


OPTION 1 COMMENTS

- Reducing width of Potomac Ave can improve pedestrian/transit experience of both
- Explore possibilities of Option 1 further to create destination for retail
- Option 1 better for transit – easier drop off for cars
- Pedestrian Environment (in Option 1), can explore options for improvement. Smaller blocks aren't necessarily better
- Don't like the concept of a loading alley in Option 1 – would prefer a skinny street, some loading dispersed might be okay, even on Park
- In Option 1, could explore Evans as the BRT stop
- Service alley in Option 1 doesn't make sense, doesn't seem like apples to apples. Also don't like long blocks created as a result
- Option 1 grid shouldn't depict the service alley as a different street classification
- Option 1 is the same as Option 2 in terms of connectivity
- Potomac Avenue and Potomac Yard Park have a symbiotic relationship in the 2010 Plan. Like the clear separation of public/private;
 - In terms of transit and pedestrian, both options are equal
 - In terms of Metro Zone landing, Option 2 favorable

FRAMEWORK PLAN AFTER FULL BUILDOUT




- Legitimate concern to cross very wide road at Metro in Option 1. However, the urban design/unique character of park/road continuity is a positive
- Option 1 feels less pedestrian friendly and more vehicular friendly.
- Option 1 eliminates most of the pedestrian positives by placing the Metro station, with its foot at a major road. This road would cut off integration of the Metro pavilion with the rest of the development and would isolate the park in this section as well.
- Option 1 gets BRT closer to the Metro station, but I do not see this as a guiding force here since, as I understand it, the purpose of BRT is to get from point to point and not necessarily to get to a Metro station for further transit. Option 1 also gets local bus circulation a bit closer, but, again, I think pedestrian safety and walkability trumps both BRT and local bus circulation.

OPTION 2 COMMENTS

- Option 2 provides better pedestrian environment (e.g. smaller blocks for pedestrians, more inviting)... concerned about Metro across Potomac Avenue in Option 1
- Need more info in order to evaluate transit circulation
- Because of smaller blocks in Option 2 and more opportunity for pedestrians/bikes, is better option for achieving 2010 vision
- In Option 2 – prefer not to have a through-road around Metro
- Option 2 – like the street grid/connectivity – options for pedestrians/vehicles/transit, more flexibility to work with
- Don't like idea of bus drop off in front of hotel/retail, because of the idling impact
- Like the angled street/jog of Wesmond
- Like BRT serving more in Option 2
- Pedestrian access – favorably inclined to Option 2 – better by a little bit particularly because of Metro crossing/BRT
- Like Option 2 better, where the Metro lands is the most important. Pedestrians can immediately disperse, whereas in Option 1, bottleneck to cross street
- BRT serving retail street and as an alternative to Metro is better for Option 2
- Like Option 2 for integrated transit, stacked BRT, local, Metro seems like it will be effective mix
- In terms of Metro Zone landing, Option 2 favorable
- Option 2 offers more flexibility from a connectivity standpoint
- Existing residential areas east of Route 1 and access to NPY – don't like the many wide roads to cross
- Would prefer Option 2 with more of focus on pedestrian/bike access and connectivity
- BRT width is a concern for both Option 1 and 2. Phasing has a major impact so that Option 2 provides more flexibility in determining the final width needed for the BRT.
- I like how Option 2 immediately provides access to open space and destinations (future retail, residential, hotel, office) while the BRT is visible from the Metro entrance/exit. I prefer that we have a more vibrant experience at the entrance/exit than the alternative which is to cross multiple lanes of traffic. If one wants to cross multiple lanes of traffic, use the southern entrance/exit of the future Potomac Yard Metro.

FRAMEWORK PLAN AFTER FULL BUILDOUT



- Both Options can score well in this category in terms of accommodating an integrated transit system (Metro, BRT, and local bus circulation). When pressed to choose, I choose Option 2. I like how the BRT is closer to the middle of the planned development area as depicted on the Option 2 Framework Plan.

- Placing Potomac Avenue at the eastern most side of NPY was probably the right thing to do at the time in 2010. I'm not certain any of us on the Advisory Group were convinced the Metro Station was going to be built. So why not design a road that quickly moves a vehicle from north to south or south to north. Made sense at the time. In Option 2 I see an opportunity to locate activities and uses directly adjacent to the Metro terminus. This is a long way of saying Option 2 is there first and foremost for the pedestrian experience and lastly for the car experience.

- Now that we are certain about the arrival of a Metro Station and having firsthand experience with Pulte's section of Potomac Avenue, I believe locating Potomac Avenue to its current physical location is an improvement over the 2010 Plan.

