



Summary of Discussion

Introduction

- March 17th Meeting Minutes were unanimously approved with no changes
- Goals of the meeting include:
 - Review and approve Corridor C recommendation (not final draft but necessary step in process)
 - Start discussion on Corridors A and B
- This meeting is not the end of public process for Corridor C, but a draft recommendation is important for reasons that include the following:
 - Beaugard Corridor Plan needs input on Corridor C
 - BRAC
 - Coordination with other jurisdictions
 - Federal funding
- Next steps for Corridor C:
 - CWG, City staff, and consultant will make recommendations to City Council
 - City Council work session June 14th
 - City Council regular session in September

Corridor C Review and Recommendation

- Presentation by David Whyte
- CWG discussion/questions
 - How would dedicated transit lanes work on Van Dorn Street currently? There is no room now.
 - Response: some right-of-way acquisition is needed, this is included in the cost estimation and follows the adopted Landmark/Van Dorn plan
 - Comment: Understanding of your point-of-view is that where we can get property, we do, and where we cannot, we will run transit in mixed flow
 - How will the transit get across Duke Street?
 - Response: In the short-term, the transit can run in mixed flow and be given transit signal priority. In the long-term a new bridge will be needed that may be constructed as part of redevelopment or another project
- *Public Comment* on Corridor C recommendation
 - The mission of the CWG is creeping. The CWG's purpose as stated by the City Manager is to review the technical and financial information. We do not need a CWG recommendation at this time. There is insufficient information at this time, the recommendations are not associated with demand. We need to set priorities within a corridor
 - There is insufficient information to make a recommendation
 - The study was undertaken with a linear approach
 - The recommendations are not associated with transit demand
 - Need to set priorities within the corridor because there is a large cost to run transit from Van Dorn Metrorail station to Arlington; we don't have to buy the whole plan; suggest the first transit segment is Mark Center to Pentagon and/or Shirlington and create a successful program that sets a precedent; this would be more practical, feasible, and have a lower price tag
 - The West End is already being torn apart, don't want any more tearing down; any plan should be low impact; recommend low impact Alternative B; do not widen streets for any purpose; Beaugard Street is beautiful with the street trees
 - The corridor is constricted at Sanger Avenue and north of Seminary Road; the master plan says to take a lane, not to add a lane; if the City does not pay for right-of-way, the capital cost will decrease
 - Option D makes a lot of sense; like the idea of taking a lane for transit, but it is politically infeasible; prioritize transit from Van Dorn Metrorail station to BRAC
 - Remind the CWG that you get what you pay for; a low cost, low impact system will have low



- effectiveness; dedicated lanes are important
- CWG comments on Corridor C recommendation
 - *Poul Hertel*
 - There is an issue between the Ad Hoc Transportation Policy and Planning Task Force and City staff regarding interpretation of the Transportation Master Plan (TMP)
 - The Task Force wanted to create a paradigm shift by taking away traffic lanes for transit
 - A Transitway that adds new dedicated lanes rather than taking away traffic lanes to create dedicated traffic lanes is not what I spent five years fighting for
 - Want a transit system that Alexandrians would use, not a rough shot through a neighborhood
 - The route on Van Dorn Street needs to be thought out more
 - Streetcar
 - Cost would be lower if used existing travel lanes
 - Route is problematic to connect to Columbia Pike
 - Travel time savings is not there
 - Limited seating supply
 - BRT
 - Travel time savings is not great compared to the Rapid Bus
 - Prefer Alternative B
 - Would support Alternative D over Alternative G
 - Want to push away through traffic and build a transit system for the City of Alexandria
 - *Donna Fossum*
 - BRAC is showing up in less than 90 days and needs to be accommodated
 - There is an issue of equity in the West End
 - Metrorail serves 30 percent of the City's population
 - City already has the northern part of the Corridor A Transitway on the books and an Environmental Assessment planned
 - 43 percent of the City's population lives on the West End
 - Want for the West End what Corridor A got
 - Recommend settling for Alternative D now, but want a streetcar (Alternative G) as soon as possible
 - *Dak Hardwick*
 - Thanks for public comments
 - Budget and fiscal advisory representative
 - Cost may be the most important factor to consider
 - Alternative D is under the threshold of New Starts; appreciate the lower project and documentation costs
 - Consider the amount of federal match for Alternative D versus Alternative G
 - Can get up to 80% of the capital costs paid federally
 - Federal funding is key to moving forward
 - Want the maximum amount of federal dollars
 - Analysis to this point is very good and appropriate for this stage
 - Obviously more detail is needed going forward
 - Equity of East End versus West End of investment; one-third of the development crescent without rail is Corridor C
 - Landmark/Van Dorn plan was passed
 - 12 million square feet of development space
 - Plans for complete streets and dedicated transit lanes
 - Plans for right-of-way acquisition needed to achieve complete streets



