

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
DISTRICT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION



Transportation Policy and Planning Administration

**Memorandum**

**TO:** Sharon Schellin, Secretary  
Office of Zoning

**FROM:** Kenneth G. Laden   
Associate Director

**DATE:** January 12, 2007

**RE:** George Washington University Campus Plan  
Zoning Case Number 06-11 and 06-12

RECEIVED  
D.C. OFFICE OF ZONING  
2007 JAN 22 AM 10: 25

On January 4, 2007, the Department of Transportation forwarded to the Office of Zoning responses to most of the questions submitted by the Foggy Bottom Association and Advisory Neighborhood Commission 2-A. The following are our responses to questions 12 through 15, which were not provided in the January 4, 2007 response.

**12. In preparing the report dated 27 November 2006, did DDOT consider the impact on traffic of the various potential transportation changes currently under consideration (e.g., Whitehurst Deconstruction Study, Juarez Circle, Bike Lanes, etc.) when combined with the proposed Campus Plan development?**

Yes, the Department does take into consideration related development activities and transportation improvements.

**(a) If your answer to question 12 is "no," why was that?**

Not applicable.

**(b) If your answer to question 12 is "yes," please identify the analysis and conclusions that were reached as to each change that was considered.**

DDOT's testimony typically is based on the review and analysis of information provided by the applicant. The Department then conducts site visits of

ZONING COMMISSION  
District of Columbia  
CASE NO. 06-11  
ZONING COMMISSION  
District of Columbia  
EXHIBIT NO. 046  
CASE NO. 06-11  
EXHIBIT NO. 246

existing conditions and observe transportation issues at the site first hand. We do not have the resources to conduct full scale “alternative” transportation studies.

In our initial testimony, dated September 14, 2006, we indicated our general concurrence with the findings and recommendations of the consultant’s analysis of existing conditions. Our testimony dated November 27, 2006 focused primarily on questions raised by Mr. Mehra regarding truck traffic assumptions, traffic queuing, traffic signal requirements, background traffic growth assumptions in the Wells Report, and parking enforcement issues.

In our review of the Wells Report and the overall Campus Plan proposed by GWU, we felt that the proposed Campus Plan significantly impact any imminent or proposed development projects or transportation system modifications in the neighborhood. Should major modifications be made to the transportation infrastructure in the Foggy Bottom/West End communities, the Campus Plan would be considered as part of any infrastructure project development.

**(c) If your answer to question 12 is “yes,” why did DDOT not address any of these points in its report of 27 November 2006?**

See response above.

**13. Another item that was not addressed in DDOT’s report dated 27 November 2006 is pedestrian safety. Did DDOT consider pedestrian safety in its analysis of the Wells reports?**

Yes, DDOT staff did consider pedestrian access and safety in reviewing the Wells report.

**(a) If your answer to question 13 is “no,” why was that?**

Not applicable.

**(b) If your answer to question 13 is “yes,” please identify DDOT’s analysis, and conclusions on this topic.**

In DDOT’s testimony to the Zoning Commission, we typically indicate those elements of the applicant’s traffic analysis we concur with in a very generalized statement, and focus our comments on where we disagree with the applicant’s transportation analysis or recommendations. Our testimony also typically focuses on where we request that the Zoning Commission consider additional or alternative traffic mitigation measures or improvements.

Regarding this specific case, our initial testimony to the Zoning Commission, dated September 14, 2006, DDOT indicated in the first paragraph its general concurrence with the conclusions and recommendations of the proposed

Transportation Management Plan. The Pedestrian Plan portion of the Wells Report is very short and recognizes that physical design impacts all forms of circulation and that pedestrian traffic within the GWU campus follows both formal and informal pathways within the campus. The Wells Report also mentioned locations where special treatment may be required at several mid-block crossing locations.

We generally agreed with this assessment and therefore did not comment directly on it in either our September or November testimony. DDOT places greater emphasis in addressing pedestrian traffic needs and safety in its testimony related to specific development projects proposed under this Campus Plan.

**(c) If your answer to question 13 is "yes," why did DDOT not address the issue in its report?**

See response above.

**14. Following the September hearing in this case, DDOT received the previously cited 4 October 2006 letter from Wells & Associates (and perhaps other communications as well). Following the 30 November hearing in this case, did any person at DDOT receive any oral, written, electronic or other communications from any person not employed by DDOT in connection with this case (Z.C. Nos. 06-11 & 06-12), the questions being propounded here or DDOT's answers to these questions?**

I am not aware of any communication with the applicant or anyone associated with this case following the November 30, 2006 hearing, except for telephone calls from the applicant and their legal representatives requesting the status of our responses. No additional technical information was shared.

**(a) If the answer to question 14 is "yes," please identify the person(s) who provided all such communications and the person(s) who received all such communications.**

Not Applicable

**(b) If the answer to question 14 is "yes," (i) please attach to your answers the text of any written or electronic communication that was received, and (ii) please summarize the contents of any oral communication that was received, identifying the person providing the communication and the person who received it.**

Not applicable

**15. Since answers to these questions are to be provided in lieu of answers to cross-examination, (a) please identify all individuals who prepared the answers to**

**these questions, and (b) please confirm that the answers provided are being provided from personal knowledge.**

Responses to these questions were prepared by Douglas Noble, Associate Director for Traffic Services and Chief Traffic Engineer, Kenneth Laden, Associate Director for Transportation Policy and Planning, and Jeffrey Jennings, Transportation Management Specialist. All responses have been drafted based upon our personal knowledge and information provided by support staff.