- Adopting Option 2 will not compromise the integrity of the 2010 Plan.

- As I said at the last meeting when we were focusing on the north pavilion for Metro, I think we have a unique opportunity to locate in a way that integrates Metro, the development, and the park when we focused on the location that would place the pavilion and plaza just north of the stormwater pond, with an extension of the plaza across the road.

This is translated best in the July 25 exercise with Option 2. Metro, connected to the park, and the development, with a minor road to cross is the ideal proposition to achieve best pedestrian access.

- Option 2 sets the standard for this area and defines the importance of pedestrian and bike access. Even if BRT and buses are a bit further west, we are only talking two blocks away. Even if Option 1 may score higher here, my vote is still for Option 2 on this issue as well.

- Potomac Avenue should continue on its current course (Option 2). Once the full buildout on both sides of Potomac Avenue occurs, I think this effect will necessarily slow down traffic and make it less of a dividing line when we look at North Phase I and the future phases. If Potomac Avenue were curved to hug the park, this sort of calming down would never occur. The park and the metro station would be divorced from the rest of the development.

- Option 2 is the best option to achieve the stated goals of the 2010 plan. Option 2 moves the potential dividing line to where it can be integrated into the overall design, as opposed to acting as a boundary.

Additional Questions/Comments

Q Option 1 and 2 as shown both need to be tweaked/ further improvement. Is it possible to divide N/S bound Potomac Avenue BRT to be side running?

Q What is the intended nature of Potomac Avenue?

Q Can BRT stay on Route 1?

Q Is it possible to do some calculations on how many people will be crossing Potomac Ave in Option 1 and Option 2 to access/use the BRT?

Q Both options seem very car-centric – can some streets be very narrow, more pedestrian focused?

Q Is Potomac Avenue a 6-lane road, wherever located?
- Trade-off in both options – explore further for both

- Smaller/larger blocks may not necessarily dictate better/worse pedestrian environment

- Concerned in both Options about how transit/buses will impact the urban environment (retail, pedestrian, etc.)

- I continue to look at the entire 175 acre Potomac Yard (Four Mile Run to Braddock) and not just the North Yard VS. the South Yard. I feel like we have an opportunity to provide for a different experience at the northern Metro terminus than what is at the south side (Pulte).

- Want to ensure that vehicle speeds are low regardless of option

- 2D plans makes it difficult to read the pedestrian environment

- Haven't explored one-way couplet

- Having a bike friendly environment is important and should be incorporated into the framework– defined bike lanes is critical – in grid ensures safety for cyclists

- Concern about addressing car drop-off parking. Should explore providing a separate lane dedicated to short-term drop-off/parking for Metro

- BRT width is a concern for both Option 1 and 2. Phasing has a major impact so that Option 2 provides more flexibility in determining the final width needed for the BRT.

- Now that we have lived into the south portion of Potomac Yards being (mostly) developed, we have a good understanding of what needs to be changed in this section. The perfect example of this is Potomac Avenue. It is wide and barely cross-able in several parts of the existing layout close to the playground. The goal was to make all of the area comfortable for pedestrians, bicycles, transit, and cars. In trying to do that in the existing area, I think cars have taken over and use Potomac Avenue as a speeding thoroughfare.

- The original street plan seems to fit the needs of the community and commuters. Asking all metro riders to have to cross Potomac Ave to catch a bus or a ride right after they get off the metro is going to cause many issues because of the steady stream of traffic from the metro and along Potomac Ave. While Potomac Ave does not currently have the traffic volume as Route 1 it is getting busier day by day. Potomac Ave should be at least a block away with the open space/park integration.

- Before the design of E Reed had a straight path/road out to the park along the water now there is a bend in it. Changing the design of the road as a plaza having this break in the view/ transportation I think will cause a lot of issues.

- Concern with transportation to and from the metro. Having the metro directly on Potomac Ave is going to cause many issues. Such as Crystal City where there is no drop off point. Even without the drop off point people still drop off people directly in the middle of the road. This is not safe and with a bigger road like Potomac Ave the risk to the public and commuters is even greater.

- For people walking or biking to the metro there seems to be a disconnect for those of us coming across Route 1 or Arlington not accessing the trail. This is why originally the path along the plaza (E Reed all the way to the trail park) was ideal place to cross for bikers but without the proper connection to the metro bikers will take alternate routes jeopardizing the safety of everyone. This also reduces the views of the water from the neighborhood not having most of the streets go all the way out to the water creating a canyon feel especially with the heights of some of these planned buildings. I cannot imagine multiple 250ft buildings in Alexandria. I would prefer to see greater heights across the board than individual skyscrapers shadowing over everything.