



Advisory Group Meeting #2 Summary

Duke Street in Motion

Wednesday, 6/1/2022; 6:30 – 8:30 pm

In-person: Alexandria Police HQ Community Room
3600 Wheeler Avenue, Alexandria VA 22304

Virtual: Zoom

1. Attendees

The attendees are based on those who were in attendance during the introductions portion of the meeting and/or those who signed in.

Name	Organization / Department	Attendance
Yon Lambert	City of Alexandria	Yes
Chris Ziemann	City of Alexandria	No
Hillary Orr	City of Alexandria	Yes
Mark Schnauffer	City of Alexandria	Yes
Jen Monaco	City of Alexandria	Yes
Kevin James	City of Alexandria	Yes
Will Tolbert	WSP	Yes
Jiaxin Tong	WSP	Yes
Lee Farmer	VHB	Yes
Jennifer Koch	RHI	Yes
Jody Fisher	NeoNiche Strategies	Yes
Aaron Gofreed	Advisory Group	No
Bob Brant	Advisory Group	Yes
Casey Kane	Advisory Group	Yes
Devon Tutak	Advisory Group	No
Erin Winograd	Advisory Group	Yes
Govan Faine	Advisory Group	No
Leslie Catherwood	Advisory Group	Yes
Lisa Porter	Advisory Group	No
Mindy Lyle	Advisory Group	Yes
Naima Kearney	Advisory Group	No
Nawfal Kalam	Advisory Group	No
Nicolas Ruiz	Advisory Group	No
Wendy Albert	Advisory Group	Yes
Yvette Jiang	Advisory Group	No
Jim Durham	Resident/DASH Advisory Committee	Yes
Resident	Toni Oliveira	
Resident	Linda Marshall	
Resident	Bill Rossello	



2. Meeting Summary

o **Welcome and Introductions**

- Yon provided welcome remarks via the virtual interface
- Mark Schnauer announced that he will be leaving the City of Alexandria for a new position and that Jennifer Monaco (formerly Slesinger) will be taking over as the project manager on Duke Street on behalf of the City starting in July.

o **Advisory Group Chair Announcement**

- Nominated by the Advisory Group (AG) Leslie Catherwood as Chair and Mindy Lyle as Vice Chair. The Chair's role will be to lead the Advisory Group meetings. Vice Chair will lead if the Chair is absent.
- Leslie introduced the concept of a "Bus Station" - where we will store off-agenda ideas
- Leslie suggested that instead of the "parking lot" terminology, the AG will may put those off-agenda items/ideas on the bus station; not a place for ideas to die; stations will see turnover too as we address and revisit them.
- Leslie is committed to ideas housed in the bus station by including them in the meeting minutes

o **Review of Meeting Minutes of AG #1**

- Erin Winograd noted the following during review of AG #1 meeting minutes:
 - o Page 2 – would like to amend notes – the interchange from EB Duke to SB Telegraph is the primary cause of congestion in the corridor. This is to be incorporated.
 - o Page 3 – Mark noted that "2012 concept plan may need some tweaks"
 - Part of AG's task is to determine if 2012 plan is still relevant; saying that it may need some tweaks prejudices our opinion as an AG.
 - Mindy thought it's fine. Since it was said, we can leave it in there.
 - Casey Kane suggested that we record Erin's comment in the meeting minutes for this meeting, and that is how we can consider the 2012 plan moving forward.
 - The City and the AG agreed in discussion that the 2012 plan should be evaluated without any prior prejudice and solely on its merits (or lack thereof).
 - o Jeanie Jacob added as person who made comment that was not listed.
- Casey requested that the project team should add note about AG members who are not in attendance.
- AG held motion to approve minutes until a quorum was present.
- **Once quorum was achieved, Mindy Lyle made a motion to approve the minutes with changes as noted, and Bob Brant seconded the motion. Minutes from AG meeting #1 were approved by majority vote (4-0 with Wendy and Casey abstaining).**

