



# COLUMBIA PIKE TRANSIT ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS



JULY 2005

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	STUDY PROCESS AND SUMMARY OF RESULTS .....	1-1
1.1	Study Background.....	1-1
1.2	Study Guidance and Participation .....	1-2
1.3	Study Process and Report Overview.....	1-3
1.4	Alternatives Considered.....	1-4
1.5	Evaluation Results .....	1-5
1.6	Findings and Recommendations.....	1-7
2.0	NEEDS ASSESSMENT.....	2-1
2.1	Transportation Planning Context.....	2-1
2.1.1	Needs Assessment .....	2-4
2.2	Existing Conditions .....	2-4
2.2.1	Physical Features.....	2-4
2.2.2	Cultural Resources & Community Activity Centers .....	2-7
2.2.3	Traffic Conditions .....	2-10
2.2.4	Transit Conditions .....	2-13
2.2.5	Pedestrian & Bicycle Facilities.....	2-17
2.3	Transit Demand .....	2-18
2.3.1	Existing Transit Markets .....	2-18
2.3.2	Access: Travel Time Analysis.....	2-22
2.3.3	Transit Market Needs .....	2-34
2.3.4	Future Transit Needs.....	2-35
2.3.5	Public Preferences .....	2-39
2.4	Statement of Needs .....	2-40
3.0	SCREENING AND SELECTION PROCESS .....	3-1
3.1	Process Overview .....	3-1
3.2	Options Considered .....	3-2
3.2.1	Mode .....	3-2
3.2.2	Alignment .....	3-6
3.2.3	Station Stop Location .....	3-12
3.2.4	Propulsion .....	3-16
3.2.5	Vehicle Storage and Maintenance Facility Location.....	3-18
4.0	DEFINITION OF ALTERNATIVES.....	4-1
4.1	No Action/New Starts Baseline Alternative.....	4-1
4.1.1	Overview .....	4-1
4.1.2	Features.....	4-2
4.1.3	Physical Characteristics .....	4-2
4.1.4	Operating Characteristics.....	4-8
4.2	Bus Rapid Transit Build Alternative.....	4-12
4.2.1	Overview .....	4-12
4.2.2	Features.....	4-12
4.2.3	Physical Characteristics .....	4-12
4.2.4	Operating Characteristics .....	4-19
4.3	Streetcar Build Alternative .....	4-24
4.3.1	Overview .....	4-24

4.3.2	Features .....	4-24
4.3.3	Physical Characteristics .....	4-24
4.3.4	Operating Characteristics .....	4-30
4.4	Modified Streetcar Build Alternative .....	4-33
4.4.1	Overview .....	4-33
4.4.2	Features .....	4-33
4.4.3	Physical Characteristics .....	4-34
4.4.4	Operating Characteristics .....	4-38
5.0	EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES .....	5-1
5.1	Introduction .....	5-1
5.1.1	Evaluation Overview .....	5-1
5.1.2	Screen 1 Considerations .....	5-1
5.1.3	Evaluation Criteria .....	5-1
5.2	Evaluation Measures and Results .....	5-2
5.2.1	Access and Mobility .....	5-4
5.2.2	Community and Economic Development .....	5-9
5.2.3	Safety, Reliability, and Comfort .....	5-11
5.2.4	Regional Connections .....	5-13
5.2.5	Community Goals .....	5-15
5.2.6	Capital and Operating Costs .....	5-17
6.0	IMPACT SCREENING .....	6-1
6.1	Environmental Impacts .....	6-1
6.1.1	Neighborhood and Community Impacts .....	6-1
6.1.2	Environmental Justice .....	6-2
6.1.3	Parks and Parklands .....	6-3
6.1.4	Historic and Cultural Resources .....	6-4
6.1.5	Property Acquisition and Displacements .....	6-5
6.1.6	Safety and Security .....	6-5
6.1.7	Hazardous and Contaminated Materials .....	6-5
6.1.8	Air Quality .....	6-6
6.1.9	Noise and Vibration .....	6-6
6.1.10	Energy .....	6-7
6.1.11	Topography .....	6-8
6.1.12	Soils .....	6-8
6.1.13	Water Resources .....	6-9
6.1.14	Protected Species and Critical Habitats .....	6-9
6.1.15	Construction Impacts .....	6-10
6.2	Impacts on Transit Service .....	6-10
6.2.1	Summary of Transit Alternatives .....	6-10
6.2.2	Ridership .....	6-15
6.2.3	Peak Hour Loads .....	6-17
6.2.4	Transit User Benefits .....	6-20
6.3	Traffic Impacts .....	6-25
6.3.1	General Assumptions .....	6-25
6.3.2	Build Alternative Characteristics .....	6-26
6.3.3	Simulation Input .....	6-27
6.3.4	Measures of Effectiveness .....	6-28

