

3. What criteria should be used to determine whether the concept could successfully address the problem?

- Hard, factual data-baseline data
- Those that reduce travel time for the most number of people
- Those that involve a constituent- building process which brings funding
- Is traffic moving/flowing?
- Long-term verses short-term solutions (prefer long-term)
- Citizen involvement throughout the process
- Difference in average speed- whether it increases
- Effect on speed on arterial roads
- Degree to which solution protects neighborhood streets
- Reduction of congestion (idle time)
- Environmentally friendly (especially air quality)
- Don't do something which causes more cars (don't let it be another I-270 in Maryland)- apply lessons learned from the I-270 development criteria
- Measurement of HOV use, trains and buses
- Control of noise impacts for residents along corridor
- Consideration of impacts on "local" streets
- Allowance for "out of the box" alternatives such as "slug lines"
- Consideration of innovative financing (i.e. design build)
- Develop solutions that can be implemented quickly
- Careful justification and analysis of cost/benefits
- To what degree is the "solution" a long-term one rather than a short-term expedient that may induce more vehicle trips
- Do the criteria damage future mass transit usage
- Will widening I-66 westbound really aid in evacuation from DC?
- Human needs should trump over minor adverse environmental impact (i.e. small wetland patches)
- The benefits to each impacted jurisdiction should be greater than the adverse impacts (i.e. don't pave over Arlington/Falls Church for the benefit of Fairfax residents)
- Effect on environment in terms of air quality, fossil fuel usage (both cars and Metro)
- More cars is not better
- No takings of property, parks or homes
- Preserving the bike trail
- Cost – public or private: (i.e. gas, taxes or tolls)
- Movement of people
- Effects on arterials and feeders
- Counts direction
- LOS
- Other multimodal corridors results

- Less time in car per commute
- Less time per distance
- Fewer cars
- Increase in HOV usage
- Vehicle occupancy
- Mode share
- Future flexibility
- Remain within ROW
- Number of incentive programs implemented
- Presence of shoulders
- Induced traffic
- Private acquisitions
- Cost effectiveness
- No more pavement
- Reliability of transit
- Regional cooperation – “win-win”
- Likelihood of litigation
- Cost
- Lack of back-ups on ramps
- Numbers of transit riders
- Percentage of carpooling & ridesharing
- How traffic on alternate roads (“side streets”) will be increased/reduced
- How will improvements affect regional traffic patterns?
- Number of alternative travel options
- Does it ease congestion
- Adversely affect current property owners
- Amount of cars and car accidents
- Does it fix technical problems in both directions
- Will it address population issues
- Does it limit sprawl
- Financial feasibility
- Improving facility may have people moving way out thus increasing the number of trips on the highway, so you are clogging it up again.
- Spillover on Washington Blvd.
- Solutions that can be implemented more quickly (For example, can implement a bus system faster than rail (Dulles Corridor Rapid Transit project)
- Spatial impacts on neighboring roads, so as not to encroach on existing residential/neighborhoods
- Metro noise (clattering)
- Bus noise
- Timing cars, i.e., origin and destination studies
- Publish and share the results of current origin and destination studies
- Against increasing the right-of-way

- Stay off local streets
- Reduced traffic volume (number of cars on road)
- Volume of people moved not cars (within time frames)
- Don't make same problem bigger!
- Commute time in all modes of transit
- Happiness of residents adjacent to I-66 (status quo)
- Protection of property value
- Better noise attenuation
- No widening of I-66
- Less traffic on feeder roads (Lee Hwy and Washington Blvd.)
- No major new construction
- People adjacent to I-66 shouldn't endure burden of region-wide problem
- Viable preventable measures for both
- Addresses air quality- gives overall solution
- No adverse affects on animals/wildlife
- Non-constructive options first (low cost)
- Ease of traffic flow
- Reversibility
- Does the solution encourage the use of mass transit
- Increase through-put – Washington DC to Toll Road
- Survey commuters prior to implementation of solution
- Make it (solution as quick as possible)
- Reduction of vehicle trips (cars) rush hour and non-rush hour
- Encourage use of mass transit during emergencies
- Noise barriers need to be set in place
- Use the “No Build” policy past Glebe Rd
- If referendum in Arlington County fails for expansion, then no building
- Air and water quality—children have a high rate of asthma
- Energy efficiency, noise and air pollution
- Exhaust all “No Build” concepts
- Balance the budget
- Do a study to identify where the cars are coming from
- Custis bike trail is adequately intact with buffers, but make sure 4 Mile Run's stream does not get pushed underground!
- No expansion within 1 mile of the school
- No domino effect of bad solutions that result from new improvements
- Remove language about expansion of west bound for evacuation purposes; reverse traffic on east bound 66 in emergency
- Keep the community boundaries together if transit projects take place
- Employ a wide based criteria system
- Very little of suggested criteria address air quality
- Current noise standard should be maintained
- Current noise evaluation methods are old fashioned

(October 2004)

