Advisory Group Meeting #9 Summary
Duke Street in Motion
Thursday, 3/16/2023; 6:30 pm
In-person: DASH Facility, 3000 Business Center Drive
Virtual: Zoom

1. Attendees

The attendees are based on those who signed in. There may be community member attendees who did not sign in, and whose names were not therefore captured in the attendance log.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization / Department</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Gofreed</td>
<td>Advisory Group</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey Kane</td>
<td>Advisory Group</td>
<td>Yes (Zoom)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon Tutak</td>
<td>Advisory Group</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin Winograd</td>
<td>Advisory Group</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Catherwood-Chairperson</td>
<td>Advisory Group (Chairperson)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindy Lyle-Vice Chair</td>
<td>Advisory Group (Vice Chair)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naima Kearney</td>
<td>Advisory Group</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nawfal Kulam</td>
<td>Advisory Group</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Brant</td>
<td>Advisory Group</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meronnette Teklu</td>
<td>Advisory Group</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvette Jiang</td>
<td>Advisory Group</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Durham</td>
<td>Advisory Group Designee for Yvette Jiang</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillary Orr</td>
<td>City of Alexandria</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jen Monaco</td>
<td>City of Alexandria</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genevieve Kanellias</td>
<td>Consultant Team (WSP)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Farmer</td>
<td>Consultant Team (VHB)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Koch</td>
<td>Consultant Team (RHI)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Martin</td>
<td>Consultant Team (WSP)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne Welsh</td>
<td>CHHOA</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Hartt</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Stearns</td>
<td>Soc. Hill HOA</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kursten Phelps</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Hoftzyer</td>
<td>Quaker Hill</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colette Kolanko</td>
<td>Quaker Hill</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles C. Grace</td>
<td>Strawberry Hill</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Radshaw</td>
<td>Brookville</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Pugh</td>
<td>Seminary Hill</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Doaks</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Minatelli</td>
<td>Wakefield</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Patterson</td>
<td>Attended via Zoom</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriett McCune</td>
<td>Attended via Zoom</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Kelleher</td>
<td>Attended via Zoom</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Attended via Zoom</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Charles</td>
<td>Attended via Zoom</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Raasch</td>
<td>Attended via Zoom</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve McKay</td>
<td>Attended via Zoom</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sash Impastato</td>
<td>Attended via Zoom</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Menez</td>
<td>Attended via Zoom</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asa Orrin-Brown</td>
<td>Attended via Zoom</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah Sepsenwol</td>
<td>Attended via Zoom</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Wiley</td>
<td>Attended via Zoom</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lizzi Alarcon</td>
<td>Attended via Zoom</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Rossello</td>
<td>Attended via Zoom</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamara Smith</td>
<td>Attended via Zoom</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Rosenbach</td>
<td>Attended via Zoom</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin G</td>
<td>Attended via Zoom</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia Gillespie</td>
<td>Attended via Zoom</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulette Johnson</td>
<td>Attended via Zoom</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy Byrd</td>
<td>Attended via Zoom</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravi Raut</td>
<td>Attended via Zoom</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustine Green Smith</td>
<td>Attended via Zoom</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Hoeffner</td>
<td>Attended via Zoom</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Wright</td>
<td>Attended via Zoom</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Zimmer</td>
<td>Attended via Zoom</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Seaman</td>
<td>Attended via Zoom</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Jordan</td>
<td>Attended via Zoom</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Jackson</td>
<td>Attended via Zoom</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julio Perez</td>
<td>Attended via Zoom</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fran Vogel</td>
<td>Attended via Zoom</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Pritzker</td>
<td>Attended via Zoom</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Byrnes</td>
<td>Attended via Zoom</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Flumer</td>
<td>Attended via Zoom</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Peyton</td>
<td>Attended via Zoom</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. Welcome/Introductions
   • Jen welcomed the AG and attendees.
   • Jen reviewed the meeting goals and guiding principles.
   • Reviewed an overview of written comments.

