National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board
777 North Capitol Street, N.E., Suite 300, Washington, D.C. 20002-4290 (202) 962-3310 Fax: (202) 962-3202

Item 7

MEMORANDUM

May 16, 2007

TO: Transportation Planning Board

FROM: Ronald F. Kirby RFK
Director of Transportation Planning

SUBJECT: Additional Comments and Responses Received after the TPB Meeting Mailout on May 9 Regarding the I-66 Spot Improvements Project and the I-95/I-395 HOT Lanes Project

A copy of a May 10 letter from Congressman Moran is attached that provides comments on the proposed I-66 Spot Improvement project. This is followed by a copy of a May 15 letter from VDOT providing response to these comments.

At the May 9 Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting, a comment was made that the project description form in the mailout for the I-66 Spot Improvements Project did not indicate that the project requires a Congestion Management Documentation form. A revised project description form is attached that changed the responses to questions 23 and 24 to indicate this form is required. The Congestion Management Documentation forms for the I-66 Spot Improvements Project and the I-95/I-395 HOT Lanes Project are attached.

Copies of comments from organizations and individuals on these projects received after May 9 are also attached.

JAMES P. MORAN
8TH DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEES:
DEFENSE
INTERIOR

www.house.gov/moran

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives

WASHINGTON OFFICE:
2239 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515–4608
(202) 225–4376
FAX: (202) 225–0017

DISTRICT OFFICES:
333 N. FAIRFAX STREET
SUITE 201
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314
(703) 971–4700
FAX: (703) 922–9436

1900 CAMPUS COMMONS DRIVE
SUITE 100
RESTON, VA 20191
(703) 971–4700
FAX: (703) 922–9436

May 10, 2007

The Honorable Catherine M. Hudgins
Chairman
Transportation Planning Board
777 N. Capitol Street, N.E.
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20002

Dear Chairman Hudgins:

I wish to register my concerns with the proposed spot improvements that would add a third west-bound lane to segments of I-66 inside the Capital Beltway.

I am concerned that this project is the prelude to building a third lane on I-66 inside the Capital Beltway and bypassing the necessary environmental review requirements. Given both the potential benefits or adverse impact of a functional third lane, any attempt by the state to convert these spot improvements into an uninterrupted continuous lane must include a full environmental review with public hearings and a full alternative analysis.

As you know, the long-term solution to traffic delays and congestion on I-66 inside the Capital Beltway rests with the success of the future Dulles rail project. As such, preservation of the right of way within the I-66 corridor for future transit options needs to be preserved. Consistent with these concerns, I recommend that the any current or future proposals within this corridor adhere to the following parameters:

- First, any improvements should be done within the existing right-of-way and preserve the highly popular hiking and bike trails;

- Second, that any widening for the current proposed spot improvements be confined to locations where it would have the greatest benefit in congestion relief and the least impact on adjacent neighborhoods;

- Third, that the use of any future continuous third land be restricted. This restriction might either follow the current restrictions now in effect during peak congestion period or limit the new third lane to transit, HOV or future "HOT" lane use; and,

- Finally, I ask that local elected officials and public participation be vigorously pursued to ensure all mitigation, including soundwalls, and alternative options are fully aired and considered.

It is absolutely essential that we protect the integrity of neighborhoods affected by I-66 with remedies that reduce the environmental impacts a wider roadway will create.

Thank you for your consideration of this request. I look forward to your response.

Yours truly,

James P. Moran

JPM/tba

COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

DAVID S. EKERN, P.E.
COMMISSIONER

14685 Avion Parkway
Chantilly, VA 20151
(703) 383-VDOT (8368)

May 15, 2007

The Honorable Catherine Hudgins
Chairman, National Capital Region
Transportation Planning Board
Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments
777 North Capitol Street, N.E.; Suite 300
Washington, DC 20002-4201

Dear Chairman Hudgins:

The Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) is in receipt of a copy of the May 10, 2007 letter from Congressman James P. Moran regarding commenting on VDOT's proposed spot improvements on I-66 (inside the Capital Beltway). VDOT has reviewed the comments/concerns noted and is pleased to report that VDOT has addressed these concerns as documented in its updated CLRP project description form submitted to the TPB on May 9, 2007.

Congressman Moran's letter notes: (1) any improvement should be done within existing right of way and existing hiking and bike trails be preserved - that is what is being proposed, as noted in the CLRP form on page 4 under question 31; (2) that an environmental review with public hearings and full alternative analysis must be undertaken before a continuous lane is added – that is what VDOT intends to do as part of the detailed multi-modal environmental study it intends to undertake, as noted in the CLRP form on page 1; (3) any widening for the current spot improvements must be confined to locations of greatest benefit – that is what is being done; the Idea66 Feasibility Study evaluated where "bottleneck" conditions existed and identified the three locations where improvements are being proposed; (4) that use of a future continuous lane be restricted – as noted in the CLRP form, on page 1, VDOT intends to undertake a detailed multi-modal environmental study that will evaluate a set of multi-modal alternatives including new lanes with restriction; and (5) public participation be vigorously pursued – which VDOT fully intends to do as was done with the Idea 66 Feasibility Study and the Spot Improvements Study.

VDOT's detailed description in the updated (May 9, 2007) CLRP project description form for the spot improvements project addresses Mr. Moran's concerns. VDOT, as always, remains committed to develop solutions to address the congestion and mobility needs of the region that minimizes any environmental impacts.

I appreciate the opportunity to respond to suggestions/comments and thank you in advance for your assistance in having the Board act on the conformity inputs in the upcoming meeting.

