



# Summary, Response to Comments, and Major Changes from Public Review Draft

## Overview

From the kickoff “Ideas Exchange” on February 9, 2013 until the release of the draft plan for public comment on May 30, 2014, moveDC evolved over an 18 month period thanks to extensive meetings and conversations with public, and the participation of thousands of citizens. The original public comment period on the draft moveDC Plan was through July 6, and this was extended through July 31 to enable more time for public feedback. During the public review period there were several avenues for public comment:

1. moveDC website: An online survey and comment forms were available, including an opportunity to “score” the overall plan and each element;
2. Email or letter submission: comments and feedback sent directly to DDOT;
3. DCCouncil roundtable: occurred on June 27, 2014 included DDOT presentation, public testimony, and dialogue with Council members.
4. Stakeholder meetings: Upon request, DDOT staff attended stakeholder meetings to present the plan and solicit feedback.

The comment period provided a valuable opportunity for DDOT to compile feedback from a variety of sources in order to strengthen the final plan. This memorandum briefly summarizes the responses into themes and outlines specific modifications to the final plan.

## moveDC Draft Plan - Online Survey

The online survey was available throughout the public comment period and was linked from the same page where members of the public were able to download the plan document. During the comment period, 561 surveys were completed.

This analysis of survey respondents is provided to show that while 561 responses represents robust feedback on the plan and provides important illustrative feedback, it should not be seen as exhaustive or conclusive of the population or moveDC’s public outreach as a whole.

Respondents were asked to evaluate their support for the overall plan and each element on a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being no support and 5 being total support. The survey also requested some basic demographic information from respondents.

From respondents to the survey, overall support for the plan was quite robust, with an average “score” of 3.99. Each element also received overall support, ranging from a high of 4.31 for the Pedestrian Element to a low of 3.62 for the Vehicular Element. The overall scores are shown below in Table 1, along with the percentage of respondents choosing each score.



**Table 1: Online Survey Evaluations**

Score	Overall	Ped.	Bicycle	Transit	Vehicle	Freight	TDM	Parking	Sust. & Liv.
5	51%	58%	64%	53%	33%	32%	41%	36%	56%
4	23%	25%	15%	23%	24%	28%	23%	23%	23%
3	11%	10%	9%	13%	25%	28%	21%	25%	14%
2	5%	4%	5%	5%	7%	8%	6%	7%	2%
1	10%	3%	7%	6%	11%	4%	8%	9%	5%
<b>Avg.</b>	<b>3.99</b>	<b>4.31</b>	<b>4.23</b>	<b>4.10</b>	<b>3.62</b>	<b>3.77</b>	<b>3.84</b>	<b>3.70</b>	<b>4.23</b>

In addition to the numerical scoring, the comments from the survey followed the same general themes as comments overall, which are outlined in more detail below.

The online survey should not be seen as exhaustive of public opinion on the plan. Analysis of the demographic information supplied by participants shows that the overall sample skewed male (302 “male” to 17 “female” to 242 “no response”) and white (372 “Caucasian”, 47 “African American”, 11 “Latino”, 20 “Asian/Pacific Islander”, 111 “No Response”). The age distribution was more in line with the population of the District, but skewed slightly towards younger and middle-aged adults than the population as a whole, as shown in Table 2.

**Table 2: Age of online survey respondents and general population**

Age	moveDC Survey	2012 Census Est.
18-25	7%	10%
26-35	44%	21%
36-50	25%	20%
Over 50	16%	28%
Unknown	8%	NA



Approximately 95% of respondents (532 of 561) provided a zipcode. The geographic breakdown of respondents was concentrated in some parts of the District, and relatively lower in other parts. Central neighborhoods were highly represented in the survey responses, while more peripheral neighborhoods were generally less well represented in the sample. These responses were mapped by zipcode and ward, and the map is provided at the end of this document.

## Thematic Comments on the Plan

From the online survey responses, emails, letters, and public testimony at the Council Roundtable, there were a number of broad themes that emerged which led to the overall assessment of public comment and to some of the specific changes detailed in this memorandum. The broad themes and DDOT responses to these themes are outlined below.

