

Whitehurst Freeway Deconstruction Feasibility Study

Design Workshops – April 30 and May 7, 2005 Summary Report

Index

1.0 Introduction	2
2.0 Summary of Significant Findings	3
3.0 Design Workshop, April 30	
3.1 Workshop Agenda and Minutes	4
3.2 Written Comments Received	4
3.3 Survey Questions	5
3.4 Information Needed for Study.....	5
3.5 Evaluation Criteria Ratings	7
3.6 Alternatives Suggested	8
4.0 Design Workshop, May 7	
4.1 Workshop Agenda and Minutes	10
4.2 Written Comments Received	10
4.3 Survey Questions	11
4.4 Information Needed for Study	12
4.5 Evaluation Criteria Ratings	13
4.6 Alternatives Suggested	13

1.0 Introduction

This report documents and summarizes questions, comments, and suggestions that were received at two design workshops for the Whitehurst Freeway Deconstruction Feasibility Study held in April and May 2005. The events were publicized in advance through half-page advertisements in *The Georgetown* and *The Current* newspapers (*The Northwest Current*, *The Georgetown Current*, and *The Dupont Current*). They were also announced at three public meetings held in April 2005 and on the District Department of Transportation's Web site.

The purpose of the design workshops was two-fold: to provide information to the public about the scope of the study and data collected so far, and to solicit public input about additional information that is needed for the study, evaluation criteria, and alternatives.

The same visual tools developed for the public meetings were used for the design workshops, including a half-hour PowerPoint presentation, a handout containing the presentation slides, and a fact sheet. Ten boards containing existing conditions information were set up on easels in the workshop areas. The presentation discussed background information about the project, study goals, existing conditions in the study area, the existing traffic model, case studies, recent related projects, and a summary of "next steps."

In addition to providing information to the public through these materials, the second purpose of the workshops was to solicit the public's views on the study. As opposed to the public meetings which featured question-and-answer forums, the workshops contained breakout sessions that provided an interactive environment in which participants could become personally involved in the planning process. Attendees were also given comment cards and surveys on which they could make their views known in writing. Returned materials have been transcribed in full for this report.

The first workshop was held on Saturday, April 30 at Palisades Library on V Street NW in the Palisades neighborhood. It was the better-attended of the two workshops, with more than 70 members of the public, local government, and media in attendance. The second workshop, on Saturday, May 7 at Hardy Middle School at 35th Street and Wisconsin Avenue NW, was located in Georgetown. About 20 members of the public and local government attended the second workshop.

Part 2 of this report summarizes significant findings from the design workshops.

Parts 3 and 4 contain the following information from each workshop:

- agenda and minutes
- transcription of written comments received
- a summary of survey results
- information that participants felt was needed to perform the study
- evaluation criteria ratings
- and a list of alternatives suggested by participants

2.0 Summary of Significant Findings

The three public meetings that took place in April yielded more than 150 questions and comments via comment card and question-and-answer sessions. By contrast, project staff received only four written comments at the design workshops, and the workshop format bypassed the Q & A forums. However, the workshops had two methods for obtaining public input that the meetings did not have: surveys and breakout sessions.

Twenty-four surveys were received at the two workshops, 14 at the first and 10 at the second. The survey results are revealed on pages 5 and 11, respectively, of this report. To summarize, only five of the 24 people surveyed said they use the Whitehurst Freeway to commute to and from work. Thirteen of 24 claimed to use the freeway fewer than twice per week, while seven reported using it ten times or more per week. Nineteen of 24 respondents believe that public transportation in Georgetown is insufficient. In addition, the survey asked participants to rate traffic in Georgetown on a scale of 1 to 10 (1 being poor and 10 being excellent) for AM peak, PM peak, evenings, and weekends. The average rating for the first workshop was between 2.5 for PM peak and 4.0 for evenings, and the average rating for the second workshop was between 4.1 for PM peak and 5.2 for evenings. Both groups ranked PM peak as having the worst traffic in Georgetown, followed by AM peak, weekends, and evenings; although with ratings of 4.0 and 5.2, respondents clearly felt that even at night time, traffic in Georgetown is less than satisfactory.

