single-family home on this property. The community met with the County to express concern that the disturbance of the RPA would impact water quality and create stormwater runoff that could flood downstream properties. The County took the concerns under consideration and described mitigations currently in the plan that included planter boxes that are supposed to slow the release of stormwater runoff. The property owner still needs to submit an acceptable infill Lot Grading Plan and the County

----- Committee Reports ----- Committee Reports -----

plans to require stormwater runoff to be directed away from downstream properties.

The developer is continuing to work with staff and plans are evolving for the project at Huntington Ave. The land attorney noted that they hope to make a resubmission to the county in late October and would like to talk to us at the November P& Z Meeting.

There was no new information regarding the Penn Daw development project.

At Lukens Lane, comments were received from Fairfax County last week. Plans are being discussed with the county and revisions are being worked on. The application has been deferred until comments have been addressed.

There are no updates on Collingwood Chase.

VDOT plans to end express lanes at Route 1. A public meeting is coming up soon to review the plan. MVCCA members expressed concern that expansion of the express lanes at the Route 1 interchange would have a negative impact on North Gateway development.

Public Safety

We are looking for a chair for this committee. If you or someone in your community are interested, please send an email to co.chair1@mvcca.org and co.chair2@mvcca.org and let us know of your interest.

Transportation

The Mount Vernon Council of Citizens' Association (MVCCA) Transportation Committee met on October 3, 2023 in a virtual gathering hosted on Zoom. Participating in the meeting from the MVCCA were Jason Zaragoza, Transportation Committee Chair & Attendance-Taker for tonight's meeting; John Bioty, Transportation Committee Note-Taker for tonight's meeting; Katherine Ward, Co-Chair, and Larry Zaragoza, Environment & Recreation Chair.

Transportation Committee representatives from the following MVCCA Associations were in attendance: Belle View Condominium Unit Owners' Association; Gum Springs Homeowners Association; Hollin Hall Village Citizens' Association; Huntington Community Association; Mount Vernon Civic Association; Mount Vee Manor HOA; New Alexandria Citizens Association; Pavilions at Huntington Metro Community

Association; Potomac Valley-River Bend Civic Association; Riverwood Homeowners Association; Stratford Landing Citizens Association; Waynewood Citizens Association; Wellington Civic Association; Wellington Heights Civic Association; Westgrove Citizens Association; Williamsburg Manor North Citizens Association.

Total attendance for the joint meeting was 19.

Chairman Zaragoza noted that meeting announcements had been sent out with the "read-ahead".

ANNOUNCEMENTS/AGENDA (listed for record purposes only):

(1) [GW Parkway South Section and Mount Vernon Trail Improvement Plan](#): The [Public Comment](#) period for this project ends on October 24, 2023. The Committee will be discussing proposed improvements to the South GW Parkway and Mount Vernon Trail this evening. Any official comments by the MVCCA will need to first come out of the Transportation Committee to be brought before the MVCCA Board. The Transportation Committee strongly encourages everyone to submit their individual comments using the link: https://parkplanning.nps.gov/GWMP_South_EA

Comments can also be mailed to:

Superintendent
Attn: GWMP South and MVT Plan/EA
700 George Washington Memorial Parkway
McLean, VA 22101

(2) [I-495 Southside Express Lane Study](#): The study evaluates the potential extension of the Express Lanes system on the southern section of I-495 by 11 miles from the Springfield Interchange across the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge, to the MD 210 interchange. The previously scheduled comment deadline of October 2, 2023 has been extended to October 10, 2023. There are several ways to provide input:

- Complete a comment form at <https://www.virginiadot.org/495southside>
- Submit comments by email to: 495southsideexpresslanes@VDOT.Virginia.gov
- Submit comments by mail, postmarked by Oct. 10, 2023, to:
Nick Nies, AICP
VDOT 495 Southside Study NEPA Project Manager
9030 Stony Point Parkway, Suite 220
Richmond, VA 23235
- Call VDOT at: 703-259-3752

----- Committee Reports ----- Committee Reports -----

PRESENTATIONS: None

AGENDA ITEMS:

George Washington Memorial Parkway (GWMP) South Section and Mount Vernon Trail (MVT) Improvement Plan:

Chairman Zaragoza led off by reminding everyone that the southern section of the Parkway includes 8.3-miles of roadway from the Hunting Creek Bridge to Mount Vernon, Virginia. The Mount Vernon Trail, on the other hand, is an 18-mile trail which extends from Theodore Roosevelt Island to Mount Vernon, Virginia. The portions of the Parkway and MVT within the City of Alexandria, however, are not a part of the plan.

The GWMP South Section Improvement Plan involves comprehensive rehabilitation to restore the historic 1932 roadway and drainage system for the first time, including complete replacement of the deteriorated road surface (concrete slabs), repairs or replacement of drainage structures, and rehabilitation of four bridges. The Plan's Environmental Assessment (EA) describes two potential choices for the way forward: (1) No-Action Plan and (2) Parkway South Section and Mount Vernon Trail Improvements Plan.

