MEMORANDUM

To: Matt Brown, Acting Director, DDOT
From: Ellen McCarthy, Acting Director, DCOP
Subject: moveDC Comments
Date: July 31, 2014

The DC Office of Planning (OP) appreciates this opportunity to provide DDOT with our comments on the draft of the moveDC Multimodal Long-Range Transportation Plan. The draft plan provides a comprehensive vision for a multimodal transportation system that will improve quality of life for residents, workers, and visitors and support the continued economic vibrancy of the District. OP is pleased to have been a participant in the Agency Advisory Committee that provided DDOT with feedback throughout the planning process, and many of our comments have already been addressed through those discussions. The draft plan is a testament to the vision, hard work, and dedication of DDOT staff and the meaningful and collaborative public engagement process that resulted in a great deal of valuable citizen input.

OP particularly supports:
- The prioritization of pedestrian accessibility, comfort, and safety as a principal focus of the transportation network
- A robust expansion of public transportation options, including Metrorail expansions in the core and a major increase in high-capacity surface transit
- A vastly expanded bicycle network that will make cycling safe and convenient over a great portion of the city
- Focus on the District’s place at the core of a major metropolitan region, and the need to ensure greater connectivity across jurisdictional boundaries

Additional Suggestions to Enhance the Plan
With a plan of this size and complexity, there will naturally be a few areas where there is room for improvement or clarification. OP offers the following comments and recommendations, organized by chapter and modal element.

Policy and Planning Framework (Chapter 4)
- moveDC sets a bold vision of zero fatalities and serious injuries on the District transportation network, but the plan document could do more to highlight that
vision. Cities around the world have used the "Vision Zero" campaign to emphasize and communicate their commitment to eliminating fatalities and serious injuries. The moveDC plan should consider using the terminology and branding of Vision Zero. In addition, a firm commitment to this goal may require measures beyond what is detailed in the current plan. For example, the Policy and Planning Framework suggests that the District “should evaluate speed limits in excess of 25 mph to assess the trade-offs between travel time and safety.” Studies have shown that the risk of death for pedestrians struck by motor vehicles increases dramatically at speeds between 20-25 miles per hour. Consequently, it should be firmly established as District policy that (with rare exceptions) the design speed as well as the legal speed limit on District roadways should not exceed 25 mph.

Reducing vehicle speeds is the single most effective strategy the District can employ to eliminate pedestrian fatalities and serious injuries.

- The draft plan appropriately mentions education and enforcement, but there is very little detail. Enforcement and coordination between the Metropolitan Police Department and DDOT requires improvement in several areas (including proper handling of bicycle crashes and the unsuccessful bus lanes on 7th and 9th). The plan should give greater guidance and set out action items for improved coordination with MPD. Safe and effective transportation operations will require strong early involvement, education, and buy-in from enforcement authorities. Alternatively, or in addition, DDOT may need to consider the development of separate enforcement capabilities, above and beyond the existing Traffic Control Officer program.

- The plan states that updates should be made to laws, regulations, and policies addressing bicycle accommodation, but provides no detail on what changes are necessary.

- In particular, we see DDOT as having a key role to play in improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the transportation system by increasing its proactivity as the manager and integrator of the system. DDOT’s control over virtually all the elements of the system seems to provide numerous opportunities to achieve major system efficiencies at relatively little expenditure to increase roadway capacity, through better management of the system elements. Examples include improving bus and streetcar speed and reliability through a strategic combination of better curbside management and enforcement, traffic signal timing, establishment of queue-jumper lanes or other priority techniques for high-occupancy vehicles; this could be quite significant. Similarly, efforts to improve pedestrian access to transit and to major destinations through place-making, signalization, installation of traffic medians and similar pedestrian facilities, and approaches to promoting cycling through looking to integrate parking, signage, public education and
information, encouragement of retailers to expand delivery options, etc. are all promising opportunities for DDOT to effect improved efficiency.

Pedestrian Element
- There has been a resurgence of interest recently in the design and management of streets where pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles share space, and design cues give direction to users on how to handle interactions. The plan should acknowledge such street design options and establish at least a preliminary framework for determining how, and under what circumstances, such places can be best incorporated into the District’s transportation and public space networks.

Bicycle Element
- The definition of BLOS could be expanded upon. A footnote provides a general description of the measurement, but there is no explanation of the distinctions among letter grades.
- Recommendation A.8 suggests a system goal for CaBi of 75 percent of residents and 90 percent of employees within ¼ mile of a CaBi station. While this seems like a reasonable goal, it would be useful to understand how the goal was determined and what impact it will have on system performance. (It would also be helpful to know the system’s current coverage on this metric.) It should also be noted that more demand-responsive goals might require multiple stations within high-demand areas. DDOT will need to evaluate population coverage goals against demand-oriented goals.

Transit Element
- The Transit Element includes many important recommendations that will be critical to the success of transit in the District and the metropolitan region, as well as the District’s economic prosperity. These include the establishment of a surface high-capacity transit network, investments in operational enhancements, and investments in Metrorail core capacity.
- The Transit Element would benefit from further clarity regarding the goals and objectives of the transit system. For example, the element begins by saying that the District plans to “extend the coverage and efficiency of the network,” without addressing the trade-offs that are inherent between those two goals. Coverage and efficiency are both legitimate goals for a transit system, but they cannot be simultaneously optimized. Failing to clarify the difficult decisions inherent in
choosing performance targets along the spectrum between the two extremes risks setting unrealistic expectations.

- The Transit Element also needs clarity on the role of the District and other stakeholders in coordinating intra-regional travel by transit and the necessary planning and investment activities to improve the regional transit network. Recommendations B.4 and B.5 address regional partnerships and coordination, and suggest that "the District should take a leadership role" in such efforts. OP endorses a proactive role, but notes that several cross-jurisdictional transit discussions currently underway (particularly including potential extensions of the planned streetcar system into Maryland and across the Potomac into Virginia) raise difficulties for DDOT and its peer agencies in other jurisdictions. DDOT lacks the capacity and authority to engage in planning activities within other jurisdictions, and vice versa; however, without proactivity in pushing for the peer agencies in the different jurisdictions to communicate and coordinate, it will not happen, so we strongly encourage DDOT to play a visible role in that respect, both in direct multilateral discussions and through the Council of Governments/TPB. OP also suggests working aggressively to engage with WMATA in these cross-jurisdictional discussions, since WMATA is authorized to act as the regional transit planning authority.

- OP strongly endorses Recommendation B.6, which suggests not only implementing standards for frequency and span of service but also developing a set of well-defined service types based on function. Such an approach would bring greater clarity to the diversity of locally and regionally operated transit services within the District. It would also ensure that as new services (such as the streetcar) are planned and implemented, there will be a clear discussion about the function of each service and where it falls within the "family" of services provided.

- DDOT is currently in the process of a few key transit planning activities that anticipate and complement the Transit Element. These include an update of the streetcar system plan, an update of the 10-year Transit Development Plan for the Circulator, and the RFP process for an Integrated Premium Transit system (which may include an assumption of responsibility for local bus service). Once the moveDC plan is adopted, OP suggests that these disparate plans need to be reintegrated into a complete District Transit Plan. A District Transit Plan should begin by asking the question "What would the District's transit service look like if we were starting from scratch, and designing a system that best met the District's needs?"

- The Transit Element should include recommendations regarding enforcement of transit priority and the exclusive use of sections of right-of-way. As previously noted, lack of enforcement was a contributor to the failure of the 7th and 9th Street bus lanes in Downtown. DDOT and partner agencies have already made initial steps
in enhanced enforcement on the H Street corridor in preparation for the launch of streetcar service, and these should be built upon.

**Vehicle Element**
The discussion of peak period travel speeds is (perhaps inadvertently) somewhat one-sided. The discussion and maps frame travel speed as primarily a congestion-related concern, implying that “free-flow” conditions are optimal. The section lacks a discussion of the impact of higher vehicle speeds on safety. In addition to maps that depict travel speeds in terms of percentage of “free-flow” speed, this section could be augmented by maps (and accompanying policy discussion) showing average travel speeds in actual miles per hour. Identifying those portions of the road network where average travel speeds exceed 25 mph would be a significant step toward determining where traffic calming and enforcement actions are warranted. Perhaps what is more important than looking to increase areas under “free-flow” conditions, is to focus on making vehicular travel times more reliable and consistent, by focusing on eliminating the bottlenecks which are particularly vexing to commuters.

OP also endorses this element’s focus on providing additional connectivity through the introduction of new streets. In particular, OP recommends that DDOT should consider raising the new connection of Eye Street NW between 3rd Street and New Jersey Avenue in priority from its current Tier 4 designation, as there may be near-term opportunities to develop such a connection.

**TDM Element**
The TDM Element appropriately recognizes that the current system of incorporating TDM through zoning cases is less than optimal. However, the discussion on page TDM-5, in order to be fully accurate, should note that discretionary zoning approvals are handled both by the Zoning Commission and the Board of Zoning Adjustment, depending on the type of case.

Regarding Recommendation B.1: OP agrees with the overall thrust of widespread incorporation of TDM into development projects, but notes that the phrase “that impact the District’s right-of-way” is not entirely clear. The wording suggests that this is intended to apply to projects requiring public space permits, but it should be clarified. OP and DDOT have previously discussed opportunities to create a more systematic approach to TDM in the development approval process (including projects that do not require public space permits), and we recommend additional effort between the two agencies on this issue.

Finally, this Element does not fully address the potential for transportation management associations or transportation management districts to manage transportation demand (and possibly parking assets), coordinate activities, and pool resources. Such organizations have been effective in other cities and states and have been previously discussed here. Partnerships between the Business Improvement Districts and DDOT have already shown positive results in promoting transportation choices, and we recommend exploring opportunities to build on these efforts through both formal and voluntary programs. There were high level discussions in the past about establishing a Transportation Management Organization on the DC side of the border in Friendship Heights to coordinate with
Montgomery County's efforts, given that that area is designated a Regional Center in the DC Comprehensive Plan, a category second in intensity of development only to the Downtown, it is important to put into place mechanisms to promote TDM measures among the developers and employers in that area, since the border between the jurisdictions goes right through the middle of the development node.

**Parking and Curbside Management Element**
OP generally endorses the overall approach of this Element, which is to focus on improved management of curb space for performance outcomes, including availability of parking and balancing multimodal objectives. This Element includes recommendations that acknowledge the connection between on-street and off-street parking and loading, including Recommendations A.2, A.3, A.6, and B.3. OP agrees with these recommendations, and has the following suggestions:

- **Recommendations A.4 and C.2**, which deal with data collection and analysis, should explicitly address off-street parking supply as well as on-street. Because the District has no overall picture of parking supply and demand (either District-wide or at more micro scales), it is difficult to make effective, informed regulatory or management decisions affecting either half of the equation. DDOT and OP have already begun preliminary efforts to understand utilization of off-street parking supply for residential buildings; these efforts should be continued and expanded. Crucially, the two agencies (including potential additional partners such as DCRA) should undertake a full parking census, so that the overall estimate of supply stated in the 2003 Task Force report can be validated and updated on a regular basis.

- **As with parking**, a more complete analysis of the extent (and accessibility) of off-street loading facilities is necessary in order to fully implement Recommendation A.6. Areas with existing off-street loading facilities are prime candidates for enhanced outreach, education, and enforcement action to reduce curbside conflicts and encourage/require the use of existing facilities. Given the severely negative impact on the flow of transit vehicles, autos and trucks and bikes, particularly from double parking to unload goods, this should be a very high priority as a way of increasing useful roadway capacity at no capital cost.

- **With regard to Recommendation B.2**, OP notes that transit access (particular on streets designated in moveDC as part of the High Capacity Transit network) is also a priority that requires consideration when prioritizing curbside space. Longer transit stops, queue jumps, and fully dedicated lanes are strategies that will often be required. Some streets with sidewalk widths inadequate to meet current or future pedestrian demand are also candidates for temporary or permanent extensions of pedestrian space.

OP also notes that the discussion of existing conditions in this Element could be augmented by a brief description of the regulatory environment that shapes the current Residential Parking Permit, Visitor Parking Pass, and metering programs. Many District residents (as
well as decision makers) are not fully aware of how existing legislation and regulation constrain the current programs, and there is therefore little clarity on responsibility for improving them.

Finally, OP notes that this Element lacks an Implementation section. OP understands that much of the detailed implementation actions relevant to this element will be dealt with in a forthcoming curbside management strategy. However, since the actions recommended in this Element do have both capital and operating budget implications (and therefore implications for resource allocation and prioritization), OP suggests that at least a high-level implementation section should be added to this element.

**Sustainability and Livability Element**
OP supports this Element and endorses its full implementation. In particular, this Element provides a welcome focus on past and current successes in placemaking in the public realm, as well as opportunities to do more. OP strongly endorses Recommendation C.4, which calls for a Placemaking in Public Space program. OP encourages DDOT to build up its own organizational capabilities in this area, including the development of internal staff resources with urban design expertise and the authority necessary to support such a program. In addition, OP offers its own resources and expertise in support of such a program, and recommends that partnerships with other entities (including the Business Improvement Districts) be used to augment the program.

As with the Parking and Curbside Management Element, this Element lacks an Implementation section, and OP suggests that such a section would provide needed focus and clarity to the prioritization decisions necessary to carry out the recommendations in the element.

**Conclusion**
We congratulate DDOT on getting the moveDC plan so close to completion, and thank you for the hard work and collaborative engagement that has made the plan possible. OP stands ready to work with DDOT over the coming years to make the moveDC vision a reality.

Thank you once again for the opportunity to offer comments. If you have any questions about our comments, please do not hesitate to contact Dan Emerine of my staff at (202) 442-8812.
DC Bicycle Advisory Comments on moveDC
7-14-14

2005 Bicycle Master Plan
MoveDC includes a status report on the implementation of the 2005 Bicycle Master Plan. It gives the implementation of the 2005 Plan a mixed rating:

- We know that the proportion of bicycle trips has increased from about 1 percent of all trips in 2001 to at least 4.1 percent in 2014, an important goal of the 2005 Plan.

- We don’t really know if we’ve reached the 2005 Plan’s goals of better bicycling on 50 miles of DC streets since 2005 or if we’re on track to reach that goal on 100 miles by next year, but we do know that 45% of the street network gets a failing grade for bicycling.

- We don’t know if bicycle crashes are increasing at a slower or faster rate than the number of trips taken by bicycle.

The bicycle element of moveDC includes a number of recommendations that should help us evaluate the performance of bicycle infrastructure and programs in the city. The stated performance criterion is to increase the number of trips made by bicycle while lowering the rate of bicycle crashes in the city. The BAC supports this performance criterion for DDOT’s bicycle program. It should be noted that most of those recommendations were included in the 2005 Plan as well.

moveDC’s Bicycle Mode Share Goal
The moveDC goal for trips made by bicycle in 2040 is 12% of work trips, an 8% increase over 26 years. This is a modest goal by any standard, but particularly when compared to the level of interest expressed by the public during the moveDC planning process. Fifty-six percent of the participating public prioritized better bicycling as their preferred outcome for this Plan. The BAC recommends setting a goal for trips made by bicycle closer to 25%, the goal that the city of Portland, Oregon, has adopted.

By setting such a low bar for increasing bicycling, moveDC misses opportunities to transform neighborhoods into the communities that people want to live, work and play in. Bicycling is not the only ingredient in that recipe, but it is the leavening.

moveDC’s Policies and Complete Streets
The BAC has long advised the District government to pursue a complete streets policy approach to balancing the needs if different users in a given corridor. The 2005 Bicycle Master Plan and the draft moveDC Bicycle Element include policy recommendations that require every transportation project to be assessed for the opportunity to accommodate bicycles.

Bicycle accommodations vary depending on the corridor. We currently have a mixture of streets with sharrows, indicating that bikes and cars need to share the same space. Painted bike lanes on streets where there is room to put them now dot the street network. The highly popular separated
cycle tracks on a handful of major downtown corridors are national models for innovative
design. The bridge access and the struggling multi-use trail network play a role in the bicycle
infrastructure network as well.

MoveDC appears to be setting a new policy direction when it states that preference going
forward is to provide “...a better quality accommodation by strategically separating travel
modes...”, rather than “...a network made up of compromises for all modes.” This new policy
seems to be letting the perfect be the enemy of the good; separated cycle tracks being the perfect,
or the “preferred”, and everything else being a sacrifice.

The BAC whole-heartedly endorses cycle tracks as an ideal type of bicycle facility but
advises DDOT to leave the door open to the use of painted bike lanes, bicycle boulevards
and other facility types to create a truly comprehensive bicycle network in the city.

The BAC urges DDOT to adopt a policy that gives preference to accommodating all users in a
corridor unless safe and efficient operation of a mode is compromised to an impracticable level
by doing so. The criteria for establishing “a better quality accommodation” needs to be clearly
articulated and widely communicated to enable the public to participate in the determination of
how the public rights of way are utilized.

The moveDC documents contain scores of maps indicating which modes will be given
preference in the public rights of way. It may be more useful to consider these maps as
informative rather than prescriptive going forward.

Anacostia River Bridges
The BAC has an ongoing concern about the bicycle network required to connect Wards 7 & 8 to
the rest of the city. MoveDC proposes “off street paths” on the Anacostia River bridges. The
BAC advises DDOT to pursue a separate accommodation for bicycles on the Anacostia
River bridges whether it is an off street path or a cycle track. Failure to do so will perpetuate
the geographic division of the city with all of the undesirable effects that creates.

Going Forward
The compilation of data and analysis on transportation in moveDC is possibly paralleled in the
history of the city. It will be a useful resource for planning and decision-making going forward.

Because city life is conducted in increments of less than a quarter century, the BAC
encourages the District government to develop action plans for transportation that spans a
3-6 year time frame. The action plans should be comprehensible to the general public. The
current documentation for the DC budget, the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority
and the Metropolitan Washington Council of Government’s Transportation Improvement
Program are indecipherable.

Because the scope and scale of most bicycle improvements are very small in proportion to the
rest of transportation expenditures, they wind up in the miscellaneous category in these
documents. There is little to no accountability for budgeting and planning of bicycle
improvements in the current system. A near to mid-term action plan aimed at taxpayers should make these investments visible.

In addition to the budget documentation for bicycling improvements, the coordination of planning for bicycling needs to occur throughout the District government, including the following:

- DC Office of Planning Comprehensive Plan,
- Department of Parks and Recreation Play DC Master Plan,
- District Department of Energy Sustainable DC Plan,
- Department of General Services Workplace Design Guidelines and
- Metropolitan Police Department Training Plans.

Submitted July 30, 2014

Thank you for giving the District of Columbia Pedestrian Advisory Council (PAC) the opportunity to comment on the Public Review Draft of moveDC, DDOT's Multimodal Long Range Transportation Plan.

This plan establishes a strong multimodal vision for D.C.'s transportation future over the next 25 years, and it places an appropriately high priority on meeting the needs of pedestrians. The District is making progress toward creating a safer, more walkable city, and the plan identifies a range of important steps D.C. can take to improve conditions further. If fully implemented, the plan's recommendations promise to further improve conditions for walking across the city.

Prioritizing Pedestrians

The PAC strongly supports the plan's call for prioritizing pedestrians and its recommendation that "[t]he District should adopt formal policy statements to confirm that pedestrians are the District's highest transportation priority." Public input received during the moveDC development process also demonstrated "[s]trong support (93% of participants) for making pedestrians the highest priority[.]"

The plan notes that "[t]he pedestrian network is the very foundation of our transportation system" and that "[e]very trip, whether by bus, bike, car, or train, begins and ends with a walk." By promoting walking, D.C. stands to benefit from less traffic congestion, improved air quality, healthier residents, and more vibrant and livable communities.

The PAC urges that pedestrian accommodation and safety be considered a higher priority for the approval of new District projects than vehicle flow and travel times.
Pedestrian Safety and Accessibility

The PAC’s mission is advise the D.C. government on pedestrian safety and accessibility, and we have spent the last four years focusing on various aspects of pedestrian safety and accessibility, including engineering, enforcement, and education. The Foreword section includes an important goal of achieving “zero fatalities and serious injuries on the District transportation network.” This follows from The District of Columbia Strategic Highway Safety Plan, which includes concrete steps to improve the safety of pedestrians and all other road users. MoveDC recommends a number of steps that will contribute to a safe walking environment.

1. Sidewalks

The PAC supports moveDC’s goal of providing “sidewalks on at least one side of every street and preferably on both sides of every street.” We note that this goal appears to be generally consistent with the requirements of DC Code 9-425.01. According to the plan, “[a]pproximately four percent of the blocks in the District have missing sidewalks on one or both sides of the street[,]” which will require building “at least 127 new miles of sidewalk by locating sidewalks on at least one side of every street in the District.” Members of the public involved in the moveDC development process “expressed strong support (77%), especially respondents from the District, in having sidewalks on both sides of streets.” The plan states the need to create “a pedestrian environment that accommodates people of all ages and abilities” and avoids “[g]aps in the sidewalk system” that would “force pedestrians— including children, seniors, and the disabled—into the street at some locations.”

In addition to safety, the PAC’s mission includes accessibility, and we support the plan’s statement that:

“All sidewalks should be constructed in conformance with the latest ADA Accessibility Guidelines, but also should strive to meet the more robust standards of Universal Design and the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board’s proposed accessibility guidelines in the Public Right-of-Way Access Guide for the design, construction, and alteration of pedestrian facilities in the public right-of-way.”

The PAC agrees with the plan’s recommendation that: “DDOT should refine the system for inspecting sidewalks and identifying and cataloging needed repairs for sidewalks that fall within the maintenance responsibility of the District.” (Recommendation A.4) Based on the PAC’s inquiry to date, we believe that DDOT inspects sidewalks too infrequently and lacks a rigorous system to prioritize repairs and reconstruction. In
many cases, repairs appear to require residents to report problem locations in order for them to receive attention. The PAC agrees with the plan that “[s]idewalk repairs and reconstruction should be prioritized based on high pedestrian demand and poor walking conditions, requests, and meeting ADA guidelines.”

2. Safe Street Crossings

Providing pedestrians with safe street crossings is of vital importance to pedestrian safety. One concern about the draft moveDC plan is that in places the plan appears to overly rely on sidewalks while neglecting to mention other important improvements like curb extensions, signals, signs, crosswalks, and other facilities that help pedestrians cross the street safely. For instance, Figures 4.3-4.6 list under “Pedestrian” only “Sidewalks on at least one side of every street” while other modes list multiple improvements. Another example is Table 5.6, which lists only sidewalks under capital investment type for pedestrians. This leaves out many other necessary features that help pedestrians safely cross the street like Leading Pedestrian Intervals (LPIs), HAWK signals, pedestrian refuge islands, and other pedestrian safety features. These are all items that should be included as high priority Tier 1 investments. The forthcoming action plan should include goals for increasing the installation of LPIs and HAWK signals and improving marking and signage at a greater number of uncontrolled crossings.

The PAC is pleased that the plan recommends that “pedestrian crossings should be provided across all legs of an intersection unless a special exception can be clearly justified.” (Recommendation A.3) Our only concern is that the term “special exception” is never defined and could be exploited to allow the practice of “closing” one or more crosswalks at intersections. We believe that exceptions should only be made when there is evidence that requiring someone to walk three ways around an intersection, in order to cross the street once, is actually safer than allowing them to cross the street once in the first place. Crosswalks should not be closed in order to facilitate motor vehicle traffic or to provide more parking spaces.

3. Pedestrian Signals and Timing

Pedestrian signals can help pedestrians safely cross the street as long as they are timed appropriately for pedestrians. Signal cycles that are timed to prioritize motor vehicles can be unsafe and impede accessibility for pedestrians, leaving them too little time to cross the street; similarly, even when overall signal length is adequate, a short pedestrian phase signal length can impede accessibility and unfairly limit the rights of
pedestrians. Both the overall pedestrian phase signal cycle and “walk” signal length should be timed to prioritize pedestrian needs. DDOT should explore innovative methods for improving pedestrian access using signal timing techniques. One concern about the plan is that Chapter 4, Section E includes a discussion of optimizing traffic signal operations to “expand person-carrying capacity” but does not mention the importance of considering pedestrians when adjusting signal timing. However, the 2009 Pedestrian Master Plan Update (Appendix P.1) indicates that the District’s new signal timing uses slower walking speeds, which is good for pedestrians, and the PAC supports this. The PAC also supports moveDC’s call for a reduction in the use of pedestrian-actuated signals (Recommendation A.5); the PAC would prefer to see the use of these types of signals minimized.

Appendix P.1 also cites the use of expanding use of Leading Pedestrian Intervals (LPIs) – a total of 117 as of December 2013 – which give pedestrians a “walk” signal several seconds before drivers receive a green light so that pedestrians are more visible as they cross the street. The PAC supports the expanded use of LPIs across the city, and we urge DDOT to systematically keep track of the locations where they are used.

4. Speed

The PAC agrees with the plan’s direction that “[t]he District should emphasize safety and vehicle speed management in the design of all streets by designing streets to meet the posted speed limit” and “evaluate speed limits in excess of 25 mph to assess the trade-offs between travel time and safety.” Speeding traffic can have deadly consequences for pedestrians so the PAC strongly supports slowing motor vehicle traffic to speeds that are safe for pedestrians. As the plan states, “lower vehicle speeds tend to result in fewer and less severe crashes for all modal users[.]” and “[i]n the case of pedestrians and bicycles, vehicular speeds of less than 20 mph result in significant safety benefits in terms of crashes resulting in fatality or severe injury.”

In addition, we note that Recommendation A-9 calls for DDOT’s traffic calming program to “shift from a policy of neighborhood-requested traffic calming to include standard assessments of where traffic calming is appropriate.” The PAC fully supports this important recommendation. In areas of heavily-populated condominium and apartment

---

¹ It is important to remember that, under DC Code 50-2201.28(b), a pedestrian’s right-of-way at a signalized intersection is tied to whether or not the pedestrian begins crossing with a “walk” signal: “A pedestrian who has begun crossing on the ‘WALK’ signal shall be given the right-of-way by the driver of any vehicle to continue to the opposite sidewalk or safety island, whichever is nearest.” Short “walk” signal cycles may make it difficult to impossible for pedestrians to comply with the law, particularly if there are significant conflicts with turning vehicles, if there are obstructions in the pedestrian’s path, or if the pedestrian faces mobility challenges.
buildings, it can be difficult to impossible for petitioners to get 75% of households to sign a petition. It also makes good sense – a traffic calming assessment should not require a majority of households to want it; if drivers are traveling too quickly through a neighborhood or otherwise not complying with DC’s traffic laws, we should be taking action to stop it.

The PAC urges that reducing speeds, on both major thoroughfares and neighborhood streets, through redesigning our streets (as well as enforcing traffic laws) be made a more prominent goal, and be clearly placed above other factors such as vehicle flow and travel times. There is a great need for significant traffic calming, re-engineering both neighborhood streets and especially arterials like Georgia Avenue, North Capitol Street, Alabama Avenue, 14th Street NW, and Connecticut Avenue NW. While moveDC certainly addresses this, it should go farther in the implementation to clearly indicate that safety considerations are considered more important than vehicle flow and travel times considered in level of service.