- Troubled that the TMP is being used to say the City cannot acquire right-of-way when the Landmark/Van Dorn plan was passed after the TMP was passed
- Donna Fossum and Dak Hardwick presented a motion regarding a recommended alternative (the final motion is included below)
- *William Denton*
 - Support Alternative D with Donna Fossum's recommendation regarding future Alternative G
 - Allows flexibility to move from Alternative B and move toward streetcar
- *Nancy Jennings*
 - The analysis presented is honest, but no origin-destination study was conducted
 - Question Corridor C as a transit corridor because do not think people want to go from the Van Dorn Metrorail station to Mark Center
 - Question the Arlington connection because of the travel time along Columbia Pike and Shirlington is a destination in the area
 - Do not want to tear out trees along Beauregard Street for a system people will not use
 - Van Dorn Street section of Corridor C is more viable for transit
 - BRAC people are not all coming from Fairfax
 - Like Alternative B, support Alternatives D or G for Van Dorn Street only
- *John Komoroske*
 - Like that numbers were provided in the analysis
 - Paul is correct regarding the intent of the TMP to create a paradigm street, but believe that instead of reducing capacity in one are, we could add capacity in other areas
 - Make sure the system is attractive and competitive because people are giving up some freedom to ride transit instead of driving a car
 - Understand the equity issue
 - Agree with Donna Fossum and Dak Hardwick's solution
- *Councilman Rob Krupicka*
 - The idea of scarcity for traffic to drive people to transit is important; need to understand where there are opportunities – i.e., which corridors make sense to widen, vs. those that already have enough congestion to change modes / habits; there is an obligation to balance the goals of mode shift versus time it will take to commute
 - A recommendation to take away a traffic lane for a transit lane requires a gigantic leap of faith; need to balance practical with ideological
 - Look at how the Transitway could be built in phases, **the phase through Landmark will be different that that through Mark Center**
 - Continue to evaluate opportunities to use existing right-of-way
 - Include language in a recommendation that says that other parts of the City do not need new right-of-way to build transit
 - Not comfortable with building a transit system that will be stuck in traffic like Alternative B
 - Show a system that people like and use to encourage other systems; success build success; it is important that we get people from Mark Center to the Pentagon.
- *A motion was made for the CWG to adopt the following statement regarding Corridor C:*
 - "Alternative D is the preferred alternative for phased implementation of transit in dedicated lanes in Corridor C until such time as Alternative G becomes feasible and can be implemented. This course of action is consistent with the Council's recent decision to provide dedicated lane transit along the segment of Corridor A that is north of Braddock Road. Evaluation and analysis will continue of Alternative D in preparation for future implementation of Alternative G.



Construction of transit in Corridor C shall be the first priority of Alexandria's transportation projects. Each subsequent corridor shall be evaluated separately regarding the need to acquire additional right-of-way for dedicated lanes as discussed in the Transportation Master Plan."

- CWG members Denton, Fossum, Hardwick, and Komoroske voted in favor of the Resolution and CWG members Hertel and Jennings voted against the Resolution.
- CWG member Bentley was absent from the meeting and CWG member Rob Krupika was absent during the vote

Corridors A and B

- Presentation by David Whyte
- Review of Transit 101
- CWG comments regarding Corridors A and B
 - *Donna Fossum*
 - Circulators would be a useful option – need to add these into the mix of alternatives
 - Along Eisenhower we should do what we did at Potomac Yard to plan an infill Metrorail station – the line is already there but the demand is not, though it is coming in the future
 - Duke Street from Jordan to Quaker Lane is only four lanes with no turn lanes
 - Perhaps transit could go where roads could not - consider transit to cross the railroad tracks and creek
 - Need a combination of services on Eisenhower Street and Duke Street
 - *Dak Hardwick*
 - Duke Street has heavy traffic east of Quaker Lane; when the Telegraph/I-495 and I-495 HOT lanes projects are completed, will traffic be alleviated?
 - Response: These projects should have a significant impact in reducing traffic, but still anticipate traffic after construction
 - In Old Town we have the beginnings of a circulator in place, but buses are inconsistent and infrequent; putting bus schedules on poles would help
 - DASH orientation in Old Town would be helpful in looking for routing
 - *Poul Hertel*
 - Would like to see the capacity of Metrorail and Metrorail ridership projections
 - The TMP looked at people moving north-south and east-west; movement east-west in the City is a big problem
 - Would like to see the capacity of metro and metro ridership projections
 - Rebranding and enhancing circulators is the best option
 - Almost guarantee that parking on Patrick Street will not be removed
 - What happens on Washington Street? Does parking go away and come back later?
 - Notion of dedicated lanes in Old Town is difficult if not impossible
 - DASH system is currently undesirable to use
- *Public Comment* on Corridor A and B
 - For Corridor A, suggest recommending the no-build option because there is already Metro in the corridor
 - A large percentage (42%) of Census tract 14 already uses Metro to go to work. What additional market will be gained from additional transit service? Area already saturated and metro will continue to be utilized
 - There has never been regularly scheduled transit on Route 1
 - Transit on Route 1 presents a safety issue, especially in area of Patrick and Henry



- East-west rail service over Woodrow Wilson Bridge is a more important problem
- The waterfront area is far from the Metro. Is there a plan for street car along the waterfront?
- In Corridor A, is the Arlington to Monroe Bridge issue settled? Need to define corridor limits better
- Adding transit will be good for Old Town economically
- Roads are low capacity, transit is high capacity so need to add transit and take away from roads
- Why not consider going up GW Parkway instead of Patrick Street?
- Dedicated bus lane takes away parking
- Need to work out transit with Maryland – a significant amount of traffic coming from MD
- There is already a bus line, is this not enough?

Conclusions

- Project team will take Corridor A and B alignment comments into account
- The next meeting is July 21, 2011
 - Alternatives for Corridors A and B
 - Location will be announced at a later date

Logistics and Next Steps

-
- The next meeting will be Thursday, July 21, 2011. The standing meeting is the third Thursday of each month at 7:00pm.
-
- A survey for Corridors A and B was available at the meeting and on the project website
 - General comments are accepted on the project website
-