The "No Action" Plan continues the present management operations and conditions. Repairs would be accomplished only "as needed". Under the Parkway South Section and MVT Improvements Plan, proposed actions would include:

- New crosswalks and intersection changes,
- Trail widening,
- Reduction of lanes and pavement striping in select areas to improve safety,
- Drainage improvements and storm-water and management.

Discussion: Chairman Zaragoza reiterated that Committee comments would be accepted only if the verbiage was agreed upon by all Committee members. He recommended that each individual citizen and community association submit comments specific to their concerns.

One Committee member stated that the current GWMP Intersection configuration for Belle Haven Road and Belle View Boulevard was a vast improvement over previous versions. However the verbiage in the National Park Service (NPS) Action Plan was unclear as to further changes and left confusion to drivers in the center median as to which vehicle had the right of way (ROW). Her recommendation was to keep the current configuration for both Belle Haven Road and Belle View Blvd versus what's in the new plan. Most members agreed. Another member commented on the plan's recommended "Road Diet". Although noting that the current Southbound Road Diet was effective as a traffic calming measure, he was unsure how the Road Diet would work for the total Roadway. Several Committee members agreed that traffic appeared to have slowed as a result of the Road Diet but in

areas where two lanes transitioned to one, vehicles were racing to get ahead of each other before entering the single lane. One member concluded that there needed to be clarification in NPS' plan on where these transition points were to be. Another member suggested that the Parkway include a single lane Road Diet (without transition Points) to correct for that problem. He suggested a single lane extending from just outside of Old Town Alexandria to the Mount Vernon Estate Circle - southbound, and from the Mount Vernon Estate Circle to Old Town Alexandria - northbound. This, he claimed would eliminate racing prior to reaching Road Diet transition points.

Several members voiced concern over the planned Tulane Intersection configuration. One member stated that NPS should repeat the configuration that exists at Belle Haven Rd and Belle View Blvd with a stop sign and yield sign present. Other members, including the MVCCA Co-Chair, stated that Tulane is just fine the way it is – however NPS needs to do more on educating users regarding ROW protocols at these intersections. Another Member voiced concern over the entire Parkway Improvement Plan interjecting that NPS needed to determine whether the Parkway was going to be a commuter route or a Memorial Highway. He favored a memorial highway. That member opposed removing trees from approximately 7 acres of land for the MVT modification. MVCCA Co-Chair Katherine Ward reminded the Committee that NPS needed to get on with the program and one of the primary purposes of the Improvement Plan was to have a document in hand to procure funding.

Chairman Zaragoza again interjected that some Committee members' comments appeared to be parochial in nature; in order to have an MVCCA position, the majority of members would have to agree on recommended comments as well as the wording to support it. To that end, the following was agreed upon by the majority of members:

- The MVCCA Transportation Committee:
 - Opposes the GWMP South Section and MVT "No Action" Plan (noting that major improvements and repairs are needed on both the Parkway and MVT).
 - Supports the GWMP South Section and MVT Improvement Plan with the following recommendations:
 - Belle Haven Rd. and Belle View Blvd. intersections remain as they are today (i.e. no changes), with one exception. It is suggested that in the NB left turn lanes onto both streets, a sign should be added below the Yield signs to specify "Yield to Southbound Parkway Traffic" to reduce

----- Committee Reports ----- Committee Reports -----

confusion as to which lanes motorists should yield to.

- The Southbound right turn lanes at Tulane Drive, Morningside Lane, Wellington Road, Collingwood Road, and Stratford Lane should remain in their current configuration and not be pushed further east as shown in the Improvement Plan diagrams. Moving the right turn lane closer to the center lanes will present a safety hazard by decreasing visibility for cars turning northbound onto the Parkway and by providing less buffer zone from cars in the center lane continuing south.
- NPS should clarify its verbiage regarding the specific locations where the road will narrow from two lanes to one (and back to two – if applicable).
- Road markings should be added to Northdown Road to clearly indicate separate auto and bike lanes.
- NPS should engage in a public education campaign on navigating right of way protocols at GWMP intersections.

I-495 Southside Express Lane Study: Chairman Zaragoza reminded Committee Members that the deadline for all comments to Fairfax County has been extended to October 10, 2023. He also advised that because of overarching concerns, the MVCCA General Counsel sent a letter to Fairfax County saying the Study was premature and more answers/ participation was needed before it could even be considered. (Letter included as an addendum to The Record)

Chairman Zaragoza said there was nothing for the Committee to do. He just wanted members to be aware of MVCCA's action.