5. Enforcement

The PAC has devoted significant attention to traffic enforcement to improve pedestrian safety. The PAC supports expanding the District’s photo enforcement program (Recommendation C.2) as a way to ensure that drivers comply with speed limits, red lights, stop signs, and crosswalks, thereby creating a safer walking environment. The evidence has shown that this program has worked in incentivizing compliance across the city.

The PAC has been engaged in an ongoing dialogue with the Metropolitan Police Department (MPD) about officer enforcement of traffic laws and we support continued officer enforcement. We note that the Pedestrian Element portion of the plan states that the District “could benefit from a dedicated traffic enforcement unit” within MPD because it “would have the potential to contribute to further improvements in vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian safety.” The PAC has discussed this issue, but we have not taken a position on the creation of such a unit. We would be interested in seeing the D.C. government conduct an assessment of the experiences in cities that have such a dedicated unit and whether such a change could benefit the District’s traffic enforcement efforts.

6. Education

Recommendation C.4 calls for DDOT to “continue its current safety education program.” The plan acknowledges that “[t]he twice-annual regional Street Smart Safety Campaign continues to be DDOT’s principle outreach tool for pedestrian safety education[.]” While the PAC supports Street Smart, we would like to see pedestrian safety education
expanded and continued throughout the year rather than occur in only two discrete periods of time each year. The plan states that:

“Safety messages specifically related to pedestrians should be broadcast year round through media outlets including radio, TV, online and printed material only in targeted locations (such as the D.C. Department of Motor Vehicles, schools, and the DDOT website). Particular attention should be paid to revising driver education and testing standards.”

The PAC believes that such an expansion of pedestrian safety efforts would enhance the District’s efforts to truly prioritize pedestrians.


Recommendation B.2 calls for revising the “DDOT Design and Engineering Manual to better address pedestrian safety” to “incorporate the prioritization of pedestrian safety and accessibility with leading-edge techniques” when it is revised in 2014. According to the 2009 Pedestrian Master Plan Update in Appendix P.1, when the manual was last updated in 2009, most pedestrian safety update recommendations “were not incorporated.”

The PAC supports this recommendation and urges DDOT to present to the PAC about its plans to update the manual before it is finalized.

8. Autonomous Vehicles

There is brief mention in the plan about supporting “autonomous vehicle implementation and connected vehicle research, using D.C. as a test bed for the nation[,]” and it states that “additional study of autonomous vehicles is needed to evaluate things like safety in a complex urban environment.” The PAC agrees that this new technology must be studied closely to ensure that pedestrians are adequately protected.

Pedestrian Investments

PAC is pleased to see in Figure 5.7 that the majority of planned pedestrian investment projects (filling sidewalk gaps), fall under the highest two priority categories – Tiers 1 ($24 million) and 2 ($18 million).
Pedestrian Element

The Pedestrian Element section of the plan serves as an update to the 2009 Pedestrian Master Plan, and it makes a number of good recommendations that will help the District realize several important goals: (1) reduce "the number of pedestrian injuries and fatalities;" (2) prioritize "pedestrians in transportation projects;" (3) create "a pedestrian environment that accommodates people of all ages and abilities;" and (4) create "a fully-connected pedestrian network." The recommendations flow from the recommendations in the 2009 master plan.

Just as the Sidewalk Assurance Act provides a system of prioritization for addressing sidewalk gaps, DDOT should have systems for prioritizing other pedestrian projects, including corridor-level improvements (Recommendation A.2), sidewalk repairs (Recommendation A.4), controlled crossings (Recommendation A.5), uncontrolled crossings and intersections (Recommendation A.6), and traffic calming (Recommendation A.9). In assessing the order in which to address these issues, DDOT should use clear criteria to judge the level of need at each location, and these standards should be available to the public. For instance, streets and intersections with high traffic volumes and faster vehicle speeds as well as locations frequented by transit users, students, older adults, and persons with disabilities should receive special attention. Neighborhood input from ANCs and community groups should receive serious consideration, but the burden of getting dangerous streets and crossing fixed should not fall on residents.

The Pedestrian Element section could be strengthened by explicitly describing how DDOT will collect, maintain and use data – including assessments of existing conditions, the locations of different types of pedestrian infrastructure, and pedestrian crash data – to drive transportation planning and decision-making. The PAC has found that the Urban Forestry Administration excels at using data, maintaining a detailed inventory of the city's tree inventory, where dead trees need to be removed, and where and when new trees will be planted. On the other hand, when the PAC asked DDOT to provide the locations of all Leading Pedestrian Intervals (LPIs), we learned that such information was not readily available in a single location.

In other cases, DDOT may have the data but decide not to make it widely available to the public as is the case with pedestrian crash data, which is tightly held and requires members of the public to file Freedom of Information Act-like requests to obtain these data. Consistent with the principles and commitments expressed in the July 21 Mayor's Order 2014-170 (Transparency, Open Government and Open Data Directive) (http://dc.gov/node/871012), in the interest of transparency, DDOT should make these data readily available to the public as frequently as possible. For example, New York City
recently began publishing daily crash reports as part of its *Vision Zero* plan (see, e.g., http://www.wnyc.org/story/nyc-opens-traffic-crash-data-finally/).

**Status of Pedestrian Master Plan Progress**

Appendix P.1 provides a status report on progress toward implementing the 2009 master plan as of December 2013. The PAC recommends that DDOT post a similar table on its Pedestrian Program website and regularly update it to demonstrate progress toward implementing the recommendations in the master plan and the new Pedestrian Element document.

**Conclusion**

The PAC appreciates the hard work of many dedicated DDOT employees and members of the public who contributed to a strong moveDC plan. The plan establishes a strong vision for a safer, more walkable city in the years to come. This vision is supported by a series of good goals and recommendations for improving conditions for pedestrians across the city. The key will be ensuring that as many good elements of the plan as possible are implemented. The PAC supports the moveDC plan and will focus our future efforts on working to ensure that the many good pedestrian components in it, and especially the Pedestrian Element, are implemented.

Approved by Unanimous Vote: July 28, 2014
July 11, 2014

Colleen Hawkinson
Manager, Strategic Planning
District Department of Transportation
55 M St SE
Washington, DC 20003

Dear Colleen,

DC Surface Transit (DCST) has reviewed the draft MoveDC plan and appreciates the opportunity to submit these comments on the transit element.

Transit Decision-Making

MoveDC identifies a wide variety of infrastructure and policy changes related to the city’s transportation network over the next thirty years. Public transit services are a critical element of that network as well as the Mayors 2012 Sustainable DC Plan.

The plan offers a compelling vision for the future of transit service in the city. It also demonstrates the need for additional consensus and cooperation between transit operators and government agencies, and a shared service-based approach to planning. To reach that future, the District of Columbia will need greater integration of these functions and a different approach to decision-making than currently exists or is planned for in MoveDC.

Service-Based Planning

Transit projects are different from other transportation infrastructure in that transit is about providing a service. That service may involve a variety of capital investments, such as vehicles, stops and shelters, storage and maintenance facilities, fare collection systems. It would have been helpful if MoveDC had started the discussion about the future of DC transit by asking what kinds of transit services are needed, instead of what the capital investments should be. The decision to invest should be based on the requirements of the transit service to be provided.

Not all transit services are the same. There are different ways to combine several elements of any transit service depending on the desired final product or the brand of service. These elements include the routing, spacing of the stops, the span of service (e.g. the hours of operation), the frequency of service, and many others.

The service elements define the brand. For example, Metrorail service has a distinct brand because of the kind of service it provides, i.e. rapid transit, not just because it is a subway system. For a surface transit example, the DC Circulator’s brand is not just about red buses that are different from Metrobus, but a distinct brand of service – relatively high frequency, all-day service, with simple routes in major activity centers.

Transit plans should be framed in terms of types or brand of services, rather than by operator or by mode/technology.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Type/Brand of Service:</th>
<th>By Mode/Technology:</th>
<th>By Type of Right-of-way:</th>
<th>By Operator:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Transit</td>
<td>Metrorail</td>
<td>Dedicated, grade-separated right of way</td>
<td>WMATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Frequency Mainline</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>Dedicated right of way with grade crossings</td>
<td>Amtrak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coverage Routes</td>
<td>Streetcar/Light Rail</td>
<td>Non-dedicated right of way, in mixed traffic</td>
<td>Contractors (such as First Transit, Keolis, Veolia, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak-Oriented Commuter</td>
<td>Mainline Rail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Service brands are more than the paint scheme for the vehicles or the marketing materials. The brand of service for riders is about the elements that make it unique from other transit services. The exact mode and technology to deliver the service matters in developing the brand, but not nearly as much as the type of service that is being provided.

**Transit Operations: Service Provider Coordination**

Often the Circulator is the transit service of choice for expansion of transit service because it is operated by the District of Columbia. However, WMATA can and does operate a similar type of service in some corridors. It is not clear what type of service the streetcar system will provide. The determination of streetcar service elements should be coordinated with Metrobus and Circulator service.

The District should not be replacing either regional or non-regional Metrobus service with Circulator service, as these are two distinct and different types of service. The Circulator was never supposed to replace existing services. It was created to move workers, residents and tourists through the core area of the city where there was insufficiently well branded bus service serving major destinations. If it is used in lower density areas that require less frequent service, the brand will be diminished and the entire system will be less reliable. Replacing regional Metrobus service with Circulator service is also very expensive to the taxpayer with no actual benefit.

**Transit Decision-Making**

Currently, decisions about transit are made at DDOT, the DC Council and WMATA and often produce conflicting results. It is difficult to imagine how the status quo will support the development of a highly functioning surface transit network. MoveDC provides a planning platform that could guide subsequent decisions about implementation plans and budgets for all transit providers and decision-makers. We urge DDOT to seek the DC Council’s endorsement of MoveDC to establish a foundation for the city’s transit future.

We look forward to working with DDOT to realize a robust transit future for DC.

Sincerely yours,

Richard H. Bradley
President
Colleen Hawkinson  
Manager, Strategic Planning  
District Department of Transportation  
55 M St SE  
Washington, DC 20003  

Dear Colleen:

The DowntownDC Business Improvement District (BID) has reviewed the District Department of Transportation’s (DDOT’s) draft MoveDC document and appreciates the opportunity to submit our comments. MoveDC’s holistic approach to congestion management is laudable. The emphasis on transit to create a sustainable transportation future for the city is right on target.

While some recommendations are ready for implementation today, other recommendations need additional analysis and consensus before moving forward. The sequence of implementation of congestion management tools needs to be reorganized as well. Finally, the failure to include a recommendation for funded dedicated for transportation is regrettable.

**MoveDC Recommendations**

**Modal Priority.** MoveDC designates modal priorities on existing roadways where freight, transit and bikes will be prioritized in the future. With the exception of some of the transit priority corridors, most of these corridors will require a deeper analysis and discussion with the affected stakeholders than MoveDC provided before a modal designation is assigned that will determine how it a corridor will function for decades to come.

**Congestion Management.** Road pricing has been a discussion topic in the metropolitan Washington region for a considerable period of time. The presentation of this topic in MoveDC lacks a regional context. Any further analysis of a road pricing strategy should be regional in scope and fully engage the transportation entities in adjacent jurisdictions.

The implementation of performance parking and bus transit priority can’t happen soon enough for downtown DC. The benefits to congestion management, parking availability and mobility for all modes are sorely needed. Only after these measures have been put in place should MoveDC’s recommendation for cordon area pricing in downtown be evaluated for implementation.
Dedicated Funding
Dedicated funding for transportation helps to provide some amount of certainty, predictability for large and ongoing investments. It also garners public support for the collection of tax dollars for this purpose. While dedicated funding designations can be repealed, it is a somewhat higher threshold of decision-making than annual appropriations of funding. We encourage DDOT to include a recommendation for dedicated funding in the final MoveDC.

We look forward to working with DDOT towards a sustainable transportation system for 2040.

Sincerely,

Richard H. Bradley
Executive Director
TO:  MATTHEW BROWN, DIRECTOR  
     DISTRICT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
FROM:  MICHAEL STEVENS, AICP  
       PRESIDENT, CAPITOL RIVERFRONT BID  
       TAMMY SHOHAM  
       VICE PRESIDENT, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH  
SUBJECT:  CAPITOL RIVERFRONT BID COMMENTS ON MOVEDC PLAN  
DATE:  JULY 28, 2014  

The Capitol Riverfront Business Improvement District (BID) has carefully reviewed MoveDC’s Draft  
Multimodal Long Range Plan issued in May 2014 and also attended the District Council hearing for MoveDC  
on June 27, 2014. We also attend many of the public workshops hosted by the MoveDC advisory committee  
and DDOT. The BID commends DDOT for drafting an integrated, long-range vision for the District’s  
transportation networks that prioritizes pedestrians, promotes safety and accessibility, and increases the share  
of non-automobile modes of transportation. An integrated, multi-modal transportation network will drive the  
continued growth of the city and will help enable the full build-out of DC’s new-growth neighborhoods, such  
as the Capitol Riverfront. The BID endorses the goals of the plan and DDOT’s long-range vision.  

The BID recognizes that MoveDC provides a regional vision and the recommendations of the plan improve  
connectivity for the District as a whole. Nonetheless, the plan will be implemented incrementally over time,  
and it is the details of alignments, timing, transit mode choices, and neighborhood connections that will  
influence the plan’s interim and ultimate successes as much as the overall vision. Thus, the details of the  
specific recommendations that affect particular neighborhoods must be considered, and the comments that  
follow pertain to three of the six specific transit connections proposed in MoveDC that connect to the  
Capitol Riverfront neighborhood, listed below.  

1. U St NW/ Florida Ave/ 8th St NE High-Capacity Transit from Woodley Park to Navy Yard (Tier 3)  
2. South Capitol Street High-Capacity Transit from Navy Yard to St. Elizabths (Tier 4)  
3. Georgetown to Waterfront Metrorail  

2040 Vision for the Capitol Riverfront  
The BID’s primary long-term transportation concern is providing adequate transit connectivity and access  
between the Capitol Riverfront and destinations to the north, including Union Station, NoMa, and the
Capitol Complex. At full build-out, the Capitol Riverfront neighborhood will house almost 100,000 employees, approximately 18,000 residents, approximately 650,000 SF of retail, Nationals Park, and the proposed new DC United stadium. To put the scale of this new neighborhood development into perspective,

- at full build-out, the Capitol Riverfront will have as much office space as Tysons Corner in 2014,
- at full build-out, the Capitol Riverfront neighborhood will have population density comparable to 2013 density levels in Downtown, Golden Triangle, Chinatown, and Capitol Hill1, and
- with over 3 million visitors per year, the Capitol Riverfront is the third most visited neighborhood in DC after Downtown and the National Mall/Capitol Complex.

The Capitol Riverfront is projected to achieve build-out by 2040, at which time WMATA projects that that the Green Line stations between L’Enfant Plaza and Navy Yard will be the most congested in the entire Metro system and demand will exceed capacity. It is imperative that the new development that is planned for the Capitol Riverfront be adequately served by transportation. Multi-modal service to the Capitol Riverfront must be scaled to serve the projected size of the neighborhood at full build-out. Moreover, the transportation routes must provide meaningful connections between activity centers, fill existing gaps in transit, avoid duplications in services, and relieve Metrorail congestion as needed.

Two years ago, the Capitol Riverfront BID completed a strategic plan for the neighborhood that identified transportation and other public realm investments most critically needed in the neighborhood. The resulting Urban Design Framework Plan, published in 2013, serves as the BID’s strategic plan for the future. This plan identified the need to establish new transit choices to relieve pressures on the Green Line and M Street, SE/SW and recommends a premium transit connection between NoMa, Union Station, the Capitol Complex, Capitol South Metrorail, Navy Yard Metrorail, Nationals Ballpark, and DC United Stadium, with the potential to extend to St. Elizabeths.

**Capitol Riverfront Comments on MoveDC Recommendations**

The high-capacity transit connections proposed for the Capitol Riverfront neighborhood fill gaps in transit connectivity and provide redundancy to relieve the over-burdened Navy Yard Green Line Metrorail station. **The Capitol Riverfront BID endorses the two high capacity transit lines in the MoveDC plan that connect between the Capitol Riverfront and Woodley Park, and between the Capitol Riverfront and St. Elizabeths. The BID encourages MoveDC to accelerate the timeline of implementation for these two alignments.**

---

1 Residential densities based on 2013 ESRI estimates of population living with a half-mile radius of each neighborhood center, as reported in WDCEP DC Neighborhood Profiles, 2014.
For the U St NW/ Florida Ave/ 8th St NE High-Capacity Transit line from Woodley Park to Navy Yard, the BID recommends the phasing be changed from Tier 3 to Tier 1 or 2. This proposed transit line connects between NoMa and the Capitol Riverfront, which DDOT projects to be the city’s third and fourth largest activity centers, both of which are classified as “Large, Near Term” activity centers today. As such, DDOT should accelerate the alignment that connects between these two activity centers. This alignment also relieves Red and Green Metrorail line congestion by providing direct connections between Woodley Park, Adams Morgan, U Street, Union Station, NoMa, and the Capitol Riverfront. NoMa and the Capitol Riverfront are both developing as high density, mixed-use urban neighborhoods that also function as regional employment centers. Connecting residents in both neighborhoods to other job centers is a priority, as well as providing additional accessibility the existing and projected employment bases at build-out.

The BID and also recommends that the U St NW/ Florida Ave/ 8th St NE High-Capacity Transit alignment endpoint move closer to the Navy Yard Metrorail station so that the line better serves the high-density core of the Capitol Riverfront neighborhood. The alignment drawn in the MoveDC plan parallels the Circulator route that travels up 8th Street. This alignment is already served by Circulator, and existing Circulator service is not generating high levels of demand to justify a second mode of transit along this alignment. The Capitol Riverfront and NoMa have a sufficient number of employees and residents to sustain a healthy level of ridership on this Circulator line, however operational deficiencies caused in part by traffic congestion along 8th Street make trip times long and on-time rates low, and as a result ridership levels on the Navy Yard Circulator line are the lowest in the Circulator system. The alignment for MoveDC should provide a more direct connection between the two high-density activity centers of Capitol Riverfront and NoMa and avoid the already-congested Barracks Row corridor. Furthermore, we ask that any future alignments for this new surface connections terminate in our neighborhood’s core intersections where high density retail, residential, and office are located.

It has been argued that by shifting this proposed north/south alignment further to the west it would be difficult to navigate a transit line through the US Capitol Complex. We have had several discussions with the Architect of the Capitol, Stephen Ayers, and his team about transit lines passing through the US Capitol Complex and providing additional north/south connectivity and accessibility. Mr. Ayers has stated that he and his team are willing to discuss such options and the feasibility of transit alignments through the campus.

---

2 DCST TDP 2014 Technical Update includes population and employment projections for the 22 activity centers in Washington DC. Capitol Riverfront, with a total of 44,291 residents and employees by 2015, is the fourth largest activity center. NoMa is projected to have 54,742 residents and employees by 2015, making it the third largest activity center. Only Central Washington and Foggy Bottom have higher concentrations of residents and employees.
They pointed out that the city’s earlier streetcar system actually had lines traversing through the US Capitol Complex, and would discuss light rail, street car or rapid bus transit lines again if they did not pass between two adjacent House or Senate buildings (for security purposes).

The BID endorses the long term plan to connect between the Capitol Riverfront neighborhood and St. Elizabeths via the South Capitol Street High-Capacity Transit from Navy Yard to St. Elizabeths (Tier 4). Connections between the Capitol Riverfront and neighborhoods east of the Anacostia River are vital to the growth and success of our waterfront neighborhood. As the St. Elizabeth’s campus develops and historic Anacostia continues to attract residential and retail development, we believe strong surface transportation connections between these two neighborhoods are vital.

The BID strongly supports the proposed Georgetown to Waterfront Metrorail. Only Metrorail can provide the level of service needed to move the anticipated 100,000 employees and 3-4 million annual visitors to our employment center, residential neighborhoods, Nationals Park and the proposed DC United Soccer Stadium. The transit demands for employees and stadium visitors clusters tightly around peak times, and no other transit system – neither streetcar, bus rapid transit, nor light rail – provides the carrying capacity needed to meet transit demand during office and game day peak transportation times. A second Metrorail station in our neighborhood, with additional connectivity to the Yellow, Orange, and Silver lines, will relieve congestion projected for the Navy Yard Metrorail station. This new Metrorail will also accelerate the build-out of the Capitol Riverfront neighborhood by increasing development value through expanded transit connections. The BID will work with DDOT, other Business Improvement Districts and their stakeholders, and other entities to accelerate the implementation of the proposed Georgetown to Waterfront Metrorail.

Conclusion

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the MoveDC Plan. The Capitol Riverfront BID endorses the DDOT’s efforts to promote the District as a city that is sustainable, accessible, and connected through multi-modal transportation systems. Investing in an integrated, multi-model transportation network will drive economic opportunity to the District and support the continued development of the Capitol Riverfront. The BID looks forward to working with DDOT on forward thinking transportation solutions that will help promote the growth of the Capitol Riverfront.
Matthew Brown  
Director  
District Department of Transportation  
55 M Street, SE, Suite 400  
Washington, DC 20003  

July 30, 2014

Dear Director Brown:

As President of the NoMa Business Improvement District (NoMa BID), I am writing to formally submit comments on the current draft of moveDC, the District of Columbia’s Multimodal Long-Range Transportation Plan (the Plan). On a whole, the NoMa BID supports the goals and recommendations stated in the Plan. Set forth below are the items of specific interest to NoMa. We have noted with particularity those elements of special importance to NoMa.

We are pleased about the prioritization, as Tier 1 investments, of the delivery of the 22-mile Priority Streetcar System, improvements to the H Street, NE Bridge, funding for the Metropolitan Branch Trail (MBT) and the expansion of bicycle facilities throughout DC (specifically the M Street Cycle Track from Florida Avenue, NE to Thomas Circle, NW).

The MBT could be an important commuter and transportation option for many people. Sadly, however, the MBT is not well used. We believe this is attributable to the fact that, unlike other high-traffic DC area bike trails such as the Capital Crescent, the MBT is very incomplete. With the completion of its off-street segments to Silver Spring as well as connection to the Capital Crescent, the trail could provide a valuable and quality service to a wide population. Importantly, increased MBT utilization would increase traffic, help to reduce incidents of crime and improve safety for users. For these reasons, we request that all segments and connections to the MBT be Tier 1 Capital Investments.

With regard to planned near-term (Tier 1) investment in bicycle infrastructure on New York Avenue, we would note that significant changes to the intersection of New York and Florida Avenues (the Virtual Circle) have been considered in the Florida Avenue Multi-modal Transportation Study. We would stress that investments in bicycle infrastructure at this extremely high traffic intersection should come only after an adaptation of the current configuration of the Virtual Circle. As it stands now, there is considerable congestion at the Virtual Circle and it is one of the most dangerous intersections in DC. To introduce new bicycle infrastructure without remediating the current situation could be dangerous for cyclists, motorist and pedestrians.

As a Tier 2 Capital Investment, we support the dedication of funds for the restoration of the street grid, especially on I Street, NW between 4th Street, NW and North Capitol Street. This
extension will fill a gap in the existing street network, providing much-needed access and easier throughput in this growing area.

Additionally, we request that the actions and priorities set forth in moveDC incorporate those recommendations established in the Florida Avenue Multimodal Transportation Study and the Mid City East Livability Study. Both studies focused on the use and configuration of sections of North Capitol Street and Florida Avenue, NE. If moveDC is not reflective of these studies’ findings, it is unlikely that it will be appropriate to local needs. Likewise, the recommendation set forth in the NoMa Vision Plan and Development Study to convert L, Pierce and M Streets, NE between North Capitol and First Street, NE to two-way operations (and also mentioned in the NoMa Neighborhood Access Study and Transportation Management Plan) should be included in moveDC. This adaptation will improve traffic throughput in NoMa and create a more bustling street environment and retail activity on these side streets.

At an overall policy level, we believe that one element is missing in the Plan. In light of recent changes in mode-splits and the introduction of new technologies in transportation, we would recommend that the Plan acknowledge the changing environment and include built-in flexibility to adapt to new transportation modalities and technology. It is likely that changes of this type will continue to occur and being able to respond to them will only improve transportation in Washington, DC.

We appreciate your consideration of these requests and are grateful for your support and partnership. Please feel free to contact me directly if you have any questions or would like to further discuss any of our comments. And again, thank you for your time and attention to improving neighborhood accessibility and connectivity, in addition to the other very important goals of moveDC.

Sincerely,

Robin-Eve Jasper
President
NoMa BID
moveDC Multi-Modal Long Range Transportation Plan
Extended Comments by Chapter
July 28, 2014
Comments prepared by Meg Maguire, Sue Hemberger and Monte Edwards

Introduction

The Committee of 100 on the Federal City has reviewed the moveDC Multi-Modal Long Range Transportation Plan and we submit the following consolidated comments. Our goal is to ensure that the final moveDC plan is the best possible guide to the city for immediate and long-term public investments and priorities, and an appropriate transportation element in the forthcoming revision of the Comprehensive Plan.

The draft plan has a number of positive features. Significant advances in pedestrian and bicycle access, safety and public education will go a long way to accommodating all road users. Prioritizing pedestrian safety and accessibility is important as we are all pedestrians, and as such, we are the most vulnerable users of the roads and sidewalks. Sustainability -- including sustaining and enhancing the beauty of our public rights-of-way -- and environmental stewardship will be given greater attention. And the city will positively reinforce the L’Enfant and McMillan legacies in guiding future development.

Our chief concerns about the draft are detailed in this response and the three appendices attached. To summarize:

- We were astounded to find that the draft is so anemic and lacking in specificity on commuter rail. On several occasions, we detailed our concerns to the moveDC Task Force; and since 2012 we have called on DDOT to develop a DC Rail Plan that is not even mentioned in the moveDC draft plan. Early in the process we submitted information on this topic in writing to the Task Force and consultants but find that it is inexplicably absent from this draft. moveDC needs to explicitly acknowledge that we cannot solve congestion and attendant pollution by DC residents alone but must focus on bringing more workers and visitors into the city by expanded commuter rail.

- The draft plan is youth-friendly but lifelong-lite in its near silence on how to meet the needs of the growing families and the elderly for whom bikes, ride-sharing and lengthy transit trips will supplement but not replace their need for a private vehicle. Isn’t our collective hope that many of these same young people coming to our city will stay as they mature, raise families and invest their talents and resources in the life of the City, even in their retirement? This would be a more appealing and realistic document if it were to weave both accurate data (see especially Appendix A: DATA CRITIQUE) and the narrative on this more inclusive vision throughout the moveDC Plan.