B. Public Comment –
   • **Joanne Welsh** – I’m a resident of Carriage House Circle. Members of our Home Owners Association appreciate the time the city officials have taken to tell us about Duke Street, and this group’s decision to recommend a mixed traffic concept from Fort Williams to Wheeler Avenue. We are very concerned that the long-term plan is still to consider building dedicated bus lanes in our heavily residential section. This would affect our ability to access our homes, and possibility result in the loss of our property against our wishes, and possibly negatively impact our property values. We recognize that we’re only one of many constituencies, but please consider that we live on Duke Street 24/7 and if you create dedicated lanes that impact our ability to make turns into our community, you negatively impact us all day, every day, unlike commuters who would only be impacted between morning and evening commutes. We use Duke Street to get to day care and to work and participate in community and sporting events. To work, shop, and run errands. Secondly, we do not wish to sell our property now or in the future. So, if you widen Duke Street, you’ll also take away our green space - our beautiful front lawn, decades-old trees that line our lawn, and you’ll push noise and bus fumes that much closer to our homes and our back patios, which sit directly on Duke Street. Thirdly, please be aware of any financial impacts on us homeowners. I consider us fortunate to own a home. Ours are relatively modest homes, and my guess is that many people in our community – for us, our homes are our primary financial asset, so we stand to bear the impact of this project. To conclude, you can imagine our concern when the city can offer no firm commitment on long-term plans and instead tells us it might pursue a long-term vision for center-running bus lanes in Segment 2A, and when the city says it won’t pursue eminent domain in the short term but makes no commitment about the long term. I’ll conclude by asking – a show of hands – how many of you live on Duke Street, in homes that you own? Thanks for that chance to speak.

   • **Bob Hart** – My name is Bob Hart. I live off Braddock Road, near the Minnie Howard School. As someone who is blind and uses a trained service dog, I use the Duke Street corridor to visit friends and occasionally run errands. For the safety of guide dog users and others with visual impairments, it’s important to have separate facilities for walking and biking. A trained guide dog handler is trained to hold the dog on his left side. While the dogs are ideally trained to guide in the center of the walking path, in practice, they usually go closer to the left curb. On a single multi-use path, this can put you in the path of oncoming traffic, and especially more dangerous bike traffic. If there’s not enough space for completely separate paths, it’s important to install what’s called a tactile delineator in the pavement. It needs to be a surface that’s easily discoverable when people with visual impairments step on it, but of course, not a barrier to wheelchair users. Based on research from the National Science Foundation, San
Francisco has installed a new type of tactile delineator which I recommend for consideration. I brought some materials with me and will leave that with you. On a related item – as someone who uses public transportation, I want to support center-running bus lanes as the most efficient bus service. Finally, I think the City should include audible traffic signals for safe crossings by people with visual impairments. The City’s ongoing efforts to do this have been very much appreciated and I use them quite frequently. Thank you.

- **Kirsten Phelps** – Hi. I’m a resident. I have almost 10 years living on Duke Street or around the corner. I, and many people in this community, use many modes of transportation – bus, bike, walk – and need safe and reliable forms of transit, including cars. I’d support center-running bus lanes as much as possible. Do not take them off the table for future consideration. We can’t wait until it’s a crisis and a more expensive and difficult process down the road. We should do what we can do now, because the more the different modes are required to mix, there’s a more likely possibility of accidents and decreased safety. As this project looks toward the next phase of community outreach and gathering community input, I want to encourage this group and City staff to engage deeply and meet the community where they’re at, and in the ways they can communicate. I’ve been excited to see the Alexandria West planning process and the way they’re using What’s App, email, videos, and web presence in order to provide information and updates in a clear way, that’s accessible regardless of the language or ability level. I hope this project will take some lessons from that.

- **Asa Orrin-Brown (online)** – Great, thanks. I know at the last meeting I spoke a little bit about the need to separate eBike and pedestrian facilities. I just did some research and have some additional facts to support that. In the US, eBikes are a really huge emerging market. There were over 500,000 sold last year. We have two physical, brick and mortar eBike stores here in Alexandria plus a number of other bike stores that sell them. It was a 49-billion-dollar industry in 2022, last year. It’s expected to be an 80 billion-dollar industry by 2027 when this is finished. For those of you who aren’t familiar with eBikes, class 3 eBikes go up to 28 mph, so it’s just really not appropriate to have a vehicle moving 28 mph in the same lane as a pedestrian who is going maybe 4 mph. I hope you’ll take them into consideration when you’re thinking about safety, when you’re thinking about having separate facilities and bike facilities, thank you.

