APPENDIX M
COMMUNITY COMMENTS

Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO.16852
EXHIBIT NO.346A6

COMMUNITY COMMENTS

This appendix summarizes comments received from citizens throughout the study. The firsts section includes comments received prior to the preparation of the draft report. The following section addresses comments with respect to the material included in the draft report. Page numbers mentioned in this appendix refer to page numbers of the Draft Palisades Traffic Impact Study and may not correspond to the page numbers of the final document.

COMMENTS RECEIVED THROUGHOUT THE STUDY

Jack Koczela:

I have done my best to go back in time and retrieve all the "recent" email on the subject of crossings on Canal Road, both at Arizona Avenue and at Reservoir Road. They are reprinted below. I think you need to read from the bottom up to keep them in any kind of chronological order. These areas represent (figuratively, not literally) the mid-point and southern ends, respectively, of the Palisades neighborhood, and the points that residents would like made safer for pedestrian and bike access to the Canal and the Capital Crescent Trail. [My focus for the moment is really on the Arizona/Canal Road area.]

I have long thought that a flashing yellow light (made red on demand only), together with a "zebra" pedestrian cross walk at Reservoir Road (to the Fletcher's Boat House area), was a rather simple improvement that could be made without much fuss from any party and with minimal cost (as these things go).

With respect to the Arizona Avenue intersection, you should be aware of the following, which I believe is accurate:

1. There are no sidewalks on Arizona Avenue or Canal Road.
2. DC residents (and others) are unable to make a left turn onto Canal Road from Arizona Avenue during an extended morning rush hour. Of course, in the evening, Canal Road is one way outbound (north) from Foxhall Road to Arizona Avenue. (Likewise, it is one way inbound [south] during the morning rush hour).
3. Rush hour is not the standard 7-9:30 or 4-6:30 as in most other locations in DC. Why the extended time frames apply on Canal Road is anyone's guess.
4. The train trestle across the Canal is a registered historic landmark. This overpass is now used by the Capital Crescent Trail (CCT).
5. There is a small pedestrian, informal path, used by the daring, that runs from the CCT at the trestle, down the hillside to Arizona Avenue. This was created during the construction process of the CCT.

Likewise, there is an informal path that goes up the hill from the CCT, through the woods to Potomac Avenue. The NPS has expressed interest in closing this unsafe path, figuring that the cost to make it safe was prohibitive and that they were already helping the neighborhood stabilize and clean up two other neighborhood access points.
6. The DC government owns the land at the southeast corner of the intersection of Arizona and Canal. It is part of the Palisades Recreation Center property. The Mayor, on various occasions, has indicated that DC has long term plans to make major improvements to the Rec Center.
7. Various persons have expressed an interest in either building sidewalks all the way down Arizona from MacArthur Blvd. to Canal Road, or otherwise creating pedestrian access at that point. [My personal view is that pedestrians and high speed traffic do not mix well. This is also our neighborhood's most traversed intersection.]

I hope that the above, together with the emails reprinted below, give you some background on these issues. Let's talk at your earliest convenience. Again, read the email from the bottom up and remember that the "conversation" goes back and forth between the Reservoir Road/Canal Road and Arizona Avenue/Canal Road intersections.
Kind regards,
Jack Koczela

-----Original Message-----
From: Bill Becker [mailto:bb@bdiusa.com]
Sent: Monday, November 26, 2001 9:14 PM
To: Brophy, Heather [DPW]; Abraham Lerner
Cc: Douglas_D_Faris@nps.gov; seawalk@starpower.net; AHG71139@aol.com; mkrayer@aspensys.com
Subject: Palisades Traffic Study

Dear Heather and Abraham,

I'm glad I had an opportunity to attend the Palisades Traffic Study meeting tonight. I'm excited to see the results of your efforts. I just wanted to summarize a few things I mentioned at the meeting (along with a few other things):

Intersection of Canal Road and Reservoir and Fletchers Boat House Entrance
This is a terrible intersection that combines speed, confusion, unclear signage, lack of signals, multiple pathways, pedestrians, bikers, and cars. While a long term solution might include a pedestrian bridge, I really hope some short term solutions will be considered including a crosswalk, signal, signage preventing certain actions (any of 4 u-turns) and advance warning of a crossing. Below, I have included a letter I sent to Dr. Gridlock at the Washington Post several months ago.

Reservoir Road at top of hill prior to entrance onto Canal Road There used to be a DO NOT ENTER sign between 6-10:30am and 2:30pm-7:30pm. This sign is now gone. The only sign is a white sign indicating ONE WAY EAST on Canal Road between 6:15-10:15am and ONE WAY WEST on Canal between 2:45-7:15pm. This one sign is inadequate and does not make it clear that you should not drive beyond this sign during the posted times. Someone unfamiliar to the area wouldn't even know where Canal Road is. A DO NOT ENTER sign should be re-posted asap to prevent a head-on collision on Canal Road during rush hour.

Reservoir Road between MacArthur and Canal Road
This section of Reservoir Road is a mess. It's unevenly paved and the parking is just gravel. Storm drainage is poorly marked adding to the hazard. This stretch of Reservoir including the parking should be repaved.

Sidewalk on Whitehaven below St. Patricks
This section of Whitehaven clearly needs a sidewalk. Students from St. Patrick's have no safe way to walk down to MacArthur Blvd. I also believe that Whitehaven should have speed-humps to slow traffic especially at the crosswalk to the recently completed gymnasium opposite the school.

Crosswalk in front of Safeway
This is a frequent crossing point on MacArthur Blvd. It is especially dangerous due to vehicles pulling out of Safeway's parking onto MacArthur (at U St.)

Walk Signal Call Buttons
Throughout Pallisades these buttons to request a Walk Light are inoperable and should be repaired.

Reservoir Road between Foxhall Road and the French Embassy
For Westbound traffic between the French Embassy and Foxhall it is unclear whether there are two lanes. These lanes should be clearly marked and parking should be eliminated especially during rush hour.

Thanks for all your efforts.

Regards,

Bill Becker

Dear Dr. Gridlock,

I live off of Reservoir Road just below MacArthur Blvd. My wife and I are avid cyclists and we often ride our bikes along the canal. In order to get over to the towpath we need to cross Canal Road at Reservoir Road. We often do this with our small children in tow on bike trailers.

This intersection of Canal and Reservoir is an accident waiting to happen. Here's the problem. During non rush hour there is two way traffic moving at a speeds of 40-55 mph. Combine this with the following:

Occasional cars heading west on Canal that attempt to make a U-turn onto Reservoir Occasional cars heading east on Canal that attempt to make a U-turn (or back into) Fletchers Boat house access. Frequent cars heading east that are baring left onto Reservoir Road. Cars exiting from Fletchers boat house that are attempting to make a U-turn to head west on Canal Road Cars exiting from Fletchers boat house that are attempting to make left turn up Reservoir Cars merging from Reservoir onto Canal Road heading west. Occasional cars attempting to make left turns from Reservoir onto Canal Road East. Runners trying to cross Canal Road. Biker trying to cross Canal Road

All this without a any traffic signal, crosswalk, or flashing caution light. The condition described above worsens when the traffic becomes one way at rush hour. The big difference is that speeds become greater because Canal Road is used by most commuters as a high speed artery into and out of the city.

It's amazing that the City or Park Service doesn't believe a light is required at this treacherous intersection.

PLEASE HELP. WHAT CAN WE DO TO HAVE A LIGHT OR PEDESTRIAN OVERPASS INSTALLED. IF SOMEONE HASN'T ALREADY BEEN KILLED AT THIS INTERSECTION, IT'S BOUND TO HAPPEN.

Thanks.

Bill Becker
4829 Bending Lane, NW
Washington, DC 20007
H)202-333-5311
W)703-803-6900 x111 BDI Becker Designed, Inc.

I got a call today from Glenn Gerstall, a resident in the Palisades area. He had three issues.

1. Intersection of Arizona and Canal -- He is interested in having left turn availability during morning peak hours so he could access Canal Road along with others from Upper Northwest going eastbound. I'm not sure what has prevented this so far.

2. Canal in the evenings -- He is interested in extending the evening time for oneway westbound traffic on Canal. He believes it stops at 7:00 and would like it extended to 7:30. I really think it goes until 7:15.

3. Canal and Foxhall intersection -- Wants a No U-turn sign put in. He says people do it and have had accidents over the years.

Heather Brophy

AHG71139@aol.com wrote:

Ann, the light at Whitehaven and Foxhall came up at the Ward 3 Traffic Task Force meeting last week. The design for the light has been completed and it has been sent out for bid. Installation will follow. There seemed to be some confusion regarding the widening of Whitehaven. Only the turning areas at the intersection are to be widened. They have no plans to add an additional lane on Whitehaven at this time.

At 10:00 AM 10/10/01 -0400, you wrote:

Alma,
Good news about the light, but the turn lane widening does not solve the problem we were trying to solve: the dangerous back up onto Foxhall of the St. Patrick's pick-up line, and the obstruction of traffic on Whitehaven during the pick-up period. Suggestions as to where we go from here?
Grae

-----Original Message-----
From: john finney [mailto:finneyj@worldnet.att.net]
Sent: Wednesday, October 10, 2001 11:07 AM
To: Grae Baxter
Cc: Laden, Ken (DPW)
Subject: Re: Update on Whitehaven Light

Grae/Alma/Ann:
AND MR. LADEN;
My suggestion would be that the traffic congestion on Whitehaven and Foxhall should be included in traffic study of the Palisades that Mr. Laden and the Division of Transportation are about to launch.

In retrospect, maybe we made a mistake in permitting DOT to rent public land to St. Patricks for faculty parking, not appreciating the congestion that would occur as parents--or nannies-- come to drop off and pick up children. The land still belongs to the District should it be found necessary for safety reasons to widen Whitehaven to accommodate traffic created by the school .

Regards,
John Finney

-----Original Message-----
From: Andrew, Robert
To: Abraham Lerner; Heather Brophy
Sent: 12/3/2001 10:49 PM
Subject: FCCA Input on Palisades Study

First: thanks for good work improving traffic light timing at Foxhall/Canal/MacArthur. Can you let us have the updated timing(s) so we can replace what we now show at http://www.foxhall.org/traffic/timing.htm?

Second: We still have concerns that two of our intersections will need physical work: http://www.foxhall.org/traffic/foxmac.htm and http://www.foxhall.org/traffic/foxres.htm

See background correspondence
http://www.foxhall.org/Letters/FoxMac44th.htm and
http://www.foxhall.org/traffic/ANC2ELetter.htm submitted by ANC2E on Nov 19, 1999

We look forward to an opportunity to discuss the issues with you soon in more detail

Bob Andrew, V.P. for
http://www.foxhall.org/
Cell #: (202) 365-4945

-----Original Message-----
From: Peter Barrett
To: abraham.lerner@dmjmharris.com
Sent: 12/4/2001 9:22 AM
Subject: St. Patrick's/Traffic Study

Mr. Lerner:

I'm sorry it has taken this long for me to get this promised e-mail off to you. As Head of School at St. Patrick's Episcopal Day School on Whitehaven Parkway, I have a particular interest in your work on the Palisades Traffic Study and would like to share my thinking with you. St. Patrick's has 440 students, three-year-old Nursery students through Grade 6, on its Whitehaven campus. This year, we opened a Grade 7 program nearby at 4880A MacArthur Boulevard and will open a Grade 8 there, as well, next year. (We have also made an offer to purchase a property at 4925 MacArthur Boulevard as a permanent home

for our Grades 7 and 8 program and have just begun rolling that proposal out to the community.)

