October 9th, 2019

Commissioner Gail Fast  
Chair, Advisory Neighborhood Commission 6D  
1101 4th Street SW, Suite W130  
Washington, DC 200024  
Email: office@anc6d.org

Re: DDOT Evaluation of Cmsr. Litsky’s Alternative Proposal for P St SW

Dear Chairperson Fast,

Per Commissioner Litsky’s request at the September ANC meeting, DDOT explored the idea of adding a bicycle trail behind the curb on the 200 – 300 blocks of P St SW. The following explains our reasoning and conclusions on the concept:

Five principal issues arise from this concept. The first being a “bicycle-only facility” with pedestrians using the sidewalk on the north side of the road. With pedestrian facilities on either end (2nd St Sidewalk and Titanic Memorial segment of ART), this condition could not be enforced, nor would DDOT ever agree to it as it violates longstanding policies on pedestrian accommodation. With that issue set aside, we can continue to evaluate this concept as a multi-use trail (MUT).

For the second issue, we are constrained on width. Per national guidance, the minimum width required for an MUT is 10’ with 2’ shoulders on either side to account for “shy distance” - Shy distance is a recognition that a trail’s usable space is less than its width if you have a vertical obstruction. So 14’ of width is required to meet the trail minimum standard. This would mean integrating the existing sidewalk into the trail width in order to meet the minimum width in the available space. In integrating the current pedestrian space into an MUT, and given the current and planned land uses, we would need to go well beyond the minimum standards. A final note on this issue, the public parking strip that comes from the original L’Enfant plan is meant to be an open setback for many reasons. In DDOT’s current practice, it is atypical to pave all the way to the property line.
The third issue comes from our storm water regulations, which are triggered if more than 5,000 SF is newly paved. The concept for a 10’ wide trail spanning the 1,110’ length of this corridor would amount to an 11,100 SF area of disturbance, requiring additional stormwater mitigation measures, such as bioswales, retention basins, and related stormwater features. Those stormwater features in theory could go in the tree planting strip, but in this case, there is a stand of mature trees with root network in this immediate area, as well as under the proposed location for new trail. Due to those trees, stormwater features would, by necessity under this concept, be in the parking lane.

A fourth issue is related to the base entrance/exit and issues with the cone of vision for drivers. For drivers entering the base, when cyclists, joggers, and walkers are positioned against that base wall, the ability of drivers to perceive them is low since they are “flattened against the wall” in visual terms. The further away from the wall an object, the greater the perception of that object. For base exits, it is worse, the trail users would be fully hidden behind the wall, and drivers hidden from their view, until they are in conflict. DDOT needs a reasonable sightline for trail users and cars crossing their path. Under this concept, it will appear to anyone exiting McNair that runners, walkers, and cyclists came out of nowhere, and it is the biggest safety concern for this idea. I should add that when I briefed Fort McNair personnel on the cycletrack option, they had no concerns beyond ensuring the base entrance continued to operate as it does today. We could not maintain the current base entrance operation with a path running behind the sidewalk. Finally, the pedestrian entrance at the gate would be too close to the MU, creating a new hazard.

The fifth issue is cost, with the additional trail paving in this space anticipated to cost at least $120,000, along with varying costs per storm water management feature. By comparison, using the curbside lane would simply be a pavement marking and fixture installation project, estimated at $25,000 to $35,000 depending on choices. The trail option would also require up to a year of design and engineering work in order to address all required elements of adding new sidewalk.

These are the principal reasons we believe rule-out further consideration of this concept. In our judgement as planners and engineers, the cycletrack option is the best one to carry forward at this time. It creates a safe connection for the ART for users of all ages and abilities, and could easily be reversed if at a future time continuing the trail via another route (through the base, around the seawall, elsewhere) were to become realistic.

I will attend your 10/15/19 planning meeting where we can discuss further. In the meantime, you can contact me at 202-671-3378.

Sincerely,

Will Handsfield
Transportation Planner
# STREET WIDTHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
<th>STREET</th>
<th>ROADWAY</th>
<th>SIDEWALK</th>
<th>PARKING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14th St. to 1st Ave.</td>
<td>10/23/67</td>
<td>85'</td>
<td>10'</td>
<td>12'</td>
<td>12'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Ave. to Canal St.</td>
<td>10/23/67</td>
<td>85'</td>
<td>10'</td>
<td>12'</td>
<td>12'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Capitol to Canal St.</td>
<td></td>
<td>85'</td>
<td>10'</td>
<td>12'</td>
<td>12'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th St. to Maine Ave. (Closed 6/22/66)</td>
<td></td>
<td>13'</td>
<td>10'</td>
<td>10'</td>
<td>15.5'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*DDOT ROW Cross Section Widths*