o **Advisory Group Governance**



- Mark reviewed the guidelines, and his presentation on Advisory Group governance will be made available to the group. Some key points discussed as follows:
 - Treat everyone with respect and courtesy during discourse.
 - Do homework and be familiar with docket ahead of time, come prepared.
 - Express ideas and opinions in an open and helpful manner.
 - Be respectful of others' time, be concise in comments/questions/discussion.
 - Focus on issues being brought before decision making body, avoid personalizing issues
 - Listen and let others express their ideas/opinions.
 - If a decision is made with which you do not concur, agree to disagree and/or use appropriate means of civil and civic recourse, and move on.
 - Advisory group members should make every effort to attend 75% of the meetings, unless excused by the Chair (COVID was an example of a valid excuse).
 - No business or action may take place without the presence of a quorum (6 members).
 - Advisory group will follow Roberts Rules of Order for meeting procedure.
 - Meetings will be open to the public and meeting materials available to the public. Public meeting notice will be at least 3 working days ahead of meeting time.
 - Meeting minutes will be recorded and there will be no secret ballots.
 - Group business cannot be conducted over email or phone.
 - All records of the Advisory Group are subject to the Freedom of Information Act.
 - Requirements must be met when greater than 2 members discuss public business.
 - Advisory Group members may not accept anything of value related to their position.
 - Leslie will facilitate meetings, public comment period, work with staff to develop agenda, ensure AG conforms to by-laws, and lead development of formal documentation with assistance from City Staff.
 - Members should let Leslie know if they want to add anything to the agenda.
 - Simple majority of Advisory Group members present will pass a motion.
- **Vision and Guiding Principles Review**
 - Mindy – Request a tracked changes version of the Vision and Guiding Principles
 - A spreadsheet was developed to track all responses to original comments and there is also a tracked changes version of the document, which is more difficult to follow but can be made available if desired.
 - Casey – Suggested a number on the tracked changes version to indicate which spreadsheet line it corresponds to.
 - Casey – There was version that was sent out prior to AG #2 has the edits that staff determined were reasonable. Would be best to start from there and discuss.
 - Leslie – Propose to start from the current version and then follow Casey's proposed approach moving forward.
 - Project Vision
 - Casey – Current version captured what Leslie suggested; fine with it
 - Erin – Second sentence in bold part. Want to say riding the bus, driving, walking, and biking. (switching “or” to “and” and moving driving up in the list). 95% of population does not take buses; putting driving at the end deemphasizes that group.
 - Mindy – **Fine with "and"**. This is a transit-driven project and as BRT comes into play and we add connections and additional bus lines to both Van Dorn and Duke Street, and we've got more emphasis on biking and walking, I think driving



becomes less of the majority. I use my car about 60% less now than 3 years ago. And as population gets younger, we are going to see more emphasis on biking, walking, and riding bus. With increased efficiency, we will see more people taking the bus, including taking kids to school in the morning.

- Casey – City projects do put an emphasis on supporting traveling in ways other than driving. Going forward, it is not to deemphasize any segments of population, not to discourage driving; rather this is to help change the paradigm though some will never embrace due to lifestyle and family circumstance. I agree with the grammatical change.
- Leslie – Consensus on changing “or” to “and”. That can then help to make those modes more equal. The order of the modes to remain the same.
- Erin – Strike the word "vibrant" from "vibrant community connector"
 - Mindy – does not want to remove "vibrant" - I think it means green spaces, a sidewalk where a mom can push a stroller and have a toddler next to her, means greater access to businesses and residential areas, it means you're opening up transit, transportation, walkability, so people can connect. King Street Metrorail station area is an example.
- Erin - Last sentence - recommend rewriting “the BRT will be tailored to fit the differing requirements and existing physical characteristics of each Segment of the corridor. Corridor improvements will be based on community needs and opinions and will maintain or positively impact Duke Street corridor residents’ quality of life, the character and integrity of the corridor’s neighborhoods, and the corridor’s businesses.”
 - Mindy – Don't want to remove reference to community engagement.
 - Erin – Part of the problem with the word "engagement" is that the City says what it wants to do and does it rather than taking community input and then modifying plans.
 - Mindy – I disagree. As the person running the Landmark AG, we have relied on community comments.
 - Casey – community engagement is what informed us to this point today. City made a heavy lift to engage people in the project.
 - Casey – Would like to keep "vibrant" - think of the unit block of King Street – does not see that as negative.
 - Casey – Some of the "existing physical characteristics" may not be so great. Guard rails help vehicles but not people on sidewalks. Don't want to retain all of those things.
 - Leslie – Intent of it is things like the service roads. Incredibly important for businesses and homes that front onto Duke Street. There have been suggestions for years now to repurpose those roads. Need to respect the people who have invested their time and money to build homes and businesses along the corridor
 - Mark – These are the points we will want to debate throughout the next year. These are meant to be just guiding principles for further discussions.
 - Leslie – **proposes removing physical characteristics; could say community engagement, needs, and opinions. Keep requirement.**