- **Michael Zimmer (online)** – Thank you for your meeting and the energy in this room. I have three reflections that I’d like to share for your consideration. First, it would be useful, as the city is looking to integrate its budget with its climate action plan, if this advisory group would consider advancing electric vehicle locations in Cameron Station and in some of the other public areas contiguous to Duke Street. There is an interest in the city in advancing public - not private – electric vehicle facilities, and the city is incorporating that into its zoning for new projects, new residential building complexes. So, we should have parity, at least in terms of existing facilities and the public locations that are part of those facilities. Second, I’d ask the group to explain in greater detail the proposed front entrance changes during this session or a future session in what’s being proposed in terms of the impact on Cameron Station. Is there traffic engineering studies to support, to back up the fact limiting the directional changes, limiting
the ability to cross Duke Street if in fact a bus station is going to be located along that corridor in front of the entrance. That entrance was properly designed over 20 years ago. We need to also be considering the back feed impacts from the changes on Duke Street within the community itself and how that’s going to alter or affect our internal roads particularly at rush hour in the morning or evening. Finally, I’d ask the advisory committee to make a public statement in your recommendations preserving the flexibility for the use of our continuing private HOA buses. This is another alternative. A transportation alternative within the community that is used more than scooters, more than bicycles, and in many instances equal to or more than the bus system. And it is a particular service requirement for people with children, for workers leaving children off and who need to get to work, and people over 50 years old in the community. Some of the other strategies to date strand their interest. So if in fact, a public statement could be made that we want to preserve, that we are not going to create any barriers, we’re not going to remove the flexibility of permitting of the private HOA buses in our communities.

C. Design Updates

- Jen walked through how the concepts have evolved since the fall.
  - Indicated earlier that we may need to pivot as we learn more, particularly in Segment 2B.
  - Looking to move forward to a preferred cross section that the Council will adopt. After that, will go through the preliminary design phase and then the final design phase.
- Received AG input about which cross sections to move forward in each segment.
- Jen walked through each corridor concept.
  - Corridor Concept A
    - More center-running facilities
    - Adjustments were made for transitions into 2A.
    - Bigger changes are between Wheeler and Roth – from bidirectional bus lane into single east-bound center lane.
    - Segment 3 – introduced more mixed traffic areas.
  - Corridor Concept B
    - Changes focused on Segment 3
    - Segment 2B – heard a lot from the community about this. Also, realize that bidirectional is a challenge operationally. We modeled it to see if it could work operationally during peak hours. It would technically work but seems risky relative to current operations.
    - Helps avoid queuing at Telegraph. Also, more future development – north side, WB lane could be incorporated into future redevelopment.
  - Segment 3 –
    - Concept A – In looking closer at the bridge, it is too challenging to have center-running in both directions.
    - Concept B – Curb running with ramps was not very beneficial.
      Center-running close to Metro Station was important for
operations.

- We are doing a full end-to-end traffic model, getting more info about bus travel time savings. Will be presenting the full information in April.

- Devon: Wanted to ask for clarification about the end point. Right now, DASH traffic turns onto Callahan to go down by the Amtrak station to turn on to King Street to get to Metro. Looks like it’s turning down Diagonal. Will it be turning there?
  - Jen: Metrobus currently goes down Diagonal and it seems like that would work for both buses.

- Mindy: When do you think all traffic modeling will be complete? Until that time, we don’t have all the information.
  - Jen: We’re planning on presenting that information to you at the AG meeting on April 13. Didn’t want to go through updated designs at the same time as the results.