The three breakout sessions at each workshop presented an opportunity for participants to work directly with project staff in three ways:

Information needed – This breakout session enabled participants to notify project staff of study elements that may be missing or other information that might be needed to perform a more comprehensive study. Comments received at the two workshops are listed on pages 5 and 12 of this report. By far, most of the comments – 22 of them – pertained to traffic issues such as counts, speeds, and access. Seven comments were related to pedestrian counts and safety; seven to air quality, noise, and vibration; six to parking; six to floodplain, stormwater, and hydrological data; and five to improvements in transit, roads, and other infrastructure. Participants also requested that information be included in the study about impacts to property values and tax revenues, land use and zoning, evacuation routes and security, architectural and historic resources, accidents, and other issues.

Evaluation criteria – In the second breakout session of the workshops, participants rated the study's evaluation criteria based on the issues most important to them. A methodology and complete results of the exercise are included on pages 7 and 13 of this report. As with the "information needed" sessions, traffic impacts rated highest, followed by public support for alternate alignments, pedestrian/bicycle access and safety, and impacts to the environment.

Alternatives – In the third of three workshop breakout sessions, participants suggested alternatives to be explored in the study. Many detailed suggestions were heard, but generally the participants' proposals fell into two camps: a no-build alternative with improvements, and build alternatives. Proposed alternatives are listed on pages 8 and 13 of this report. Some potential post-deconstruction options were mentioned more than others. Among the build alternatives suggested multiple times were: a proposal to build a tunnel between Canal Road and Washington Circle; improving access to local roads at the east end of the freeway; connecting Canal Road to K Street and/or Key Bridge; depressing K Street and building pedestrian bridges over it for waterfront access; replacing the freeway with a new structure that is more context sensitive; and making general improvements to K Street, including transforming it into a boulevard.

3.0 April 30 Design Workshop

3.1 April 30 – Workshop Agenda and Minutes

The first design workshop took place on April 30, 2005, from 10:00 AM to 2:00 PM at Palisades Library, 4901 V St NW, Washington, DC. Approximately 70 members of the community and local media attended this meeting.

Registration, open house, and refreshments were from about 9:45 to 10:15 am. The meeting started at 10:15 with opening remarks given by the District Department of Transportation's (DDOT) Ramona Burns. DMJM Harris' Steve Del Giudice announced the ground rules for workshop decorum and explained the agenda and purpose of the event.

Introductory comments were followed by a half-hour presentation by Abi Lerner of DMJM Harris from 10:30 AM to 11:00 AM. After Lerner's presentation, participants divided into four randomly assigned groups of roughly equal size for breakout sessions. During sessions, project staff recorded all participant comments onto flip charts, which have been transcribed and summarized below.

Breakout Session #1, from 11:00 AM to 11:30 AM, gave participants an opportunity to tell project staff what information they needed to perform the most accurate study possible.

In breakout session #2, from 11:30 AM to 12:15 PM, participants rated the study evaluation criteria based on which issues were most important to them as individuals. Issues pertaining to the study were presented and each participant rated them high, medium, or low using color-coded stickers on a pre-plotted chart. Participants were encouraged to add criteria to the list they felt were missing.

Lunch was provided from 12:15 PM to 12:45 PM.

After lunch was the last of three breakout sessions, in which participants discussed alternatives. Maps, graphics, aerials, tracing paper, and markers were provided to facilitate the activity. This session lasted for one hour.

From 1:45 PM to 2:00 PM, participants reconvened for a "wrap-up" session and the workshop adjourned.

3.2 April 30 – Written Comments Received

Two written comments were received at the workshop, both of which were opposed to removal of the freeway.

1) Questions: "What is the problem? What are the alternatives?"

Comments: "Your failure to answer these two questions means this exercise is a waste of time and money for DC when we have many other needs and our streets need paving."

[Comment noted.]

2) Questions: "When traffic is the #1 problem in the metropolitan area, why would a project that will only make traffic worse be considered? No 'study' will convince me that traffic will not be made worse."

[Comment noted.]

3.3 April 30 – Survey Questions

Fourteen surveys were returned to project staff. Questions and results are listed as follows:

1) What is the closest intersection to where you live? [This question sought to establish the neighborhoods in which workshop attendees live, without asking for their addresses.]

