Connecticut Avenue NW
Reversible Lane Operations and Safety Study
Community Advisory Committee Meeting #3
(incorporates comments from CAC Post-Meeting)
October 1st, 2020
Tonight’s Agenda

1. Introduction
2. Project Updates
3. Stretch Break - Optional
4. Competing Priorities
5. Next steps
6. Public meeting logistics
7. Adjourn and Thank You!
Welcome
Meeting Logistics
Attendance/How has your summer been?
moveDC Status Update

1. Introductions
moveDC Update

- DDOT is updating the long-range transportation plan for Washington, DC
- Purpose: Streamline goals to inform policies, strategies and performance criteria for project selection
- Will influence plans for investments and improvements to the transportation network you use, including:
  - Public transit
  - Bicycle and pedestrian amenities
  - Freight and passenger vehicles
  - Equity
moveDC Update

- **We want to hear from you during this process!**
- **Ways to be involved:**
  - Survey will be available October 6th
  - Virtual Town Halls
    - October 13th: 6:30-8 pm
    - October 15th: 1:30-3 pm
  - Telephone office hours
    - October 20, October 22, October 27, October 28
  - Please visit [wemovedc.org](http://wemovedc.org) for more information


Source: [https://www.newfrederickdouglassbridge.com/construction-progress?lightbox=dataItem-keojlu5o](https://www.newfrederickdouglassbridge.com/construction-progress?lightbox=dataItem-keojlu5o)
Please reach out for more information!

Haley Peckett, AICP
Project Manager, Project Delivery
movedc@dc.gov

Lezlie Rupert, PMP
State & Regional Planning
movedc@dc.gov
Cleveland Park Streetscape and Drainage Improvement Project

Project Update
Cleveland Park Streetscape and Drainage Improvement Project

CLEVELAND PARK STREETSCAPE AND DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENT
From Macomb Street to Quebec Street, NW

Project Scope:
• Streetscape design, drainage improvement: design, roadway improvements, upgrading ADA ramps, traffic and pedestrian safety improvements, upgrading traffic signal, lighting, signage and pavement marking.

Project Status:
• Design phase is completed
• Solicitation process in progress and will be advertised in FY 2021 (funding dependent)

Challenges:
• Utility conflicts – needed utility relocation design of DCW lines
• Drainage overflow to the project area and an outfall connection at Porter St (Ph-2)

Project Schedule:
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Started</td>
<td>July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design completion</td>
<td>Winter of 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Begins (Anticipated)</td>
<td>Winter of 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Completion (Anticipated)</td>
<td>Summer of 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Budget: $20 million (Design & Construction)
2. Project Updates
Purpose and Need

• Purpose: To improve multimodal accessibility, safety and operations:
  – Remove or modify the reversible lane system, and/or
  – Add Protected Bicycle Lanes

• Needs:
  – Safety for motorized and non-motorized users
  – Traffic operations
  – Curbside parking and loading
  – Transit access and operations
  – Bicycle and pedestrian accessibility
Guiding Principles

• **Quality of Life**
  – Accommodate the needs of people who live, work, and recreate within the Connecticut Avenue corridor.
  – Prioritize the needs of corridor residents and businesses.
  – Provide sustainable, resilient, and equitable transportation options for all modes.

• **Safety and Vision Zero**
  – Alternatives should reduce the number of crashes and fatalities as compared to current conditions.
  – Incorporate Complete Streets principles to reduce vehicle speeds along the corridor.

• **Traffic Operations**
  – Mitigate significant traffic impacts, to the extent feasible, when considering alternative concepts.
  – Understand diversions impacts within the corridor and mitigate, where possible.

• **Parking and Loading**
  – Retain some level of parking and/or loading within commercial areas in the corridor.

• **Pedestrians**
  – Integrate pedestrian improvements into each alternative concept.

• **Bicycles**
  – Incorporate concept(s) that include a protected bicycle lane (PBL).