6.3.5	Conclusions.....	6-39
6.4	Cost Impacts.....	6-39
6.4.1	Capital Costs.....	6-39
6.4.2	Operating and Maintenance Costs .....	6-46
7.0	RECOMMENDATIONS .....	7-1
7.1	Technical Evaluation Process .....	7-1
7.1.1	Summary of Evaluation Results.....	7-1
7.1.2	Policy Guidance Received.....	7-2
7.1.3	Preferred Alternative.....	7-3
7.2	Project Development Process .....	7-4
7.2.1	Planning and Design .....	7-4
7.2.2	Funding Sources .....	7-5
7.2.3	Next Steps.....	7-6
APPENDIX	.....	A-1
A.1	Public and Agency Involvement .....	A-1
A.1.1	Technical Working Group .....	A-1
A.1.2	Policy Advisory Committee.....	A-2
A.1.3	Agency Comments Received .....	A-3
A.1.4	Arlington Transit Advisory Committee.....	A-6
A.1.5	Design Dialogues May 17 – 21, 2004.....	A-6
A.1.6	Public Open Houses November 8 and 10, 2004.....	A-19
A.1.7	Public Open Houses April 25 and 26, 2005 .....	A-21
A.1.8	Comments Received via Email.....	A-26
A.1.9	Further Public Outreach .....	A-37
A.2	Bicycle Treatments .....	A-38
A.3	Summaries of Capital Cost Estimates .....	A-42
A.4	Summaries of Operating and Maintenance Cost Estimates .....	A-46
A.5	Description of VISSIM Traffic Simulation Process.....	A-53

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1-1:	Goals and Objectives .....	1-3
Table 1-2:	Summary of Transportation Characteristics Alternative .....	1-6
Table 1-3:	Summary of Costs by Alternative .....	1-7
Table 2-1:	VDOT Relative Density of Traffic Ranking of Columbia Pike .....	2-11
Table 2-2:	Arlington County Metrorail Ridership .....	2-16
Table 2-3:	Weekday Bus Passengers on Columbia Pike, by Bus Stop.....	2-35
Table 3-1:	First Level Screening Matrix.....	3-5
Table 3-2:	Mode Selection Summary Table for Columbia Pike Corridor.....	3-6
Table 3-3:	Comparison of Build Alignment Alternatives .....	3-11
Table 3-4:	Initial Screening Results.....	3-18
Table 4-1:	PikeRide Metrobus Service Characteristics.....	4-10
Table 4-2:	PikeRide ART Service Characteristics .....	4-11
Table 4-3:	Connecting Metrobus Service Characteristics .....	4-11
Table 4-4:	ART Feeder Service: Modifications for BRT .....	4-20
Table 4-5:	Background PikeRide Service: Modifications for BRT .....	4-21
Table 4-6:	Background Metrobus Service: Modifications for BRT.....	4-23

