

Friends of Rose Park

Meeting Minutes.

RE: Chris Holben of DCDOT presentation and discussion at the FRP Board Meeting on October 16, 2006

By Russell Katz, FRP Board Member.

Chris gave a general explanation of the status of his new project, which includes areas within Rose Park. The project is to refurbish and extend a bike trail. At this time, contracts have been signed as follows, by DDOT:

- - Wilber Smith Group Large Engineering, Main Design
- - Rodeside + Harwell Landscape Architecture (main focus: Rose Park)
- - Toole Design Group Trail Design
- - Mercato Surveying Surveyor

The areas included in the project are divided into 5 groups:

1. Rose Park
2. P Street Ramp (from parkway to Rose Park)
3. Zoo Bridge
4. Piney Branch Trail
5. P Street to Broad Branch

The budget for all 5 parts is \$2.5 million; \$600,000 of which is for design and is currently allocated.

There are 4 entities involved in supporting the project:

1. National Park Service largest stakeholder
2. DC DPR Rose Park area only.
3. DDOT provider manpower and management.
4. National Zoo owner of segment of trail near zoo.

The project is broken into 2 separate parts, that will proceed separately:

1. Rose Park, including the P Street ramp.
2. The rest.

The stated goal for the Rose Park section is:

- To make a safe multi-use trail; which may include:
 - repaving with a porous surface
 - width change
 - upgrading to ADA

The scheduled timeline is:

- 1 year total timeline, starting as of 9.15.06 when contracts were signed.
 - Initial Design Phase (30%):
 - October 28, 2006 – meeting at Pierce Mill, 4 hour meeting for community comment
 - Identify any obstructions and probably deviations along route.
 - Result will be concept design by Jan 2007, presented at 2 public meetings. (Rose Park will be separate from rest of trail).
 - Second Design Phase (60%)
 - Takes into account comments from Initial Phase presentations.
 - Result will be 1 or 2 final options.
 - Presentation in March 2007 at further public meetings.
 - Usually this is the most contentious time. Can result in changes; however, if there is serious opposition to the presented plans the result will likely be a stall in the process.
 - Final Design Phase (90%)
 - Takes into account comments from 60% Phase presentations.
 - If enough support found for design, final design will be complete to 90% in August 2007.
 - Construction Document Phase (10%)
 - 3 month period.
-

Main concerns of FRP were discussed:

- Most users of Rose Park are in conflict with bike riders. Pedestrians, children, strollers, elderly, and people walking dogs are the main users of the park. Rose Park is a heavily used park. Even the current, low level of bike use is dangerously in conflict with the park's primary users.
- The so-called "bike trail" has always been designated as a "sidewalk" and is considered by FRP to be a "foot-path". No biking should be allowed through the park; however, the foot-path should be renovated at its current width and location.
- Additional safety and convenience items are welcome. For instance:
 - a fence along the foot-path on the side of the hill
 - bike racks at the entrances to the park for those who bike to use the park.
 - Refurbishment of the foot-path
 - Signage restricting bicycle access.
- The path discussion is not new to FRP. In the past the old oak tree by the tot lot has been identified as an "obstruction". FRP does and will stand firmly in opposition to any adverse impact upon that tree. Further, the response in the past to the tree position has been to suggest routing the path around the tot-lot and through the center of the southern portion of Rose Park. This solution will never be supported, and will be most strenuously opposed by FRP.

Q&A Session:

1. Who among the controlling entities would have final say should there be a conflict?

A - Probably the Park Service.

2. Does “multi-use” have to include bike use?

A – Not necessarily, but as a starting point, yes.

3. How can it be justified to build a “bike path” through Rose Park when (a) there is a perfectly good bike path running parallel at the base of the hill along Rock Creek Parkway; and (b) when the path will dead-end at the southern point of Rose Park?

A – A path needs to end somewhere.

FRP Response – Then it should end at the entrance to Rose Park.

4. As people who bike in the area, many FRP board members suggested that riding on the streets of this area of Georgetown is preferable to riding on a path where one is in conflict with so many other, and slower users. Again, why put the trail through the park?

A – Most bike riders prefer trails.

FRP Response – You can’t say that because its not necessary true. As we’ve stated bike users who ride here; it is better to ride on our quiet streets than on any bike trail.

Please immediately notify the sender of any additions or corrections.

DISTRIBUTION: FRP Board / Chris Holben /