

Question 1: What issues should be addressed in the design of the spot improvements?

- Rather than expanding I-66, why hasn't VDOT considered the cost-benefit analysis of HOT lanes, 8-car trains on the orange line, other toll options
- Reduce congestion in AM rush hour on Wash. Blvd. to West 66. Also Wash. Blvd. Sycamore intersection
- This is very bad planning. Spot Improvements should come after transit improvements
- Widening (or making spot improvements) to I-66 westbound will induce more traffic- thus worsening I-66 traffic volume eastbound each day
- HOV-3 seems to work on 395 W Slug Lanes since people are going into a rather compact center city. HOV-3 should be implemented on I-66 before any spot improvements are made
- Do the multi-modal study before any widening of spotting
- Synchronize HOV hours inside and outside beltway, go back to HOV 3
- No spot improvements that eliminate or narrow any shoulder
- Traffic is not only # of cars, also public transportation, HOV, carpools. These "improvements" only address # of cars
- No spot improvements, better sound walls
- Partially widening I-66 westbound will create problems if/when the full 3rd lane is completed and restricted in its usage- thus irritating motorists
- Why the spot improvements wont solve the problem of two-lane choke points
- What will be done about noise and pollution abatement for residential and park areas?
- "Spot" improvements should focus on transit, pedestrian, and bicycle improvements, not paving more lanes!
- Again, wrong questions! The transportation issue is much broader. Metro funding, traffic reduction, bike trail and widening and maintenance are the issues to be addressed
- Reduce pollution for residents near Wash. Blvd./Sycamore St. and 66
- Sycamore St.-Integrate plans w/ those for redevelopment of Metro EFC as a mini-Clarendon-Arlington County/ WMATA collaboration
- Do the same with East bound on I-66 there are the same traffic problems and we do need it in both directions
- Sycamore St. do not destroy bike path that links W. side with east over bridge
- I would like to see alternatives to widening 66- Metro. Arlington roads have been narrowed throughout the county and traffic, pollution, noise all will be red on I-66
- Bike trails. Metro-money from I-66 project should be given to expand/maintain metro. No benefits to expansion
- The "spot widening" should not occur at all! We don't want any increased noise or pollution in Arlington
- Are any of these essential?

- Existing sound barriers walls along parts of I-66 in Arlington are too low- thus creating too much noise in nearby neighborhoods
- The “improvements” should not happen
- Widening the spot improvements areas will create more erratic driving
- Do not infringe upon Westover Park
- The trail is sacred-Arlington is not a throughway but a destination. Spot improvements is pure rhetoric- the trail must be preserved
- Do not use the word “spot improvement”- use “major disimprovement”
- Improve and expand the Custis Trail. Provide additional connectivity suitable for bikes on side streets
- Not impacting bike path during any construction
- Need to ensure an adequate shoulder for the full length for safety
- Will we have three stalled lanes side by side during rush hour? 1 ½ times the emission output of vehicles
- Environmental impact- more pavement, more pollution, more exhaust. Maintain adjoining bike trails. This plan adds choke points- traffic will speed up and slow down every time lanes increase/decrease
- There should be no places without emergency pull offs
- Trees. Other transpo methods. Don’t build this
- The so-called spot improvements create two new choke points. How will the proposed construction improve overall traffic flow
- The improvements are not legal because of the Coleman Report
- Why has this approach been adopted instead of effective traffic management methods
- Save the bike trail
- No spot improvements
- What happens when these “improved” lanes start backing up? And you know they will! Let’s be real-we need alternatives not more sacrifices for cars/ gas guzzlers!
- Sound barriers need to be funded to be completed where missing and improved to current standards
- Widen I-66 ONLY if it is to build a light rail track. There are enough cars on the road already. Widening will only increase traffic. Stress should be on building public transport
- Continuing spot improvements throughout east & west entire direction, not just in spots
- #3 from Spout Run to Glebe makes no sense- use the funding for East bound or sound barriers
- You build it in any form/design and more cars will come. Let’s spend state funds on alternative methods of transportation NOT this project! Plant many trees to combat air and noise pollution
- The two choke points (Westover being one) must have a safety lane for pull off. Otherwise vehicle occupants will die when their cars break down
- Why improvements on East-bound I-66 weren’t considered
- Widen the break-down shoulders, narrow travel lanes