### Theme 1: “I don’t support Project XX.”

*Examples: Comments identified concerns about specific projects proposed in moveDC, including the designation of Military Road NW and Van Ness Street NW as “High Frequency Transit” corridors and the potential impacts on adjacent homes or there were concerns about specific streets identified for potential bicycle facilities.*

**Responses:** The moveDC Plan is intended to be a starting point—a vision plan—for coordinated transportation investments in the District over the next 25 years. The moveDC Plan focuses on a system-level analysis, it does not present specific and final design solutions, nor has the plan analyzed all of the tradeoffs for individual components of the plan. The vast majority of moveDC recommendations will need to undergo additional evaluation, further development, and public input—consistent with established city processes—prior to implementation.

moveDC is a long-term plan for a reason: achieving its full vision will require decades of investment and continued commitment—and feedback—from residents, city leaders, as well as the support of local and regional partners. In general, this theme of comments did not result in large-scale changes to the potential capital investments, but did lead to clarifications of the process and the meaning of some of the recommendations. For example, the description of “High Frequency Transit” was clarified to highlight the focus on operational improvements rather than expansion of roads for dedicated lanes.

For some specific investments or policy recommendations, notably roadway pricing through managed lanes and a downtown cordon charge/congestion management area and the Priority Streetcar System, there were a number of comments that did not show a consensus either for or against the recommendation. These projects elicited a number of comments but did not yield a consensus view, highlighting the need for more focused analysis and active, engaged public process going forward.



## Theme 2: “I strongly support Project XX. It should be a higher priority and be in Tier 1.”

*Examples: Comments highlighted concerns about pedestrian projects missing from Tier 1 (aside from sidewalks), specific trail projects, such as the Met Branch Trail moved to Tier 1, and requests for specific High Capacity Transit or Pedestrian projects to be shifted within Tier system.*

**Responses:** All of the recommendations contained in the moveDC Plan are ultimately recommendations in order to meet the long-term needs of the District. An important element of the moveDC planning process was ensuring that investments were prioritized using a data-driven method that provides the public and decision-makers with a clear view of why and how individual recommendations were ranked and ultimately prioritized. The moveDC capital investment recommendations were prioritized objectively based on quantitative and qualitative evaluation measures. Because public comments on tier levels typically came from individual commenters, DDOT staff did not feel it was appropriate to adjust tier levels based on these comments.

moveDC recommendations are subject to the District and DDOT’s budgeting process and the availability of funding. Some recommendations and projects may depend on funding from, or in cooperation with, regional partners. As the plan moves forward, if funding or partnership opportunities arise that may enable or expedite a project, there may be opportunities for projects to shift within the Tier system, and the tier system should be re-evaluated on a regular basis to adjust to changing conditions.

Not all potential improvements were analyzed through the prioritization process. “Pedestrian investments” for example were focused on filling sidewalk gaps, and project rankings were prioritized in a slightly different manner than other modes, with a focus on proximity to schools, parks, transit stops. Many pedestrian safety investments will continue to be implemented either as stand alone projects or embedded into large scale projects, for example Leading Pedestrian Intervals (LPIs) as part of DDOT’s Citywide Signal Optimization Plan, or specific intersection modifications as part of focused analysis and thus specific locations for some pedestrian investments are not called out in the tier rankings. Some of the detailed actions are highlighted in the **moveDC Action Plan** that accompanies the final plan.

## Theme 3: “The moveDC Plan should aim higher and increase moveDC/the District’s performance goals from X to XX.”

*Examples: There were comments about the performance of the recommended plan, including aiming higher for reducing vehicle usage and emissions, increasing bike mode share goals, and expanding the District’s tree canopy coverage goals.*

**Responses:** The goals of moveDC are intended to be far-reaching and visionary targets. They are not always easy to measure precisely under future conditions or through the forecasting tools available today. The forecast mode share performance in the plan reflects the effect of moveDC’s recommended investments on a population and workforce with travel attitudes and behaviors similar to those today. As population and employment conditions change, travel trends and behaviors shift, and technologies



improve, performance monitoring will be needed to evaluate progress on the moveDC goals. In general, these comments were useful in understanding broad public attitudes towards the plan, but did not result in specific changes to recommendations or goals.

**Theme 4: “moveDC should focus more on regional investments.”**

*Examples: Comments noted support for expediting DDOT funding and investments in Metrorail and Commuter Rail and called for more specificity about how these would be achieved.*

**Responses:** The majority of moveDC capital investments will be led and implemented by DDOT, working in coordination with other agencies and stakeholders and partners in the region. In some instances, DDOT will act in a support role to other agencies or organizations, and implementation may be at the discretion of those partners. From trains to trails, regional investments that involve multiple jurisdictions and stakeholders require a high level of coordination and investment, all of which play a role in how a project is implemented. Wherever possible, the moveDC plan identifies both DDOT-led projects or initiatives and those that must be led by others with support from DDOT. The final moveDC Plan was modified to expand on and clarify these roles and responsibilities. DDOT will also continue to partner with other jurisdictions and agencies in the region through the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, WMATA, and other opportunities to advance transportation improvements that benefit the District and the Metropolitan Washington region as a whole. The **moveDC Action Plan** highlights some of the areas where this will be especially important in the near term.