• **Transit**
  – Include bus transit operational improvements as part of design concepts.

• **ROW/Construction**
  – The alternative must be constructed within the 60-foot curb-to-curb cross-section.
# Stakeholder Meetings Held

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAC Meeting No.1</td>
<td>04-30-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAC Meeting No. 2</td>
<td>06-11-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 3 Vision</td>
<td>06-22-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Park Main Street</td>
<td>06-25-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3BA</td>
<td>06-29-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANC 3/4G</td>
<td>07-13-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANC 3E</td>
<td>07-16-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Ness Main Street</td>
<td>07-17-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANC 3C</td>
<td>07-20-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANC 3F</td>
<td>07-21-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERAGENCY Meeting</td>
<td>07-22-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodley Park Community Association</td>
<td>07-23-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Park Citizens Association</td>
<td>07-29-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSEMA</td>
<td>07-30-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithsonian Zoo</td>
<td>09-02-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard University Law School</td>
<td>09-03-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>09-19-2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Comments (as of 10/1/2020)

• DDOT has received over 80 formal and informal comments through CAC members, ANCs, and stakeholders
  – DDOT recorded 63 official responses and captured 21 unofficial comments via social media

• A total of 268 unique comments have been noted, and 513 issues were raised by way of those comments

• Major issues are identified on the next few slides
Major Issues

• Reversible Lanes (RLs)
  – Build concepts should not retain RLs
  – RLs may be needed due to heavy traffic

• Travel Lane Dimensions
  – Reduce travel lane dimensions

• Transit
  – Include dedicated bus lanes
  – Ensure safety of all bus passengers with all bike lane designs
  – Provide greater transit service

• Pedestrians
  – Make pedestrian improvements

• Parking and Loading
  – Retain parking and loading for commercial viability
  – Residential buildings need parking

• Speeding
  – More enforcement needed
  – Reduce speed limit from 30 mph to 25 mph

• Left Turns
  – Eliminate left turns at some intersections

• Safety
  – Address safety in all concepts
Major Issues

• **Signage**
  – Poor signage/lack of visible signage

• **Traffic Operations**
  – Vehicle gridlock and neighborhood diversion concerns

• **Multimodalism/Quality of Life**
  – Design the corridor safely and equitably for people to choose whether to walk, bike, take transit, and/or drive
  – Consider the interests of all modes to be equal to commuters and drivers

• **Protected Bike Lanes**
  – Provide data on projected bicycle usage along the corridor, with the bike facility
  – Major corridors like Connecticut Avenue should provide safe and dedicated bike lanes
  – Use alternative bike routes to support cyclists within the study area, not along Connecticut Avenue
PBL Infrastructure Bike Forecasts Methodology

- **Purpose**: To project bicycle demand along the Connecticut Avenue NW corridor. Develop short-term and longer-term forecasts.
- **Methodology**
  - Use of Cycle Streets Routing algorithm
  - Data Sources: CABI, historic bike count data, Connecticut Avenue Bike Counts.
  - Adjustments for: most direct route, most comfortable route, balanced route
- **Assumptions**
  - PBL forecasts are based on rerouted trips/current data and induced demand.
### Origins and Destinations - Select Locations along Connecticut Avenue

**North of Military**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From/to Study Area</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Study Area to Region</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Region to Study Area</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through Study Area (to/from Region)</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Van Ness to Upton**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From/to Study Area</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Study Area to Region</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Region to Study Area</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through Study Area (to/from Region)</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**South of Calvert Street**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From/to Study Area</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Study Area to Region</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Region to Study Area</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through Study Area (to/from Region)</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Connecticut Avenue Streetlight Analysis
CURBSIDE BUSINESS SURVEY
DRAFT RESULTS 10/1/2020