- VDOT's March 2005 'Idea-66' report non-widening traffic- mgmt alternatives would be superior to a 3rd westbound lane yet VDOT is advancing construction of 3 disconnected pieces. Why widen??!
- This workshop is just for show. There are no design issues on Improvement 2 to resolve, the engineers say. So my input on it doesn't matter.
- This process is anti-democratic. Shame on you
- Wider access to ramps to 66 will increase volume and speed of traffic on the feeder roads thru neighborhoods. How will increase traffic be kept separate from homes and kids?
- Increase the number of buses on I-66 in both directions. There should be 10-minute headways to dozens of destinations in Fairfax County
- Multi-modal studies must be done first-all options must be fully considered-mass transit, express bus, etc.-before any action is taken that could preclude better options from being implemented- once you pave, it cant be undone
- Public transport should be encouraged on 66
- 66 should not be widened at all-it was agreed not to do so.
- What will you do to increase safety in the neighborhood surrounding the expanded on-ramps?
- Should multi-modal considerations be addressed before any widening?
- Design should include assessment of alternatives and should study environmental impacts
- If expand shoulders what land is taken away- does this impact homes
- Adding lane on Wash. Blvd. to Dulles access ramp-what impact on existing home on Wash. Blvd. Where exactly is the 2nd on ramp lane on Wash. Blvd
- Don't take out the Custis Trail
- The "spot improvements" are a step towards a complete third lane. Would the complete 3rd lane impact the trail?
- What does "the trail will be maintained" mean?
- Maintain the bike trail-we know that the ultimate goal is to take the bike path to widen the road. Don't do it!
- Show the public where new bottlenecks would appear once the proposed spots are modified
- Need to preserve parkland bike trails. Who pays? Users should. Metro line through freeway
- Additional noise analysis needs to be done
- Improve sound barriers. Improve design bike path. Do not widen I-66. Extend Metro to Dulles
- Participation format is somewhat of a farce- people want to have a voice, but believe the process is done. Exercises of the past do not seem to reflect Q's of today- poor process
- Design Express Bus stops near I-66 so it's convenient to get Express Buses serving Arlington
- Don't take out the Custis Trail

- Adding a second lane to the Wash. Blvd. ramp will cause even more cars to travel at high speeds on Wash. Blvd. to get onto 66
- Will bike trails be affected by the spot improvements and later lanes that may be added
- We want a study of multi-modal options (Metro, HOV, buses, etc.) before discussions on spot improvements are made. We insist on this!! Should not make decisions on spot improvements before multi-modal
- Having 3 lanes will increase car speeds, unsafe driving jockeying to get ahead of the next person and unsafe passing. Now it is a relatively safe 2-lane highway now
- This is not 3 spot improvements this is one large widening from Spout Run to Sycamore
- These sessions are “checking the block” of involving us (Arlington County residents) in something we don’t want and doesn’t benefit us
- Do not make any spot improvements until Metro is expanded
- If you have to widen (and you don’t have to widen) do only spot 1 and see if it improves as expected. If not, model is flawed and other spot improvements need more study
- Do an Environmental Impact Statement
- Environmental Assessment or EIS is needed. Must consider all feasible alternatives to project. Construction delays on Westbound I-66 and diversion of traffic. Air, water, noise, pollution. Motorist safety. Incident management. All environmental mitigation in original I-66 EIS and ROD must be preserved. Loss of tree and parkland. Degradation of Custis Trail. Traffic impacts on: Eastbound I-66, All connecting roads, Rosslyn-Ballston corridor. Loss of Metro ridership and fares. Reduced carpooling. Increased CO2 emissions. Induced traffic and sprawl. Full width shoulders on both sides
- Is there a plan for increasing wildlife diversity as the proposed construction begins, continues, ends?
- No widening before you look at impact on county parks. Look at EIS and revisit it
- What are a) health risks b) Chesapeake Bay and tributary stream impairments from unearthing cement factory, railroad and other wasted in the I-66 corridor?
- How can you widen I-66 without disrupting the Custis bike trail? It is adjacent
- Will there be room to add express Metro lines in both directions after I-66 is widened? The Orange line is near capacity and room for 2 more tracks must be maintained
- Why are you moving forward on I-66 expansion before you do the multi-modal study? You may preclude some valuable options by widening now
- Stop calling it a spot improvement and state the truth, it is a third lane
- Create adequate sound barriers and retaining walls prior to construction
- The safety of people now using the trail should not be compromised. At all times the experience of the trail should be improved even during construction. After “improvements” the trail should be vastly improved