New Business: Gum Springs Homeowners Association Representative, Queenie Cox, addressed the Committee with two issues: (1) Gum Springs' Historical Marker and (2) the congestion on Gum Springs Roadways – especially Sherwood Hall Lane's approach to Richmond Highway.

Regarding the Gum Springs Historical marker, this was an item that the Transportation Committee had discussed before. The Committee had supported a motion to calling for the removal of an obstruction in front of the sign. Ms Cox stated that after discussions with County Officials and VDOT, it was determined that the marker had been placed on private property and not a VDOT right-of-way. Rather than move it, the decision is to leave it where it currently is. The cost to move the marker is estimated to be \$2,000.00. Moreover, with anticipated

modifications to Richmond Highway beginning in 2025, the Gum Springs Historical marker might have to be moved again, so the issue will be revisited once final designs for Richmond Highway have been made.

Regarding traffic congestion in the Gum Springs area, Ms Cox stated that congestion on Sherwood Hall Lane – especially during rush hour – has increased as the result of Inova Mount Vernon Hospital's expansion, which was approved by the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors in 2011. She stated that as part of the proffers of the expansion, public meetings were to be held to discuss impacts on traffic. Neither former Supervisor Gerry Hyland nor current Supervisor Stock have held one.

The Committee asked for Ms. Cox's assistance in locating the proffer documents and also suggested coordination with other members of the community such as Walt Whitman Middle School. Ms. Cox agreed and will return to the Committee with supporting information.

Meeting Adjourned:

Upon completion of new business, a motion to adjourn was presented and quickly seconded. Chairman Zaragoza notified the Committee that the next two meetings will take place on the second Monday of the month so as not to conflict with the MVCCA Planning & Zoning Committee meeting. The meeting concluded at 8:32 PM.

Future (2023) Scheduled Transportation Committee Meetings:

- Monday, Nov 13th
- Monday, Dec 11th

Note: Until further notice, all meetings will be held remotely.

Special Committee on Stormwater Management

.....
Meeting minutes not available.

Fairfax Federation

.....
Meeting minutes not available.

SFDC

.....
There will be a verbal report at the General Council meeting.

----- Resolutions/Letters -----



The Mount Vernon Council of Citizens Associations, Inc.

P.O. Box 203, Mount Vernon, VA 22121-9998

Mr. Nick Nies, AICP
VDOT 495 Southside Study NEPA Project
9030 Stoney Point Parkway, Suite 220
Richmond, VA 23235

September 30, 2023

Dear Mr. Nies:

The Mount Vernon Council of Citizens' Association (MVCCA) was formed as a 501 c 4 in 1972 and represents condo, HOA and civic associations and their community members in the Mount Vernon Magisterial District of Fairfax County, Virginia. Our members utilize the road networks in and around the beltway as well as the Route 1 corridor on a daily basis. Our members are very concerned with the current status of the VDOT 495 Southside Study NEPA Project.

The information presented at the public meetings held in May 2022 and then again on September 12, 2023, were unsettling in direction and continue to be vague. While we understand that this is a work in progress, we feel that our concerns have not been seriously considered since the May 2022 meeting. We therefore raise these concerns:

1. In May presenters stated that you would be building within your right of ways. You made that same statement at the September meeting. However, on both occasions you were asked about the locations of your right of ways, and you continue to be unable or unwilling to answer the question. It is difficult for us to believe that someone in VDOT does not know where your right of ways are. Please put a graphic map location of your right of ways and/or easements along the stretch of 495 from Van Dorn to the Woodrow Wilson Bridge on your website.
2. We are greatly concerned that any expansion of the 495 roadway or the development of a Route 1 interchange will encroach into Fairfax County plans for redevelopment of North Gateway (Fort Hunt Road, Route 1 and WW bridge area) and the resource protection area (RPA) at that location. The County Government and the citizens have a right to know where your right

----- Resolutions/Letters (continued) -----

of ways and easements are located so we can make more informed decisions as to the value of your project.

3. Perhaps most important is what happens to the traffic from MD Route 210 if Maryland does not extend the express lanes around the beltway? There will still be the inevitable blockage at that point with backups westward on 495 into Virginia. Your presenters acknowledge rush hour backups on the free “express” lane that often reach the Van Dorn exit. However, in neither your May nor your September presentations did your presenters answer the simple question of whether or not Maryland plans to build express lanes on the beltway.

4. Presenters did note the obvious fact that vehicular congestion was extremely bad on Route 1 with vehicles waiting to go east on the bridge, but there was no plan to address that problem since the bridge congestion is unlikely to change. And building any sort of Route 1 interchange near the Woodrow Wilson Bridge will only damage redevelopment plans for North Gateway and the RPA (see item 2 above).

