

Overview of Public Meetings

May 25, 2010

**Washington, D.C. Public Meeting
Westminster Presbyterian Church
400 I Street Southwest
Washington, D.C. 20024**

Attendees:

Number of Attendees: 10

Attendee Overview: Representatives from the Holocaust Museum, Navy, WMATA, DDOT, ANC 6D (Two), and PB were present as well as three local residents.

Public Informational Feedback:

Traffic Conditions:

- One Agree
- Comment:
 - o Traffic conditions are bad – but I have doubts about how far the proposed improvements will help as these proposals are just cosmetic band-aid in nature.

Alternative 1:

- One High Importance.

Alternative 2:

- One Low Importance

Alternative Three:

- One Low Importance

Alternative 4:

- One High Importance

Alternative 5:

- One High Importance

Alternative 6:

- One Low Importance

Alternative 7:

- One Medium Importance

Alternative 8:

- One High Importance

Alternative 9:

- One High Importance

Alternative 10:

- Comment:
 - o Assigning lanes on the bridge as HOT lanes are nonsense.

Alternative 11:

- Comment:
 - o Not Recommended

Alternative 12:

- One High Importance

Alternative 13:

- Comment:

- Assigning any available space for buses will make that space idle during other times when buses are not on that road.

Management Strategy 1

- One Low Importance

Management Strategy 2

- One Low Importance

Management Strategy 3

- Comment
 - o Wrong Strategy

Management Strategy 4

- One High Importance

Management Strategy 5

- One Medium Importance

Management Strategy 6

- One Medium Importance

Management Strategy 7

- One Low Importance

Management Strategy 8

- One Medium Importance

Evaluation Form Responses:

Question 1: One 3

Question 2: One 3

Question 3: One 3

Question 4: Email Alert

Question 5: No additional comments

Suggestions/Lessons Learned from Washington, D.C.:

- With the low level of attendance at 6:30, a presentation was not given.
- The Holocaust Museum representative was very pleased that a special note was added to the Alternative 7 board that addressed their concerns. The museum's staff would be happy to work with the team in the future and they have contacted USDA and BEP to contribute to the project.
- There was a concern with the amount of meetings taking place on the same day.
- There was concern based on the level of notification.
- Due to the low attendance, it was requested that all the information from the meeting be placed on the project's website. *This was done on Wednesday following the meeting.*
- Information for this stage of the project should be displayed in public libraries and local ANC offices for those residents who do not have computers.

May 27, 2010

Arlington Public Meeting

Walter Reed Community Center

2909 16th Street South

Arlington, VA 22204

Attendees:

Number of Attendees: 11

Attendee Overview: Representatives from Arlington County, WMATA, Navy and DoD were present as well as seven local residents.

Public Informational Feedback:

Traffic Conditions:

- One Agree
- Comment:
 - o Traffic conditions are bad – but I have doubts about how far the proposed improvements will help as these proposals are just cosmetic band-aid in nature.

Alternative 1:

- Three High Importance
- Comments:
 - o Need to improve connections in DC to 15th St. and Maine Avenue.
 - o Very low Cost
 - o One person questioned the bridge name and did not select an importance.

Alternative 2:

- Three High Importance
- One Low Importance
- One person circled and started their selection to indicate this as their highest importance alternative.
- Comments:
 - o Connect to Mt. Vernon Trail. Extend Bridge in DC to Maine Avenue or beyond.
 - o Two separate issues.

Alternative Three:

- Two High Importance
- One Low Importance
- Comments
 - o New bike connections are too limited. Put up way-finding signs now.

Alternative 4:

- One Medium Importance
- Two High Importance

Alternative 5:

- One Medium Importance
- Two High Importance

Alternative 6:

- Two High Importance
- Two Low Importance
- Comments:
 - o In Alternative #6, you MUST condition that removal of North and South entrances to GWP cannot be done until and unless there is the new vehicular bridge to Boundary Channel from GWP North of CIM.

Alternative 7:

- Two High Importance
- One Medium Importance

Alternative 8:

- One Low Importance
- One Medium Importance
- Two High Importance

Alternative 9:

- One Low Importance
- One Medium Importance
- Two High Importance

Alternative 10:

- One High Importance
- One Low Importance

Alternative 11:

- One High Importance
- One Low Importance

Alternative 12:

- One Medium Importance
- One Low Importance
- One High Importance

Alternative 13:

- Two High Importance

Management Strategy 1

- Two High Importance
- One Medium Importance

Management Strategy 2

- Two High Importance
- One Medium Importance

Management Strategy 3

- Two High Importance
- One Medium Importance

Management Strategy 4

- Two High Importance

Management Strategy 5

- Two High Importance

Management Strategy 6

- Three High Importance

Management Strategy 7

- One Low Importance
- One Medium Importance
- One High Importance

Management Strategy 8

- Three High Importance

General Comments on the Feedback Forms:

- Consideration should be given to a dedicated bus bridge connection Pentagon to DC.
- Please address how BRAC, the opening of the Marc Center at Seminary Road and I-395 and forecasts for the Pentagon will affect commuting patterns.
- Perhaps beyond the scope of your study, however, unless close-in real estate prices and rents are not affordable, people will have to live further out the result is increased commute times, cars on the road, etc.
- Improve detail and clarity on webpage.

Evaluation Form Responses:

Question 1: One 1, One 2, One 3, Two 4

Question 2: One 1, One 2, Two 3, One 5

Question 3: One 1, One 2, Two 3

Question 4: Three Email Alert, One Friend, One Flyer PDF Link on Twitter.

Question 5:

- Thank you for all your time!!!
- Very poor publicity, timing and preparation
- Comments on Alternatives from one individual:
 - o Support Alt. 1 if it involves bridge widening to widen the bike/ped trail. If not, prefer Alt. 2.
 - o Alt 3 should be pursued regardless of the other Alternatives considered/chosen. Bike signage should include distances to destinations.
 - o Alt 4 should be pursued regardless
 - o Prefer Alt 6 over Alt 5, but include the Alt 5 reconfig. of the ramps from NB GWP to NB 395 and SB 395 to NB GWP.
 - o Oppose Alts 8, 9, 11, 12, and 13. Full 12 ft outside shoulders (at least 10ft minimum) should be retained on the Rochambeau Bridge.
 - o Support 10
 - o If HOT lanes do not extend across the bridge, HOV restrictions should.

Suggestions/Lessons Learned from Arlington:

- More detail was requested to put onto the website, specifically plans of the alternatives.
- The website should be more user-friendly.
- It would be helpful for a typical section to be on the board.
- The drawings of the alternatives did not show exactly what is proposed.
- Too much emphasis was put on the impacts table and the before/after pictures. Most wanted to see the details of the Alternatives and how the changes would affect their commuting.
- Have a note on renderings if there is not a difference or explain the difference.
- Better outreach is needed in the future for public meetings.

Comments in General from Both Meetings:

- We should look into alternative methods of advertising including Twitter and Facebook and links to each site can be provided to both sites on the project website. This will allow for another option for the public to receive information on the project and also provide us with feedback.
- More extensive outreach is needed. Due to the timeframe to put the meetings together, the team was not able to do the desired amount of outreach as we have done in the past for Public Meetings. We were not able to advertise in The Southwester, a very important publication in DC in our study area.
- More information needs to be put on the website about the project, but specifically the alternatives.