**Theme 5: “What specific investments or policy changes will there be and when are you going to start on this?”**

*Examples: Comments focused on specific investments and the timelines for implementation or a desire to see action on a range of specific projects, such as protected bicycle lanes, transit improvements, or additional studies.*

**Response:** In many places, the **moveDC Plan** was clarified to be specific about types of projects and improvements. In addition, DDOT has prepared a **moveDC Action Plan** that details some of the critical next steps in the coming 2 years that will begin implementation of the plan. The Action Plan is not exhaustive of everything DDOT will do to implement the plan, but it highlights 35 specific commitments, and will be supplemented by quarterly and annual reporting on progress.



## Specific Changes to the moveDC Plan

Beyond the thematic comments, many comments were specific as to confusing language, unclear recommendations or other errata in the draft Plan. The following is a compilation of specific modifications based on public comments and DDOT's internal review of the draft Plan.

**Table 3: Specific changes to moveDC Plan based on comment period**

Chapter	Change	Origin	Type
Global	Map Placement in Chapters	Internal	Editorial
Global	moveDC vision at front of each chapter	Internal	Expand/Clarify
Global	Revise GWU as "campus/institutional" on land use map	External	Correction
Global	Titles, headers and labels revised for clarity and readability	Internal	Editorial
Global	Language added to discuss full spectrum of District population, expressly addressing families and seniors	External	Comment
Global	Stylistic edits for readability and clarity.	Internal/ External	Expand/ Clarify
N.A.	Added Acknowledgements page	Internal	Editorial
N.A.	Added moveDC Executive Summary in lieu of foreword	Internal	Editorial
1	Ensure consistent use of COG data for District and regional population projects	Internal	Correction
1	Language added to "Modern City" in Chapter 1 about role of driving and integration with other modes.	External	Comment
2	Added language in Chapter 2 to address future land uses in relationship to transportation	External	Comment
3	3 Approaches maps and performance moved to Appendix	Internal/ External	Comment
2	Language revised to "auto ownership rate"	External	Comment
2	Call-out box "Looking Toward Peers in Chapter 2 deleted	Internal	Editorial



Chapter	Change	Origin	Type
2	Call-out box in Chapter 2 “The National Influence” rewritten and new title	Internal	Editorial
3	MoveDC final plan vision, goals and outcomes added to Chapter 3, following 3 approaches	Internal	Expand/Clarify
4	Revised “Next Steps” to reflect Action Plan and approach to ongoing updates/review of plan recommendations	Internal	Editorial
<b>Ped</b>	Revise Rec A.3 text	Internal/ External	Expand/Clarify
<b>Ped</b>	Added Rec A.4	Internal	Expand/Clarify
<b>Ped</b>	Revise Rec A.1 to include language regarding pedestrian accessibility and routes amidst construction sites	Internal/ External	Comment
<b>Ped</b>	Revise Rec A.5 to include signal timing for pedestrians	External	Comment
<b>Ped</b>	Revised "Opportunities for Improvement" to include crash data related to automated traffic enforcement	External	Comment
<b>Ped</b>	Revised Rec A.8 to include language noting pedestrian plazas as means of expanding network	External	Comment
<b>Ped</b>	Revise Rec C.3 to include updates on status of pedestrian element of moveDC	External	Comment
<b>Ped</b>	Revised Rec C.4 rec language to "expand" instead of "continue".	External	Comment
<b>Ped</b>	Minor revisions to Intro language	Internal	Editorial
<b>Ped</b>	Minor map revisions to ensure legend and maps are visually aligned	Internal	Editorial
<b>Bike</b>	Revise Rec B.2 to include sentence about coordination among District agencies	External	Comment
<b>Bike</b>	Revise Rec C.5	Internal	Expand/Clarify