My immediate concern is traffic flow and safety along the short stretch of Whitehaven Parkway on which our main campus is located. We make certain demands on that piece of road: Two times a day, for about 30 minutes-plus each time, the carpools that drop off our students at the beginning of the day (mostly between 7:45 and 8:20 a.m.) and pick them up at day's end (between 2:45 and 3:20 p.m.) pretty much make one lane of upper Whitehaven (above our campus) their own. Two smaller Nursery carpools - at about 9 a.m. and noon - also occur daily. (All carpool traffic is instructed to approach the school from Foxhall Road.) For 25 years at this location, St. Patrick's has had to get students to school and then send them on their way home again. One of my hopes is that during the period of the traffic study you will observe the operation to get the feel of it. "Success" for us is, in large part, keeping queuing back-ups off Foxhall Road. We have been more successful recently, with the disappearance of our general contractor's construction trailer from the lower third of our driveway three or so weeks ago, enabling us to break up more readily a sometimes persistent logjam. "Success" also entails moving the cars in our driveway along safely and efficiently, a goal that involves a significant faculty presence at arrival and dismissal times.

Upper Whitehaven used to be considerably more congested than it is today. Two years ago, St. Patrick's - at its own expense - effectively widened the travel lanes by carving out the diagonal parking spaces that exist there today. (Because those spaces are in public space, we pay an annual assessment to the District in order to reserve them for our community's use.) At the same time, St. Patrick's installed the sidewalk that runs from Foxhall to our campus, the only sidewalk along Whitehaven Parkway, significantly increasing pedestrian safety for our faculty and staff, students, parents, and visitors - as well as anyone else walking in that area. Between the diagonal parking spaces and the recently completed two-level parking facility below our new gym, St. Patrick's has created more than 100 spaces for use by its faculty and staff and other members of our school and church facility, effectively pulling all of our day-to-day parking off of Whitehaven Parkway.

That new gymnasium is located on the north side of Whitehaven, across the street from the main Day School building. Also located across the street are a playground (adjacent to the gym) and a playing field (above and behind the gym), meaning at various times during the day, we have young children crossing the street to move from one part of campus to the other - presumably under teacher supervision.

While area residents may complain about the delays caused by occasional queuing back-ups along upper Whitehaven and onto Foxhall during our carpool times, the truth of the matter is that traffic usually travels up and down Whitehaven at speeds that are altogether too high, period, and certainly too high for a street that is the school-home for 440 elementary school students. Whitehaven serves as a convenient cut-through between Foxhall and MacArthur, and far too few drivers seem to care much about who inhabits the street.

Complicating this picture is that GWU/MVC was forced to move its main entrance from W Street to upper Whitehaven Parkway - and will open that entrance in the next couple of months. And the traffic signal planned for the intersection of Foxhall and Whitehaven will also provide a magnet for traffic along Whitehaven (it will be immeasurably safer for traffic to turn north on Foxhall off of a traffic-signaled Whitehaven than off of an uncontrolled W Street). The impact of the Field School opening on Foxhall Road next year will certainly increase traffic on Foxhall, and perhaps on Whitehaven, as well. So traffic is bound to increase, perhaps dramatically, meaning that our children will be put further at risk.

St. Patrick's never opposed that new entrance. Instead, we said repeatedly that we could work with GWU/MVC to create a workable situation along the street. My confidence in that statement, to be honest, has diminished since the time I made it, in large part because I think the community's - and the District's - attentions are so relentlessly focused on the impact of GWU/MVC.

We recognize that Whitehaven, with just one owner-occupied residence among the three remaining homes on the street, is bound to receive traffic pushed over from more residential streets. We accept that fact - but ask, in return, that the District and area residents recognize the imperative to protect the children who spend their days along upper Whitehaven. I fear that institutional voices carry little weight amid the clamor of residential voices.

Whitehaven Parkway is in desperate need of traffic-calming measures, particularly as one approaches the crosswalk that links the two parts of our campus. Those measures might include rumble strips (with the firehouse at the foot of Whitehaven, I doubt either speed humps or speed bumps are likely) on both the eastbound and westbound approaches to the Day School and its crosswalk. Certainly proper signage and flashing lights are necessary, as well. Furthermore, I would suggest that stop signs at the crosswalk itself would begin to provide the level of protection our children need - at the same time they have the overall effect of slowing traffic along this route.

We're going to get the traffic - that's for sure - at whatever speed. I only ask that we get the range of measures that are necessary to protect our children and other members of our community.

I would be pleased to have you visit St. Patrick's, especially during one of our carpool times, so that we can discuss these issues on-site and brainstorm some possible solutions. Please call me at 202.342.2804 to set a time for your visit.

I am delighted that the District has undertaken a Palisades Traffic Study and look forward to the positive impact such a study can have on traffic and safety in the area. Thanks for your attention to this over-long e-mail.

Peter A. Barrett
Head of School

St. Patrick's Episcopal Day School
4700 Whitehaven Parkway, NW
Washington, DC 20007
202.342.2804
barrett@stpatsdc.org

From: TTGWASHDC@cs.com [SMTP:TTGWASHDC@cs.com]

To: thomas.prestia@dmjmharris.com

Cc:

Subject: Foxhall & Reservoir Intersection

Sent: 1/31/2002 11:09 AM **Importance:** Normal

Tom:

As promised last evening at the Sibley Hospital meeting, attached is the proposal regarding the Reservoir and Foxhall intersection and the proposal the FCCA Board and local residents developed over a two year period to resolve the Eastbound A.M. rush-hour traffic-jams and commuter-rage problems. This proposal was approved by all but one vote at a formal Foxhall Community Citizens Association meeting convened to discuss this matter.

Please note the difference with your group's current recommendation: we recommend that the right lane should be converted back to a Right-Turn-Only lane to prevent the more aggressive commuters from trying to pass center lane commuters on the right to make the light. This is what makes tempers flare, has caused several accidents, and forces bottlenecks at the Foxhall intersection. Adding the left-turn lane at the light should eliminate any problems from left turners holding up the center-lane traffic. Pushing the no-parking area back on the East side of Foxhall will merely encourage more right-lane usage to jump the light. If rush-hour street parking between Foxhall and Georgetown Hospital were eliminated entirely, which we determined to be unfair and inconvenient for the residents, then use of the right lane for through traffic would make sense - not otherwise.

Hope this input is helpful.

Peter Moriarty
4636 Reservoir Road
DC 20007
202-466-5760

Government of the District of Columbia
District Division of Transportation
Washington, D.C.
Attn: Kenneth Laden
Heather Brophy
Abraham Lerner

RE: Palisades Traffic Study – Reservoir & Foxhall Intersection

At the regularly scheduled, duly noticed Foxhall Community Citizens Association meeting held on February 21, 2001, the following resolution was approved by all but one vote:

"Whereas aggressive driving and congestion problems currently plague Eastbound Reservoir Road morning commuter traffic at the Foxhall Road intersection. Impatient commuters use the right lane to pass left-lane through-traffic and then cut back in line across Foxhall Road causing a bottleneck at this intersection."

"Whereas the Eastbound Reservoir Road right lane is intended primarily for right turns at the Foxhall Road intersection."

"Therefore it is resolved that the Department of Public Works should replace the existing "Merge Left Ahead" sign at Kenmore Drive with signs stating "Right Lane Right Turn Only" plus arrow instructions for right-lane-right-turn-only and for straight-ahead/left-turn lane. These signs should be located: on the pole at 4612 Reservoir Road; on the pole just before Kenmore Drive; and before the Foxhall intersection. Furthermore, it is resolved that the Department of Public Works should yellow-stripe the street pavement area before the triangular island at the Reservoir/Foxhall intersection to identify the right-turn-only and no-cross-over requirements for the right lane."

This matter was never formally voted on by the ANC-2E, in part because no provision was made for alleviating potential problems from Eastbound left-turn traffic during rush hour. To resolve this problem a third lane for left-turn only traffic could be created in place of the existing raised-concrete median strip. Essentially, this layout would mirror the lanes across Foxhall for Westbound Reservoir Road traffic. It may be found necessary to have a left-turn arrow on the traffic light if left-turn traffic is considered to be heavy enough.

These proposals have been carefully thought out by members of our neighborhood over the last two years and should be of assistance. Feel free to call with any questions.

Sincerely yours,

Peter F. Moriarty

From: TTGWASHDC@cs.com [SMTP:TTGWASHDC@cs.com]
To: thomas.prestia@dmjmharris.com
Cc:
Subject: Further Comment on DMJM Harris Proposal For Reservoir & Foxhall Roads
Sent: 1/31/2002 12:21 PM **Importance:** Normal

Tom:

I re-read your narrative proposal for "fixing" eastbound Reservoir Road traffic at the Foxhall intersection. It is not what I originally thought. You're not recommending more No Parking for East of Foxhall, but rather for West of Foxhall - which would make the problem considerably worse.

The problem is that aggressive commuters seek to dive into the right lane as far West of Foxhall as possible specifically to jump the light and then aggressively push their way back into the left lane on the far side of Foxhall - which enrages and backs up the left-lane through commuters. Currently, a car which waits its turn in the left through lane to cross the intersection, loses one light for every five cars that jump the light using the right lane because the latter force their way back into the single lane on the far side of the intersection, causing the bottleneck. To add more running room for this practice would dramatically exacerbate the problem.

The solution for traffic calming and control West of Foxhall involving Eastbound traffic is to eliminate use of the right lane except for right-turn traffic! Unless the East side of Foxhall is two lane for Eastbound traffic all the way to the Georgetown Hospital (which will never happen), then no traffic should be permitted to use the right lane for through-traffic purposes on either side of the Foxhall intersection.

Peter Moriarty

From: Prestia, Thomas
To: 'TTGWASHDC@cs.com '
Cc:
Subject: RE: Further Comment on DMJM Harris Proposal For Reservoir & Foxhall Roads
Sent: 1/31/2002 1:28 PM **Importance:** Normal

Peter:

I re-read the preliminary improvements list, and I see what you are referring to. The improvement should be "Prohibit parking on eastbound Reservoir Road for the first 300 feet east of Foxhall Road." Saying "west" instead of "east" was a typo, albeit a large one.

We will take your proposed solution into consideration as we evaluate the preliminary improvements and make our final recommendations.

Thank you for your input.

Sincerely,

Tom Prestia
Project Engineer

-----Original Message-----
From: Peter Barrett
To: abraham.lerner@dmjmharris.com
Cc: BradleyK@advisory.com; heather.brophy@dc.gov; mjwells@mjwells.com; Mark Vershbow
Sent: 2/10/2002 11:23 AM
Subject: Whitehaven Parkway traffic

Mr. Lerner: I apologize for the lateness of this reply to your 1/30/02 presentation at Sibley Hospital of the findings of your Palisades Traffic Study to date. First, let me observe that you said at the end of the meeting that you had not settled on a date or a place for the next meeting. I would be pleased to make space available here at St. Patrick's School at 4700 Whitehaven Parkway for that purpose. We have a number of possible locations for such a meeting - especially if the crowd will continue to be as "intimate" as it was on 1/30. We'd just have to make sure there isn't a conflict with something like Scouts or a Church event, but I am confident that we could host your next presentation in even more pleasant surroundings. Now on to substance: As I mentioned to you and Ken Laden after the meeting, I am delighted with your identification of issues and recommended improvements along Whitehaven Parkway. My earlier correspondence with you tried to focus attention on the need for pedestrian safety, with more than 400 nursery and elementary schoolchildren at St. Patrick's alone, as well as the safe flow of traffic. Your recommended improvements get right to those issues. Let me respond to them individually:

Convert Whitehaven Parkway to one-way westbound: It sounded like this proposal is dead on arrival. We wouldn't support it in any event. The opening of the GWU entrance on Whitehaven probably is enough to kill it. Our diagonal spaces were designed - at DPW's direction - to be approached eastbound.