5. We are curious about your vehicle count. Michelle Shropshire said that volume has risen to pre-pandemic levels. As workers return to commuting, that number is sure to rise. We wonder if you are correctly incorporating projections for vehicle growth, both on the Beltway and on Route 1 and we are worried that your volume numbers may be too low. Therefore, traffic congestion will not decrease with this expansion of express lanes. We believe that the VDOT mission needs to refocus itself on mass transit and not the continued asphalt building for motor vehicle usage that brings increased heat island impacts in this climate change environment (see item 7).

6. We are confused about where the new express lanes would go. The briefing said the Wilson Bridge cannot be widened, and any added lanes (in addition to the two existing express lanes) must occur between the fixed barriers. The addition of two more express lanes each way would in one of the options (making four express lanes each way) would require narrowing the lanes by as much as 25%. Narrower lanes lead to a higher rate of traffic accidents and 25% is a significant narrowing. It makes no sense to make four lanes to the blockage point when two lanes currently have no place to go!

7. We are very disturbed that WMATA is not a partner on this project. While we understand that planning, funding, and construction of rail service may take longer, it has been the intent as far back as the agreement to build the new Wilson Bridge that Metro would cross it. Metro included crossings on the bridge in its proposed future expansion plans. Ignoring WMATA during the planning phase seems foolish and narrow minded. We believe the funds to build the proposed express lanes could be used to help WMATA bring rail to the beltway.

8. Why should Virginia build new paid express lanes at all if Maryland does not build them to continue on the beltway. Millions of dollars and years of construction with concomitant traffic delays would, in our view ultimately accomplish nothing. It seems obvious that VDOT favors partnering with Transurban to finance and operate these express lanes as a means to building express lanes in order to secure funds from Transurban toll collections. But there seems to be no mention of how Fairfax County will benefit from these collected funds.

----- **Resolutions/Letters** (continued) -----

Unfortunately, your briefings to date have done nothing to justify the cost and disruption caused by the project and is lacking in forward thinking to mitigate air pollution - climate change from vehicle exhausts.

Katherine Ward

Katherine Ward
Cochair
MVCCA

CC: Senator Scott Surovell
Delegate Paul Krizek
Supervisor Dan Storck

----- WETLAND BOARD CHAIR PRESENTATION -----

Presentation by Clyde Wilber – Chair of Fairfax County Wetlands Board

Wetlands Board Job

Balance environmental, economic,
public and private benefit and detriment.

No net loss of Wetlands

To the best of my knowledge

- 1972 Law – Protect Wetlands
- 2020 Law –Living Shorelines Required Where Suitable
- No one is coming to take your property The FCWB,VIMS, VMRC, Fairfax County, The commonwealth
HOWEVER, you may need a permit so call.
- Maintenance only requires a permit if wetlands are disturbed
(barges?) CALL!

Questions on FCWB Applicant Guide

- Best Available Science
- Do I need a Permit
- Grandfathering/Maintenance
- Yes Navigable Channels Matter
- Cost/Complexity
- Not a taking
- Grants
- Community Cooperation

Unsure?

- Call the County Wetlands Board Staff
 - 703-324-1380

- Please Search Read:

- “Fairfax Wetlands Board” to find the web site with

“ Applicant Guide For Tidal Wetlands Alteration/Stabilization”

<https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/plan2build/sites/plan2build/files/assets/documents/pdf/wetlands-board/applicant%20guide.pdf>

----- WETLAND BOARD CHAIR PRESENTATION (cont.) -----

The following pages contain a raw Microsoft Transcript from the Fairfax County Wetlands Board Chair presentation to the MVCCA

Clyde Wilber – Chair of Fairfax County Wetlands Board

Thank you for joining us and you're muted please you're muted fine you're muted thank you got it but OK better I thank you so much for inviting me I hope I can clear up any confusion about what the wetlands board does and how we deal with wetlands in the Commonwealth and in the county I have just a few slides just kind of to guide me if you don't mind I'm going to throw those up uh let's see if that works did that come up yes the wetlands board job I want to point out that there's a lot of regulation in the state in the county and elsewhere where technical people with public works jobs tell you what you can build and what you cannot build and when the wetlands law was passed in 1970 to the Commonwealth and the 10th and wisdom wanted to put some citizens between you and the technical people that have applied those permits so the what this board is composed of just regular citizens appointed by individual board of supervised members to do this to balance the environmental economic public and private benefit and detriment those are actually six things and I'm constantly trying to remind board members that they have to think about all six things before taking a vote or making a decision so our job is kind of like to apply those different criteria to take anything that comes before us but in addition are I ask you In addition to trying to balance those six things for which we have virtually no guidance just our common sense we're also charged with the idea of no net loss of weapons the Commonwealth has lost it probably 2/3 of its weapons over the years and again they the General Assembly kind of made the decision it doesn't want any more net loss so let me go into a little more of the nitty gritty these things are to the best of my knowledge you know there are other people that know more about this than I do even though I've been on the board forever new terms pop up and I really don't know what they mean but you know the job really is to really act like just the citizen to try to balance those things but a little bit of history to protect lens wetlands law has been around since 1972 and has been modified and updated over the years adding more things to work right. In 2020 the really big change was that living shorelines are now required we're suitable that's an important term where suitable before I go any further I wanna assure you no one is coming to take your property it's not the weapons board not the Virginia institute for marine science not the Virginia marine resources people not the county not the Commonwealth however you may need a permit to do work in and around your wetlands and you're gonna hear me say this over and over again call and then the person to call is actually on the the call this evening Catherine do you want to introduce yourself she's probably muted yes hi everyone I'm Katie Hartman I am the staff lesson for the wetlands board and I help perform a site visits and coordinate with our state partners and also help provide the technical reviews of permit applications

