

CONNECTICUT AVENUE REVERSIBLE LANE OPERATIONS AND SAFETY STUDY

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

FROM PUBLIC MEETING NO. 1, MARCH 30TH AND APRIL 1, 2021

Contents

Parking	1
Traffic	7
Modal Share	12
Pedestrians	13
Transit	14
Bicycle	15
Safety	15
Concepts- No Build Option	17
Concepts- Option B	18
Concepts Option C	20
Concepts-Other	25
Concept Evaluation Matrix	28
Project Coordination.....	29
Consistency with District of Columbia Plans and Programs	30

Parking

Question 1. If you remove all of the parking spots don't you inconvenience homeowners nearby because people still have to park their cars to go to the Connecticut Avenue businesses? Businesses will see a reduction in sales if you move parking further away.

DDOT will consider the optimal mix of time-based parking, metered-parking, dynamic parking pricing, and use of sides streets, surface lots and alleys where applicable, to maximize parking supply in the commercial areas. There is research that business activity may actually increase-or there may be a neutral effect in cities like New York and Portland. Studies show that there may be reduced sales on a per-visit basis, but the actual number of monthly visits and sales increase overall. DDOT will place studies from other areas on the project website. By adding more short term pick up and drop off parking spaces, we can provide more accessibility at certain times of the day.

Question 2. My wife is disabled. She uses a wheelchair or a walker. She can't travel very far. Will disabled parking spaces be set up to accommodate all disabled people?

DDOT will consider the parking and access needs for all users, including Accessible Meters (i.e. Red Top) and designated pick-up/drop-off areas, on a block-by-block basis should Concept C be recommended as a preferred alternative.

Question 3. I am concerned that the merchants are not being considered here. Know that any reductions in parking along the corridor is death to retail.

Merchants have been considered during the entire Connecticut Avenue Reversible Lane Operations and Safety Study. Concept B only minimally reduces parking (spaces) that are proximate to intersections to increase visibility. Concept C is a compromise solution that would retain one lane of parking on either side of Connecticut Avenue and incorporate peak and non-peak period parking spaces (where is no peak period parking today). We would also optimize the mix of parking spaces to provide for more short-term/high-turnover and pick-up & drop-off parking spaces. In addition, DDOT has an ongoing curbside business survey that is being distributed to business to understand existing and future loading and parking needs.

Question 4. The claims that reducing parking would be "death to retail" are not supported by evidence and not conducive to a congenial exchange of views.

Comment noted. DDOT will place the studies that we have on this subject on the project website.

Question 5. In my opinion, Connecticut Avenue should not have ANY street parking on it at all. In case you didn't hear, there is a climate crisis in this country, and we need to rapidly shift away from using cars. Ninety-nine percent of people could switch to bikes, transit and walking.

Comment noted.

Question 6. The retailers in Woodley Park have nearly unanimously opposed the loss of parking and loading.

Comment noted.

Question 7. Do we have an accurate count of the private parking supply? That is, all spaces in paid lots and all spaces dedicated to specific businesses?

We do not have a total count of all private parking spaces in the Connecticut Avenue corridor. We know that there are parking spaces in surface lots, garages and along alleys and circular driveways for the residential uses along the Corridor. Not all businesses/buildings publicize the number of spaces including how they regulate the use of those spaces available in their facilities. We will be evaluating the parking supply further if a Concept advances that includes a reduction of parking spaces.

Question 8. How many parking spots does Option B remove in the Cleveland Park commercial core from Macomb to Porter? How many parking spots does Option C remove in the same area from Macomb to Porter?

All numbers are approximate if, and until, conceptual design engineering is complete. As of this writing, Option B would remove 2 parking spaces on the north side of Connecticut Avenue between Macomb and Porter. Option C would remove 25 parking spaces in that same section.

Question 9. I strongly support getting rid of wasteful parking spaces to make room for greener forms of transit. Can DDOT increase parking meter fees for those people who still drive to Connecticut [Avenue] to better reflect the costs to the neighborhood of their cars?

Comment noted. DDOT will look at all on-street spaces, metered and non-metered, to consider changes in parking regulations (conversion of long-term to short-term/high-turnover or pick-up & drop-off spaces).

Question 10. The data presented included how many parking spaces may be removed. Is there data on how much those spots are used? Also, how many of them are actually retail/restaurant customers vs. all day residential parking?

As part of the study's existing conditions, parking utilization counts were conducted on Thursday, March 5, 2020 (Pre-COVID) between 11:30 AM and 12:30 PM. Please see the Existing Conditions Report, pages 48-50, located on the Project website.

Question 11. It should also be noted that Concept B does not permit any parking during five peak hours on weekdays. Concept C provides some level of parking 24/7.

Comment noted.

Question 12. In testimony before the DC Council last week, I heard Cleveland Park's merchants said that parking was key to their survival by 10:1. So why is DDOT insisting in Option C on getting rid of parking. Are you trying to kill small businesses?

DDOT is presenting two options that appear to be potentially viable to the Community. Option C removes parking on one side of the street in commercial areas. This Concept would modify the existing time-of-day parking restrictions and convert existing longer-term spaces to short-term/high-turnover or pick-up & drop-off spaces to provide greater availability for retailers. DDOT will collect comments from all stakeholders in the Corridor prior to making a recommendation for a preferred alternative.

Question 13. What is the purpose intended for the removal of parking for cars when so many locals and visitors need to be able to park if they arrive in this area by car?

DDOT has developed two alternatives that appear to meet either the partial or the full purpose and need of the study. Option B removes minimal parking to increase visibility at intersections and to help reduce crashes. Option C retains parking on one side of the Connecticut Avenue and provides parking during peak periods as compared to today, where peak period parking is restricted. The Corridor is a multimodal corridor and as such, locals and visitors have the opportunity to take transit or Metrorail, bike, walk and use scooters. There is only 60-feet, curb-to-curb, to allocate for all uses. Some parking is retained in both Concepts.

Question 14. Is there any data on how many households on/near the corridor have available off-street parking?

This information is not available at this time. Should an alternative be selected that includes the removal of a substantial number of parking spaces, DDOT will work with our Parking and Ground Transportation Division, the ANCs and the public, to collect additional data related to residential off-street/private parking.

Question 15. If Concept C causes a 17.5% gain in parking availability, why not always display those numbers with the reduction in parking spots? That's a big advantage in availability. One can easily argue that Concept C provides more time for parking.

To be clear, Concept C will remove more than half of the parking spaces in the 2.7-mile Connecticut Avenue Corridor. It is very likely that spaces will be removed in most areas where there are residential uses such as condos and apartment buildings. Parking will be maintained on commercial block faces, where parking will be permitted on one side of the street. There would be no peak hour parking restrictions in these areas. What this means is that there would be an additional five hours a day per available parking space (or an additional 25-hours per week in parking space availability). This additional parking space availability would be on those blocks where we retain parking. The overall conclusion, however, is that Concept C will remove greater than 50 percent of the parking spaces in the Corridor.

Question 16. Even on these individual slides, would be good to know changes in parking availability rather than just parking spots (e.g., slide 30).

Slide 30 from the Traffic and Parking Learning Room portion of the March 30/April 1, 2021 Public Meeting presents an illustrative example of how the parking configuration might look if Concept C is recommended as the preferred alternative in the section of the Connecticut Avenue corridor from Porter Street NW to Newark Street NW. We indicate that 38 spaces would be removed, and 28 spaces would be retained. These estimates of parking supply changes are subject to change based on subsequent phases of design. Parking availability is defined as the ability to find a parking space when you need it. DDOT did conduct parking utilization counts on Thursday, March 5, 2020 (Pre-COVID) between 11: 30 AM and 12:30 PM. Please see the Existing Conditions Report, pages 48-50, located on the Project website. Understanding the level of parking utilization can help us in estimating parking available, by time-of-day.

Question 17. Aren't there still plenty of parking spaces available in this Corridor, for example, the shopping center at the Cleveland Park Metro?

The use of the term "plenty of spaces available in the Corridor" is subjective. Parking utilization counts were conducted on Thursday, March 5, 2020 (Pre-COVID) between 11: 30 AM and 12:30 PM. Please see the Existing Conditions Report, pages 48-50, located on the Project website, for an inventory of on-street parking spaces along the Connecticut Avenue corridor. The question appears to be referring to the surface parking lot, "Sam's Park N-Shop," in Cleveland Park. Parking is \$25 for two-hours and \$40 all-day. Parking validation is available for 30-minutes and one-hour free parking for Target customers. This is not public parking and it is privately regulated.

Question 18. With regard to residential parking, is it an assumption in this project that by 2045 there will be fewer residents who own and keep cars in this 2.7-mile study area.

Assumptions regarding the number of vehicles per residence were not considered in the development of concept alternatives under 2045 build conditions. Recommendations are intended to balance safety, accessibility, and operations for all transportation modes (vehicular traffic, transit, bicycle and pedestrians) in accordance with vision, goals, plans and programs of the District of Columbia (e.g. VisionZero and MoveDC).

