

“Restore I-66 Improvements Now”

**Statement of David Guernsey
To the National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board
March 18, 2009**

It doesn't take more studies to know that I-66 inside the Beltway is one of the region's most congested and neglected transportation corridors or that at least one additional lane in each direction is needed.

The fact that the westbound I-66 spot improvements will improve corridor travel speeds and safety is also obvious.

So obvious that these improvements were previously approved by Virginia's Commonwealth Transportation Board, the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority and the Transportation Planning Board.

In fact, one year ago public comment received by the TPB was 100-1 in support of putting these improvements in the CLRP and TIP. One hundred to one. And that support still exists.

I believe it is fair to say that the vast majority of residents in this area are absolutely astounded that the TPB would act to remove these projects from the CLRP and TIP, put millions of federal dollars at risk and cause tens of thousands of area residents to sit even longer in traffic.

Some have said the TPB's decision to remove I-66 westbound spot improvements from our region's long range plan last month was caused by confusion over the status or content of an I-66 study.

The Washington region isn't the nation's second most congested because it has failed to study or plan. It is number two because it has failed to build what it has studied and planned.

Any study conducted in conjunction with spot improvements should be commensurate with the spot improvements themselves.

More complex policies and strategies should be the subject of a more comprehensive future environmental impact statement.

The bottom line is: the I-66 improvements are a logical and necessary step to enhance mobility and safety in this corridor.

They deserve to be restored to the 2009 Constrained Long Range Plan and FY 2010-2015 Transportation Improvement Program with no additional strings attached and the Alliance asks that you do so at today's meeting.

Thank you.

P.O. Box 6149
McLean, VA 22106-6149
tel 703-883-1830
fax 703-883-1850
www.nvta.org

Comments to TPB 3/18/09
In Opposition to I-66 "Spot Improvements"

1. **Lived Along I-66 Corridor for 16 years** – I have lived along the I-66 Corridor from Arlington to Vienna for 16 years now. I understand the commuting issues.

1. **Oppose the Spot Improvements to I -66** – they are neither "spot," nor "improvements."

1. **Massive amounts of people** – We need to move massive amounts of people through this corridor. The funding that is dedicated to the I-66 "Spot Improvements" could be far better used for other transit projects that would move volumes of people through the corridor in a far more efficient way, as opposed to trying to move one person, in one car, one at a time. In this cost strapped environment, we should be using these dollars for the best bang for taxpayers buck.

2. **No Benefit to I-66 Spot Improvements** – VDOT itself admits that after spending the \$75 million dollars, the spot improvements may only gain riders 3-4 minutes in that corridor, and there would still be bottlenecks. If we are spending \$75 million dollars to gain 3-4 minutes, there is something seriously wrong with the cost benefit analysis. Furthermore, VDOT cautions that the I-66 spot improvements would "increase storage of vehicles on the road." As such, do we really want to spend \$75 million to turn I-66 into a parking lot?

3. **VDOT Needs to AT LEAST Consider Other Options** – So many organizations and individuals would not be against the spot improvements if VDOT had at least considered other means of moving people through this corridor. But it hasn't. VDOT has gone straight to "widening" I-66 as its solution. We think this is poor planning. VDOT needs to at least consider what other options are out there to better move people through this corridor, before it plows ahead with what might be the worst possible option. There are other ways to increase the number of people moving through that corridor, such as: fully funding metro, adding more metro trains, operating buses to neighborhoods that currently can not access metro to pick people up and take them to metro, fast bus lanes, congestion pricing, more enforcement of HOV, etc.

- **From my experience living in Vienna**, hundreds more people would take metro to work if there were viable solution for getting to people to metro – such as neighborhood buses to pick people up, or more parking capacity at metro. But there isn't, so people drive. We could put funding into those solutions.

4. **Doing Nothing** - the IDEA-66 study showed that there would be better traffic movement in 2030 if we did nothing now. As such, the conclusion is that doing nothing is a better alternative than the I-66 spot improvements.

5. **I-66 Spot Improvements Are Dangerous** - The I-66 spot improvements leave us with no break-down lane. If there are accidents, and there are many, this lack of a breakdown lane will prevent emergency vehicles from getting to the accidents, and will prolong the time everyone sits on I-66 even more so than now. At least now when there is an accident, the cars can move off to the side and traffic can pass. This will no longer be the case.

