

## Technical Memorandum Update

### Appendix 11 Public Outreach

Since the 2007 Approved CE (on attached CD), the proposed transit corridor has been modified along Segment E. Whereas the previous two-way transit alignment followed Clark and Bell Streets, the modified alignment is a one-way pair with southbound service along Clark and Bell Streets and northbound service along Crystal Drive between 26<sup>th</sup> Street and 15<sup>th</sup> Street. Note that the project alignment for the entire corridor is shown in Figure 1: Modified Alignment and CCPY Improvements (Appendix 1 of the current CE Update). Attachment Part A of the Documented CE Update document is a detailed description of the transit alignment in each segment.

Table 1 lists the public and stakeholder meetings that were conducted to inform community residents and businesses and provide updates about the transit improvements proposed in the project area.

<b>Date</b>	<b>Meeting Title</b>	<b>Attendees</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Minutes (Page #)</b>
May 2007 to September 2009	Crystal City Master Plan: Public and Stakeholder Meetings	Regular sessions of appointed Task Force; community meetings open to the public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Master Plan assumptions and principles</li> <li>• Alternative visions for land use and transportation</li> <li>• Transit alignment and features</li> </ul>	Incorporated by reference. See Arlington County Department of Community Planning, Housing and Development
March 17, 2010	Stakeholder Meeting	Invitations emailed to a list of participants in previous Crystal City planning studies; open to the public.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project purpose</li> <li>• Project history</li> <li>• Ongoing work activities</li> <li>• Environmental update</li> </ul>	Appendix 11   Attachment A
April 20, 2010	Stakeholder Working Group Meeting	Invitations emailed to a list of participants in previous Crystal City planning studies; open to the public.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transit stop locations</li> <li>• Transit stop features</li> </ul>	Appendix 11   Attachment B
July 27, 2010	Stakeholder Meeting	Invitations emailed to a list of participants in previous Crystal City planning studies; open to the public.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results of technical evaluation</li> <li>• Ongoing work activities</li> </ul>	Appendix 11   Attachment C

## Technical Memorandum Update

This page intentionally left blank

**Technical Memorandum Update**

**Appendix 11 | Attachments A, B and C**

**Attachment A: Stakeholder Meeting- March 17, 2010**

**Attachment B: Stakeholder Working Group Meeting-  
April 20, 2010**

**Attachment C: Stakeholder Meeting- July 27, 2010**

## Technical Memorandum Update

This page intentionally left blank.

## Technical Memorandum Update

# Appendix 11 | Attachment A Stakeholder Meeting

### Crystal City Potomac Yard Transitway Project MEETING NOTES

**To:** Wendy Jia, WMATA, and Matthew Huston, Arlington County

**From:** Jason Mumford, Susan Anderson, AECOM

**Re:** Stakeholder Meeting

**Date/Time:** March 17, 2010 5:30 – 7:30 pm

**Location:** Aurora Hills Community Center, 735 18<sup>th</sup> Street South, Arlington, Virginia

**Attendees:** Christer Ahl (Crystal City); Maureen Dowling (Jones Lang La Salle); Mason Bower; Linda Massaro; Sandra Marks (City of Alexandria); Michael Dowell (Aurora Highlands CA), Chick Walter (Arlington Ridge CA); Mitch Bonanno (Vornado/CES); Ben Helwig (NPS/GWMP); Elaine Gooding (Cassidy-Turley); Rob Mandle (CCBID)

Project Team: Steve DelGiudice, Bee Buegler, Matthew Huston, Anthony Fusarelli (Arlington County); Wendy Jia, Jim Ashe (WMATA); Timothy Ramey (PB); Jason Mumford, Susan Anderson, Selman Altun (AECOM)

#### **Meeting Summary:**

A stakeholder meeting was held at the Aurora Hills Community Center in Arlington County to provide attendees with an update of the project, with a particular focus on the environmental review update and a discussion of potential level of investment and location of proposed transit stops.

Matthew Huston of Arlington County presented a brief history of the project and provided context for the current effort. The focus of current work is an update—in light of recent Crystal City master plan efforts—of Federal environmental documentation for the initial segment of Crystal City Potomac Yard transitway. Design and implementation of the CCPY service will follow. Questions from the assembled stakeholders and responses from the project team included the following:

#### **Comments: General**

1. How does this project (CCPY) link to the Columbia Pike project? At what point will these two projects connect?
  - The project team noted that this part of the CCPY study is focused on bus improvements, not streetcar.
  - Future connections to the Columbia Pike project would likely occur on 12<sup>th</sup> Street South near South Hayes Street, after 12<sup>th</sup> Street is constructed.
2. How much of this planning effort is being coordinated with the portion of the project in Alexandria?
  - The project team relayed that Alexandria is moving forward with their portion as they have just received federal money for assisting with the project.
  - Potomac Yard redevelopment in the north portion of the Alexandria segment will change alignment, so the city is looking at an interim project through the Potomac Yard retail center.
  - The City is also considering an infill Metrorail station at Potomac Yard.

