



AGENDA

North Potomac Yard Small Area Plan Update Advisory Group Meeting #10

Tuesday, January 31, 2017 | 7:00-9:00PM | Charles Houston Recreation Center

Topic: Transportation Analysis and Sustainability Follow-up

[Click here to watch video of the meeting](#)

RED – AG Comment/Question

BLUE – Public Comment/Question

1 Welcome and Recap

Richard Lawrence, P&Z

Staff provided a brief recap of the previous Advisory Group Meeting, provided an overview of where we are in the process, and outlined topics to be addressed in future Advisory Group meetings.

2 Transportation Analysis

Carrie Sanders, T&ES

Staff presented the components that were included as part of the transportation study. The study elements included: the existing transportation infrastructure in and around the Plan area and existing traffic conditions; future infrastructure to be provided by other City plans and policies (streets, transit, and bicycle facilities), regional growth, and approved and unbuilt developments built upon existing conditions information; and future built conditions under Phase I and full build-out of the Plan area were incorporated to analyze transportation impacts for the entire area. Staff then focused the discussion on Potomac Avenue mitigation under Phase I implementation and identified criteria based on AG feedback. Staff also discussed Phase II implementation of Potomac Avenue criteria discussed thus far. The staff presentation concluded with additional information that will be presented at February's AG meeting and provided an outline for next steps relative to transportation related topics.

3 Comment/Questions

Based on the staff presentation, AG members provided the following questions/comments and staff responded:

- *Under Phase I, how will the BRT be integrated into Potomac Ave?*
- *The Phase I Potomac Avenue criteria should ensure that the road does not split the east and west development.*
- *Per traffic management, does this ensure the prevention of spill over traffic into adjacent neighborhoods, and ensures traffic remains on Route 1?*

Community members provided the following transportation-related comments:

- *Will there be a bike path on Potomac Ave? Will the existing Potomac Yard trail on the west side of Route 1 remain with Phase I redevelopment? With the inclusion of additional traffic signals with Phase I, commuter cyclist conflicts should be considered. It may not be efficient for cyclist considering the amount of traffic lights proposed.*
- *The plans should better show the bike path on the east. The design of the multi-use path/trail in the Potomac Yard Park extension should mitigate conflicts between cyclists and pedestrians; delineate bikes and pedestrians.*
- *A seamless connection on the northern end can better achieve the modes split assumed (17%).*
- *What is the current mode split share for the Plan area? (The graphic in the presentation assumes the mode split at 60% non-vehicle trips.)*
- *The design/width of Potomac Ave should not necessarily require 6-lanes. 10-yrns from now transportation modes and technology may change and prevent the need for a 6 lane intersection/larger road.*
- *What is the relative traffic increase from the development, per intersection? That information will be provided at the next Advisory Group meeting or made available on the project website as reference to the transportation study.*

- *Can the mode split assumed in previous transportation studies be used to create a benchmark to study mode split assumptions over time?*
- *Is Route 1 maxed out at 40,000 today? Yes, there are certain intersections that would be considered “failing”.*
- *Since Route 1 is designated as a high traffic arterial to move vehicles, is it possible to divert traffic from Potomac Avenue to Route 1 and improve the existing conditions and pedestrian experience on Potomac Avenue?; Is there a potential to reduce the overall dimension on Potomac Avenue to a smaller cross-section (2-lanes) for the entire length?*
- *Providing greater emphasis on bike lanes and corridors will increase the mode share split to achieve the 17% referenced in the chart.*

4 October AG Follow-up – *Sustainability* Jeff Farner, P&Z; Khoa Tran, OEQ; Matt Ginivan, JBG

Staff provided a follow-up presentation on sustainability discussed previously in October’s Advisory Group meeting. The presentation discussed the City’s plans and policies in place that that inform and implement environmental sustainability, the role of Small Area Plans in advancing citywide goals for sustainability, and the role of Development Special Use Permits (DSUP) and Coordinated Development Districts (CDD) in implementing specific actions and conditions related to sustainability. The presentation described the sustainability measures recommended/required by the NPY Plan. Staff also provided an overview of LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) and discussed the evolving requirements within LEED, building, and stormwater requirements. JBG then provided a brief presentation on their company’s sustainability philosophy and discussed a case study that incorporated evolving LEED requirements. Staff concluded their presentation by discussing draft sustainability recommendations, including recommended revisions from AG member, Jeremy Fretts.