Eliminate AM peak hour parking on north side in front of St. Patrick's: We have created more than 100 new off-street spaces (the diagonals and our new gym parking garages) across the last two or three years, so we can certainly envision on-street parking restrictions and/or prohibitions to limit congestion and promote traffic flow. Our on-going work with Marty Wells of Wells & Associates embraces such restrictions and/or prohibitions from St. Patrick's first driveway down as far as the western edge of our gymnasium, on both the north AND south sides.

Construct sidewalk the length of north side: We would, of course, love to see this happen, but our local ANC commissioner has said the District has already told her it won't happen. As a (shorter) alternative, why not consider the south side? The topography would seem to be better (the north side climbs pretty quickly in most areas), there's pretty much a single property owner on the south side (the Lab School, although I guess PEPCO has some property closer to MacArthur), and you'd only have to bring it to our property, where the sidewalk could then hook up with the one in front of our school and with the one we installed along upper Whitehaven. Just a thought.

Install raised crosswalk between school and gymnasium: YES! I have noticed that there has been a stop sign installed recently at the crosswalk at 39th Street and Klingle Place, between Cathedral Avenue and Massachusetts Avenue, near Annunciation School. (39th is one-way in that stretch.) I continue to wonder if stop signs wouldn't be appropriate at our crosswalk, even with the raised crosswalk - and definitely if that raised crosswalk were, for some reason, to disappear from the plans.

Install speed humps, one between crosswalk and Foxhall and the other between crosswalk and MacArthur: YES!

Please remember my expressed concern that there might be some parking restrictions and/or prohibitions in front of our building but that the raised crosswalk and speed humps might (mysteriously or otherwise) disappear. The effectively widened street would encourage higher speeds along Whitehaven, especially approaching our crosswalk from upper Whitehaven, unless there are traffic-calming measures like speed humps and the raised crosswalk. I implore you not to restrict and/or prohibit parking unless such traffic-calming measures are in place.

I hope someone in your office has, by now, had an opportunity to have some conversation with traffic engineer Marty Wells (703.917.6620). We look forward to continuing to refine proposed improvements for Whitehaven Parkway. We appreciate your attention to the safety needs along this street, which will only get more traffic as the GWU entrance opens and Field School comes on line.

Peter A. Barrett
Head of School
St. Patrick's Episcopal Day School
4700 Whitehaven Parkway, NW

Washington, DC 20007
202.342.2804

-----Original Message-----
From: TheRiches2@aol.com
To: abraham.lerner@dmjmharris.com
Sent: 2/3/2002 4:32 PM
Subject: Palisades traffic iimprovements

Dear Mr. Abraham,

I attended your presentation at Sibley Hospital January 30th and commend you for your report and excellent presentation. I would like to make a couple of comments and suggestions.

1) Arizona and Loughboro: I have a great deal of trouble making a left turn off of Arizona onto Loughboro Road in the afternoon. Cars coming down Loughboro and turning on Arizona like to go through the stop sign 3-5 cars at once on their way home to Virginia. (I do note the license plates.) Your suggestion of adding "all way" will perhaps help a bit, but the only way really to stop people is with a red light.

2) MacArthur and Arizona: On my street, Hurst Terrace, we have seen a great increase in commuters cutting through. They go fast and often don't stop at the stop sign. With a public school on Hurst and so many young children, I can't help but worry. I think "left turn lanes" at MacArthur and Arizona would be beneficial for commuters, residents and those of us who have a hard time turning left onto MacArthur both ways from Arizona because of the Virginia/Chain Bridge traffic. It is very hard to see oncoming cars coming north on Arizona at MacArthur because of the incline and the cars so speed that by the time you see them, they are about on you. I often go west on MacArthur at Arizona and then go down a block and "U" turn back onto MacArthur east. Its easier. I like your idea of taking part of the medium for left turns on MacArthur. Already on Arizona, there are the left turn lanes, but the light does not have a green turn arrow. I have lived in Palisades for over thirty years and have seen a number of accidents there.

3) Foxhall and Reservoir: Going east it is awful in the morning. A left turning lane, a through lane and a right turn lane are the best solution there. I don't think the DC property owners on Reservoir east of Foxhall should have to give up their right to park in front of their homes because of commuters. Its not fair as there is no parking on the other side of the street and the alleys behind these homes do not allow parking.

4) Reservoir and Canal Roads: And as I said the other night, the intersection of Reservoir Road and Canal Road at Fletchers Boathouse is extremely dangerous. The fast speeds cars are driving on Canal are way over limit and it is so hard to get across there. A light is the only solution and it would help to slow these speeders down. I cross that

intersection quite regularly and each time, I fear I will be crashed into and probably crushed by a big SUV. Also in the mornings at 10:00am to 10:15, while it one lane is closed to clear for two way traffic is the only time I can get across easily, but then I can't get out and across. It would be helpful to have a flashing yellow "hidden intersection" sign from both directions. It would be helpful to have the bushes and weeds cleared from the street that make it almost one lane on Reservoir. The cars coming up there in the morning speed up thinking it is one lane. I fear just driving down to Canal. You may wonder why I even go there, but I love it down there.

I am sorry to go on and on. I am so grateful that this study has taken place and that you are open to suggestions. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,
Sherry Rich

Re: Palisades Traffic Study
From: SMNevins@aol.com [SMTP:SMNevins@aol.com]
To: abraham.lerner@dmjmharris.com; Dottiemw@aol.com
Cc:
Subject: Re: Palisades Traffic Study
Sent: 2/5/2002 5:46 PM
Importance: Normal

Thanks for the information. I am sorry I missed the meeting and appreciate being filled in. In scanning the "Issues & Preliminary Improvements..." the section of Canal Road between MacArthur & Whitehurst Freeway is the first section to back up causing conjestion up-stream, ie northbound Foxhall & westbound MacArthur. The recently reconstructed Whitehurst/ Key Bridge/Canal Road intersection is choked because of eastbound traffic entering Georgetown. This traffic blocks the southbound traffic going onto Key Bridge. I believe there is enough width at the Whitehurst/Canal Road traffic light to allow a designated lane for cars turning onto Key Bridge. I would think loosening up this bottleneck on eastbound Canal Road would have a positive impact during rushhours as well as during the other times that Canal Road backs up.

I'd be interest in your thoughts on this.

Many thanks, Sherry Nevins

Suggestions to Palisades traffic study

From: Kauffman, Nick [SMTP:nkauffman@dchealth.com]
To: abraham.lerner@DMJMHarris.com
Cc: "alma gates"AHG71139@aol.com; finneyj@worldnet.att.net

Subject: Suggestions to Palisades traffic study
Sent: 2/12/2002 11:56 AM
Importance: Normal

Hi Abraham,
Alma Gates gave me your name in regard to the "Issues and Preliminary Improvements in the Palisades Area" document. I'm delighted, as is the entire neighborhood, to see a comprehensive assessment of the problems being worked on. I have two immediate requests to make of you.

1. I note that you have listed the intersection of Foxhall Road and Reservoir Road at an area-of-concern. I note this AOC is listed due to ?northbound traffic on Foxhall turning left on Reservoir and westbound traffic on Reservoir turning left onto Foxhall. These may be problems more encountered by commuters. I and many of us local residents have greater problems in morning rush hour proceeding inbound on Reservoir Road with intent to turn right onto Foxhall and proceed to Canal Road. The inbound Reservoir Road right lane is always blocked at the Foxhall light by lane jammers trying to get back into the left thru lane after the light. They have caused many problems and are a potential accident waiting to happen. Moreover they completely back up the traffic wanting to turn right onto Foxhall while they wait to crowd back into the thru lane after the light changes. This lane should be marked "right turn only during rush hour" at a minimum. Pliase add this to your issues for this intersection.

2. The plethora of intersections noted is difficult without a simple map or diagram. If you could add a map with the AOCs circled it would be a great help in visualization.

Thank you,
Nick Kauffman
Environmental Chairman
Palisades Community Association

Foxhall/Reservoir & Foxhall/MacArthur Intersections

From: Bob Andrew [SMTP:rdandrew@erols.com]
To: Abraham Lerner; Prestia, Thomas
Cc: Scott Polk; Peter Moriarty
Subject: Foxhall/Reservoir & Foxhall/MacArthur Intersections
Sent: 2/5/2002 8:58 PM
Importance: Normal

Foxhall/Reservoir

I have posted at http://www.foxhall.org/FoxRes.jpg an annotated aerial photo that illustrates the points Peter Moriarty and Scott Polk have been making to you.

Foxhall/MacArthur

Rather than a traffic circle, how about my concepts at
http://www.foxhall.org/FoxMac.jpg for avoiding "blocking the box". once you rephase the light for 44th St.

Regards, Bob Andrew

P.S. these are also linked from
http://www.foxhall.org/traffic/corridor.htm right under your own diagrams
Peter Moriarty plans a write-up for our "Foxhall News".

Status of Palisades Traffic Study?

From: Bob Andrew [SMTP:rdandrew@erols.com]
To: Abraham Lerner; Ken Laden
Cc: Scott Polk; John Finney
Subject: Status of Palisades Traffic Study?
Sent: 4/4/2002 7:20 PM
Importance: Normal
It's now been over two months since the Jan 30 public meeting at ANC3D (see www.foxhall.org/traffic/corridor.htm). If I remember correctly, the next steps were to identify short-term, medium-term, long-term action items for action, planning, funding. When will DDOT be ready to bring any of these back for public review? It would help if it included plans to commit the left-over money (over and above Field School entrance modification money) from $2 million congressional funds for Foxhall Road safety improvements on pedestrian and

cyclist safety, specifically for that narrower section above Whitehaven Parkway. (See our weekly column at http://www.foxhall.org/Current/2002Feb27.htm). Also, any specific plans on entrance/exit for the 1801 Foxhall Rd(mayoral mansion project would also be helpful.

Regards, Bob Andrew
Cell : (202) 365-4945

Palisades Traffic Study

From: Peter Barrett [SMTP:Barrett@stpatsdc.org]
To: abraham.lerner@dmjmharris.com
Cc:
Subject: Palisades Traffic Study
Sent: 5/20/2002 2:08 PM
Importance: Normal

Mr. Lerner: Could you up-date me on the status of these Whitehaven Parkway-focused recommendations of the Palisades Traffic Study? (Has that study been completed? Will there be another public meeting regarding the study soon?)
1. Raised crosswalk between St. Patrick's main building and the gym and parking garage.
2. Speed humps - one east of the raised crosswalk and one west of it.
3. Sidewalk on south side, from MacArthur to St. Patrick's.
4. No parking on north and south sides (7 am to 4 pm) from St. Patrick's gym eastward toward Foxhall - study period, July-October.
Am I forgetting anything?
5. Traffic signal at Foxhall/Whitehaven?

Thanks.
Peter A. Barrett
Head of School
St. Patrick's Episcopal Day School
4700 Whitehaven Parkway, NW
Washington, DC 20007
202.342.2804

>>> "Lerner, Abraham" <abraham.lerner@dmjmharris.com> 05/23/02 01:35PM >>>

Mr. Barrett,
Mr. Ken Laden of the District Department of Transportation is trying to set up a meeting to discuss the recommendations of the Palisades study. He is trying to set up the meeting during the first week of June, 2002. Once the time and place is set up, I will send you an e-mail with the meeting information.

Thank you for your help in the Palisades Traffic Study,
Abi Lerner

RE: Palisades Traffic Study

From: Peter Barrett [SMTP:Barrett@stpatsdc.org]
To: abraham.lerner@dmjmharris.com
Cc:
Subject: RE: Palisades Traffic Study
Sent: 5/24/2002 3:55 PM
Importance: Normal

Thanks for your reply. That first week of June will be a bear, as we finish up the school year and get everyone "graduated," but I'll hope to be able to attend any meeting that's scheduled. (The next week looks better for me.)In the meantime, have the recommendations I listed below survived this far in the process? Any additional ones been added that might be of interest to folks along Whitehaven Parkway?