- Erin: Devon just asked whether line 30 is now going to change and go to Diagonal. We haven’t talked much about line 30 vs. BRT. Can we talk about that?
  - Jen: Intention is that line 30 will continue down King Street. Will do an operations analysis moving forward to see if there need to be any changes.
  - Devon: BRT would be its own route?
  - Jen: Infrastructure is the same as the Metroway route. Existing bus routes will use the bus lanes. More of a BRT corridor than a BRT bus. There might not be a single route from Landmark to King Street metro.
  - Leslie: Up until now, I thought we were hearing there was enough room to do center-running in Segment 3. Telegraph Bridge as a pinch point. Is this a permanent change to both short- and long-term plans for Segment 3? That we need to do mixed traffic in both terms? That would up-end discussions we’ve had about Segment 3 to date.
    - Jen: Changing a bridge is costly. Slope is challenging.
    - Hillary: Bridge likely to be a pinch point but doesn’t mean that all of Segment 3 couldn’t change. There are other pinch points. Some things are not possible within the budget of the funding we have (re-grading service roads, etc.).
    - Leslie: If Telegraph Road is pinch point, shouldn’t it change just at the bridge?
      - Jen: Different challenges with curb vs. center running. Bridge piers vs. ramps.
    - Hillary: Bridge is a pinch point, but the Roth-WTR area is a pinch point but that’s probably more of a short-term thing. To completely take the service road down to grade is likely out of what we can afford with this project.
    - Leslie: Feels like we want to get the buses away from the congestion – leading up to Telegraph Ramp.
      - Jen: Having it in center to Witter means it will bypass the queue.
- Devon: Eastbound, where are the stops? Is there one at Witter?
  - Jen: West Taylor

- Devon: So that would keep you in the busy part?
  - Lee: Eastbound, you’re center running until Witter. Then you have a block to make it over one lane to the stop on the east side of West Taylor Run.
  - Hillary: All ramp traffic is in the ramp lane because of the delineators at that point.
  - Leslie: Would the station be in the center?
  - Hillary: You’d be able to widen that space – the scary crossing – to widen that to make a nice station and pedestrian refuge.

- Naima: In April, will there be cost information?
  - Jen: We'll have estimates at that point.

- Jim: If you haven't ridden the 30 today - as the eastbound DASH bus approaches the Telegraph Road off-ramp, the bus skips three stops. It doesn’t stop until you get to Moncure. Skips those stops for about three hours a day in the afternoon. Witter/WTR is particularly hazardous for people accessing the bus. Is there a center running bus station near there?
  - Hillary: Challenge today is that bus stop is in the middle of the block. People cross mid-block to get there. Very dangerous. By moving the stations to WTR, we can have safe bus stops at a crossing. In both concepts A and B, you’d have that, the stations just may be placed in different spots.

- Naima: Would they still skip all those bus stops?
  - Jen: No.

- Jen walked through a map of corridor stations and discussed station spacing.
  - Originally talked about ¼ -1/3 mile spacing. The last layout had .35 miles on average between stops. 1/3 mile is about a 6-minute walk. Now at 4/10-mile average. If on Duke Street, max of a 4-minute walk to a station. Half mile spacing at the greatest point. Consolidated the stop at Sweeley, serving Alexandria commons more in the center. Shifted station to Wheeler instead of between Wheeler and Fort Williams – helps operations a bit in that segment. We are showing a station at Dove. Exploring whether that would make more sense for the long-term plans. 10-minute walk to metro and it’s also hard for the bus to get there. Less than 30 riders per day now. Will keep it on the radar for long term at a minimum.
  - Will be collecting feedback on stations, but council won’t be adopting specific station locations. As we get further into design, we could still shift a bit.

- Erin: Question about time estimates for walking to and between
stations. Sounds like those are for able-bodied, fit people unencumbered by small children. For people with mobility, vision challenges, or children, what’s the estimated walk time? Right now, line 30 often has 1/10 mile between stations. Slows down the bus but provides a lot of accessibility.

- Jen: One benefit of this is that we will have full ADA accessible stops. We will be asking about the trade-offs including whether people are comfortable with a slightly longer walk.
- Hillary: Assuming that a 20-minute walk mile is an average, knowing that some people walk much slower, some much faster.

D. Recommendation Template

- Jen talked through the differences between near-term and long-term recommendations, as outlined on the slide.
  - We are asking the AG for a concrete near-term recommendation, as well as a future vision that can be a little less concrete. The feasibility of all recommendations will be reviewed in the next stage.
  - Casey: Slide says near term vs. long term, but also future vision. Vision to me means we don’t quite know what we’re doing. Trying to push toward a more solid idea.
  - Jen: Sorry for using multiple terms. I see it as a vision for the long-term. Hopefully the bullets under the heading capture what we’re looking for.
  - Erin: Concerned that the voluntary property acquisition caveat is excluded from the future vision section would like to see that carried through.
  - Mindy: Yon noted that eminent domain would not be used for this project.
    - Erin: If that’s the case, that’s great. We should add to the future vision.
    - Hillary: Not knowing what we’re doing in the future, and not knowing what redevelopment would occur, not fair to put that in. There will be a Duke Street small area planning process. Not fully comfortable taking off the table for the future. Agree that we’re not doing that in the near term. It’s never the city’s goal to do that, we never want to do that, but we don’t know what may happen 20 years down the road?
    - Leslie: Can we reiterate the near-term bullet for the future vision?
      - Erin: They are saying they don’t want to do that.
      - Hillary: Can’t take that off the table for something that is 20 years out. Could be a small sliver of property with a huge benefit to the city.
  - Devon: Is there some compromise language? Commitment to avoiding it as much as possible? Firm commitment to avoidance would be incredible.
Hilary: Absolutely, yes.

