

Public Information and Participation Comments

Two public meetings were held in December. The first meeting was December 6, 2011 at Mary Ellen Henderson Middle School and had 36 public attendees. The second meeting was on December 14, 2011 at the Arlington County Government Offices and had 40 public attendees. Table 1 provides a summary of the 85 public comments received as of February 14, 2012, organized thematically. If more than one person made the same comment, the number of respondents appears in parentheses at the end of the comment.

- Seven completed comment forms were received at the meetings: four in Fairfax and three in Arlington.
- Ten comments were transcribed by the court reporter: two in Fairfax and eight in Arlington.
- 58 comments have been submitted through the email address, posted on the webpage (info@i66multimodalstudy.com).
- One comment was submitted through the project phone line.
- Two comments were submitted through standard mail.
- Seven comments, from the Arlington Civic Federation, were emailed directly to Sharp & Company (public involvement subconsultant for this project).

Table 1. Comment Summary

Theme	Summary Comment
1 Highway Capacity	17 respondents were in favor of adding highway capacity to I-66 25 respondents were opposed to any additional highway capacity on I-66
2 Bus	15 respondents were in favor of increased/improved bus services. Specific comments include: Add more buses in general in the study area. (5) Improve bus services from Metro stations in study area to downtown D.C. and Virginia during peak periods to alleviate Metrorail congestion. (4) Add Priority Bus to major roads, considering routes on U.S. 29, U.S. 50, VA Route 7 between King Street Metro and Tysons Corner, I-395 to Little River Turnpike to Main Street Fairfax, and Columbia Pike between Pentagon and Annandale with connection to Little River Turnpike/Main

Theme	Summary Comment
	<p>Street Fairfax Line. (3)</p> <p>Establish large parking lots along the I-66 corridor that would be serviced by buses that would travel to Metro stations. (3)</p> <p>Add a bus-only lane to I-66. (2)</p> <p>Add more 3Y buses on Lee Highway.</p> <p>Allow buses to use shoulders on urban interstates when speeds drop below 25 mph.</p> <p>No respondents stated opposition to bus options.</p>
3 Metrorail	<p>12 respondents were in favor of Metrorail improvements. Specific comments include:</p> <p>More frequent trains and track improvements to ease peak Metrorail congestion periods. (7)</p> <p>Parking availability at Metro stations should be addressed. (3)</p> <p>Revisit the East Falls Church Metrorail Project. (3)</p> <p>A western entrance to the Ballston Metrorail station would help ease crowding. (3)</p> <p>Before widening I-66, wait and see how the new Metrorail Silver Line will affect traffic on this corridor. (2)</p> <p>Eight car trains on the Orange Line should be a high priority for Metrorail. (2)</p> <p>Add an interline connection between the Orange and Blue Lines on Metro, as well as an interline connection between the Yellow and Blue Lines. (2)</p> <p>Add a double-deck track over the Orange Line Metro.</p> <p>Extend the Metrorail Orange Line to Centerville and Manassas.</p> <p>No respondents stated opposition to Metrorail options.</p>
4 Bicycle	<p>14 respondents were in favor of bicycle improvements. Specific comments include:</p> <p>Improvements in bicycle travel and key connections are needed throughout the study area. This includes new and wider pavement on existing paths such as W&OD and Custis as well as new connections to transit. (6)</p> <p>Provide a bike/pedestrian crossing near West Falls Church Metro to link</p>