5 Comment/Questions

Following the staff presentation the AG members had substantive discussion on the role of the Plan to establish sustainability measures/outcomes in compliance to or beyond other City policies (i.e. the Environmental Action Plan (EAP) and Green Building Policy).

- *As requirements continue to increase within LEED certification, building code, and stormwater, should the Plan be equal to or better than the rest of the City? The AG should choose one position of the other; preference should be to exceed (M. Chapman).*
- *Will the City keep updating the EAP? As an example, LEED has increased requirements three times since NPY was approved in 2010.*
- *The Plan should not require specific technologies to achieve sustainability measures because technologies become obsolete/evolve. It is more important to identify performance measures.*
- *The Plan should use more concrete terms instead of “strive” and “encourage”. (M. Chapman; J. Fretts)* Staff explained that terms like strive and encourage are appropriate within the context of Small Area Plans because City goals towards carbon neutrality are difficult to achieve in a small area plan alone as opposed to citywide. Furthermore, sustainability goals will be difficult to achieve by 2040 without significant changes also occurring on federal and state levels. Implementation and sustainability measures are achieved at the CDD zoning and development special use permit (DSUP) level. In the case of North Potomac Yard, this would occur with the submission of an Environmental Sustainability Master Plan which would be part of a public process.
- *“Strive” and “encourage” are appropriate for the Master Plan/SAP level. (M. Caison)*
- *AG members should participate in the public process related to the CDD zoning to ensure that the zoning “has teeth” and enforces what the AG and community are hoping for the Plan to achieve through terms like “strive”. (G. Erdle)*
- *How would developers update the Sustainability Plan? (J. Frederick)* The Sustainability Plan would require update with the submission of DSUPs for redevelopment.
- *Clarify the meaning of recommendation 2.12 regarding charging stations. (G. Erdle)* The recommendation endorses provision of electrical charging stations within garages. The amount and location of the facilities are determined as part of the DSUP process.
- *Recommendation 2.14 – Is solar ok on roofs? (N. Appleby)* The recommendation requires solar and/or green roofs. Given the proximity to the airport and potential conflicts with FAA, the

incorporation of solar would need to be evaluated at the DSUP/ building design stage to determine feasibility.

- *Strike “land” in Recommendation 2.18. (N. Appleby) Incorporated*
- *It is important to achieve connectivity between parks/open spaces (Daingerfield Island) to transportation infrastructure. The Plan should increase access and connections to transportation. (G. Erdle)*
- *Recommendation 2.16 should also, if feasible, utilize recaptured water and be integrated into parks/open spaces. (B. Hendrickson)*

Community members provided the following comments relative to sustainability:

- *Has there been any thought to considering a road designed just to serve transit, bikes, pedestrians – no cars?*
- *The EPC would like to provide some feedback on recommendations if that is desired from the AG. Would like Alexandria to advance “up the escalator” in terms of sustainability requirements. DC has recently adopted a new plan that requires much higher levels to achieve carbon/net neutrality. I would like to see NPY be more aggressive in terms of sustainability. (S. Barstow, EPC)*
- *Be mindful there are real expenses that go with the goals the Plan is trying to achieve. There are other goals (affordable housing, transportation, open space, etc.) that need to be considered as well.*
- *Has there been any study to the considerations that future users would want to see relative to sustainability requirements? Depending on the use, particularly with office tenants, certain users may have specific requirements. This would be better known once a potential tenant has been identified. – JBG*
- *It is disappointing to see the recommended target has changed from 2030 to 2040. Recommend “The Energy House” which highlights examples of places where sustainability measures have been successfully implemented.*

6 Next Steps

Richard Lawrence, P&Z

Staff outlined next steps for the February AG meeting, discussed upcoming meeting topics and the process for AG review of Plan amendments, and adjourned the meeting.