6. **I-66 Spot Improvements Pose Safety Risks** - the safety of the proposed more narrow 11-foot lanes that do not meet federal regulations are being questioned when you have traffic that is going

55 miles per hour. Communities typically use more narrow lanes as traffic calming measures because such lanes are harder to navigate and force traffic to go slower. Obviously, this may not be the “fix” we want to apply in order to move traffic faster through this corridor.

7. 1-66 Spots Will Destroy the Green Corridor and Alternative Commuting – We need to be encouraging alternative commuting right now, not discouraging it. The proposed I-66 spot improvements will destroy the natural buffer of trees and shrubs (which VDOT terms “swale and ditches”) that we currently have between the bike path and I-66, and make it more dangerous and more unpleasant for thousands who bike to work. Consuming this buffer puts bikers and cars, in some cases, dangerously close together. If and when the 1-66 spot improvements are completed, we may as well bike on the highway, as all enjoyment of the “green corridor” will have been taken – not just from bikers, but from joggers, walkers and other recreational activities. We need to be encouraging alternative commuting right now, not discouraging it.

8. I-66 “Spot Improvements” are Riddled with Flaws – There are so many “design exceptions,” “a-typical processes,” “categorical exclusions,” avoidance of NEPA reviews, and lanes that do not meet federal regulations in the I-66 spot improvement proposals that these so called “spot improvements” are just setting themselves up for legal fights and failures.

9. Before Further Consideration -- VDOT needs to promptly complete a full, fair, and transparent alternatives feasibility study for the future of the I-66 inside-the-Beltway multimodal corridor.

10. Please remove the three 1-66 Spot Improvements from the VDOT plan – and cut funding for these projects.

Sarah Vilms
Arlington, VA

ANNUAL CORPORATE SPONSORS



Arlington Chamber of Commerce Remarks To the National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board

**Submitted by: Mark S. Ingrao, Arlington Chamber
Board Member and President, AspenStrategies, LLC**

March 18, 2009

- The Arlington Chamber of Commerce, which represents 750+ companies in Arlington County and throughout the region, has long considered the widening of I-66 as one of its top transportation priorities.
- I-66 inside the Beltway is a vital transportation link to all of Arlington's major employment centers including the Ballston/Rosslyn Corridor, the Pentagon and Pentagon City and Crystal City. Widening I-66 is critical to keeping these centers prosperous and accessible to the region's workforce.
- The I-66 improvements will keep regional traffic off Arlington neighborhood streets.
- I-66 is also a critical regional transportation corridor especially for District residents accessing jobs in Northern Virginia and serves as a vital evacuation route for those living and working in the District.
- The Arlington Chamber supports the I-66 westbound improvements as an important initial strategy to widen the I-66 corridor and improving multi-modal travel in both directions.
- The Arlington Chamber urges the TPB to restore these improvements to the 2009 Constrained Long Range Plan and FY 2010-2015 Transportation Improvement Program at today's meeting.

WASHINGTON AREA BICYCLIST ASSOCIATION

1803 connecticut ave. nw — washington, dc 20009

p: 202-518-0524 f: 202-518-0936 www.waba.org



My name is Eric Gilliland and I'm the director of the Washington Area Bicyclist Association. I'm here today to urge the members of the Transportation Planning Board to ensure that priority bike and pedestrian projects are funded with infrastructure dollars from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). These funds should be an investment in the transportation future of the region in lines with the goals of this body to promote alternative modes of travel.

I recently read a memo from the Director of the Department of Transportation Planning, entitled "Summary of ARRA Act of 2009". The memo was intended as a summary of a very complex bill, but failed to fully explain some that could fund important bike and pedestrian projects in the DC region. According to the legislation, 3% of the \$27.5 billion in infrastructure dollars must be allocated to the Transportation Enhancement program which has been a great source of funds for biking and walking projects and is flexible enough to fund bike and pedestrian safety education efforts. That this information was not explicitly provided to TPB members is a disservice to the many people here that want to see better bicycling and walking in their area.