Responses: 6 – Georgetown
6 – Palisades
2 – Foggy Bottom/West End

2) Do you use the Whitehurst Freeway to commute to and from work?

Responses: 10 – No
4 – Yes

3) About how many times per week do you use the Whitehurst Freeway?

Responses: 4 – none
4 – ten times or more
2 – once
2 – twice
1 – three times
1 – five times

4) On a scale of 1 to 10 (1 being poor and 10 being excellent), how would you rate traffic in Georgetown?

Average of
Responses: 3.6 – AM Peak
2.5 – PM Peak
4.0 – Evenings
3.4 – Weekends

5) Would you say there is sufficient public transportation in Georgetown?

Responses: 10 – No
4 – Yes

3.4 April 30 – Information Needed for Study

The following list summarizes participant comments about information they felt was needed to complete the study as accurately as possible. The April 30 workshop had four groups.

Group A

- Intersection counts at P/Q Streets & Wisconsin Ave; 27th/25th/23rd & Virginia Ave; Rock Creek Pkwy & Virginia Ave; Foxhall & Reservoir Roads;
- Pedestrian counts at 26th & Penn Ave; 25th/23rd & Virginia Ave
- Property values around Washington Circle, Foggy Bottom, 27th St (GWU dorm), P & Q Streets (and all east-west routes), Upper Georgetown (north of M St), 2600 Penn Plaza (800 25th St), Watergate, 2555 Penn Ave.
- Case studies in Toronto and Philadelphia.
- Land use and zoning around Kennedy Center.
- Accident data.

- Air quality and noise.
- Parking north and south of M St.
- Additional intersection data for 23rd St and Virginia Ave.

Group B

- Expectations of property owners
- Parking capacity
- Access to K Street
- Study area, gateway/flow
- Vision: what we want; macroeconomics
- Floodplain

Group C

- Canal Road to Georgetown entrance
- What happened to the traffic when the freeway was last refurbished?
- Purpose and need of taking the freeway down?
- Verify speeds on M Street and Whitehurst.
- Independence Ave & E Street needs improvement.
- Greater coordination with the Department of Planning.
- Verify counts on Key Bridge going to M Street and Whitehurst.
- Include environmental data, such as air quality.
- Coordinate with Waterfront Park in terms of timing and schedule.
- Study local road conditions relative to freeway.
- Consider effects of flooding.
- Rate of growth of traffic over the next few years.
- Is there a subway stop planned for Georgetown?
- Stormwater retention location?

Group D

- Need an evaluation of Chain Bridge, Canal Road, Arizona Street, Dalecarlia Road, Loughboro Road – study area must be expanded.
- Georgetown itself needs a new traffic study; will new traffic counts include 27th & K?
- How will this affect traffic on the ramp to the Kennedy Center, Virginia Ave, and the E Street Expressway?
- What is DDOT doing with the infrastructure around the Kennedy Center?
- How much time do cars spend on the freeway? Not just counts, but are there numbers on actual time spent per vehicle?
- What can be done to move traffic more efficiently through M Street? Is it possible to prohibit trucks on M Street during AM and PM peak?
- What will the traffic effects be on the new Boathouse?
- Will there be a projection of pedestrian traffic on K Street?
- Is it possible to bring in regional planners (VA, MD, Washington COG) on the study? Maybe they can help determine the spillover effect on adjacent roadways.
- Will parking be eliminated on K Street? How can traffic be sped up through there?
- How will this affect parking and traffic on Water Street?
- What will happen to the 600 existing parking spaces when the new waterfront park is built?
- Will traffic impacts to Rock Creek Parkway be studied?
- Is the Teddy Roosevelt Bridge at or over capacity during the AM/PM peak periods? If so, how much?
- When will the new traffic counts be done?