- Jen walked through the recommendation components as outlined on the slide.
- Jen shared the draft recommendation outline.
  - Template with some bolding of main elements. Some “fill in the blank” pieces. It’s just a general structure. We tried to flesh it out with some example language for the curb features.

Leslie:
- I’d like to take a step back to explain the thought process that went into this. The main output from the AG will be a recommendation to Council – a written document. In my experience, a large group of people working on a document will take hours and hours. It’s often much easier to respond to something in writing. At least there’s a template – something to start from. Personally, the worst thing in the world is a blank Word document. If we can at least flesh out an outline, we can all be on the same page about where we’re going, in terms of format, not content. Not making hard decisions today or predetermining anything. I’m suggesting that we start looking at what this could look like, not the specific information.
- The idea is to get through some of this now, while we have a bit of time. Once we have the data and feedback from the public comment period, we’ll be a bit more ready to insert our recommendations into the template.
- Once we started building this out, it got to a high-level very fast. Not trying to prescribe anything or make decisions. Trying to give an example of what it could look like. Are there any questions about the idea of this, or what we should discuss?
- Looking at the long-term vision, it’s not something that the city can necessarily implement today. Could happen in 20 years or might not happen at all. Trying to get at the idea of what the AG would like to see as the Duke Street corridor redevelops.

Jim: Near-term is defined by funding. Long-term should be dependent on future funding or redevelopment.

- Mindy: The ultimate vision is just high-level. I don’t think you need anything about funding in there.
- Devon: Makes sense to me.
- Erin: Makes sense to me, too. Cost concerns are a consideration in the near and long term.
- Jen: I will make notes in the document as we go.

Leslie: OK with starting with future vision?

- Erin: Yes. I don’t agree with what’s on the screen, but I’m ok starting with the future vision.
- Casey: Wording changed from Future Vision, long term, now ultimate vision. I’d prefer Future to Ultimate. I would prefer long-term. I don’t think ultimate is the right term.
Leslie: Future or long-term preferred.

Meronne: I think having started the vision is great. Helps us get on the same page. Wanted to ask City staff – don’t we already have a vision and guiding principles? Can we include that in the recommendation document?

Jen: Vision the group adopted is shaping the cross section.

Meronne: Visioning and strategic planning is my jam. A vision statement isn’t always a specific solution – efficient, etc. – should be a rally cry to get support for the project. Then this document should be more prescriptive. Could use the vision statement as a high-level statement. The solutions we’re proposing as options should come later in the document.

Erin: Shorter is better when dealing with Council.

Hillary: Good point. Maybe Vision is the wrong word. We want Council to understand that we’re not starting from scratch. You all have ideas for what the corridor should look like. We already have a vision for the corridor.

Meronne: Unless we think we need to redefine that vision, it still holds. Many years of work done on that.

Leslie: Want to replace Vision with Long Term Plan as much as possible.

Leslie: Near term paragraph is a transition. We’ve included a statement about maintaining two general purpose travel lanes along the entirety of the corridor. How does the group feel about that statement?

Jen: Noting head nods for the record.

Leslie: Next couple of paragraphs are fairly blank. Should leave them that way for now. It’s the meat of the recommendation for this group. Once we’ve received the data analysis and public comments, we’ll have more information to make a recommendation. Will show modeling and analysis for two concepts in each segment. It might not be 100% what we suggested due to pinch points. They’ll propose some alternatives. May look different than our recommendation.

Leslie: We may want to have a piece in here about station locations. AG doesn’t need to endorse specific locations, just note priorities for setting locations. The thought was that priorities would be distance between station locations. AG won’t get into the level of detail of specific stations.

