



March 18, 2024

Ted Van Houten, AICP  
*Transportation Planner*, Planning and Sustainability Division  
District Department of Transportation  
250 M Street SE  
Washington, DC 20003

***Re: Georgetown Transportation Access and Circulation Study – Draft Recommendations***

Dear Mr. Van Houten:

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the Draft Recommendations for the Georgetown Transportation and Circulation Study (study). The recommendations are underwhelming in terms of providing viable and comprehensive solutions to the myriad of issues and concerns raised by the Citizens Association of Georgetown (CAG), ANC 2E and the Georgetown Coalition for Public Spaces (GCPS). It also does not address CAG's purpose for participating in the study, which is to improve the quality of life for Historic Georgetown, balancing pedestrian, multi-modal transportation and curbside demands for both the **commercial** and residential areas. Specifically:

1. We are disappointed by the study because DDOT both limited the scope of the study at the outset, and then further limited the scope, to avoid addressing important issues for the community or to take a comprehensive look at Georgetown's transportation issues as we requested. In particular, the decisions to exclude analysis of Wisconsin and M Streets, 34th Street, and bicycle and enforcement issues. It is very difficult to comment on the proposals in the report, for example, the one-way suggestions for 28th and 29th Street and the denial of one-way treatment for N off Wisconsin, without knowing, for example, what will happen to Wisconsin Avenue and M Street. It is not clear that DDOT can effectively proceed with the study under the current scope.
2. We are also very disappointed in the lack of detail and analysis in the report. We are deeply concerned that the solutions proposed for each location would involve the placing of signs, markings, flex posts and curb extensions that will clutter and impede the public space. If the study proceeds, DDOT will need to hold individual meetings with key residents affected by the proposals to explain their analysis and rationale. To cite one example, a meeting should be held with the residents of 28th and 29th Streets to elucidate the traffic assumptions and answer questions about cut-through traffic, parking, street design and flow, among other things. Residents cannot provide any worthwhile input based on the information in the current draft report.

Sincerely,

Carol Truppi, AICP, ASLA, LEED AP  
Co-Chair CAG Historic Preservation and Zoning Committee

Stephanie Bothwell, ASLA, FCNU  
Vice President, CAG Board of Directors  
Chair, CAG Urban Landscape Committee