"Prestia, Thomas" wrote:

Ms. Baxter:

Recently, the ANC approached DMJM+Harris and DDOT concerning the draft Palisades Traffic Impact Study with regards to improvements at the GWU Mt. Vernon Campus. There appear to be a few discrepancies, and the ANC has requested that we verify what is actually taking place. If you are not the correct person to contact regarding this information, please forward this email to those responsible for it.

The issues are as follows:

1. "The George Washington University at Mount Vernon College Master Plan Traffic and Parking Assessment," prepared by Gorove/Slade Associates, Inc., and dated May 17, 1999 shows approximately 80 vehicles using the W Street driveway during the AM peak hour, roughly half of the 155 total AM peak hour trips. However, a mediation agreement between GWU and the BZA dated December 9, 1999 states under Draft Condition 2.(a) "The Applicant estimates that over 90% of campus related vehicles will use the Whitehaven Parkway entrance after completion of Phase 1." Is the information contained in this Agreement still current and valid?

2. A public meeting was held on June 26, and the issue of sidewalks on GWU's property along Foxhall Road was raised. Will GWU be providing sidewalks along Foxhall Road?

The ANC is looking to move forward on other projects in the area and has requested that we resolve these issues as soon as possible.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me at 202.671.1485. Thank you for your time.

Very Truly Yours,

Thomas F. Prestia
Project Engineer
DMJM+Harris, Inc.
thomas.prestia@dmjmharris.com

From: Grae Baxter [SMTP:gbaxter@gwu.edu]
To: Prestia, Thomas
Cc: Charles Barber; Joyce Javois

Subject: Re: Palisades Draft Traffic Impact Study and GWU-Mt. Vernon
Sent: 6/28/2002 1:58 PM **Importance:** Normal

Mr. Prestia,

The following will respond to your inquiries in connection with the Palisades Draft Traffic Impact Study and GW at Mount Vernon College:

1) The Traffic and Parking Assessment accurately described the situation at the time of the Gorove/Slade study. The shift in campus traffic patterns contemplated in the mediation agreement subsequent to that study has in fact occurred. This past spring, as Phase I construction neared completion, we opened the new Whitehaven entrance. Our experience to date is as anticipated, over 90 percent of campus-related vehicles, including all shuttle buses and student, faculty and staff cars, use that entrance. The W Street entrance is now generally restricted to use by visitors.

2) In response to a request from the community, the university agreed to contribute $20,000 towards the city's installation of a sidewalk on the east side of Foxhall Road, across Foxhall from our property, running between the Whitehaven and W Street intersections, on the public right of way.

Please let me know if you have any further questions.

Grae Baxter

Dear Ms. Gates:

This email is in response to issue/questions concerning St. Patrick's Episcopal Day School raised at our meeting on June 27.

Concerning the PM peak hour used in the queuing comparison for St. Patrick's, TSA started with the same school peak hour traffic volumes used in the Wells study. These are not the same peak hour volumes used in the Palisades Study. St. Patrick's volumes, as well as volumes for GWU and the Field School were then added to the school peak hour to account for additional development traffic.

The discrepancy between the daily traffic volume data on Foxhall Road that was collected in the Palisades study (16,000), vs. the other daily volumes shown at the meeting (approximately 17,500) can be attributed to daily fluctuations in traffic. As Abi Lerner said in regards to peak hour traffic volumes, they may vary by as much as 10 – 15 percent on any given day.

Ms. Grae Baxter of GWU emailed me concerning the usage of the W Street driveway and the sidewalk issue along Foxhall Road. As stated in the Agreement, the W Street

driveway is expected to handle visitors only, accounting for 10% of traffic to the Mt. Vernon campus. In light of this, and as requested, we have re-evaluated the expected future St. Patrick's queuing along Whitehaven Parkway and Foxhall road, based on new traffic distributions, taking into account GWU's driveway usage. A revised table is attached. The table shows that the additional traffic using the GWU driveway will create a very slight increase in the queuing on Foxhall Road and Whitehaven Parkway.

The university has agreed to contribute $20,000 to the construction of sidewalk on the east side of Foxhall Road, on public right-of-way, between Whitehaven Parkway and W Street.

Please forward this email to Ms. Van Sickle. If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me at 202.671.1485.

COMMENTS ON DRAFT REPORT

Subject: Telephone conversation Peter Moriarty on Palisades Study with Abi Lerner
Location: Telephone

Start: Tue 5/28/2002 9:30 AM
End: Tue 5/28/2002 10:00 AM

Recurrence: (none)
Peter will send a petition on the intresection of Foxhall and Reservoir Road today.

Two more issues:

1. Kenmore Drive access: Zebra stripe to prevent vehicles blocking the intersection. No parking area north side of Reservoir Road

2. Hubard Road/Hatfield/45th Street: Pedestrians cannot safely get across the intersection. Cars have a right turn lane and proceed without looking at pedestrians. Install a pedestrian button for right turn signal if technically possible. Or construct a sidewalk on the east side of Foxhall from Reservoir to Whitehaven Parkway (going across mayor's mansion).

I told him that we will conduct field observations of these two issues.

Palisades Traffic Study

From: AHG71139@aol.com [SMTP:AHG71139@aol.com]
To: abraham.lerner@dmjmharris.com; ken.laden@dc.gov
Cc:
Subject: Palisades Traffic Study
Sent: 5/31/2002 9:57 AM
Importance: Normal

Abi and Ken, the Palisades Traffic Impact Study is impressive. As a practical matter could you put together one additional piece of information? A chart showing the long-term and short-term implementations recommendations in the study? Also an explanation of what those terms mean to DDOT? I think it will save you a lot of questions and perhaps give the community a guide as to when things might happen. It will also be useful for the Ward 3 Traffic Task Force. Thanks, Alma Gates

---

Foxhall Safety Study

From: Jjohnsoncalari@worldbank.org [SMTP:Jjohnsoncalari@worldbank.org]
To: abraham.lerner@dmjmharris.com; ken.laden@dc.gov
Cc: ccalari@worldbank.org; barrett@stpatricks.washington.dc.us;
tgibson@whwg.com; stephen_gardner@McKennaCuneo.com;
Jarmstrong2@worldbank.org
Subject: Foxhall Safety Study
Sent: 6/9/2002 2:43 PM
Importance: Normal

Dear Mr. Lerner and Mr. Laden,
I understand the you have led the Palisades Traffic impact study and I wanted to bring to your attention the acute situation of the children and other pedestrians who need to walk down Foxhall on segments where there are no sidewalks. The segment that is articularly critical is the section between W Street and Whitehaven Parkway. Students and other residents who live in Wesley Heights can now access W Street through the new footwalk from 44th Street, which the Field School donated to the US Park Service. Also, the Field School will be building a sidewalk between Dexter and W Street. The walk on Foxhall from W Street to Whitehaven Parkway, however, is extremely dangerous. One must walk on a 15 inch footpath within a couple feet of speeding cars. There is also no easy alternative because of the space occupied by George Washington--Mount Vernon. We understand that there is now federal money of $2-3million to improve the safety of Foxhall Road and we ask if you could ensure that this situation will be addresed. We have continously raised the issue of the dangerous situation for pedestrians who need to walk on Foxhall Road, which is a residential street zoned as a country road. George Washington promised to donate $30,000 to build the sidewalk between W Street and Whitehaven Parkway when they acquired Mount Vernon but we have seen nothing in two years. The Department of Public Services testified at the BZW hearing for the Field School that Foxhall Road was too much dangerous for Field School students to cross at W Street and we raised then the issue of the residents facing the same situation. We have written to the newspapers, called the city and raised this issue at numerous neighborhood meetings. Now that there is money allocated for the improvement of the safety of Foxhall and there is a stoplight planned for Whitehaven Parkway, which will allow residents to cross. As an aside, it would also improve the traffic situation as the families who live on the east side of Foxhall need to drive to the neighborhood schools, which are all on the west of Foxhall, creating car pool stack-ups. The walk to school would be a convenient alternative and would alleviate traffic problems. (Within the neighborhood, St Patricks Day School, the Lab School, Our Lady of Victory, Georgetown Day School and

Rock Creek International School are all on the west side of Foxhall.) On behalf of the neighborhood, we look forward to discussing this issue with you at the upcoming meeting June 26th on the Palisades traffic situation.

With best regards,
Jennifer Johnson-Calari
2205 Foxboro Place, NW
Washington DC

RE: Palisades Traffic Study
From: Peter Barrett [SMTP:Barrett@stpatsdc.org]
To: abraham.lerner@dmjmharris.com
Cc:
Subject: RE: Palisades Traffic Study
Sent: 6/10/2002 5:21 PM
Importance: Normal

Mr. Lerner: Thanks for your reply. I'll certainly plan to attend that evening. I'm particularly concerned that the recommended raised crosswalk (and therefore, presumably, the speed humps) appears to be in danger, based on discussions our staff and consultants have had with Ms. Pollack. We'll be right where I feared we would end up - an effectively widened upper Whitehaven Parkway (with no parking on the north or south sides) inviting even higher speeds than already exist on the street, with increased traffic as a result of Field School, GW, and the eventual traffic signal at Foxhall and Whitehaven. As a policy matter, I think the safety of children on the street should trump local concerns about traffic elements that have been used effectively in other jurisdictions.

Comments prepared June 10, 2002
by Jack Koczela, 5525 Hawthorne Place, NW, Washington, DC 20016
via e-mail

1. Although I was not involved in any of the initial planning meetings held to get this study launched, I am certain that others in the neighborhood were. I need to find out exactly who, so I can better coordinate our comments and not step on toes. Do you know who was part of the very initial undertaking?

2. A. As mentioned in an earlier email I sent, DCDOT was questioned about why the study was restricted only to major arterials and we did not really get a satisfactory answer. It might be that funding for the study somehow legislated the purview of the study itself. I am in favor, however, of studying the worst problems first. I think your questions on the "budgetary guidelines" for the purview of the study as well as for cost considerations of remedial proposals should definitely be answered by DMJM and DCDOT.

B. We have a real quandary about prioritizing expenditures and prioritizing solutions, when it comes to our "less traveled" streets. For example, the 50-60 cars that upset my neighborhood tranquility and traverse my street (quiet little Hawthorne Place) daily, are a spit in the bucket to the thousands on MacArthur, Arizona, etc. The traffic I mention is generated by the Palisades School and Community Church, and St. David's, which are at either end of the street. I am hard pressed, however, to try to focus the study and solutions on Hawthorne when the magnitude of the problem at the other locations is so great. We do live in a city and a certain amount of traffic is to be expected; that is what makes it vibrant. I believe we have to help our public employees prioritize. In this regard and again for example, the PTIS now makes mention of the significant cut through traffic on Cathedral from Arizona to MacArthur. The authors from DMJM and DDOT missed this in the first draft, but listened at the community meeting to comments made, and then made adjustments to their report, now in its second draft. Good productive process.

3. In the Palisades we are cursed, as you point out, with being a victim of "foreign traffic." We don't want it, but it is also unlikely that enough barriers can be put up to keep it out. Therefore, in order to avoid gridlock and make flow of our own "Palisades based" traffic somewhat smoother, we have to find ways to not only get rid of the "foreign traffic" but also to have it flow more smoothly (not faster) through and out. I give you an example. My kid is part of a daily carpool of 5 kids that attend Hardy Middle School. Parents alternate driving over the 5 school days. All of us have no choice but to use the secondary and tertiary streets--that's where we live (Sherier, Dorsett, Hawthorne, and 48th Streets)--but we also must traverse MacArthur and Arizona, etc., etc, where the volume is great. [For the record, I am sure that some of these trips have become part of the count on Sherier where 2 of the 5 kids reside.]