Sincerely,

Dennis C. Morrison
District Administrator
VDOT – Northern Virginia District

Cc: Mr. James P. Moran, (with CLRP Project Description form)
Mr. Pierce Homer, Transportation Secretary, Commonwealth of Virginia (w/ CLRP form)
Ms. Julia Connally, CTB Member At-Large Urban (w/ CLRP form)
Mr. J. Douglas Koelemay, CTB Member NoVA Dist. (w/ CLRP form)
Mr. David Ekern, Commissioner, VDOT (w/ CLRP form)
Mr. Mathew Tucker, Director, VDRPT (w/ CLRP form)
Ms. Jo Anne Sorenson, Assistant District Engineer, VDOT

FINANCIALLY CONSTRAINED LONG-RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN FOR 2030
PROJECT DESCRIPTION FORM

BASIC PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Agency Project ID: VDOT Secondary Agency:
2. Project Type: _System Expansion; _ System Maintenance; X Operational Program; _ Study; _ Other
   (check all that apply) X Freeway; _Primary; _ Secondary; X Urban; _ Bridge; X Bike/Ped; _ Transit; _ CMAQ; X ITS; _ Enhancement; _ Other
3. Project Title Idea66 Spot Improvements Inside the Beltway

	Prefix	Route	Name	Modifier
4. Facility:	I	66 WB	Spot 1 Fairfax Dr to Sycamore St	Extend accel/decel la.
5. From (_ at):	I	66 WB	Spot 2 Washington Blvd to Dulles Airport Access Connector (DAAR)	Add accel/decel la.
6. To:	I	66 WB	Spot 3 Lee Hwy/Spout Run to Glebe Road	Extend accel/decel la.

7. Jurisdiction(s): Arlington/Fairfax
8. Description:

The Idea 66 Spot Improvements project addresses existing operational and safety related problems on three different stretches of westbound I-66, between the Rosslyn Tunnel in Arlington and the Dulles Airport Access Road in Fairfax County. The proposed project will extend and or add acceleration/deceleration lanes as noted above and described at the end of this section. Funding for the project is derived from SAFETEA-LU earmarks, federal NHS and state matching funds. These interim improvements were recommended for implementation by the Idea 66 Feasibility Study completed by VDOT and FHWA in March of 2005. In addition to recommending the implementation of these spot improvements, the Feasibility Study also recommended that a detailed multi-modal environmental study be undertaken to further study and identify the long term solutions for the congestion along I-66, inside the Beltway. The Preliminary Engineering phase of these spot improvements was amended into the 2005 CLRP and FY 2006-2011 TIP on January 18, 2006.

At the time of approving the Preliminary Engineering phase of the spot improvements, the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority and the TPB asked VDOT to seek funding for the long-range multimodal environmental study. TPB's resolution, TPB R11-2006, noted: "Separate from the action on this TIP amendment [for PE of spot improvements] …… NVTA asked that funding be sought for a long-range multimodal environmental document that will address the public transportation needs for the I-66 Multimodal Corridor. This document will include a comprehensive and objective evaluation of long-term public transportation needs in the I-66 multimodal corridor. Most importantly, analysis must address any potential conflicts between the proposed improvements and the planned extension of Metrorail to Tysons Corner. This evaluation should also address the ability to accommodate third and fourth Metrorail tracks in the median of I-66 inside the Beltway, should they be required for express service for the planned 23-mile Dulles Rail Extension into Loudoun County, or for the planned Orange Line extension to Centreville or Gainesville, or to maintain adequate Metrorail capacity within Arlington County. As part of the multimodal environmental document, VDOT should study value pricing and relatively low-cost traffic-operation, solutions such as provision of express bus service and HOV-3."

VDRPT and VDOT are seeking funding for the study as part of the agency's FY 2008 program. The TPB will be notified when VDOT receives funding and initiates this study.

Spot 1 Arlington County– Extend existing westbound acceleration / deceleration lane (1.5 miles) from Fairfax Drive on-ramp to existing deceleration lane at Sycamore Street off ramp to reduce congestion and improve safety by reducing short distance weave and merge movement.

Spot 2 Arlington and Fairfax Counties– Add a continuous acceleration /deceleration lane from Sycamore St/Washington Blvd on ramp to existing Dulles Airport Access Ramp Rte 267 (1.6 miles).

Spot 3 Arlington – Extend existing acceleration lane from Lee Hwy/Spout Run on-ramp to existing deceleration lane at Glebe Road off ramp to create a continuous acceleration / deceleration lane (0.9 miles).

Work on all three projects will be within existing ROW, including any required retaining and sound walls relocations or additions. All the proposed spot improvements encompass design evaluation of enforcement areas / safety pull offs, sight distance improvements, ramp metering, signing, traffic management systems, and reconstruction of the shoulder to provide for emergency evacuation.

9. Bicycle or Pedestrian Accommodations: _ Not Included; X Included; _ Primarily a Bike/Ped Project; _ N/A
10. Total Miles: Three improvements totaling approximately 4 miles
11. Project Manager: L&D Project Manager – Jeff Daily 12. E-Mail: Jeff.Daily@VirginiaDOT.org
13. Project Information URL: www.virginiadot.org/projects/const-project.asp?ID=404
14. Projected Completion Year: 30% design plans completed 2008, 100% design plans completed 2010 or Design Build construction beginning 2010
15. Actual Completion Year: N/A ____Project is ongoing. Year refers to implementation.
16. his project is being withdrawn from the Plan as of: N/A
17. Total cost (in Thousands): Spot 1 – $31.6M (PE$3.6M, CN $28M), Spot 2 – $29.9M (PE $3.4M, CN $26.5M), Spot 3 – $14.1M (PE $1.6M, CN $12.5M): Total costs for all three improvements – $75.6M
18. Remaining cost (in Thousands):
19. Funding Sources: X Federal; X State; _ Local; _ Private; _ Bonds; _ Other