- Transportation funds should be used to improve trails and public transit. Compromising the safety and convenience of the trail to speed auto traffic is immoral
- How much pollution will be created after widening the road? What % improvement. Want a study of widening lanes vs. improvements in mass transit before spot improvements
- What are plans to address the “bottleneck” that will still exist between Sycamore Street and the Dulles Access Road DUH!!!
- Do the multi-modal design study before you start designing changes to I-66
- Don’t mess with bike lanes
- Do not get rid of bike trail. Do not shunt bikes onto roads during construction. It is unsafe and can seriously disrupt commuters...i.e. more traffic
- Need to look at “no build” option plus higher HOV plus variable pricing, plus full EIS to determine impact on trails, expansion of Metro, etc.
- Stop calling it a “spot” improvement. It is a third lane. How will this affect bottlenecking after it narrows!
- How will trail be improved?
- Bike trail. Trees lost. Environmental impact
- Consideration of “no build” plans, Metro, etc. Size and design of trail. How trail maintained during construction. ROW for more Metro, HOV. Impact on Maywood. Real consideration of alternatives, i.e. Metro. Assurance would only be 4 lanes. Consideration of “no build” plus other alternatives. Full environmental impact study
- Consider alternative solutions (to road widening) before road widening is undertaken and have public debate on these alternatives
- Were there not commitments made to Arlington at time of 66 construction? Arlington already paid a big price for 66
- Preserving the current bike path
- The proposal seems to violate the Federal Executive Order on Environmental Justice. It is an incentive for bring more cars and their pollution from rich areas into the more poorer District of Columbia. Has VDOT done and Env. Justice analysis? Is the Civil Rights Act violated?
- Why the improvements are isolated and not interested to provide a complete solution
- How can we not do this?
- What long-term plan does this fit into? If none- why not? Why aren’t other options for alleviating traffic being considered that don’t increase auto traffic, pollution, decrease the area for the bike path? Don’t widen 66!
- Noise barriers!!
- Noise abatement; limit impact is a necessity- it’s bad now and will only get worse with widening. On surrounding neighborhoods, no net loss of wetlands should be permitted
- Going from 3-2-3 lanes will create choke points and weaving. Must leave room for additional Metro lane to Rosslyn as well as west. Must leave room for additional Metro connections out west (silver and orange). Environmental. Where will diverted traffic go

- Why increased throughput on Metro hasn't been addressed, such as an express track from Rosslyn to East Falls Church (Airport).
- Consider tolling on I-66 before widening or doing spot improvements
- If the widening should be done at all, no widening of the existing walls, no impact on bike path, shoulders should be sacrificed before walls and bike trails
- Maintain the bike path off road
- Widen W/B to 3 lanes for entire length- the 3 spot improvements will create choke points where the road goes back to two lanes
- With BRAC and other movement of businesses out to Dulles Corridor had the live-work pattern for 66 long-term been studied? Do it first
- This process was awful (despite kind, helpful facilitators at tables). Allow people to ask VDOT questions. Provide answers.
- If you have to widen, make lanes thinner, minimize new pavement, plant more trees around and install embankments or sound walls
- Maintaining the Custis Trail and associated/nearby green areas is very important and must be considered along with any possible improvement in traffic flow
- Do not widen the road, try to improve public transportation or pedestrian transportation or HOV lanes to reduce traffic instead of making more room for SUVs
- These so called 'spot improvements' are creating de facto 3rd lanes, thus widening I-66 against the wishes of the community. How can we stop these spot improvements?
- Access and use of Custis Trail is important to maintain. Maintain existing (large) green space areas
- Improve the bike path fewer ups and downs!
- Define shoulders. GW Parkway has curbs. They are dangerous. I want no curbs on side of road. Widening will create a bottleneck at West Falls Church. Don't create bottlenecks
- Why only spot improvements?
- Don't reward gas guzzlers- invest in and improve Metro, Bus routes, and alternatives
- No need for design of a wider road. We don't need a wider road. We don't need more cars
- Why not build an underground express lane from the bridge to the beltway instead
- "Spot improvements"? By adding lanes and encouraging more cars? Can VDOT cite any examples where road widening relieved traffic congestion after a period of 5-10 years? Where is the focus on transit???
- HOV Westbound!
- Do a full alternatives analysis before any widening project! Don't focus on just 1 option!
- Spend the \$66 million to subsidize public transit not widening 66
- Design with variable tolls in mind. Will that help?
- Consider extending Metro. Build an express rail to Rosslyn. Starting a Park & Ride Bus service, all instead of widening
- There is a built-in presumption in this question, to wit: Let's do this in the absence of information & data from analysis of other approaches (public transport,