Chapter	Change	Origin	Type
<b>Bike</b>	Revise Rec C.7 to include providing financial benefits for District employees who bike to work	External	Comment
<b>Bike</b>	Added bikeshare station data to Existing Conditions	Internal	Expand/Clarify
<b>Bike</b>	Corrected title of BIkeStation at Union Station	Internal	Correction
<b>Bike</b>	Image caption on B-31 moved to be legible	Internal	Correction
<b>Transit</b>	Extended HFT on New Hampshire Ave to Ft Totten	Internal	Comment
<b>Transit</b>	Revise maps to show correct recommendations on Van Ness St NW- variance on maps (p.T-27 and T-37).	External	Correction
<b>Transit</b>	Added new Rec A.10 "Support regional expansion plans"	External	Comment
<b>Transit</b>	Revised Rec A.1 to discuss regional coordination and efficiency to serve District residents with reverse commutes	External	Comment
<b>Transit</b>	Revised Rec B.3 to acknowledge ease of transfers at multimodal facilities	External	Comment
<b>Transit</b>	Added language to Existing Conditions about expansion plans and capabilities of VRE and MARC	External	Comment
<b>Transit</b>	Added Table T.3 added to expressly outline goals and operational characteristics of High Capacity Transit vs. High Frequency Transit	External/ Internal	Expand/Clarify
<b>Vehicle</b>	Added language to address EMS/Fire/safety needs on roadways	External	Comment
<b>Vehicle</b>	Revised financial projections based on adopted FY15-20 budget, included strategies to address the financial gap	Internal/ External	Comment
<b>Vehicle</b>	Language added to "Opportunities for Improvement" about air quality impacts.	External	Comment
<b>Vehicle</b>	Revise Rec C.5 to include increasing TCOs at rush hour	External	Comment





Chapter	Change	Origin	Type
<b>Vehicle</b>	Add language to "Opportunities for Improvement" about future technology/vehicle technologies	External	Comment
<b>Vehicle</b>	Revised Rec A.4 to encourage future updates and state of best practice about signal optimization and networking technology	External	Comment
<b>Freight</b>	Language added to clarify why and how multimodal facilities can co-exist with freight routes	External	Comment
<b>Freight</b>	Rewrote chapter intro	External	Expand/Clarify
<b>Freight</b>	Added new policy, Rec B.1, to address the preservation of key citywide freight routes	Internal	Expand/Clarify
<b>Freight</b>	Added new Rec, A.4, to address passenger bottleneck areas on rail lines	External	Comment
<b>Parking</b>	Added language to Existing Conditions about RPP pricing and demand	External	Comment
<b>Parking</b>	Expanded language in "Opportunities for Improvement"	External	Comment
<b>Parking</b>	Revised Rec A.1 to expand language on performance parking and current pilot project in Chinatown-Penn Quarter	External	Comment
<b>Parking</b>	Add new Rec C.3 "Balanced Enforcement of Curbside Management" to maximize benefit of curbside space as public resource.	Internal	Expand/Clarify
<b>Parking</b>	Text revised to note "rate of car ownership"	External	Correction
<b>Parking</b>	Added language referring readers to DDOT Curbside Management Study for details on parking demand and management.	External	Comment
<b>TDM</b>	Rewrote chapter intro	Internal/ External	Expand/Clarify
<b>TDM</b>	Revised Rec B.2 to reflect new DC law	Internal	Expand/Clarify



Chapter	Change	Origin	Type
<b>TDM</b>	Revised Existing Conditions to include additional data on existing commuter impacts and text about future TDM opportunities to manage the network	External	Comment
<b>TDM</b>	Revise Rec A.1 to highlight localized demand and performance parking approaches; cross-referenced to Parking Element	External	Comment
<b>S+L</b>	Added new policy B.11 about health outcome considerations in transportation investments	Internal	Expand/Clarify
<b>S+L</b>	Removed call-out box on S-12 listing approved DDOT tree species	External	Comment
<b>S+L</b>	Added new policy, Rec B.10, encouraging use of alternative modes and low-emission vehicles	External	Comment
<b>S+L</b>	Revised Recs A.2 and A.4 to include reducing heat through cooler surfaces	External	Comment
<b>S+L</b>	Revised Recs A.6 and B.4 to include language on clean riverways.	External	Comment
<b>S+L</b>	Revised Rec A.4 to include coordination for green traffic calming measures	External	Comment
<b>S+L</b>	Added new Rec, A.9, to address light pollution, adapted from Sustainable DC Nature Action 2.2	External	Comment
<b>S+L</b>	Map revision to Figure S.1, UFA canopy map, to include ward boundaries	Internal	Clarification



Figure 1: moveDC Online Survey Comments by Zip Code (map represents 95% of all survey responses)