CONGESTION MANAGEMENT INFORMATION

20. Do traffic congestion conditions necessitate the proposed project? X Yes; _ No
21. If so, describe those conditions: X Recurring congestion; _ Non-site specific congestion; _ Frequent incident-related, non-recurring congestion; _ Other
22. Is this a capacity-increasing project on a limited access highway or other arterial highway of a functional class higher than minor arterial? X Yes; No
23. If yes, does this project require a Congestion Management Documentation form under the given criteria (see *Call for Projects* document)? X Yes; No
24. If not, please identify the criteria that exempt the project here:
    _ The number of lane-miles added to the highway system by the project totals less than 1 lane-mile
    X The project is an intersection reconstruction or other traffic engineering improvement, including replacement of an at-grade intersection with an interchange
    _ The project will not allow motor vehicles, such as a bicycle or pedestrian facility
    _ The project consists of preliminary studies or engineering only, and is not funded for construction
    _ The project received NEPA approval on or before April 6, 1992
    _ The project was already under construction on or before September 30, 1997, or construction funds were already committed in the FY98-03 TIP.
    _ The construction costs for the project are less than $5 million.

SAFETEA-LU PLANNING FACTORS

25. Please identify any and all planning factors that are addressed by this project:

X Support the economic vitality of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency.

X Increase the safety of the transportation system for all motorized and non-motorized users.

a. Is this project being proposed specifically to address a safety issue? X Yes; _ No

b. Please identify issues: _ High accident location; _ Pedestrian safety; _Other
_ Truck or freight safety; X Engineer-identified problem

c. Briefly describe (in quantifiable terms, where possible) the nature of the safety problem:

Existing levels of congestion is exacerbated by the intense weaving and merging movements happening over a short distance along with inadequate sight distance. The recurring congestion and associated operational/safety effects poses concerns on the corridor's ability to serve as an efficient emergency evacuation route.

X Increase the ability of the transportation system to support homeland security and to safeguard the personal security of all motorized and non-motorized users.

X Increase accessibility and mobility of people and freight.

_ Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, improve the quality of life, and promote consistency between transportation improvements and State and local planned growth and economic development patterns.

_ Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight.

X Promote efficient system management and operation.

_ Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system.

ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION

26. Have any potential mitigation activities been identified for this project? _ Yes; X No

27. If yes, what types of mitigation activities have been identified?

_ Air Quality; _ Floodplains; _ Socioeconomics; _ Geology, Soils and Groundwater; Vibrations;

_ Energy; _ Noise; _ Surface Water; _ Hazardous and Contaminated Materials; _ Wetlands

INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS

28. Is this an Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) project as defined in federal law and regulation, and therefore subject to Federal Rule 940 Requirements? _ Yes; X No
This project is not an ITS project, however, this project will include ITS component and therefore the ITS component will comply with the applicable requirements of Rule 940.

29. If yes, what is the status of the systems engineering analysis compliant with Federal Rule 940 for the project? _X Not Started; _ Ongoing, not complete; _ Complete
VDOT has developed a User Guide and Rule 940 checklist which will be adhered to ensure compliance with applicable Rule 940 requirements.

30. Under which Architecture:

_ DC, Maryland or Virginia State Architecture

_ WMATA Architecture

X_ COG/TPB Regional ITS Architecture

X_ Other, please specify: VDOT Northern Region ITS Architecture
(http://www.vdot-itsarch.com/Default.htm)

31. **Other Comments:**

The National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board (TPB) in approving the preliminary engineering work for the proposed project on January 18 2006 (resolution No. TPB R11-2006), indicated six points of clarification that were to be incorporated into the study. The following notes how these points have been incorporated into the overall agency's activities.

1. Coordination with the planned extension of Metrorail to Tysons so as to not preclude a third Metrorail track:

   VDOT is a member of the planning team working directly with DRPT and Dulles Rail project staff on the Dulles Rail project. DRPT exhibits show the proposed Dulles Rail location within the existing median of I-66. The proposed spot improvement **is not within the median** but ~~and is~~ on the outside of the westbound lanes[1]. **The proposed spot improvements on westbound I 66 thus do not preclude the Metrorail extension to Tysons, a third Metrorail track** and**/or** any express bus operations. The proposed projects are interim improvements to address operational and safety issues in the near term. The long term solutions for the corridor include a detailed NEPA study comparing all modal alternatives. The design of a third rail may require portions of the roadway to be relocated and/or design exceptions for narrow shoulders. **Once the engineering design drawings for the project are completed, these will be shared with the CTB, NVTA and local jurisdictions to demonstrate that the planned extension of Metrorail to Tysons or a third Metrorail track will not be precluded.**

2. Certify that project complies with NEPA:

   VDOT is in full compliance with all requirements of NEPA. VDOT recommended and FHWA concurred that a Categorical Exclusion (CE) is the appropriate level of level of NEPA document for the spot improvements. Work on the CE documentation is underway. The public will have the opportunity to review and comment on this document at the Public Hearing to be scheduled later this year.