- From the opening chapter, DDOT should be clear that the specific proposals implied on the maps are subject to community scrutiny through ANC hearings, budget approval and oversight. The difficult-to-decipher maps need to be improved and described in the text so that people can
easily understand how streets in their neighborhoods will be affected by corridor improvements, parking policies, transit-dedicated lanes, bike and pedestrian accommodations. At the June 27 Council hearing on the moveDC Plan, citizens from Van Ness St. and Military Rd. expressed alarm that their narrow streets were slated for greatly expanded transit service. How will DDOT reassure residents that this plan provides an overall framework but that the specifics of how the goals will be achieved are not set in place?

We fully agree that the city must move forward with a blended approach of different transit modes. Doing nothing is not a viable option. Given existing conditions, we need to significantly expand our transit system to meet our environmental goals — and even simply to prevent our existing quality of life from deteriorating as the city and the region continue to grow. But greater recognition of the role of private vehicles and an emphasis on commuter rail need to be in that blend, and in the current draft they are either distorted or grossly deficient.

We will live with this plan for the next 25 years and it will most likely constitute the transportation element of the next comprehensive plan. We strongly suggest that DDOT arrange neighborhood hearings on the Plan after the current revisions are in place so that people can understand what is on the difficult-to-decipher maps and how DDOT views changes in their neighborhoods.

Chapter 1. The Long View (plus additional general comments affecting content and recommendations)

#1: Chapter I – The Modern City needs to recognize cars along with transit, biking, walking, buses and streetcars.

The Modern City includes people not recognized in the moveDC Plan whose professional and personal lives require private cars — doctors, nurses, teachers, ministers, DC church goers from the region who greatly enrich the life of the city, parents juggling kids’ many activities, people with bad knees (like the authors of these comments) or other health problems that restrict their mobility, people who work odd hours and cannot wait on lonely corners for infrequent buses, construction workers who commute from more affordable communities outside DC — the list could go on and on. DC residents are not just youthful newcomers but people of diverse ages, incomes, needs and preferences. This is reflected in the fact that, while the rate of auto ownership may be decreasing slightly the actual number of cars in DC is increasing with the increasing number of residents. For further discussion of vehicle ownership and other data, see attached Appendix A: DATA CRITIQUE – 1. Vehicle Ownership Data Critique

Failure to acknowledge the existence of private car use in this section immediately signals that moveDC chooses to ignore the realities of balancing vehicle ownership — which is up by 20,000 — with other modes of travel through transit, biking and walking.

#2: Chapter I should include more explicit discussion of congestion caused by commuter vehicles with appropriate maps.

- Specifically recognize that most of the congestion in DC is from out-of-DC cars that contribute heavily to pollution and congestion, and state that DC must find ways to greatly reduce this impact. Seventy-five percent of the cars on DC’s streets during the daytime are from out of DC.
- Summarize the importance of commuter rail and mention the ambitious expansion plans of Amtrak, VRE and MARC; and the expansion of freight due to expansion of Panama Canal.
Chapter 2. Growth, Travel Patterns, and Needs and Chapter 3. Exploring the Future

#1: Data on population growth and employment forecasts should use MWCOG forecasts based on actual census data from 2000-2010 rather than OP’s inflated forecasts that are based on three years of exceptional growth projected out over 25 years.

moveDC includes both MWCOG population and employment forecasts and OP forecasts (which anticipate significantly higher rates of growth), and seems to suggest that the OP forecasts are more up-to-date (see p. 20). We strongly suggest that MWCOG’s estimates should be used rather than OP’s. Not only is it problematic to take three years in which exceptional growth was estimated and project it forward for the next 25 years; there are also good reasons to believe that the post-2010 census estimates OP has relied upon are significantly inflated. By contrast, data from 2000 to 2010 is based on actual census counts rather than on extrapolations. (See Appendix A: DATA CRITIQUE – 2. Population Estimates)

#2: The Plan needs to take into account the growth of employment centers in the metropolitan area and the increasing number of DC residents who will work in those areas. DC operates in a highly competitive environment when it comes to attracting both jobs and residents. As DC becomes a more attractive place to live, Northern Virginia (with the opening of the Silver Line) becomes an increasingly attractive place to locate jobs and to work. As a result, we should expect to see more reverse commutes – i.e. an increasing number of DC residents who travel to work in other jurisdictions. We can’t rely on a transit model that assumes that DC residents’ transportation needs will all be met within DC. Getting in and out of the city is an issue not only for suburban commuters but also for DC residents.

#3: Assertions about vehicle ownership should be based on census data, not on unsupportable claims that “car ownership is decreasing.” As noted in Chapter I above, census data since 1990 suggest that car-ownership rates (and the % of carless households) have been remarkably stable in DC. Yet the text claims “Car-ownership is decreasing.” But the only statement that follows is “The District has, by far, the highest percentage of no-vehicle households in the region.” While this statement may be true, it does not support the assumptions that there will be fewer number of cars owned by a growing population of residents. This statement also fails to underscore that almost ¾ of DC’s workers come from other jurisdictions in the region. (See Appendix A: DATA CRITIQUE – 1. Vehicle Ownership Data)

- The data just do not support the claim that there has been a significant change in the numbers of cars owned in DC. Judging from the best available census data, the percentage of carless households in DC has been remarkably stable since at least 1990:
  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The DMV includes all registered cars and trucks, public and private including commercial. (It is not clear whether they include motorcycles and buses.) DDOT/OP sometimes suggest that only private non-commercial vehicles should be counted yet to our knowledge neither agency has ever provided a count or a justification for excluding commercial vehicles, motorcycles or busses. Whatever it takes to service the population is relevant and should also be counted: Zipcars, Car2Go, UPS trucks, city buses, etc. The issue is what’s on the road to meet our needs for delivering people and goods regardless of who owns it. For example, while one may not drive to the supermarket, but if Peapod delivers the groceries to a residence, those groceries still traveled by "automotive" means.
• The average number of cars per MOVE DC has also remained quite stable over that period (about .9 -- while we have a significant number of carless households, we also, of course, have households that own 2 or more cars).

#4: Better documentation both on how transit demand has been modeled (see, e.g., p. 36) and on a number of factual claims (e.g. “Travel is Evolving,” p. 32) -- is necessary to assess the validity of DDOT’s analysis.

• The most recent/reliable publicly available census data show a 36.7% transit share for DC workers (S0804 ACS 5yr 2012) and a 37.8% share for DC residents (S0802 ACS 5yr 2012). moveDC’s 42% figure on transit is ambiguously phrased -- it is unclear whether it is referring to DC residents’ commutes to their jobs (wherever located) or commutes to DC jobs (regardless of where the workers come from). Neither figure is 42% -- both are lower. Where does the 42% transit mode share figure (see pp. 33, 38) come from? It is possible that 42% of DC residents commuting to jobs in DC used public transit, but if that's all DDOT is considering, then the document needs to say so, because it's only a partial picture of commuting behavior on DC streets. (See Appendix A – DATA CRITIQUE 4. Transit Demand)

#5: Many of the maps in the Plan are difficult to read with little or no commentary on their significance.

• For example, while Chapter II is filled with maps, there is no commentary on their significance. The reader is left with many questions: What are the transportation implications if, as predicted, most increases in residential density occur east of 16th ST NW and most increases in employment density are south of Florida Avenue? How/Have the proposals in moveDC been shaped by these assumptions?

Chapter 4: Policy and Planning Framework and Chapter 5: Implementation

#1: An aggressive approach (as suggested on p. 77) to educating all users on the rules of the road could go a long way towards reducing road tensions.

• The DMV could be tasked with sending every registered motorist a booklet focused on how to share the road with pedestrians and cyclists. And the biking community could increase its efforts to reach its constituency with a code of good biking conduct and practices. Perhaps the Bicycle Advisory Council could put forward those legal changes that would make cycling safer, educate young bikers through the public schools, and suggest ways of enforcing those laws.

#2: Tax incentives and fees to encourage car-lite living should be studied.

• We encourage moveDC to call for a study of incentives and fees to encourage car-lite living. For example, the study would look at the implications of the current registration fee for the first car in each residential unit and a double charge for the second car. How would this system accommodate inter-generational families and single-family households, with multiple employed members? How could this system be monitored and enforced? What might be the unanticipated consequences of such a policy?

#3: While there is tacit support for commuter rail service expansion (p. 91), the discussion is woefully inadequate. There is no mention of the L’Enfant VRE Station improvements, the Long Bridge or SW track issues.
We are very skeptical that the cordon tax as proposed for the CBD will be acceptable to Congress, to many DC residents, to churches or to many businesses located downtown. While revenue from this source is attractive, we caution against using it in any realistic financial projections.

**Transit Element and Freight Element**

**#1:** The plan fails to deal with serious issues related to projected increases in freight, intercity and commuter passenger service and does not acknowledge the need for a DC Rail Plan. See *Attachment B: Committee of 100 testimony to Council by Monte Edwards, June 27, 2014* on the moveDC plan relative to commuter and freight rail. Providing practical alternatives to automobile commuting should be the overriding theme of the moveDC Plan. Commuter rail is the most efficient and cost-effective means of doing so. 3/4 of the cars on DC streets during the day are non-DC residents. Several Metrorail stations in downtown DC are at or near capacity and even with planned improvements, their capacity will be exceeded by 2020 (Figure T-2, page T-4). The bridges that bring Metrobuses, commuter buses, intercity buses and private vehicles in from Virginia are badly congested during rush hour.

- The moveDC draft provides no evaluation of the capabilities of the different transit modes to serve projected growth in ridership and does not even mention the recently initiated Amtrak-Virginia commuter service.
- The expansion plans and capabilities of MARC and VRE are not discussed in the draft.
- The moveDC draft ignores key components of our transit infrastructure and fails to deal with how to remedy deficiencies in transit intermodal centers.

moveDC should include the potential of commuter rail to provide a practicable supplement to Metrobus, Metrorail and vehicular commuting.

**#2:** The discussion of extending the streetcar network fails to include reference to the ongoing search for wireless streetcar operating systems and the two 2010 DC laws on overhead streetcar wires. See *Attachment C: Committee of 100 testimony to Council by Meg Maguire, March 3, 2014* on failure of DDOT to implement DC Code § 9-1173 and § 9-1174. We understand that DDOT intends to comply with the law and remedy this deficiency and we look forward to reviewing their report.

**#3:** moveDC should take into account the need for 24-7 childcare and public transit. This issue has emerged from the Barry Farms small area plan where residents noted that they work multiple jobs or work overnight and that there are many impediments, including transportation, to successfully holding a nighttime job.

- Has DC collected any data on the times of entry and exiting into DC -- are the majority of workers arriving during traditional morning commuter times?
- Are there trends demonstrating that our public transit needs to be more flexible to accommodate the travel needs of people who do not work conventional hours?

**Transportation Demand Management Element and Parking and Curbside Management Element**
#1: See Chapters 2 & 3 - #4 above and Appendix A: DATA CRITIQUE re. transportation demand modeling and data on car ownership.

#2: DC does not understand either the supply or the demand for parking. moveDC needs to call for a thorough study of all parking in DC.
The study should include but not be limited to:
- Numbers and types of vehicles registered in DC including individually owned cars and trucks, shared services, taxis, motorcycles, etc.
- Supply and location of parking spaces on streets and in public garages as well as private underground parking (including apartment houses that provide parking underground);
- A sample of license plates in garages to determine how many of these are out-of-state and, based on address data, as well as how close these commuters live to public transportation;
- A study of shared garage arrangements, lessons to be learned and recommendations on the criteria for successful application in DC;
- A study of other experiments in reducing/eliminating parking requirements such as at the Babe’s Billiards site redevelopment in Tenleytown, including the effectiveness of bans on residential parking permits for buildings offering no parking; and
- A study of how to use underground resources in the process of redevelopment to take cars and buses off the streets when they are not in use.

#3: The plan should take a fresh look at the potential of the city’s underground resources for storing cars and buses when they are not in use. Providing parking has been rejected as stimulating driving, but the effect on car ownership of the failure to provide parking is still not well documented. Once underground and off-street parking in new development is discouraged, the potential to get cars off the streets and store them underground is lost forever. When cars are stored on the streets it makes other choices such as dedicated bus and streetcar lanes, bike lanes, pedestrian friendly sidewalks, etc. much more difficult to implement. DDOT’s and OP’s thinking about this issue is constricted and shortsighted.

**Sustainability and Livability Element**

This is one of the strongest elements in the Plan. The many tangible opportunities for environmental stewardship outlined in moveDC can have great appeal for all age and income groups throughout the city.

#1: Wherever urban forestry operations are ultimately located in the agencies – DDOT or DOE – acceleration of this important program will bring many positive environmental benefits to DC.

- The proposed reorganization of DDOT, now undergoing Council and public review, proposes to move tree operations to DDOE. Casey Trees has proposed that operations remain with DDOT and that policy be moved to DDOT. While the Committee of 100 has not taken a position on this issue, we believe in close integration of bold policy goals and efficient operations. Only a small part of the tree canopy is under the control of DDOT (page S-3): DC’s tree canopy covers 14,600 acres or 37% of DC, amounting to 1,900,000 trees. Only 148,000 of the trees, or less than 8% are in DDOT ROW and subject to the Urban Forestry programs.
This section of the Plan could be strengthened by making data more clear.

- Expanding the Tree Canopy Or Keeping up With Losses? (page S-10)
  The math in moveDC regarding trees is not clear. DDOT currently plants 7,000 trees a year. The plan is to increase that to 8,600 trees per year to reach 40% citywide tree canopy by 2032. Planting 8,600 trees for the next 17 years would amount to 146,000 trees. Since we now have 1,900,000 trees for 37% citywide tree canopy, a 3% increase in the tree canopy would require 57,000 additional trees. Is the difference, 89,000 trees over 17 years, the tree mortality/loss rate of 5,060 tree per year?

- Are DDOT’s Stormwater Management Efforts Sufficient? (page S-4): DC has a land area of 39,400 acres. 43% of land in DC is impervious, or 16,940 acres. 23% of land is public space (9,060 acres) is under jurisdiction of DDOT. In 2012, DDOT restored 3 acres of impervious surfaces. On page S-10 the document states that the agency completed 4 green alleys in 2013 and plans to do four more in 2014 (alleys are not the only type of impervious area in the city.) Thus, DDOT is restoring impervious land at the rate of 0.03% per year.

#2: The glaring inconsistency regarding use of native tree species needs to be corrected. The document advocates, rightly so, for the use of native tree species but then includes the list of Approved UFA Tree species on which none of a major native species of our area is included. We suggest that the list of trees from the Rock Creek Watershed Tree Association be used instead or as a supplement to the list now referenced.

#3: The plan shows great sensitivity to beautification through environmental design. DC’s Public Realm Design Handbook of 2008 is an excellent guide and should be more widely circulated to ANC’s, non-profit organizations and activists who emerge in project-specific planning throughout the city. The same can be said of other documents mentioned in the plan: give them new life for a new generation of those who want guidance in caring for the city.

***************
Appendix A: DATA CRITIQUE
moveDC Multi-Modal Long Range Transportation Plan
July 28, 2014

1. Data Critique: Vehicle Ownership Data

- Census data since 1990 suggest that car-ownership rates (and the % of carless households) have been remarkably stable in DC. Yet the text claims “Car-ownership is decreasing.” But the only statement that follows is “The District has, by far, the highest percentage of no-vehicle households in the region.” While this statement may be true, it does not support the assumptions that there will be fewer number of cars owned by a growing population of residents. This statement also fails to underscore that almost ¼ of DC’s workers come from other jurisdictions in the region.

- Obviously, registration understates traffic, but it’s important for DDOT to recognize that the number of vehicles has grown along with the population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>268,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>275,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>279,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>284,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>288,000+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Source: 2009-12 from DMV submission in Babe’s case; 2013 from Baber’s FY2013 oversight testimony.]

There are at least three other sources of car-ownership data (beyond Census and DMV). Two are based on DMV reporting:

1) MWCOC's TPB does a triennial vehicle census with the next one due out late this year. Their data does the break down of car/light trucks/heavy trucks and looks like it may be consistent with, but slightly lower than, the DMV data given above. (Note: 2-5% of the data DMV gives to TPB can't be used because if they can't decode the VIN, they can't use the datum.

2) FHWA also publishes vehicle registrations by state in its annual Highway Statistics. Their numbers come out higher than DMV's. When AAA tried to figure out why, their conclusion was that DMV only counts "active" registrations and a car loses its "active" registration (e.g. you can't renew the existing registration) for a variety of reasons -- including things like unpaid parking tickets or child support.

---

2 The DMV includes all registered cars and trucks, public and private including commercial. (It is not clear whether they include motorcycles and buses.) DDOT/OP sometimes suggest that only private non-commercial vehicles should be counted yet to our knowledge neither agency has ever provided a count. Whatever it takes to service the population is relevant and should also be counted: Zipcars, Car2Go, UPS trucks, city buses, etc. The issue is what's on the road to meet our needs for delivering people and goods regardless of who owns it. For example, while one may not drive to the supermarket, but if Peapod delivers the groceries to a residence, those groceries still traveled by "automotive" means.
3) The third source is the National Automobile Dealers Association (NADA) that hires IHS Automotive to come up with their numbers rather than rely on registrations. Registrations don't include diplomats, military, scofflaws, people who live here but retain a legal residence elsewhere, so it's not surprising that NADA's numbers are always higher than the DMV's. Since IHS doesn't publicize their methodology since they sell their estimates, we were unable to understand how they derive their numbers.) Nonetheless, here is the NADA info, collated from their annual publications.

### Total Light Vehicles in Operation in DC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Passenger cars</th>
<th>Light trucks (GVW 1-3)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>220,195</td>
<td>54,394</td>
<td>274,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>149,274</td>
<td>68,354</td>
<td>217,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>217,076</td>
<td>54,621</td>
<td>271,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>209,905</td>
<td>56,488</td>
<td>266,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>214,050</td>
<td>95,697</td>
<td>309,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>219,344</td>
<td>101,359</td>
<td>320,703</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: the data from earlier NADA publications isn't commensurable

- As to parking inventory data, off-street inventories are essential given the importance of the parking tax.

- The data just do not support the claim that there has been a significant change in the numbers of cars owned in DC. Judging from the best available census data, he percentage of carless households in DC has been remarkably stable since at least 1990:
  - 1990: 37.4%
  - 2000: 36.9%
  - 2012: 36.5% (5yr ACS data -- which has replaced the Census long form)

- The average number of cars per MOVEDC has also remained quite stable over that period (about .9 -- while we have a significant number of carless households, we also, of course, have households that own 2 or more cars).

### 2. Data Critique: Population Estimates

moveDC includes both MWCOG population and employment forecasts and OP forecasts (which anticipate significantly higher rates of growth), and seems to suggest that the OP forecasts are more up-to-date (see p. 20). We strongly suggest that MWCOG's estimates should be used rather than OP’s. Not only is it problematic to take three years in which exceptional growth was estimated and project it forward for the next 25 years; there are also good reasons to believe that the post-2010 census estimates OP has relied upon are significantly inflated. By contrast, data from 2000 to 2010 is based on actual census counts rather than on extrapolations.
• Inter-census estimates are notoriously unreliable.\(^3\) And there is already evidence that the current method for projecting urban populations mistakes churn for growth.\(^4\) Recently released IRS Statistics of Income (SOI) suggest that the Census Bureau’s domestic migration figures for 2010 to 2011 were significantly higher than actual migration. Additional evidence that post-2010 population growth projections are inflated comes from the fact that, according to the Census Bureau’s own estimates, DC gained just over 6,000 housing units between 2010 and 2013 -- a period in which its population supposedly grew by almost 45,000 people.\(^5\)

3. Data Critique: Employment

• DC operates in a highly competitive environment when it comes to attracting both jobs and residents. And, unlike the District, neighboring jurisdictions have access to the resources of their respective states to finance infrastructural improvements, fund public services, and provide development or relocation incentives.

• As DC becomes a more attractive place to live, Northern Virginia (with the opening of the Silver Line) becomes an increasingly attractive place to locate jobs and to work. As a result, we should expect to see more reverse commuters – i.e. an increasing number of DC residents who travel to work in other jurisdictions. We can’t rely on a transit model that assumes that DC residents’ transportation needs will all be met within DC. Getting in and out of the city is an issue not only for suburban commuters but also for DC residents.

\(^3\) See Debbi Wilgoren, “Census Reports Decline in D.C. Population,” Washington Post, December 22, 2005 (p. B-04) for an account both of the (ultimately) successful 2005 challenge to the Census Bureau’s intercensal estimates of DC’s population in the early 2000s and of the Bureau’s mis-estimation between 1990 and 2000 (when the actual count revealed a change in population of less than 35,000 instead of the projected change of approximately 88,000).

\(^4\) 2/3 of the US cities that suffered population losses between the 2000 and 2010 census counts simultaneously reversed that trend in the 2011 estimates. [http://moveDC.governing.com/blogs/by-the-numbers/city-populations-increase-following-declines-census-estimates-show.html](http://moveDC.governing.com/blogs/by-the-numbers/city-populations-increase-following-declines-census-estimates-show.html) Planners in NYC expressed skepticism, pointing out that moveDC’s ‘churn’ has long characterized the city, and represents a fluidity that is difficult to characterize using the net migration measures presented herein. They concluded that ‘While there is little doubt that New York City has experienced a substantial population increase post-2010, it is probably overstated.’ [http://moveDC.nyc.gov/html/dcp/html/census/popcur.shtml](http://moveDC.nyc.gov/html/dcp/html/census/popcur.shtml) To put this more abstractly, the projected levels of urban population growth after the 2010 census may be as much an artifact of changes in statistical methodology as a reflection of actual shifts in population.

In the context of DC, this analysis make sense – e.g. If a surveyor calls 10 households in DC, odds are she’ll find one that includes a recent arrival. If she calls a similarly small sample in another state, odds are slim that she’ll find someone who recently left DC. The net result is that the American Community Survey (ACS), which now uses very small but very frequent samples, captures in-migration and misses out-migration because newcomers are concentrated in DC, while departees are widely dispersed. That’s why the IRS’s SOI data is more reliable—it’s not a complete picture of DC’s population (non-filers aren’t captured) but it is a robust data set consisting of everyone who filed a return using a DC address in one or both of the years analyzed.

\(^5\) Compare US Census Bureau, “Annual Estimates of Housing Units” (Chart PEPANNH1U) for DC 2013 with US Census Bureau, “Annual Estimates of the Resident Population” (Chart PEPANNRES) for DC 2013. There’s no significant change in vacancies that would explain this discrepancy – i.e. it’s not a situation where, in 2010, we had lots of vacant housing that newcomers filled before we needed to build more to accommodate increased growth through 2013.
- If we want to connect more people to more jobs we need to think carefully about where new residents and new job will be located – and to pay attention to the relationship between anticipated wages and housing costs. If, as some analysts predict, DC’s future job growth is likely to be in lower wage industries such as hospitality and other service sectors, the District’s affordability crisis will only worsen, driving more workers outside of the city – and into their automobiles to get to the city. In general, the crucial question here is not just “how much?” but “where?” and “what kind?” Over the past decade, we’ve seen DC office markets outside the CBD shrink. And the Downtown BID is projecting significant office vacancies (20-25%) in the CBD over the next 5-10 years.6

4. Data Critique: Transit Demand

- The most recent/reliable publicly available census data show a 36.7% transit share for DC workers (S0804 ACS 5yr 2012) and a 37.8% share for DC residents (S0802 ACS 5yr 2012). moveDC’s 42% figure on transit is ambiguously phrased -- it is unclear whether it is referring to DC residents' commutes to their jobs (wherever located) or commutes to DC jobs (regardless of where the workers come from). Neither figure is 42% -- both are lower. Where does the 42% transit mode share figure (see pp. 33, 38) come from? It is possible that 42% of DC residents commuting to jobs in DC used public transit, but if that's all DDOT is considering, then the document needs to say so, because it's only a partial picture of commuting behavior on DC streets.
- The relevant universe should be all DC workers (regardless of residence) plus DC residents who work elsewhere. If you look at that group, close to 868,000 workers commute to and/or from DC -- and 55% of them travel by car to do so. While we could not compute transit share for this more comprehensive universe, we know it’s less than 38% because both components (DC residents + DC workers) are less than 38%.
- The professed goal of this plan is to reduce "automotive" commutes to 25%. The magnitude of the challenge is to get 200,000 cars off the road during commute hours. If 200,000 seems low it's because the 55% of car-commuters includes carpoolers so there's not one car per car commute.
- Carpoolers raise the question of whether the goal should be to maximize the number of commuters who choose some means other than car or whether we should be trying to minimize the number of cars used in commuting. These are potentially different goals since if you convince 3 members of a 4-person carpool to take public transit, you've shifted the mode of 75% of those commuters but you still have the same number of cars. The problem should be framed to point to strategies for change: With X number of cars, how can we reduce X? Instead the authors seem to frame the issue as a moral one: "People shouldn't use cars to get to work."
- Better data -- and interpretations of the data -- will identify the problems more clearly and lead the city to more effective solutions.

---

July 31, 2014

moveDC, c/o Colleen Hawkins
District Department of Transportation
Policy, Planning and Sustainability Administration
55 M Street, SE
Suite 500
Washington, DC 20003

Re: moveDC Draft Multimodal Long Range Transportation Plan

On behalf of the Metropolitan Washington Road & Transportation Builders Association, I respectfully offer comments on the “moveDC” Draft Multimodal Long Range Transportation Plan.

MWRTBA is the voice of the transportation construction industry in the District of Columbia and the Metropolitan Washington area. Incorporated in 1948, the MWRTBA actively promotes the development, reconstruction, and repair of the highways, streets, bridges, airports, and transit facilities throughout the region.

MWRTBA’s membership includes contractors, subcontractors, materials suppliers, engineering firms, law firms, accounting firms, bonding and insurance firms, the construction equipment industry, and the traffic safety products industry.

MWRTBA applauds the District of Columbia Department of Transportation (DDOT) for initiating the moveDC plan and pro-actively addressing the District of Columbia’s future transportation needs. When the moveDC process reaches its conclusion, MWRTBA members will play an integral role in constructing the transportation improvements called for in moveDC’s final recommendations.

As such, MWRTBA has identified three areas where we would like to direct the attention of DDOT and the Council:

- **Funding:** The transportation improvements envisioned by moveDC are going to require substantial funding to both build and maintain. MWRTBA’s main mission is to advocate for robust transportation funding in the metropolitan Washington area. As such, we believe that any revenue generated for moveDC must be solely dedicated to the creation and maintenance of transportation infrastructure. If revenue dedicated for transportation is diverted at some point in the future to other needs, it will delay the
achievement of the moveDC’s goals and also inhibit the District’s ability to properly maintain all of the new transportation improvements brought about by moveDC.

- **Modal Choice:** MWRTBA members help to construct improvements for all modes of transportation and we support moveDC as a multi-modal transportation plan. However, we would caution that DDOT should recognize the distinction between providing transportation choices and prioritizing one mode of transportation over another. It is not DDOT’s role to sway the users of DC’s transportation system towards one particular mode, but rather to enhance all modes of transportation in order to provide greater mobility of both people and goods throughout the District.