Q: Katie you're in the land development side of the county or environmental which office are you in?

A: I'm in the department of planning and development

Clyde: thank you thanks just a good captain Catherine keeps all of us straight and on board and schedules meetings and puts up with a lot from all of us so a big question has been about maintenance I wanna say up front maintenance only requires a permit if wetlands are disturbed but you know you may not have the same perception of disturbance that the county and the regulators have so if you're going to do work around your bulkhead your rip wrap just call Catherine and she'll resolve it for you don't try to make a judgment by yourself I wouldn't so OK now this this next outline is uh well after the 2020 law was developed VMRC developed very technical guidelines we at the Fairfax County wetlands board thought they were difficult for us to understand and so we developed our own guidance for Fairfax County and I'll get to that in a minute and well I think the guidance is useful I think more useful was the questions that we got about it and so these things that I'm listing here are the different types of questions that we received and to the best of our ability the answers that we have to them first of all living shorelines best available science a living shoreline is not suitable for all shorelines in the county if you live right on the Potomac River and you have a very long fetch that is if you look out over the water and the shoreline in the distance is 3 miles away dims is very unlikely to say that you need to have a living shoreline because they the waves are too large and they'll rip it out anyway but if you live on a quiescent piece of water the best available science may say that if it can be made suitable that a living shoreline may be may be required if you go into a construction project that disturbs tidal levels so the next thing is do you need a permit you need a permit if you're going to disturb tidal wetlands it's just that simple but again try not to make that decision yourself call Catherine there's been a lot of words tossed around and the word grandfathering and maintenance comes into effect here and I want to take a moment here to describe really what I think has generated so much pain and confusion over this there is no grandfathering in the law you know it doesn't say you can you can keep something that you had there forever the real issue here is are there tidal wetlands on your property and if you do have title wetlands that is if the water is going up and down between mean low and mean high on your property then you almost certainly need some kind of a permit to work on it if you're going to do maintenance on an existing bulkhead and there's there isn't any tidal water moving back and forth on your property the good chance that you won't need a permit but again ask and in addition you know there have been statements coming

----- WETLAND BOARD CHAIR PRESENTATION (cont.) -----

around that say you don't need a permit if you only do maintenance and you don't disturb tidal wetlands I want to point out that many construction contractors will want to bring up the topic of the tidal wetlands that would be disturbing the tidal wetlands I'm not saying they can't do the maintenance but you will likely need a permit we have a lot of questions about the loss of navigable channels navigable channels are an economic benefit to the community and cost and complexity unfortunately if fortunately maybe if you live on tidal wetlands there is cost to associated with taking care of those tidal wetlands and in particular if you want to do some kind of a permanent construction in them is it complex yes and has gotten very complex over the years I think we're trying to make it simpler but there's no doubt about it it's complex to do one of these projects it takes some time it's going to take at least you know three or four months to get a permit typically it's not easy or simple there's been a lot of discussion about the actions of the wetlands board you know requiring a living shoreline and you know if they did that would that be a taking and I'm not an attorney but several attorneys have told me that that is not the case there are some attorneys who think it is the case but as far as the county is concerned it's not as tanky I do want to point out that there are grants available for the construction of living shorelines they're available for through the soil conservation people and I personally have worked with them a bit and they're very accommodating and if you have an expensive project that you can't afford all by yourself but I would think about asking them for a grant but my final comment about this I the Wetlands board is all volunteers we don't have a budget for outreach or doing actual work we took volunteer and show up for these meetings really but I really think community cooperation in how to address your shoreline would be a very useful thing to do and if a community would like to get together and do a plan for their shoreline I think it's possible that that we might be able to get some grant money for you to do that so unsure call Catherine this is her phone number is 703-324-1380 if you want more details about this I tried to copy the link and it ends up so long that it's almost unbelievable but if you if you just Google or whatever you use the Fairfax County wetlands board you'll end up with a site that has an applicant guide for title wetlands alteration stabilization on it and if you read through that you'll get much more detail than I just gave you tonight with that I'm going to stop but I do want to mention that you know there have been some difficult permits here recently and they are all about where tidal wetlands in particular vegetative tidal wetlands that actually have plants on them have developed land word of a failed bulkhead you know in in in some cases where the bulkhead has completely fallen away and that's really passed the whole maintenance question and even if it wasn't there are now tidal wetlands landward of the original bulkhead and for that the likelihood is that a living shoreline will be required