- How will this affect Virginia's roadways that are adjacent to Key Bridge? (Spout Run Pkwy, GW Pkwy, streets in Rosslyn)
- As it is now, you can get from Palisades to National Airport in 20 minutes with no traffic. How much travel time will be added if there's no freeway?
- Pedestrian counts are needed near the new movie theater (K & Wisconsin), Washington Harbour, and bars/nightclubs on K Street. Counts should be done in summer months.
- How would evacuation and homeland security issues be affected by the absence of a freeway?
- Need studies on the water table and soils along K Street, especially for east bank development.
- How do we know land values in Georgetown will increase in Georgetown if the Whitehurst is gone?
- What will the ridership impacts to nearby Metrorail stations be?
- How would the freeway removal integrate with other things going on in Georgetown? Are they trying to make this like another Baltimore Inner Harbor or tourist destination?
- Financing: can the freeway removal tap into 9/11 or Department of Homeland Security funds? Can we expect help from VA representative Tom Davis?
- A tunnel should not be discounted, because cost – not feasibility – is the issue with a tunnel. See Paris for many examples on how it could be done.

3.5 April 30 – Evaluation Criteria Ratings

The following table summarizes the Whitehurst Freeway evaluation criteria that were most important to the approximately 70 participants of the April 30 design workshop. Criteria, in the left column, are ranked from highest priority to lowest priority. The score, in the center column, is based on the total of highs, mediums, and lows each criteria received from evaluation participants. Each green dot that participants placed on the flip chart, for "high priority," was given a score of 3. Each yellow dot, or "medium," was given a 2, and each blue dot, or "low," was given a 1. The scores were then added for all four tables. Note: some people did not assign a priority ranking to all criteria. In these cases, it was assumed that the non-rated criteria were of no importance, and were given a score of zero. In addition, some criteria suggested by participants (such as "no-build") are actually alternatives and not criteria.

Evaluation Criteria	Score	Breakdown
Traffic impacts	72	23 high, 1 medium, 1 low
Levels of public support for alternate alignments	51	14 high, 2 medium, 3 low
Pedestrian/bicycle access and safety	47	10 high, 6 medium, 5 low
Impacts on historic and cultural resources (and aesthetics)	47	7 high, 9 medium, 8 low
Impacts on the natural environment (air quality, noise, views, flooding)	42	9 high, 14 medium, 1 low
Property value and revenue impacts	41	4 high, 5 medium, 17 low
Structural/engineering feasibility of removing freeway and constructing alternate alignments	35	8 high, 4 medium, 3 low
Cost effectiveness	32	6 high, 3 medium, 8 low
Impacts to existing and future transit (light rail, trolleys)	31	5 high, 5 medium, 11 low
No-build	27	9 high, 0 medium, 0 low

Impacts on existing infrastructure	25	8 high, 0 medium, 1 low
Impacts on availability of local funds	18	6 high, 0 medium, 0 low
Pedestrian access to parklands	18	6 high, 0 medium, 0 low
Impacts outside the present study area	15	5 high, 0 medium, 0 low
Quality of life issues	13	4 high, 0 medium, 1 low
Accident data	12	2 high, 3 medium, 0 low
Keep freeway and improve its delivery system	12	4 high, 0 medium, 0 low
Emergency access and response	10	2 high, 2 medium, 0 low
Economic vitality and prestige	9	3 high, 0 medium, 0 low
Impacts on Maryland and Virginia residents/freeway users	8	1 high, 0 medium, 5 low
Ability to make certain movements without stops	8	2 high, 1 medium, 0 low
Security concerns	7	0 high, 1 medium, 5 low
Impacts to parklands	7	1 high, 2 medium, 0 low
Tourism	6	0 high, 0 medium, 6 low
Construction phase impacts (transition and traffic maintenance)	4	1 high, 0 medium, 1 low

3.6 April 30 – Alternatives Suggested

The following list summarizes build and no-build alternatives suggested by workshop participants. The April 30 workshop had four groups.