The District's sustainability goals call for 75% percent of trips to be by sustainable modes including transit, walking, and cycling or other forms of micromobility. DDOT expects that vehicle ownership will be impacted by enhancements to multimodal travel, which could result in lower vehicle ownership in residential areas. DDOT will continue to use the best data available to identify trends relevant to transportation network planning and operations.

Question 19. If parking is alternated from east side to west side and back, would drivers and delivery persons be at great risk in crossing the busy roadway surface?

Parking and loading could be alternated from one side of the street to the other, based on the needs of individual businesses within each blockface. As we stated, where parking is retained, we can only have parking or loading on one side of the street if a bike lane concept is selected. We understand that there are existing loading issues on Connecticut Avenue. We will look for opportunities to convert some parking spaces to loading at specific times of the day. Delivery persons parking on one side of street and making deliveries on the opposite side of the street is not optimal. Given this situation, delivery persons would need to use a marked crosswalk at an intersection or midblock crosswalk location.

Question 20. What is the thinking about the relative value of parking vs. usable safe transit? Basically, does providing short-term parking in areas where there seems to be limited demand outweigh the value of making the street more multi-modal and safer?

It appears the individual wants to know whether providing parking spaces in close proximity to a business (or other use) is placed at a greater than developing a safe, multimodal corridor? DDOT would say that the "value" one places on parking vs. multimodal corridor. accessibility and safety will be based individual needs—everyone who lives, works, shops, recreates and commutes in the Corridor will have a different "value". From DDOT's perspective, implementing roadway designs with greater multimodal accessibility and safety are in accordance with the vision, goals, plans and programs of the District of Columbia.

Question 21. Many of the businesses along Connecticut Avenue are small, independently owned businesses who rely on on-street parking to attract customers. What would you say to them if you eliminate on-street parking? Are they simply out of luck- any plans to augment parking?

If a Concept that includes a protected bicycle lane is ultimately selected, DDOT will look at each blockface to determine if the metered, two-hour spaces, can be converted to short-term/high-turnover or pick-up & drop-off spaces to help to create more parking availability. We would work with the businesses to do the best job that we can, to retain as many parking spaces as possible within the commercial nodes. Some parking will still be retained in a concept that includes protected bicycle lanes.

Question 22. How much does reducing two-hour parking reduce the amount of business local shops get? There are so few spaces currently and turnover is so infrequent, it seems unlikely that parking availability is a significant factor in whether people go to a business?

DDOT cannot answer this question with regard to businesses on Connecticut Avenue. Studies in other localities such as in New York City and Portland show that business income may be neutral, or it may increase where bike lanes have been located and parking has been removed. In some situations, revenue has increased overall on a monthly basis, but may decrease on a per visit basis. Regarding factors that may motivate a person to go into a business or not, it will depend on business type, unique business services, professional services and relationships between customer and business owner, a local vs. commuter-oriented business, the ability to walk or bike to a business, and parking. We cannot say if “parking availability” alone is a significant factor regarding if someone will or will not patronize a business. It will depend on context.

Question 23. Could loading spaces convert to PUDO based on time of day?

DDOT will need to consider the loading requirements on each specific blockface and the uses and types of businesses that may also require pick-up and drop-off space, by time-of-day. A recommendation would be developed working with the businesses, the ANCs and others that have specific requirements.

Question 24. What happens to local businesses if parking is removed for customers and loading?

Studies have shown that there may be a neutral impact on businesses or even an increase in retail sales. The per visit sales may decrease; however, the number of sales per month may increase and that could lead to an overall increase in monthly sales. The specific business impacts will be context-sensitive based on the mix of business types, location, availability of non-auto modes and other factors. DDOT will include a list of research studies from various jurisdictions on the Project website.

Question 25. I would actually like to see the studies you have referred to about retail traffic.

The studies of economic effects of parking to businesses will be placed on the Project website.

Question 26. You mentioned the economic benefits to retailers with protected bike lanes in the earlier session. Are plans being discussed to study the impact of Concept C if it is implemented? Is that something that DDOT and DMPED could do? That measurement would be helpful.

The studies of economic effects of parking to businesses will be placed on the Project website. DDOT will consider conducting more detailed parking/economic analysis/research and discussions with DMPED, should a Concept be developed that includes substantial parking removals be advanced. Please note that most of the research conducted to date study the economic impacts of protected bicycle lanes under a before and after implementation framework.

Traffic

Question 27. Why is DDOT using the antiquated and car-focused LOS metric?

DDOT consistently uses the well-adopted level of service measurement from the Highway Capacity Manual for all of our traffic analyses. Though the HCM methodologies and LOS keep evolving in the past few decades, due to the restrictions and limitations of the new methodologies, DDOT along with many other agencies, e.g., FHWA, FRA, MDOT, and VDOT, still follows the previous version of the HCM, which provides better adaptability to various types of geometries and traffic operational conditions, though it lacks the capability to analyze the pedestrian or bicycle traffic.

Meanwhile, in accordance with moveDC 2021, DDOT will continue our efforts in updating the analysis methodologies to incorporate pedestrian, bicycle, and transit MOE's into our overall evaluation of projects.

Question 28. It seems that the flawed LOS measurement receives higher priority than pedestrian safety, based on the number of slides dedicated to each. Option C is the only option which prioritizes pedestrian safety.

The level of service measurement from the HCM is the industry standard, also widely adopted by almost of the federal, state, and local transportation agencies. This metric is not used to 'determine' pedestrian safety needs. This measurement allows traffic engineers to understand and compare traffic operations in a standardized way among alternatives with different intersection geometries. Regarding intersections, vehicular delay is the measurement specifically used to measure the level of service in this situation. It allows traffic engineers to consider the turning movement requirements and signal operations (e.g., phasing and timing) required at an intersection. Other factors are used to consider pedestrian needs such as pedestrian crossing distance and crossing time, the number/density and general age of pedestrians, and how long a pedestrian need to wait to cross street.

Concept B shows an illustrative set of safety and mobility improvements (see slides 57 and 59) for the 04/01 General Meeting). We show improvements such as implementation of HAWK Signals, Bus Stop Relocations and Consolidations and left turn calming treatments, under Concept B. Under Concept C, we have the ability to create left and right turn lanes, where needed, construct pedestrian islands, and implement HAWK signals, should they meet certain warrants. It would be accurate to say that Concept C provides a greater degree of pedestrian safety and one of the reasons, would be the inclusion of a protected bicycle lane. This would help slow the traffic down on Connecticut Avenue and would reduce the severity of crashes.

Question 29. The level of service analysis that was discussed only addressed auto traffic. Did DDOT conduct a similar analysis of bicycle traffic?

DDOT conducted a bicycle level of service analysis for the Connecticut Avenue corridor during the moveDC 2014 update; not for this current study specifically. This analysis found that Connecticut Avenue had a Bicycle Level of Service of "fair to poor" throughout the Corridor.

Question 30. Were level of service calculations performed for people walking and riding bikes, or only for cars?

Level of service is an accepted traffic engineering and operations methodology for considering the amount of delay at intersections and provides a letter grade for how the intersection is operating. DDOT considered a

bicycle level of service measure a few years ago during the moveDC 2014 update and it was shown that Connecticut was rated as fair to poor when considering Bicycle level of service (BLOS).

We use other methods to consider pedestrians and bicycles in our transportation system. If we provide for protect bicycle lanes, the design will help reduce the speed along the Avenue and may help to reduce some level of crashes. For pedestrians, we show a number of and safety and mobility improvements that would provide for increased safety such as Leading Pedestrian Intervals, HAWKS and bulb-outs (to shorten the crossing distances).

Question 31. Will you remove the slip lane on Nebraska and Connecticut?

This is something that we would consider—removing the slip lane or changing the angle of the slip lane.

Question 32. Does this study assume that Rock Creek Parkway/Beach Drive is open for commuters (like it was pre-pandemic)? If the parkway continues to be closed to traffic or is closed permanently, how might that affect the study's assumptions?

When we conducted our study, our models did not specifically take this potential scenario into account. The National Park Service will be conducting a traffic study of the potential Beach Drive closure and DDOT will be a reviewing party to that effort. DDOT will ensure that all assumptions made under the Connecticut Avenue Study will be carried forward into the National Park Service's efforts.

Question 33. Is Connecticut Avenue considered a "high" or "low" volume?

Connecticut Avenue is a principal arterial with a six-lane roadway cross section. Traffic volumes range from 30,000 to 32,000 vehicles per day in the mid and northern portions of the study corridor and approximately 24,000 vehicles per day in the southern portion of the corridor in the vicinity of Calvert Street NW. The use of the words, "high" or "low" are adjectives that are not readily used when analyzing traffic operations. Traffic operations are evaluated based on the volume as compared to the capacity of the road based on the number of lanes (through lanes and turn lanes), signal operations and other factors. If we think about Connecticut Avenue in this sense, the Avenue generally has a number of intersections during peak hours which are constrained and where queuing exists (pre-pandemic).

Question 34. Three of the intersections with perceived drops in LOS are outside of the Connecticut Avenue corridor and are all intersections I am very familiar with. But all three of the intersections today are struggling with managing E-W traffic not N-S traffic. Can't they take on more N-S?