Survey Update
Survey Respondent Profile

Location of Businesses
- Woodley Park: 11%
- Cleveland Park: 54%
- Between Van Ness and Cleveland Park: 8%
- Van Ness: 19%
- North of Van Ness: 8%

Type of Business
- Residential
- General Retail
- Restaurant
- Office
- Special Use (Entertainment/ Hair Salon)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>General Retail</th>
<th>Restaurant</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Special Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woodley Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Park</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Btw Van Ness and Cleveland Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Ness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North of Van Ness</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Employee and Customer Profiles

Estimates by business survey respondent

**NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES BY USE**
- General Retail, 85, 27%
- Residential, 145, 45%
- Restaurant, 30, 9%
- Special Use (Entertainment/Hair Salon), 56, 18%
- Office, 2, 1%

**EMPLOYEE MODE SHARE**
- Drive Alone or Carpool 42%
- Transit 13%
- Rideshare/Pick Up and Drop Off 9%
- Walk/Bike 27%
- Not Sure 9%

**ESTIMATED CUSTOMER MODE SHARE**
- Drive Alone or Carpool 42%
- Transit 13%
- Rideshare/Pick Up and Drop Off 9%
- Walk/Bike 27%
- Not Sure 9%
Available Parking Options

Off-Street Parking Options by Business Type

- Yes, parking spaces in off-street underground parking lot
- Yes, parking spaces in a shared off-street parking lot with other businesses
- Yes, parking spaces in an off-street surface parking lot
- Not relevant to our business, most instruction takes place in downtown locations
- No, there is no off-street parking

Off-Street Parking Options by Location

Businesses that do not have off-street parking utilize both Connecticut Avenue and side streets for parking. (employees, visitors, residents).
Commercial Loading

Where Does Your Business (Commerically) Load?

- Woodley Park: 1
- Cleveland Park: 7
- Btw Van Ness and Cleveland Park: 5
- Van Ness: 2
- North of Van Ness: 4

Off-Street Loading Access:
- ½ of businesses have alley access
- ¾ of businesses do not have a dedicated loading berth/ dock

Commercial Delivery Schedules:
- More than half of businesses receive a minimum of 1 to 2 deliveries daily, with restaurants and residential uses receiving up to 3 to 5 daily deliveries
- Deliveries are concentrated in early and mid-morning hours
Curbside Pick Up and Drop Off (PUDO)

**DAILY DELIVERY PICK UPS AT YOUR BUSINESS?**
- Not Applicable (N/A) - my business does not have delivery pick up: 31%
- Less than 15: 41%
- 15 to 30: 14%
- 30 to 50: 7%
- 50+: 7%

**DAILY PASSENGER PICK UP/ DROP OFFS DESTINED TO OR FROM YOUR BUSINESS? (UBER, LYFT, TAXI, ETC.)**
- Less than 15: 43%
- 15 to 30: 21%
- Not Sure: 36%

**Delivery Pick Ups:**
- Most restaurant uses receive 15-30 daily pick ups with a small percentage that receive more than 30 pick up deliveries.

**Location:**
- A majority of pick up/ drop off activity occurs along Connecticut Avenue (goods and passenger).
If curbside loading was no longer available on Connecticut Avenue NW, what would your business do to address loading needs? Please explain.

“We have a private driveway for the passenger pick up and drop off.”

“Would make the Alley more difficult to use when all delivery trucks will revert back to the alley for delivery tell people top park on side street.”

“My driver would have to park illegally twice a day for pickup and deliveries resulting in huge parking fines.”

“It would be really hard to function curbside and be able to have orders picked up by drivers.”

“Go out of business.”

Detrimental to Business (go out of business)  Use side street or alley  Not sure  Off-street option available  Other (park illegally)  N/A

DRAFT
If parking along Connecticut Avenue NW was eliminated, what would you expect your employees and customers to do?

- “They would need to park in the residential neighborhood and it would be a big problem, not so much because it’s far away (it’s not), but because of the perception that it’s far away. Now we can tell customers that there is parking right outside our bakery along Connecticut Avenue.”