OK wonderful thank you Clyde for that constructive bit of information I know we've got a lot of questions so I'd like to go ahead and turn it over if you have a question would you please raise your hand

Ellen: Clyde I know you have said that only that living shorelines are required we're suitable so if for instance A bulkhead for some reason there was a big storm and a bulkhead has failed and the owner can't get a permit and then the wetlands board and the county are forcing them into a living shoreline and it takes all of their property maybe not the house but everything else that reduces their property value how would that not attacking that is a taking so getting into the complexity of the law the regulation a little more there is actually an emergency permitting procedure that can act very quickly we've never had one in Fairfax but there is an emergency procedure to get action very quickly umm you know I hesitate to speculate about what a Wetlands board would do in that situation but uh I think that you know the wetlands board job is to balance you know economic public and private benefit and if there was an extreme private economic impact that that's one of the considerations that wetlands board does it may say you know we can't do this we had a permit a number of years ago on the Potomac River where the permittee wanted to build a bulkhead on the water side of their property and it's in that case it would have been possible technically to build a new bulk land word however it was 22 feet from the from the failed bulkhead to her front door and we felt that was kind of silly so we did permit and allow that property owner to place a new bulkhead I think it was 2 feet of towards the water of the existing bulkhead and fill in the land in between that that was however still a taking of tidal wetlands and there's a mitigation fee for that so it's in the law that you know if you if you take a title wetland so that was like 2 feet times 40 feet or 80 square feet I don't remember the unit cost at that time but it wasn't a huge amount of money well you know that that's in the eye of the beholder you might feel differently if that was your property but of course I would I you know I think things that are legal are not necessarily moral to do to people and so I mean people are worried that there are people who live way above the water and they have you know retaining walls and umm I think one person may have been denied a permit but I'm not sure but what are you supposed to do you're 20 feet up from the river So what now you're going to force you know living shoreline and take their whole property well I think I think one point that Clyde made that I think I certainly was confused about is that if you are on the Potomac River and you have a fetch you're I'm going to say 99% sure you're not going to have to do a living shoreline because the water is such that it takes that stuff away as it moves and goes back and forth with the waves so umm but that's a good point Ellen I have let's see I think we've got somebody's trying to get in the chat anybody else have a question while we're looking at when I'm looking at the chat somebody raised me Karen unmute yourself what's your question Karen unmute yourself please OK guys we're having i don't know what the technical issue is we never have problems like this so put your stuff in the chat karen you're docks then and you're doing maintenance on them you do not need a permit so Clyde there seems to be some sort of a confusion between the senators letter that was approved by the state's attorney looked at by the Fairfax County attorney and what you guys think could you speak to that a little bit yes so this is a maybe an important detail maybe not if you can maintain your bulkhead from the landward