- **Safety:** MWRTBA members are constantly out in work zones creating transportation improvements. As such, safety is a prime concern. moveDC calls for many transportation projects where different modes intersect. It is absolutely necessary to ensure that sufficient safety measures are taken when these projects are being constructed, as these work zones may be different than work zones for projects which are solely road-based or solely transit based.

MWRTBA looks forward to continued involvement in the moveDC process.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Michael A. Sakata
Executive Director
Mr. Matthew Brown, Acting Director  
D.C. Department of Transportation  
55 M Street SE. Suite 400  
Washington, D.C. 20003

Re: MoveDC Plan, clarity of mission and vision and other comments

Dear Mr. Matthews:

On July 9, 2014, at a duly noticed, regularly scheduled meeting of ANC 6C, with a quorum of 6 out of 6 commissioners and the public present, the abovementioned matter came before us. The commissioners voted unanimously to send this letter prepared by a member of our ANC 6C Transportation/Public Space Committee.

Overall, the report is comprehensive and provides a broad view of transportation issues facing the District over the next 25 years.

The photos and the report title on the front page are fine, while the titling on the second of the two inside cover pages and the lack of clarity elsewhere in the report concerning how priorities in one part of the plan are related to priorities in other parts of the plan make it hard to tell from the report what the main priorities of investment and measures of accomplishment will or should specifically be for DDOT as an agency in the years ahead.

One problem is illustrated on the second title page (which is un-numbered) and continues in different forms throughout much of Part I of the plan. As listed on the title page, the two main overarching objectives of DDOT are its "mission" and its "vision" are hard to distinguish from each other. From what is said in the report, "vision" is apparently meant to be what guides the agency’s accomplishment of its mission. If the mission is making our transportation system more "sustainable" and "convenient," while protecting the "cultural resources of the city," how is this different from, as stated in the report, the vision of "sustaining a high quality of life through creating more sustainable travel practices, safer streets and outstanding access to goods and services" through "providing next generation alternatives to single occupancy vehicles?" What makes the former the agency’s "mission" and the latter its "vision"? What is the difference between these two aspects of the plan?
It takes quite a while to figure out what the overall structure and content of the report is and what its implications are for (1) DDOT’s transportation budget needs, and (2) its investment strategies over time until one completes reading and re-reading much of it. Parts I and II are presumably intended to be bound together into one final report rather than published as two separate reports, but readers need to be aware that Part I discusses overall goals of the agency and different strategies of investment in multiple modes of transportation, while Part II discusses individual modes of transit without any specifications of what the level of investment would be in each of them in relation to the others and to the overall level of investment by the agency. But exactly how the two parts fit together and should be understood is unclear.

In the initial part of the report three possible directions for the future development of the transportation system of the District of Columbia are outlined. These are (1) placing a greater emphasis on “connecting neighborhoods,” (2) fostering travel from surrounding areas into the central city, including both surrounding counties and outer areas of the District, and (3) “staying the course”—i.e., not changing the proportions among types of transportation (cars, bicycles, Metrorail, etc.). A problem with the report is that the specific differences between these three approaches in both planned investments and expected policy outcomes are not shown with sufficiently specific definitions and consistency throughout the report for the three modes to be understandable in detail.

For example, differences by the modes of projected transportation system usage within the District under all three alternative strategies of transportation investment considered in the report are shown in the graphs on pages 64 and 65. However, these graphs are not adequately explained, making them hard to figure out in detail. For example, under all three of the alternative future courses of investment in transportation considered (Stay the Course, Get to the Center, and connect Neighborhoods), the expected percentage of “motorized trips” (by car or truck within the District) is shown to be less in the graphs as a percentage of all daily trips than currently, while the percentage of all trips by transit (within the District) is expected to be greater under all three approaches—including under the “neutral approach,” which is “Stay the Course.” Is the prediction here that transit use will grow even without further investment in it or that even under Stay the Course, some investments in transit will still be made?

Also shown in the diagrams are predicted levels of a “future baseline” for some of the transit modes displayed. Why these future baseline levels are different from the level of Approach 1, or the “Stay the Course” option, is unclear because that is what Approach 1 is—i.e., no change in current transportation investment policy by the District between now and 2040. If so, what is the reason why the levels of the “future baselines” shown for each of the modes of transit in the different graphs are different from the level of Approach 1?

One of the reasons for these differences may be that the main recommendations of the report are not specifically based on any of the three approaches or some explicit combination of them, but on
a fourth plan, called the move DC Plan, which was generated separately from the three different “Approaches.” Precisely how the move DC Plan was generated is not clear.

Furthermore, the “Future Baseline” levels that are shown in the graphs on pages 64 to 65 are apparently not directly related to any of the three “Approaches” to transportation system development considered, including the “Stay the Course Approach.” Given this, what the “Future Baseline” labels shown in the graphs on pages 64 to 65 are related to and mean is also unclear. “Baseline for what?” is an unanswered question.

The statements of the mission and goals of DDOT vary in the report. For example, on the title page inside the front cover DDOT’s mission is stated as:

1. DDOT Mission
   Develop and maintain a cohesive sustainable transportation system that delivers safe, affordable, and convenient ways to move people and goods - while protecting and enhancing the natural, environmental and cultural resources of the District

And the vision is stated as:

2. DDOT Vision
   The District Department of Transportation (DDOT) is committed to achieving an exceptional quality of life in the nation’s capital through more sustainable travel practices, safer streets and outstanding access to goods and services. Central to this vision is improving energy efficiency and modern mobility by providing next generation alternatives to single occupancy driving in the city.

On page 15 no DDOT mission is stated but the DDOT vision is stated as:

3. DDOT VISION
   The District of Columbia will have a worldclass transportation system serving the people who live, work, and visit the city. The transportation system will make the city more livable, sustainable, prosperous, and attractive. It will offer everyone in the District exceptional travel choices. As the transportation system evolves over time, the District will:
   - Be more competitive and attractive locally, regionally, nationally, and internationally
   - Have safer and more vibrant streets and neighborhoods
   - Have cleaner air, streams, and rivers, and be more responsive to climate change
   - Accommodate the travel needs of all residents, workers, and visitors regardless of age or ability
   - Integrate the District’s transportation system with the region’s transportation network

While on the same page, DDOT’s more specific goals under the move DC Plan are stated as:
4. MoveDC GOALS

MoveDC's goals and objectives are derived from existing District plans, including Sustainable D.C. and the Strategic Highway Safety Plan, prior DDOT vision and goal statements, and input from the public during the moveDC proces.

- Sustainability and Health: Achieve 75% of all commute trips in the District by nonauto modes.
- Citywide Accessibility and Mobility: Maximize system reliability and capacity for moving people and goods.
- Neighborhood Accessibility and Connectivity: Support neighborhood vitality and economic development.
- Safety and Security: Achieve zero fatalities and serious injuries on the District transportation network.
- Public Space: Reinforce Washington, D.C.'s historic landscapes and quality of neighborhood public space.
- Preservation: Maximize reliability for all District transportation infrastructure by investing in maintenance and asset management.
- Funding and Financing: Invest in transportation to achieve outcomes within the plan horizon.

From the description and elsewhere in the report, it is not very clear how the "moveDC Plan" described above was generated from the three other plans described earlier in the report (Stay the Course, Get to the Center, and Connect Neighborhoods) and how they are related to what is repeatedly referred to as the "2040 Baseline Plan." Maybe the relationship is that the moveDC plan is derived from the 2040 Baseline Plan in some way by incorporating responses to certain trends, such as providing more capacity for bicycling as a new and growing mode of transit. Or maybe the relationship is the same as the Baseline Plan, but this is difficult to determine from the report. The 2040 Baseline Plan, as referred to in the report and described in Chapter 2, Section III, Part D (p. 36) of the Part I report, ostensibly forms the "basis" for the move DC Plan, but what this might mean is very unclear.

Having clear knowledge of this is very important to knowing how to interpret and value the results and information provided in Part II of the report, including especially all of the separate analyses and recommendations by transportation mode, which is apparently based on the moveDC Plan. But are they or not? Barely.

A practically informative way of describing the moveDC Plan might in the end be to build a table like the one on page 53 that lists specific projects and investments that would be made in going forward with it over the first ten years or so, as examples...
illustrating how the Plan would be implemented and how it differs from the Stay the Course Plan, the Get to the Center Plan, and the Connect Neighborhoods Plan.

The “by-mode” analysis and recommendations in Part II of the report for pedestrians, bicycles, transit are apparently not based at all on the analysis earlier in the report. For the most part, the main contributions of Part II of the report are the detailed listings of specific improvement projects by mode throughout the District as rated by panels of selected members of the public.

It would be helpful if the key on the multi-mode route maps shown for each mode of transportation had the correct color for the routes of all the types of transportation included in them.

It would also be helpful if he “performance” column of the tables of “Element Performance” had a somewhat different title for the performance column, such as “Effects” or something like this.

Overall, the moveDC Plan outlines important possible directions for the future development of the transportation system of the District of Columbia that could help to spur growth in the city toward a future of greater emphasis on both “connecting neighborhoods” and “getting to the center,” but the differences in both planned investments and expected policy outcomes between Approach 1 (Stay the Course), Approach 2 (Growth, Travel Patterns, and Needs), Approach 3 (Connecting Neighborhoods), and the combination of the into the moveDC Plan, are not shown with much specificity in the report. Consequently, exactly how the various “plans” presented in the different chapters of the report differ is not clear.

Equally important, missing from the report in its current form is consideration of needed improvements in the parking enforcement efforts of the agencies, especially in the areas of auto, truck and bus parking, and the development of specific plans for implementing them. In certain neighborhoods, the improvement of parking enforcement could well result in major improvements in parking capacity. To repeat this, the improvement of parking enforcement may be one of the better ways of improving capacity for meeting the needs of legitimate parkers. Because of this, parking and parking enforcement issues should receive considerably more attention in the moveDC Plan than they do.

A limited but thorough parking study completed in ANC 6C demonstrates this. The study could be widely repeated elsewhere.
Last, a missing description:

There is mention of the implementation of a new “congestion pricing cordon” completely surrounding the downtown area of Washington, DC, extending from Rock Creek Parkway to U Street NW, to 4th Street NE on the east, to the Potomac River on the south. In a parking cordon, how will vehicles be charged and how much? Will the parking charges within the zone—and within the entire zone—vary in price by the time of day? And importantly, how will the prices for vehicles be set? By setting a goal for the number of cars that enter the cordon zone during peak hours and then adjusting the price to achieve metric? The only discussion of cordon parking is on page 123 of Part II of the report.

Thank you for giving great weight to the recommendations of ANC 6C. If questions arise regarding these comments, please do not hesitate to contact us.

On behalf of ANC 6C,

Karen J. Wirt
Karen Wirt
ANC 6C chair
July 27, 2014

To: Colleen Hawkinson  
D.C. Department of Transportation  
D.C. Mayor Vincent Gray  
Tommy Wells, Ward 6 D.C. Councilmember  
Mary M. Cheh, D.C. Council Committee on Environment, Public Works &  
Transportation Chair  
David Grosso, At-Large D.C. Councilmember  
David Cantinia, At-Large D.C. Councilmember  
Vincent Orange, At-Large D.C. Councilmember  
Anita Bonds, At-Large D.C. Councilmember  
(via email)

Re: Southwest Small Area Plan

Dear Ms. Hawkinson:

The Southwest Neighborhood Assembly (the Assembly) applauds DDOT for creating a forward-looking vision to serve the District’s transportation needs for years to come. Given our city’s strong expected population and job growth, the plan importantly recognizes the need to invest in new transportation and better manage our existing assets. We’d like to offer a few thoughts on how to improve the plan for residents and businesses in Southwest.

Of the plan’s many ideas, the proposed cordoned congestion priced zone in Downtown DC is particularly important to Southwest. Our neighborhood is unique among those in the city in that it is isolated from the rest of the District by the Southeast-Southwest Freeway, the Potomac River and South Capitol Street and our residents frequently travel through downtown to enjoy other major parts of the city for shopping, dining and other amenities unavailable in Southwest. Our residents are therefore disproportionately impacted by such a priced cordon.

We urge DDOT and the DC Government to closely consider and mitigate the impact of such a cordon on residents and businesses in Southwest, such as through an exemption to the charge for trips originating in Southwest, so that we can continue to increase mobility and connections across all quadrants of the city.

MoveDC also proposes to change the core of our community’s fabric by upending the current street grid that was created during urban renewal in the 1950s and 1960s. Southwest’s unique street grid creates intimate neighborhood spaces and reflects the historic nature of the redevelopment era. While some connections, such as improvements to the 2nd St tunnel and 4th Street underpass that link areas across
I-395 can help reduce Southwest’s isolation, the other proposed reconnections, including K, L, N, O and 3rd Streets are not in line with the character and sanctity of our neighborhood. In particular, the Assembly strongly opposes the proposed reconnection of K Street and L Streets through Lansburgh Park. This proposal would reduce the green space of the neighborhood and would be deleterious to our neighborhood’s quality of life and future development.

While thoughtful restoration of the L’Enfant grid can be useful in certain areas, the Assembly encourages DDOT to recognize that a street grid should reflect the evolving need of a neighborhoods and the L’Enfant grid should not simply be re-imposed for the sake of historical authenticity.

The Assembly is excited about two major new transit elements proposed for Southwest in the plan—a new North-South Streetcar and new Metro line along Eye Street. While the Assembly wholeheartedly supports Metro’s proposal, as mentioned in a previous letter to DDOT on March 25, 2014, we are deeply concerned that the preferred North-South Streetcar alignment will duplicate existing services, wasting an opportunity to connect Southwest to the rest of the city—and vice versa.

We strongly encourage DC’s transportation department to consider a route that would provide connectivity between Southwest and the western edge of downtown while meeting additional demand from the $1.5 billion waterfront development and the L’Enfant Plaza redevelopment. Such a route could follow Maine Avenue past the new waterfront development, turning north at 10th Street through L’Enfant Plaza, turning west at Independence Avenue until 14th Street, where it would turn north.

As DDOT continues to hone the Move DC plan, the Assembly urges it to incorporate feedback from residents and other stakeholders in a holistic manner that recognizes that future transportation management and investment will impact Southwest more than any neighborhood in the city.

Respectfully Submitted,

SOUTHWEST NEIGHBORHOOD ASSEMBLY, INC.

By Kael Anderson Kevin McDonald
President Vice-President
Colleen Hawkins
Manager
Strategic Planning Branch
DC Department of Transportation
55 M St. SE
Washington, DC 20003

Ms. Hawkins,

We are members of the transportation sub-committee of the Citizens Association of Georgetown. We appreciate the opportunity to provide comment on the DC Department of Transportation’s ("DDOT") WeMoveDC plan. Our comments relate to how the plan would affect Georgetown, its residents, workers and visitors. We divided our comments to reflect the primary elements of the plan: Transit, biking, pedestrian, and vehicle.

Transit Element

The transit recommendations in DDOT’s proposal are refreshingly ambitious. We approve of such thinking as the city ponders how to add hundreds of thousands of residents over the following decades.

New Metro Line

We enthusiastically endorse the plans for a new Metro line through Georgetown with two stations. This would be a dramatic catalyst to transportation to and from Georgetown that would bring profound improvements to the neighborhood and city at large.

We acknowledge the challenge in constructing a new Metro line and support DDOT formally adopting WMATA’s proposals.

Streetcar

We also enthusiastically support the construction of a streetcar line to Georgetown. However, we encourage DDOT to explore constructing dedicated lanes for the streetcar from Washington Circle to Georgetown. Keeping the streetcar in mixed traffic through this heavily congested corridor will significantly reduce the quality of service for the streetcar.

We also encourage DDOT to consider extending the streetcar up Wisconsin Ave. instead of continuing along Water St. The majority of Georgetown residents—residents who might be willing to ride the streetcar daily—will be discouraged by the need to travel to K St. in order to alight. Further, once a Metro line is constructed heading east-west along M St., the need for a streetcar going the same route will diminish. At that point having the streetcar travel Wisconsin Ave. to feed into the Georgetown Metro stop will increase transit accessibility immeasurably.
Bus Service

We are concerned about the lack of specifics as to the role of the Circulator in the MoveDC plan. The report calls for the construction of a "high capacity bus corridor" along Wisconsin Ave. north to Tenleytown. The lack of specifics, however, leave it unclear whether the Circulator will be that service. Whatever shape DDOT recommends for this "high capacity bus corridor" we strongly recommend it provide the salient features of the Circulator, including 10 minute headways, reduced fare, and recognizable branding.

We also request clarification whether the Wisconsin Ave. Circulator will continue its current route to Union Station. DDOT may consider it redundant once the streetcar is constructed, but until DDOT constructs a streetcar extension on Wisconsin Ave., Georgetowners would suffer a reduction in bus service if the Circulator terminates at the southern end of Wisconsin Ave. We request that DDOT consider alternatives that would provide a one-seat-ride at least along the present Circulator route.

Bicycle Element

Proposed Cycletracks

We strongly support the proposals to improve the bicycle facilities to and through Georgetown. As some of us bike frequently, these improvements would be greatly appreciated.

The proposed cycletracks along Pennsylvania Ave. from 17th to M St., along K St. and Water St., and along Q St. to R St. would each provide much safer routes for bikers. This will benefit all road users. For example, as bikers will use sidewalks less frequently they will come into conflict with pedestrians less frequently. And when bikes use the cycletracks instead of the normal travel lane, they will come into conflict with automobiles less frequently.

This improvement is especially needed along K St. and Water St., where more and more complaints of bicyclist/pedestrian/automobile conflict have arisen as the Georgetown Waterfront Park and the Capital Crescent Trail have both attracted huge numbers of users in recent years.

M St. Bike Lane

We also support improving bike facilities on M St. This stretch is particularly dangerous for bicyclists as is. While the proposal to create bike lanes would be an improvement, we recommend that DDOT consider continuing the M St. cycletrack instead. If room for a cycletrack cannot be found, we support the bike lanes as a second best option.
We advise DDOT that once planning begins on these improvements, close cooperation with the affected residents is crucial. We look forward to assisting DDOT in this process.

**Pedestrian Element**

We support the general contours of the pedestrian elements, but are disappointed in the lack of specifics. The report contains few concrete recommendations for pedestrian improvements in Georgetown.

For instance, sidewalks along M St. are frequently congested beyond safe use during weekend afternoons. We recommend DDOT consider some steps to improving this situation, such as temporary sidewalk widening or all pedestrian crossing phase at intersections (i.e. “Barnes Dance”).

We also strongly recommend DDOT apply many of the tools discussed in the MoveDC proposals to the crosswalks (particularly the unsignaled crosswalks) along Wisconsin Ave. in Georgetown. The current situation puts pedestrians at great risk whenever they attempt to cross Wisconsin Ave. Bulb-outs, high visibility crosswalks, and traffic calming measures should all be considered when addressing this situation.

**Vehicle Element**

The primary recommendations regarding vehicles in Georgetown are the rehabilitation/reconstruction of Key Bridge, the creation of all-day two-way lanes on Rock Creek Parkway, and managed lanes on Canal Rd.

**Key Bridge**

Key Bridge is a landmark structure of historical significance. We support the preservation and rehabilitation of the bridge as necessary to ensure its continued life.

**Two-Way Lanes on Rock Creek Parkway**

We support the creation of all-day two-way lanes on Rock Creek Parkway. This will allow access to the highway from K St. where currently one does not exist. However, we advise DDOT to closely monitor the impact the change has on traffic along K St.

**Managed Lanes on Canal Rd.**

We strongly oppose the extension of managed lanes on Canal from Foxhall Rd. to Georgetown. This would bring highway conditions to the doorstep of one of the most pedestrian and bike heavy areas of the city and should be rejected as a retrograde solution; more appropriate to the 1950s not the 2020s.
Moreover, this would significantly complicate the routing of the GUTS buses from Georgetown University to Rosslyn.

We strongly feel that any capacity created by this change would be quickly absorbed by shifts in suburban commuting behavior. We would be left with even more cars and just as much congestion.

We look forward to reviewing the final MoveDC report and working closely with DDOT in implementing the report's recommendations.

Respectfully,

/s

Christopher Mathews
Jacques Arsenault
Hazel Denton
Ken Archer
Colleen Hawkins, AICP | Manager, Strategic Planning Branch
Policy, Planning & Sustainability Administration | District Department of Transportation
55 M Street, SE, Suite 500, Washington, DC 20003
tel: 202.671.2228 | fax: 202.671.0617 |
www.ddot.dc.gov

From: Cheryl Cort [mailto:cheryl@smartergrowth.net]
Sent: Monday, July 14, 2014 2:18 PM
To: Hawkins, Colleen (DDOT)
Cc: Alex Posorske
Subject: Comments on MoveDC & bus priority corridors

Coleen -

We wanted to express concern about the timing for improvements for major bus priority corridors (other than 16th St) which appear to be delayed. The first tier of investments is dominated by streetcar, with most bus corridor upgrades occurring later. Given the immediate need and efficacy of bus priority corridor improvements, we ask that DDOT reexamine the short term planning for investments to make our Metrobus network work. This should be coordinated with, but not duplicative of other bus services. Bus remains the most important transit service for DC residents, and short term investment plans should reflect this. We also ask that more serious consideration be given to the problem of overlapping Circulator and Metrobus services, and the many languishing Metrobus improvement recommendations that have yet be be supported by DC.

Overall, we are very excited about MoveDC and are eager to move to implementation. Linked here, please see our comments on MoveDC and short term implementation recommendations.

Thanks for your and DDOT’s good work on this effort. We are eager to move to implementation.

- Cheryl Cort
Policy Director, Coalition for Smarter Growth.

DC Public Schools’ Beautification Day is on Saturday, August 23! Roll up your sleeves and help beautify our schools. Sign up to volunteer.
Thanks for the comments Will!

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 26, 2014, at 5:43 PM, "Will Handsfield" <whandsfield@georgetowndc.com> wrote:

Dear Sam and Colleen,

Please accept these additional comments on the MoveDC transit element:

The Georgetown BID requests some mention of aerial gondola as a mode of urban transit where topography, hydrology, or other geographic factors limit the traditional transit options. Specifically, we would like to see language suggesting a study of linking Georgetown to Rosslyn (DDOT/Rosslyn jointly applied for a MWCOC TLC grant to do just that in May), and possibly from Anacostia Metro to St. Elizabeth's campus. By way of background, this mode is a proven, and growing form of cost-effective urban mass transit. Systems are prevalent in South America, Europe, and Asia, with planning underway for systems in Canada and the U.S.

We also recommend synchronizing the planned transit network with ongoing Circulator planning efforts, such as extending the Rosslyn/Dupont line to reach the U Street/Howard U area, the mall route, and other imminent projects. These changes would be under high-frequency bus corridor, and Circe Torruellas will have the most recent planning documents.

We endorse the concept of marine transit along the Potomac and Anacostia rivers, and humbly request some discussion of professionalized dock management be included within the MoveDC plan on this topic. Georgetown is one of the few areas of DC with existing marine transit, and the major limiting factor for its future expansion is the ad hoc dock and harbor management system which sees both professionally run transit ferries, recreational craft, and non-motorized vessels all interacting and competing for river space and dockage space along the Georgetown Waterfront. We believe the next step in expanding water transit is to institute a more professional dock management system that would reign-in some of the excesses we see, particularly in the recreation vessel category, and provide a more orderly and predictable system for using the rivers as a transit resource.
Colleen,

Here are some vehicle element comments from the Georgetown BID:

- We wholly endorse the proposed reconfiguration of Rock Creek Parkway to allow 2-way traffic all day, and the associated plans for reconfiguration of 27th Street, K Street, Virginia Ave, access ramps to and from Whitehurst freeway and I-66/E street Expressway. We recommend this be elevated to Tier 1 priority since streetcar planning is somewhat contingent on any changes that are planned for this area.

- MoveDC should add, and DDOT should consider a study of a new vehicular bridge crossing the C & O canal at 33rd Street NW. This was once a vehicle bridge, but was at some point demolished and replaced by a pedestrian bridge. When this was done, the area east of Wisconsin along Water Street was an industrial area; it is now a mixed-use post-industrial district with residential, commercial office, and retail uses. The issue is that congestion and special events that occupy K Street and Wisconsin can block motor vehicle access to all of these residents and businesses on the 3200 – 3600 blocks of Water St, and there is no way for even emergency vehicles to enter or leave this segment of roadway and points beyond (Capital Crescent and C & O trails).

Additionally, there are no at-grade bicycle crossings between Wisconsin Ave. and the Foundry Branch Tunnel (at Foxhall Rd) – every bridge west of Wisconsin requires cyclists to dismount, and walk up one or more flights of stairs to travel between M Street and the C & O towpath/Capital Crescent. A vehicular bridge at 33rd Street would serve as the best connection between the trails in this section of lower Georgetown and M Street + points North and West (Georgetown University, Key Bridge, Arlington).

In the Georgetown 2028 plan, a one-lane, limited access vehicular bridge at 33rd Street was recommended for further study. In our initial consideration, we imagined a one-way vehicular (northbound), 2-way bicycle facility that could support 2-way access for fire and EMS vehicles, with a sidewalk on at least one side. We recommend adding this as Tier 3 priority, and possibly including it in the bicycle element since a contraflow bike lane + sharrow configuration could work very well for cyclists traveling over the canal at this point.

WILL HANDSFIELD | TRANSPORTATION DIRECTOR
GEORGETOWN BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT
1000 POTOMAC STREET NW | SUITE 122
WASHINGTON, DC 20007 | WWW.GEORGETOWNDC.COM
T 202.298.9222 x 203 | F 202.298.9223
E whandsfield@georgetowndc.com
I believe the North side of Water street is DDOT ROW as that is where the storm drains are located, while the South side is NPS. It is a challenging area to determine property lines. I've seen public documents that say the Whitehurst dripline is the divider (which would include the South sidewalk are in the DDOT realm), and I have been told by NPS that everything after the asphalt is theirs.

More comments to come.

---

Thanks Will.

1. The sidewalk prioritization is the Priority Sidewalk Assurance Act 2010/ ROW ownership and whether a sidewalk is missing on both or one side of the street. If Water Street ROW is NPS property, then that is why it would not be TIER 1. That said, if it's not NPS ROW please let me know.
2. Noted
3. Noted

Colleen

Colleen Hawkinson, AICP | Manager, Strategic Planning Branch
Policy, Planning & Sustainability Administration | District Department of Transportation
55 M Street, SE, Suite 500, Washington, DC 20003
tel: 202.671.2228| fax: 202.671.0617 |
www.ddot.dc.gov

---

Additional pedestrian element comments:
Missing sidewalks which should be elevated to priority 1:

- Water Street NW from 34th Street to the former Aqueduct (stone bridge at Cap Crescent terminus). This area is former B & O railroad warehouses and NPS land, and is missing sidewalks on both sides of the street. Please ensure that the map makes clear the missing sidewalk is on the street underneath this section of the Whitehurst Freeway and Key Bridge.
- 29th Street at C & O Canal is missing the sidewalk on the east side of the bridge over the canal, and the sidewalk along the east side adjacent to the former GSA heating plant is narrower than ADA standards permit.