- “I am not sure what the customers would be able to do. Our employees already park far away in free timed street parking areas and walk a long way in order to park, sometime employees leave work to move their cars - they park far away in-order to keep spots open on Connecticut Ave so guests can pick-up curbside & or delivery drivers. Lastly the guests that dine on the patios can park.”

- “Most of our customers call in there orders for curbside pick up- they would most likely try switching to a delivery service and that service would also have issues parking to get the food. Also the quality of the food would not be as great because of waiting and traveling with the food would take longer. It really would hurt business not having anywhere to park.”

![Bar chart showing responses to the question about what employees and customers would do if parking along Connecticut Avenue NW was eliminated. The chart indicates that most people believe it would be detrimental to the business (go out of business), followed by using a side street or alley, being not sure, having an off-street option available, going elsewhere, or using other modes (delivery/walk).]
Other Comments

- “Keep parking on the street and come up with a proactive (approach).”

- “I would consider moving or closing my business if this happens … “

- “This is a retail shopping strip. a suburban dc location, people use their cars 99% of the time. The service rd. could go, but we need ct. ave. parking until 630pm.”

- “You have taken away the service lane for parking don’t take parking on Connecticut Ave away. That would be absolutely detrimental to our business.”

- “Even as it is, we have way too many metered parking spots.”

- “I would like to see the lane reversals gone forever and I would like Connecticut Avenue not to be used as a highway. Over the years, I have heard and witnessed numerous car crashes and narrowly avoided crashes as a result of the rush hour lane reversals on Connecticut Avenue. As a vehicle owner and frequent driver, I don’t love the idea of more congestion on Connecticut Avenue, but I will gladly add a minute or two to my trips if it means fewer car accidents along the corridor.”

- “Metro transit should advertise that the park zoo stop will Cleveland Park.”
4. Competing Priorities: Consideration of Alternatives
Connecticut Avenue Study Objectives

- What are the original objectives/biggest priorities of the project?
- What is the goal and who is the project for?
- How do we balance local community needs with regional access?
- Need to prioritize time and space for pedestrians.
- Commercial viability and success
- Freight, loading, curbside access
- So many demands in the corridor. Mobility, access, transit, pick-up, drop off, commuters. Bicycle lanes, pedestrians.
- How do we make the tradeoffs?

CAC Members: Tell us from your constituencies’ standpoint, what is the #1 and #2 biggest priorities that you see for the project?
Four (4) Build Concepts → Path Forward

1. Developed initial concepts
2. Presented and received feedback from 25+ ANC, CAC, Stakeholder, Agency groups
3. Lead to identification of fatal flaws (Of note, traffic operations evaluation is not complete)
4. Initial fatal flaws make two alternatives unacceptable
5. Development of potential ancillary improvements;
6. Development of refined parking/loading accommodations

Presented and received feedback from 25+ ANC, CAC, Stakeholder, Agency groups

Developed initial concepts

Initial fatal flaws make two alternatives unacceptable

Development of potential ancillary improvements;

Development of refined parking/loading accommodations

Lead to identification of fatal flaws (Of note, traffic operations evaluation is not complete)
## Concept A  RECOMMEND ELIMINATION

### Fatal Flaws: DDOT Standpoint
- Retains reversible lane
- Does not appear to meet purpose and need of project
- One lane in the off-peak direction
- Curb lane bus stops (buses unlikely to pull completely out of the travel lane and will block the only available travel lane)

### Safety
- Improves safety for non-motorized users
- Safety for vehicles is not improved due to retaining both reversible lanes.