Table 4-7: ART Feeder Service: Modifications for Streetcar .....	4-31
Table 4-8: Background PikeRide Service: Modifications for Streetcar .....	4-31
Table 4-9a: Background PikeRide Service: Modifications for Streetcar Service at 6-minute Headways.....	4-40
Table 4-9b: Background PikeRide Service: Modifications for Streetcar Service at 12-minute Headways.....	4-42
Table 5-1: Evaluation Criteria and Measures of Effectiveness .....	5-3
Table 5-2: Assumed Vehicle Capacity.....	5-7
Table 5-3: Percentage of Land in Revitalization Districts within Walking Distance of Station Stops .....	5-9
Table 5-4: Percentage Savings over Baseline in Peak Period Person Transit Travel Time from Columbia Pike to Regional Activity Centers .....	5-14
Table 5-5: Percentage Savings over Baseline in Peak Period Person Transit Travel Time from Analysis Area to Regional Activity Centers .....	5-14
Table 5-6: Number of TAZs Providing Access to Regional Employment within 60 minutes ...	5-15
Table 6-1: Typical Hourly Service Frequency .....	6-12
Table 6-2: Summary of Bus Operating Plans by Alternative .....	6-14
Table 6-3: Daily Corridor Ridership (2030) - Columbia Pike Alternatives.....	6-15
Table 6-4: Daily Boarding/Alighting by Station Stop - Columbia Pike Build Alternatives .....	6-16
Table 6-5: Morning Peak Hour Passenger Loads for Streetcar and Modified Streetcar Alternatives.....	6-17
Table 6-6: Morning Peak Hour Capacity and Service Levels.....	6-19
Table 6-7: User Benefits (hours) for the BRT Build Alternative – Total Trips All Day .....	6-24
Table 6-8: User Benefits (hours) for the Streetcar Build Alternative – Total Trips All Day .....	6-24
Table 6-9: User Benefits (hours) for the Modified Streetcar (6 Min) Alternative – Total Trips All Day .....	6-25
Table 6-10: User Benefits (hours) for the Modified Streetcar (12 Min) Alternative - Total Trips All Day .....	6-25
Table 6-11: Simulated Observed Intersection Performance, Morning Peak Hour .....	6-31
Table 6-12: Simulated Observed Intersection Performance, Afternoon Peak Hour .....	6-32
Table 6-13: Summary of Simulated Observed Intersection Performance, Morning and Afternoon Peak Hour .....	6-33
Table 6-14: Average Auto Throughput at Columbia Pike and George Mason Drive, Morning Peak Hour .....	6-35
Table 6-15: Average Auto Throughput at Columbia Pike and George Mason Drive, Afternoon Peak Hour .....	6-35
Table 6-16: Eastbound Person Throughput at Columbia Pike and George Mason Drive, Morning Peak Hour .....	6-36
Table 6-17: Travel Time Results, Morning Peak Hour .....	6-38
Table 6-18: Travel Time Results, Afternoon Peak Hour .....	6-38
Table 6-19: Summary of Capital Costs by Alternative .....	6-40
Table 6-20: Summary of Operating Service Levels and Vehicle Requirements .....	6-46
Table 6-21: Summary of Operating Statistics by Alternative.....	6-47

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2-1: Study Area Map .....	2-2
Figure 2-2: Land Use in Columbia Pike Study Area.....	2-6
Figure 2-3: Potential Columbia Pike Historic Sites in Arlington.....	2-9