The traffic diversion was considered for all roadways in the study area, and also all various directions in a particular direction. The traffic model provided the results to achieve an equilibrium state for vehicles traveling along different routes. However, signal timings may need to be adjusted as new traffic patterns will be formed.

Question 35. There are many public and private schools along Reno Road and high traffic for them is from 7:30 AM to 9 AM. Why do you spread your diversions over 5 hours? This seems unrealistic.

Diversions are not spread over five hours. Diversions are spread out over 10 hours over the morning and evening peak periods. The morning peak period runs from 6 AM to 11 AM and the evening peak period runs

from 3 PM to 8 PM. The daily traffic volume diversions are not evenly divided by 10 hours; they are proportionately spread out.

Question 36. Has DDOT met with John Eaton and Murch Elementary PTAs and school administrations since you are forcing thousands more cars on to Reno Road that goes directly in front of both of these schools.

DDOT met John Eaton Elementary School on April 27, 2021. Eaton Elementary School will be submitting comments to the Connecticut Avenue project record. DDOT contacted the principal at Murch Elementary School and the Connecticut Avenue project was discussed.

Our traffic analysis does not show “thousands” of more cars that will divert to Reno Road as a result of the reduction of one or two travel lanes along Connecticut Avenue. Below are two tables that show the distribution of diverted traffic by hour-of-the-day and the total number of daily Reno Road diverted vehicles. As shown, the forecast is for 365 and 428 daily diverted vehicles, under Concepts B and C, respectively. If our forecasts are “low” by a factor of two, Concept B would have 530 diverted vehicles per day, and Concept C would have 856 diverted vehicles per day. Today, pre-pandemic, Reno Road has approximately 12,000 vehicles per day.

Distribution to Reno Road by Hour of the Day											
Concept B	Hourly	Total	19%								
	5-6 AM	6-7 AM	7AM-8 AM	8- 9AM	9-10 AM	3-4 PM	4-5 PM	5-6 pM	6-7 PM	7-8 PM	
	30	48	49	48	42	23	32	34	32	27	
											365

Distribution to Reno Road by Hour of the Day											
Concept C	Hourly	Total	11%								
	5-6 AM	6-7 AM	7AM-8 AM	8- 9AM	9-10 AM	3-4 PM	4-5 PM	5-6 pM	6-7 PM	7-8 PM	
	39	48	51	48	46	34	41	42	41	39	
											428

Question 37. My children and I live at Reno [Road] which already is very busy. With the opening of Eaton Elementary, we cannot push any more traffic into our neighborhoods.

Comment noted.

Question 38. DDOT needs to circle back to the schools on Reno Road as Page 41 of DDOT’s Report shows that Option C results in the thickest blue line of increased traffic pressure is on Reno Road which DDOT is endangering school kids.

DDOT met John Eaton Elementary School on April 27, 2021. Eaton Elementary School will be submitting comments to the Connecticut Avenue project record. DDOT contacted the principal at Murch Elementary School and the Connecticut Avenue project was discussed. Other schools in the study area will be contacted if a decision is made to proceed with either Concept B or Concept C.

Question 39. Is the Study Group familiar with the rush hour traffic on Connecticut Avenue in Maryland between Chevy Chase Circle and East-West Highway? This is an area of reduced lanes. The rush hour traffic is a nightmare. How would Connecticut Avenue traffic in DC be different?

Our traffic forecasts and capacity analysis show how traffic would operate under Concepts B and C. As we showed in our presentation, approximately four to five intersections of the 44 intersections in the combined primary and secondary study area would have congestion issues that would need to resolve itself through additional modal shifts or behavioral changes such as teleworking.

For some of the traffic diversion that we forecast, people in adjacent jurisdictions would make their travel decisions even before they arrive in the District of Columbia. Our traffic forecasts and level of service analysis are predicated on no substantial change in mode split for the Corridor. Traffic volumes are increased on an annual basis between 2018 and 2045. And, no change in pre-pandemic telework levels are assumed. If the traffic forecasts, as we have shown, are present in 2045, signal optimization changes alone will not be sufficient to prevent queuing, constrained levels of service and travel time increases at some intersections within the study area.

Question 40. Do diversion data take into account [the] effect of double-parking to load/unload, particularly diversion to local alternate routes?

It would be prohibited to stop and load in the Corridor along the travel lane. A component of any change in traffic operations is enforcement. We did not assume that there would be cars parked in the travel lane. If a travel lane is blocked today, it creates a choke point, however, modeling does not take into account sporadic or special situations described in this question.

Question 41. How does DDOT characterize these traffic and diversion estimates under Concepts B and C, respectively? Are they minor, manageable, significant or extreme?

Overall, DDOT has characterized the traffic and diversion estimates under Concepts B and C as manageable. We used this adjective because 39-40 of the 44 intersections had acceptable vehicle levels of service. Approximately 4 or 5 intersections incurred constrained levels of service (either LOS "E" or "F") and those intersections could be characterized as having significant impacts.

Question 42. And how might such traffic [in the area in Maryland between Chevy Chase Circle and East-West Highway] effect diversion analysis to nearby routes?

Our study area is comprehensive. We considered traffic volumes and developed forecasts at 24 intersections along Connecticut Avenue which captures the east-west cross street impacts. We considered 20 intersections in the secondary study area which considers roads such as Broad Branch Road/Beach Drive, Wisconsin Avenue, Reno Road, and Massachusetts Avenue. When we modeled the traffic with the alternative concepts, we were able to see the extent to which diversion might occur on nearby routes. Although our study did not analyze impacts to traffic in Maryland, the diversions are based on a "regional" model that accounts for vehicles traveling along Connecticut Avenue with origins/destinations outside of the primary or secondary study areas.

Question 43. I live on Woodley Place. Cars frequently divert to it from Connecticut and sometimes through the alley.

Comment is noted. Woodley Place is already oriented with paired one-way segments so it cannot host diverted through traffic from Connecticut Avenue. Our study did not specifically look at alley access.

Question 44. See Page 40 of your report which states that “55-60% of traffic diversions will occur from Connecticut Avenue with Option B diverting 3,160 [vehicles per day] but Option C would divert 122% more traffic to the alternative roads of Reno, Wisconsin Avenue and Massachusetts Avenue.

This is an accurate statement. The traffic analysis shows 3,160 vehicles per day diverting under Concept B and 7,020 vehicles per day diverting under Concept C.

Question 45. If you go with Option B, what percent of the car traffic will be diverted to Reno Road, Wisconsin Avenue and to Mass Avenue?

Option B is estimated to divert the traffic to the roadways noted above, as follows:

- Reno Road (19%)
- Wisconsin Avenue (38%)
- Massachusetts Avenue (27%)

Question 46. Are there anticipated changes in travel time in the corridor outside of the AM/PM rush hours, which is to say—will travel times be different in the 90% of the week that is not rush hour?

DDOT stated in our travel time analysis of the alternatives that peak hour peak direction travel times would increase by three and seven minutes during the morning peak hour for Concepts B and C, respectively. During the evening peak hour, the travel time would increase by four and eight minutes, for Concepts B and C, respectively. We would expect some increases in travel time in the shoulder periods (of the peak hours), but that number would be reduced during each successive hour during the peak periods, as traffic volumes decrease. During all off-peak periods (14 hours a day for Mondays through Fridays and 24-hours a day during weekends), there should not be travel time impacts. Therefore, during 118 of 168 hours a week, there would be minimal travel time changes within the Corridor (about 70 percent of the time).

Question 47. Does the reduced number of cars under Concept C result in faster bus service?

No. Since the capacity of Concept C is reduced by two travel lanes (as compared to today), buses would be in the same traffic stream as vehicular and other traffic. As we stated in the traffic impact analysis, Concept C would result in an additional 7 minutes in the morning rush hour peak direction (southbound) and an additional 8 minutes in the evening rush hour peak direction. Buses would incur the same/similar travel times as cars. DDOT would begin coordination with WMATA to develop revised service plans and mitigations should Concept C be selected.

Question 48. The legal definition (DCMR 18-9901) of “traffic” is not confined to motor vehicle drivers. “Traffic” [includes] motor vehicles and all other vehicles, pedestrians and animals of every description.

Comment noted.

Question 49. What provision in the study will be made for the fact that at present the total volume of traffic is significantly reduced but may resume at a level undetermined at this time, so will this project be paused until we can more accurately evaluate what the traffic volume will be when commerce resumes to pre-COVID levels.

Our traffic forecasts do not take into account the fluctuations of traffic volumes on a year-to-year basis. We look at the year 2045 horizon traffic volumes. The traffic forecasts are predicated on the number of employees and population estimates within the study area transportation analysis zones and within the Metropolitan Washington DC region.

Question 50. This may have been addressed already, but do you have diversion numbers if the vehicle use only returns to 75% of pre-COVID, given the expected continuation of some work-from-home?

We have modeled the diversion results for 2045 traffic conditions. We did conduct a what-if analysis that looked at a potential 20-percent decrease in traffic volumes, for example, if more people worked at home, compared to Pre-Covid and there would be less diversion and better vehicular levels of service than reported. Also, if diversion is less than our forecast on Connecticut Avenue, levels of service and travel time would be worse than reported.

