



# 7

# PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND AGENCY COORDINATION



Agency, stakeholder, and public outreach have been important components for this study.

## Chapter 7 → Public Involvement and Agency Coordination

Agency, stakeholder, and public outreach have been important components for this study. The following section describes the coordination efforts that have occurred.

### A. AGENCY COORDINATION

Federal, regional and local agencies participated throughout the AA study. Three interagency meetings were held on: February 20, 2013, April 11, 2013 and May 23, 2013. Agencies contacted and represented have included: FTA, FHWA, NPS, DC Office of Planning, Commission of Fine Arts (CFA), National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC), Union Station Redevelopment Corporation, WMATA, and DC State Historic Preservation Office.

Agency comments expressed at these meetings included the following topics:

- > Limits of the study area, particularly the western terminus
- > Purpose and need
- > Location of alignments
- > Pros and cons of shared or exclusive lanes for transit
- > Importance of frequency and reliability of new transit service
- > General preference for Alternative 1 Streetcar

### B. STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH

Stakeholder coordination continues to be important component of this project. DDOT held four meetings with BIDs on: February 6, 2013, February 20, 2013, April 11, 2013, and May 23, 2013. The BIDs in the study area include: Georgetown, Golden Triangle, Downtown, NoMA, and Capitol Hill. The study area also includes the Mount Vernon Triangle Community Improvement District (CID). At the request of the BIDs, DDOT has also met with the Georgetown BID on March 12, 2013, with the Golden Triangle BID on April 12, 2013, and Downtown BID on June 28, 2013.

Coordination with the Advisory Neighborhood Commissions (ANC) also occurred through an email list serve for distribution of informational flyers to the representative leaders, and ANC representatives attended public meetings.

## C. PUBLIC OUTREACH

The public outreach for this study included a project website for ongoing information sharing and public feedback, and three public meetings to ensure input at key decision points during the study process.

Advertising for each public meeting included:

- > Newspaper advertisements in the Express and El Tiempo Latino newspapers
- > Bi-lingual meeting advertisements in the DC Circulator buses along the Georgetown to Union Station route
- > Meeting information and displays posted on the project website
- > Email notification to the project mailing list
- > DDOT list serve email notification

Public meeting dates, locations, attendance, and topics are summarized in **Table 7-1**. A list of the display boards presented at each meeting is shown in **Table 7-2**.

Table 7-1: Public Meetings Summary

Meeting	Date	Location	# of Attendees	Topics
1	February 20, 2013 6:00 pm to 8:00 pm	American Association for the Advancement of Science 1200 New York Ave NW, Washington, DC	39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Project introduction and overview</li> <li>&gt; Request for initial input on routes and modes</li> </ul>
2	April 11, 2013 6:00 pm to 8:00 pm	Carnegie Library 801 K Street NW, Washington, DC	37	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Project update</li> <li>&gt; Request for feedback on alternatives under consideration</li> </ul>
3	May 23, 2013 6:00 pm to 8:00 pm	Carnegie Library 801 K Street NW, Washington, DC	21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Presentation of analysis results</li> </ul>

Following the first public meeting, if the information on the display board was still up-to-date DDOT reused display boards for each subsequent public meeting. Therefore, only the new display boards for each public meeting are listed in **Table 7-2**. All the display boards from each public meeting are available for viewing on the project website [unionstationtogeorgetown.com](http://unionstationtogeorgetown.com).

Table 7-2: Public Meeting Display Boards

Display Boards from Meeting 1	New Boards for Meeting 2	New Board for Meeting 3
Welcome Board	Project Purpose & Needs	Traffic Levels of Service 2013: AM and PM Peak
Project Study Area	Traffic Data Collection	Traffic Levels of Service 2040: AM and PM Peak
Project Purpose	Propulsion Study	Comparison of Vehicles Chart
Project Needs	Existing Conditions Map	Propulsion Technologies
Project Scope	Alignment Links	Comparison of Propulsion Technologies
Alternatives Analysis Process	Guiding Principles for Station Locations	Alternative 1 Streetcar Facts
Schedule	End-To-End Streetcar Alternative 1 plus Typical Sections	Alternative 2 Streetcar Facts
Public Involvement	End-To-End Streetcar Alternative 2 plus Typical Sections	Alternative 3 Streetcar Facts
Previous Studies	End-To-End Premium Bus Alternative 3 plus Typical Sections	Existing bus routes

Meeting details and key findings are described below for each public meeting. Common themes in the comments received during the three public meetings included:

- > Connectivity/ extension to Georgetown University
- > Right-of-way concerns on K Street between 10th – 12th Streets
- > Use of overhead wires in historic view sheds
- > Preference for streetcar as the mode
- > Preference for Alternative 1 Streetcar over the other 2 build alternatives

### 1. Public Meeting #1: February 20, 2013

Public Meeting #1 was a two-hour meeting with informational display boards and knowledgeable staff were organized around the meeting room to explain the purpose and need of the study, describe the process and timeline, and answer questions. Large maps were rolled out on tables and participants were encouraged to provide written input on potential alignments to be considered, and offer comments on proposed modes. Participants were encouraged to complete questionnaires and comment forms. These forms could be submitted at the meeting, or mailed to the project manager.



The meeting was attended by 39 people, nine questionnaires were completed, and two comment forms were submitted. At the display board about project needs, participants were asked to place green dots next to the top three reasons why they think the project is needed. Participants noted “efficient east-west transit connectivity” most frequently of the five.

In general, respondents to the questionnaire favored streetcar as the transit mode. K and M Streets were most frequently cited as alignments for consideration. Respondents noted capacity, congestion, reliability, and efficiency, among others, as the main issues for consideration. Expansion of the study to include Georgetown University was of interest to many of the respondents. Coordination with land use planning was also noted by several respondents as an important issue.

### 2. Public Meeting #2: April 11, 2013

Public Meeting #2 included informational display boards were displayed around the room and staff was readily available to further describe the study and answer questions. Three large maps were displayed on tables noting the three alternatives under consideration. Participants were encouraged to complete questionnaires and comment forms. These forms could be submitted at the meeting, or mailed to the project manager.



The meeting was attended by 37 people, ten questionnaires were completed, and seven comment forms were submitted. There was a general preference for the streetcar option. Many respondents noted the importance of dedicated right-of-way in order to optimize efficient travel and make a significant improvement over current bus travel. Also a dedicated travelway makes the transit service easier to find and understand its route and service.

### 3. Public Meeting #3: May 23, 2013

Public Meeting #3 included informational display boards and project staff available to answer questions. Large maps of the three end-to-end alternatives were displayed on tables with a fact board at each map presenting analysis results for that specific alternative. There were traffic simulations of the no-build and three build alternatives playing on laptop computers. Participants were encouraged to complete questionnaires and comment forms. These forms could be submitted at the meeting, or mailed to the project manager.



The meeting was attended by 21 people, with five people providing comments on forms provided at the meeting. Three additional comments were received via email to the project manager. The comments included preference for Alternative 1 Streetcar, dedicated right-of-way along K Street, and noted the challenges if premium transit is added to M Street.