3. Clarify if all proposed construction can occur within existing right of way and adjacent parkland and Custis trail will be maintained:

   The right of way boundaries were validated by a detailed land survey and the finding was that the proposed construction can occur within the existing Commonwealth right of way. Proposed construction will maintain adjacent parkland and trails. VDOT has verified the adequacy of the I-66 right-of-way to accommodate the spot improvements that are being designed and constructed during this phase of the study. An exhaustive review of courthouse records of deeds, titles and property plats along the corridor has been completed. The plat description and features, including property lines and corners, were verified using a project coordinate system and field instruments during an actual on-the-ground survey. **Once the engineering design drawings for the project are completed, these will be shared with the CTB, NVTA and local jurisdictions to demonstrate that the adjacent parkland and Custis trail will be maintained.**

   The right-of-way mapping may be viewed at VDOT or Arlington County as listed below:

VDOT	Arlington County
14685 Avion Parkway, Plan Room	2100 Clarendon Blvd, Suite 900
Chantilly, VA 20151	Arlington, VA 22201
Theresa DeFore at 703-383-2150	Tamara Ashby at 703-228-3833

1. Dulles Rail Env. Conditions document: Sheet 1 of 6 (rev 03-17-06) & Rail Sections:K56-TW-001-003 (rev 01/24/06).

4. Evaluation of HOV enforcement areas, a continuous 12-foot shoulder, signing, TMS and ramp metering has been included in the current PE work and where validated as needed will be included in the design and construction:

This work includes coordination with the VA State Police to identify locations for enforcement areas, improvements to the signing and the variable message signs, and redesign and upgrade of the ramp metering in the westbound direction within the project limits. **The project designs will focus on the safety aspects of the facility including adequate shoulders. As preliminary designs are completed, these will be shared with all stake holders, including the CTB, TPB and NVTA. VDOT's design practices emphasize safety and will ensure that any design impacts on operations are adequately mitigated. It must be noted that all designs and design exceptions have to comply with the FHWA requirements and oversight**.

5. Coordination with ongoing efforts to develop a regional emergency evacuation plan: VDOT is an active participant in the state's and MWCOG's efforts in developing regional emergency coordination plans:

Working with the state of Maryland, the District and MWCOG staff, the Virginia emergency coordination includes Virginia Department of Emergency Management (VDEM), Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT), Virginia State Police (VSP) Department of Rail & Public Transportation (DRPT) American Red Cross, Department of Health Services (DHS), Department of Corrections (DOC), Department of Military Affairs (DMA), Local Jurisdictions, and National Park Service (NPS). The basic framework for an operational evacuation plan.

a. Provides a basic plan that could be implemented in the interim should an event occur prior to completion of a more detailed plan.
b. Synchronizes the efforts of all State agencies during a major evacuation within this area.
c. Provides a Virginia evacuation plan to synchronize mutual supporting plans of local jurisdictions within Region VII (Northern Virginia).
d. Provides basic concepts which can be incorporated into plans being developed by other organizations within the NCR and the National Park Service.

The design of the proposed spot improvements fully considers the benefits that could be provided for efficient traffic movement along westbound I 66 in events of emergency as anticipated by the regional emergency plans.

6. Safety (along westbound I 66)will not be degraded: The proposed spot improvements will improve safety due to the enhanced access and egress conditions, improved signage, improved sight distance and other project evaluations and designs:

Specific safety issues that will be addressed with the spot improvements include lengthening weaving and merging areas, decreasing speed fluctuations, improving level of service (LOS) to reduce "stop and go" crashes, increasing additional storage capacity for incidents on the mainline and reducing travel time for emergency responders.

CONGESTION MANAGEMENT DOCUMENTATION FORM FOR PROJECTS IN THE 2030 CLRP

BASIC PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Agency: VDOT Secondary Agency:

2. Project Title: Idea66 Spot Improvements Inside the Beltway

4. Facility:

Prefix	Route	Name	Modifier
I	66 WB	Spot 1 Fairfax Dr to Sycamore St	Extend accel/decel la.
I	66 WB	Spot 2 Washington Blvd to Dulles Airport Access Connector (DAAR)	Add accel/decel la.
I	66 WB	Spot 3 Lee Hwy/Spout Run to Glebe Road	Extend accel/decel la.

5. From (_ at): Fairfax Drive, Arlington County

6. To: Dulles Airport Access Road, Fairfax County

7. Jurisdiction(s): Arlington and Fairfax Counties

8. Indicate whether the proposed project's location is subject to or benefits significantly from any of the following in-place congestion management strategies:

Yes Metropolitan Washington Commuter Connections program (ridesharing, telecommuting, guaranteed ride home, employer programs)

_ A Transportation Management Association is in the vicinity

_ Channelized or grade-separated intersection(s) or roundabouts

_ Reversible, turning, acceleration/deceleration, or bypass lanes

Yes High occupancy vehicle facilities or systems

Yes Transit stop (rail or bus) within a 1/2 mile radius of the project location

_ Park-and-ride lot within a one-mile radius of the project location

Yes Real-time surveillance/traffic device controlled by a traffic operations center

Yes Motorist assistance/hazard clearance patrols

_ Interconnected/coordinated traffic signal system

_ Other in-place congestion management strategy or strategies (briefly describe below:)

9. List and briefly describe how the following categories of (additional) strategies were considered as full or partial alternatives to single-occupant vehicle capacity expansion in the study or proposal for the project.

a. Transportation demand management measures, including growth management and congestion pricing

The facility benefits from the regional rideshare program, Commuter Connections that is jointly funded by Virginia, Maryland and the District of Columbia. Commuter Connections and its many program elements are all demand management strategies. Additionally VDOT and VDRPT provide funding and technical expertise to Arlington and Fairfax Counties to implement rideshare assistance programs within their jurisdictions aimed at demand management.

b. Traffic operational improvements

The entry ramps to this stretch of I-66, where the spot improvements are being proposed, are being managed with ramp metering. The freeway also has surveillance and motorist assistance programs aimed at monitoring and managing traffic operations. The purpose of the spot improvements being proposed are in fact to address traffic operational problems caused in part by the short merge, weave and diverge areas on this stretch of I-66.