----- WETLAND BOARD CHAIR PRESENTATION (cont.) -----

side and you do not have to disturb the wetlands on the water side of your bulkhead then no permit is needed a lot of contractors want to come in with a barge and park them on top of the tidal wetland to repair the bulkhead now let me clarify that it will i know this call Catherine some bold caz with the bulkhead in other words you come out to your property you look down at the water there's always water there that's not titled wetlands but it is under the jurisdiction of the MRC and they may want to look at what you're doing and they may be looking for different applications and permits so I always hesitate to tell you a permit is not absolutely necessary the I don't really think that the maintenance of bulkheads that are not failing will typically require a permit if you can do the work from the from the land side so the senators letter is correct but I want to be careful that I want you to check that out with Catherine before you make that call by yourself and in particular if you have a contractor show up and say I don't need a permit or I will get you permits please call Catherine there are more problems with contractors selling people on things than anything else it's pretty rare I think for a homeowner to you know intentionally even accidentally violate the law but the contractors have been a problem and we've been receiving testimony at our meetings and hearings that that we should attempt to correct that problem with the with the contractors we don't have all the brothers board does not have a lot of power in in enforcing things against contractors there's a little bit but VMRC and the County Attorney do OK thank you very much we have an item in the chat and I'll it's kind of lengthy statement and then it's a question and I think you've already kind of answered it but they're wanting to know if the wetlands board is interested and willing to engage with larger communities in a complete discussion of the issues and not just individual homeowners go down and look over the general area and listen to their concerns because a lot of these folks as you pointed out feel that the actions to date from the wetlands board are unreasonable so it's umm I think that anybody who would like to have either the county staff or wetlands board members come out and visit their property and or Community property I'm sure we could arrange that I will tell you there's a little bit of a limitation on us the sunshine laws in the Commonwealth mean that no more than two of us can meet together in any kind of a form frankly where something that might come before the board can be discussed so only two of us at a time can come but by all means if someone would like to arrange you know I think Catherine would be happy to arrange something where we come and visit with you be happy to do that and I have several other wetlands board members I think who would be happy to do it as well all right Larry do you have a question your hand is up and Ellen if you don't have any more questions you might want to lower your hand thank you I have one more everybody else asks it first but let's go OK thank you Larry you're up OK I would just like to observe that the cost of living shorelines can involve a lot of different permanent revisions it can take a process of years as we have seen and it can result in the loss of a significant part of the yard so one of the things that concerns me is Clyde you explained how there's all these different factors you need to balance so when you look at those different factors it's not clear how the impact to the property owner is considered and it could be considered differently from case to case because there I know no guidelines no constraints on how the wetlands board does its work and so I'm really asking what clarity can you offer to give property owners some comfort on as Ellen raised the question people can be afraid that they could lose the vast majority of their yard and there's nothing that I see in the law or in any guidance that would preclude that and that would be that would be hard for someone to take because it really alters the utility of their of their home thank you so this has been of course a a major concern in the community again you're not going to be asked to put in a living shoreline for an existing well taken care of rip wrap or bulkhead if there isn't tidal wetlands landward of your bulkhead dims is never going to be involved at all they will never come and say a living shoreline is needed now you know the extent and requirement of the living shoreline we do get a decision from the EMS on whether or not a living shoreline is required and if you look at some of the general guidance that comes on living shorelines Larry is correct if you were to apply those universally everywhere some homeowners would lose the substantial part of their property however in my personal experience vibs has been very is you you're asking for comfort I will try to give that if I can Dems has been very reasonable about these things and has not asked for very long very shallow slopes that would take up large amounts of property and in addition you if the wetlands board wasn't here you would be looking at an absolutely technocratic application of this but because there is a wetlands board we are as a board allowed to consider the economic impact on the homeowner so the other comfort you have to the extent that I can offer it is that the board is appointed by your Board of Supervisors and chosen at least in theory I and I think an intention to balance these things carefully between the environment and the impact on the homeowner in the past I think we have heavily deferred to the homeowner cost we have a little less flexibility now under the 2020 law so I don't want to leave you with the impression that that what Larry is concerned about is not without merit but I would conclude from it principally that you really have to take care of your existing bulkhead you really do take care of it maintain it because once title buttons develop on your side of the property you will be faced with dealing a permitting process that may include some of the concerns that Larry has Ellen you have another question yeah and so applied your answer to that just kind of led right into my question then Paul krizek sponsored a bill that I have heard I don't haven't followed the wetlands board's decision making that you opposed which would have addressed some of these concerns about you know allowing people or you know requiring them to maintain their bulkheads why did you oppose that so Jed you're talking about really a vote that was put together by the Environmental Quality advisory Commission correct is that what you're thinking of and I don't know how you voted I'm just saying that you opposed his bill house bill 739 so which addressed some of these issues for homeowners and I just wondered why you will post it because it included the language of grandfathering without respect to wetlands being developed land word of the of the bulkhead once you know our job is to preserve wetlands and once there's wetlands particularly vegetated wetlands