Question 51. Perhaps residents would prefer to have a lane of parking and only one travel lane, instead of two travel lanes in both directions. Are two travel lanes necessary?

Two travel lanes are required in each direction along Connecticut Avenue to ensure adequate traffic operations.

Modal Share

Question 52. Do the vehicle/mode projections account for all people reducing solo driving to reduce their climate impact?

Traffic projections (Year 2045) account for employment and population estimates within the District of Columbia and the Metropolitan Washington region. The demographic projections are agreed upon by each of the jurisdictions that comprise the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOC). General mode splits for 2045 are accounted for at the regional level; however, specific changes in mode split for the Connecticut Avenue corridor is not incorporated into the modeling efforts.

Question 53. moveDC calls for moving 75% of commuter trips out of private vehicles, yet your analysis for even Concept C shows only 50% of trips on Connecticut Avenue moving to non-car modes. Is DDOT being aggressive enough?

The 75% number is aspirational for the District as a whole, not for specific corridors. The numbers that we are showing are a combination of forecasts and existing modal percentages (where available, such as existing bus and Metro ridership). Slide 72 (General Public Meeting Presentation, March 30/April 1, 2021) shows that with Concepts B and C, we would have approximately 58 percent and 51 percent, car trips on the Corridor, respectively. It is possible that with constrained traffic volumes along Connecticut Avenue, additional commuter traffic would select an alternative mode such as bus or Metro.

Question 54. How many residents along the Corridor own cars vs. the total number of residents? Why are the car free residents required to subsidize the ... choices of car owners?

Please see vehicle ownership estimates in Ward 3 based on the American Community Survey (2014-2018):

Means of Transportation to Work, Residents

	<i>District of</i>	<i>Ward 3(%)</i>
<i>Drive-alone</i>	<i>34.3</i>	<i>39.3</i>
<i>Public Transportation</i>	<i>34.8</i>	<i>32.7</i>
<i>Carpool</i>	<i>5.3</i>	<i>6.4</i>
<i>Bicycle</i>	<i>4.5</i>	<i>2.7</i>
<i>Taxi, Motorcycle, Other</i>	<i>1.9</i>	<i>2.1</i>
<i>Walk</i>	<i>13.1</i>	<i>7.6</i>
<i>Worked at home</i>	<i>6.1</i>	<i>9.3</i>
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>

Question 55. What are DDOT’s latest numbers on how people get to work before the virus (i.e., take Metro or bus, walk, bike, drive, rideshare, etc.)?

Citywide, pre-pandemic, DC was carrying around 42% of commuters by Metro / bus, around 6% by bicycle, and around 5% by walking. The remainder was by personal vehicle. DC’s goal is to have 75% of commuter trips by Metro/bus, bicycling, and walking by 2030.

Question 56. This has been a recurring issue in this process—the mode share on roadway users looks at the entire corridor which incorporates suburban drivers but the mode share on Metrorail only looks at local riders. In total, the Red Line moves way more people than cars. An apple to apples comparison would compare local car trips vs. local origin transit or corridor length car trips vs. corridor length transit trips.

Our study did not include modeling multimodal shifts as that is a significant effort on its own. We looked at the make-up of multimodal users on the corridor vs other users of the corridor. It is not an incorrect assumption that some suburban drivers will choose to use alternate routes such as the Metrorail Red Line instead of taking their car and that would not be captured in our study.

Pedestrians

Question 57. Why do your numbers not include the significant pedestrian usage of the Corridor?

Please see DDOT’s Existing Conditions Report. We show the number of pedestrians for each of the intersections within the study area for morning, midday and evening peak hours. Pedestrian counts are provided for all 44 primary and secondary study area intersections.

Question 58. Please detail protections for pedestrians and wheelers (and Metro Access drop-offs from the bikes in the bike lane)? Sadly, many bikers don’t respect traffic rules.

With regard to the comment that many bikers do not respect the traffic rules, DDOT believes that our transportation system is based on laws, regulations and expectations that all traffic (vehicles, pedestrians,

cyclists, scooters, etc.) will follow the “rules of the road” and obey traffic laws. However, we note that all modes do not always follow traffic laws. When we do not provide safe infrastructure for cyclists, they are left to their own devices and that’s when we see the least compliant behavior.

Question 59. Do we forecast foot traffic?

We have not forecasted pedestrian volumes.

Transit

Question 60. Far-side bus stops will back up traffic when the bus stops to pick up or drop off riders. What will happen to stopped traffic that is stuck in the nearside intersection?

This is a very general statement and not all far-side stops will necessarily create that condition. It will be based on each individual bus stop and specifically designed in accordance with the analysis for that stop. We will have different bus stop designs based on whether Concept B or Concept C is selected.

Question 61. Under Concept B, would any efforts be made to enable bus efficiency and biker safety (e.g., encouraging use of side lanes for these modes of transport only)? If so, what can you say about projected effects of such changes?

Under Concept B, DDOT shows the potential conversion of near-side bus stops to far-side bus stops. Generally, efficiencies in terms of reduced lost time at bus stops have been shown at far-side bus stop locations. Bicycle access along Connecticut Avenue would be the same under Concept B, generally, as it is today. Bicycles and buses may use the outer lanes of the six-lane cross section. No special signage or markings for bicycles or buses are anticipated under Concept B. Once a concept is selected, the Project Team will work with the Bus Priority Team in DDOT to make sure various tools from our Bus Priority toolkit are used to ensure that bus operations are improved and made safe with whatever concept is selected.

Question 62. Why aren’t bus priority improvements being considered along Connecticut Avenue?

We have a bus priority program at DDOT. You can go to our website and learn more about the bus priority network which was developed in partnership with WMATA and the Circulator Team and reflected in the moveDC update. As noted in our current moveDC update, Connecticut Avenue is not identified as a bus priority corridor. That is due to the presence of Metrorail along the Corridor, the constrained right-of-way and the need for dedicated bike facilities. At this time DDOT is not considering dedicated bus lanes on Connecticut Avenue. We will be considering other strategies that are more tactical or operational in nature that will allow us to maintain and improve bus operations and to make sure that everyone can access the existing and proposed bus stop locations.

Question 63. There have been talks about the Cleveland Park Metro stop being closed. How will this affect your plans for traffic in the area?

With the American Recovery Plan stimulus recently passed by Congress, WMATA has indicated they are reevaluating the need for station closures. DDOT will continue to monitor future WMATA operational changes.

Bicycle

Question 64. The increase in daily bike usage on Connecticut Avenue under “C” from 300 to 3,200 is significant. Are there other on-street bike facilities in DC that carry a comparable volume? And does that level of increase in bike use have a positive impact on retail.

The 15th Street NW cycletrack has is a comparable daily volume, anywhere from 2,500 to 4,000 riders per day. Economic studies of the business effects of a bike lane along Connecticut Avenue have not occurred. Research studies from cities that have implemented protected bicycle lanes on arterials will be posted on the Connecticut Avenue Project Website. Generally, these studies look at before and after impacts; they have not forecast business effects before the bike lanes have been implemented.

Question 65. How can you say that 3,000+ cyclists will use Concept C? This would be an increase of 10 to 50 times the current usage! You admit you don’t have models for this...so did you pull this number out of a hat?

The 3,000+ cyclists predicted is based upon a model utilizing existing bike counts and Capital Bikeshare data and comparing that to increases seen when developing similar facilities. The bicycle forecasts are for a long-term horizon.

DDOT has estimated long-term bicycle usage along the Connecticut Avenue corridor using the following data sources.

- *Historic bike count data from DDOT (2009-2019). This dataset includes annual manual counts for 92 locations in the District.*
- *Bike count data from DDOT for Connecticut Avenue NW.*
- *Capital Bikeshare (CaBi) origin-destination (O-D) data from Capital Bikeshare. This is a robust dataset that includes the day, time, start and end bikeshare station for every CaBi trip taken since the system launched in 2010.*

We used the CycleStreets routing algorithm to assign bike trips to the roadway network and simulate the effects of a Connecticut Avenue NW separated bike facility on cyclist trip choices in the vicinity of the study area. This algorithm, developed specifically for bicycle route planning, assigns bike trips to the roadway network based on a variety of factors, including bike facility type, traffic volumes, posted speed, and elevation change. Trip routing can be adjusted by the end user to indicate preference for the most direct route, the most comfortable route (aka, the “quietest” route), or a balanced route that balances directness and comfort.

Safety

Question 66. Can you recap which concept improves safety the most?

Concept C would improve safety more than Concept B. Concept B will provide a reduction in crashes just by removing the reversible lanes. Concept C, by the removal of the reversible lanes and including protected bicycle lanes should result in a decrease in speed along Connecticut Avenue and increase pedestrian safety by

separating bicycles from pedestrians on sidewalks. Concept C also provides for left turn pockets which would help to provide a reduction in angle crashes.

Question 67. Have there been studies to date [that] include sidewalk crashes involving bikes and scooters? I wonder what would be the safety impacts for sidewalk pedestrians if a dedicated bike lane was provided along Connecticut Avenue.