c. Public transportation improvements

Public transportation service providers in the corridor include WMATA and Arlington County. VDOT understands that these service providers do examine their service routes and make enhancements as needed to address the changing demand. The Spot improvements being proposed are interim in nature and are intended to address traffic operational issues. VDOT plans to address the longer term demand and capacity issues of the corridor in a separate detailed multi-modal environmental study and identify the long term solutions for the congestion along I-66, inside the Beltway. A variety of public transportation strategies will be examined as part of the alternatives improvement scenarios in this multi-modal study. VDOT has currently requested funding for the study.

d. Intelligent Transportation Systems technologies

Ramp metering, variable message signs and freeway surveillance system are part of the ITS components that are currently operational on this stretch of the facility. VDOT's Smart Traffic Center program continues to upgrade the system components as needed and when funding becomes available. The Spot improvements project will evaluate the existing ramp metering and variable/static message signs and upgrade them as needed within the project limits. The long term multi-modal study VDOT intends to undertake for this facility will also look examine for any new / enhancements ITS components as part of the long term solution.

e. Other congestion management strategies

The long term multi-modal study VDOT intends to undertake for the facility will include a comprehensive examination of existing congestion management strategies and evaluate the need for any new/enhanced strategies.

f. Combinations of the above strategies

As above.

10. Could congestion management alternatives fully eliminate or partially offset the need for the proposed increase in single-occupant vehicle capacity? Explain why or why not.

No. As noted earlier the proposed improvements are to address operational problems caused by geometric conditions of the short merge, weave and diverge areas along this heavily used facility. Ramp metering, one of the most effective tools to manage demand on freeways, is currently being used.

11. Describe all congestion management strategies that are going to be incorporated into the proposed highway project.

As noted earlier, the facility currently benefits from a comprehensive set of congestion management strategies. No additional congestion management strategies are being proposed as part of this interim operational/safety improvement project.

12. Describe the proposed funding and implementation schedule for the congestion management strategies to be incorporated into the proposed highway project. Also describe how the effectiveness of strategies implemented will be monitored and assessed after implementation.

As noted above, there are no new congestion management strategies being proposed as part of the spot improvements project, but rather a continuation of the comprehensive set of congestion management strategies. The geometric changes being proposed as part of this project are expected to relieve congestion and improve safety. The TIP form describes the funding for the spot improvements project.

CONGESTION MANAGEMENT DOCUMENTATION FORM FOR PROJECTS IN THE 2030 CLRP

BASIC PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Agency Project ID: Secondary Agency:
2. Project Type: ✓ System Expansion; _ System Maintenance; _ Operational Program; _ Study; _ Other
   (check all that apply) ✓ Freeway; _ Primary; _ Secondary; ✓ Urban; _ Bridge; _ Bike/Ped; _ Transit; _ CMAQ; _ ITS; _ Enhancement; _ Other
3. Project Title: **I-95 / I-395 HOV / Bus / HOT Lanes Project**
4. Facility: I-95 / 395
5. From (_ at): Eads Street, Arlington County
6. To: Route 610 (Garrisonville Road), Stafford County

No.	Route	Connection Location:	Morning connections:	Evening connections:	Type of Modification:
1	I 395	Eads Street	NB HOT Lanes to Eads Street	Eads Street to SB HOT Lanes	Expanded
2	I 395	Between South Hayes Street and Washington Blvd.	SB Express Lanes to SB general purpose lanes	SB Express Lanes to SB general purpose lanes	Deleted (to accommodate No. 1 above) [1]
3	I 395	VA 402 (Shirlington Circle)	NB HOT Lanes to Shirlington Circle	Shirlington Circle to SB HOT Lanes	New
4	I 395	VA 420 (Seminary Road)	NB HOT Lanes to Seminary Road	Seminary Road to SB HOT Lanes	New [1] (Bus only access)
5	I 95	Between VA 236 (Duke Street) and VA 648 (Edsall Road)	NB HOT Lanes to NB general purpose lanes	N/A	New
6	I 95	VA 7100 (Fairfax County Parkway)	N/A	Fairfax County Parkway to SB HOT Lanes	New
7	I 95	Between VA 7100 (Fairfax County Pkwy) and VA 638 (Pohick Road)	N/A	SB HOV Lanes to SB general purpose lanes	Deleted (to accommodate No. 6 above) [1]
8A	I 95	Between VA 7100 (Fairfax County Pkwy) and VA 642 (Lorton Road)	NB HOT Lanes to NB general purpose lanes	N/A	New
8B	I 95	Between VA 7100 (Fairfax County Pkwy) and VA 642 (Lorton Road)	NB HOT Lanes to new bus station, back to NB HOT lanes (Buses only)	SB HOT lanes to new bus station, back to SB HOT lanes (Buses only)	New, reversible bus-only ramp
9	I 95	Between VA 123 (Gordon Road) and VA 3000 (Prince William County Parkway)	NB HOT Lanes to NB general purpose lanes	SB HOT Lanes to SB general purpose lanes	New
10	I 95	Between VA 610 (Cardinal Drive) and US 234 (Dumfries Road)	NB HOT Lanes to NB general purpose lanes	N/A	New
11	I 95	Between US 234 (Dumfries Road) and VA 610 (Garrisonville Road)	N/A	SB HOT Lanes to SB general purpose lanes	Expanded

[1] Integration of this proposed modification in the project design is currently under evaluation.