4. I agree that the "Study Goals" are admirable as a start, but that the report is basically silent on pedestrian and bicycle safety, mobility, and infrastructure. Again, this was pointed out to them at the last community meeting. Both Sebastian and Cepeda have joined the DCDOT staff since then, so perhaps we can prevail upon the department to let them weigh in [if it is deemed "too late'", perhaps they could write a bike and ped section each as an official '"addendum" to the report]. What do you think?

5. Your example of the traffic signal by the Safeway being rejected is right on point as far as I am concerned. If one assumed that the goal of capital improvements was to increase pedestrian safety as a first priority, then perhaps the cost of signaling that intersection would not seem so great--especially if the neighborhood wants a light there. As you point out, we are probably fighting USDOT standards. However, it might help if our local officials took the sides of the locals rather than promulgating the federal party line. Who is the report for, anyway? That way a comment by OUR officials such as, "Although a peak hour

signal warrant analysis was conducted...and the warrant was not met under any conditions, nevertheless the local community is strongly in favor of such a signal for pedestrian safety concerns and it is therefore deemed to be recommended by this department." How does that
sound? Would it play in Peoria? How about on Capitol Hill? Do you think we can get the ped unit of DCDOT to count pedestrian crossings at a dozen or so major intersections in the study area (especially when schools are in session--they are out already this year)?

6. The "green wave" suggestion you made in your note as well as at our bike/ped meeting is excellent. I used to live in Jersey City, NJ and I believe they had the best green wave in the country on Kennedy Blvd., the main north/south route in town.

Comments prepared June 14, 2002
by Jack Koczela, 5525 Hawthorne Place, NW, Washington, DC 20016

1. The format and much of the content of the report is excellent, and the work done to date is very commendable.

2. As pointed out at a community meeting held earlier this year, the report is devoid of any study of pedestrian and bicycle traffic and therefore, in my opinion, is incomplete. I am aware of a current and ongoing city-wide bicycle study being conducted by DDOT. The findings of that study, as they pertain to the auto PTIS study area, should be incorporated into a "comprehensive" PTIS. In addition, pedestrian traffic in the study area should also be included.

3. The report needs to outline, as a condition of its parameters and findings, the budgetary guidelines that indeed control its study parameters and recommendations.

4. Page A-2, third bullet, second line: delete "and Canal Road"

5. Can the report identify the citizen groups and/or individuals who provided the bulk of the "assistance" to the Study Team?

6. Figure 1, Study Area Map, omits the Palisades Pre-School and Community Center Church on Cathedral Avenue. This school and community center has a regular student body, houses the local boy scouts and cub scouts, the Jungian Society, and is the home of regularly scheduled music instruction. All known licensed pre-schools in the Study Area should be included as well. The Study Area Map also omits the location of the Palisades Branch of the DC Library on V Street, NW. While none of the Study Area churches are shown, I believe they all should be located on the map.

7. MacArthur Boulevard (page 8): The description of this roadway fails to mention that the landscaped median is not present from Reservoir Road to Canal Road. Further,

MacArthur Boulevard has both AM and PM rush hour parking restrictions on much of the same stretch from Reservoir Road to Canal Road. (I believe, but have not verified, that parking is prohibited on the west side of MacArthur along the boundary of the reservoir facility.)

8. Please make the strongest possible statement about the M4 loop (page 11) and the need to continue that service. I believe, but cannot verify, that the ANC and the PCA have both passed resolutions endorsing a permanent loop.

9. The study should, if possible, include license plate based surveys at the major educational institutions in the study area WHEN SCHOOLS ARE IN SESSION. This data would be valuable, not only for the current PTIS, but would serve as an excellent objective measurement benchmark for all future development of these institutions. Some of the institutions are "neighborhood based" (e.g., Our Lady of Victory School and Key School) and encourage walking; most of the others do not and in fact are "foreign traffic" generators.

10. The "Safety" section (page 25) is really only a report on automobile accidents in the area (a necessary part of the PTIS, of course). The report needs to find a way to deal with pedestrian and bicycle "lack of safety" as a cause for residents not wanting to walk or ride their bikes on our streets. It is the proverbial negative catch 22: we can't get more folks to walk or ride bikes if they don't feel safe, and if they are not safe, they won't walk or cycle. The recent striping of many crosswalks on MacArthur Boulevard is a step in the right direction. The addition of numerous yellow pedestrian "caution" signs is also extremely helpful. How can the report deal with the need for more of these?

11. Development Traffic (page 35): It is not clear what projected new vehicle volumes had to be met to make this list, but perhaps the following were overlooked:

    11.1. Sibley expansion (more than what is already in place);
    11.2. All new infill residential development throughout the area (not too hard to count);
    11.3. Meeting enrollment caps at any of the schools (e.g., Rock Creek) that presently are under allowable caps, or expansion (e.g., Key and St. Patrick's);
    11.4. Other retail development (e.g., Dana & MacArthur);
    11.5. Although it is "outside" the study area, the redevelopment of the Sangamore shopping area is already generating cross jurisdictional traffic as folks, particularly those west of Arizona go to that Safeway and the local restaurants as an alternative to the U Street Safeway and restaurants;
    11.6. Same comment applies to any developments and increased employment at the Defense Mapping Agency locations on MacArthur and on Sangamore as part of DOD expansion.

12. Arizona Avenue (pp59-62)

12.1. Preliminary improvements Nos. 5 and 6 (page 60): Why cannot the installation of a sidewalk be a short or mid-term improvement and why, to the layperson, is reclamation of pavement a cheaper solution? It would seem that moving a curb would be tremendously expensive.

12.2. Arizona and Canal intersection

12.2.1. I applaud the long awaited recommendation to allow AM left turns from Arizona onto Canal. Maybe once, DC taxpayers will be allowed to use DC streets.

12.2.2. While I find it important to add a crosswalk to the intersection, it must have a pedestrian controlled "walk" signal to go with it. In addition, while I am supportive of the need to provide additional access for pedestrians and cyclists to the Capital Crescent Trail, I question the wisdom of *introducing and mixing* ped/bike traffic with automobiles at the highest speed, "...highest [auto] accident rate...intersection in the study area...." To me, that is a formula for disaster. Finally, if these improvements are made for peds/bikes, rather than paving the path to the CCT, I would suggest a lower impact type of improvement. Something along the lines of the wooden steps and a bike ramp similar to that which was installed at the Manning Street access path might be more appropriate and safer.

12.3. Arizona cut through on Cathedral (page 61) – The recommendation to install the Do Not Enter signs and all-way stops signs is applauded. The 4-way stop at Cathedral and Hawthorne, in front of the Palisades Pre-School and Community Church, has had a measurable impact. However, if speed bumps eventually are installed on the stretch, rather than two at the top end of Cathedral, one should be placed just below the line of sight to the light at MacArthur, as it is there that motorist speed up to try to make the green signal.

13. Reservoir Road (page 62-63). Please clarify the issue. If the issue is cars turning right to go south onto MacArthur from Reservoir, I would suggest that the installation of more signs is not the solution. That is just "sign pollution" for sake of a standard law. A driver is simply NOT allowed to turn right from a left lane at anytime, anywhere, unless it is signed to the contrary. A little enforcement would be a better solution. However, the issue is not clear as presently stated.

14. Canal Road and Reservoir Road Intersection (page 64). All of the auto movements, which are listed as unsafe, assume an uncontrolled, un-signaled intersection. If priority, at non-peak hours, were given to pedestrians and to auto traffic trying to access Fletchers Boat House and the C&O Canal, and the intersection was managed in that fashion, than most of the problems listed as unsafe for automobiles also get resolved.

15. Canal Road "Evaluation" (page 66) regarding lane control signals being affixed to the trail bridge. That trestle is on the National Historic Register (I believe) and therefore, DCDOT will have difficulty affixing anything to it.

From: "reillydolan" <reillydolan@msn.com>
To: "john finney" <finneyj@worldnet.att.net>,
<dan.tangherlini@dc.gov>,
<muhammed.khalid@dc.gov>,
<wilhelm.derminassian@dc.gov>,
<ken.ladden@dc.gov>,
<drgridlock@washingtonpost.com>,
<anthony.williams@dc.gov>,
<schwartzc@dccouncil.washington.dc.us>,
<dcatania@dccouncil.washington.dc.us>,
<kpatterson@dccouncil.washington.dc.us>,
<mayor@dc.gov>
Cc: "James Dolan" <JDOLAN@FTC.GOV>
Subject: proposed changes to traffic pattern on loughboro rd.
Date: Tue, 25 Jun 2002 21:49:46 -0400
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4133.2400
X-OriginalArrivalTime: 26 Jun 2002 01:50:30.0181 (UTC)
FILETIME=[D9FDD550:01C21CB3]

Dear sirs:

I just learned this evening (Tuesday, June 25th) that the DC Transportation Department has scheduled a meeting tomorrow evening, June 26th, at Sibley Hospital to solicit input for proposed changes to the traffic pattern and parking on Loughboro Rd. It is my understanding that the proposed plan is to ban parking on the street, so that the road becomes dedicated 4 lanes (as opposed to the current 4 lane road where parking is permitted, and God-forbid, drivers have to be alert for parked cars ahead of them).

Unfortunately, I am unable to attend tomorrow's meeting, BUT DO NOT CONSIDER MY INABILITY TO ATTEND AS TACIT APPROVAL OF YOUR PROPOSAL. Quite to the contrary, your proposal is irresponsible to, and reckless endangerment of, the residents on the street.

First, if you proceed with your plan, your are recklessly endangeringthe lives of a number of small children. If you had studied the demographics of this neighborhood, you would know that the average age of residents has dramatically decreased over the last few years. What was once considered to be an elderly neighborhood, now is a young neighborhood with a number of young children, many living on Loughboro itself. I have a 2 year-old, as does my neighbor. And 3 other toddlers live just around the corner on a Loughboro side street. As it is, I am very concerned about not allowing my son to walk in the front

of my house because if he bolts towards the road, he is DEAD. By removing parking, and announcing that all 4 lanes are dedicated to traffic, the DC government is converting Loughboro into a parkway, or should I say speed way. As it is, cars routinely drive 35 miles or faster (evidence of this can be seen by looking at every tree along the street. There probably is only 1 or 2 that have not had a car far exceeding the 25 mile per hour limit plow into it.) By converting the road to No -parking, the message is loud and clear that Loughboro is the same as Canal Rd, where the speed limit is 35/45 miles, but no one does less that 55 mph. (in contrast, even major thoroughfares such as Mass. Ave. allow street parking).

Second, one of your base assumptions why it is acceptable to ban parking is flawed. It is my understanding that 1 reason provided as justification for the plan is that cars do not park on Loughboro anyways. The reason, however, is directly due to the DC government's incompetence or lack of interest for protecting residents in this area of the city. The primary reason most residents avoid parking on Loughboro is that we are concerned about leaving our cars in a road that already is a speedway. As mentioned above, cars routinely exceed the speed limit, and it is not uncommon for cars to, in essence, race down the street, only to have the inside car have to swerve to avoid a parked car. Yet there is only minimal law enforcement, and attempts to get well-placed stop signs installed are rejected because "there are not enough accidents to warrant such a safety feature." Sometimes a car in the inside lane does not swerve in time or at all. For example, currently there is a car "parked" on Loughboro with the rear left tire practically ripped off and the front right tire on the curb. Obviously some car was speeding (the only way the rear tire could be ripped off the axel as far as it is). For other examples, look at every tree again (one tree 2 doors down from my house is scarred because a 20-something male was driving 70 miles an hour, crossed all 4 lanes, and plowed head first into the tree. I watched him die. I also watched a woman who was speeding and wrapped herself around the tree directly across the street die). The answer is not to remove legally parked cars and encourage such behavior, but to enforce the speed limit, and take steps other governments employ to curtail commuting abuses, such as stop signs (I recognize speed bumps are not practical because Sibley is on Loughboro).