New Facilities (same comment sent to DDOT for bike element):
- The Georgetown BID recommends inclusion of text explaining the pedestrian/bike bridge which would connect the Georgetown Waterfront with Teddy Roosevelt Island and the Mount Vernon Trail. The bridge is shown on pages B.14, figure B.5, as well as on page P.11, but neither has a description of the facility. We would also request that this facility be elevated to priority 1 as it would quickly become the main at-grade crossing between the Rock Creek, C & O, Cap Crescent, and Mount Vernon Trails, as well as link the 50 acres of wilderness on TR Island to DC with a direct connection.

From: Will Handsfield [mailto:whandsfield@georgetowndc.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 03, 2014 12:22 PM
To: 'Hawkinson, Colleen (DDOT)'; 'Zimbabwe, Sam (DDOT)'; 'George.branyan@dc.gov'; Joe Sternlieb
Subject: Ped Element comments for MoveDC

I wanted to flag a couple of pedestrian element comments from our initial review of the Draft of Move DC. We focused our analysis within the BID boundaries and at major intersections affecting our operations.

Our most challenging access point is the associated intersections of 27th/K/Whitehurst, 27th/Virginia Ave, Virginia Ave/Rock Creek Parkway. I made a drawing indicating the most significant pedestrian challenges from a missing infrastructure standpoint. In the ped element, 27th street south of K should be marked in red as “no sidewalks on either side”. Additionally, there are a number of missing painted crosswalks and associated signal crossing time. The reason these are so important, a walking route from Foggy Bottom metro to Washington Harbour would be a very short and comfortable walk if a direct walking route along the North side of Virginia Ave were available. The present configuration makes the same walk uncomfortable and confusing, and the priority is quite clearly car movements. Please consider adding these elements to the pedestrian element.
The ped element shows no sidewalks at M and 28th, and sidewalks on only one side of both 28th and 29th. This must be an error as these aerials show the sidewalks are indeed present. These locations should be removed from the ped element map:
The ped element shows no sidewalks on 30th Street at Washington Harbour. I believe this must be an error as 30th street has sidewalks here (see streetview image, along with bollards at the farther end and something of a woonerf feel when you get to the circle along the waterfront. I believe this street should be removed from the plan.
The pedestrian element shows no sidewalks on Cecil Pl. NW between Water Street and Grace Street. This is not correct, there is a sidewalk on the west side of Cecil Pl, but no sidewalk on the east side. FYI, it is unlikely that a sidewalk could be added while maintaining a vehicle lane due to the extreme narrowness of Cecil Pl.

33rd street NW is shown as having a sidewalk on only one side, this is correct, but there is an enclosed staircase that appears to be within the public right of way, adjacent to the PEPCO substation on 33rd. We believe this was at one time intended to serve as the sidewalk, but it is chained off by PEPCO management.
From: Will Handsfield <whandsfield@georgetowndc.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 03, 2014 3:57 PM
To: Hawkinson, Colleen (DDOT)
Cc: Zimbabwe, Sam (DDOT); Branyan, George (DDOT); Joe Sternlieb
Subject: RE: Ped Element comments for MoveDC
Attachments: photo 1.jpg; photo 2.jpg; photo 3.jpg; photo 4.jpg

Just to elaborate a little further on the pedestrian situation on 33rd Street, here are some photographs of the existing walkway/staircase next to the substation which is blocked off by a metal fence. We would love to see this open as a pedestrian walkway, provided it could be managed so it wouldn’t become the de facto covered hangout area for public nuisance-type activity (drinking, homeless camps, etc).

This strikes us as an easy win for DDOT to open this side up since the infrastructure already exists. Happy to engage on it with you guys.

From: Will Handsfield [mailto:whandsfield@georgetowndc.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 03, 2014 12:22 PM
To: 'Hawkinson, Colleen (DDOT)'; 'Zimbabwe, Sam (DDOT)'; 'George.branyan@dc.gov'; Joe Sternlieb
Subject: Ped Element comments for MoveDC

I wanted to flag a couple of pedestrian element comments from our initial review of the Draft of Move DC. We focused our analysis within the BID boundaries and at major intersections affecting our operations.

Our most challenging access point is the associated intersections of 27th/K/Whitehurst, 27th/Virginia Ave, Virginia Ave/Rock Creek Parkway. I made a drawing indicating the most significant pedestrian challenges from a missing infrastructure standpoint. In the ped element, 27th street south of K should be marked in red as “no sidewalks on either side”. Additionally, there are a number of missing painted crosswalks and associated signal crossing time. The reason these are so important, a walking route from Foggy Bottom metro to Washington Harbour would be a very short and comfortable walk if a direct walking route along the North side of Virginia Ave were available. The present configuration makes the same walk uncomfortable and confusing, and the priority is quite clearly car movements. Please consider adding these elements to the pedestrian element.
The ped element shows no sidewalks at M and 28th, and sidewalks on only one side of both 28th and 29th. This must be an error as these aerials show the sidewalks are indeed present. These locations should be removed from the ped element map:
The ped element shows no sidewalks on 30th Street at Washington Harbour. I believe this must be an error as 30th street has sidewalks here (see streetview image, along with bollards at the farther end and something of a woonerf feel when you get to the circle along the waterfront. I believe this street should be removed from the plan.
The ped element shows no sidewalks on Cecil Pl. NW between Water Street and Grace Street. This is not correct, there is a sidewalk on the west side of Cecil Pl, but no sidewalk on the east side. FYI, it is unlikely that a sidewalk could be added while maintaining a vehicle lane due to the extreme narrowness of Cecil Pl.

33rd street NW is shown as having a sidewalk on only one side, this is correct, but there is an enclosed staircase that appears to be within the public right of way, adjacent to the PEPCO substation on 33rd. We believe this was at one time intended to serve as the sidewalk, but it is chained off by PEPCO management.
Further comments on the Bicycle Element:

The Georgetown BID recommends inclusion of text explaining the pedestrian/bike bridge which would connect the Georgetown Waterfront with Teddy Roosevelt Island and the Mount Vernon Trail. The bridge is shown on pages B.14, figure B.5, as well as on page P.11, but neither has a description of the facility. We would also request that this facility be elevated to priority 1 as it would quickly become the main at-grade crossing between the Rock Creek, C & O, Cap Crescent, and Mount Vernon Trails, as well as link the 50 acres of wilderness on TR island to DC with a direct connection.

Please also consider adding this connection to the Sustainability and Livability element as it would provide direct, non-motorized access to a significant open-space asset that is currently a challenge for most District residents to reach.

WILL HANDSFIELD | TRANSPORTATION DIRECTOR
GEORGETOWN BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT
1000 POTOMAC STREET NW | SUITE 122
WASHINGTON, DC 20007 | WWW.GEORGETOWNDC.COM
T 202.298.9222 x 203 | F 202.298.9223
E whandsfield@georgetowndc.com

Hey Colleen,

Good talking to you today, and congratulations on getting MoveDC to this point.

Since you are accepting comments, I thought I'd chime in early on one thing I noticed that is a priority for Georgetown - connecting the Cap Crescent Trail with the Rock Creek Trail via dedicated bicycle facility (most likely a cycletrack) on K Street/Water Street NW. I think there was an error in the composition of the bike element where this facility is shown and described to be on the Whitehurst Freeway. I am fairly confident that a cycletrack on the Whitehurst wasn't discussed or recommended by the public, but rather it is the streets underneath the Whitehurst which are the intended location for a cycletrack. Within our own Georgetown 2028 planning document, the K/Water Street bicycle connection was one of the top transportation priorities, and individuals who participated in both MoveDC and Georgetown 2028 advocated for this facility in both plans.

I can understand the error since K/Water street are invisible on aerial maps of this area, and if the map was compiled by individuals unfamiliar with the unique situation there, it would be easy to mistake the intent, and draw a cycletrack on top of the freeway, rather than underneath it.

From a more qualitative standpoint, the Georgetown BID recommends elevating this facility to priority 1. The reason is...
twofold, reconfiguration of K/Water street for streetcar is imminent, and any plans for a cycletrack must be harmonized with plans for streetcar and other streetscape elements. Secondly, the GBID and ANCs receive a significant amount of comments (3-5 per week) about the need to fix this particular segment of roadway, and create more order between modes.

Just last week we held a meeting with DDOT and ANC 2E on site to discuss what could be done, and came to the conclusion that a cycletrack makes a lot of sense.

In the final version of MoveDC, please make the necessary adjustments to this facility to reflect that it will be at the ground level on K/Water Streets.

Thank You,

WILL HANDSFIELD | TRANSPORTATION DIRECTOR
GEORGETOWN BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT
1000 POTOMAC STREET NW | SUITE 122
WASHINGTON, DC 20007 | www.georgetowndc.com
T 202.298.9222 x 203 | F 202.298.9223
E whandsfield@georgetowndc.com
Colleen,

I had a chance to review the moveDC plan as it relates to ANC 3F. I am writing to express my opposition to the plans to significantly increase bus traffic on Van Ness St. NW between Reno Rd. NW and Wisconsin Ave. NW.

My strong opposition is based on the following reasons:

1. The Bus Proposals Harm The Van Ness Commercial Corridor - The moveDC plan proposes making high density bus routes up Connecticut Ave. NW, down Van Ness St. NW and then up Wisconsin Ave. NW. This will significantly harm the businesses in the Van Ness corridor. As you are probably aware, a large number of commercial and retail establishments line Connecticut Avenue between Van Ness St. NW and Nebraska Ave. NW. If high frequency buses were to bypass these businesses, they will not get the benefits that high density bus service can bring to commercial and retail establishments. The moveDC plan should be revised so that the high density bus lines travel up Connecticut Ave. NW to either Nebraska Ave. NW or Military Rd. NW, where they can connect to Wisconsin Ave. NW. This will remove bus traffic from Van Ness St. NW and also benefit our valuable, lively commercial corridor.

2. Van Ness St. NW Is Not Designed For Buses - If you have ever visited Van Ness St. NW between Reno Rd. NW and Wisconsin Ave. NW, you will note that Van Ness St. NW is a narrow two-lane road with parking along one side. The narrow width of the street is not conducive to heavy bus traffic. Van Ness St. NW was never designed to accommodate bus traffic and should not. Unlike connector streets like Military Rd. NW or Porter St. NW or multi-lane arterial roads such Nebraska Ave. NW, each which was originally designed to handle significant cross-town vehicle traffic, Van Ness St. NW was never designed to be a connector road between Connecticut Ave. NW and Wisconsin Ave. NW. Because of this, the homes along Van Ness St. NW are built much closer to the road than homes on Nebraska Ave. NW and Military Rd. NW. The current levels of bus traffic are a significant nuisance to the residents along the street from noise and vibration. The ANC already receives numerous complaints every month relating to noise and vibration from the Metro buses that run on the street. We have worked hard with WMATA to limit bus usage of the street and any planned increases to bus traffic on the street will only increase the noise and vibration issues.

3. Heavy Bus Traffic Raises Pedestrian Safety Issues - Van Ness St. NW is a major pedestrian corridor in our ANC since it is a highly walkable route between Reno Rd NW and Wisconsin Ave NW. Van Ness St. NW is also the main school route to the Hearst and Sidwell schools. I have very deep concerns about increasing bus traffic on a road that is frequented to a high level by pedestrians and school children. We have had issues with drivers along Van Ness St. NW causing significant danger to pedestrians. As a result of these issues, the residents of Van Ness St. NW have worked hard with the ANC, our Councilmember, DDOT and MPD to increase enforcement of traffic laws, to limit truck traffic on the street and we are working to install stop sign and speed cameras. Increasing bus traffic on the street goes against the pedestrian safety improvements we have been working so hard to get.

We hope moveDC will reconsider its proposal to increase bus traffic on Van Ness St. NW and instead reconfigure the high density buses to travel through our vibrant commercial corridor along Connecticut Ave NW until they reach Nebraska Ave. NW, a multi-lane arterial road that will connect the buses safely with Wisconsin Ave NW.

Thank you.
Thank you for your comments. We appreciate your input.

Colleen

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 25, 2014, at 1:02 PM, "Bryan Stockton" wrote:

Dear Ms. Hawkinson,

As the coordinator for the moveDC plan, congrats on a very thoughtful and exciting plan.

I am very enthusiastic about the long term vision for public transit in the city. As a resident of Van Ness and as one of the few people in the neighborhood that does not own a car and actually rides the H2 bus, I nevertheless am strongly opposed to creating a high-density bus lane on Van Ness St. NW between Wisconsin and Reno Rd. I hope my comments below are not just NIMBYism but offer constructive comments for moveDC.

1. Van Ness St. between Reno Rd. and Wisconsin is not built for such high volume bus, vehicle, and bike traffic. I understand the need for an efficient route between Wisconsin and Connecticut Aves., but using Van Ness is not the solution. Currently, the H2 bus uses Veazey St going westbound and Van Ness St. for eastbound routes. The moveDC plan only shows Van Ness St. for the high frequency service. Currently, Van Ness St. between Reno Rd. and Wisconsin has only one side of parking for residents, a shared bike lane, and two narrow lanes for vehicle traffic. Using the street for two directions of bus traffic plus bike traffic will create a nightmare and safety hazard. All the other streets in the neighborhood have parking on both sides, even Veazey St. The residents of Van Ness should not shoulder all of the burden of noise, lack of parking, safety, etc.

Vehicle traffic uses Van Ness already during rush hour, and sometimes the cars back up an entire block as they wait for the light at either Reno Road or Wisconsin to change. Channeling more traffic onto this street will only increase negative impacts on those who live on Van Ness. The current levels of bus traffic are a significant nuisance to the residents along the street from noise and vibration.

2. Instead, the proposed route should go further north on Connecticut Ave. before connecting with Wisconsin via Nebraska or Military Road. That would allow the buses to
service the vibrant commercial sector north of the Van Ness metro station. When I used
to live at Brandywine and Connecticut, I would always look to take a bus to and from the
metro station, but the buses were so infrequent and unreliable that it made more sense
to walk. If service can be improved north to at least Albemarle, I think ridership would
increase. Nebraska Ave would make the route longer, but it is a multi-lane arterial road,
and it would take the route directly by a middle and high school.

3. At the very least, the high frequency cross-town route between Reno Rd and
Wisconsin Ave should follow the existing H2 route, which divides the east/west route
along two parallel streets. Private vehicle traffic will continue to use Van Ness as the
main cut through between Wisconsin and Connecticut. Residents cannot reroute the
private vehicle traffic, but we can suggest alternatives for increased bus traffic. We
should lessen the impact on Van Ness by spreading the effects of the increased bus
traffic along several neighboring streets.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment, and good luck on your work.

Bryan Stockton
3719 Van Ness Street NW
Washington, DC 20016
bryan.stockton@gmail.com
Hi Ms. Dinsmore-

Thank you for your comments. We appreciate your input.

Colleen

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 26, 2014, at 11:27 AM, "barbara dinsmore" wrote:

Greetings

I have lived at 3726 Veazey Street NW for almost 40 years.

Veazey is a short (3 block long), narrow street with parking on both sides. We have TWO bus routes that presently use this street going from East to West.

I understand that the MoveDC plan will increase bus traffic on Van Ness Street, NW, which presumably will lead to more bus traffic on Veazey as this is the 'tried and true' east/west route for the buses at this point.

My husband and I respectfully request that you PLEASE not go ahead with this plan. The bus and car traffic, including trucks and off route buses coming from west to east on Veazey make this a very high volume and dangerous few blocks. There are a number of elderly people living here (some disabled and using wheelchairs) and at last count at least 18 children under 10 living here. There are two large schools within 3 blocks of Veazey - Hearst and Sidwell - and the Washington Home. This accounts for a lot of pedestrian traffic and a huge amount of vehicular traffic. We not only do not want, but truly cannot handle more traffic.

Sincerely,

Barbara Dinsmore
202-244-6214
Dear Ms. Hawkinson,

My family and I would like to echo Adam’s strong opposition to the proposed high-density bus route on Van Ness St. NW, where we live (re-posted below).

In addition to the points he correctly raises about the proposal harming the Van Ness Commercial Corridor and the street not being designed for such traffic, we have a small child, and are concerned about increasing the amount of traffic on the street for safety reasons. Given that many people take this street to walk to Hearst playground and elementary school, we feel that high-density bus traffic would greatly raise the risk of pedestrian accidents.

All of the neighbors I have talked to strongly share this sentiment, and we hope you will support the idea to reconfigure the proposal so that the high-density buses travel along Connecticut Ave NW until they reach Nebraska Ave. NW, a multi-lane arterial road that will connect the buses safely with Wisconsin Ave NW.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Best regards,
Rebecca

My strong opposition is based on the following reasons:

1. The Bus Proposals Harm The Van Ness Commercial Corridor - The moveDC plan proposes making high density bus routes up Connecticut Ave. NW, down Van Ness St. NW and then up Wisconsin Ave. NW. This will significantly harm the businesses in the Van Ness corridor. As you are probably aware, a large number of commercial and retail establishments line Connecticut Avenue between Van Ness St. NW and Nebraska Ave. NW. If high frequency buses were to bypass these businesses, they will not get the benefits that high density bus service can bring to commercial and retail establishments. The moveDC plan should be revised so that the high density bus lines travel up Connecticut Ave. NW to either Nebraska Ave. NW or Military Rd. NW, where they can connect to Wisconsin Ave. NW. This will remove bus traffic from Van Ness St. NW and also benefit our valuable, lively commercial corridor.

2. Van Ness St. NW Is Not Designed For Buses - If you have ever visited Van Ness St. NW between Reno Rd. NW and Wisconsin Ave. NW, you will note that Van Ness St. NW is a narrow two-lane road with parking along one side. The narrow width of the street is not conducive to heavy bus traffic. Van Ness St. NW was never designed to accommodate bus traffic and should not. Unlike connector streets like Military Rd. NW or Porter St. NW or multi-lane arterial roads such Nebraska Ave. NW, each which was originally designed to handle significant cross-town vehicle traffic, Van Ness St. NW was never designed to be a connector road between Connecticut Ave. NW and Wisconsin Ave. NW. Because of this, the homes along Van Ness St. NW
are built much closer to the road than homes on Nebraska Ave. NW and Military Rd. NW. The current levels of bus traffic are a significant nuisance to the residents along the street from noise and vibration. The ANC already receives numerous complaints every month relating to noise and vibration from the Metro buses that run on the street. We have worked hard with WMATA to limit bus traffic on the street and any planned increases to bus traffic on the street will only increase the noise and vibration issues.

3. Heavy Bus Traffic Raises Pedestrian Safety Issues - Van Ness St. NW is a major pedestrian corridor in our ANC since it is a highly walkable route between Reno Rd NW and Wisconsin Ave NW. Van Ness St. NW is also the main school route to the Hearst and Sidwell schools. I have very deep concerns about increasing bus traffic on a road that is frequented by a high level of pedestrians and school children. We have had issues with drivers along Van Ness St. NW causing significant danger to pedestrians. As a result of these issues, the residents of Van Ness St. NW have worked hard with the ANC, our Councilmember, DDOT and MPD to increase enforcement of traffic laws, to limit truck traffic on the street and we are working to install stop sign and speed cameras. Increasing bus traffic on the street goes against the pedestrian safety improvements we have been working so hard to get.

We hope moveDC will reconsider its proposal to increase bus traffic on Van Ness St. NW and instead reconfigure the high density buses to travel through our vibrant commercial corridor along Connecticut Ave NW until they reach Nebraska Ave. NW, a multi-lane arterial road that will connect the buses safely with Wisconsin Ave NW.
Good afternoon –
Thank you for your comments. We appreciate your input.

Colleen

Colleen Hawkinson, AICP | Manager, Strategic Planning Branch
Policy, Planning & Sustainability Administration | District Department of Transportation
55 M Street, SE, Suite 500, Washington, DC 20003
tel: 202.671.2228| fax: 202.671.0617 |
www.ddot.dc.gov

From: Sandy Petrykowski [mailto:
Sent: Wednesday, June 25, 2014 12:38 PM
To: Hawkinson, Colleen (DDOT); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); adam@adamtope.com
Subject: In opposition of making Van Ness St a high density bus corridor.

Dear Colleen Hawkinson and Councilmember Mary Cheh,

I am writing in opposition of the MoveDC plan to make Van Ness Street a high density bus corridor. This proposed plan would dramatically negatively affect our neighborhood.

My husband and I bought a house on Van Ness St NW last November, and moved in with our two young girls just days before Thanksgiving. We chose Van Ness Street because it is a pedestrian and family friend street. This bus route proposal would be a huge negative in our view.

Van Ness is a very narrow street with parking on only one side. Our house is on the side with no parking, and after we park we have to cross the street with our two children. In fact many families with young children live on this street, and because there are two elementary schools - Sidwell Friends and Hearst - just two blocks away, there is a high amount of related foot and car traffic. Creating a high-density bus corridor would make it a much less safe place for our children.

I have strong concerns about adding a high level of bus traffic and related noise and vibration issues to an already narrow and congested street. If high density buses are going to be added, they should travel along major roads built and maintained for such level of traffic - such as Connecticut, Wisconsin, Reno, Military Road - not Van Ness. Van Ness was simply not designed to handle this added capacity.

I hope you take the thoughts and concerns of those in the neighborhood into consideration before drastically altering the traffic patterns and safety on Van Ness St.

Best regards,
Sandy Petrykowski
Thank you for your help.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 23, 2014, at 8:07 AM, "Hawkinson, Colleen (DDOT)" <colleen.hawkinson@dc.gov> wrote:

Thank you for submitting comments. We appreciate your input.

Colleen

Colleen Hawkinson, AICP | Manager, Strategic Planning Branch
Policy, Planning & Sustainability Administration | District Department of Transportation
55 M Street, SE, Suite 500, Washington, DC 20003
tel: 202.671.2228 | fax: 202.671.0617 |
www.ddot.dc.gov

-------- Forwarded message --------

From: Janice Schneider <janiceschneider@dc.gov>
Sent: Saturday, June 21, 2014 3:20 PM
To: Hawkinson, Colleen (DDOT)
Subject: Fwd: Oppose moveDC Van Ness Street, NW Plans

I live on Van Ness Street proposed for High Capacity Transit. I read the proposed plan to suggest increased bus traffic on Van Ness Street at a frequency of at least every 15 minutes for 18 hours per day (and more frequently during peak hours). I do not believe the street is suitable for the proposed use. The street is narrow with parking on one side. My car has been hit, my neighbor's car has been hit and another neighbor's car has been totaled. My house is relatively close to the street and I can hear every bus that goes by, even with double paned windows. There is already Metro access btw Tenleytown and Van Ness Street and thus more frequent bus routing is not needed. I believe a better routing would be up Connecticut and across Albermarle Street or Military Street, both of which are wider and can accommodate this type of use. Additionally, more frequent buses up Connecticut will help to stimulate business on the Connecticut Avenue corridor which has languished for years. Thank you for your consideration of these comments.
Reason #14: Enroll now so you can relax on the beach later! Learn the 13 other reasons why you should return your enrollment forms to DC Public Schools right now by visiting deps.dc.gov/enroll
Good afternoon –

Thanks for your comments. We appreciate your input.

Colleen

Colleen Hawkinson, AICP | Manager, Strategic Planning Branch
Policy, Planning & Sustainability Administration | District Department of Transportation
55 M Street, SE, Suite 500, Washington, DC 20003

From: Rebecca Regan-Sachs [mailto:mailtos:eccececececececem] On Behalf Of Rebecca Regan-Sachs
Sent: Wednesday, June 25, 2014 9:16 AM
To: Hawkinson, Colleen (DDOT)
Cc: Tope, Adam (ANC 3F01)
Subject: Oppose moveDC Van Ness St NW Plans

Dear Ms. Hawkinson,

My family and I would like to echo Adam’s strong opposition to the proposed high-density bus route on Van Ness St. NW, where we live (re-posted below).

In addition to the points he correctly raises about the proposal harming the Van Ness Commerical Corridor and the street not being designed for such traffic, we have a small child, and are concerned about increasing the amount of traffic on the street for safety reasons. Given that many people take this street to walk to Hearst playground and elementary school, we feel that high-density bus traffic would greatly raise the risk of pedestrian accidents.

All of the neighbors I have talked to strongly share this sentiment, and we hope you will support the idea to reconfigure the proposal so that the high-density buses travel along Connecticut Ave NW until they reach Nebraska Ave. NW, a multi-lane arterial road that will connect the buses safely with Wisconsin Ave NW.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Best regards,

Rebecca

My strong opposition is based on the following reasons:
1. The Bus Proposals Harm The Van Ness Commercial Corridor - The moveDC plan proposes making high density bus routes up Connecticut Ave. NW, down Van Ness St. NW and then up Wisconsin Ave. NW. This will significantly harm the businesses in the Van Ness corridor. As you are probably aware, a large number of commercial and retail establishments line Connecticut Avenue between Van Ness St. NW and Nebraska Ave. NW. If high frequency buses were to bypass these businesses, they will not get the benefits that high density bus service can bring to commercial and retail establishments. The moveDC plan should be revised so that the high density bus lines travel up Connecticut Ave. NW to either Nebraska Ave. NW or Military Rd. NW, where they can connect to Wisconsin Ave. NW. This will remove bus traffic from Van Ness St. NW and also benefit our valuable, lively commercial corridor.

2. Van Ness St. NW Is Not Designed For Buses - If you have ever visited Van Ness St. NW between Reno Rd. NW and Wisconsin Ave. NW, you will note that Van Ness St. NW is a narrow two-lane road with parking along one side. The narrow width of the street is not conducive to heavy bus traffic. Van Ness St. NW was never designed to accommodate bus traffic and should not. Unlike connector streets like Military Rd. NW or Porter St. NW or multi-lane arterial roads such Nebraska Ave. NW, each which was originally designed to handle significant cross-town vehicle traffic, Van Ness St. NW was never designed to be a connector road between Connecticut Ave. NW and Wisconsin Ave. NW. Because of this, the homes along Van Ness St. NW are built much closer to the road than homes on Nebraska Ave. NW and Military Rd. NW. The current levels of bus traffic are a significant nuisance to the residents along the street from noise and vibration. The ANC already receives numerous complaints every month relating to noise and vibration from the Metro buses that run on the street. We have worked hard with WMATA to limit bus usage of the street and any planned increases to bus traffic on the street will only increase the noise and vibration issues.

3. Heavy Bus Traffic Raises Pedestrian Safety Issues - Van Ness St. NW is a major pedestrian corridor in our ANC since it is a highly walkable route between Reno Rd NW and Wisconsin Ave NW. Van Ness St. NW is also the main school route to the Hearst and Sidwell schools. I have very deep concerns about increasing bus traffic on a road that is frequented to a high level by pedestrians and school children. We have had issues with drivers along Van Ness St. NW causing significant danger to pedestrians. As a result of these issues, the residents of Van Ness St. NW have worked hard with the ANC, our Councilmember, DDOT and MPD to increase enforcement of traffic laws, to limit truck traffic on the street and we are working to install stop sign and speed cameras. Increasing bus traffic on the street goes against the pedestrian safety improvements we have been working so hard to get.