DDOT has not conducted studies regarding sidewalk crashes involving bikes and scooters. These crashes typically do not get included on police reports. Anecdotally, we have heard from the community that these crashes occur.

Question 68. I would like to hear some crash statistics for Connecticut Avenue, particularly those occurring during peak hours or transitions to/from reversible lanes.

We looked at 1,507 police-reported crashes and we determined that 401 resulted in injuries or possible injuries, 64 involved pedestrians, and 39 involved cyclists. We did find that 46 percent of all crashes occurred during reversible lane hours. Of those crashes, 36 percent can be directly attributable to the reversible lane condition. Many of these crashes were due to vehicles turning out of the wrong lane, making U-turns, or drivers confused by the operations of the reversible lanes. We also looked at comparable corridors and we found that Connecticut Avenue had a higher crash rate than some corridors like Wisconsin Avenue or Massachusetts Avenue, but had a lower rate than Georgia Avenue or Rhode Island Avenue.

Question 69. The speed limit is 30 mph. What is the actual average speed? I suspect it is much higher. Drivers go way too fast on Connecticut Avenue.

Anecdotally, we have heard from the public that the speeds on Connecticut Avenue are greater than the posted speed limit of 30 mph. When we took our speed counts, they were at around 30 mph or below. Please keep in mind that when we determine the average speeds among road segments, we will not see the extremes such as the high speeds and low speeds since they are incorporated into the average value. There have been a number of emails and comments from the public attesting to speeding vehicles along Connecticut Avenue. DDOT is recommending that the posted speed be reduced from 30 mph to 25 mph. After the speed change is in effect for a period of time, DDOT would consider the addition of one or two automated speed cameras to enforce the posted speed limits.

Question 70. Do any of these options address excessive speed for through traffic such as by deployment of speed cameras or via additional enforcement? Currently, it appears that very few motorists are penalized for dangerous excessive speed.

One of the recommendations is to reduce the posted speed along Connecticut Avenue from 30 mph to 25 mph. Most likely, DDOT can implement this recommendation before the "larger concepts" might be implemented. We would then wait a period of time so that drivers can get used to the new speed limits. We would work with our automated enforcement staff to consider one or more locations where we could potentially deploy speed cameras.

Question 71. What period of time does your crash stats cover? Was it independently validated by MPD?

The crash stats cover the years from 2015 to 2019 (pre-pandemic). The statistics are directly taken from the MPD crash database and police reports.

Question 72. Do you have any sense of how many of the crashes along Connecticut involved elderly drivers?

For the crash analysis, the project team did not analyze the demographics of motorists. This is something that we can look into. However, it may be noted that older drivers are more challenged by skewed (angled) intersections.

Concepts- No Build Option

Question 73. With regard to the No-Build Concept, are you satisfied that you can legitimately be guided today by the concept of what the “No-Build” concept will result in given the timeframe is 25-years hence.

Yes. The No-Build Concept is established as a baseline for which to measure and compare the impacts of other alternatives that are under consideration. The No-Build Concept assumes 2045 employment and population estimates in the Corridor that have been agreed to by the District of Columbia and jurisdictions within the Metropolitan Washington DC Region (Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments component jurisdictions). The No-Build Concept assumes that that capacity and directionality of the peak hour travel lanes remain as they are today. This type of analysis helps us to understand the traffic operational conditions in the Corridor without any capacity and geometric changes.

Question 74. Would we be able to leave the “No-Build” in place for a term such as 5 or 10 years and then revisit this entire project with a greater amount of accurate data collected in the meantime?

Certainly, the “existing condition” or a “No-Build” condition could be left in place for a period of time if it is desired by stakeholders in the Corridor.

Question 75. Can we accept the “No-Build” but eliminate the lane reversal and just let the roadway have two lanes northbound and southbound with parking on both east and west sides to move traffic efficiently and protect pedestrians at the same time?

Concept B eliminates the reversible lanes and retains parking on both sides of the street during the off-peak hours. Concept B substantially maintains the roadway capacity with less diversion. Concept B retains the off-peak condition exactly the way it is today.

Question 76. I understand there are two groups against overhead signs or arrows, but I think that arrows overhead would help enormously for reversible lanes. Is there any possibility of having overhead arrows, like there is on Colesville Road?

DDOT believes that overhead signs and arrows would make the Corridor safer under No-Build conditions, that is, if no changes were made to the reversible lane system. However, as you mentioned, the groups that would be opposed to the overhead signs and signals are the Commission on Fine Arts and the State Historic Preservation Office. Their concerns are related to the visibility and historic impacts if overhead signs and signals were constructed. DDOT does not believe that we could overcome the objections of these two groups, and potentially, other members of the Community that may raise visibility and historic issues.

Question 77. What is CFA’s specific objection to overhead signage and why does CFA get a veto?

One, this is a federal project and we will be preparing environmental documentation in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act including our Section 106 process. The primary objection is that overhead signals would have visual impacts to the Corridor. Many areas of Connecticut Avenue have historic properties and therefore, historic and visual issues will be important considerations.

Question 78. Will there be large electric signs along the MD line?"

The individual is speaking of overhead signs and signals similar to what is shown on Colesville Road in Montgomery County. Please see the photograph below. DDOT is not considering the placement of overhead lane use signals in the Connecticut Avenue corridor. We have proposed this as one possible solution. The Commission on Fine Arts and the DC State Historic Preservation Office does not support this lane use solution due to potential visual impacts.



Question 79. If the no build is selected, would there still be opportunities to get some safety improvements like Hawk Signals.

On Slides 57-59 for the General Public Meeting presentation, we show a number of potential safety and mobility improvements. If the No-Build Concept or a Build Concept is selected, we will evaluate the identified locations and conduct specific engineering studies to determine if the locations meet warrants.

Concepts- Option B

Question 80. Does DDOT expect Concept B would result in increased speeding on the Corridor?

It is hypothesized that since Concept B has six lanes of traffic during peak periods, with no turns or buffers, the vehicle speeds under Concept B would be greater than under Concept C.

Question 81. Option B is the only Option that benefits the overwhelming majority of DC residents and taxpayers. Option C punishes the majority for the luxury of the handful of privileged.

Comment is noted.

Question 82. If DDOT goes forward with Option B, how should I bike in the Corridor? If the answer is “on the street”, can you honestly tell me that is safe? Or should I bike on the sidewalk?

That would be a choice for cyclists. Option B does not provide bicycle protection. The condition would be basically like it is today.

Question 83. Why would Concept B only remove parking to 25-foot visibility? DCMR 18-2405.2c prohibits parking within 40-feet of intersections, not just 25-feet (25-feet is for stop signs, the far-side of one-way streets and residential areas)?

The intersection clearance includes 25-feet plus the crosswalk width of 15 to 20 feet, and therefore combined we have in excess of 40-feet.

Question 84. I ride my bike regularly along Connecticut Avenue and find it very dangerous. Since bike safety is agreed as one of the priorities of this project, I would have thought that Concept B would be out of the running. Please explain why bike safety is not decisive.

There are no Concepts “out of the running” until DDOT receives all input from stakeholders. We have received significant input from stakeholders prior to the March 30/April 1, 2021 Public Meeting, and we expect to conclude formal stakeholder input by May 1, 2021. All factors, not only bike safety, will be taken into account when rendering a recommendation for a preferred concept.

Question 85. If Concept B doesn’t meet multimodal and safety goals, then why is it still being entertained? Some compromise with buffers is better than completely ignoring bike/ped safety.

DDOT stated that not all concepts will meet the full project purpose and need. As we stated, Concept B removes the reversible lanes which does meet our safety goal. It does not, however, meet our multimodal accessibility goal. Concept C provides a compromise—it provides additional multimodal accessibility via a protected bicycle lane with reduced buffers and removes the reversible lanes. Both options are retained until after the public meeting where we will review comments from all stakeholders and consider the consistency of each option with the plans, programs and vision of DDOT and the District of Columbia.

Question 86. Explain Concept B regarding use of buses and bikes.

All lanes would be available for all modes. There are no dedicated lanes for transit and bikes. There would be no special signage. Therefore, the condition is similar to what it is today with the exception of the removal of the reversible lanes. Buses and bikes can use any lanes that they desire; however, we observe in the field that buses and bike, for the most part, use the outer right lanes today and this would not change under Concept B. Bus usage under Concepts B and C would not be sensitive to lane usage. Bus usage relates to cost and travel time elasticities and land uses in the Corridor such as employment and residential accessibility. Bus usage is also sensitive to income and car ownership. Travel time for buses would be the same as other vehicles in Concept B. They would be in the same traffic stream as other vehicles. (And this is true for Concept C as well).

Question 87. Is it possible to bifurcate the work so that Concept B could be implemented from Cathedral to Calvert?