7. Jurisdiction(s): Arlington County, City of Alexandria, Fairfax County, Prince William County, Town of Dumfries, Stafford County

8. Indicate whether the proposed project's location is subject to or benefits significantly from any of the following in-place congestion management strategies:

- ✓ Metropolitan Washington Commuter Connections program (ridesharing, telecommuting, guaranteed ride home, employer programs)
- _ A Transportation Management Association is in the vicinity
- _ Channelized or grade-separated intersection(s) or roundabouts
- ✓ Reversible, turning, acceleration/deceleration, or bypass lanes
- ✓ High occupancy vehicle facilities or systems
- ✓ Transit stop (rail or bus) within a 1/2 mile radius of the project location
- ✓ Park-and-ride lot within a one-mile radius of the project location
- ✓ Real-time surveillance/traffic device controlled by a traffic operations center
- ✓ Motorist assistance/hazard clearance patrols
- ✓ Interconnected/coordinated traffic signal system
- _ Other in-place congestion management strategy or strategies (briefly describe below:)

9. List and briefly describe how the following categories of (additional) strategies were considered as full or partial alternatives to single-occupant vehicle capacity expansion in the study or proposal for the project.

a. Transportation demand management measures, including growth management and congestion pricing

- The I-95/395 HOV/Bus/HOT Project will employ dynamic pricing as a transportation demand management program in the corridor. These tolls will target SOV ("single occupancy vehicles") and non-HOV 3+ vehicles, while HOV-3+ vehicles and buses will not be charged a toll.
- The dynamic pricing will vary based on the time of day, the day of the week, and the level of congestion. In essence, as congestion levels increase in the HOV/Bus/HOT lanes, toll levels will be raised to manage SOV demand in the lanes. In addition the variation of tolls by time of day will contribute to the retiming of trips to less congested periods.
- Additional transit services, both routes and frequencies, have been included as part of the proposal for the project. These factors are two of the most significant contributors to transit mode choice and as such the improvements are anticipated to increase demand and usage of transit along the corridor.
- Additional park-and-ride capacity will be provided along the corridor for transit and local informal carpools ("sluggers"). Both of which are designed to facilitate the use of high occupancy vehicles and transit services.

b. Traffic operational improvements

- The Project also proposes to address a traffic operational issue noted with the existing HOV system. During peak PM periods, traffic traveling in a southbound direction in the current HOV system is often congested at the point in which the HOV lanes terminate and merge into the general purpose lanes at Dumfries. This project proposes to relieve this current congestion problem by both expanding this current merge point, and providing for the extension of a single lane for 9 miles, to be used by southbound HOT lanes traffic, from Dumfries to Route 610 (Garrisonville Road) in Stafford County.
- The Project proposes to make improvements at Eads Street, the proposed northern termination point (for tolling purposes) of the HOT lanes. Improvements at Eads would affect both am and pm peak traffic, and provide for additional lanes for HOV/HOT lane traffic exiting at Eads, including a ramp dedicated exclusively for use by buses exiting into/out of the Pentagon reservation.

c. Public transportation improvements

- There are numerous transit elements integrated into this Project, including an increase in bus service along the I-95/395 corridor, expansion of HOV capacity from two lanes to three lanes, an increase or expansion of access points between the HOV/Bus/HOT lanes and the general purpose lanes, and other infrastructure additions and improvements along the corridor.
- The transit plan proposed by the Project provides for additional transit services in the I-95/395 corridor in the form of new and expanded bus services. This is a preliminary transit plan that has been developed for the conformity analysis, and is based on what is reasonably expected to be funded by this Project. The Transit Advisory Committee ("TAC"), a group established by the VA Secretary of Transportation to facilitate coordination between the transit service providers in the corridor and the Project, is developing a detailed Transit/TDM Plan.
- The proposed new and expanded bus service in the I-95/395 corridor will add about 40,000 hours of bus service in 2010, about 80,000 hours of bus service in 2020 and about 88,000 hours of bus service is 2030. Compared to the bus services assumed for the base year (2006) in the CLRP these additional hours of bus service represents an increase of approximately 11% in 2010, 22% in 2020 and 25% in 2030. These increases in bus operating hours in the corridor will be realized via addition of new routes and reducing headways of services currently assumed in the CLRP in the respective years.
- In addition, the seamless, free-flowing network of the HOV/Bus/HOT lanes, park & ride lots and access points along the corridor will create the opportunity for current public, private regional/local service providers to expand their existing services, or provide new services to key activity and employment centers in the I-95/395 and I-495 corridors beyond that which is included in this Project.
- Beyond the addition of the above high quality bus service and the opportunities afforded to existing transit providers through the addition of new/expanded infrastructure, the Project also proposes to provide a bus-only ramp into and out of the Pentagon at Eads Street (part of the northern terminus of the HOT lanes), a transit-only access ramp at Seminary Road in the City of Alexandria, and a reversible bus-only ramp from the HOT lanes into and out of a new bus station located adjacent to the Lorton VRE Station. A pedestrian bridge would provide access between the proposed bus station and the VRE station.
- The Project proposes to add six (6) park & ride facilities, an equivalent of 3,000 additional parking spaces, to the network of park & ride lots along the corridor. The Project has proposed one facility be located in Fairfax County, two in Prince William County, two in Stafford County and one in Spotsylvania County. The location plans for these lots are being developed in consultation with the local jurisdictions and the TAC. The Project also proposes to provide enhancements to several existing bus stations/stops along the corridor.
- Once the I-95/395 HOV lanes have been converted into HOV/Bus/HOT lanes, they will still be classified as "fixed guideway miles" for purposes of the transit funding formulas administered by the Federal Transit Administration.

d. Intelligent Transportation Systems technologies

This Project employs numerous "ITS" technologies. For instance:

- Dynamic pricing;
- Fully electronic (free flow) tolling;
- 24-hour monitoring/surveillance of the roadway;
- Lane management signs – where the shoulders are inadequate;
- Continuous data collection;
- Variable message signage along the I-95/395 corridor;
- Signage located on arterial approach roads; communicating information to users in advance of getting on I-95/395
- Website to support Travel Demand Management (linked to VDOT website and 511 service)

e. Other congestion management strategies

f. Combinations of the above strategies

10. Could congestion management alternatives fully eliminate or partially offset the need for the proposed increase in single-occupant vehicle capacity? Explain why or why not.