## Technical Memorandum Update

- Arlington residents would use transit to shop in the Alexandria portion of Potomac Yard.

### Comments: Dedicated vs. Shared Lanes for Transit

- Transit vehicles sharing lanes with general traffic is preferred by property owners; they feel that dedicated lanes are less compatible with the pedestrian environment.
  - The previous study assumed dedicated lanes through Crystal City. Current technical evaluation is considering both scenarios, and these findings will be the subject of further stakeholder discussion.
- Will the project team submit both options with the final review?
  - The project team will evaluate both options and, with stakeholder input, recommend a preferred configuration.
- The project team gave an overview of some of the key assumptions in terms of transit and traffic circulation:
  - Transit will operate in a dedicated lane along Clark and Bell Streets as previously approved by FTA.
  - The proposed transitway improvements are near-term, so they must balance CCPY Master Plan recommendations with the need for near-term implementation.
  - Crystal Drive is assumed to be configured as a two-way street throughout the study area; Clark is assumed to remain one-way.
  - The proposed CCPY Alignment is essentially the current 9S bus route, enhanced to include exclusive running way south of 26<sup>th</sup> Street and to include dedicated lanes between 26<sup>th</sup> Street and 15<sup>th</sup> Street.
  - Transit service levels associated with the transitway will increase in step with development in the corridor between the 2015 and 2030 forecast years.
- What is the proposed directional flow of 26<sup>th</sup> Street, north and south of the Airport Access Road?
  - The project team will evaluate both options and, with stakeholder input, recommend a preferred configuration.

### Group Discussion: Station/Stop Level of Investment

- The project team introduced several points to guide discussion:
  - Primary thought should be to look at integrating into the “urban fabric” of the community to determine an appropriate level of investment. Planners should consider plans for redevelopment within the corridor.
- Participants asked whether stations have funding mechanisms in place.
  - The project team responded that, yes, funding is included based on cost estimates from previous work.
  - The transitway is funded through federal, state, local, and private sources for the initial segment.
- One participant noted that the word “station” implies an elaborate investment. “Stop” may be more appropriate. Residents of the nearby single family neighborhood would prefer more civilized bus stops over elaborate stations.
- Participants noted that the level of investment (in features such as shelter, benches, bike racks, trash cans) should be in keeping with the number of boardings at a stop location.
- What is the cost of a stop?
  - The project team responded that a typical bus shelter is about \$15,000. The planned station at the EPA building is estimated at approximately \$500,000—note that this station is for both directions of travel; the Crystal City stops will be for one direction of

## Technical Memorandum Update

travel. The proposed stops along Segment E would be somewhere between these two figures.

13. What about off-board fare collection? Boardings at multiple doors?
  - The CCPY service would lend itself to these features, as it primarily serves workers, residents, hotel visitors.
  - 7<sup>th</sup> Street DC Circulator service is a test case for off-vehicle fare collection.
14. There was some discussion of what makes a permanent stop vs. a temporary stop.
  - Project staff noted that the expected life cycle of a bus shelter is 15-20 years with routine maintenance.
  - Participants suggested that if “temporary” is in the range of 5 to 10 years, then they would prefer treating stations as more “permanent” investments. One participant noted that 2-3 years could be considered “temporary.”
15. Participants offered that any feature that enhances the experience for the rider encourages more ridership.
  - They expect shelter, trash cans, bench, but do not need public art, heat, or other “luxury” items at the stops. One participant supported incorporating public art at stops.
  - One participant underscored the need for trash cans at stops, making specific reference to Route 1, north of McDonalds, and trash cans at Pentagon City. Alexandria keeps trash cans at most bus stops.
16. What will the impact be on the currently operating government buses?
  - Project staff responded that there will still be a need for shuttle connections to new locations, and that coordination with Federal agencies would be ongoing.
  - One participant noted a Federal mandate to use public transit, instead of private government shuttles. Some shuttles will remain because they provide a specific door-to-door service.
17. There was some discussion regarding the need for bicycle storage at stop locations.
  - One participant expressed the concern that bicycles create clutter at stops, pose risks to pedestrians, and occupy valuable space.
  - Another participant noted that provisions for cyclists are important. Some stations may be able to accommodate bikes, and some may not. There is a need to look at the trade-offs at each stop.
18. The project team polled the group on certain amenities at stations/stops. The results were as follows:
  - Canopy/Shelter – important
  - Landscaping – less important
  - Passenger information – important
  - Bike parking – less important
  - Public Art – less important
  - Heating – less important
  - Seating – important
  - Others? Trash cans – important; off-board fare collection – important