Theme	Summary Comment
	<p>Haycock Rd./W&OD with Pimmitt Hills neighborhood. (2)</p> <p>More bicycle parking is needed at Metro stations. (2)</p> <p>Provide bicycle access along U.S. 50 across the Beltway to connect Merrifield and Graham Rd. areas. (2)</p> <p>Try to create a safe bike trail into the heart of Tysons Corner from the W&OD trail.</p> <p>Extend the Custis Trail beyond East Falls Church.</p> <p>The Custis Trail needs to be completely redesigned and rebuilt. The steep slopes discourage commuter cycling. The trail should have the same gradual changes in elevation as do the highway travel lanes.</p> <p>A viable two-way solution to reducing traffic is to further promote the use of what is already there along I-66 - a bike path.</p> <p>Need an improved bike/pedestrian connection from Rosslyn/Iwo Jima Memorial to Theodore Roosevelt Bridge.</p> <p>1 respondent stated reservations about bicycle options, as they thought few people would commute very long distances via bicycle, especially in extreme weather.</p>
<p>5 Arterial Enhancements</p>	<p>11 respondents provided comments on arterial enhancements. Specific comments include:</p> <p>Improve critical intersections on U.S. 50 that create bottlenecks and are unsafe. (5)</p> <p>Consider public transit for U.S. 50 that extends into D.C. This is already a huge commuting corridor that could benefit further from rail or rapid bus transit. (3)</p> <p>Eliminate some of the left turns on U.S. 50 to alleviate congestion.</p> <p>Widen U.S. 50 From Eaton Place to Main Street and through the Seven Corners intersection.</p> <p>Without widening U.S. 29 through Falls Church (which, in my opinion, would be strongly opposed by Falls Church), the enhancements to U.S. 29 identified in the report will not reduce congestion on I-66 inside the Beltway.</p> <p>2 respondents stated opposition to arterial enhancements. The specific comments are:</p> <p>The widening of non-highway, local roads would simply serve to turn local roads into more highly congested routes. It creates a more</p>

Theme	Summary Comment
6 HOV Restrictions	<p data-bbox="573 275 1382 302">dangerous, new problem without remotely solving the first problem.</p> <p data-bbox="573 338 1425 468">Changes to U.S. 50, especially those designed to turn it into a freeway, should be done with caution. Pedestrians use U.S. 50 and cross U.S. 50 – these connections need to be maintained. The ability to drive faster along this road shouldn't necessarily be a goal in of itself.</p> <p data-bbox="573 514 1328 573">12 respondents provided comments on HOV options. Specific comments include:</p> <p data-bbox="573 590 1049 617">Eliminate hybrid vehicle exemptions. (5)</p> <p data-bbox="573 653 867 680">Increase enforcement. (3)</p> <p data-bbox="573 716 1125 743">Make it HOV-3+ under current HOV hours. (3)</p> <p data-bbox="573 779 1414 846">Introduce the same carpool restrictions on both sides of I-66, during am and pm peak commute periods. (3)</p> <p data-bbox="573 882 1049 909">Make I-66 inside the beltway HOV 24/7.</p> <p data-bbox="573 945 1425 1012">Include a process or metric to trigger an increase of the HOV standard to four or more persons per vehicle.</p> <p data-bbox="573 1047 1393 1171">Mobility Option A should be analyzed to be sensitive to the length of HOV restrictions in the reverse direction. It should look at 1 hour, 1.5 hours, 2 hours, and 2.5 hours reverse direction HOV restrictions to minimize adverse impacts on alternate routes.</p> <p data-bbox="573 1207 1411 1304">Increase the fine for first and repeat violators. If they don't pay the fine within a week, double the fine. This will help pay for transportation alternatives. Eliminate all warnings.</p> <p data-bbox="573 1346 1357 1404">7 respondents stated opposition to HOV-3+ options. The specific comments are:</p> <p data-bbox="573 1421 1214 1449">Continue current HOV-2+restrictions, not HOV-3+. (5)</p> <p data-bbox="573 1484 1435 1583">Increases in HOV passenger requirements will simply shift the congestion to secondary roads that are even less capable of handling more traffic. (2)</p>
7 HOT Lanes	<p data-bbox="573 1629 1398 1688">4 respondents mentioned support for tolling in their comments. The specific comments include:</p> <p data-bbox="573 1705 1430 1801">The only way to successfully address congestion (short of improved land management practices) on highways is to implement tolls on major highways, such as I-66. (3)</p> <p data-bbox="573 1837 1414 1894">Revenue needs to drive all options for the future. Fast service is worth money. People driving in luxury vehicles can afford to pay. The rest of</p>