- All noise issues to be re-evaluated along whole study area
- Better criteria impacts – quality of life, economic, environment
- Drivers should be made to incur ‘real’ environmental cost of the comfort of driving
- Solutions of ‘adding another lane’ should be last choice only after all other possible options have been studied/deemed not possible
- Question effects of traffic flow – induce traffic
- Calculate health effect associated with traffic
- EIS should precede any decision
- Compensation plan – users should compensate Arlingtonians.
- Traffic volume using neighborhood roads need to be addressed/studied
- Better bus system in Fairfax
- Variable speeds – works in U.K. (M25) should work here – include speed cameras for drunk drivers, etc.
- Look at other jurisdictions & countries for good and bad examples
- Survey highway users as to transportation preferences
- Economic analyses
- Increase in occupants in vehicles
- Maintain existing quality of life in Arlington
- Demographic analysis/projections
- Improve congestion on adjoining roads
- More entry/egress points outside of Arlington
- Pilot express bus study – during rush hours/non-rush hours
- Hard data on evacuation plan
- Regional evacuation plans
- Seasonal evacuation plans
- Measurable reduction in accident rates throughout region for all transportation modes
- Quality of life in Arlington County – bike trails kept, parkland kept
- Reduce use of I-66
- Don’t foreclose future transit options- leave room for another Metro line
- Evaluate induced traffic impact of widening
- Address mass transit and ride-sharing solutions
- Evaluating solutions effect on smart growth
- Look at European models
- Safety (Don’t sacrifice breakdown lane)
- Not impacting property values
- Observe the principles of the Coleman Decision
- Fewer cars on neighborhood streets and arterial streets
- My property value doesn’t decrease
- Moving more people
- Being able to get on the metro in Arlington
- Cost benefit

- Induced traffic on Eastbound side
- Reduction of single occupancy vehicles
- Public Acceptance
- Reduction of crashes
- Equity leads to the user cost which equals the benefit
- “Enforceability” of concept
- Neighborhood conservation: reconnecting across I-66, etc....
- Improved aesthetic visual
- No screening based on evacuation
- Reducing travel time by all modes
- Amount of new mixed use development
- Reduce delays during incidents
- Funding allocated cost-how to invest money
- Fifteen, ten, five year outlooks to solve congestion
- Integrates with a regional transportation plan
- Short-term impact on transit
- More people work at home
- Has it worked somewhere else? Best practice
- Evening out congestion
- Get most people off I-66 (cars)
- No impact on house – taking property, environment
- Exhaust levels increase, noise levels increase
- No change effect on residents- noise, air quality, impact to local road network, don’t negatively impact other modes (bike, etc.)
- Evacuation issue is red herring
- Evacuate potential for future needs
- Outside ability to have SOV be more important than travel time
- Time saved with third lane (is it worth it)
- Environmental criteria (all on the list)
- Cost criteria – adding roadway is a poor use of resources in a corridor already served by rail. (Could analyze the cost of improvement in comparison to regional needs/funding.)
- Tolls are good as long as existing capacity is maintained
- Safety – costs and impacts considerations
- Noise is an important criteria and noise walls.
- Trip chaining
- Time save (this is a double edge sword as capacity goes up as travel time goes down)
- Include transit in model for non-compact members
- How many people are we talking about evacuating from DC? What measurement would VDOT use?
- Need to look at Arlington Community Values verses Fairfax County Values
- Criteria needs to reflect cost per person trip mile

(October 2004)

- Induced traffic by mode, SOV, HOV and transit
- Look at safety and use of shoulder
- VDOT needs to tell people about construction schedules
- Arlington will want insurance that the road will never be widened to 4 lanes in each direction
- Metro needs to expand to Dulles- help the congestion on I-66
- Need to measure the solution with numbers, data, etc.
- What are the current numbers of those traveling into the corridor?
- VDOT needs to share timeline/schedule- see mixing bowl as an example of how they kept people informed
- DC continues to grow causing more congestion
- Look at Arlington population growth versus site plan development
- Look at all no-build options
- How are you going to solve eastbound problem? Can't fix Westbound only
- Quality of life improvements- less noise, ability to get around
- Review regional zoning and air pollution
- Need regional solution
- Evacuation should not be considered because we are not going to be able to get people out- adding a lane will not make a difference
- This area will continue to grow "build it and they will come"
- HOV/HOT combination involves I-66, 395, 95 and the Dulles Corridor
- Accidents on I-66 cause congestion on parallel roadways
- Funding for BRT- Would it be part of Metro? Long term funding?
- Need management solution – TDM policy by DC could take some traffic off I-66
- Less miles traveled is better-VMT on highway is better than VMT on local streets
- Increased access for emergency personnel
- The draft criteria should focus on capacity not transit
- Look at induced development and induced traffic
- I-66 made growth possible in Fairfax, Loudoun and etc.
- Solution needs to look at land use issues with a stronger link to transit development
- Look at PPTA's, tolls, funding models, cost of solution and "finance ability"
- Do traffic counts on Washington Blvd and Wilson Blvd
- Look at the networks of roads for counts
- Give the heaviest weight to the solutions that save people time "fastest trip time"
- Re-evaluate measure definitions
- Methodology options
- Feeder Roads
- Rail (now and future impacts)
- HOT lane revenue
- Induce travel (provide broken out and clear data)
- Maintaining unrestricted access and improving access to Dulles Airport (provide as independent travel trip)

(October 2004)

- Reflect all modes (ref: page one of criteria)
- Accessibility for environmental justice groups (i.e., low income) (ref: page two of criteria)
- Compatibility with law enforcement
- Fewer criteria the better
- Frame as outcome vs. output