### **Group Discussion: Potential Stop Locations along Crystal Drive and Criteria to Refine Locations**

19. The project team introduced this topic, noting that the general stop spacing had been laid out in earlier phases of planning. General locations have been chosen based on accessibility to activity centers and transit transfer points, such as Metrorail and VRE stations, and on transit operations.

## Technical Memorandum Update

20. The following points when asked what criteria they felt important in stop location selection:
- The highest priority is accessibility.
  - Crystal Drive near 23<sup>rd</sup> Street: consider retailers and minimize visual obstruction of retail façades because of potential to harm business.
  - Consider transit operations and potential conflicts and weigh these considerations against the ideal “right” spot.
21. Does the Master Plan show that the Airport Access ramp will come down? When?
- Project staff responded that the plan depends on some redevelopment at this location, but probably during a later phase of the Master Plan implementation.
  - Current plans for the transitway assume that the ramp remains in place.
  - One participant commented that the ramp area is already a dangerous area; planners should consider moving the “A” stop location closer to the mid-block cross walk to avoid additional conflicts.
22. The project team opened the discussion to any other potential issues/concerns that stakeholders may have. Stakeholders expressed the following:
- Consider the disruption to local business, even if the impact is only visual.
  - Single-family neighborhoods would like the study to look more broadly at the surrounding communities and related transit services, particularly along 23<sup>rd</sup>/Ridge Road as they are affected by the proposed service.
  - Arlington County asked whether it should be looking at more local ART/Circulator service. Citizens responded that they have pretty good service today. However, Crystal City is the only urban center that doesn’t have ART; consider connections to the North and South and to the airport.
  - One participant suggested that the project team should consider facilitating streetcar/rail to minimize delay going to streetcar service in the future. The project team explained that this is a Federal project, so we can look at accommodating rail in the future, but cannot consider the rail investment as part of this bus study as it may preclude federal funding of the project.

## Technical Memorandum Update

# Appendix 11 | Attachment B Stakeholder Working Group Meeting #1

April 20, 2010, 3:00 to 5:00 p.m.  
Crystal City BID Offices

### Attendees:

Andrea Walker (Arlington Ridge Civic Association); Christer Ahl (Crystal City resident); Mitch Bonanno, Tanya Seyfert, Marty Freeman (Vornado/CES); Ginger Remian (Lowe Enterprises); Rob Mandle (Crystal City BID); Anthony Fusarelli, Steve DelGiudice, Bee Buegler, Matthew Huston (Arlington County); Jim Ashe, John Magarelli (WMATA); Bill Pugh, Selman Altun, Jason Mumford (AECOM)

### Meeting Summary:

This meeting was convened to seek input of the stakeholder Working Group on general locations for proposed transit stations/stops along Crystal Drive.

After introductions, Matthew Huston gave an overview of the project and explained the goals of the meeting:

- 1) Discussion of evaluation criteria for selecting a preferred location for each stop, particularly the relative importance of the criteria;
- 2) Preferred general location for the two stations/stops on Crystal Drive
- 3) Whether the preferred locations identified should be considered "permanent" or "interim"

Bill Pugh explained the criteria used by the project team in its draft memorandum on station/stop locations, and asked Working Group members to rate the criteria in terms of importance. The criteria are listed here in order of importance, according to the number of "votes" each received:

Traffic operations – 10  
Compatible adjacent uses – 9  
Space requirements – 9  
Pedestrian safety – 6  
Multimodal connections – 5  
Compatibility w/ streetcar conversion – 3  
Transitway operations – 2  
Capital cost – 1  
Environmental resources – 0  
Existing Utilities – 0

The group took a walking tour of the location options, then reconvened for discussion.