Group A

- Connection from Canal Road to Lower K Street. K St to be 4 lanes with the elimination of ramps at east end of the freeway. Or, replace stop signs with signals; no connection from Key Bridge.
- Same as above with six-lanes, and prohibit on-street parking during peak periods (no turn lanes).
- Same as above with direct ramp from Key Bridge to Lower K Street.
- Tunnel option on ramp from Key Bridge.
- Bypass tunnel option throughout Whitehurst Freeway.
- Tunnel underneath Key Bridge and connect to ramp coming down from Canal Road.
- Put two lanes in each direction, especially for through traffic, and one lane for local traffic.
- Keep existing ramps at east end in tact as much as possible (from transportation and non-developer point of view. Connection to bypass at 27th Street (eastbound right turn at 27th Street).
- Access from Canal Road to Key Bridge in both directions.
- Four-lane travel lane and two lanes for parking.
- Keep freeway as it is, with a connection from Key Bridge to Lower K Street

Group B

- No-Build
- Deconstruct Whitehurst, leave Lower K as is
- Deconstruct Whitehurst; make Lower K a 5 or 6 lane boulevard with Key Bridge's existing ramp modified to send traffic to grade level
- Deconstruct Whitehurst; make Lower K a 5 or 6 lane boulevard with no ramp from Key Bridge
- Maintain access to E Street, Teddy Roosevelt Bridge, and the Potomac River Freeway at the east end of the Whitehurst Freeway
- Depress K Street roadway, use bridges to access waterfront
- Cut and cover tunnel: under the ground would be a thruway, with local access above ground
- Grade separation at 27th & K
- Improve bottleneck at either end of the freeway

Group C

- No-build with improvements; boulevard will not function like a freeway, accessibility will decrease.
- Build access ramps to Rock Creek Pkwy northbound from freeway and K Street.
- Explore possibility of building another bridge.
- Flow from Canal Road to Lower K Street and improve traffic conditions for Washingtonians, and do not provide accessibility to VA and MD.
- Remove stop signs and improve speed and accessibility across K Street to park.
- Make a more aesthetically pleasing four-lane freeway.
- Fix intersection and improve flow of Key Bridge & M Street with new structure.
- Beautify existing freeway overpass.
- Improve north-south pedestrian access.
- Improve visibility at exit ramp from Whitehurst onto Potomac Pkwy.
- Access to northbound Rock Creek Pkwy from Whitehurst and K Street.
- Improve left turn access south, eastbound throughput on K Street.
- Improve parking.
- New Whitehurst bypass, 5-lane contra-flow with aesthetically pleasing cantilevered supports.

Group D

- Refer to previous studies; there are some good ones in them. Followed by discussion of the previously studied Passonneau alternative.
- Tunnel alternative – explore the feasibility of replacing the freeway with a tunnel, with an at-grade K Street above it.
- Depress K Street and have pedestrian bridges cross over it.
- A parking lot could be constructed under the new waterfront park.
- There should be a walkway and a marina along K Street.
- DC is studying a light rail or bus rapid transit line to go through K Street; there should be alternatives consistent with this plan.
- Need a wider turnaround of the ramp from Key Bridge to Canal Road.
- Improve the geometrics of the off-ramp from the freeway to 27th Street.
- Make Whitehurst Freeway three lanes with a reversible lane in the middle and a landscaped dedicated lane for pedestrians and cyclists.
- Replace sections of the freeway with strong glass so more light can get through to Lower K Street.

4.0 May 7 Design Workshop

4.1 May 7 – Workshop Agenda and Minutes

The second design workshop took place on May 7, 2005, from 10:00 AM to 2:00 PM at Hardy Middle School, 1819 35th Street NW, Washington, DC. Approximately 20 members of the community attended this workshop.

Registration, open house, and refreshments were from about 9:45 AM to 10:15 AM. The meeting started at 10:15 AM with opening remarks given by the District Department of Transportation's (DDOT) Ramona Burns. DMJM Harris' Steve Del Giudice announced the ground rules for workshop decorum and explained the agenda and purpose of the event.

Introductory comments were followed by a half-hour presentation by Abi Lerner of DMJM Harris from 10:30 AM to 11:00 AM. After Lerner's presentation, participants divided into two randomly assigned groups of roughly equal size for breakout sessions. During sessions, project staff recorded all participant comments onto flip charts, which have been transcribed and summarized below.

Breakout Session #1, from 11:00 AM to 11:30 AM, gave participants an opportunity to tell project staff what information they needed to perform the most accurate study possible.