Theme	Summary Comment
	<p>us should be happy taking the train and its connecting bus.</p> <p>Converting the entire highway to toll during non-HOV hours should be considered.</p> <p>5 respondents mentioned opposition or concern about HOT Lanes. The specific comments are:</p> <p>HOT lanes disproportionately benefit the rich and should not be considered. (3)</p> <p>Opposed to tolling I-66 24 hours a day, 7 days a week with HOT Lanes. Only toll when there is congestion, not during free-flow. (2)</p> <p>Tolls might be justified for a new road on a new right of way but not for an existing one.</p>
<p>8 Transportation Demand Management</p>	<p>4 respondents expressed support for TDM in their comments. The specific comments include:</p> <p>Think about rideshares and bicycling incentives (2).</p> <p>Promote carpooling, vanpools, and ridesharing and establish locations for slug lines. (3)</p> <p>TDM measures are critical and must be part of the package. Some local jurisdictions in the region have had considerable experience with these measures which should be put in place for all routes under consideration. The measures must be ongoing and considered an important element to maintain facility performance.</p> <p>Telework should be included as part of the solution.</p> <p>No respondents stated any opposition to TDM options.</p>
<p>9 Public Meetings</p>	<p>10 respondents provided comments on the public meetings. The specific comments include:</p> <p>I think there should have been room for people to ask questions after the presentation. (5)</p> <p>I was going to attend one of the public input sessions, but if VDOT has already determined that the outcome will include widening the highway, what is the point of doing public input for this multimodal study at all, if part of the “recommendations” are already set? [e-mail referred to pre-meeting press release that also discussed opening of Spot Improvement #1]</p> <p>I think that the public participation should have been much earlier in this process so that the public could have helped define the study, not just giving input after six months of the study.</p>

Theme	Summary Comment
10 Miscellaneous	<p data-bbox="573 275 1341 338">Place more materials on the project webpage in advance of public meetings.</p> <p data-bbox="573 373 1390 468">A multitude of different ideas and options were described in the slide show but were not handed out or otherwise made available to participants to physically look at.</p> <p data-bbox="573 504 1422 598">Having public meetings in April and then providing a final report in May does not seem like you are taking the public comments seriously in this process.</p> <hr/> <p data-bbox="573 642 1370 737">9 respondents provided comments on topics that were not directly relevant to any of the mobility options. The specific comments include:</p> <p data-bbox="573 751 1430 879">Any attempts to relieve congestion in the study corridor will be unsuccessful if current zoning and urban planning practices continue. The final report should recommend changes in local zoning and land use practices. (3)</p> <p data-bbox="573 915 1435 1010">Phase #1 and #3 spot improvements should be removed from the Baseline. The study was established to consider alternatives to these lane additions. (2)</p> <p data-bbox="573 1045 1409 1140">Fairfax County should follow Arlington's lead and increase zoning and density of development near Metro stations to encourage Metro ridership and use of trails for bicycle commuting.</p> <p data-bbox="573 1176 1422 1270">Why is VDOT ignoring I-66 outside the beltway? Those of us that live in Manassas and below have no alternative to get to Tysons Corner or McLean, other than a 2-hour commute via public transportation.</p> <p data-bbox="573 1306 1430 1400">Please continue exploring streetcars/light rail up the VA 7 corridor from the Skyline Area (where the Columbia Pike Street Car plans to terminate) up through to the Tysons Corner Metro stations.</p> <p data-bbox="573 1436 1386 1564">If a business moves into the Dulles corridor, adding hundreds of new cars on the roads, they should be taxed with developing more public transportation (including bike and pedestrian paths) and require a percentage of its employees use such transportation.</p> <p data-bbox="573 1600 1409 1791">Arlington County with only one representative on a PARC of 17 members is grossly underrepresented, suggesting the results will have little to do with the County's interests. A supplementary group representing corridor residents in Arlington and Fairfax should be established to increase the value and acceptability and credibility of the final recommendations.</p> <p data-bbox="573 1827 1435 1890">Discuss all of the baseline data, specifically how it has accounted for federal spending reductions, which is expected to slow growth, new</p>

Theme	Summary Comment
	traffic alignments, and new roadway capacity (specifically the Beltway HOT Lanes).
	In front of our development site (the former Colony House furniture store (1700 Lee Highway), I-66 is sandwiched between the eastbound and westbound lanes of Lee Highway. If the I-66 widening was to occur, how would it be accomplished in the vicinity of our site?