- Jim – What do we mean by "duke street corridor residents"
 - Could remove "duke street corridor" to be more inclusive of the surrounding neighborhoods and residents.
 - **Adopted language after discussion as follows: "The BRT will be tailored to fit the differing requirements of each segment of the corridor. Corridor improvements will be based on community engagement, needs and opinions, and will maintain or positively impact residents' quality of life and the character and integrity of the corridor's neighborhoods and businesses."**
- Guiding Principles
 - Convenient: no further comments
 - Efficient
 - Erin – (third objective) Shared mobility devices should be located on the properties where the most residents live instead of dispersed randomly. Have lost some green space near my residence because City staff were reluctant to speak to private property owners about hosting the bike racks. Should strive to use already paved places.
 - Casey – Agree. City has said that can't always put them where we want to put them. There is a level of compromise.
 - Mindy – Didn't the City study bike/scooter locations?
 - Will – Part of the job of the consultant is to evaluate this over the next 12 months and part of the job of the AG is to review our work. We have a subconsultant specifically looking at bike connections. Same with travel time. We will have an alternative that likely has zero negative impact on vehicle travel time and we'll have an alternative that likely does have some negative impact on vehicle travel time, and as a collective group we will need to evaluate the cost/benefit of these alternatives.
 - Wendy – Is there a way we can word it to say that alternative mobility devices should be placed where there is already cement? (i.e. no reduction of greenspace)
 - Jim – Don't think we should dive into this detail today – **should add this to the bus station**. Agree with Will that there will be many opportunities to comment and call for less specificity
 - Leslie – **Would like to propose we keep "efficient" as is.**
 - Erin – Would like to have a goal of no negative travel time impact if this is a "goal"
 - Casey – May run into safety issues. If the tradeoff is for more time for pedestrian to cross the street, then someone has to give up a little time.
 - Jim – There are other issues in here, such as safety. Leading Pedestrian Interval for example leads to reduction in crashes but it requires a 3-7 second delay in the green light. "No impacts" is likely not an achievable goal.
 - **After discussion, majority opinion was to keep language in "efficient" as is.**
 - Equitable
 - Erin – I live in one of the more demographically diverse communities. Suggest we add language to not disadvantage these communities in reaching jobs, etc. For example, near Fox Chase people park on street; 4600 Duke Street, people park in her neighborhood; Some of the 2012 proposals would have negative impacts on this.