While the District of Columbia in their TIP amendments has requested funding for a bike sharing expansion and sidewalk improvements, to our knowledge no funds for biking and walking have yet been requested by Maryland or Virginia. We urge TPB members to ask their departments of transportation how they will use stimulus dollars to improve conditions for biking and walking.

We are also concerned that though WMATA has request \$230 million for capital projects, not one dollar has been allocated to improving bike parking or bike access to metro stations. This is especially important since between 2002 and 2007 the percentage of people access Metrorail by bike increased by 60%.

In Maryland, which has a fix it first policy, road resurfacing projects should be used to build complete streets and to build parts of the bikeway network. Maryland was recently ranked 35th out of 50 in the League of American Bicyclist's Bicycle Friendly States program and needs to work much harder to make the state's roadways safe for cyclists.

Regarding the DC TIP amendment we are encourage to see walking, biking and safe routes to schools play such a prominent role. We urge this body to adopt this amendment. However, we request that any future investment in bike sharing be done only after a thorough review of the DC pilot project and that the project expansion be made with an eye towards regional integration.

13)

Arlington Coalition for Sensible Transportation
PO Box 5574, Arlington, VA 22205, 703 271-0895, www.acstnet.org

Statement to the National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board
by Allen Muchnick, President, March 18, 2009

I'm Allen Muchnick with the Arlington Coalition for Sensible Transportation (ACST).

For at least the past decade, the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT)--not Arlington County--has consistently impeded an expeditious and permanent end to traffic congestion on I-66 inside the Beltway.

In the mid 1990s, the TPB directed VDOT to regularly monitor I-66 traffic congestion during the HOV-2 restrictions and to restore HOV-3 if the HOV-2 restrictions failed to regularly assure free-flowing traffic. However, since Congressman Frank Wolf invalidated the landmark 1977 Coleman Decision in 1999--removing TPB and WMATA oversight of I-66 congestion management--VDOT has ignored that directive.

In October 2001, the TPB authorized VDOT to conduct a funded \$5 million alternatives feasibility study for the future of I-66 inside the Beltway, but after VDOT failed to initiate that study over the next 20 months, the Commonwealth Transportation Board reallocated the funds in June 2003.

In May 2004, the TPB authorized VDOT to conduct a second alternatives feasibility study--dubbed *Idea-66*--that was limited to the westbound direction. After soliciting initial public input in fall 2004, VDOT excluded all outside input and peer review. In March 2005, VDOT's *Idea-66 Report* recommended adding a continuous westbound travel lane, while VDOT had already internally scoped the current "Spot Improvements" project.

The master alternatives evaluation matrix from VDOT's March 2005 *Idea-66 Report* is attached to my written remarks. As is plainly evident, the so-called "Spot Improvements"--highlighted in yellow--provide no significant improvement over the "No Build" baseline (aka 2030 CLRP), whereas non-widening traffic-management alternatives such as longer HOV-2 hours, congestion pricing, and express bus improvements--highlighted in green--provide the greatest net benefit, even under VDOT's analysis and without considering the synergies of combining these alternatives..

As we noted previously, the current DPRT Transit/TDM study disregards the TPB's May 2007 condition for the Commonwealth to conclude a full, fair, and transparent multimodal alternatives analysis, by ignoring the need to provide an uncongested busway with either HOV restrictions, congestion pricing, or use of the I-66 shoulders. Moreover, today's draft resolution to reconsider the TPB's February 18 vote provides no assurance that VDOT will ever complete the *Idea-66* feasibility study that it abandoned four years ago. Thus, we urge the TPB to reaffirm its February 18 vote to remove the I-66 "Spot Improvements" until the "*Idea-66*" alternatives analysis is fully, fairly, and openly completed.