DDOT's objective is to ask the Community-- Do you want a bicycle facility (including the removal of the reversible lanes) along Connecticut Avenue or do you want only the removal of the reversible lanes? If Concept B is selected (removal of the reversible lanes only), the project would be completed in its entirety from Calvert Street NW to Legation Street NW (this is the section of the reversible lanes). Perhaps this question is not worded as the respondent intended. We think perhaps the respondent wanted to know—can we remove the reversible lanes in their entirety and only implement protected bicycle lanes from Legation Street NW to Cathedral Avenue NW. If this is the case, DDOT's position is that we would want to include a protected bicycle facility for the entire length of the study corridor or not implement a bicycle facility, at all. A continuous network of protected bike lanes provides the safest and most comfortable option for bike users and meets the moveDC goals for the corridor.

Concepts Option C

Question 88. [Concept C] Our customers will not walk a block out of their way to come into the retail outlets.

Your comment is noted.

Question 89. I think you should emphasize more that Concept C does include an important benefit for drivers and the smooth flow of traffic with the additional turn pockets- currently, cars turning left constrict Connecticut Avenue traffic to one lane and create dangerous merges behind queued cars.

We agree. This is a benefit of Concept C which provides turn pockets to improve safety for vehicles turning left while also allowing for protected-only signal phasing across the one-way cycle track. This ensure that vehicles are not turning concurrently with bicycles crossing the side streets.

Question 90. "Concept C is the only one that accommodates all people and all modes." It is the only viable option. Followed up by "Parking is not an absolute right."

Comment noted.

Question 91. In Concept C parking numbers, are you assuming that the bike lane will be squeezed down below minimum dimensions for ALL blocks in the corridor? Initially, the proposal was only to reduce bike lane width (and comfort) at commercial blocks only.

In Concept C, DDOT has stated that our primary emphasis will be to provide parking on one-side of the street in commercial nodes. DDOT also stated that if there are parking issues that are identified in specific residential blocks, we would consider the possibility of a parking lane in limited situations.

Question 92. How much will Concept C cost?

Concept C is estimated to cost \$4.6M.

Question 93. I strongly support Option C. I also encourage DDOT to reduce the lane size to 9-feet rather than 10-feet and add bulb outs to reduce the amount of road pedestrians have to cross.

Comment noted. DDOT desires to retain 10-foot travel lanes since Connecticut Avenue is a designated truck and bus route that needs to accommodate larger vehicles.

Question 94. In Concept C, are you now proposing to include some parking/loading on every block? This severely impacts the comfort, capacity, and potentially, safety of the protected bicycle lane. Initially, parking for Concept C was discussed only on commercial blocks.

In Concept C, DDOT has stated that our primary emphasis will be to provide parking on one-side of the street in commercial nodes. DDOT also stated that if there are parking issues that are identified in specific residential blocks, we would consider the possibility of a parking lane in limited situations.

Question 95. Would Concept C add 24-hour PUDO in areas where it does not exist today? If so, where would they be?

DDOT cannot state what the optimal mix of short-term and longer-term parking would look like until we initiate conceptual engineering of the Corridor. In the event that an option is selected that removes parking, we will begin conceptual engineering and evaluate each blockface individually to identify the appropriate mix of specific time-based parking spaces as well potential dynamic pricing of the parking supply.

Question 96. If Alternative C is not chosen, then where does DDOT expect people on bikes to proceed through the Corridor safely?

If a bicycle facility is not selected for Connecticut Avenue, it would be just as it is today. People would find alternate routes through the neighborhoods or bike on Connecticut Avenue.

Question 97. I support Concept C. I hope the Council funds it to allow for a thorough analysis and implementation to best place loading, PUDO, and metered parking at and around our commercial centers. Concept B is a surrender of the many DC transportation and climate goals.

Comment noted.

Question 98. [Concept C] Is the concrete barrier absolutely necessary?

We have a variety of barriers and usually we do not determine which ones to use until final design. We have some ideas if Concept C is selected. Connecticut Avenue is a fairly narrow cross section. If we did go a Concept C cross section, perhaps an 8" wide barrier would be appropriate to give that extra protection within the available space.

Question 99. [Reference to Concept C]. There has been a dramatic increase in online shopping and as a result, we have many more vehicles that need short-term parking from Amazon, FedEx and food deliveries. How will trucks needing to make deliveries be able to park for short periods of time on Connecticut Avenue?

Under Concept C, parking would be accommodated on one side of the street in commercial areas and to a very limited extent (potentially) in some residential sections of Connecticut Avenue. The existing on-street parking spaces would be optimized to change long-term spaces to short-term and Pick-Up-Drop-Off spaces.

Short-term deliveries within residential areas will be encouraged to use circular driveways and off-street parking provided by condo and apartment buildings where practical.

Question 100. Should Concept C be chosen, how would DDOT determine whether to extend Concept C north to Chevy Chase?

DDOT has indicated that we would consider the potential extension of a protected bicycle facility to perhaps just south of Northampton Street if a protected bicycle lane concept is recommended. If Concept C becomes a preferred alternative, DDOT would conduct additional due diligence efforts for parking and traffic conditions from Legation Street NW to south of Chevy Chase Circle and engage businesses and stakeholders as necessary.

Question 101. There is an existing bike lane system running on Woodley Place along Connecticut.

Comment noted.

Question 102. Why not move the bike lane to Reno Road and let Connecticut Avenue serve the needs of the majority who use buses, pedestrians and cars?

We do have bike lanes on a portion of Reno Road from Tilden Street to Van Ness. North of this location, protected bicycle facilities are not proposed as the road is only 30-feet wide. Connecticut Avenue provides a greater degree of connection to residential and commercial land uses where Reno Road is largely residential. Reno Road is not in any planning documents or bicycle facility plans.

Question 103. If Concept C is adopted, will it be possible to use the same concrete barriers that were used on the Crosstown Cycletrack by Washington Hospital Center? These provide much more protection than the little wheel stops.

We have a variety of barriers and usually we do not determine which ones to use until final design. We have some ideas if Concept C is selected. Connecticut Avenue is a fairly narrow cross section for all of the things we are trying to fit into it. If we did go with that cross section, perhaps an 8" wide barrier would be appropriate to give that extra protection within the available space. We have a variety of concrete wheel stops and they probably would be narrower than Irving Street because of the constraints in the right-of-way.

Question 104. I have been a victim of traffic violence in DC as well as my spouse and my kids. Option C makes the street safer for everyone. With 30 people dying of traffic violence every year in the District of Columbia, if they could be here, I think we know what option they would pick. So please choose Safety.

Comment noted.

Question 105. What traffic calming and safety options would there be for pedestrians and bicyclists affected by the traffic diverted in Option C? Please just don't move the problem over to their streets. Take the opportunity to address this comprehensively.

In future planning efforts, we would look to see if there are issues today in terms of unsafe behaviors by drivers already on the roads that might continue if a change to Connecticut Avenue occurs. Do residents see speeding on adjacent corridors such as on Reno Road, Wisconsin Avenue and other roadways? Are there pedestrian and cyclist crashes that are occurring on these parallel roads that may warrant traffic calming

mitigation? If the community identifies potential problems that are already in their neighborhoods, DDOT can work with those neighborhoods to identify potential traffic calming strategies.

Question 106. According to your pre-pandemic existing conditions report, which does not show the obvious decline in winter bike usage, the average intersection on Connecticut Avenue sees under 100 cyclists per day, meanwhile there are 30,000 cars that utilize the same corridor every day, you admit that virtually all of these road users will be will be negatively impacted by Concept C either by diversion or making the same trip down a more congested Connecticut Avenue and take over 50 percent longer and by diverting thousands of cars daily to places like Wisconsin Avenue and Mass. Avenue and Reno Road, etc. you are making travel more difficult for almost 100,000 other drivers per day. Given these statistics which are your statistics how can you in good conscious justify punishing about 125,000 cars per day to appease 100 cyclists.

DDOT is considering the vision of District of Columbia and the vision and mission of the District Department of Transportation while taking into account all of the District-wide plans, programs and policies. It is true that we have a low bicycle usage today likely due to the absence of protected facilities. The projections for bicycle usage would be just over 3,000 cyclists per day in the long-term if we accommodate an alternative that has a protected bicycle facility. We are looking at safety, multimodal accessibility and mobility as part of the overall vision for the Corridor. DDOT has not selected a preferred concept as of this writing and therefore, the No-Build Concept and Concepts B and C are under consideration.

Question 107. [Regarding Concept C]. You have selected this 2.7-mile corridor as your principal study area, and in the previous learning room, you indicated that the secondary study area does extend from Western Avenue to the north and Dupont to the south. What will be the process to decide whether you will extend the protected bicycle facility to the north? And then if I am driving south on Connecticut Avenue and I get to Calvert and then onto the Duke Ellington Bridge?

The alternatives that we are looking at, at this time, are limited to the Connecticut Avenue corridor that was initially identified. In the event that Concept C is selected as a preferred concept, DDOT would consider the possible extension of the protected bicycle lanes to the north, perhaps, just south of Chevy Chase Circle. We would need to conduct our due diligence in terms of additional traffic and parking studies.

Protected bicycle facilities south of Calvert Street are not being studied or planned at this time. The dimensions of the Taft Bridge are a major impediment. If a protected cycle track ends at Calvert Street, you can connect to the Rock Creek Trail.