### Group Discussion:

#### 23<sup>rd</sup> Street Northbound

##### Option 1:

- Concerns of Option 1 location
  - Restriction of vehicular access into buildings on west side of Crystal Drive from Airport Access Road – would left hand turn movements be allowed?
  - Multiple buses backing up traffic

## Technical Memorandum Update

- Pedestrians crossing mid-block
- Future retail on west side of Crystal Drive
- Solution of merging issue
- Option 1 could be a great location in the future
  - Future development, especially on east side of Crystal Drive (redevelopment of plaza) and new streetfront retail along west side
  - Airport Access Road ramp will go away
  - New building parcels created
  - Future new development/redevelopment at location would allow for proactive planning of station stop to avoid blocking retail and resolve potential traffic conflicts
- General impression that Option 1 has too much to address right now to be a short-term station location
- Implications for level of investment if different location is preferred for long-term (Option 1) versus short- to mid-term (Option 3)
- Good to be as close to 23<sup>rd</sup> Street as possible – this is a future focal point of area and new construction is anticipated
- Streetcar – consideration for future station location, especially Option 1. There is a potential paired (northbound and southbound) stop location south of 23<sup>rd</sup> Street due to the uncertainty of the timeframe for realignment of Clark Street south of 23<sup>rd</sup> Street.

### Option 2:

- Blocking existing retail is a significant concern at Option 2 location

### Option 3:

- Option 3 had least concerns
  - Adjacent pedestrian crossing is a significant advantage
- Minor issues of Option 3 include:
  - electrical traffic signal box at location (also, speculation if the electrical box indicates the extent of the public right-of-way)
  - Location of parking structure underneath plaza/sidewalk

*Initial group recommendation for 23<sup>rd</sup> Street location: Pursue Option 3 as the “interim” location. A station near 23<sup>rd</sup> Street, Option 1, is the recommended long-term location.*

### 18<sup>th</sup> Street Northbound

#### Option 1:

- Advantage is that adjacent to pedestrian crossing
- Apartment building driveways
  - Could Option 1 location be shifted so that it fits in between the existing driveways?
  - Can we consolidate driveways?
  - Can driveway be lined up with traffic light?
  - Noted that the design of the driveways was due to the original configuration of this segment of Crystal Drive as a one-way northbound street
  - Noted that residential building directly south of Water Park is an apartment building so it may be easier to work with a single building owner/property manager
  - Need input from Archstone (owner of residential building) on Option 1 location
- How close should 18<sup>th</sup> Street and 23<sup>rd</sup> Street stops be located?

## Technical Memorandum Update

### Option 2:

- The adjacent area of Water Park is not as sensitive to visual impacts – kiosk and paved area and large planter bed by entrance to Mount Vernon Trail, although one person commented that the view of the park from the south is most significant due to the orientation of the fountain
- New mid-block crossing
  - There is a need for crosswalk now regardless of station consideration. This segment of Crystal Drive is a long “superblock” which would ordinarily have one of two intersections and crossing opportunities. Already lots of people crossing here.
  - How can this be designed to handle potentially heavy volumes of people (going to VRE, park, Mount Vernon Trail, etc.) without creating conflict with waiting passengers at an Option 2 stop location
  - Would new mid-block crossing help relieve crowds at existing crossing by VRE entrance or create other location of crowding at south end of Water Park?
- Would there be conflicts with pedestrian/bicycle traffic at Mount Vernon Trail connector? One person noted that the apartment service driveway to the south allows bicyclists to enter street traffic.

### Option 3:

- Some commented that Option 3 intrudes on “heart” of Water Park, fountain area and attractive views from north
- Concern that Option 3 location already has too much pedestrian activity with VRE station entrance and other existing bus stops immediately to the north

### Water Park (general issues):

- General feeling of group that impacts on green space should be minimized
- Need to consider visibility of stops by Water Park versus need to “blend in” and avoid negative visual impacts on park. In general, how “transparent” can stop be to avoid impacts on areas behind them?
- Master Plan and Sector Plan process – the public really values the Water Park and also wants to activate the edges
- Current status of Water Park
  - Ownership – south end is owned by Vornado; north end is owned by Archstone
  - Management – entire park is managed by Vornado
  - The general public (residents and area workers) treat it like a public park
  - Discussion in Master Plan and Sector Plan process that the potential loss of other small open space areas in Crystal City raises the relative importance of the Water Park – for example there was an idea mentioned of possible public dedication of Water Park

*Initial group recommendation for 18<sup>th</sup> Street location: Option 1 near 18<sup>th</sup> Street and Option 2 at south end of Water Park are both generally acceptable locations. Both should be explored further.*