telecommuting, job-location shifting, for example) to the issue. That said- inadequate action on reducing exhaust emissions is underway- how will these be dissipated so that their impact on adjacent neighborhoods is minimized? Fragile eco-systems must be considered- this project runs along Four-mile Run!

- This is a feel-good meeting. Environmental Processes are not being followed
- Hold open public sessions (discuss alternatives to spot improvements- esp. mass transit)
- This public “workshop” is worthless – no real dialog or discussion
- Why hasn’t overall flow been considered?
- Pass legislation prohibiting development without the creation of mass transit, including subsidized buses
- A full study of all modes, with full study of all environmental impacts should come before any money is spent on “spot improvements”
- Pedestrians, bikes, and alternatives to widening should be discussed! “Spots” tend to spread, bleeding over into adjacent thoroughfares for 2-legged and 2 wheeled users!
- Better sound abatement. Re-engineer the flow/control of Four Mile Run
- Take serious look at alternatives (mass transit)
- What measures will VDOT take to protect homes and families from increased speed and volume of traffic on the access roads leading to expanded on-ramps?
- Approach to ramp from Wash. Blvd. to Dulles is a bottleneck at Lee Highway and Sycamore St.
- If the only construction contemplated is the 3 “spot improvements” what were extensive land surveys conducted well outside of the existing I-66 footprint?
- Do not widen I-66. There are more intelligent ways to move more people efficiently
- Do an EIS and follow its conclusions. Put up noise barriers artificial or natural where neighborhoods want it
- No spot improvements
- Why are we not addressing why volume of cars is so high? What are other options like transit improvements not addressed by VDOT?
- Some space for carpooling should be near entrances- a safe place to park and consolidate cars. Re-do bike trail near Spout Run so it is level with the highway
- Improve public transportation, HOV both directions during AM and PM rush. Environmental impact? Need emergency lanes at all times- not traffic lanes
- Study the design of other I-66 stretches, overall maybe no spot improvements affect the overall experience of I-66
- This process is rigged, because it does not allow the opinion that the “improvements” should not happen at all
- Constantly going from 2 to 3 lanes and back and forth could cause more traffic issues with people trying to merge when it goes down to 2
- Washington Blvd. at spot improvement 2 is already a drag strip. An extra lane onto 66 will make faster traffic and more traffic on Wash. Blvd. Are there ways to better isolate this road and on-ramp from the nearby residencies?