- The congestion management alternatives, such as those listed above, are expected to make a significant contribution to offsetting the growth in single occupant vehicles. However, existing levels of traffic demand and congestion in the corridor, coupled with the expected growth in traffic volumes, indicate that there has been a clear and growing need for additional capacity relief.
- The congestion management strategies outlined in this document have been collectively designed to make best use of the available resources by provide the additional capacity for all vehicles while maintaining and/or improving the services and benefits specifically available to non-SOV's.

11. Describe all congestion management strategies that are going to be incorporated into the proposed highway project.

Please see Question 9 above.

12. Describe the proposed funding and implementation schedule for the congestion management strategies to be incorporated into the proposed highway project. Also describe how the effectiveness of strategies implemented will be monitored and assessed after implementation.

Schedule

- Construction for the Project is projected to begin in early 2008, with an estimated construction completion time of two and a half years. The facility is expected to enter operations in mid to late 2010. The current schedule calls for environmental review in compliance with Federal (NEPA) and state regulations.

Financial Plan

- The Project will be constructed using a combination of private equity and third party debt, including private bank loans and/or Private Activity Bonds, with the potential for TIFIA funding as a form of subordinated debt. As the Project progresses, the project's private consortium partners will explore all avenues of funding to ensure the lowest cost of capital for the Project. The Project will not require Commonwealth or Federal funding support.
- The Consortium partners operating the facility will be fully authorized to collect tolls on the facility, which will serve to pay debt service, operating/maintenance costs (including enforcement and transit operations) and return on equity. Toll revenue will be the main source of revenue. The Commonwealth will enter into a Comprehensive Agreement with FTU, which will authorize them to raise the necessary funds to construct the Project.

GREATER WASHINGTON
Board of Trade

Growing Business. Building Community.

May 10, 2007

The Honorable Catherine M. Hudgins
Chair
National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board
777 North Capitol St., N.E. – Suite 300
Washington, DC 20002-4290

Dear Chair Hudgins:

Thank you for your leadership of the Transportation Planning Board. In view of the Transportation Planning Board's expected consideration of the scope of work for air quality conformity assessment for the 2007 CLRP, I am writing to reiterate our support for the I-395 / I-95 / HOV / Bus / HOT lanes proposal and spot improvements to I-66 inside the Beltway.

One of the Board of Trade's top transportation priorities is a region-wide system of HOT lanes. A key opportunity before the TPB in this regard are plans for added HOT lanes and new transit capacity within the existing I-395 / I-95 right-of-way. This project will be financed by private investment and by tolls from those who chose to use the new improvements. An added benefit is that excess revenue, purposefully designed into this project, will be designated to the Commonwealth of Virginia to use for transit improvements within this transportation corridor.

The second project providing important relief to traffic congestion is spot improvements on I-66 inside the Capital Beltway. Providing relief from regularly occurring congestion on this section of I-66 is important both for potential future HOT lanes as well as to alleviate backups that result in wasted time, fuel, unnecessary air pollution and diversion of I-66 traffic onto Arlington's neighborhood streets. This project is also needed to provide for emergency evacuation of the District of Columbia in the event of future threats to Homeland Security.

We respectfully urge you to retain these important projects in the 2007 CLRP and move them forward post haste. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Michael G. Anzilotti
Co-Chair
Transportation and Environment Committee

1725 I Street, NW, Suite 200 Washington, DC 20006 T 202.857.5900 F 202.223.2648 www.bot.org

Ron Kirby

From: Thom Barry [tb2arch@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2007 12:42 PM
To: TPBPublicComment; Ron Kirby
Cc: czimmerman@arlingtonva.us
Subject: Widening 66

Attachments: WDCMetroTrans.jpg

WDCMetroTrans.jpg (759 KB)

The following is the same content as the attachment.

---

16 May 2007

To: The Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments' Transportation Planning Board
c/o TPBPublicComment@mwcog.org, rkirby@mwcog.org

Re: Widening 66

To all members of the Transportation Planning Board,

In considering widening 66 please account for the following.

Givens:

1) Urban areas are concentrations of human activity for the purpose of commerce and sedentary living.

2) Urban areas are located along transportation access routes for ease of access for 'outside' trade.

3) Studied urban plans segregate, limit and/or remove automobile access as a primary part of increasing habitability.

Conclusions:

a) An urban area does reach a point where it is too big to reduce transportation times both internally and externally. The WDC Metro Area has passed that point. Widening access routes into WDC will only expand the surrounding "support" area and increase - not decrease - congestion to an ever increasing distance away from WDC.

b) Widening roads is a short term solution that has failed. The pressure to widen 66 is based on population having purchased cheap housing outside the city in exchange for increased commuting time. Now that the commuting time has increased due to that decisions making the desire is to widen the roads. But in reality only more cheap housing will be built to fill the roadway with new commuters. This is a failure in mass transit and master planning.

c) A wider 66 will not decrease environmental pollution. It will support development of non self sustaining communities that will be more greatly impacted by rising energy constraints, lost man-hours on the road, increased infrastructure installation and maintenance cost, and displaced agriculture. It will create a larger volume of cars sitting and not moving generating a higher volume of emissions.

d) State (regional) transportation funds are being used to supplement bad planning of commercial centers and cheap housing developments that will require

greater resources in the future to maintain.