We hope moveDC will reconsider its proposal to increase bus traffic on Van Ness St. NW and instead reconfigure the high density buses to travel through our vibrant commercial corridor along Connecticut Ave NW until they reach Nebraska Ave. NW, a multi-lane arterial road that will connect the buses safely with Wisconsin Ave NW.
Dear Ms. Hawkinson,

I live on Van Ness Street, NW and was shocked to learn about the MoveDC proposal to turn a residential section of Van Ness Street into a high-density bus corridor. Thankfully, our ANC brought this plan to our attention and I want to join with the ANC (see below) and all of my neighbors in strong opposition to this disturbing proposal.

Please, direct all plans for increases in bus traffic and any creation of new high-density bus corridors to arterial roads. Accommodating regular artery to artery traffic is their function within the DC road system. Additionally, as the ANC points out, the business community along Connecticut Avenue would welcome the enhanced bus traffic especially if it connects the Van Ness commercial corridor to the Nebraska/Connecticut commercial corridor and further north to Chevy Chase.

This neighborhood has worked hard in recent years to improve the livability of the street for all its residents and the many young families that have bought houses here. Your plan would destroy much of the progress the neighborhood and the city have worked so hard to achieve.

Sincerely,

Susan Rausch
3606 Van Ness Street, NW
Washington, DC 20008

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Tope, Adam (ANC 3F01)" <3F01@anc.dc.gov>
Subject: Oppose moveDC Van Ness St NW Plans
Date: June 18, 2014 at 11:07:18 AM EDT
To: "Hawkinson, Colleen (DDOT)" <colleen.hawkinson@dc.gov>
Cc: "Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL)" <MCheh@DCCOUNCIL.US>, "Fabrikant, Michael (EOM)" <Michael.Fabrikant@dc.gov>

Colleen,

I had a chance to review the moveDC plan as it relates to ANC 3F. I am writing to express my opposition to the plans to significantly increase bus traffic on Van Ness St. NW between Reno
My strong opposition is based on the following reasons:

1. The Bus Proposals Harm The Van Ness Commercial Corridor - The moveDC plan proposes making high density bus routes up Connecticut Ave. NW, down Van Ness St. NW and then up Wisconsin Ave. NW. This will significantly harm the businesses in the Van Ness corridor. As you are probably aware, a large number of commercial and retail establishments line Connecticut Avenue between Van Ness St. NW and Nebraska Ave. NW. If high frequency buses were to bypass these businesses, they will not get the benefits that high density bus service can bring to commercial and retail establishments. The moveDC plan should be revised so that the high density bus lines travel up Connecticut Ave. NW to either Nebraska Ave. NW or Military Rd. NW, where they can connect to Wisconsin Ave. NW. This will remove bus traffic from Van Ness St. NW and also benefit our valuable, lively commercial corridor.

2. Van Ness St. NW Is Not Designed For Buses - If you have ever visited Van Ness St. NW between Reno Rd. NW and Wisconsin Ave. NW, you will note that Van Ness St. NW is a narrow two-lane road with parking along one side. The narrow width of the street is not conducive to heavy bus traffic. Van Ness St. NW was never designed to accommodate bus traffic and should not. Unlike connector streets like Military Rd. NW or Porter St. NW or multi-lane arterial roads such Nebraska Ave. NW, each which was originally designed to handle significant cross-town vehicle traffic, Van Ness St. NW was never designed to be a connector road between Connecticut Ave. NW and Wisconsin Ave. NW. Because of this, the homes along Van Ness St. NW are built much closer to the road than homes on Nebraska Ave. NW and Military Rd. NW. The current levels of bus traffic are a significant nuisance to the residents along the street from noise and vibration. The ANC already receives numerous complaints every month relating to noise and vibration from the Metro buses that run on the street. We have worked hard with WMATA to limit bus usage of the street and any planned increases to bus traffic on the street will only increase the noise and vibration issues.

3. Heavy Bus Traffic Raises Pedestrian Safety Issues - Van Ness St. NW is a major pedestrian corridor in our ANC since it is a highly walkable route between Reno Rd NW and Wisconsin Ave NW. Van Ness St. NW is also the main school route to the Hearst and Sidwell schools. I have very deep concerns about increasing bus traffic on a road that is frequented to a high level by pedestrians and school children. We have had issues with drivers along Van Ness St. NW causing significant danger to pedestrians. As a result of these issues, the residents of Van Ness St. NW have worked hard with the ANC, our Councilmember, DDOT and MPD to increase enforcement of traffic laws, to limit truck traffic on the street and we are working to install stop sign and speed cameras. Increasing bus traffic on the street goes against the pedestrian safety improvements we have been working so hard to get.

We hope moveDC will reconsider its proposal to increase bus traffic on Van Ness St. NW and instead reconfigure the high density buses to travel through our vibrant commercial corridor along Connecticut Ave NW until they reach Nebraska Ave. NW, a multi-lane arterial road that will connect the buses safely with Wisconsin Ave NW.

Thank you.

Adam
Dear Ms. Hawkinson, My name is Maureen Richardson Nagle and I live at 3715 Van Ness St., NW. I have lived at this address since 2002. I am writing to strongly oppose the moveDC plan to make a high density bus route up Van Ness St.

On a personal level, the block I live on is a narrow two-lane road with parking on one-side. The road is simply not wide enough to accommodate these buses. The neighborhood is vibrant - filled with young children who walk to local schools (including Hearst, Sidwell, Sheridan and area preschools), play on its sidewalks and walk, skip and jump to visit each other’s houses. The safety of those children on the narrow residential blocks should be a primary concern. My neighbors have worked very hard with DDOT to increase the safety of these children -- increasing enforcement of traffic laws and working to install stop sign and speed cameras – and this plan endangers those children by re-routing bus traffic to very narrow, residential streets. I vehemently oppose this plan for that reason.

The plan also seems extremely short-sighted from an economic perspective for the city. A large number of commercial and retail establishments line Connecticut Avenue between Van Ness St. NW and Nebraska Ave. NW. Politics & Prose, Comet, and the numerous other small businesses that line that stretch of Connecticut avenue are supported by the bus traffic that the existing bus routes bring. It would seem extremely short sighted to re-route bus routes from a commercial district to residential streets, instead of maintaining existing bus routes that support a commercial district. In addition, it would seem much more likely to me that the residents of the large apartment buildings that line Connecticut Avenue use the DC bus system. I do not believe the city can afford to be short-sighted economically at this time and needs to support its existing business so as they do not leave - like the Davenport Safeway is doing.

For the safety of DC children, for the support of a existing business corridor along Connecticut Avenue between Van Ness and Nebraska, for the taxes those businesses bring to the cities, and for the increased revenue to the high density buses of travelling along a corridor with large apartment buildings, I strongly hope and deeply suggest moveDC will reconsider its proposal to increase bus traffic on Van Ness St. NW and instead reconfigure the high density buses to travel through the commercial corridor along Connecticut Ave NW until they reach Nebraska Ave. NW, a multi-lane arterial road that will connect the buses safely with Wisconsin Ave NW.

Please feel free to reach out to me if you have any questions.
Best regards,

Maureen Richardson Nagle
3715 Van Ness St., NW
Thanks for passing these along as well!

Colleen

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 20, 2014, at 12:03 PM, "Eileen M" wrote:

Colleen, I'm also forwarding Elvira's comment. Eileen (Vira, I used the wrong email originally. Sorry.)

On Jun 20, 2014 10:55 AM, "ELVIRA SISOLAK" wrote:

Colleen,

I have just one brief comment. It concerns motorcycles. I work in NoMA. A colleague who would like to ride his motorcycle to work tells me that there is no on-street parking specifically for motorcycles in the area. Since motorcycles are clearly energy-efficient, I would think that one or more parking spaces for cars could be converted to motorcycle spaces so we could encourage this mode of transport. I know there are such spaces on Independence Ave., SE between 2nd and 3rd Sts, SE just below the annex to the Library of Congress. I think parking during the week in these spaces is restricted to motorcycles but that cars can be parked in there on weekends. I think NoMA, with its large numbers of commuters, would be the perfect place for such motorcycle parking. I am sure that other areas of the city with large numbers of commuters would also benefit from motorcycle parking.

Vira Sisolak
PAC representative from Ward 6

>>> Eileen M 6/20/2014 10:32 AM >>>

Hi Colleen,

I understand you are the official recipient of comments on the draft MoveDC plan. Mine are attached. Thanks for your consideration.

Eileen McCarthy

--
You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "DC Ped Council" group. To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to dc-ped-council+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.
For more options, visit https://groups.google.com/d/optout.
--
You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "DC Ped Council" group.
To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to dc-ped-
council+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.
For more options, visit https://groups.google.com/d/optout.
Comments on June 2014 DDOT Draft MoveDC Plan

Preliminary Note: I’ve lived in DC since June 1980 and have neither owned nor driven a car. I travel around the city and its environs by foot and/or transit, and usually walk between 15 and 30 miles each week (depending on weather, etc.). I also represent Ward 3 on the DC Pedestrian Advisory Council (PAC). My comments draw from both my personal experience as a pedestrian in DC and from information exchanged during public PAC meetings, but express only my personal views and not those of the PAC as a whole.

General Comments

Overall, the plan, if implemented, will be a great step forward for the city and its pedestrians and DDOT’s authors have done an admirable job of trying to balance the sometimes competing interests of people traveling about the city. Although some of my comments below could be seen as negative (though I intend them as further support for the overall policy changes DDOT staff are trying to make), I found far more to like in the MoveDC plan than to dislike. I look forward to the plan’s further development and implementation, and appreciate that some of the comments I and other PAC members made during DDOT’s presentation at the PAC’s November 2013 meeting are reflected in the report.

As you might expect, I especially like the plan’s clear statements that “Every trip starts and ends as a walking trip” and “Prioritizing pedestrians of all ages and abilities will continue to be a high priority for DDOT in the future”. That said, I also think this promise would be a more useful theoretical underpinning for the plan if it were fleshed out just a little more. The policy recommendations in the plan are generally good (with some caveats noted below), but ultimately giving priority to pedestrians should mean that the needs of pedestrians, especially the most vulnerable pedestrians, must be considered whenever any transportation decision is made and, at the very least, DDOT will adopt an “first, do no harm” approach to all pedestrians – e.g. a statement along the lines of “DC should never take actions that increase the risk of harm to, and/or increase the burdens placed on, people walking in order to accommodate vehicle speed or to favor other types of travel over walking. DC also will work to undo past policies and actions that have been inconsistent with the policy of prioritizing pedestrians. In particular, the needs of the most vulnerable pedestrians (children, seniors, pedestrians with disabilities) will receive the highest priority.” It’s especially important to acknowledge that past actions, stemming from the City’s previous focus on enabling drivers to travel as quickly as possible, continue to perpetuate unfair challenges for pedestrians and to begin to remedy them.

I also would like to see a clear commitment to open government and transparency from DDOT, particularly in the realm of crash data. New York City recently began publishing daily crash reports and we should be working toward doing that, too. The plan has some isolated references to moving in this direction (e.g. Recommendation C.4), but a more explicit commitment in the overall policy discussion would be welcome.
Finally, it would be helpful for DDOT to make a clear and open call to other DC agencies to similarly refrain from engaging in practices that harm or burden pedestrians. Currently, while DDOT and some other DC agencies (e.g. MPD) generally seem to be moving in the right direction in acknowledging the importance of walking, in some quarters – even within DDOT -- there appears to be little or no sensitivity to the potential effects of actions (or, in some cases, inaction) on pedestrians. A recent obvious example of this problem is potholepalooza: after this extravaganza finished, I once again saw that in the process of filling potholes within crosswalks, DC staff had wiped out crosswalk markings, sometimes completely obliterating all markings. If we had a process for crosswalks to be re-marked quickly (i.e. within a day or two), this would be tolerable; my experience, though, is that post-potholepalooza re-marking doesn’t happen unless the public reports it to 311 (and even then it may take months). Similarly, I regularly see (and move) empty garbage and recycling bins that have been left in the middle of sidewalks by DPW staff. DDOT could do the most thorough and perfect job of installing and maintaining sidewalks, and this type of unnecessary and thoughtless behavior by other agency staff would still make the sidewalks impossible for some people to navigate on foot. (I realize some residents also place their trash cans on the sidewalk, or obstruct pedestrians by parking their cars on the sidewalk, but we can work on changing resident behavior after we get agency staff to set better examples.) Both of these are the types of institutional problems that should be easy to fix. I don’t think these specific problems need to be addressed in the plan but, assuming the Mayor moves forward with adopting it, he and DDOT together could provide the leadership that encourages everyone else to move in the right direction; the City Council also could incorporate this principle into the resolution that DDOT is recommending (page 78, Part 1).

Comments on Specific Sections of the MoveDC Plan

1. Page P-7: The bullet titled “Enhance Accessibility” refers to DDOT using FHWA and DDOT guidelines to improve crosswalks on high-speed multi-lane streets. This discussion also concludes, “DDOT should continue to invest in intersection improvements such as curb ramps, high-visibility crosswalks, and sidewalks that ensure the transportation system meets the needs of pedestrians of all abilities.” One further point to consider here is that DC does have a “white cane” law which appears to require drivers to take special precautions when approaching certain blind and/or deaf pedestrians. Specifically, DC Code 7-1004 provides:

   The driver of a vehicle in the District of Columbia approaching a blind pedestrian who is carrying a cane predominantly white or metallic in color (with or without a red tip) or a deaf pedestrian, either of whom is using a dog guide shall take all necessary precautions to avoid injury to such blind or deaf pedestrian, and any driver who fails to take such precautions shall be liable in damages for any injury caused such pedestrian.

DDOT may wish to note the existence of this law in discussing steps it will take to enhance accessibility and to support other aspects of the plan (e.g. education of drivers could include this requirement, lower speed limits might be necessary if drivers are really going to be able “take all necessary precautions to avoid injury” to blind or deaf pedestrians covered by the law).
2. Page P-9: Recommendation A.3 says, “pedestrian crossings should be provide across all legs of an intersection unless a special exception can be clearly justified (see Recommendation A.5 and A.6)“. Recommendation A.5 (on page P-12) makes a similar statement. This issue was a point of concern for me and another PAC member at the November 2013 PAC meeting, and I am pleased to see the plan address it. I do have two concerns about the current formulation of the recommendation, though:

- The term “special exception” is never defined and I am concerned that this concept could be exploited to allow the practice of “closing” one or more crosswalks at intersections to continue without significant change. Exceptions should be few and far between, and almost always temporary, and should only be made when there is evidence that requiring someone to walk three ways around an intersection, in order to cross the street once, is actually safer than allowing them to cross the street once in the first place. It also might be appropriate to close a crosswalk if required by some overriding law, although the law in question should be examined carefully before such a decision is made. In other words, to be blunt, no crosswalk should be closed because DDOT staff think that it is more important to move motor vehicle traffic, or to provide more parking spaces, than to require drivers to obey the law. The plan should discuss the meaning of “special exception”, articulate the basic criteria that will be applied, and give an example or two of situations that would justify closing a crosswalk – e.g. if a sinkhole develops next to a crosswalk, it would be appropriate to close the crosswalk until the sinkhole is fixed; closing a crosswalk because turning drivers do not stop for pedestrians in the crosswalk, on the other hand is absurd: DC law requires drivers to stop and give right of way to pedestrians at all crosswalks; drivers who fail to stop, and/or who are driving impatiently or recklessly, are breaking the law; their behavior should be countered by engineering and/or enforcement that targets those drivers, not by approaches that impose additional burdens and dangers on their potential victims.

- In the past, DDOT has sometimes designed intersections in a way that does not formally “close” a crosswalk (i.e. no sign is posted closing it) but that effectively prevents or deters pedestrians from using the crosswalk. I’ve seen this problem in many locations around the city, but here are a few examples:
  - All over the city, usually at “T” intersection, unmarked crosswalks are obstructed by parked cars. The drivers of those cars park there because DDOT’s parking signs indicate that they can do so. In my own neighborhood (McLean Gardens, which is just west of Wisconsin Avenue between Rodman and Newark), for example, we have far more unmarked crosswalks than marked, many at “T” intersections, and all of them are obstructed by parked cars at many times (especially at night). Crossing in one of those crosswalks requires

---

1 For example, earlier this year I learned that DDOT intended to close the east crosswalk of 22d and I NW because one of the corners cannot accommodate a curb ramp, as required by the Americans with Disabilities Act, thus requiring everyone who wants to go from the NE corner to the SE corner (or vice versa) to cross first to the NW corner, next to the SW corner, and finally over to the SE corner. Interpreting the ADA in this way to require this action seems question and clearly does not enhance accessibility.

2 DC Code 50-2201.28(a) requires drivers to stop and give right-of-way to pedestrians at both marked and unmarked crosswalks at an intersection, but does not define what an unmarked crosswalk is. DCMR 18-9901, however, defines “crosswalk” as “that part of a roadway at an intersection included within the connections of the lateral lines of the sidewalks on opposite sides of the highway measured from the curbs, or in the absence of curbs, from the edges of the transverse roadway; or any portion of a roadway at an intersection or elsewhere distinctly indicated for pedestrian crossing by lines or other markings on the surface” (emphasis added).
pedestrians to squeeze between two cars, either of which may be obstructing the pedestrian’s view of oncoming traffic. Crossing at a marked crosswalk could require a person to walk one or more blocks out of their way and meander around the sidewalks and parking lots of the complex before finding another one. Fortunately, all of the intersections within the complex are unsignalized, people can legally find a mid-block area with more space and better sightlines (usually where there’s a fire hydrant), cross there, and just make sure to give right-of-way (as required by DCMR 18-2304.2) to drivers. But we shouldn’t have to do that. Either parking in crosswalks should be completely prohibited or, if it is truly a city imperative to allow drivers to store their property in what is legally pedestrian right-of-way space, then we should do away with crosswalks entirely in these areas, reduce the speed limit to 15 mph, and change our laws to restore the right-of-way throughout the street to pedestrians.

- The north (unmarked) crosswalk at Connecticut Avenue and 24th Street NW (https://www.google.com/maps/@38.924956,-77.052351,3a,90y,180h,90t/data=!3m4!1e1!3m2!1sTR5bofWiijgAmb901k04rAI2e0I6m1l1e1) is not posted as closed, but it is frequently blocked by cars and there is no pedestrian signal on that leg (and the arrangement of the remaining signals makes it difficult to gauge when it would be safe to cross, even if one gets past the first two obstacles).

- Even worse is the intersection of Nebraska Avenue and Davenport Street NW (https://www.google.com/maps/@38.952168,-77.073752,3a,90y,199h,90t/data=!3m4!1e1!3m2!1sdxwuPf7m1nwaNOWHQdYlcmg12e0I6m1l1e1). The west and south crosswalks of this intersection are both marked, but there are no pedestrian signals on either leg. Pedestrians trying to use the west crosswalk have to strain to see even the vehicle signal because it is slanted toward Davenport at an angle. Pedestrians crossing the south crosswalk from west to east can use the vehicle traffic signal as guidance, but pedestrians crossing east to west cannot see any signal. When the intersection is busy, crossing in either direction can be quite intimidating.

These are just some examples of the kinds of issues that are raised by closing crosswalks, whether clearly and formally or informally and haphazardly. I am not asking DDOT to address the specific example in the plan, but if DDOT is going to continue the practice of closing crosswalks, it should do so clearly based upon specific standards for doing so (and those standards should not sacrifice the underlying principle of giving pedestrians priority).

3. Page P-12: Recommendation A.5 says, “In locations with high pedestrian activity (pedestrians present at least 50% of the cycle at peak hour), particularly around transit stations, pedestrian actuated signals should not be used.” As with the previous recommendation, this approach would be better than current practice, but it does not go far enough. Leaving aside the basic unfairness of requiring pedestrians to push a button to cross a street while no driver is required to do so, I have several concerns:

- My personal experience is that these buttons sometimes do not work (they don’t call a “walk” signal) and, when they do stop working, it can take DDOT months – even years – to fix them, during which time pedestrians may have to either walk blocks (at least one up and one back) out of their way to cross the street legally or take their chances and cross with a “don’t walk” signal when the
presence of a car automatically triggers the green signal for drivers. As noted above, I live in McLean Gardens. I’ve lived here 20+ years and almost every night have walked from Tenleytown Metro to my home just west of Wisconsin and Rodman. Along this route, there are three intersections that require pedestrians to push buttons in order to cross Wisconsin Avenue: Warren Street (relatively new), the entrance to FNMA, and Rodman Street. All of the buttons along this route have malfunctioned at one point or another during their tenure. At one point, for example, pushing the button at Rodman Street resulted only in calling a “don’t walk” signal to cross Rodman, but no “walk” signal to cross Wisconsin. It took more than a year of episodic back and forth with DDOT to get that semi-permanently fixed. When the same problem recurred a few years later, it again took months to fix. I’ve also reported issues with the buttons at Warren several times, most recently in January and again in April (after my January service request was closed without any action by DDOT). DDOT did finally fix the problem in April – and obviously three months is an improvement over previous experience – but pedestrians should not have to go that long without being able to cross a street legally. Since I’ve been on the PAC, I’ve made a point of walking different parts of Ward 3 (and other parts of the rest of the city) and I test any buttons I come across. I would say that at least 20-30% are not working. I do usually report these to 311, but it can take months of repeated reports and contacts to get them resolved.

- Even when buttons do work, they can be problematic if access is obstructed. Whenever there is a snowstorm, for example, DPW’s plows pile the snow from the street not only into the adjacent crosswalks and curb ramps, but also up against the poles that house the buttons that pedestrians have to push. So, in order to cross the street, the pedestrian first climb up one pile of ice to push the button, and then clamber over the second pile of ice that leads to the crosswalk. This can go on for weeks at a time during winter, depending on how heavy and frequent the snow. A second type of a more permanent access problem is where the button is located a distance from the crosswalk and/or is obstructed by poles or other obstacles. At Massachusetts Avenue and California Street NW, for example, pedestrians who want to cross Massachusetts from the south to north have to push a button that is located 15-20 feet away from the crosswalk, with a tree and large metal object in between (https://www.google.com/maps/@38.915562,-77.055128,3a,75y,270h,90t/data=!3m4!1e1!3m2!1sfoiYGxi38DFj1qY5u34RKQl2e0).

- It is not unusual for push button signals to be located near bus stops and it is incredibly frustrating to walk up to the corner just as the light turns green for the driver who beat me there, and realize that I will have to wait through another full cycle of the signals in order to get a “walk” signal to cross the street to the bus stop. This inevitably happens when there is a bus in view and I know there will not be another for 15 or more minutes.

DDOT should stop requiring pedestrians to push buttons anywhere but, if you are not ready to commit to that change in this iteration of the plan, you should at least commit to tracking, addressing and resolving the above types of issues (meaning not just the specific issues I have given as examples, but the more general problems I’m trying to illustrate). For example, you could address the malfunctioning button issue by requiring DDOT staff to actively monitor the functioning of these types of signals and requiring them to respond to a 311 report within 2-4 hours. If a button cannot be fixed immediately, then the signal timing should be modified to provide a walk phase during each cycle until the button can be fixed. The second problem could be addressed by repositioning the equipment and/or crosswalk or, if that isn’t possible, removing the button involved. The last problem could be easily fixed by allowing pedestrians to call a walk signal even after the light has turned green for cars. I know it is possible to do
this because the mid-block crosswalk button signal in the 3000 block of Porter allows me to call a walk signal even after a speeding driver has triggered the light there to change to red.

4. Page P-13: Recommendation A-9 calls for DDOT’s traffic calming program to “shift from a policy of neighborhood-requested traffic calming to include standard assessments of where traffic calming is appropriate.” This is excellent, and extremely important, especially for areas populated by heavily-populated condominium associations (like McLean Gardens) where it is difficult to impossible to get 75% of households to sign a petition. It also makes good sense – a traffic calming assessment should not require a majority of households to want it; if drivers are traveling too quickly through a neighborhood or otherwise not complying with DC’s traffic laws, we should be taking action to stop it. A corollary problem here is that DDOT’s communications about these types of requirements have not been clear in the past. At a public PAC meeting earlier this year, DDOT’s James Cheeks explained that it actually isn’t necessary for neighborhoods to obtain 75% of household signatures for a traffic calming assessment. The request form on DDOT’s website (http://ddot.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/ddot/publication/attachments/traffic_calming_application.pdf), though, still instructs users that the 75% requirement must be met. In the short-term, it would be helpful for DDOT to update its website and forms to be consistent with current requirements and ensure that its staff is up to speed on current requirements.

5. Page P-15: Recommendation C.2 supports increased MPD photo enforcement and observes, “Decreased motor vehicle speeds are essential to improving pedestrian safety in the District. Motorists exceeding posted speed limits are significant hazards for pedestrians. Higher vehicle speeds on non-freeway corridors tend to increase the frequency and severity of pedestrian crashes and reduce the comfort of pedestrians walking along the street.” Again, this is an excellent recommendation and I concur wholeheartedly. I also would like, however, to see a commitment to better education of drivers on the potential violent outcomes of driving at speeds over 25 mph – e.g. that the driver’s risk of killing a pedestrian begins to increase exponentially and that the driver’s field of vision may be affected by how fast they are going.
Ms. Hawkinson,

As a resident of Van Ness Street, I agree completely with ANC Chair Adam Tope's opposition to the proposed plan to significantly increase bus traffic on Van Ness Street between Reno Road NW and Wisconsin Avenue NW. Adam accurately describes the years of effort by Van Ness Street residents to curtail and limit the use of this narrow residential road by large vehicles such as WMATA buses.

Kindly consider ANC Chair's alternative route. It will support the efforts recently underway to improve the Van Ness commercial corridor and the ANC's proposed solution would serve the community better with less negative impacts for pedestrians, bicycle use, and residents.

Lawrence Rausch
3606 Van Ness Street, NW

On Jun 18, 2014, at 11:07 AM, Tope, Adam (ANC 3F01) <3F01@anc.dc.gov> wrote:

> Colleen,
>
> I had a chance to review the moveDC plan as it relates to ANC 3F. I am writing to express my opposition to the plans to significantly increase bus traffic on Van Ness St. NW between Reno Rd. NW and Wisconsin Ave. NW.
>
> My strong opposition is based on the following reasons:
>
> 1. The Bus Proposals Harm The Van Ness Commercial Corridor - The moveDC plan proposes making high density bus routes up Connecticut Ave. NW, down Van Ness St. NW and then up Wisconsin Ave. NW. This will significantly harm the businesses in the Van Ness corridor. As you are probably aware, a large number of commercial and retail establishments line Connecticut Avenue between Van Ness St. NW and Nebraska Ave. NW. If high frequency buses were to bypass these businesses, they will not get the benefits that high density bus service can bring to commercial and retail establishments. The moveDC plan should be revised so that the high density bus lines travel up Connecticut Ave. NW to either Nebraska Ave. NW or Military Rd. NW, where they can connect to Wisconsin Ave. NW. This will remove bus traffic from Van Ness St. NW and also benefit our valuable, lively commercial corridor.
>
> 2. Van Ness St. NW Is Not Designed For Buses - If you have ever visited Van Ness St. NW between Reno Rd. NW and Wisconsin Ave. NW, you will note that Van Ness St. NW is a narrow two-lane road with parking along one side. The narrow width of the street is not conducive to heavy bus traffic. Van Ness St. NW was never designed to accommodate bus traffic and should not. Unlike connector streets like Military Rd. NW or Porter St. NW or multi-lane arterial roads such Nebraska Ave. NW, each which was originally designed to handle significant cross-town vehicle traffic, Van Ness St. NW was never designed to be a connector road between Connecticut Ave. NW and Wisconsin Ave. NW. Because of this, the homes along Van Ness St. NW are built much closer to the road than homes on Nebraska Ave. NW and Military Rd. NW. The current levels of bus traffic are a significant nuisance to the residents along the street from noise and vibration. The ANC already receives numerous complaints every month relating to noise and vibration from the Metro
July 28, 2014

Colleen Hawkinson
Move DC Project Manager
55 M Street SE, 5th Floor
Washington DC 20003

Re: Move DC Public Comments

Hi Colleen,

I am a resident of DC, a city planner and urban designer, as well as an avid bicyclist, transit and carshare user. I want to thank DDOT for developing an impressive and forward-thinking plan for DC’s future transportation network.