Casey: For station locations, may want to include safety. “Taking into account ridership demand, safety.”

Aaron: Is ridership demand taking into consideration how many riders are at each station now?

Jen: Yes

Devon: Would be more comfortable if accessibility was incorporated.

Jen: Anything we touch will be made accessible, but we can make that clearer.

Mindy: Should take into account redevelopment areas. Just approved a 194-unit apartment building on Duke. There’s a few of those development sites – will have an impact on station locations.
- Jen: I added current and potential ridership demand.
- Mindy: That works. When we re-plan Duke, that'll impact it. Landmark redevelopment will have an impact.

**Devon:** Stations themselves haven’t been discussed. There has been some vague talk. Will we provide any recommendations about features for those, standards of those, or is that beyond our scope?

- Jen: Can gather that feedback from you, but beyond the scope of what we would include in this level. You can talk about certain “nice to have features”.
- Devon: Haven’t been informed about pros/cons, so couldn’t discuss that.
- Hillary: All of the stations will be covered, have seating, have lighting, be accessible, have real-time information. But there’s always new features coming out and we want to be able to take advantage of those when they come out. All stations will have the same set of core features.

**Leslie:** Now at the curb features section. Last month, we discussed that this group prioritizes pedestrian safety. I’d offer that we should talk about pedestrians first. When we say that pedestrians are our priority, what does that mean for this group? Including suggested language that it could mean a continuous sidewalk.

- Mindy: Language there is a good start. Should be a #1 priority. It’s an extremely dangerous corridor to walk in, no matter which end you’re in. 2’ sidewalks in a lot of places. Needs to be done from the first time there’s dirt moved. Need to make Council aware that this is a priority. On the very west side of Duke Street, we’ve had several fatalities. Bike, pedestrian, children killed. Starting in 2012, I went to Council once a year – I stopped it during the pandemic. I pulled Hillary up and down Duke Street the first week she worked for the city.
- Leslie: Is there stronger languages we should incorporated?
  - Mindy: Put it in bright red – flashing neon lights. Do something about the sidewalks, make them safer, buffer it from traffic. Separated from other uses.
- Naima: Lots of cars in the middle of the intersection. Often you can’t get onto Duke Street from the side streets. Impacts pedestrian safety. It has become an even bigger problem during rush hour, at Telegraph Road.
  - Leslie: Have seen some places where there are hash marks on the street to help stop blocking the box.
- Devon: Some ableist language. Should define what a pedestrian is. “People walking” excludes people in wheelchairs, people in strollers.
  - Leslie: Suggestions for more inclusive words/phrases?
- Casey: On the continuous sidewalks - glad it’s there. Need to make sure people understand what we mean. They don’t just connect
down the corridor. Sidewalk that is raised as a person goes across driveways, streets, not going up and down curb ramps. At intersections, I’d encourage some language about the traffic signals themselves. There are some intersections in the city where you don’t have to push the button, you just get close to the button, and it recognizes you want to cross the street. We also need to make sure ADA requirements are met for people crossing the street.

- Leslie: Some disagreement in the room about the levelness of the sidewalks crossing driveways.
- Casey: By having it raised, it means a person driving a vehicle has to slow down. Give the pedestrian a better shot at surviving if it. If you’ve ever had to use a walker or wheelchair, it can be difficult to go up and down.
- Hillary: It’s a great point. I think raised crosswalks are excellent. It can be expensive and involve a lot of stormwater. If this group values that, it could be something that is “nice to have” as we get into design. Can prioritize at locations that have certain criteria – ped volumes, non-emergency routes, etc. Good conversation to have.
- Casey: What was meant by continuous sidewalks?
- Hillary: No gaps.
- Casey: We should clarify that.

- Meronne: Comment mostly focused on Segment 1. I live off of Walker. Walking/biking/scooter/etc. on Duke Street sucks. Everybody knows that. Also concerned about people walking from the Fairfax County side into the new West End transit hub. 395 intersection is very dangerous. Cars go very fast. Hate seeing elderly people walking down a sliver of sidewalk going to church. See people grocery shopping on the other side of the bridge and walking into Alexandria property. I want to consider – maybe not in this project – something like the overhead pedestrian bridge by Seminary Rd. Something to keep in mind. Also, we will have new housing by the big lots.
  - Hillary: New development will – particularly on the north side – have a wide shared-use path, sidewalk with the west end development. Some things on the south side. Crossings will be much safer. Pedestrian refuge islands. Coming off 395, there’ll be a new signal to have a safer crossing at Walker. The bridge is VDOT owned. We did apply for a grant to install a pedestrian bridge over 395, and we did not get that, but it’s on the books as a possible future project.