Third, any decision to ban parking in front of our homes, and dedicate all 4 lanes to traffic makes Loughboro homeowners second class citizens. I often must wait several minutes to pull out of my driveway during morning rush hour, and many times the only reason there is a break is because the homeowners several blocks up the street often park on Loughboro, causing traffic to slow down and free up the inside lane. If the pattern was changed making Lougboro a speedway, who knows how much more difficult it will be to get out each morning. What makes this even more frustrating is that the DC government would be doing this solely for the benefit of Maryland drivers using Loughboro as a commuter way.

Since I cannot attend the meeting tomorrow, please place this correspondence on the public record (with my street address & ph #s properly redacted).

James Dolan

Date: Wed, 26 Jun 2002 10:55:41 -0400
From: "Christine Hagerty" <Christine.Locke-Paddon@bea.gov>
To: <Ken.Ladden@dc.gov>
Cc: <dan.tangherlini@dc.gov>, <finneyj@worldnet.att.net>
Subject: Conversion of Loughboro Road in the Palisades Traffic Impact Study Draft

June 26, 2002

Ken Ladden
Ken.Ladden@dc.gov
Associate Director of Planning
D.C. Department of Transportation
Washington DC

In Re: Conversion of Loughboro Road from 2 lanes to 4 lanes in the Palisades Traffic Impact Study Draft Report.

Dear Mr. Ladden:

I am writing to request your help with Loughboro Road. I am unable to attend the Transportation Department's public hearing tonight on the Palisades Traffic Study; however, it is urgent that I comment on the "Draft Report" of the Traffic Impact Study of the Palisades. The most pressing concern and need is for improving safety. Safety comes first before the improvement of the flow and control of traffic and the recent conversion from 2 to four lanes on Loughboro Road has caused traffic to go from dangerous to life threatening.

Loughboro Road has recently been converted ahead of plans being finalized and without notice to residents from a two lane road to a four lane road. Already, this change has dramatically increased the speeding which was already a serious problem. Importantly we have only one means of ingress and egress for our property which requires that we be able to safely back out on Loughboro Road in order to exit our home. The additional lane has made it impossible for us to safely do so. Often our only remedy to safely access our property is via on-street parking however since the repaving it has become impossible to park in front of my home. Not only is this very dangerous, it is disturbing our peaceful enjoyment of our property. Commuters honk when we attempt to park in front of our home because the second lane appears to be a drive though lane rather than for residential parking. As I already mentioned, because the only means of ingress and egress for our property is to back out , it is essential that we park in front of our home for safe access. The proposal outlined on Page 52 of the draft Palisades Traffic Study recommends eliminating our parking as follows:

"1. Stripe Loughboro Road as two lanes in each direction between Chain Bridge Road and Arizona Avenue.

2. Prohibit peak hour parking on the south side of Loughboro Road between Lowell and Chain Bridge Roads.
3. Prohibit peak hour parking on the north side of Loughboro Road between Indian Road and Arizona Avenue.
4. Add no parking signs on both side of the above area."

This proposal will significant deprive us of the safe use and enjoyment of our property.

The recent conversion from 2 lanes to 4 lanes has not only increased the speeding, it has become extremely dangerous and life threatening to simply back out of our driveway. The other day a terrible situation happened to me on my way to work. When I pulled out of my drive way, a speeding car almost hit me directly on the driver's side. I barely escaped being very seriously injured. This danger is a direct result of Loughboro Road becoming a four lane road. Furthermore, the conversion has made it impossible to safely cross the street to obtain the side walk.

Please help me to rectify this immediate, dangerous situation directly caused by the striping as two lanes in each direction on Loughboro Road. It is only a matter of time before there is a much more dire situation to report.

Respectfully yours,

Christine Hagerty
4845 Loughboro Road, NW
Washington DC 20016
(202) 237-6460 Home
(202) 606-9863 Work

John Finney

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

A laudable, long awaited study of Palisades Traffic. Impressive in its detail but in its general thrust fear that it emphasizes smooth, faster movement of commuter traffic on main streets of the Palisades at the expense of the parking, safety and quality of life of Palisades Residents. Also, little or no consideration of impact of commuter traffic using residential sidestreets as short cuts or cut throughs.

SPECIFIC POINTS

1. Conversion of Loughboro into a four-lane speedway. Possible solution: eliminate second stripe in road; post parking signs.

2. Need Crosswalks painted on Loughboro so riders can get to M-4 bus stops, now only on North side of Loughboro.

3. Danger of congestion and accidents on Foxhall if Field School is permitted to open this fall without traffic light and broadening of road to permit left turn into campus.

4. Need for left-turn signals for Arizona Avenue traffic trying to turn left on to MacArthur.

5. Bus pads on MacArthur between Loughboro and Arizona made unduly long, thus depriving tax-paying residents of parking places near or in front of their houses.

6. Need for sidewalks on Arizona for pedestrian safety.

7. Need for Traffic Light at MacArthur and U Streets – a heavily used crosswalk area – in place of traffic lights at MacArthur and V Streets.

8. Re-examine impact upon parking by taxpaying residents if parking on northbound lane of Foxhall Road (p 44) is prohibited so out-of state commuters can move more quickly. Do residents on Foxhall have off-street parking available. Believe not.

9. Commend proposed improvements for intersection of Reservoir and Foxhall. Dangerous now.

10. Oppose four-laneing of Loughboro (p 52) as a dangerous imposition on residents, turning a residential street into a speedway.

11. Oppose prohibition of peak hour parking on Loughboro between Indian Road and Arizona as depriving taxpaying resident s of parking space or safe egress, all to permit commuters to move more swiftly on Loughboro (P 52.)

12. the four laneing of Loughboro was presented as fait accompli to taxpaying residents, with no consultation with ANC3D or residents and in advance of final approval of Traffic Impact Study.

13. Palisades residents would vehemently oppose any move to cut into median strips to provide for left-hand turn lanes as proposed on page 56 at MacArthur and Arizona. Such a move probably would run into objections from Washington Aqueduct and WASA, both of whom have pipes running undedr median strips.

14. Approve suggestion of raised crosswalk on MacArthur by Safeway Store (P57) and strongly urge traffic signals at intersection of MacArthur and U. This is a dangerous intersection. Sufficiently dangerous that it Warrants a traffic light, despite other definitions of warrants.

15. Heartily approve suggestions for bus shelters.

16. Believe more study is needed of congestion on MacArthur at Q in early morning and mid-afternoon, caused by drop-off and pickup of students at Georgetown Day.

17. Approve elimination of parking on west side of Whitehaven down to Ginger Lane, but with understanding this is a four-month trial to determine its effects, particularly in causing more parking on nearby residential streets. (p 59). Resigned to fact that St. Patricks's has turned that section of Whitehaven into an academic alley. Let them

complete the takeover by building their new junior high on the lower part of Whitehaven.

18. Oppose elimination of parking on east side of Arizona to permit use of pavement for a sidewalk. Page 60).If sidewalk to be built, then use the 12 feet of public space from the curb set aside for a sidewalk. Besides, taxpaying residents should not have to give up parking spaces on public streets to make room for speeding commuters.

19. Strongly approve construction of sidewalk from Sherrier to Canal Road to provide accesss to Crescent Trail. (p62).

20. Not sure you have solved the problem of safe, easy access to Fletcher's Boathouse (page64

From: gerstell@milbank.com [mailto:gerstell@milbank.com]
Sent: Friday, August 09, 2002 2:43 PM
To: ken.laden@dc.gov
Subject: Palisades Traffic Impact Study

I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you yesterday regarding the draft Palisades Traffic Impact Study, and as you requested I am sending some comments to you for your consideration. I am a citizen who resides in upper Northwest, and in addition I serve as the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority, so I travel around the District extensively. I am eager to see the District improve its transportation, and I think that the Study is a very thorough and thoughtful analysis of the transportation problems in the Palisades area.

I am presenting my comments in the order in which issues appear in the Study:

1. Foxhall and Canal Road intersection (p. 41) -- a sign should be placed prohibiting U-turns on westbound Canal Road (as well as eastbound).

2. Foxhall at Whitehaven Parkway (p. 49) -- I concur that the striping for the left turn lane is inadequate, but since the road markings are not visible to the motorist until too late (due to the curve in the road), it is very important that clear signs be placed well before the left turn lane.

3. Loughboro and Arizona Avenue intersection (p. 52) -- I agree that addition of the "All-Way" signs would be helpful, but I would strongly urged that "STOP" be painted on the roadway in the westbound lanes of

Loughboro (which are downhill, and the existing Stop signs are partially hidden by trees until too late to be seen by the motorist).

4. Left turns onto Canal Road at Arizona during morning rush hours (p. 60). This is a great idea and one that I and many others have been requesting for several years. A traffic signal permitting the turns will not materially impair the traffic time for Maryland motorists. I should add here that the pavement of Arizona between Canal and MacArthur is in horrible condition, slows traffic, and must be repaired.

5. Canal Road speeding (p. 64) -- this is the one area of the Study that I disagree with. Of course, excessive speeding is dangerous and illegal. But we also have to be realistic and recognize that motorists on this type of road (often relatively lightly traveled, with no sidewalks or parked cars or traffic signals that would tend to cause motorists to slow down) will typically want to travel around 45 or 50 MPH. I think the currently posted speed limit is unrealistically low and just doesn't make sense, at least during periods when there is only one-way traffic (no danger of head-on collisions). I of course recognize that the road is not designed for 65 MPH traffic. Moreover, from a traffic-flow standpoint, is probably worthwhile to have a higher speed limit to ensure that during the PM rush hour, traffic promptly exits the congested downtown part of the District.

What I think is far more important is (1) the installation (as the Study recommends) of plates and energy attenuators on the stone wall adjacent to the boathouse driveway, and (2) better systems for making sure that motorists do not continue using both lanes of outbound Canal after the 7 PM cutoff. Typically, from around 7:00 to about 7:10 PM motorists will illegally and unsafely use both outbound lanes, risking a head-on collision with a vehicle that (improperly) uses the inbound lane at that time (there is a 15 min. buffer between the two-way changeover, but this is routinely ignored). Police should actively enforce the 7 PM cutoff, and the existing traffic signal should be altered at the westbound entrance to Canal Road at Foxhall with a red arrow indicating that the second lane is not available after 7 PM.

Lastly, I would like to strongly recommend that the cut-off time from one-way outbound to two-way be pushed back from 7:00 to 7:30 -- I don't think this will materially affect incoming traffic (which can still use the lightly-traveled (at that hour) MacArthur or Foxhall) and will make a BIG difference in clearing out congestion in the K Street/Whitehurst corridor during that half-hour period. After 7:30 the traffic seems to drop off considerably.

6. Canal Road -- entrance to Whitehurst Freeway (p. 68) -- while some very small signs have been recently added, they are completely inadequate. Why can't we simply have a large sign that indicates "Georgetown/M Street Only" for the left lane and "Whitehurst Freeway/Downtown Only" for the right lane? Moreover, the existing signage is inadequate to prevent motorists from avoiding the backups in the left lane by improperly waiting in the right lane (thus blocking Whitehurst Freeway traffic). Perhaps you could install some kind of traffic barrier (as opposed to simply the existing markings on the roadway) that would prevent vehicles in the right lane from continuing straight to Key Bridge and M Street. Also, while it may not be technically within the scope of the Study, the existing signage on westbound K Street is completely inadequate at 25th Street -- there isn't even a hint of the confusing series of ramps that confront the motorist -- why can't we have a big sign that says "Whitehurst Freeway" or "K Street"? Finally, the "No turn on red" sign in the eastbound exit lane of Canal Road onto Key Bridge is misplaced, and is visible only to drivers in the left lane, which is not the one from which drivers might be making right turns on red. Another sign should be added to the traffic light directly in front of the turning vehicles (i.e., on the opposite side of Key Bridge).