Although they are fairly specific in regards to bikeshare operations and bike network holes, I believe that my public comments may be of value to the stated aspects of the plan. Following are my comments:

---

Bikeshare
Over the years, the success of Capital Bikeshare has grown. But a Move DC plan with proposals only for “additional Capital Bikeshare stations throughout the area” will not be enough to solve the supply/demand problems that already exist under the current number of bikeshare users. I believe that currently, the rebalancing efforts of CaBi provider are commendable, and their added special event services such as the Fourth of July corral on the Mall is a testament to how the service has anticipated issues and helped to solve problems before they even occur – all while encouraging a safer and more sustainable way to travel on special holidays. Additionally, the advent of apps that help to notify users of when their preferred stations are running low of either bikes or docks are excellent accompaniments to the system framework, which can promote use and decrease user dissatisfaction.

But with the expansion of the system, and the inevitable expansion of users of this transportation mode, DC’s bikeshare system must advance its operations and management to better serve its user base. I believe that bikeshare can do a better job with rebalancing stations. The rebalancing teams should work to develop a list of any bikeshare station that experiences daily weekday or regular weekend issues with over-supply (or over-demand). Then, have the team develop a time-based schedule for those stations, indicating when users can expect those specific stations will be rebalanced. This added service will allow Capital Bikeshare to increase the reliability of the service and user trust in this transportation mode.

Another thought I have for bikeshare is to locate more bikeshare stations in ROW parking lanes (in relevant areas, downtown zones, as well as other areas with substantial on-road bicycle facilities). I think this may help decrease the number of bikeshare users on sidewalks. Moreover, if all bike racks were located within parking lanes of roads, perhaps it will help to change the false mindset of those inclined to believe that bikes do not belong on roads.

Bicycle Network
As a resident of Columbia Heights and an employee in the Brookland neighborhood, my current commuting route on bicycle is along the highly-trafficked Irving Street, north of the hospital complex. Move DC’s “Northern Planning Area Bicycle Network” proposes a “bicycle connection between Brookland and Columbia Heights”, and the map displays both an existing bicycle path on the south side of the street and a proposed bicycle path on the northern side of the street. As a frequent user of this route, I believe that what is currently being called a bicycle path on Irving Street is NOT one. This alleged bicycle path is an approximately 6’ concrete sidewalk with frequent expansion joints and five at-
grade crossings of high-speed, large-radius on and off-ramps to North Capital Street and Michigan Avenue (in addition to two other crossings at Park View Road NW and First Street NW).

The plan’s proposed northern bike path could create as many as seven crossings along this route (five of them being for on- and off-ramps to North Capital Street. The plan also proposes a bicycle path along Michigan Avenue NE, between Irving and Monroe Streets NE, where both the roadway and sidewalk have a high volume of users.

If these pathways are constructed as separate from the roadway, they will act only as a glorified sidewalk and will not serve bicyclists as a safe and efficient mode of transportation (and I will, without a doubt, continue riding in the roadway as I currently do now). I believe that the bicycle connection between Brookland and Columbia Heights should be a striped or protected bike lane on the street and within the roadway, to better address the needs and safety of cyclists and pedestrians alike.

I have not thought exhaustively about options for bicycle route alignments across Irving Street and Michigan Avenue NE, however I do have some suggestions:

**Suggested location of bike facilities along Irving Street:** 1) Striped or protected bike lanes on the right side of the road would give riders the right-of-way to any vehicles entering or exiting Irving Street via the on- and off-ramps. 2) Bike lanes on the left side of the road and closest to the medians could give riders high visibility and security along most of the travel distance.

**Suggested location of bike facilities along Michigan Avenue NE:** Bike lanes on the right side of the road.

Thank you for your hard work on a great plan. And thank you for continuing to collect comments and input from the public.

Sincerely,
Emily Oaksford
Dear Ms. Delhommeau –

Thank you for reaching out to me. I’m very sorry to hear about your experience. While we are trying to provide more choices for people to get around, safety remains our top priority. In that vein, you are correct that it is illegal to ride a bike on sidewalks in the downtown business district. In this case that is defined as the area between Mass Ave (NW-NE) to the north, 2nd Street, NE to the east, D Street to the south and 23rd Street, NW to the West. You can see the boundaries on the Washington, DC Bicycle Map: http://ddot.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/ddot/publication/attachments/dc_bike_map_2012_full_version.pdf

Additionally, we have included numerous policy recommendations in bicycle element of moveDC that would increase education, and provide training. There is also a recommendation to reevaluate current regulations on sidewalk riding to address conflicts in high-volume pedestrian corridors. Details can be found in the Bicycle Element chapter on page B-31 in the moveDC draft. (www.wemovedc.org). Any comments you would like to send regarding that recommendations (or anything else in the plan) would be helpful as we move forward from a draft document to the final document.

Again, thank you for reaching out. Please feel free to contact me with any additional questions or comments.

Colleen

Colleen Hawkinson, AICP | Manager, Strategic Planning Branch
Policy, Planning & Sustainability Administration | District Department of Transportation
55 M Street, SE, Suite 500, Washington, DC 20003
tel: 202.671.2228 | fax: 202.671.0617 |
www.ddot.dc.gov

From: Anne Delhommeau (mailto: Anne.Delhommeau@dc.gov)
Sent: Tuesday, June 03, 2014 8:07 PM
To: Hawkinson, Colleen (DDOT)
Subject: MoveDC

Hello Colleen – I am writing to address a safety concern. I understand fully why DC wants to encourage cyclists instead of more cars. I agree. What I don't agree with at all is why cyclists are allowed to use the sidewalks. All across the city, we have sacrificed precious traffic and parking lanes to provide cyclists a safe place to ride. Why then do they continue to zig zag between pedestrians on the crowded sidewalks? This evening on my walk home I was almost struck by a cyclist speeding between pedestrians on the sidewalk near 18th and L. Surely it should be illegal. While walking up 14th I noticed new Dot signs stating that we are all safer when cyclists are not on the sidewalks. Can something stronger be used prohibiting it instead? Educating the public on proper use of cycles is really important. At this point I feel cyclists think they rule the city and can do whatever they want.

Are there any regulations in place?

Thank you very much for the work you do for the city and for all of us!
Brent Burton  
3613 Military Road, NW  
Washington, DC 20015

June 26, 2014

moveDC, c/o Colleen Hawkinson  
District Department of Transportation  
Policy, Planning and Sustainability Administration  
55 M Street, SE  
Suite 500  
Washington, D.C. 20003

Dear Ms. Hawkinson:

I am writing to submit comments on the moveDC Draft Plan. My name is Brent Burton. I have lived in Ward 3, on Military Road, NW since 2010 and in DC for two decades. My wife and son were both born in DC. My son, who is six, has been attending DC Public Schools for two years.

I am writing because I am greatly concerned with several aspects of the moveDC Draft Plan as they pertain to Military Road, NW. Although the stated goal of the Draft Plan is to make the streets “better for everyone” and “make the city more livable,” several elements would have the opposite effect.

One of the problems with living on Military Road—our section of which is a two-lane residential road—is the noise from the constant barrage of traffic. This was true when we moved into our house in 2010 and it has only gotten worse. Since October of 2013, we have been inundated with construction vehicles. For example, concrete trucks make hundreds of trips in front of our house every day except Sunday. These vehicles thunder by on the way to construction sites in Northwest DC and Bethesda, Maryland.

When these concrete trucks go by, they rattle the windows and vibrate the floorboards, even if they manage to avoid the potholes in front of our house. These trucks can be heard in every single room. Recently, at breakfast, my six-year old son asked me if one of these trucks was going to drive into our house. The only time that we get a reprieve is between 7:00PM and 6:00AM on Monday through Saturday and all day Sunday.

The residents of Military Road do not need more heavy, fossil fuel-burning vehicles rumbling past. Instead, we need more restrictions and more enforcement. Which is why I find it highly disconcerting that the “Multimodal Long-Range Transportation Plan” designates Military Road as a “High Frequency Local and Regional Bus Corridor.” This designation will only worsen an already-congested road, while doing nothing to improve “livability” for my family and our neighbors.

This Draft Plan not only makes our home life more disruptive by adding more heavy buses to Military Road, but also does nothing to alleviate the existing high volume of commercial vehicular traffic. In fact, the “Freight Element” of the Draft Plan recommends a pilot program to
encourage commercial vehicles to make more deliveries between 7:00PM and 6:00AM. As I noted above, this period is the only time my family gets a reprieve from the thunderous noise of commercial trucks. How is this recommendation making our lives more “livable”?

Some of the Draft Plan’s proposals are predicated on projections of unprecedented population growth (Figure 2.1: Historic and Future Population Summary). Yet, according to an April 11, 2014 article in The Washington Post (“Washington’s Population Growth Slows”), the Washington region is “in the midst of a striking slowdown in its growth rate.” The article goes on to state that census figures reflect a growth rate that has “slowed by more than a quarter in just three years.” Just six days ago, The Washington Post ran another article about the slowdown in the District economy (“Regional Job Market Stuck in Neutral in May”). According to the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis, the District’s economy contracted in 2013 to $105.47 billion from $105.99 billion in 2012.

However, in the Draft Plan projections, growth is accelerating, counter to what is currently happening. I urge moveDC to commission new population projections based on the most recent census data. There doesn’t seem to be a compelling reason for the city to rush into projects based on outdated projections.

Earlier this year, the District crafted a series of education policies, several of which would’ve taken away my son’s guaranteed access to his neighborhood school (DC’s April 2014 school boundary proposal). Now, moveDC has released a proposal that will make my son’s street noisier, more chaotic, and more dangerous for pedestrians. As a DC resident who has invested in the District, our neighborhood, and local elementary school, it’s hard not to feel besieged by the city’s recent policy efforts. So, in terms of revising the Draft Proposal, I would suggest the city not focus so much on the people who might live here 25 years from now. Instead, if we want to make this city truly livable, the city should start by listening very carefully to the people who actually make their home here right now.

Sincerely,

Brent Burton

(240) 476-0426
moveDC, c/o Colleen Hawkinson
District Department of Transportation
Policy, Planning and Sustainability Administration
55 M Street, SE
Suite 500
Washington, DC 20003

Ms. Hawkinson,

I strongly oppose the proposal in the Multimodal Long Range Transportation Plan for Military Road to be designated as part of a High-Frequency Local and Regional Bus Corridor (Transit Element, pages T-32, T-36, T-53).

West of Rock Creek Park, Military Road is a residential street, lined with several hundred detached, duplex, and row homes; it is not a commercial thoroughfare. The zoning is almost entirely R-1-B and R-2 low-density residential zoning, totally incompatible with a high-frequency Bus Corridor at our front doors.

The E-2, E-3, E-4 buses ("Military Road Crosstown Line") start at Friendship Heights and go to Fort Totten - already. The Purple Line Metro will be another major east-west path.

Military Road is already dramatically over-burdened and handles far more than its fair share of traffic abuse. It certainly doesn't need high-frequency buses added on top of this. Many of the largest, heaviest vehicles (i.e., concrete mixing trucks, full loads of gravel, etc.) use the street daily. Already, all day long, heavy vehicles rattle the windows and disturb the peace. There is backed-up traffic part of every weekday in front of my house on Military Road at 43rd Street. Already, the noise level from traffic frequently makes it impossible to have a conversation in my front yard. We need LESS large vehicle traffic, not more. What we really need here is a vehicle weight restriction, with camera enforcement.

Hazel Rebold
4228 Military Rd. NW
Washington, DC 20015
-----Original Message-----
From: MoveDC (DDOT)
Sent: Thursday, July 03, 2014 10:03 AM
To: Edith Tatel; Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Benjamin, Aukima (COUNCIL)
Cc: Gina Buchina
Subject: RE: Do Not Make Military Road, NW More Congested

Good morning -

Thank you for your comments.

There are no plans to widen Military Road. If you would like to see the details of moveDC, you can find the information at the project website: 
www.wemovedc.org.

Thank you.

Colleen

-----Original Message-----
From: Edith Tatel
Sent: Wednesday, July 02, 2014 8:11 PM
To: Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Benjamin, Aukima (COUNCIL); MoveDC (DDOT)
Cc: Gina Buchina
Subject: Do Not Make Military Road, NW More Congested

Dear Council Members,

We live at 4301 Military Road, N.W., Apartment 106. Like many people, we face Military Road--it is our back yard. We just moved here in January and are shocked to learn that DC is considering designating Military Road a "High Frequency Local and Regional Bus Corridor," and even widening the road. As it is, the heavy traffic on Military Road is already barely compatible with the residential neighborhood through which it passes. Adding more heavy traffic -- and enlarging the street -- will increase the burden already borne by homeowners and pedestrians and bikers who travel here. In addition, widening the road would destroy valuable and beautiful old trees, whose presence is not only an aesthetic pleasure, but which help absorb the carbon dioxide emitted by vehicles.

Of course we understand that this is urban living. Increasing the noise, emissions, and congestion further, however, is unfair to the DC residents who already bear such a significant traffic burden.

We hope that you will protect our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Edith S. Tatel
David S. Tatel
From: MoveDC (DDOT)  
Sent: Thursday, July 03, 2014 10:02 AM  
To: Presant, Neal (PSC/FOH/CHS) (CTR); Benjamin, Aukima (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL)  
Cc: Neal Presant  
Subject: RE: MoveDC plans for Military Road

Thank you for your comments. There are no plans to widen Military Road. For details on moveDC, you can visit the project website at www.wemovedc.org.

Colleen

From: Presant, Neal (PSC/FOH/CHS) (CTR)  
Sent: Thursday, July 03, 2014 9:04 AM  
To: Benjamin, Aukima (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); MoveDC (DDOT)  
Cc: Neal Presant  
Subject: MoveDC plans for Military Road

I am on the board of the condominium at 4301 Military Road NW, where Military Road meets Western Avenue and Wisconsin Avenue. Someone recently put this flyer under every door in the building. I looked up the pages that were referenced on the sheet and noted that there are plans for a new bus route linking Friendship Heights and Ft. Totten. However, I did not see any reference to widening Military Road by 18 feet on each side. Is this really part of the plan? At the end of Military Road this would eat up one wall of the Embassy Suites and would come perilously close to our building so I do not think this is really feasible. Could you please let me know if there are actually any plans to widen Military Road and if that would involve the final stretch where it meets Western Avenue?

Thanks,

Neal L. Presant, M.D.

From: Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL) [mailto:MCheh@DCCOUNCIL.US]  
Sent: Thursday, July 03, 2014 9:36 AM  
To: Presant, Neal (PSC/FOH/CHS) (CTR)  
Cc: Benjamin, Aukima (COUNCIL); MoveDC (DDOT); Neal Presant  
Subject: Re: MoveDC plans for Military Road

I don't know who put this out but it is irresponsible, flat wrong, and has just upset people unnecessarily. I specifically raised the issue with DDOT at the hearing and they confirmed that there are no plans to widen Military road.

I'm sorry that someone, obviously sophisticated and so should know better, chose to falsely raise fears and cause anxiety. I had heard about the flyer but until now had not actually seen it. So thanks very much for sending it to me.

Best

Mary

Mary M. ChehCouncilmember, Ward 3
On Jul 3, 2014, at 9:03 AM, "Presant, Neal (PSC/FOH/CHS) (CTR)" wrote:

I am on the board of the condominium at 4301 Military Road NW, where Military Road meets Western Avenue and Wisconsin Avenue. Someone recently put this flyer under every door in the building. I looked up the pages that were referenced on the sheet and noted that there are plans for a new bus route linking Friendship Heights and Ft. Totten. However, I did not see any reference to widening Military Road by 18 feet on each side. Is this really part of the plan? At the end of Military Road this would eat up one wall of the Embassy Suites and would come perilously close to our building so I do not think this is really feasible. Could you please let me know if there are actually any plans to widen Military Road and if that would involve the final stretch where it meets Western Avenue?

Thanks,

Neal L. Presant, M.D.

--------Original Message--------
From: icassagnol
Date: Jul 30, 2014 4:32:40 PM
Subject: "Transit Element" of MoveDC's Proposal
To: mcheh@dccouncil.us

Dear Councilwoman Cheh:

I have lived at 5357 Reno Rd., NW, Washington, DC20015 (Corner of Reno Rd. and Military Rd), for over forty years.

First, I am thankful for the information and clarification provided by Mr. Anthony Cassillo, Constituent Services Specialist, both via telephone and E-mail to

Second, I find it appalling that Move DC would consider the potential of designating Military Rd. as a "High Frequency Local and Regional Bus Corridor".

Even a draft proposal considering buses along Military Rd., in the future or at any time would dramatically overburden this corridor. It is an ill-conceived and poor planning idea.

Third, Military Road East-West is already an overburdened traffic road. Oversized construction trucks, construction trucks of all kinds and shapes, large contractors'vans, etc continuously use this road. Also, there are the ambulances and fire truck ambulances that continuously move at high speeds to access Sibley Hospital, Washington Hospital Center, Howard Hospital and Children's Hospital. Additionally, there are the Fire Trucks, and Police Cars that also move at high speed through Military Road. Then, of course, the regular traffic and the East-West high volume rush hour traffic.

Fourth, any additional bus traffic of any type, whether, with controlled traffic signals, bus stops or any other mechanism is totally unacceptable to the many homeowners/residents along Military Road.

Fifth, the introduction of any bus traffic volume on Military Rd. would be unbearable to the homeowners/residents of this corridor. Not to mention the added trepitation and noise pollution, which would be a costly nuisance to us.

Sixth, the decrease of property value along Military Road for the reasons given above would be substantial and detrimental.

Lastly, we, the homeowners/residents of the neighborhood along Military Road deserve better than this. It is shameful that this back burner draft/proposal are always to the detriment of its residents and would negatively impact the character of the neighborhood.
Councilwoman, I know you care for us residents along Military Road. You and your office were instrumental in helping my daughter, with a problem she had along Military Road. Please see that no bus traffic of any kind gets added to Military Road.

Regards,
Maria Reff

From: pratherj On Behalf Of Jennifer Steel
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 7:24 PM
To: MoveDC (DDOT); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL)
Subject: MoveDC draft plan and Military Road

I want to write in to say that I am mostly supportive of the city's plan to improve DC's transportation system. It desperately needs upgrading for the city's future growth and the considerations made for cyclists and pedestrians is greatly appreciated. While I recognize that this plan is just a draft, I want to make my voice known a few issues and I hope to get a response back.

My husband and I purchased a home near the corner of Nebraska Rd NW and Military Rd NW. We recognized that this area was going to be busy when we purchased the home -- so no complaints on my end about that. However I believe that it can be busy but also be safe (it currently is not), which is what I am hoping this letter will result in. On my side of Military--the busier side of Military Road--we face several issues that must be addressed in any future transportation plan affecting the area. Most of the people who travel this road do not live on it and therefore do not recognize the severity of these issues. I hope you take them into consideration when implementing your MoveDC plan.

1) CONFUSING INTERSECTIONS

First off, this is a residential neighborhood that with school-age children all around (Lafayette Elementary is nearby). As you may know, this intersection of 3 main roads (Military, Nebraska, Broad Branch) is incredibly confusing and dangerous. Because it exists on the cusp of 2 City Council wards, no one has given it due evaluation and consideration—despite the fact that it affects constituencies in both wards and people across the DMV area. Also at this intersection, Military Road merges from 4 lanes of traffic to 2. In just 3 years of living here, I have seen no fewer than 10 accidents at this intersection and even more near-misses. This is unacceptable. Most of the crashes that take place here go unreported. It needs to be listed as one of your top 20 Hazardous Intersections in this report. If we plan to add bike lanes and even more buses to this already heavily congested area, we need to make sure that it is safe to do so by improving the function of this intersection for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists.

2) SPEED OF TRAFFIC

Most people use this intersection (and Military Road specifically) as a thru-road, with very little regard for the people who actually live here. Many people use Nebraska as a main thoroughfare from Maryland to Connecticut Avenue, whereas they use Military Road because it is one of the only connectors in the entire city between the East and West sides of Rock Creek Park.

Despite all of this traffic there are far too many people eager to “beat the light” at this intersection. People are constantly running this light in all directions and frequently speeding in order to do so. The speed limit is 25 mph, but most travelers have no regard for this speed limit, particularly at
night. Without hyperbole, people literally go over 50-60 mph on Military Road when there is little traffic and this unacceptable. I have been in contact with the DC Police, Ms. Cheh's office and Ms. Bowser's office to request speed cameras to be placed on Military, but so far this request has not been fulfilled. I hope that your transportation plan can accommodate this very simple request so that traffic laws are enforced and no one is hurt.

3) DESIGNATED PRIMARY TRUCK ROUTE AND NOISE

In addition to having at least 4 bus lines (3 of which serve exclusively school-age children during the school week), tremendous rush hour traffic and constant emergency vehicle traffic, there is also a lot of thru-traffic for large-scale tractor trailers and commercial construction vehicles. When these large scale and heavy commercial vehicles break the speed limit (which they almost always do), they literally shake my house and the homes of my neighbors. These tremors happen at all hours of the day and night. Homes in this area are almost 100 years old and were simply not built to withstand heavy trucks on the roads. The draft plan has the eastern part of Military Road listed as a Primary Truck Route. While I appreciate that this is one of the main arteries that actually connects the east and west sides of Rock Creek Park, this is not a sufficient reason to mark it as a Primary Truck Route. Unlike most of the other areas listed as Primary Truck Routes, the surrounding areas on Military are exclusively residential. There is no commercial activity on Military Road from the Parkway until you reach Wisconsin Avenue that would necessitate the trucks to use this road. Heavy trucks should use the beltway and bigger streets such as Connecticut and Wisconsin where there is significant commercial activity, larger apartment buildings that can withstand the shakes and tremors from the speeding trucks, and few if any single family homes.

In addition to the immediate danger these careless drivers are presenting to the neighborhood, their speed also contributes to a tremendous amount of noise. Faster cars are louder cars – particularly when they slam on their brakes at the last second at the intersection at Military and Nebraska. Car crashes and incessant car-horn honking contribute to angry residents and frustrated commuters. Also, when people have accidents at this intersection, they usually park in front of my house to discuss the details – sometimes becoming very angry, hostile and one time, even violent. This area is already incredibly noisy and anything that can be done to bring it down a decibel or two would be greatly appreciated.

4) TREES

Many of my neighbors are concerned that this MoveDC plan will require the roads to be widened and trees to be cut down. Chevy Chase has some of the oldest and most beautiful trees. I would ask that any changes to the roads do no affect the trees that line our streets.

5) USE OF DRIVEWAYS, ALLEYS AND STREET PARKING

Because Military Road is such a busy street, it is already incredibly difficult for homeowners to use their driveways that open onto Military. My home does not have alley access and I use my shared driveway every single day. I do not want to lose access to my driveway because of increased traffic congestion on Military or a cycle trak directly in front of my home, making it impossible for me to pull in and out of the driveway. My neighbors use the alleys frequently and it would be helpful to ensure access to the alleys despite plans for Military. Please consider this when deciding how to implement your plan.
Street parking is extremely limited on Military. Please do not remove any of the street parking in this area.

6) 1-WAY STREETS AND ALLEVIATING TRAFFIC FROM MILITARY

Right off Military Road, there are several streets which are 1-way streets (32nd Street, parts of Broad Branch Rd, Chappell Rd). These are taxpayer funded roads yet are being restricted to essentially only those who live on these roads. You could alleviate some of the congestion to and from Military by opening up these streets. The burden of the traffic must be shared and Military cannot be the only street to face the unruly amount of traffic going east to west and vice-versa. These streets are important tributaries to Rock Creek Parkway, Nevada Ave and Connecticut. Commuters looking to go north while avoiding the madness that is Military and Nebraska Ave could benefit from having access to these streets.

7) BIKE LANES AND CYCLE TRAK

I think this is a wonderful idea for Military Road -- extending through the park and across the entire city. Kudos to whomever thought to do this! I am also thrilled about the cycle trak bike lanes all the way on Connecticut. This part of the plan needs to be implemented immediately because I have seen way to many cyclists being nearly run over by speeding motorists driving across the parkway. A dedicated and protected bike lane is the only way to ensure this doesn't happen. I think you will see a huge flux of riders and I look forward to joining them myself. As I am sure you have already heard from others, losing a driving lane will likely cause a lot of disruption and increased congestion. I hope that you can provide details on the plan to prevent this from happening.

I hope that I hear back from someone on my concerns. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call or write me.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Steel
3239 Military Rd NW

cc: Mary Cheh, Muriel Bowser

From: Mimi Tygier
Sent: Friday, July 11, 2014 3:40 AM
To: Benjamin, Aukima (COUNCIL)
Cc: Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); MoveDC (DDOT)
Subject: DON'T DESIGNATE MILITARY ROAD AS A HIGH FREQUENCY LOCAL AND REGIONAL BUS CORRIDOR

Mr. Benjamin,

My husband and I live at 3704 Military Road, NW and strongly oppose any plans to widen or increase usage of this road. Military Road is already over-burdened. Concrete mixing trucks, full loads of gravel, even the occasional 18-wheeler trucks use this road regularly. We need fewer large vehicles, not more, on this residential street.
Please vote to preserve Military Road as a two-lane road.

Best,
Mimi Tygier
3704 Military Road, NW

From: CLEWISPHD@
Sent: Monday, July 07, 2014 6:27 AM
To: MoveDC (DDOT)
Subject: don’t

Please don’t use Military Road as a bus route. It is already too noisy and dangerous as a residential street. I am concerned for the welfare of my older patients who cross that street daily. Don’t do it! Please!!!

Carole B. Lewis
5343 43rd St. NW

From: Randa El rashidi Sent: Sunday, July 06, 2014 11:18 PM
To: Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL)
Cc: waledsayed1@gmail.com; Benjamin, Aukima (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); MoveDC (DDOT)
Subject: Re: Military Road- high Frequency Local and Regional Bus Corridor

Thank you for your response and reassurance.