Question 108. How does flipping parking back and forth—east side, west side, as proposed in one of the options allow for a contiguous bike lane?

A continuous bike lane would be provided along the corridor for Alternative C. Wherever there is a parking lane, we must narrow the bike lane and then narrow the buffer. Shifting from one side of the road to the other requires maintaining transition areas that work with design standards. We cannot go back and forth multiple times in short distances such as the length of a block.

Question 109. Drop-off spaces will be filled with trucks making deliveries. They won't be used by consumers. Will parking spaces be identified differently for consumers.

We would work with the businesses on a block-by-block basis and try to make a determination of the general parking time requirements of customers on a particular blockface. We recognize the shortage of loading in the corridor currently which is why you see trucks blocking travel lanes or taking up parking spaces that should be dedicated to consumers. We will be looking at the total allocation of parking space types on each blockface and considering additional loading at various times of the day for trucks to make deliveries. Enforcement would be key to ensuring that the spaces are occupied by the types of vehicles intended by any new regulations.

Question 110. [Regarding Concept C]. Have you considered the pick-up and drop-off needs of the many Zoo visitors during rush hours?

DDOT would coordinate with the Zoo regarding their access needs in the event that Concept B or Concept C is selected.

Question 111. Has there been any exploration of extending the protected bicycle lanes from Calvert Street to California Road where the Connecticut Avenue Deckover streetscape project is being completed? It seems to me that having that Connection would really help to be able to connect to the rest of the District's [bicycle] network. Having these connections are very critical and I encourage you to explore that.

The area to the south of Calvert Street has not been part of our scope of work. DDOT conducted a very high level of analysis looking at the width of the road and what would be necessary to continue a protected bicycle facility to the south along Connecticut Avenue. The Connecticut Avenue roadway width narrows to 50-feet and then over the Taft Bridge its only 40-feet. There has been no traffic analysis or public outreach for this effort, thus far.

Question 112. My question relates to deliveries being made in residential areas. We all know that there has been a dramatic increase in online shopping vs. shopping at retail stores, and as a result, you have many more trucks from Amazon and UPS, from FedEx, all parking in residential areas to make deliveries. Has this long-term trend been taken into account to accommodate trucks stopping to make deliveries?

We initially said that we would accommodate parking on one side of the street (for Concept C) in commercial areas. DDOT has since stated that we would consider locations for on-street parking where the condos and apartments are located, where there are currently no proximate opportunities such as circular driveways, surface lots or other areas where trucks can go to deliver their packages. Any consideration of a parking lane in residential areas would be limited.

Question 113. Are you assuming that the truck drivers will cross a busy Connecticut Avenue to deliver a package? They are going to want to park on the side where the Apartment is located.

DDOT will need to consider strategies for aggressive enforcement to ensure that trucks do not block traffic lanes.

Question 114. Why wasn't Reno Rd. considered for a bike route? It would connect with the bike lane being built on Massachusetts Ave."

The only section of Reno Road identified in planning documents for bicycle lanes is between Tilden Street and Van Ness Street. We installed lanes on that section last year.

Concepts-Other

Question 115. Is there some way to make the choice less binary? Options B and C seem to be "rising to the top" but are very far starkly different in terms of what each value (bike lanes for parking). How can the process work to find a compromise between the two?

No. Concept B simply removes the reversible lanes and includes six-travel lanes (three lanes in each direction) during peak periods and four-travel lanes with two parking lanes during non-peak periods.

DDOT considered the requirements for many concepts in terms of traffic operations, potential diversion, parking, bicycle, pedestrian and transit access and other criteria. Concept C represents a compromise in that bicycle lanes would be provided with reduced widths and buffers at commercial locations in exchange for the provision of one-lane of all-day parking (i.e. within the fixed 60' curb-to-curb width). Other concepts that we looked at would eliminate ALL parking in the Corridor. If the public has additional ideas for other feasible concepts that DDOT may not have considered, please let us know.

Question 116. Why is D-1 and D-2 not feasible?

Option D-1 deficiencies include:

- *Traffic signal and signing required to include left/right-turn "protected only" phases or restrictions to meet DDOT Bicycle Facility Design Guide for two (2) way cycle tracks.*
- *The addition of turn lanes, per DDOT Standards, would preclude the inclusion of the NB parking lane as shown in the concept.*
- *Left and right turn lanes are not constructible along the same or opposing approaches.*

Concept D-2 deficiencies include:

- *Traffic signal and signing required to include left/right-turn "protected only" phases or restrictions to meet DDOT Bicycle Facility Design Guide standards for two (2) way cycle tracks.*
- *Left and right turn lanes not constructible along the same or opposing approaches.*
- *Concept D-2 has only one travel lane in the northbound direction in the off-peak period.*

Question 117. Can you discuss the use of concrete barriers in a potential cycle track option?

We have a suite of different protection products that we use for longitudinal and vertical barriers and we usually wait until we have a plan view layout chosen. Some of the common products that we use are either 18" or 24" wide continuous concrete blocks, sometimes the protection devices are more like a long concrete fill shape. We may space them out every 20-feet with a vertical post in between them. We can use concrete wheel stops similar to what you see in parking lots. And for raised platforms, there is a new product that DDOT is sourcing. They are called Zicla vectorial systems where it brings the bike lane up to sidewalk level and

makes a level platform for bus boardings and alightings and deconflicts the bus stops so that we have a level grade out to the existing sidewalk.

Question 118. If we can have parking + bike lanes in place of the traffic lane on one side of the Avenue in Option C, why not in place of a lane on the other side? And can some parking be added to non-commercial strips, to help with capacity and to improve safety?

Given the curb-to-curb width of 60-feet along Connecticut Avenue, only one lane of parking can be accommodated in Concept C. The areas targeted for the one lane of parking would be the commercial nodes along the Corridor. We are considering parking in residential areas in very limited circumstances.

Question 119. Will either plan have an impact on the side access streets in Cleveland Park? Will they become pedestrianized?

At this point in the project development process, DDOT anticipates that we would look at the parking regulations on all side streets within Cleveland Park (and other areas) to identify the optimal mix of time-of-day needs, parking pricing and potential conversion of longer-term spaces (e.g., residential parking, two-hour spaces, and other) to short-term and Pick-Up/Drop-Off (PUDO) parking spaces. DDOT will also consider the access and circulation requirements for side streets vis-à-vis any changes to Connecticut Avenue.

Question 120. Woodley Place is 250-feet from Connecticut Avenue, isn't there a way to have a bike lane going through Cleveland Park, protected lane area, in front of the Zoo down Cathedral to Woodley Place?

If a bike lane alternative is selected, it is DDOT's desire to have a consistent protected bicycle lane for the entire length of Connecticut Avenue Study Area corridor. Even if a bicycle lane ended at Woodley Place, in our view, bicyclists would continue along the Avenue instead of diverting to Woodley Place, Calvert Street and then back onto Connecticut Avenue.

Question 121. Is there a difference in the locations of the southern terminus between each Concept (i.e., the intersection where the streetscape would end)?

No. The southern terminus of each concept is the same- Calvert Street NW.

Question 122. Perhaps DDOT could talk to the businesses/Main Street organizations about creating a shuttle service for people in the neighborhood who can't walk or bike to the stores and restaurants.

We can certainly speak with Main Streets about a potential business shuttle operation. In addition, we can meet with our Circulator Team and discuss potential Circulator operations as a complement to any roadway design and parking changes that might occur in the Connecticut Avenue corridor.

Question 123. DDOT just built a new bike lane at the community's request along Woodley Place to circumvent the commercial district. Why would we look to duplicate the work that was just done?

Connecticut Avenue is on the moveDC Long-Range Plan as a bicycle priority corridor. We are looking at directness of route, topography and ease of use. The Woodley Place project was installed in 2019. The idea was to connect to the Calvert Street bike lanes. The Woodley Place NW bike lane serves as a low volume neighborhood connector bike lane. There is a fair amount of grade change. It would be difficult to design how a person traveling south on Connecticut Avenue would turn safely onto Woodley Road (or Cathedral Avenue)

and turn right onto Woodley Place. This is a very complex series of maneuvers and especially, with the range of bicycle volumes that we expect along Connecticut Avenue.

Question 124. Is the existing tree canopy retained for all options?

The existing tree canopy is not affected in any of the options since any changes to Connecticut Avenue will be within the existing 60' curb-to-curb width of the roadway.

Question 125. Have you considered how Options B and C would accommodate weekend Zoo Parking and Zoo special events such as Zoo Lights?

DDOT has met with the Smithsonian Zoo's Office of Planning and Project Development. Zoo planners have said that their primary concern is availability of street parking in the neighborhoods. DDOT would continue to meet with Zoo planners to discuss ingress and egress requirements at the Zoo entrance during different times of the day including seasonal differences in Zoo attendance. DDOT will coordinate with Zoo Planners to identify potential transit needs during the "Zoo Lights" event and at other times of the year.

Question 126. Why is the intersection visibility only 25-feet if regulations now indicate the new standards are 40-feet?

The intersection clearance includes 25-feet plus the crosswalk width of 15 to 20 feet, and therefore combined we have in excess of 40-feet.