----- WETLAND BOARD CHAIR PRESENTATION (cont.) -----

landward of the bulkhead the Commonwealth has said they must be protected and preserved and on top of that they said once you do that if you go for a permit you may be required to put them in a living shoreline so does this subject was discussed at the Environmental Quality advisory Commission which is a separate board from the wetlands board and separately appointed by county wide Board of Supervisors and if I recall the vote was 12:50 in favor to opposing the law and the principal issue was this idea that grandfathering would allow the disposition the destruction of wetlands which it is something that we oppose and understand that but again it's ending up costing people a lot of money and taking of their land because this is a new law you know which came into being right before the pandemic so I just think it's extremely unreasonable it's very disappointing OK I have one quick question and then it looks like Larry has one and then we're going to move on because we have a long agenda for tonight and Supervisor Storck will be joining us shortly and he's got a bunch of stuff for us I guess my concern is that we can certainly remove the word grandfather if that freaks you guys out because you really don't understand what it means in the sense that we understand it but I think that needs to be taken care of the other thing I'd like to point out is that umm you said you would go out to communities but you could not have more than two people in the room because then it becomes the public meeting all that requires you to do like any of us is announce it you have to publish it publish it but you also have to take notes So what so take note someone needs to do that well that's the citizens responsibility to take notes I mean Clyde I find that unacceptable honestly that you don't go because these are people I'm not saying we wouldn't go I think we absolutely could find two people to come to any meeting you ask right but you can't get more than two at a time well OK and maybe they'd be happy with just two but maybe there's more that they would like to have if you came like in my community as a quick example we've got just shy of 60 houses on the Potomac River on the river a large number of them are high up so whether my community would want to have you guys come we might want more than two of you and then yeah we take notes we know how to do that so anyhow that's just a comment Larry what do you have and then we're going to move on to the rest of our agenda so there was Ellen's question raised on reminded me of something and that is that HB739 also had a provision in it that requires homeowners or property owners to repair their shoreline stabilization structures and so my understanding is one of the big problems we have in in in is the structures that are not repaired and HB739 would have helped with that the other thing I would observe is that when it comes to the impetus for the law my understanding is the impetus was largely based on the issues they have on the Eastern Shore where they might have a failed bulkhead that's 60 feet out into the water and is precluding the free flow of water so that you can have a healthy wetland that is not the kind of situation we're based here in burning I was wondering if you could speak to those and have you read HB739 I have read the bill I really II hesitate to comment on legislative matters particularly since I'm kind of here for the wetlands board I think if the community would really like to get another position you know on this I think it really would be best for you to speak to your own elected leaders or you know the equation folks are charged with advising the Board of Supervisors by all means you might ask the chair to come speak to them and he's here with you tonight I'm just noting that you're saying that you don't want to speak to legislative issues and yet you spoke in probably should not have Larry you're correct OK let's all right this is a meeting to advise people in this room what Clyde has provided us here's how they look at it here's how they're set up here's how it works he's given us some advice on if you have issues if you've got concerns you get a hold of Katie Herman she's on here we'll make sure her contact information is in our next record and you will all get that if you have other questions and you would like to send them to me I would be more than happy to forward them on to Clyde and to Katie and I'm sure they'd be happy to respond and then we can ask some questions of Dan stork this evening when it's his turn to talk to us in about 30-40 minutes so anyhow thank you Clyde for coming and we did give us some really good information could I ask you to send those since our recording seemed to screw up would you be kind enough to send me those slides and then I can post them very good wonderful you're welcome to stick around otherwise you're welcome to leave and I know you've got a busy agenda for other things and Katie thank you for joining us as well very good OK thank you everyone and good evening goodnight

----- Treasurers Report -----

Mount Vernon Council of Citizens' Associations, Inc.

Treasurer's Report, Current Month and Fiscal Year to Date Compared to Annual Budget
Periods Ending September 30, 2023

	September	Total July 1 to September 30	2023-2024 Annual Budget	Budget Variance To spend or Favorable (Unfavorable)
<u>Cash Receipts (including deposits in-transit):</u>				
Dues - Current Members	\$ 775	\$ 3,250	\$ 4,250	
Money Market Interest	-	0	2	
Total Cash Receipts	775	3,250	4,252	\$ (1,002)
<u>Cash Disbursements (including outstanding checks):</u>				
Administrative	-	241	545	304
Insurance Premium	-	-	760	760
Outreach/Town Hall Meets	-	-	-	-
"Record" Production	-	80	1,400	1,320
Web Site	-	-	1,000	1,000
Total Cash Disbursements	-	321	3,705	3,384
Net Budget - Receipts in Excess(less than) Disbursements:	775	2,929	547	\$ 2,382

Other Sources/Changes in Cash:

Cash at Beginning of Period	10,779	8,625	8,625	
Total Cash at End of Period	\$ 11,554	\$ 11,554	\$ 9,172	

End of Period Cash Balances by Account (adjusted for outstanding items):

Burke & Herbert - Checking	\$ 5,392			
Burke & Herbert - Money Market	6,162			
Total Cash	\$ 11,554			

Respectfully Submitted,
William J Kane, Treasurer
October 4, 2023

Notes:

- 1 This financial statement uses the cash basis of accounting except as noted on the face of the statement.
- 2 Amounts are rounded to the nearest dollar.

NEXT COUNCIL MEETING

October General Council is canceled
Wednesday, November 15, 2023, 7:00 p.m.
Virtual

AGENDA

- Call to order
- Minutes Approved
- Committee Reports
- Treasurer Report
- Co-chairs Report
- Resolutions
- Supervisor's Time
- Members Time
- Adjourn

COMMITTEE CALENDAR

MVCCA Council—November 15, 7:00 p.m., Virtual
MVCCA Board—November 14, 7:00 p.m. Virtual

Comm	Date	Time	Place	Chair
BUDG	TBD	7:00	Virtual	open
EDU	TBD	7:30	Virtual	Hosek
E&R	11/1	7:00	Virtual	L. Zaragoza
PL/Z	11/6	7:00	Virtual	Mathur
PS	TBD	7:00	Virtual	open
TRAN	11/13	7:00	Virtual	J. Zaragoza
MSCS	TBD	7:00	Virtual	Milanowski

*The Record is published monthly except August by the
Mount Vernon Council of Citizens' Associations, P.O. Box 203,
Mount Vernon, VA 22121-0203.*