- Leslie – May be very specific to one neighborhood.
- Bob – Safety and accessibility for all "including" those connecting to transit leaves room for others. Would be comfortable with it as stated.
- Leslie – **Offer that we keep this as-is. Majority opinion was to keep language as is.**
- Safe
 - Erin – recommend an addition related to preserving service roads.
 - Leslie – Would suggest that is something we'll need to discuss later; AG cannot make that decision now.
 - Wendy – But we do need to look at it again when we go along. Can create a mess if service roads are removed. Parking gets further north and south into the neighborhoods.
 - Casey – careful with service road purposing – has to be a compelling case if ever to be repurposed
 - Leslie – **"Bus Station" topic - Note that we will have a full and open discussion about the service roads as part of the process.**
- Vibrant/Sustainable
 - Erin – Prefer "community oriented"
 - Mindy – Vibrant talks about what we're trying to do along the corridor
 - Erin – For reduced vehicle emissions – want to say it's "primarily" related to bus vehicles. What about metrobus?
 - Hilary – There is funding in this topic for electric buses (14 battery electric buses in DASH fleet and 50 more on its way)
 - Jiaxin – Noted that Metro just started a transition study
 - Casey – regarding stormwater improved/no negative impacts. Seems like any project the City undertakes moving forward, should likely need to improve impacts.
 - Mindy – Everything we're doing is improving stormwater.
 - Change objective to improve stormwater management
- Leslie – Are people comfortable voting tonight?
 - Bob – motion to approve. Casey – second.
 - Majority in favor (4). One abstains (1). Erin votes no (1). Adopted.
- **2012 Plan Discussion**
 - Will introduced the objective – the objective of the AG is to evaluate the preferred alternative from the 2012 plan against the recently adopted Vision & Guiding Principles.
 - Focus discussion on Segment 1 (Landmark to Jordan St) today
 - Mindy – We know the Landmark area will change. How do we consider that?
 - Hilary – There will be a new transit street in Landmark Mall, so that will change.
 - Casey – Was station placement based on best guesses from 2012?
 - Jiaxin – Was recommended in the 2012 plan. This is where they thought would be best in 2012.
 - Bob- What factors went into that?
 - Jiaxin – Ridership, land use, station spacing.
 - Jiaxin – Explained the board activity.
 - "somewhat address" can be used if only addresses some objectives.



- Jiaxin – Example: Will mentioned that the orange line represents a curb-running bus lane. 2012 plan says frequency is 7 minutes on peak and 15 minutes off-peak. Also mentioned improved reliability. May want to consider bus lanes and transit signal priority.
 - "Improved boarding experience" is not clearly stated in the 2012 plan.
 - Mark - the adopted plan is kind of our "no build" alternative, so we're doing this activity to see what we may need to adjust on this baseline.
 - Casey – We don't have all the detailed information from the plan that we would need.
 - Mark – Today, we want to focus on the physical characteristics
 - Hilary – This is also a good time to throw out all of our questions and we can look to answer them next time.
 - Erin – Headway times are proposed, not guaranteed. There's nothing that says that the Dash 30 couldn't do 7 minute headways with more operators and buses.
 - Lee – If you make improvements to the bus efficiency in the corridor, you can use the same bus more times, thus allowing for less headway
 - Jiaxin shared a table that was created for the 2012 plan.
 - Leslie – Sounds like you're asking us to rate curb-side dedicated lanes and additional crosswalks.
 - Jiaxin – There's also a bike lane included between the right travel lane and the bus lane.
 - All agree that the bike lane placement on the 2012 plan is inappropriate.
 - "Duke Street is very convenient for a bike, but very dangerous"
 - Erin – Also very hilly
 - Erin – Part of the 2012 plan was to reduce the land width.
 - Mark suggests that we move the conversation to the next meeting.
 - Will post all 2012 information online, and will send updated Vision/GP.
 - Hillary suggests that WSP sends out images of other constructed BRT corridors.
 - Leslie – Proposes that we set up a recurring monthly meeting, e.g., last Wed of the month. Need to coordinate with the city calendar.
 - Thursdays are usually pretty good.
 - TENTATIVELY say first Thursday of every month, with next meeting July 7. Commitment through the next year, but may cancel some monthly meetings. Will try to nail down an exact schedule within the next two weeks.
 - PC often gets bumped to first Thursday due to holidays.
 - Could also chose Thursdays and then choose which Thursday on a monthly basis.
 - Casey – Would like to avoid having a city meeting commitment every week
 - Casey made motion to adjourn. Bob seconds.
- **Adjourn**
 - The meeting concluded at 8:30 pm.

3. Action Items

Task	Responsible Party	Due Date
Include Bus Station Items in Minutes for Future Review/Actions	WSP Consultant Team	



Update Vision and Guiding Principles	Mark Schnauffer	
Schedule the next AG meeting	Mark Schnauffer	
Look into bus/walking tour for the AG (carryover from AG #2).	Mark Schnauffer	
Prepare additional materials for AG to complete the evaluation of the preferred alternative from the 2012 plan in the next meeting.	WSP Consultant Team	

4. Bus Station Items

- Explain how we can preserve green space for hard infrastructure like Capital Bikeshare stations
- Full and open discussion about service roads