### Other General Issues for Crystal Drive

- There was discussion of hours of operation and frequency of Transitway service and how this would align with retail hours in district.
- There was discussion of the length of station platforms accommodate short headways and multiple other buses.
- Number of buses from other services:

## Technical Memorandum Update

- Surprise at how many buses during peak hour along Crystal Drive
- Lots of existing stops
- Project team had originally planned consolidation of many stops but now wonders how much can be consolidated given recent large increases in bus service
- Some of the existing bus services are already blocking the 9S bus and slowing it down – will this also happen to future bus transitway service?
- Discussion of dedicated lanes versus mixed traffic lanes:
  - Dedicated transit lanes would generally also allow right-turn movements by general traffic into driveways.
  - Largest number of buses is during the peak period – the need for dedicated lanes may be less in the off-peak. There may be a way to have different rules for use of the Transitway lanes at different times of day.
  - Loading – many delivery trucks use Crystal Drive right-hand lane for unloading because it is often quicker than using internal loading docks. It is important to address loading needs of businesses while implementing a dedicated lane for transit. It was suggested that the project team can research how other cities operate bus transitway services.
  - Sluggers – pickups and drop-offs of sluggers also use the right-hand lane.

### Next Steps and Action Items

- The project team will move forward over the coming month to complete environmental documentation for the initial transitway project.
- As the project team completes environmental documentation and moves into preliminary engineering, there is a need for additional information on easements and infrastructure
- The stakeholder Working Group will meet again during summer 2010 to assist the project team in beginning to refine preliminary design.

## Technical Memorandum Update

# Appendix 11 | Attachment C Stakeholder Meeting #2

July 27, 2010, 5:30 to 7:30 p.m.

Aurora Hills Community Center, 735 18th Street S., Arlington, VA 22202

### Attendees:

*Stakeholders/Public:* Christer Ahl (Crystal City resident), Jerry Norris (EDC), Pierre Holloman (Alexandria Transit), Rob Mandle (Crystal City BID), Mitch Bonanno, Jason Fudin (Vornado/CES), Neal Sigmon (Arlington Parks & Recreation), Janet Gregor (NOVA Streetcar Coalition), Peter Fallon (Arlington Planning Commission), Kate Youngbluth (Arlington DES Transportation Planning), Heather Perkins (Arlington Potomac Yard), Don Alberstadt (public)

*Project Team:* Matthew Huston, Bee Buegler, Steve DelGiudice (Arlington County), Wendy Jia (WMATA), Tim Ramey (PB), Jason Mumford, Selman Altun, Susan Anderson (AECOM)

### Meeting Summary:

This meeting was the second of a series of stakeholder meetings with interested parties along the project corridor. The focus of this meeting was to update stakeholders on the status of the environmental documentation and to present the findings of analysis. After a formal presentation by Arlington County, the meeting was opened up for discussion and comment on the findings. The power point presentation is attached. Below is a summary of the comments, questions and responses from the meeting by topic.

### ***Transit Travel Time/Dedicated Lanes***

The relationship between dedicated lanes and transit travel times was discussed. Stakeholders asked for clarification on the transit travel time improvements reported. How does the percentage reported relate to time?

*The project team explained that the travel time savings is related to the reliability improvement associated with dedicated lanes and that is a key finding. The percentages reported translate into a 68 second savings in 2030 AM peak and 49 seconds in 2030 PM peak. However it should be noted that these travel time savings are for one segment of the project and that as other segments of the project come online, the cumulative benefit could be significant.*

Stakeholders commented on the existing shuttle bus services within the corridor and questioned if those shuttles will be able to utilize the dedicated transitway and stations and if so, doesn't that affect the reliability of the bus service/travel times. Can the county legislate or control the dedicate lanes? Wouldn't this also impact a future streetcar?

*Arlington stated this CE update assumes only public transit buses use the transitway during the peak periods. The County would like to be able to control the bus lane and will look at it in a later phase as part of the operating plan. Arlington stated that they need to differentiate among public vs. private shuttle providers and understand how many stops they make, their frequency and regularity. The County agreed that this has the potential to create congestion in the bus transitway and future transit investment. As planning for the future transit project progresses, Arlington will need to think about operations and conduct additional analysis, such as detailed traffic simulation.*

## Technical Memorandum Update

A representative from BID stated that they are working on consolidating shuttle services. They also mentioned that SLUG lines will also likely have an impact on operations.

Another stakeholder talked about “leap frogging” of buses in the current conditions. They observed buses going in and out of lanes to get to stops and they are concerned about how dedicated lanes will actually work.