### Vehicle Operations
- Three (3) peak period, peak direction travel lanes
- One (1) peak period, non-peak direction travel lane
- No protected signals; shared turn lanes
- 2, 10-foot and 2, 11-foot travel lanes

### Reversible Lanes
- Retains both reversible lanes

### Multimodal Access
- Bicycle-includes PBL
  - Pedestrian-PBL provides slower speeds, buffers provide shorter crossing distances
  - Transit-mixing zone conflicts between buses and bicycles

### Parking/Loading
- None. Does not provide for parking/loading. Management solutions will be required.
**Concept D** RECOMMEND ELIMINATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>AM Peak</th>
<th>PM Peak</th>
<th>MD/Off-Peak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety compromised because of bus/bike lane concepts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety issues with northbound/southbound bike lane on same side of street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle lane positioning vis-à-vis left turn movements,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaving/confusion resulting from left turn movements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vehicle Operations**

- AM: three (3) lanes inbound, two (2) lanes outbound; PM: two (2) lanes inbound, three (3) lanes outbound.
- Operating protected left turns from a non-dedicated lane results in

**Reversible Lanes**

- Removes one (1) reversible lane

**Multimodal Access**

- Bicycle-Two-way PBL on the west side of Connecticut Avenue
- Pedestrian- During the off-peak period, the center lane can be repurposed as a pedestrian refuge/median. The parking lane would be eliminated.
- Transit-Southbound bus stops conflict with Protected Bicycle Lane

**Parking/Loading**

- Off-peak parking is permitted on the east side of Connecticut Avenue.
Concept D RECOMMEND ELIMINATION

**Fatal Flaws (DDOT)**
- Fatal flaw relates to the two-way cycle track. Standards require left turns across a two-way cycle track to be protected-only movements. Considering the opposing volumes and the need to look out for oncoming vehicles, there will be conflicting pedestrians and cyclists in the two-way cycle track.
- Left-most northbound lane would need to be designated as left turn only. Violation of MUTCD to operate a protected left turn lane from anything other than a dedicated left turn lane. It would result in a single NB lane during AM and off-peak periods.

**Summary**
- DDOT does not support this concept as presented
- The concept is the most difficult to implement
CONCEPTS RECOMMENDED BY OTHERS

- The Cleveland Park Smart Growth Concept

- Consider encroaching on the existing wider sidewalks in commercial areas to incorporate protected bicycle lanes and parking/loading spaces

**Issues**

- Same traffic control issues as DDOT Concept D
- Additional coordination with WMATA and NPS may be necessary
- Does not conform to DDOT Guiding Principles
- Cleveland Park Streetscape Project design impacts

**DDOT does not support this concept**
Where do we go from here?
## Concept B: RECOMMEND TO RETAIN

### Fatal Flaw(s)/Summary
- DDOT has no objectives to retaining this base concept.
- No operational fatal flaws.
- Does not meet the full project purpose and need.

### AM Peak

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inbound</th>
<th>Outbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reversible Lanes</td>
<td>Removes both reversible lanes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PM Peak

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inbound</th>
<th>Outbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reversible Lanes</td>
<td>Removes both reversible lanes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MD/Off-Peak

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inbound</th>
<th>Outbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reversible Lanes</td>
<td>Removes both reversible lanes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Safety
- Anticipated safety improvement due to removal of both reversible lanes.

### Vehicle Operations
- Three (3) travel lanes in each direction (NB and SB) during the AM/PM peak periods.
- Two (2) travel lanes in each direction (NB and SB) during the mid-day and off-peak periods.

### Reversible Lanes
- Removes both reversible lanes

### Multimodal Access
- Bicycle: No PBL
  - Typical section does not contain any buffers between pedestrians and vehicles.
- Transit: Curb lane access for buses.

### Parking/Loading
- Yes. Off-peak parking permitted on both sides of Connecticut Avenue (existing today).
Concept B Moving Forward

- Retain concept
- Understand that Concept B does not meet the full purpose and need
- Develop traffic operations findings. Understand how this alternative operates in the future compared to other build and no-build concepts.
- Obtain broader commentary from the general public
**Fatal Flaws**
- Peak hour parking would be a fatal flaw. If one or two cars are parked illegally on each block, the available peak hour roadway capacity reverts to a single lane. Off-peak parking could be limited to critical commercial areas with a vigorous corridor-wide enforcement plan.