Figure 6-2a. Comparison of Concepts to 2030 CLRP

| CONCEPTS | MEASURES OF THE PROBLEM | | | | | | MEASURES OF THE SOLUTION | | | | | | MEASURES OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS | | | | | | MEASURES OF EFFECTIVENESS | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|--|---|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|---------------------|------------------------------|--|------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---------------|---------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| | Changes in Volume-Capacity Ratios | Change in Duration of Congestion for All Modes | Change in Incident Occurrences at Current Locations | Change in Evacuation Potential | Presence of Continuous Shoulders | Change in Accessibility/Travel Time | Change in Mode Share Percentages | Change in Mode Share Numbers | Person Throughput on East-West Roadways | Changes in Vehicle Miles Traveled | Change in Total Daily Person Trips | Change in HOV/HOT Volumes | Network Connectivity Improvement | All Work Can Be Done within Existing ROW | Utilities Relocated | Retaining/Noise Wall Impacts | Existing Land Cover Converted and Visual Impacts | Water Resource Impacts | Presence of Sensitive Noise Receptors | Air Quality Impacts | Potential Displacements/Acquisitions | Multi-Use Trail/Public Lands/Parklands Impacted | Capital Costs | Operating and Maintenance Costs | Design Exceptions Required to Stay within ROW | Ability to Maintain Bicycle Traffic | Ability to Maintain Traffic | Temporary Construction Impacts |
| HOV - CURRENT CONFIGURATION | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HOV-2 AM and PM Peaks | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| HOV-2 All Day | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| No HOV-2 West of Exit 69 (Sycamore St.) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| HOV-3 AM and PM Peaks | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| HOV-3 All Day | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| No HOV-3 West of Exit 69 | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| HOV - ADDITIONAL LANE (WIDENING) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Dedicated HOV-2 Lane All Day | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| All Lanes HOV-2 AM and PM Peaks | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| All Lanes HOV-2 All Day | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| All Lanes No HOV-2 West of Exit 69 | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| All Lanes HOV-3 PM Only | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| 1 Dedicated HOV-3 Lane All Day | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| All Lanes HOV-3 AM and PM Peaks | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| All Lanes HOV-3 All Day | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| All Lanes No HOV-3 West of Exit 69 | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| HOT - CURRENT CONFIGURATION | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| All HOT Lanes | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Variable Pricing | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| HOT - ADDITIONAL LANE (WIDENING) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dedicated HOT Lane | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| All HOT Lanes | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Variable Pricing | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| ROADWAY WIDENING (ALL LANES HOV-3 - PM ONLY) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Scott Street to DAAH | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Lee Highway to DAAH | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Fairfax Drive to DAAH | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Scott Street to Sycamore Street | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| SPOT IMPROVEMENTS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fairfax Drive On-Ramp (Add Lanes) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Sycamore St/Washington Blvd. On-Ramp | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Improve Sight Distance | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Shoulder Improvements | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Lane Balancing | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| EXPRESS BUS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Improved Express Bus Service | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| In-Additional Dedicated HOV Lane | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Orange Line Reliever Services | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| ORANGE LINE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Orange Lane Improvements | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Additional Track/New Crossing | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| New Metro Line/New Crossing | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| BUS RAPID TRANSIT | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| I-66 - Additional Lane | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| US 29 Corridor | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| US 50 Corridor | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

○ = Greatly Improved upon 2030 CLRP ○ = Improved upon 2030 CLRP ○ = Comparable to 2030 CLRP ○ = Less Effective than 2030 CLRP ○ = Much Less Effective than 2030 CLRP NA = Not Applicable

100INSIDE000

VIRTUALLY ELIMINATE SPEED DIFFERENTIAL SAFETY HAZARD AND RAMP CONGESTION ON GEORGE WASHINGTON PARKWAY QUICKLY NO FUNDING USING ONLY STANDARD TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES

Citizen suggestion to Greater Washington Transportation Planning Board on 3/18/09

I am Carroll George, and today my suggestion is not, I repeat not, the one by which most of you know me for my repeated attempts to get the process of meshing two high density lanes of traffic together into a single lane of high density traffic by reforming the merge to eliminate the speed differential safety hazard between prevailing speed and stopped drivers.

Today my suggestion is to reveal how readily both a vast reduction in the prevalent safety hazard and ramp congestion in the traffic flow from the 14th Street Bridge to the GWP NB can quickly be accomplished using only standard MUTCD procedures without funding, no reform.

The details of my survey of the operation of the traffic flow at that site and my suggestion for quick relief of the congestion on that ramp, plus elimination of most if not all prevailing speed drivers speeding toward either stopped drivers or drivers initiating their acceleration from a stop, the profuse speed differential safety hazard so prevalent there, are contained in the attached letter of this date to Mr. Morteza Salehi, Northern Virginia VDOT Administrator.