I hope the foregoing is helpful to you, and again commend you on an excellent study. If you wish to contact me, please feel free to call me at my office, 202-835-7585.

Thank you.

Glenn S. Gerstell

APPENDIX N
SCOPE OF WORK

Palisades Traffic Study
Scope of Work

Purpose

The District Division of Transportation (DDOT) is presently planning traffic management improvements in the area known as Palisades, Foxhall and Wesley Heights. These efforts are in response to citizen concerns regarding speeding traffic and other safety concerns. The purpose of the study is to examine existing traffic conditions in the study area and to determine short-term and long-term traffic management and infrastructure improvements to reduce traffic congestion, especially during peak morning and evening travel hours; improve traffic and pedestrian safety; and protect surrounding residential streets from traffic impacts.

Study Area

The "study area" for this project includes the following four traffic corridors and their surrounding residential neighborhoods:

- Foxhall Road, NW from Loughboro Road, NW to Canal Road, NW
- Canal Road, NW from the District Of Columbia boundary to 'M' Street, NW at Key Bridge
- MacArthur Boulevard, NW from Loughboro Road, NW to Foxhall Road, NW
- Loughboro Road, NW from MacArthur Boulevard to Foxhall Road, NW
- Arizona Avenue, NW from Loughboro Road, NW to Canal Road, NW

Definition of Work

The contractor will examine existing traffic conditions in the study area and make recommendations to improve mobility and traffic safety. Over an 18–week period, investigate current and future needs regarding vehicle, pedestrian and bicycle mobility, and safety and work in close connection with community stakeholders in addressing their safety concerns.

Description of Work to be Performed

Task 1: Scoping Meeting

The contractor shall develop a meaningful community participation process that will consist of at least three meetings with community stakeholders in the Palisades study area. The purpose of these meetings shall be to obtain input for development of the traffic management concept designs. The first meeting to be held with Advisory Neighborhood Commissions 2E and 3D, local community groups and stakeholders to discuss the proposed scope of work and schedule for the traffic study, and receive public comment. This meeting will be scheduled for the first week of the study. The aim of this meeting will be to announce the project to the neighborhood, outline the projected

timeframe for the study and introduce the contractor to community stakeholders. This meeting will also allow for community input in refining the study scope of work.

With the assistance of the Division of Transportation and the Office of Planning, the Contractor shall develop a project mailing list within the study area and other interested parties.

Task #1 to be completed Week One

Task 2: Collect and Consolidate Data

The contractor will collect data on the following elements:

- Existing traffic volumes and level of service for roadway segments within the study area. This includes mapping, aerial photography, historical research and other materials available from the DC Office of Planning, DPW Traffic Services and Transportation Planning, and other District and Federal government agencies.

- Field reconnaissance of the general corridor areas (Foxhall Road, MacArthur Boulevard, Canal Road and Loughboro Road) noting existing land uses, existing roadway geometric and traffic control conditions, traffic flow patterns, transit facilities and services, as well as opportunities and constraints pertaining to access from the intersecting sidestreets and driveways.

- Identify turning motions at key intersections during the morning peak period and the afternoon peak period on typical weekdays. These key intersections should include, but are not limited to, the following intersections:

  1. Canal Road and Foxhall Road
  2. Foxhall Road and MacArthur Boulevard
  3. Foxhall Road and Reservoir Road
  4. Dalecarlia Parkway and Loughboro Road
  5. Foxhall Road and Loughboro Road
  6. Foxhall Road and Garfield Street
  7. Foxhall Road and 'W' Street
  8. Whitehaven Parkway and Foxhall Road
  9. Reservoir Road and MacArthur Boulevard
  10. Canal Road at Chain Bridge
  11. Canal Road and Reservoir Road
  12. Canal Road at Key Bridge
  13. Canal Road and Whitehurst Freeway
  14. Loughboro Road and MacArthur Boulevard
  15. Macomb Street and MacArthur Boulevard
  16. MacArthur Boulevard and Arizona Avenue
  17. MacArthur Boulevard and 'U' Street
  18. White haven Parkway and MacArthur Boulevard
  19. MacArthur Boulevard and Foxhall Road

  The list of key intersections will be refined during the initial scoping meeting with local ANC's and neighborhood citizens.

- Mechanical/continuous vehicle volume, speed and classification surveys at one location along each of the four major corridors, covering a two-week period.
- Travel time and delay studies along the four major corridors, during the morning and afternoon peak periods.
- Generalized origin-destination observations at key portal points along the corridors.
- Generalized parking inventories and usage surveys for the four major corridors of the study area.
- Queuing observation of traffic along the four major corridors of the study area.

Task #2 to be completed Week Four

Task 3: Short-term Options

The contractor will analyze the current vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian traffic conditions and identify short-term options which could be implemented in 12 months to improve mobility, safety and reduce congestion, such as traffic control measures, traffic calming measures, improved signage, signalization, channelization, etc. The contractor shall prepare a brief report summarizing their findings and recommended short-term improvements. As part of this analysis the contractor will calculate the impact of each proposed improvement on mobility, safety, and level of service on the four corridors listed in the study area. The contractor shall also analyze average delays, queues and travel times along the four major corridors both with and without the recommended short-term options using a Sychro software modeling program.

Task #3 to be completed Week 6

Task 4: Long-term Options

The contractor will analyze the current traffic situation and identify long-term options to improve mobility, safety and reduce congestion, such as road widening, intersection modification and other long-term improvements. The contractor shall also identify methods of improving pedestrian and bicycle connections with the Capital Crescent Trail and other adjacent bicycle routes. The contractor shall prepare a brief report summarizing their findings and recommended long-term improvements. As part of this analysis the contractor will calculate impact of each proposed improvement on mobility, safety, level of service. The contractor shall also analyze average delays, queues and travel times along the four major corridors both with and without the recommended long-term options using a Sychro software modeling program.

Task #4 to be completed Week 6

Task 5: Public meeting

The contractor will conduct a public meeting to review options with the ANC, community groups and stakeholders.

Task #5 to be completed Week 10

Task 6: Draft Report
The contractor will prepare a draft report of findings and recommendations regarding traffic and safety improvements.

Task #6 to be completed Week 12

Task 7: Review of Draft Report
DDOT and other District and federal agencies will review and comment on the Draft Report.

Task to be completed Week 13 to Week 15

Task 8: Public Meeting
The contractor will conduct a final public meeting to review the final draft report with the ANC, community groups and stakeholders.

Task #8 to be completed Week 16

Task 9: Final Report
The contractor will prepare the Final Report.

Task #9 to be completed Week 18

Deliverables

- Detailed scope of work and study schedule
- Preliminary report on findings and recommended short-term and long-term improvements
- Final report of short-term and long-term improvements
- Visual aids including maps or aerial photos of study area as needed
- Monthly progress reports

Coordination
Consultant will work closely with the DPW/DDOT/Traffic Services office, ANC's from the neighborhood, other community groups, stakeholders and the DC Office of Planning.

Key Dates/Schedule
Week 2: Conduct a scoping meeting with local Advisory Neighborhood Commissions and community groups.

Week 4: Determine existing traffic volumes and level of service for roadway segments within the study area. Identify turning motions at key intersections.

Week 6: Identify short-term improvements to improve mobility, safety and reduce congestion.

Week 10: Public meeting

Week 12: Draft Report

Week 15: Public Meeting

Week 18: Final Report

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

OFFICE OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

MEMORANDUM

TO: Wil DerMinassian
Associate Director for Traffic Services

FROM: Kenneth Laden
Associate Director for Transportation Policy and Planning

DATE: December 5, 2001

SUBJECT: Palisades Traffic Study Scope of Work Amendment

This memo is requesting amendments to the Scope of Work for the Palisades Traffic Study. There are three specific changes.

1. Remove ANC 3B from the ANC's with which the study is to be coordinated.
2. In response to community concerns, include Arizona Avenue among the corridors of the study.
3. Remove the requirement that a mailing list of all property owners within the study area be developed.

Please notify DMJM Harris of these amendments to the Scope of Work.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Attachment

cc: Abraham Lerner, DMJM Harris

APPENDIX O
PRELIMINARY PLANNING COST ESTIMATE

Palisades Preliminary Planning Cost Estimate

Location	Description	Unit	Qty.	Unit Price (A)	Total
Foxhall and Canal Roads (p. 41)	"No Right Turn" Sign (R3-1)	SF	4	$ 81.21	$ 325
	"No U-Turn" Sign (R3-4)	SF	4	$ 81.21	$ 325
				Location Sub-Total:	**$ 650**
Foxhall Road and MacArthur Boulevard (pp. 43-44)	Left Mandatory Movement Lane Control Sign (R3-5)	SF	7.5	$ 81.21	$ 609
	Thermoplastic Pavement Marking 4 Inch	LF	120	$ 0.69	$ 83
	Thermoplastic Pavement Arrow	EA	1	$ 93.80	$ 94
	Thermoplastic Pavement Letter	EA	4	$ 64.75	$ 259
	"Left Turn Yield On (symbolic green ball)" Sign	SF	5	$ 81.21	$ 406
				Location Sub-Total:	**$ 1,451**
Foxhall Road North of Q Street (p. 44)	Parking Restriction Signs	SF	4.5	$ 81.21	$ 365
	Thermoplastic Pavement Marking 4 Inch	LF	600	$ 0.69	$ 414
				Location Sub-Total:	**$ 779**
Foxhall and Reservoir Roads (pp. 44-50)	Thermoplastic Pavement Marking 4 Inch	LF	750	$ 0.69	$ 517
	Thermoplastic Pavement Marking 12 Inch	LF	300	$ 2.72	$ 815
	Thermoplastic Pavement Arrow	EA	11	$ 93.80	$ 1,032
	Thermoplastic Pavement Letter	EA	24	$ 64.75	$ 1,554
	Roadway construction	LF	200	$ 318.35	$ 63,669
	"Do Not Enter" Sign (R5-1)	SF	12.5	$ 81.21	$ 1,015
	"One Way" Sign (R6-1)	SF	3	$ 81.21	$ 244
	"One Way" Sign (R6-2)	SF	3	$ 81.21	$ 244
	"Yield to Pedestrians While Turning" Sign	SF	10	$ 81.21	$ 812
	Sidewalk Construction	SY	300	$ 42.00	$ 12,600
	Island Construction & Roadway Delineators	LS	1	$ 10,000.00	$ 10,000
				Location Sub-Total:	**$ 92,502**
Foxhall Road and Whitehaven Parkway (pp. 50-51)	Signalization	LS	1	$ 100,000.00	$ 100,000
				Location Sub-Total:	**$ 100,000**
Speeding on Foxhall Road (p. 52)	Radar speed monitors	LS	1	**B**	**B**
				Location Sub-Total:	
Foxhall Road Sidewalk (p. 52)	Sidewalk Construction	SY	2000	$ 48.62	$ 97,241
	Retaining Wall Construction	LF	200	$ 270.00	$ 54,000
	Utility Relocation	LS	1	$ 185,000.00	$ 185,000
				Location Sub-Total:	**$ 336,241**
Signage on Foxhall Road (pp. 52-53)	"No Left Turn" Sign (R3-2)	SF	4	$ 81.21	$ 325
	Parking Restriction Signs	SF	18	$ 81.21	$ 1,462
				Location Sub-Total:	**$ 1,787**
Foxhall and Loughboro Roads - Signage (p. 53)	Optional Lane Control Sign (R3-6)	SF	7.5	$ 81.21	$ 609
				Location Sub-Total:	**$ 609**