- Are these really improving the road? Concerns about more pollution, about encroachment on multi-use trails along the road
- Widening the lanes will just encourage more traffic on 66 and will ultimately result in no more improvement of congestion
- The “spot improvement” should not occur at all. The trail could be closed due to construction. We cant have that. Did you consider the number of people who take the path to work? Thousands of people commute by path to work. You are putting my life at risk because you are decreasing the distance between me as a biker on the path between me and cars. If there are accidents on the highway you are now endangering my life. How about running express bus lanes rather than doing a widening?
- The lorax is right
- I do not believe these are improvement at all. I think they are called “spot” improvements to avoid complying with environmental review. I am very concerned about the loss of trees and increased pollution. I think losing the shoulder causes safety problems.
- Reducing current noise and air pollution from I-66. Improving present poor bike path design and maintenance.
- Higher noise levels from more traffic and more and longer metro trains.
- BIKE TRAIL: do not hurt it; improve it. Do not shut it down or shut it to roads during construction. METRO: add more lines (express) instead of car lanes to reduce car traffic and limit pollution. Do not widen the road.
- Bicycle path.
- Continue modeling vissim throughout design. Make arterial regulatory changes to get traffic onto I-66 if approved.
- Traffic volume is going to continue to increase; widening the road will not solve the problems associated with traffic flow. Traffic flow will be changed by additional measures taken to improve public transport, additional trains, buses and HOV!
- Approaches to ramps, environment studies to sound barriers and ave studies done.
- They should not be built. Any changes must enhance parkland, bike trail experience and environmental quality. These proposals will diminish these resources and our community.
- Noise barriers- many stretches of 66 were originally intended to have them but they were never built. Any project to increase capacity throughout MUST have them. Where is the long-range plan that shows this project does not preclude mass transit potions? Or that this is not simply an interim step to create a full 3rd lane? (Over strenuous local objections).
- This “workshop” was structured in an insulting and demeaning way. Questions for discussion were phased in a tendentious and one-sided fashion. Arlington residents are generally skeptical of the widening of I-66 and styling this as “spot improvement” merely fuels their skepticism.
- I want to see how the comparison of traffic congestion improved if this money was spent on metro, ride sharing, telecommuting. This is a waste of my money. I’ll remember at election time.

- This plan adds multiple choke points that will cause traffic to speed up only to slow down again. This will cause accident. Also it will encourage more drivers to use the road, increasing noise and air pollution. Also it will take away shoulders, which is extremely dangerous.
- Please find a way to solve out traffic problems that does not include widening I-66. The history of widening roads is one of increased traffic. Better alternatives would include investments in and incentives to use public transportation and investments in affordable housing does to jobs.
- How these “short” lengths of “widening” will not improve traffic, but they may “relocate” it a few yards one way or another.
- Since I live 2 roads from the proposed changes, I do not want any more traffic than is already there. Do not widen the road! I already have enough noise and pollution.
- Need to stop and back up. Proceeding with the design and construction of this initial series of “spot improvements” is a textbook segmentation of a longer project with out full public involvement and NEPA/MHPA compliance—especially the cumulative impacts analysis. No further work on the “spot improvements” should continue until a formal decision on the longer project has been made by USDOT/FHWA.
- Minimize damage to parks, trails, and adjacent homes. Improve sight lines on trails, currently substandard in vicinity of George Mason Blvd.
- Use the money to design a second orange line tunnel.
- The “spot improvements” do not provide a plausible long-term solution to traffic management on I-66. They should not be constructed.
- These spot improvements should not be made-it’s a de facto widening of I-66 against the wishes of the community.
- Build within the existing road space.
- Improve Metro. Find alternatives to adding lanes to I-66.
- Environmental impact, noise impact, induced traffic and de-incentivise use of metro and buses and other commuting.
- Before “spot improvement” consider other improvement to corridor, i.e., extend HOV hours and rush hour in both directions.
- Poorly initiated workshop. No explanation of what VDOT is considering, doing before we were told to go to tables.
- Saving shoulders-design should correct the lag jam that ruining traffic flow.
- Use of public transit instead. Amount of CO, NO, and other pollutes emitted with increased car volumes. Impact on neighboring ecosystems and impact on public health from increased volume.
- I see little benefit in the spot improvements. I believe the money should go to improving mass transit.
- You should be developing public mass transit solutions, such as improved and extended metro access, not building more roads for more private cars to operate during rush hour.
- A comprehensive smart growth overview and study rather than one that shoves more car oriented ex-urb traffic down Arlingtonians.