**Summary**
- DDOT tentative support
  - Need to assess traffic operations for this concept
  - Need to assess diversion within and external to the corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AM Peak</th>
<th>PM Peak</th>
<th>MD Off-Peak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AM Peak
- **Safety**: Increase in safety due to removal of reversible lanes.
- **Vehicle Operations**:
  - Shifts in bike lane buffers can provide dedicated left-turn lanes.
  - During the AM, PM, and Off-Peak Period, two (2) travel lanes inbound and two (2) travel lanes outbound. Lane usage consistent all times of the day.

### PM Peak
- **Reversible Lanes**: Removes both reversible lanes
- **Multimodal Access**:
  - Bicycle- Includes Protected Bicycle Lane
  - Pedestrian-Bike Lanes enhance pedestrian safety, flexible buffer could enable shorter crossing distances
  - Transit- Allows for floating bus islands.
- **Parking/Loading**: No Parking/Loading in cross-section. Additional solutions required.

### MD Off-Peak
CONCEPT C OPTIONAL ELEMENTS

• Consider options to modify Concept C
• Would include:
  – Loading and Pick-Up Drop Off Zones
  – Overnight parking
  – Concentrate on the commercial areas within the corridor:
  – Conduct detailed traffic operations evaluation to identify if Concept C will work from a traffic operations standpoint (not complete).
Concept C – Option Proposed Parking/Loading Lane
PROJECT MANAGEMENT TEAM RECOMMENDATIONS TO ADVANCE

• Eliminate Concepts A and D

• Retain Concept B

• Consider options to modify Concept C that contain loading and Pick-Up Drop Off Zones and overnight parking with several locations along Connecticut Avenue

• Include No-Build spot improvements in Concepts B and C, which includes pedestrian, traffic operations, enforcement and speed, and other improvements

• Consider extending the protected bicycle lane alternatives to north/south of Northampton Street NW
5. Next Steps
7. Next Steps

- Eliminate Concepts with Fatal Flaws
  - Traffic Operations Analysis
  - Tradeoffs Comparison
  - No-Build Rec

- Prepare for Public Meeting
  - CAC Meeting 4
  - Interagency Meeting

- Public Meeting

- Preferred Concept

- Detailed Traffic Operations Analysis
  - 10% Design

- Environmental Documentation

- Early Oct 2020
- Oct to Nov 2020
- Fall/Winter 2020
- Fall 2020/Winter 2021
- Winter 2021
- Winter 2021
- Spring 2021
6. Public Meeting Logistics
December 2020 Public Meeting Logistics

• Highlight of Preliminary Format (consideration of 2 meetings)
• Getting on November Meeting Agendas for ANCs & Civic Groups
• Rack Card or Poster Distribution Usefulness
• Drop Off Locations
• Save the Date Email Blasts
• Information on website
• Translation
7. Adjournment
Thank you for your time!
Contact Information

Project Website-

Project Email-
Conn-Ave-revstudy@dc.gov

Ed Stollof, Project Manager
Manager, Project Planning Branch
Planning and Sustainability Division
Email: Edward.Stollof@dc.gov

Cynthia Lin, Deputy Project Manager
Project Planning Branch
Planning and Sustainability Division
Email: Cynthia.Lin@dc.gov

Donise Jackson, DDOT Ward 3 Community Engagement Specialist
Office of the Director
Email: Donise.Jackson@dc.gov

Charlotte Ducksworth, Community Engagement Specialist
Partner and Vice President of Business Affairs, Commun-ET, LLC
Email: cducksworth@commun-et.com

Ian Swain, Community Engagement Specialist
Managing Partner, Commun-ET, LLC
Email: Ian Swain iswain@commun-et.com