Notes:
A) Unit prices developed based on information provided by the District of Columbia Department of Public Works and other recent metro-area construction pricing sources
B) To be provided by the Metropolitan Police Department (MPD)

Sketch-plan cost estimates. Actual improvement cost estimates to be calculated upon design completion of each improvement.
All costs exclusive of Right-of-Way acquisition costs

Palisades Preliminary Planning Cost Estimate

Location	Description	Unit	Qty.	Unit Price (A)	Total
Foxhall and Loughboro Roads - Roadway Construction (p. 53)	Left Turn Construction	LF	200	$ 318.35	$ 63,669
	Right Turn Construction	LF	200	$ 506.46	$ 101,292
				Location Sub-Total:	**$ 164,961**
Loughboro Road and Arizona Avenue (pp. 54-55)	Thermoplastic Pavement Marking 4 Inch	LF	300	$ 0.69	$ 207
	"All-Way" Sign (R1-4)	SF	2.25	$ 81.21	$ 183
	"Stop" Sign (R1-1)	SF	6.25	$ 81.21	$ 508
	Thermoplastic Pavement Arrow	EA	3	$ 93.80	$ 281
	Thermoplastic Pavement Letter	EA	12	$ 64.75	$ 777
	Signalization	LS	1	$ 100,000.00	$ 100,000
				Location Sub-Total:	**$ 101,956**
Loughboro Road (pp. 54-57)	Crosswalks	EA	8	$ 200.00	$ 1,600
	"No Parking" Signs	SF	27	$ 81.21	$ 2,193
	Thermoplastic Pavement Marking 4 Inch	LF	5000	$ 0.69	$ 3,465
	Thermoplastic Pavement Marking 12 Inch	LF	600	$ 2.72	$ 1,632
	Bus Shelter	EA	1	$ 5,000.00	$ 5,000
				Location Sub-Total:	**$ 13,890**
Loughboro Road - Dalecarlia Parkway to MacArthur Boulevard (pp. 57-60)	Bus Shelter Relocation	EA	1	$ 5,500.00	$ 5,500
	Thermoplastic Pavement Arrow	EA	2	$ 93.80	$ 188
	Thermoplastic Pavement Letter	EA	4	$ 64.75	$ 259
	Thermoplastic Pavement Marking 4 Inch Dash	LF	100	$ 0.77	$ 77
	Thermoplastic Pavement Marking 4 Inch	LF	200	$ 0.69	$ 139
	Thermoplastic Pavement Marking 12 Inch	LF	400	$ 2.72	$ 1,088
	"No Left Turn" Sign (R3-2)	SF	4	$ 81.21	$ 325
				Location Sub-Total:	**$ 7,576**
Speeding on Loughboro Road (p. 60)	Radar speed monitors	LS	1	**B**	**B**
				Location Sub-Total:	**$ -**
MacArthur Boulevard and V Street (p. 61)	Parking Restriction Signs	SF	3	$ 81.21	$ 244
				Location Sub-Total:	**$ 244**
MacArthur Boulevard and U Street (pp. 61-62)	Raised Crosswalk	EA	1	$ 7,657.69	$ 7,658
				Location Sub-Total:	**$ 7,658**
MacArthur Boulevard and Q Street (p. 62)	Parking Restriction Signs	SF	9	$ 81.21	$ 731
				Location Sub-Total:	**$ 731**
MacArthur Boulevard (p. 62)	Bus Shelter	EA	1	$ 5,000.00	$ 5,000
				Location Sub-Total:	**$ 5,000**
Whitehaven Parkway (pp. 62-63)	Parking Restriction Signs	SF	9	$ 81.21	$ 731
	Raised Crosswalk	EA	1	$ 3,828.84	$ 3,829

Notes:
A) Unit prices developed based on information provided by the District of Columbia Department of Public Works and other recent metro-area construction pricing sources
B) To be provided by the Metropolitan Police Department (MPD)

Sketch-plan cost estimates. Actual improvement cost estimates to be calculated upon design completion of each improvement.
All costs exclusive of Right-of-Way acquisition costs

Palisades Preliminary Planning Cost Estimate

Location	Description	Unit	Qty.	Unit Price (A)	Total
Whitehaven Parkway (cont.) (pp. 62-63)	Speed Humps	EA	2	$ 3,828.84	$ 7,658
	Sidewalk Construction	SY	1100	$ 48.62	$ 53,482
				Location Sub-Total:	**$ 65,700**
Arizona Avenue Protype Sidewalk (pp. 63-64)	Stone Sidewalk	SY	400	$ 18.23	$ 7,293
				Location Sub-Total:	**$ 7,293**
Arizona Avenue (pp. 63-65)	Sidewalk Construction	SY	2000	$ 48.62	$ 97,241
	8"x12" Granite Straight Curb	LF	2350	$ 42.00	$ 98,700
	Thermoplastic Pavement Marking 4 Inch	LF	2000	$ 0.69	$ 1,386
				Location Sub-Total:	**$ 197,327**
Arizona Avenue and Canal Road (pp. 64, 66-67, 71-72)	Sidewalk Construction	SY	700	$ 48.62	$ 34,034
	Crosswalk	EA	1	$ 200.00	$ 200
	Trail Upgrade	SY	50	$ 26.33	$ 1,316
	Pavement Marking Removal	SF	400	$ 4.20	$ 1,680
	Lane Control Signals	LS	1	$ 100,000.00	$ 100,000
				Location Sub-Total:	**$ 137,230**
Reservoir Road (pp. 68-69)	"No Right Turn from Left Lane" Sign	SF	4	$ 81.21	$ 325
	"Do Not Enter" Sign (R5-1)	SF	10	$ 81.21	$ 812
				Location Sub-Total:	**$ 1,137**
Canal Road (p. 69)	Radar Cameras	EA	12	**B**	**B**
				Location Sub-Total:	**$ -**
Canal Road and Reservoir Road - Safety Improvements (pp. 69-70)	"No Left Turn" Sign (R3-2)	SF	8	$ 81.21	$ 650
	"No Right Turn" Sign (R3-1)	SF	8	$ 81.21	$ 650
	Thermoplastic Pavement Marking 4 Inch Dash	LF	40	$ 0.77	$ 31
	Crash Attenuator	EA	1	$ 10,000.00	$ 10,000
	Reflectorized Plate	SF	4	$ 84.00	$ 336
				Location Sub-Total:	**$ 11,667**
Canal Road and Reservoir Road - Signalization & Sidewalk (pp. 69-70)	Signalization	LS	1	$ 100,000.00	$ 100,000
	Sidewalk Construction	SY	30	$ 38.90	$ 1,167
				Location Sub-Total:	**$ 101,167**
Canal Road and Reservoir Road - Pedestrian Crossing (pp. 69-70)	Grade-Separated pedestrian crossing	LF	400	$ 2,169.68	$ 867,871
				Location Sub-Total:	**$ 867,871**
Clark Place (pp. 70-71)	"Do Not Enter" Sign (R5-1)	SF	12.5	$ 81.21	$ 1,015
	"One Way" Sign (R6-1)	SF	3	$ 81.21	$ 244
	Misc. Signs	SF	18	$ 81.21	$ 1,462
				Location Sub-Total:	**$ 2,721**
Cathedral Avenue - Initial Traffic Calming Measures (p. 66)	Peak Hour "Do Not Enter" (except local traffic) Sign (R5-1)	SF	12.5	$ 81.21	$ 1,015

Notes:
A) Unit prices developed based on information provided by the District of Columbia Department of Public Works and other recent metro-area construction pricing sources
B) To be provided by the Metropolitan Police Department (MPD)

Sketch-plan cost estimates. Actual improvement cost estimates to be calculated upon design completion of each improvement.
All costs exclusive of Right-of-Way acquisition costs

Palisades Preliminary Planning Cost Estimate

Location	Description	Unit	Qty.	Unit Price (A)	Total
Cathedral Avenue - Initial Traffic Calming Measures (cont.) (p.66)	"Stop" Sign (R1-1)	SF	37.5	$ 81.21	$ 3,045
	"All-Way" Sign (R1-4)	SF	2.25	$ 81.21	$ 183
				Location Sub-Total:	**$ 4,243**
Cathedral Avenue - Additional Traffic Calming Measures (p. 66)	Speed Humps	EA	2	$ 3,828.84	$ 7,658
				Location Sub-Total:	**$ 7,658**
Canal Road and Key Bridge/Whitehurst Freeway (p. 73)	"No Turn on Red" Sign (R10-11a)	SF	5	$ 81.21	$ 406
	Roadway construction	LF		**C**	**C**
				Location Sub-Total:	**$ 406**
W Street (p.73)	"Stop" Sign (R1-1)	SF	12.5	$ 81.21	$ 1,015
				Location Sub-Total:	**$ 1,015**
Area-Wide (pp. 73-75)	Signal Timing/Phasing Changes	LS	1	$ 100,000.00	$ 100,000
				Location Sub-Total:	**$ 100,000**
				Sub-Total:	$ 2,341,470
				15% Engineering and Design:	$ 351,221
				15% Contingency:	$ 351,221
				Total:	**$ 3,043,911**

Notes:
A) Unit prices developed based on information provided by the District of Columbia Department of Public Works and other recent metro-area construction pricing sources
C) Improvements will be implemented as part of the Georgetown Improvement Project

Sketch-plan cost estimates. Actual improvement cost estimates to be calculated upon design completion of each improvement.
All costs exclusive of Right-of-Way acquisition costs

Palisades Improvement Implementation Schedule

Within 1 year:

Foxhall and Canal Roads - Signs
Foxhall Road and MacArthur Boulevard - Signs and markings
Foxhall Road North of Q Street - Markings and parking modification
Foxhall and Reservoir Roads - Roadway and sidewalk construction; markings; signs
Foxhall Road and Whitehaven Parkway - Signalization
Foxhall Road - Radar speed monitors
Foxhall Road - Signs
Foxhall and Loughboro Roads - Signs
Loughboro Road - Bus Shelter, crosswalks, markings, signs
Loughboro Road - Radar speed monitors
MacArthur Boulevard and V Street - Signs
MacArthur Boulevard and U Street - Raised crosswalk
MacArthur Boulevard and Q Street - Signs
Whitehaven Parkway - Sidewalk, raised crosswalk, speed humps, signs
Arizona Avenue Protype Sidewalk
Reservoir Road - Signs
Canal Road and Reservoir Road - Safety improvements
Clark Place - Signs
Cathedral Avenue - Initial traffic calming measures
W Street - Signs
Canal Road and Key Bridge - Signs

Between 2 - 5 years:

Foxhall Road - Sidewalk
Loughboro Road and Arizona Avenue - Signalization, signs, markings
Loughboro Road - Dalecarlia Parkway to MacArthur Boulevard - Markings and signs
MacArthur Boulevard - Bus shelter
Arizona Avenue - Sidewalk and markings
Arizona Avenue and Canal Road - Sidewalk, crosswalk, trail upgrade, lane control signals
Canal Road - Radar cameras
Canal Road and Reservoir Road - Signalization and sidewalk
Cathedral Avenue - Additional traffic calming measures
Area-Wide - Signal timing and phasing changes

After 5 years:

Foxhall and Loughboro Roads - Roadway Construction
Canal Road and Reservoir Road - Grade-separated pedestrian crossing
Canal Road and Key Bridge/Whitehurst Freeway - Roadway Construction

Costs:

1 year:	$	314,483
2-5 years:	$	994,155
>5 years:	$	1,032,832
Total:	$	2,341,470

Notes:

Costs do not include MPD-related projects or Georgetown Improvement-related projects
Sketch-plan cost estimates. Actual improvement cost estimates to be calculated upon design completion of each improvement.
All costs exclusive of Right-of-Way acquisition costs.