Since there are so many suggestions coming to the powers that be, this idea of one citizen like me can easily fall into the cracks. However, with the help of this Board collectively, or even by individual members of stature, who see the sheer logic and promising results not requiring any funding and so quickly available on approval by functional authorities, the suggested action just might actually take place, providing much relief pending completion of the long range solution both north and south now in progress there.

The data I collected, and that VDOT surely has, is clear evidence that only using standard MUTCD traffic control devices and procedures that the gross congestion reaching back up on the bridge, waste of gas, emission of much unnecessary pollution, and risking of the gross speed differential safety hazard prevalent there, can be vastly reduced with dispatch pending completion of the long range solution there.

May I suggest this Board go on record requesting this action be taken and the news media take note of it. This particular bumper to bumper congestion does not show up on the weather station's traffic pulse because it is on a ramp, but the GWP shows yellow essentially all day on that weather station traffic pulse which shows clearly what an essential component the GW Parkway is for visitors and workers entering and exiting Washington throughout the day.

To park some day after 3PM for a bit where this data was taken would be most revealing for self of both the congestion and safety hazard there that can so easily be corrected. The angle of one's car mirrors is a real safety hazard at that intersection that just might be helped with a sign size cylindrical surfaced mirror installed at that intersection.

CARROLL H. GEORGE
3104 N. Inglewood Street
Arlington, VA 22207

March 18, 2009

Mr. Morteza Salehi, Administrator
Northern Virginia VDOT
14685 Avion Parkway
Chantilly, VA 20151

Dear Mr. Salehi,

This letter contains concrete flow data on the 3 to 5:40PM operation of the ramp from the 14th Street Bridge to the GW Parkway NB which was completely backed up onto the bridge for the entire period on 3/10, though a bit less so on 3/16. Quite a number of times I have joined the group backed up on that ramp between the middle and a third of the way across the bridge where it was interfering with the 395 traffic flow.

The data shows clearly that the two lane GWP flow rate during the entire period both days was seldom even close to 75% of one lane capacity, which is clear evidence that only using standard MUTCD traffic control devices that gross congestion, waste of valuable time, waste of gas, distribution of excess pollution, and the stopping gross speed differential safety hazard, can be vastly reduced with dispatch pending completion of the long range solution both north and south at the site.

On 3/10 and 3/16, parked about half way between the 395 overpass and the ramp from 3 PM to 5:40, I took 60 one minute counts of the flow both days at the 5 locations listed.

| | Average | 3/10 | Max | Average | 3/16 | Max | Accepted |
|---------------|-----------|---------|---------|-----------|---------|---------|-------------|
| Right lane to | 10.2/min, | 12/min, | 720/hr | 12.9/min, | 22/min, | 1320/h | capacity of |
| Left lane to | 11.2/min, | 16/min, | 960/hr | 16.8/min, | 28/min, | 1680/hr | 2 lanes |
| Ramp to | 18.4/min, | 25/min, | 1500/hr | 15.7/min, | 20/min, | 1200/hr | 4,500v/hr |
| GWP From | 43.2/min, | 51/min, | 3060/hr | 39.2/min, | 46/min, | 2760/hr | |
| GWP To | 21.4/min | 25/min, | 1500/hr | 30.7/min, | 39/min, | 2340/hr | |

The distance between the prior ramp entering the GWP north bound right lane and the constantly backed up ramp of this study, as estimated by map book scale, is about 800 feet, which should be adequate in that light traffic for any cars entering at that prior ramp to merge into the wide open spaces of the less than the average peak 1/2 capacity loaded left lane, except the lane line is now solid, keeping most right laners in the right lane, a hazard that can be virtually eliminated except for a few that may still not merge. Even a sign size cylindrically curved mirror at the junction could provide safer visibility for ramp drivers.

Logic indicates that GWP approach center lane line should be a broken line, and both the standard pictorial and MERGE LEFT signs be installed to vastly reduce the hazardous number of fast moving cars approaching stopped or initially accelerating ones.

Sincerely,

Carroll George
R&D Mechanical Design Engineer, Ret.
Driving since 1935