In breakout session #2, from 11:30 AM to 12:00 PM, participants rated the study evaluation criteria based on which issues were most important to them as individuals. Issues pertaining to the study were presented and each participant rated them high, medium, or low using color-coded stickers on a pre-plotted chart. Participants were encouraged to add criteria to the list they felt were missing.

Lunch was provided from 12:00 PM to 12:30 PM. Because of the small number of participants, project staff and community members agreed to a "working lunch" with the potential of finishing the day's work ahead of schedule.

After lunch was the last of three breakout sessions, in which participants discussed alternatives. Maps, graphics, aerials, tracing paper, and markers were provided to facilitate the activity. This session lasted for one hour.

From 1:30 PM to 1:45 PM, participants reconvened for a "wrap-up" session and the workshop adjourned.

4.2 May 7 – Written Comments Received

Four written comments were received at the workshop; one was opposed to freeway removal while the other three were neutral.

1) Comments: "The sessions were good at the design workshop at Hardy M.S. on May 7, 2005. It was a good workshop. Thank you."

[Comment noted.]

2) Questions: "With traffic being one of the biggest logistical and quality of life issues in the metro area, how can our elected officials dismiss it as a concern? Why is it not the first issue answered?"

Comments: "This should not even be considered without detailed evaluation of traffic impact. This problem could negatively impact property values in Georgetown and Foggy Bottom. Environmental impacts is imperative – air quality, noise, heat, and pollution of Potomac River and

Rock Creek. Impact in pedestrian safety on K Street also of paramount concern (bicycles too). Also, what happens to evacuation routes? Thus far, I remain opposed until these issues are resolved satisfactorily.”

[Comment noted.]

3) Questions: “What legislative body will have to authorize deconstruction?”

Comments: “Suggestion for an art project – hold a competition for painting the Whitehurst in a color scheme that would beautify it and make it a feature similar to the Golden Gate Bridge.”

[Comment noted.]

4) Comments: “You need to take seasonal traffic patterns into account when measuring traffic patterns. Traffic is lighter during certain periods, such as summer and late spring. You need to study the impact of traffic on Reservoir, P, Q, and R with the possible removal of the Whitehurst. I feel that poor access to the Whitehurst discourages its usage; this may influence traffic counts.”

[Comment noted.]

4.3 May 7 – Survey Questions

Ten surveys were returned to project staff. Questions and results are listed as follows:

1) What is the closest intersection to where you live? [This question sought to establish the neighborhoods in which workshop attendees live, without asking for their addresses.]

Responses: 6 – Foggy Bottom/West End
2 – Georgetown
1 – Palisades
1 – Arlington, Virginia

2) Do you use the Whitehurst Freeway to commute to and from work?

Responses: 9 – No
1 – Yes

3) About how many times per week do you use the Whitehurst Freeway?

Responses: 3 – none
3 – ten times or more
2 – twice
1 – three times
1 – six times

4) On a scale of 1 to 10 (1 being poor and 10 being excellent), how would you rate traffic in Georgetown?

Average of
Responses: 4.5 – AM Peak
4.1 – PM Peak
5.2 – Evenings
4.8 – Weekends

5) Would you say there is sufficient public transportation in Georgetown?

Responses: 9 – No
1 – Yes

4.4 May 7 – Information Needed for Study

The following list summarizes participant comments about information they felt was needed to complete the study as accurately as possible. The May 7 workshop had two groups.

Group A

- Intersection counts at different times of the day other than peak hours, especially at P, Q, and S Streets, Reservoir & 31st, K Street east of Thomas Jefferson, Virginia & 23rd, M St and Potomac Freeway. Need counts where K Street splits at 27th.
- Architectural impacts
- Historic properties
- Land use and zoning: need information on vacant land and development of vacant blocks around 27th and K Streets. Who owns the property in Foggy Bottom?
- Security at embassies in study area, pedestrian access to embassies
- Vibrations from buses, especially at Columbia Hospital
- Pedestrian and bike facilities and crossings
- Public parking
- Seasonal/tourism impacts
- Air quality at Canal Road