Question 127. I live in the Connecticut Avenue corridor and would like to use Connecticut Avenue to get to different neighborhood main streets in order to shop and run errands. What steps will be taken to provide for bike parking and turning safety in these areas.

Residents can request bike racks in the public space by submitting a 311 request. As part of the Connecticut Avenue project, if Concept C were selected, we would work with our planners in DDOT's Sustainability Programs Branch to develop a plan for Bike Parking perhaps in the short-term, mid-term and long-term. Also, please see the following website: <https://ddot.dc.gov/service/bicycle-parking>

Question 128. Why doesn't the study extend to the Maryland border? And south to Dupont for that matter?

The scope of the study, including the study limits, was set forth in 2018 and 2019 with comments taken into account by the ANCs and the Community. DDOT has stated that if a bicycle lane concept is recommended as the preferred alternative, we would consider analyzing a potential extension to the north with the limits at approximately south of Northampton Street. DDOT is not considering, during this study effort, any potential extension of protected bicycle lanes to the south to Dupont Circle. There are right-of-way/curb-to-curb width constraints at the Taft Bridge and other locations to the south, and that would be the subject of another evaluation.

Question 129. How will DDOT choose between either Concept B or C?

The DDOT recommendation will be based upon the vision of the District of Columbia and the vision and mission of DDOT. In addition, we will consider all stakeholder comments that are sent to us and then frame the decision based on those factors.

Concept Evaluation Matrix

Question 130. The evaluation criteria do not consider the effect of each of the proposals on traffic flow overall in NW DC; nor the effect on the commuter cut-through traffic on streets closely parallel to Connecticut Avenue (such as Linnean Avenue, Albemarle, 30th Street and Nevada).

The traffic modeling and analysis that was performed included 24 intersections along the Corridor itself plus an additional 20 intersections within the area bounded by Massachusetts Avenue (to the west), Western Avenue, (to the north) Broad Branch Road/Beach Drive (to the east) and Dupont Circle (to the south). The traffic model that was used was the regional Metropolitan Washington Council of Government (MWCOG) model that includes the entire transportation network within the Washington DC region including areas in Northwest DC. We stated that the model does have limitations in terms of more accurately predicting travel on higher-level roads such as Wisconsin Avenue and a lower level of accuracy in predicting traffic volumes on lower-level roads such as Linnean Avenue, etc.

Question 131. Since both Concept B and C have the same score, how will DDOT choose between the two?

DDOT will not look at discrete scores, per se. We are looking at a number of factors. Basically, Concepts B and C contain positive values and the other concepts all score in the negative. The selection of a preferred concept will be based on: (a) all stakeholder comments received prior to the public meeting, at the public meeting and during the 30-day comment period; and (b) a review of the consistency of each concept with current DC plans and programs, and the established goals and vision for DDOT and the District of Columbia. We will consider such plans as Vision Zero, moveDC, Bicycle Master Plan, Sustainable DC 2.0, Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Amendment Act of 2016, Vision Zero Enhancement Omnibus Amendment Act of 2019 and others.

Question 132. The Concept Evaluation Matrix weights all of the criteria equally. Why should parking and loading and PUDO (for example) be as important as safety (for example)?

The evaluation did not weight each criterion. Parking to some constituencies may be as important as safety and other goals. The idea was to identify which concepts, overall, had positive values and attributes and those concepts that had negative values where major constraints could make implementation very difficult or not constructible.

Question 133. Please explain why parking is rated a +2 for "B" and a -1 for "C". It seems that "C" gets insufficient credit for the pick-up and drop-off zones.

Parking is rated a +2 in Concept B because only minimal parking is removed. We rated Concept C as a -1 because a parking lane on one side of the street can be retained in commercial areas.

Question 134. In your evaluation matrix allowing for plus and minus ratings for various items, please explain why bike/scooter use is rated as a higher priority than pedestrian safety as well as transit, PUDO, and constructability.

Bikes and scooters are not rated as a higher priority than pedestrian safety, PUDO and constructability. The evaluation matrix is not weighted. There is not a concept that fully satisfied all elements of the purpose and need. We did rate each of the criteria with respect to providing or not providing each element of the purpose and need.

Question 135. Why does parking, loading, PUDO have a score of -1 for Concept C? It actually is between +1 and -1 for the descriptions given. Concept C should have a score of 0 for evaluation criteria 6 for Parking.

In Concept C, we would be removing parking in most of the Corridor. We did not see that as an added benefit to be scored as a +1 or 0 and wanted to be conservative in our evaluation. We do not know the exact number of parking spaces to be removed until, and if, we initiate conceptual engineering for a Concept that would include a protected bicycle facility. Since we are "taking parking away" we have scored this as a -1.

Project Coordination

Question 136. When will the [business] questionnaire be delivered to merchants?

The business questionnaire has been sent to merchants' numerous times via the ANCs and the Main Street Organizations. The business questionnaire is on the project website and the survey is active. We encourage businesses to complete the survey.

Question 137. Was there any coordination with traffic planners and public safety in neighboring Maryland communities which are a source of most of the commuter traffic on Connecticut Avenue?

DDOT met with planners and engineers from the Montgomery County Department of Transportation early in the study process. We will set up a meeting with Montgomery County and others during the next phase of project development to provide Montgomery County with a summary of the study results.

Question 138. Was there any coordination with MPD and other policing agencies as well as DC Fire and EM, all of whom operate and are responsible for enforcement on Connecticut Avenue and related neighborhood streets.

MPD and the DC FEMS were part of an interagency task force that has met and considered the project over the past year.

Question 139. What is the process for final selection and approval of a concept? Does this require Council approval? What is the timeframe?

After the Public Meeting, DDOT staff will collate and summarize public comments. We will develop a staff-level recommendation and present that recommendation to the DDOT leadership. Once DDOT makes a decision, it will go to the Mayor's office for consideration. The project is not funded for design or construction at this point. Ultimately, we would need funding by the DC Council as well.

Question 140. People are coming out of a pandemic where their minds are not focused on your models. There are serious problems [in society] now. People don't understand what you are suggesting to do. You cannot do this without having open public meetings where people can come and talk and say what they believe.

DDOT has held more than 40 meetings with Ward 3 stakeholders including ANCs, Main Street Organizations and associated businesses, institutional uses such as the Smithsonian Zoo and UDC, civic associations, Smart Growth, bicycle advocates and property managers of condo and apartment buildings. We have also established an interagency taskforce comprised of the Metropolitan Police Department, DC Fire and Emergency Management, Homeland Security (HSEMA), MOCRS, National Park Service, Commission on Fine Arts, State Historic Preservation Office, Federal Highway Administration, etc. and all applicable DDOT administrations. DDOT believes that there has been sufficient community outreach and education during this past year, with individual and organizations being able to weigh the pros and cons of the issues and concepts presented to date. We will continue our outreach efforts to other stakeholders that may not have been reached during this process if a recommendation is to proceed with conceptual design of a Build alternative.

Question 141. How will commuter motorists be notified of the infrastructure changes (once a decision is made)?

As of this writing (date), there is no funding for either the design or construction for either Concept B or Concept C. DDOT hopes to make an internal decision on a Build or No-Build alternative by early Summer (2021). Once that decision is made, we will communicate the preferred alternative through the ANCs other stakeholder groups, on the project website and through social media. We anticipate holding a second public meeting at the conclusion of the next phase of conceptual design if a Build Alternative is selected.

Consistency with District of Columbia Plans and Programs

Question 143. Since 2014, moveDC has designated Connecticut Avenue as a Bike Priority corridor. How can we do anything other than Option C?

MoveDC is our Long-Range Transportation Plan. However, we do need to give equal weight to the engineering feasibility studies that we are conducting now. DDOT will take all stakeholder comments, including ANC positions, into account when we recommend a preferred concept for the Corridor. We will also consider any potential changes to Connecticut Avenue with regard to consistency with the District of Columbia's vision, goals and policies, as well as existing plans and programs.

Question 144. DCP-2. Given DC priorities for reducing carbon emissions (Sustainable DC), increasing non-vehicular travel (moveDC), and eliminating traffic deaths (Vision Zero, DC), how can DDOT seriously consider implementing anything other than Option C?

DDOT will take all stakeholder comments, including ANC positions, into account when we recommend a preferred concept for the Corridor. We will also consider any potential changes to Connecticut Avenue with regard to consistency with the District of Columbia's vision, goals and policies, as well as existing plans and programs.

Question 145. as your team looked into whether the Vision Zero Omnibus Amendment Act of 2019 would apply here particularly Section 5 (b) that says DC has to build bike lanes when rebuilding a street, if bike lanes are present in the Long-Range Plan?

The Vision Zero Omnibus Amendment Act of 2019 has not been funded by Council or the Mayor and therefore, the provisions cannot be applied until they are funded. The intent of the section that is referenced is for DDOT to capture capital projects—projects like streetscapes, or a project where a road will be reconstructed. The work on Connecticut Avenue would involve modifying pavement markings, adding paint, changing signalization and other elements, but it is not substantially roadway reconstruction.