- The “spot” improvements should focus on pedestrian, bicycle, transit and ride sharing-Not more polluting, noisy cars.
- As an initial matter I object to referring 4.1 miles of road widening as a “spot improvement.” Regardless of what it is called however other alternatives should be considered, including: HOT lanes, expanding existing HOV restrictions, ave improving Metro capacity (i.e. 8 car trains or two orange lines).
- Ride sharing, express buses and public transportation improvements.
- Don’t widen I-66.
- Sound barriers. This “improvement” will increase traffic by 50 percent on Westbound 66 between Fairfax and Sycamore streets. When 66 was first built, money was saved by not building sound walls along some portions (between McKinley Rd. and Nicholas St, for example), and low and inadequate sound barriers along other portions of the right of way. The 50 percent increase in traffic will be moved north, closer to the neighborhood, increasing noise exponentially. Sound barriers and sound barrier improvements will have to be considered. Traffic already backs up from West to East. Leaving the choke point from the Sycamore St. exit to the Washington Blvd entrance ramp will do nothing to alleviate traffic. In addition, the increased traffic Westbound on 66 that will exit at Sycamore in order to get to Falls Church and Westbound on Lee Highway will easily overwhelm the two lanes that are currently available for left turns at Sycamore and Washington Blvd. This area is residential and has a high pedestrian traffic because of the East Falls Church Metro Station. Traffic light timing for pedestrians is already terrible and it can only get worse. What are you going to do about the Quincy St. garage? You can’t move the abutments that support it. How are you going to squeeze 4 lanes in there (3 traffic and one shoulder) without killing people?
- Impacted functionality of adjacent properties.
- Before any spot improvements, VDOT should fix the signage on the entrance ramp to I66 from Washington Blvd at 25th Street. Currently the vast majority of signage (4 signs total) are indicators for thru traffic on Washington Blvd. When 90% or more of the vehicles are destined for the entrance ramp. This lack of signage causes numerous small accidents (I have witnessed six) and illegal sounding of the horns.
- Moving as much traffic thru the proposed improvement in the fastest manner.
- I do not agree with your assement that this is spot improvements. One of the things you need to address is that there is chain link fence keeping cars coming onto the bike path at the Spout Run on ramp; this needs to be address safety risk.
- Just don’t cut the access road to out house. Please check the map; the right of way is cutting the access road to our house.
- Sound wall-no wall presently for Westhampton neighborhood. Your widening and rail will greatly increase noise.
- This widening of I66 helps cars from Roslyn to get faster to the choke point.
- Add a new trail from Washington Blvd on ramp to Dulles Connector. Lots of issues- EA or EIS and alternatives analysis is needed.

- I-66 cannot be viewed only by this “improvement” now. Better that a more comprehensive approach to transportation first. Anything that widens I-66 violates the original agreement with Arlington neighborhoods.
- Are these improvements simply way stations on the road to widening the entire highway? Why should another lane help when motorists will simply occupy the road until it becomes congested and inconvenient?
- Put a sign on Fairfax Dr. going west on 66 to tell if there is congestion on 66.
- Why waste money and ask folks for input when they outcome is already predetermined. Those meetings are a sham-simple dr. without any substance. It’s an insult to the community.
- Why moving forward with spot improvements rather than metro, HOV, and other alternatives? The route will still narrow to 2 lanes, just moving congestion further down.
- These improvements do nothing to help the over-crowding of I-66. Widening the lanes does not cure the problem.
- I do not see the necessity for “spot improvements.”
- Wiser not wider!
- No spot improvements should be done-that is ideal. Barring that, the number of trees needs increasing to combat added exhausts, the bike trail CANNOT be compromised at any time, there should be more buses to more places as an alternative transportation source.
- Are any of these changes essential? What will these improvements do to residential areas surrounding roads? Environmental noise studies.
- Why hasn’t a through third lane not been proposed?
- Do eastbound too!
- This project will only incent more driving. It should not proceed. We need better planning, more mass-transit, more telecommuting, and not more people driving I-66. Inevitably, the traffic will build up after the “improvements” and people will be back in a few years wanting more lanes as congestion inevitably builds again. These improvements incent the wrong behavior. How can there be credibility for any future plans/promises if you break the promise for the original construction of I-66. What research has been done on other cities/MSAS adding lanes to highways and how quickly they have again become congested? We will only be on a pat to make our air pollution worse.
- Benefits do not outweigh costs.
- Delay design and look at other options such as tolling the road, HOV 2 for longer hours or go to HOV-3.
- The secretary of transportation signs a bill or proclamation saying that no more lanes would be added. Keep the promise!
- These “improvements” i.e. widening of I66 only address the number of cars that can move on a road. A wider road moves more cars until gridlock. Again widening moves more cars, etc. It is well known that widening does not solve the problem of congestion. However traffic deals with moving people. There are also factors of

public transportation: extend metro to Dulles, expand i.e. add metro by building third rail, HOV: carpool; express bus. Go from HOV 2-HOV 3-HOV 4 on both East and Westbound lanes.