Figure 2-4: Annual Average Daily Traffic Volume.....	2-11
Figure 2-5: Pike Ride, Metrorail and Metrobus Map .....	2-12
Figure 2-6: High Accident Locations Along Columbia Pike .....	2-14
Figure 2-7: Commuters Using Transit (2000) .....	2-20
Figure 2-8: Percent of Zero Car Households (2000).....	2-21
Figure 2-9: TAZs within Columbia Pike Study Area.....	2-22
Figure 2-10: Percent Employment Access within 20 Minutes .....	2-23
Figure 2-11: Percent Employment Access within 40 Minutes .....	2-24
Figure 2-12: Percent Employment within 60 Minutes.....	2-25
Figure 2-13: Regional Transit Access to Tysons Corner .....	2-26
Figure 2-14: Transit Access to Alexandria from Columbia Pike .....	2-27
Figure 2-15: Transit Access to Skyline from Columbia Pike .....	2-28
Figure 2-16: Transit Access to the Pentagon from Columbia Pike.....	2-29
Figure 2-17: Transit Access to Ballston from Columbia Pike .....	2-30
Figure 2-18: Transit Access to L'Enfant Plaza from Columbia Pike .....	2-31
Figure 2-19: Transit Access to Metro Center from Columbia Pike .....	2-32
Figure 2-20: Transit Access to Rosslyn from Columbia Pike .....	2-33
Figure 2-21: Columbia Pike Revitalization Areas.....	2-37
Figure 3-1: Proposed BRT/Streetcar Alignment (2 pages) .....	3-9
Figure 3-2: Potential Facilities Site A .....	3-20
Figure 3-3: Potential Facilities Site B .....	3-21
Figure 3-4: Potential Facilities Site C .....	3-21
Figure 4-1: Planned Transit Improvements, 2005-2010 TIP .....	4-3
Figure 4-2: 2005-2010 TIP Roadway Improvements Along Columbia Pike .....	4-4
Figure 4-3: Typical Sections, Baseline Alternative.....	4-6
Figure 4-4: Proposed Locations of Super Stops.....	4-7
Figure 4-5: Proposed Alignments for BRT, Streetcar, and Modified Streetcar (2 pages) .....	4-14
Figure 4-6: Typical Sections, BRT Alternative .....	4-16
Figure 4-7: Typical BRT Vehicle.....	4-17
Figure 4-8: Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Vehicle Dimensions .....	4-18
Figure 4-9: Typical Sections, Streetcar Alternative.....	4-26
Figure 4-10: Typical Streetcar Vehicle .....	4-27
Figure 4-11: Streetcar (TRAM) Vehicle Dimensions.....	4-28
Figure 4-12: Skyline Station Stop Concept.....	4-35
Figure 4-13: Jefferson Station Stop Concept.....	4-35
Figure 4-14: Four Mile Station Stop Concept.....	4-36
Figure 4-15: Potential Storage and Maintenance Facilities: North Tract Site .....	4-37
Figure 4-16: Potential Storage and Maintenance Facilities: Near the Navy Annex .....	4-38
Figure 6-1: Existing Streetscape along Columbia Pike .....	6-2
Figure 6-2: Streetcar in Portland, Oregon.....	6-7
Figure 6-3: Mix of Transit Service by Alternative .....	6-13
Figure 6-4: Morning Peak Hour Ridership for Streetcar and Modified Streetcar (6 min) Alternatives.....	6-18
Figure 6-5: Streetcar Alternative User Benefits – Home Based Work Peak Productions .....	6-21
Figure 6-6: Modified Streetcar Alternative (6 Min) User Benefits– Home Based Work Peak Productions .....	6-21
Figure 6-7: Streetcar Alternative User Benefits – Total Productions.....	6-22
Figure 6-8: Modified Streetcar (6 Min) Alternative User Benefits – Total Productions.....	6-22
Figure 6-9: Streetcar (6 Min) Alternative User Benefits – Total Attractions .....	6-23

---

Figure 6-10: Modified Streetcar (6 Min) Alternative User Benefits – Total Attractions.....	6-23
Figure 6-11: Streetcar Construction, Tampa, Florida.....	6-44
Figure A-1: Proposed Bicycle Lanes, Baseline Alternative (as Shown in Arlington County Street Space Recommendations) .....	A-39
Figure A-2: Proposed Bicycle Lanes at a Streetcar Station Stop, Option 1.....	A-40
Figure A-3: Proposed Bicycle Lanes at a Streetcar Station Stop, Option 2.....	A-41