- Meronne: Someone from the comment period mentioned dedicated lanes for biking and walking. Hoping we consider options to have more dedicated lanes for pedestrians and cyclists.
  - Jen: Can show the map from last meeting showing where we can fit separated facilities and where a shared use path
would be needed. Most improvements are planned for the north side of the corridor. May be some spots on the south side. Mostly making sure that sidewalks have a minimum sidewalk width with some sort of buffer.

- Mindy: I’m getting bombarded with texts. When I say continuous sidewalks, I do not mean that fences at places like Cameron Station are coming down and sidewalks are going up to homes. That was not what I said when I said I think we need continuous sidewalks so that people can walk safely.
- Jim: Part of safety is not having vehicles coming off the roadway to hit you. Would like something like “roadway design for safe speeds” – part of the pedestrian safety issue.

- Leslie: I’m hearing continued consensus that this is a desperate need for Duke Street. A top priority for our communities and our Advisory Group. Support for continuous, uninterrupted sidewalks. I’ll extrapolate that we want those on both sides of the roadway. Buffer from traffic. Separated from other uses such as cyclists. We put in best practice recommendations for 10’ wide sidewalks. Will ask you to think about that width. We heard support for not blocking the box, ADA pedestrian signals, roadway designs. There are three additional bullets for best practices for pedestrian safety. Some of it deals with road traffic – slower turns, reassessing the need for slip lanes, and creating some pedestrian refuge islands.

- Jen: We didn’t talk about when space is limited.
- Leslie: We did hear that there is a need to separate pedestrians and cyclists. We did discuss last time that there are some places where there’s not enough space to have a sidewalk, buffer, and a cycle track. When we did the poll last time, we heard some consensus on going to a shared use path if needed. There would still be a continuous space for pedestrians and cyclists to continue on their way.
- Erin: Regarding corner radii – we need to be careful about the amount of truck traffic entering Duke Street. Be careful with engineering that we don’t make it more dangerous and cause more congestion. Getting into tradeoffs about the shared us path – I’m concerned about losing greenery and our ability to add greenery. It is important to maintain shade cover as much as possible.
- Naima: Want to make sure that everyone can see the crosswalks, especially the cars. If they need to be raised, etc.
- Mindy: Erin, related to canopy cover – the west end actually has more canopy coverage and greenspace than other parts of the city. I’ve asked them to put together the numbers. We have the numbers for Quaker Lane west. I’ve asked them to compile the numbers so we can see it.
- Erin: I’m talking about canopy coverage along the Duke Street corridor.
• Leslie: Can flesh that out more.
• Aaron: Will there be a speed limit in the shared use areas? Lots of kids may be present.
  o Jen: Can consider that.
  o Aaron: In areas with bike lanes – if riding in the sidewalk, I think that should be a fine or something like that. Scooters too.
• Hilary: Can bring together lots of comments to bring together best practices to design the roadway for safe speeds.