- This whole plan should be reassessed considering that the study conducted does not advocate these “spot improvements.” Expand Metro; add busses, a light rail and Metro parking. Arlingtonians are against this! STOP!
- This is not a discussion-it appears we are only checking the block for Public Participation-a farce a total farce. Does spot improvements exclude certain Environmental or legal issues that a total widening would include- are we circumventing the issues. It appears to be a VDOT not an Arlington issue.
- There is no global plan. The focus is all on auto-what about bikes and metro?
- What’s the improvement for 3 lanes then 2 between Glebe and Fairfax, then 3 lanes then 2 lanes turn Sycamore and Wash Blvd, then 3? Traffic will back up each time the lanes go from 3 to 2? Boneheads? Modeling or beltway and local traffic (Pentagon to Glebe o 395) shoulders show traffic bottlenecks.
- None of the things that you call improvements are real improvements. What do they improve? What problem is solved?
- This process is cooked. People clearly want transit improvements before widening (don’t call them “spot improvements.”)
- Existing walls should not be moved, bike route should not be touched, shoulders should be sacrificed before the above, going from 3 to 2 lanes and back and forth will cause more issues w/ merging and leaving lanes and possibly cause more accidents, and impact to nature-plants, animals, etc.
- There is a bottleneck in I66 Eastbound just outside the beltway. So this widening of I66 inside the beltway only lets cars from Roslyn get there faster. And the sit. So what now?
- Impact on neighboring roads and homes, environment-pollution redirection, EFC metro traffic flow-redevelopment, and reduce rush hour flow on external roads.
- We don’t wait the spot improvements, in large part because no one believes that these spot improvements will stay.
- Could not get a definitive answer of how this will affect the bike lane and existing homes close to the bike trail. VDOT employees would only say it is well within existing VDOT right of way, what does that mean?
- The Westhampton neighborhood needs sound walls. When the DCR was being built, we measured only 49 decibels according to the 1980 Environmental Impact Stmt. (EIS). In 2004 the EIS for the Dulles Rail Project measured Greenwir Street at 66 decibels, a noise level sufficient for type I and type II projects to add sound walls. However they rail project won’t add sound walls because they say it is the DOT’s responsibility to do this. As a type II, DOT won’t add them. Our hope is that with this new addition to 66, we will finally get the sound walls we need up to at least 1,000 feet from the end construction point. Sound walls of sufficient height are long overdue, especially since all that exists in places is a chain link fence. Please also keep in mind that the rail project will begin operating in 2012. So, while your current

noise estimates will not include this additional noise of 75 decibels per train, that additional noise will be there soon. Thank you in advance for keeping our community in mind.

- Biking trails-one (over Spout Run) is right at nose level. Environmental impact statement-how much more pollution could be expected. Public transportation.
- Keep within existing roadway, maintain and improve existing I-66 trails, express busses on
- I-66? Add another subway line?
- Environmental impact: air, noise and water. Keeping the bike path as a viable transportation route and local recreational resource. How to mix alternative high volume transportation methods with cars-carpooling, express buses.
- Arlington County gains nothing and has many additional expenses and problems.
- You did not take in to account: increased pollution (this affects bike path users who commute this way), increased noise, increased danger (you add traffic on that 3rd lane on Glebe to Spout Run, already the cars are right up against bike path users. You are putting out lives at stake). There is no room for accidents.
- Noise abatement wall adjustment-existing walls are too low for the noise. Tree retention.
- Three safety issues at Exit 69 WB to Sycamore: existing traffic needs to turn left on WB Wash. Blvd creating chaotic conditions. Pedestrians are not safe crossing at Sycamore-Wash Blvd intersection, and pedestrian crossing requirement delays traffic. I'd like to see a pedestrian bridge or tunnel. The WB Wash. Blvd left turn entrance on the metro parking lot is dangerous.
- Public safety vehicular and pedestrians, transit use.
- Does re-strategy improve the environment, reduce fuel imports and increase parkland? Does it encourage environmentally responsible transportation such as walking, biking and use of mass transit?
- Why hasn't VDOT published the results of the traffic analysis modeling study that was used to justify spot improvements?
- As you have so far, preserve (please) the primary bike path along I-66.
- Better signage-larger letters would help.