Group B

- Access to parking and loading spaces
- Construction impacts (orders of magnitude)
- Noise and air quality impacts due to increased congestion
- Flooding on K Street
- Environmental impacts to park and river; will this create a “hot spot”
- Pedestrian access and safety, especially Virginia Avenue
- Impacts to evacuation plans and routes
- Subsurface information (geology, soils, utilities)
- Impact to tax revenues
- Traffic impacts to Rock Creek Pkwy, Virginia Ave, and areas north of M Street

4.5 May 7 – Evaluation Criteria Ratings

The following table summarizes the Whitehurst Freeway evaluation criteria that were most important to the approximately 20 participants of the May 7 design workshop. Criteria, in the left column, are ranked from highest priority to lowest priority. The score, in the center column, is based on the total of highs, mediums, and lows each criteria received from evaluation participants. Each green dot that participants placed on the flip chart, for “high priority,” was given a score of 3. Each yellow dot, or “medium,” was given a 2, and each blue dot, or “low,” was given a 1. The scores were then added for both tables. Note: some people did not assign a priority ranking to all criteria. In these cases, it was assumed that the non-rated criteria were of no importance, and were given a score of zero.

Evaluation Criteria	Score	Breakdown
Traffic impacts	40	12 high, 1 medium, 2 low
Levels of public support for alternate alignments	37	9 high, 4 medium, 2 low
Impacts on the natural environment (air quality, noise, views, flooding)	37	9 high, 4 medium, 2 low
Pedestrian/bicycle access and safety	35	8 high, 5 medium, 1 low
Structural/engineering feasibility of removing freeway and constructing alternate alignments	30	6 high, 6 medium, 1 low
Quality of life issues (air quality, views)	26	8 high, 1 medium, 0 low
Impacts on historic and cultural resources (and aesthetics)	25	3 high, 6 medium, 4 low
Cost effectiveness	24	2 high, 6 medium, 6 low
Land use impacts	24	7 high, 1 medium, 1 low
Circulation within Georgetown	24	8 high, 0 medium, 0 low
Impacts on Maryland and Virginia residents/freeway users (access to District of Columbia from other communities)	23	6 high, 2 medium, 1 low
Security concerns, evacuation routes	21	6 high, 0 medium, 3 low
Impacts to parklands	20	4 high, 4 medium, 0 low
Property value and revenue impacts	20	1 high, 4 medium, 9 low
Impacts outside the present study area (access to Georgetown from other communities)	16	3 high, 3 medium, 1 low
Pedestrian access to parklands	14	4 high, 1 medium, 1 low
Benefits of deconstructing freeway	13	4 high, 1 medium, 0 low
Parking availability	12	3 high, 0 medium, 3 low
Construction phase impacts (transition and traffic maintenance)	12	2 high, 2 medium, 2 low
Impacts on availability of local funds	6	0 high, 0 medium, 6 low

4.6 May 7 – Alternatives Suggested

The following list summarizes build and no-build alternatives suggested by workshop participants. The May 7 workshop had two groups.

Group A

- No left turns during peak hours for 5- to 6-lane boulevard on Lower K St.
- Tunnel option – extend to Washington Circle
- East end of Lower K Street should be at-grade where ramp splits to Whitehurst Freeway and L Street
- Need connection from 27th St northbound to L Street

- Virginia Avenue needs direct connection to Pennsylvania Avenue to K Street
- Alternative should include wider pedestrian crosswalk and bike path
- No-build: just improve existing facility and improve parking

Group B

- East end of Lower K – improve connections to E Street and Rock Creek Parkway
- Lower K should become a boulevard with a ramp from Key Bridge (loop ramps)
- Lower K – boulevard without ramp to/from Key Bridge
- Pedestrian bridges, tunnels, and traffic signals on K Street
- K Street should be a depressed road with cross-street bridges
- Tunnel from Washington Circle to 34th Street with surface road
- Tunnel direct to Canal from Whitehurst or K Street at 36th Street, north side (resolves Canal Road intersection problem)
- Transit from downtown to Palisades via Georgetown
- No-build: Whitehurst left in place with improvements to east end connections; an arrangement that makes more sense
- No-build: leave Whitehurst in place with tunnel section from Whitehurst/K Street to Canal Road, north side, west of 36th Street