*The County restated the question of who regulates and who has authority over the dedicated lanes. The draft Crystal City Sector Plan considers a multimodal center/stop that would focus some of these other services within the corridor.*

*WMATA also suggested that DDOT (DC) is also looking at some of the same issue of how to handle commuter buses. One thing that DDOT is considering is designating certain streets for commuter buses to use and other streets for Metrobus/Circulator.*

A stakeholder questioned justifying the dedicated lane for the transitway based on the recommendations of the Crystal City Sector Plan. The Sector Plan relied on transit staff recommendations to advance a dedicated lane, therefore the transitway project should look at other merits of dedicated lane.

A concern was also raised about the cross section presented for Crystal Drive and that right turns would be blocked by pedestrians.

*The project team stated that right turns are accommodated in the transit lane shown in the cross section. However, the comment is a good comment regarding pedestrians.*

It was also stated that access to off-street parking also creates problems with traffic.

Attendees also stated that with no barriers between the designated and non-designated lanes, there will be lane switching by non-transit vehicles and there will be less of a travel time benefit.

The findings state that transit lanes will be dedicated during peak hours of operation, what are the peak hours considered? Attendees noted that the peak travel times in Crystal City are earlier than average given the number of government/military workers.

*The project team stated that it is assumed that there will be a 3 hour peak period designated in the AM and PM peak. They also questioned if the peak periods would be the same after BRAC. This will be evaluated in future stages of analysis.*

Stakeholders questioned if dedicated lanes are actually justified in both peak periods and that they may be justified in the PM peak, but not the AM.

*The project team noted the difference in travel behaviors observed in both the AM and PM peak periods. The team looked at the cross section closely and considered the differences in the AM and PM travel patterns. By providing the left turn lanes, improvements are provided. The team also thought about the cross section from an urban design/street space perspective.*

## Technical Memorandum Update

### **Ridership**

Stakeholders asked about current ridership and projections.

*Arlington stated that the 9S serves about 1600 riders/day and that number is rising. Ridership forecast was developed in the 2003 DRPT study for the entire corridor from Braddock to Pentagon. It did not break out the portion of ridership for Crystal City.*

### **Connectivity**

How this project connects to the broader context of transit in the area was discussed. It was hoped that this would not be just a circulator service, but provide connectivity.

*The County reminded participants that this is just the first piece of a larger project and that in conjunction with Alexandria, the project is moving towards the full corridor. Arlington is also working on a transit development plan that connects various points, such as the Pentagon, Pentagon City to Long Bridge Park, which may be some sort of local circulator service. WMATA also talked about adjustments along the Blue/Yellow line of the Metrorail service and how those adjustments include looking at some supplemental bus services in the vicinity of this project.*

### **Future Streetcar Project**

Attendees were interested in the future streetcar project and asked several questions regarding that. While the future streetcar project was not the focus of this meeting, the project team did respond to questions related to the future transit investment.

Stakeholders questioned the timeframe for the streetcar and how long the bus transitway will last before streetcar is implemented.

*County staff responded that the recently adopted Capital Improvement Program (CIP) targets fiscal year 2016 for starting construction for streetcar and then that project will need an additional time before operation service can begin. Arlington will be undertaking the planning process for the streetcar study this fall to determine if the project could apply for federal funding (New Starts/Small Starts). The County also has to make decisions on how the project would be implemented (Design Bid Build, other).*

*Arlington County stated that the bus transitway project will hopefully be operating by 2012 and would operate during construction of the future streetcar project.*

Is the 2012 timeframe stated specific to the rubber-tire mode?

*Yes, the 2012 operation is specifically for the rubber-tired bus. However, Arlington feels like the investments made as part of the bus transitway project are long-term investments and should be suitable for future transit investments. In 2012, the current project may extend into Potomac Yard, but is currently limited by the bridge over Four Mile Run. Arlington is working with Alexandria and developers to understand the timing of potential bridge improvements to extend the bus transitway project to Alexandria.*

What kind of propulsion is being looked at for the rail cars (streetcar)?

*The current study is for a CNG/hybrid bus technology and is the focus of discussion at this meeting. However, the future streetcar study will likely look at overhead electric propulsion, but will continue to look into other propulsion technologies. Arlington also mentioned that they are*

## Technical Memorandum Update

*starting the process to look at community based energy plan that may provide an alternative way to power a future streetcar system.*

At the close of the meeting, Arlington stated that both the presentation and the current version of the Documented Categorical Exclusion will be posted on the project website July 28, 2010.