E. Engagement Plan
• Jenny walked through the engagement plan slides.
• Erin: How much before our May meeting will we receive community feedback?
  ▪ Jen: The Friday before.
  ▪ Erin: I find that a little troubling. This is supposed to be the last community period before finalizing our recommendation. That is insufficient time to review. I’d also like to see it in raw form rather than your summarized form.
  ▪ Hillary: If you’re ok getting it in a raw form rather than summarized with themes, we can probably get it to you a little faster.
  ▪ Erin: That would be great.
• Jim: Regarding targeted outreach. You’ve probably got this covered, but I worked for the Alexandria Health Department during COVID. It involved a lot of outreach to hard-to-reach communities. It could be good to have a conversation with Natalie Talis. She established a relationship between the health department and community groups. She’s an excellent resource.
• Devon: Bishop Ireton is in the far east section and a higher-income area. I’d like to see an open house further west – closer to rental density and businesses. Suggest making use of the central library. They’re right there on Duke Street. Even a semi-permanent display in the entry area.
  ▪ Jenny: We will definitely have materials at the library. Bishop Ireton allows us to start a meeting earlier, which is one of the reasons we planned for a meeting there.
• Meronne: This round of engagement is really important. Last round, the pop-ups and tally polls were really successful. I hope to continue seeing that. With public notices – if it’s in budget, ask that you consider things like mailers, door hangers, direct outreach to apartment and condo buildings. I’m curious about the translation of these materials. What languages are we supporting?
  ▪ Jenny: In terms of languages - Spanish, Amharic, English at a minimum for several types of materials (especially summary materials).
  ▪ Jen: We’ve found that people often like Amharic notices but respond in English. Might be hard to translate everything into Amharic. We’re also doing Hello Lamp Post in Amharic and Spanish.
  ▪ Meronne: Spanish, Amharic, Arabic, English considerations are on my mind. ACPS has 100+ languages spoken at home by their students. The web based form and any public notices: I would hope those are available
in other languages. I see other parts of the city doing targeted outreach in specific languages.

- Jenny: I think we also did mailers last round and have done some door hangers. We’ve had a bit of trouble getting permission to post things at apartment buildings.
- Hillary: We did mailers that went to residents in the area.
- Meronne: I don’t personally think I received one.
- Hillary: We will look at the radius.

- Jim: Public open house really needs to be in Segment 1. Community around Bishop Ireton is really well engaged. Don’t see a ton of engagement from people in apartments, around McDonald’s. That’s where the apartments are, people who use the bus. They really need to be involved.
  - Jen: We recognize that it’s hard to get different groups at meetings. That’s why we’re doing Hello Lamp Post, pop-ups, other types of outreach. We’re trying to go where those folks are. We did two meetings at the rec center as well.
  - Genevieve: We’re also looking at bus ride-along to reach folks.
  - Hillary: Also continuing to do targeted outreach for other communities, such as a meeting focused on the Duke at WTR intersection.

- Mindy: Agree on moving the meeting west. You have Patrick Henry School. Also, MacArthur and Samuel Tucker. To follow on to Meronne, with the Alex West Planning, we have done three adjustments to reach different populations in different languages - suggest talking to Richard Lawrence.

- Naima: For Bishop Ireton school, there are multiple low-income housing apartment buildings, and also public housing, close to that school. I don’t think it’s necessarily a bad place. I don’t know how attendance/representation would be. Earlier in the day wouldn’t be the best time. Patrick Henry is also a good location. Rec center timing – lots of kids in after school programs. 6PM is a good time. Segment 3A open house is not necessarily a bad idea – maybe BI would not be my top choice.
  - Hillary: Will note that logistics is not as easy as it seems to find these spaces. Don’t know that we can switch. If we could, would this group prefer it be moved west if the time for the open house needs to be shorter and later? BI allows us to start earlier and go longer.

- Devon: Could we do more than one open house?
- Hillary: We’ve been planning for a long time and with the earlier open houses, we found a lot of the same people came to each open house. This time we wanted to focus on one open house with more pop-ups, Hello Duke Street, and other activities. It might be challenging to schedule at this late point. We can look into it.
- Devon: Want to be clear that showing up at an open house doesn’t mean your feedback gets more weight than other ways that people give feedback. There are people who think they have more weight in this matter because they could show up.
- Jen: When we come back in May, we’ll have a summary of everything we heard from the different avenues. We’ve talked about whether to have a public
comment period at the May meeting – wary of over-emphasizing those comments.

- Erin: I believe in the past, when someone declined to answer a demographic question, in a way, that respondent was excluded from the pool altogether. When we get the summary, I want to see that 6% said they don’t want to answer, 50% said female, etc. I want to see the number of people who are declining to answer any demographic question.
  - Jenny: Ok, we can do that.

F. Next steps:
   - Hold 6:30-9pm for both April and May meetings.

G. Approval of AG #8 Meeting Minutes
   - Leslie: Erin and Leslie made some corrections to typos and wording. Any other edits?
   - Erin/Mindy: Motion/second
   - Minutes approved.

2. “Bus Station” Items

Follow Up Items Before Next Meeting
   - Utilize a more inclusive term for “pedestrian” or “walker”