It would be a good idea if there is a way to counter this rumor as it raised a lot of concerns.

Best regards
Military road neighbor

Sent from my iPhone

> On Jul 6, 2014, at 7:28 PM, "Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL)" <MCheh@dcccouncil.us> wrote:
> 
> I had a hearing on the MoveDC plan and there is nothing in it regarding widening Military Road. There is no plan, no intention, no expectation, nothing about widening Military Road. And DDOT confirmed there is nothing to this rumor. Someone did send me a copy of the circular someone handed out. It is false information and why someone would put out this claim and alarm people is a mystery to me. Again there is nothing to it.
> Regards
> Mary
> 
> Mary M. Cheh
> Councilmember, Ward 3
> 
> Sent from my iPad
> 
> >> On Jul 6, 2014, at 4:16 PM, "Randa El rashidi" wrote:
>>
To Whom It May Concern,

We received a notice regarding the possibility of expanding military Road to make it a local and regional bus corridor.

This proposal is detrimental for the following reasons: (1) it is a safety hazard for children and adults as we have witnessed several accidents with the current level of traffic (you will find information in police records); (2) it will be devastating for the natural habitat in Rock Creek park; (3) this will significantly depreciate the value of properties on Military Road; (4) the increase in traffic will increase the vibration and cause structural damage to property on Military Road; and (5) the level of noise will increase significantly above the normal human tolerance which could cause mental and emotional disturbance to neighbors living on Military Road.

Based on the above we strongly Oppose this initiative.

Military road neighbors

From: Karin Hillhouse
Sent: Sunday, July 06, 2014 9:12 PM
To: MoveDC (DDOT)
Subject: Comments re MoveDC draft plan & Ft. Totten-Friendship Heights bus route

July 6, 2014

Re: Comments, considerations, & suggestions on MoveDC’s draft plan for a Fort Totten/Friendship Heights bus route

Dear Ms. Hawkinson,

First of all, thank you. The MoveDC draft plan demonstrates a powerful appreciation of the city’s transportation needs both now and in the future—a future that is closing in on us fast. Through the comments in this letter I’m grateful to be able to accept MoveDC’s invitation to residents to collaborate on the draft before a final version is published. I’m particularly keen for you and your colleagues to consider certain hyper-local details with which I have daily experience as a home owner, neighbor, pedestrian, motorist, transit user, and retired avid urban and long-distance bicyclist (Denver).

Second, as a 20-year resident, lifelong professional writer/editor, and proud holder of a master’s degree in urban planning and community development, I am sorely tempted to take up many of the compelling issues the plan addresses and suggest a tweak or more in each of the plan’s chapters. But, genuinely believing that “less is more,” I will focus my comments on different aspects of a single issue, namely, the proposed Fort Totten – Friendship Heights bus route that would include Military Road.

1. Improving transportation choices for residents living in the NE quadrant is an important goal. And more, it’s one I would fully support when I can understand both the data that MoveDC
has on ridership demand that warrants investment in such a route AND the specific elements, e.g., size and type of vehicles, Move DC envisions in any implementation plan that aims to respect the safety, pedestrian needs, existing congestion and traffic/road configuration, and environmental character of the neighborhoods that would be affected.

- Simple edits to the MoveDC draft could address both these issues and thus provide reassuring details that the final plan is as smart and flexible and focused on safety and human scale as the draft promises it to be.

- Proposing a “High Frequency Bus Corridor” for an altogether new bus route, which Ft. Totten to Friendship Heights would be, substantially burdens the plan and planners to justify the idea and frightens residents prematurely about potential impact. Perhaps a recommendation to designate it a “Low Frequency” corridor or to expand the DC Circulator system to serve the route is a more appropriate first step.

- An even more promising idea to consider: MoveDC proposes a DC Innovation Pilot for the route to both gauge demand and generate demand. The pilot proposed would aim to use electric mini buses for a two- or three-year period to showcase the service and position DC as the innovative transportation capital: meeting ridership demand at the highest level of service with the least impact on neighborhoods’ safety, character, and economic integrity.

2. As laudable and reasonable as the proposed Ft. Totten-Friendship Heights route may be in the draft, I would recommend that the final plan lay out the vision for an even more ambitious, cohesive route than the Riggs/Missouri/Military one. If MoveDC does indeed want to create prosperity and accessibility for underserved, far-flung sections of the city through a transportation network of opportunity, then it should seize its own opportunity and complete what seem to be desirable loops (See Fig. T.8 in Transit Element) in its plan.

- At or near Ft. Totten, extend the route farther along South Dakota Ave. to Bladensburg to reach the National Arboretum and/or Kenilworth Aquatic Gardens.

- At or near Friendship Heights, extend the route west from Wisconsin Ave along Western Avenue to River Road, then Massachusetts Ave, to Dalecarlia Parkway (to Sibley Hospital) and finally to MacArthur Blvd.

- The low-impact electric mini buses proposed for the pilot have the capacity to attract demand for such a bus route originating in NE and NW. In addition, they are likely candidates for investment/grant dollars from stakeholder partners eager to associate with innovation and progress in the District.

3. All parties recognize the necessity of high-capacity transit in some instances along certain routes ALONG with the necessity of not degrading existing neighborhoods or adding to
congestion or levels of service that existing corridors can accommodate. In this context MoveDC would do well to state expressly the policy principle “First do no harm.”

- High-capacity levels of service can be met with low-capacity vehicles running more often. Human-scale, quiet vehicles integrate better into established residential neighborhoods and obviate residents’ real concerns about safety and quality of life and the environment.

- To apply its criterion that a proposed project not add to existing congestion, the final MoveDC plan for any Ft. Totten-Friendship Heights bus route should recommend that any such the route run north on (the bus-and-freight-corridor) Connecticut Avenue between Military Road and Chevy Chase Circle to Western Avenue (an existing four-lane evacuation route with existing bus stops) and then west to Wisconsin Avenue and beyond.

- The Freight Element in the MoveDC draft shows no freight route along Military Road between Connecticut and Wisconsin. As it is at present, however, in practice, this half-mile, two-lane residential section of Military Road is overfull daily with freight: concrete mixers, gravel trucks, and multiple four- and six- and eight-axle vehicles. There’s zero enforcement of the no freight/no trucks segment that MoveDC specifies.

- Further, moving buses westbound through the intersection at Military, Western, and Wisconsin would be a perfect nightmare for all involved. It is already with no buses. The current mix of families, shoppers, Metro riders, office workers, restaurant and movie goers, motorists, trucks, and buses (on Western and Wisconsin) makes for a lively situation whose size and complexity ought not be challenged further.

- Ft. Totten-to-Friendship Heights buses running their last mile along Connecticut Avenue-to-Western via Chevy Chase Circle would move faster than they would along Military Road and avoid exacerbating the “left turn” from Military Rd to Western/Wisconsin problem altogether.

4. The prospect of a High-Frequency Bus Corridor sited along any portion of Military Road between Connecticut and Wisconsin Avenues is a dismal prospect for residents, myself included. It’s also one that seems to violate every sound, wise principle on which MoveDC stands.

- The presence of daycare centers, playgrounds, and senior centers on or within a block of Military Road along that residential half mile means that vulnerable residents and visitors are coming and going on foot, on scooters, in baby carriages and the like all day long.

- Their safety and that of their parents and other caregivers is at risk already because of the truck traffic, and adding any sort of bus route to the mix would
seriously threaten life and limb, and MoveDC would do well indeed to rule out any idea of it in its final plan.

- Evidence of such attention to detail would go a long way to giving ordinary citizens confidence that the planners' are aware of the fine-grained details on which the merit of their vision and recommendations ultimately rests.

5. In my view the potential role for “innovation” in problem-solving transportation issues in the District of Columbia is given precious little attention in MoveDC’s draft. A “Foreword” or a postscript to the final plan that highlights innovation would add valuable room for policy and implementation.

- Innovation is not to be understood as innovation for innovation’s sake. Nor is it some hollow buzzword. We’re not calling on novelty to aid people’s serious needs, but rather robust and rigorous innovation in the way MoveDC does things.

- Innovation at the hands of MoveDC would change the way DDOT gathers evidence; in the way it measures success; in the way it collaborates with ANCs and other neighborhood groups and uses social media; in the way it breaks new ground in business/bureaucracy as usual; in the way it identifies new partnerships for capital investment; in the way it markets itself to investors; in the way it allows itself to “fail fast” with impunity in the interests of the greater good for DC and the ongoing refinement of DDOT’s development process; in the way it tests new vehicles, puts them into one service and then another as experience offers up new ideas and possibilities.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment. I would welcome the chance to answer any questions or add further to any of these points.

Sincerely,

Karin Hillhouse
4110 Military Road NW

From: mjsimon524@
Sent: Sunday, July 06, 2014 2:11 PM
To: MoveDC (DDOT)
Cc: 
Subject: Comments on WeMoveDC

The WeMoveDC document included a recommendation to designate Military Road as a High-Frequency Local and Regional Bus Corridor, and residents along Military Road are quite justified in being concerned about a recommendation to adopt a designation that can be used justify major changes in their neighborhood.

Currently most of Military Road west of Rock Creek Park is lined with single family homes. Most of that area is designated as low-density residential on the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map and as a
Neighborhood Conservation Area on the Comprehensive Plan Generalized Policy Map. There are no current bus routes along much of that portion of Military Road, although I have observed a significant amount of truck traffic as well as out-of-service buses, presumably heading to and from the Western Bus Garage.

While the document does not actually describe what types of changes might flow from this designation, the designation of a street through a low-density neighborhood as a high-frequency bus corridor invokes images of house-rattling buses every few minutes. The addition of frequent buses on a street that already has problems with traffic back-ups would either exacerbate existing problems or prompt changes to address traffic issues, such as the removal of on-street parking or even street widening in places. If congestion and back-ups are addressed by eliminating on-street parking or road widening, clearly, area residents will suffer. If this designation results in increased back-ups and congestion, failure to address the additional problems would also affect the residents of Military Road, residents of nearby streets and Military Road users.

The 500-plus page plan (plus appendices) was released on Sunday, June 1, 2014 (with the first press coverage on June 4). The 30-day comment period closes on Sunday, July 6. Many of the neighborhoods that will be impacted by recommendations in this Long-Range Transportation Plan might not even yet be aware of what is in the report. It appears that there has been no effort made to reach out to the neighborhoods where changes in the transportation network are being proposed. Residents of Military Road discovered this recommendation themselves, since DDOT did not mail notices or post signs summarizing the recommendations of the plan. Residents of Van Ness Street testified that they did not become aware of the recommendation that their street be designated as a High Frequency Local and Regional Bus Corridor until 8 days before the recent Council Roundtable. Can we expect all the affected neighborhoods to include residents that will realize that they need to review a 500-page document released in the middle of the summer with a 30-day comment period?

More importantly, most of the plan is vague in terms of what changes might be facilitated by adoption of this Plan. There does not appear to have been any studies to evaluate the various proposals. If implemented, how would these recommendations affect the functioning of our transportation network? What is the potential impact on our neighborhoods? Yet, inclusion of a designation in an adopted Plan can steer future proposals, even if there was no analytical basis for its inclusion in this document.

In spite of the vagueness of the recommendations, there are specific cost estimates associated with many of the recommendations, with no indication of what is included or how those estimates were derived. How can cost estimates be provided when there are no concrete plans or timelines associated with many of the recommendations? For example, the cost of designating Military Road as a High Frequency Local and Regional Bus Corridor is estimated at $31 million. What was contemplated when the estimates were determined, and why isn’t that described in the report?

We should require more from our transportation planners. New designations should have clear implications for future actions and those potential actions should be studied. Any proposals should be offered for genuine public review, with notice to the affected residents, prior to their adoption in a Transportation Plan.

Marilyn Simon
5241 43rd Street, NW
Original Message

From: Sally Paxton
Sent: Sunday, July 06, 2014 11:09 AM
To: MoveDC (DDOT)
Cc: Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL)
Subject: Designation of Military Rd as High Frequency Corridor

I am writing to state my strong objection to the designation of Military Road as a high frequency corridor in the Move DC draft plan. Military Road, particularly to the west of Rock Creek Park, is a two lane residential area that is already completely overburdened by heavy trucks and returning buses and lots of rush hour traffic that backs up for blocks. It is hard to understand how putting more traffic on this two lane road will improve transportation. It will certainly negatively affect the quality of life for residents on and around Military Road.

There has also been the suggestion that this designation will be accompanied by a widening of the road by 18 feet on each side, cutting into the yards of Military Road residents. Some reports have said this isn't really contemplated but nonetheless this remains a possibility.

It appears that the designation has been done without analysis, without community input and without common sense. I urge that this part of the plan be eliminated.

Thank you,
Sally Paxton

From: Sarah Underwood
Sent: Sunday, July 06, 2014 9:15 AM
To: Benjamin, Aukima (COUNCIL); MoveDC (DDOT); mchech@dccouncil.us; Bowser, Muriel (COUNCIL); Catania, David A. (COUNCIL)
Subject: Proposed High Frequency Buses on Military Road

I am a homeowner on Military Road, NW, and would like to comment on the proposal contained in the Move DC Draft Plan for high frequency bus service along our street.

I consider myself a proponent of smart growth and I fully recognize the lack of east-west transit options this far north and across Rock Creek Park for people who don’t, or don’t wish to drive. Therefore, I don’t want to take a position in total opposition to the proposed service. I do hope however, that if the service is to be truly high frequency, smaller buses such as those used by Ride- On in residential neighborhoods in Montgomery County, could be used on Military. Also, although I am lucky enough to have off-street parking behind my house, I am not certain that that is true for all the blocks of Military, and eliminating existing parking on Military for residents who don’t have off-street options would be a major hardship, so I hope you will investigate that situation first before finalizing the recommendation.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sarah Underwood
4104 Military Road NW
From: Susan Efird  
Sent: Saturday, July 05, 2014 3:49 PM  
To: MoveDC (DDOT)  
Subject: Military Rd NW bus corridor designation

Dear Ms. Hawkinson,

Thank you for this opportunity to comment regarding moveDC’s draft transportation plan for D.C. The plan clearly demonstrates a comprehensive consideration of myriad challenges that the district faces now and will in the future. In this letter I will focus only on the area mentioned in the plan that is closest to me, namely, the Military Road NW neighborhood. It’s the one I have been familiar with for 20 years and where I’ve lived for 12.

Only a couple of weeks ago a group of neighbors became aware of moveDC’s draft plan and sent along word that the plan appears to recommend that the entire stretch of Military Rd. NW be designated a “High Frequency Bus Corridor” as part of proposed Fort Totten-Friendship Heights transportation corridor. They are alarmed at the prospect of any such designation, particularly as a logical or reasonable next step for a route that is not now a bus route at all AND particularly for the last half mile of the route.

Right away they were asking “Why?” and then “Why high frequency?” and then finally “Why not run any such proposed route along existing bus and high-frequency corridors (Connecticut & Western Aves) that would be far better able to absorb any new incremental load?”

Even as a relative newcomer to the neighborhood, I found myself sharing their concerns and thus feel qualified to offer some candid recommendations. Based on my experience as a 5x/week runner in my residential neighborhood, I have intimate, local knowledge of the daily rounds of pedestrians, motorists, and truck drivers. The focus area includes the already over-burdened half-mile two-lane section of Military Road NW between the two commercial zones at Connecticut and Wisconsin/Western.

Respecting moveDC’s stated commitment to safety, the city’s continued growth and prosperity, and attention to environmental concerns, I can recognize the desirability of providing better transportation choices between Fort Totten and Friendship Heights. Perhaps a bus route is the right choice. Perhaps a “low-frequency” corridor designation is a moveDC alternative that might be considered. It is not clear from documents I’ve seen how the ridership need has been determined or calculated. Did DDOT planners assume a present or future need? Are underserved bus riders asking for these choices now? How many passengers and what estimated hours of day constitute “high frequency?” Finally, if there is indeed a need, why not use existing high-capacity roads wherever possible to meet the same goals?

Here lies real opportunity for moveDC to support all neighborhoods and their residents at the local-local level. The fine-grained details of policy planning and development are, I know, of utmost concern not only to residents but also to DDOT.
Among the distinctive qualities in the District of Columbia that have sparked a surge in population are the very quiet and safety in neighborhoods that a high-frequency bus route would jeopardize.

Except for the corner establishments at each intersection, between Connecticut Ave. and Wisconsin Ave. there are no commercial or institutional properties. Military Road along this half-mile stretch is a two-lane residential neighborhood. In my experience, the existing complicated intersections at 41st, Reno Road, and Military Rd and at Military Rd./Western/Wisconsin—along with presence of the heavily used Chevy Chase children's playground and other daycare facilities at each location—make any bus route designation that includes this half mile of Military Rd problematic at best and professionally negligent at worst.

If moveDC determines that it will move ahead to designate Military Rd. a high-frequency bus corridor, at a minimum I urge that the route follow the existing bus route along the commercial corridor that connects Connecticut Avenue to Chevy Chase Circle to Western Ave to Wisconsin. That route would be far safer and would respect environmental values far more carefully. There seems no reason to jeopardize the 100-year-old residential character of the half-mile section along Military Rd. where many families with young children live and work.

The issues here are complicated and the impact far reaching. My principal concern at this stage is that many more voices and ideas be brought to bear. The draft commenting period is coming to an end, and it seems people have only just learned about moveDC and its recommendations. As a next step I would urge you to convene an evening with my ANC 3E in which interested parties can hear from you and understand more fully the objectives of the proposed bus route and collaborate with you to ensure more local input goes into your planning process.

Thank you again for opportunity to comment. I look forward to learning more about the proposal at upcoming meetings and planning sessions.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Efird
4110 Military Rd. NW

-------- Forwarded message --------
From: William Montwieler
To: <abenjamin@dccouncil.us>, <moveddc@dc.gov>, "MCheh@DCCOUNCIL.US"
<MCheh@DCCOUNCIL.US>, <mboswer@dccouncil.us>
Cc:
Date: Thu, 3 Jul 2014 13:09:33 -0400
Subject: Proposed Designation of Military Road as a "High Frequency Local and Regional Bus Corridor

Dear Ms: Hawkins, Cheh, Bowser, and Mr. Benjamin:

My wife, Nancy, and I have lived at 3939 Military Road NW for 36 years; before that we lived just south of Military on 29th Street NW for 8 years. We have been vested in DC affairs going back to January,
1969 when we first moved into DC. Although we have been unable to download the draft plan for examination, we have been following the discussions on the Chevy Chase list serve and are quite interested in the topic as it directly affects us and decisions that we need to make at the beginning of our "retirement" years. As you can no doubt assume by our long term tenancy we are quite happy where we are, despite the uneven condition of Military Road both in front of our house, and heading west to Wisconsin. The road is a washboard and when trucks and empty buses pass by, the house shakes. I have had 36 years of repairing cracked plaster which, frankly, I don't mind too much. I can't imagine having to do that task more and more frequently if the plan is approved. That being said, how can any plan to widen Military be undertaken until the road itself has been smoothed? Secondly, while I know the 18 foot on either side is subject to a right of way, I suspect that may be a scare tactic— if it is, it worked as it got my attention. However, any attempt to widen the street at all will result in the removal of every single tree on Military. In the overwhelming number of cases, the trees are within a foot of the curb so any attempt to expand the street will be environmentally destructive. If 18 feet is actually contemplated, you will take every tree, every sidewalk and hedge after hedge of valuable property. Whether DC has the right of way or not, I suspect litigation will tie up the attempt for a long, long time. As an aside, I believe I have seen articles about expanding the DC Connector Bus from downtown out to Friendship Heights. If plans go forward, I presume you will coordinate with whomsoever is in charge of that.

Right now there is a parking lane on the south side of Military. What will happen to that? How will folks who park on the street be affected? What will happen to McKinley Avenue as a bus transit street? How will buses navigate out of Friendship Heights to Military? It seems you will need to consider continuing to allow buses to turn left on Western, or turn right and then a left, on to Military. Or, will you continue to push buses down McKinley to Connecticut, and then left on Military? Or will you leave it the same way it is now?

Nancy and I are not politicians but we recall the question is cui bono? Who benefits if a plan is implemented? Who pays the price? And at what cost?

Finally, and I admit that I am not schooled in transportation schemes, who really needs a "High Frequency Local and Regional Bus Corridor"? It appears to us that some folks may have looked at a map without consulting the neighborhood in person, and just said, "Look at the map. Doesn't this make sense?" Well, from the street level, from the residents of Military Road, we suspect there is a unanimous view that any plan to remake Military Road as a "High Frequency Local and Regional Bus Corridor" is unnecessary, costly to implement, and in need of outright rejection as costs seem to far outweigh the benefits especially for the residents of Military Road.

Nancy H. and William J. Montwieler

From: MoveDC (DDOT)
Sent: Wednesday, July 02, 2014 4:58 PM
To: John Vereker
Subject: RE: Proposed Bus Corridor on Military Road

Thank you for your comments. We appreciate your input.
Colleen

From: John Vereker  
Sent: Monday, June 30, 2014 10:13 AM  
To: MoveDC (DDOT)  
Subject: Proposed Bus Corridor on Military Road

DC Government

We are vigorously opposed to the proposal in the DC Government’s Priority Corridor Network Plan for Military Road to be designated as a high frequency local and regional bus corridor.

Military Road is a narrow - predominantly two lane - suburban road which already carries far more traffic than is safe or comfortable for those living along it. It is heavily congested during the evening rush hour. There are many pedestrians, including nursery schools crossing to use local playgrounds. It is totally unsuitable for a major bus route. The main corridor should continue to be Western Avenue, which is a four lane highway.

We would be grateful for these objections to be taken into account when the proposal is considered.

John and Judy Vereker  
5358 43rd St NW

From: MoveDC (DDOT)  
Sent: Wednesday, July 02, 2014 4:53 PM  
To: Malcolm Friar  
Subject: RE: Military Rd.

Good afternoon –

Thank you for your comments. We appreciate your input.

From: Malcolm Friar  
Sent: Wednesday, July 02, 2014 4:50 PM  
To: MoveDC (DDOT)  
Subject: Military Rd.

It’s a bad idea. Anyone who has bothered to stand at the intersection of Western/Military at rush hour both morning and night would have to have their head examined if they thought otherwise. Busses will make the traffic just so much worse. Unless there is going to be a dedicated effort to totally change the intersection so that buses can get to the bus depot without having to get onto Western and that you widen Military Road from Western to Nevada it just won’t work. Just a bad idea old together. If the rest of the plan is as bad as this particular part of the plan then MoveDC should Move Out of DC.
--------Original Message--------
From: Elizabeth Barrett Topping
Sent: Wednesday, February 05, 2014 10:02 PM
To: MoveDC (DDOT)
Subject: Feedback on latest proposal: East-West connections

Hi,

I was disappointed to hear that the latest iteration of the East-West transit plans includes a route on Harvard or Columbia Road (where you already have many options and so much bus and rail transit) but doesn’t include the East-West Military Rd/Missouri Avenue route that was under discussion before. I really liked the earlier proposal for East-West transit along Military Road/Missouri Ave--please add it back to the routes under discussion!

There is a really huge expanse of the city in this area between Ft Totten and Friendship Heights or Tenleytown that doesn’t have access to a metro station--and desperately needs better public transportation. People in this area, including myself, rely on public transit every day and improved speedy public transit options are critical. A speedy(!!), reliable option like a circulator through the area would be wonderful, hugely appreciated and very much used. Also, so many of the city’s transit routes are North-South and very few are East-West and connect neighborhoods or neighborhoods to other transit hubs. Right now there is an E2 bus that runs East-West on Kennedy St; yet the bus only runs at half the officially scheduled times so it is very hard to rely on. Also, it is slow—an express bus or a fast option like a circulator would be great.

--------

From: MoveDC (DDOT)
Sent: Wednesday, July 02, 2014 5:02 PM
To: Bryan Stockton; Hawkinson, Colleen (DDOT)
Cc: Tope, Adam (ANC 3F01)
Subject: RE: MoveDC comments--oppose high density transit on VanNess St. NW

Good afternoon!

Thank you for your comments. We appreciate your input.

Colleen

From: Bryan Stockton
Sent: Wednesday, June 25, 2014 1:02 PM
To: MoveDC (DDOT); Hawkinson, Colleen (DDOT)
Cc: Tope, Adam (ANC 3F01)
Subject: MoveDC comments--oppose high density transit on VanNess St. NW

Dear Ms. Hawkinson,

As the coordinator for the moveDC plan, congrats on a very thoughtful and exciting plan.

I am very enthusiastic about the long term vision for public transit in the city. As a resident of
Van Ness and as one of the few people in the neighborhood that does not own a car and actually rides the H2 bus, I nevertheless am strongly opposed to creating a high-density bus lane on Van Ness St. NW between Wisconsin and Reno Rd. I hope my comments below are not just NIMBYism but offer constructive comments for moveDC.

1. Van Ness St. between Reno Rd. and Wisconsin is not built for such high volume bus, vehicle, and bike traffic. I understand the need for an efficient route between Wisconsin and Connecticut Aves., but using Van Ness is not the solution. Currently, the H2 bus uses Veazey St going westbound and Van Ness St. for eastbound routes. The moveDC plan only shows Van Ness St. for the high frequency service.

Currently, Van Ness St. between Reno Rd. and Wisconsin has only one side of parking for residents, a shared bike lane, and two narrow lanes for vehicle traffic. Using the street for two directions of bus traffic plus bike traffic will create a nightmare and safety hazard. All the other streets in the neighborhood have parking on both sides, even Veazey St. The residents of Van Ness should not shoulder all of the burden of noise, lack of parking, safety, etc.

Vehicle traffic uses Van Ness already during rush hour, and sometimes the cars back up an entire block as they wait for the light at either Reno Road or Wisconsin to change. Channeling more traffic onto this street will only increase negative impacts on those who live on Van Ness. The current levels of bus traffic are a significant nuisance to the residents along the street from noise and vibration.

2. Instead, the proposed route should go further north on Connecticut Ave. before connecting with Wisconsin via Nebraska or Military Road. That would allow the buses to service the vibrant commercial sector north of the Van Ness metro station. When I used to live at Brandywine and Connecticut, I would always look to take a bus to and from the metro station, but the buses were so infrequent and unreliable that it made more sense to walk. If service can be improved north to at least Albemarle, I think ridership would increase. Nebraska Ave would make the route longer, but it is a multi-lane arterial road, and it would take the route directly by a middle and high school.

3. At the very least, the high frequency cross-town route between Reno Rd and Wisconsin Ave should follow the existing H2 route, which divides the east/west route along two parallel streets. Private vehicle traffic will continue to use Van Ness as the main cut through between Wisconsin and Connecticut. Residents cannot reroute the private vehicle traffic, but we can suggest alternatives for increased bus traffic. We should lessen the impact on Van Ness by spreading the effects of the increased bus traffic along several neighboring streets.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment, and good luck on your work.

Bryan Stockton

3719 Van Ness Street NW
Washington, DC 20016