Suggestion:

i) Regional Transportation Planning needs to revise its thinking from Concentric Ring Theory and supplemental Linear City Theory and accept that all planning requires some self constraints.

ii) Look at self sustaining concentrated commercial and residential centers planned around region wide access each tied together to allow mutual swapping of population, agriculture and ecosystem resources and specialized commercial capabilities. We now need to be planning region wide urban interaction to offset spreading megalopolis. Parasitic development needs to stop and symbiotic development needs to start.

Thank you for your attention.

Thomas Buford
Architect

cc: Frank Wolf FAX (202) 225-0437
Christopher Zimmerman czimmerman@arlingtonva.us

April 20, 2007

To Selected Members of the Transportation Planning Board

Sirs:

I am writing in opposition to the proposed conversion of I-395 to HOT lanes. Attached is a copy of the letter to the Washington Post I wrote on this subject.

I have commuted on the HOV lanes since 1988 and would be glad to discuss this with members of the board.

Sincerely,

Bob Hugman
14550 Gilroy Ct
Woodbridge, VA 22193

Home 703-878-0945
Wk 703-373-6635
rhugman@icfi.com
bhugman@comcast.net

Hugman, Robert

From: Bob and Carolyn Hugman [bhugman@comcast.net]
Sent: Sunday, March 25, 2007 1:58 PM
To: closetohome@washpost.com
Cc: Bob and Carolyn Hugman; Hugman, Robert; bhugman@hotmail.com
Subject: Don't Allow I-395 to be Converted to HOT Lanes

Don't Allow I-395 to be Converted to HOT Lanes

As a long-time commuter on the I-95/395 HOV lanes, I am against the proposed conversion by the Virginia Department of Transportation of these HOV lanes to High Occupancy Toll (HOT) lanes. The Post has reported that the operators are forecasting that tolls may be as high as $40 roundtrip ($800 per month if paid every day) from Woodbridge to the Pentagon. This truly puts this project in the category of "Lexus Lanes"
with only the affluent able to access them regularly without being part of a carpool. (HOV-3 would at least initally be free). However, my reasons for opposing HOT lanes go far beyond this aspect of the project.

A HOT conversion of 395 represents a game of roulette with the most successful HOV system in the country. This HOV system has been operating for decades and is the mass transit mode for something like 30,000 people each day. No other HOT lane conversion in the country has dealt with a carpool corridor that was as successful. HOT lane agreements typically allow the private developer to obtain a contract for 50 to 60 years. We are handing over a taxpayer-paid infrastructure for decades to come, and will relinquish much of the control over it.

Since this is a profit-based venture, the developers are going to push for tolls and policies that will maximize profit. But the news media and county leaders have not been asking the difficult questions that surround this aspect of the project. The biggest question that comes to mind is: "What happens if the profits don't materialize as projected, or there are financial losses?" To me, the obvious possibilities are that either the proposed southern extension to Fredericksburg is impacted or the state must allow the tolling of carpools. Tolling of carpools will reduce the incentive to carpool since the regular lanes will be free.

I am a skeptic when it comes to the concept of "dynamic tolling." This is a system of changing the toll rate perhaps as often as every few minutes to maintain traffic flow. The theory is that if there are too many toll vehicles, then the tolls will be increased, thus encouraging many cars to go back to the regular lanes. Sorry, but by the time the lanes start clogging, it will be too late to make this kind of adjustment on a timely basis. Does anyone really believe that toll payers will wait in line to get out of the HOT lane to go back to even slower-moving regular lanes? The success of this project depends upon the ability of dynamic tolling to adjust traffic flow. I submit that this is an experiment that will fail because of the corridor's high utilization rate, exit contraints, and the 14th Street Bridge bottleneck. No system of dynamic tolling elsewhere has approached the complexity of this project with as many carpool vehicles, so we will be acting as guinea pigs.

Enforcement and safety are also concerns that have been minimized. All enforcement will have to be a the entry/exit points, because single occupant vehicles will be assumed legal once in the lanes. Carpools will be inconvenienced relative to toll-payers because carpool verification will have to be by visual inspection, and it appears obvious that carpools will have to be verified on each trip. As for safetly, the I-395 segment will apparently have only a 3 foot shoulder on one side to make way for three narrow lanes and a right-hand shoulder. The narrow lanes will create a hazard.

One possible compromise if we must have HOT would be to allow HOT lanes only on the portion of I-95 outside the Beltway. This would allow the system to connect to the Virginia Beltway HOT lanes that will run between Springfield and Tyson's Corner without having such bad consequences for 395.

Finally, the U.S. Congress should have a say regarding this or any Interstate Highway project that impacts a successful HOV system.

Harrison, Goldie

From: Strand, Paul [Paul.Strand@cbn.org]
Sent: Monday, April 30, 2007 8:53 AM
To: Hunter Mill BOS Email
Subject: Concerning the possible widening of I-66

Dear Ms. Hudgins:

I'm writing this note to you since you're a member of the TPB. Please be aware that there are many, many bicyclists like myself who use the Custis Trail and the W&OD Trail as a crucial part of our bike commute to work everyday. We are worried the impact of widening I-66 might have on these trails, especially the Custis. Please take these concerns into consideration as you ponder the future of I-66.

I'm a constant evangelist for getting people out of their cars and onto their bikes. The number one concern they have about getting around on their bikes is whether or not they'll have to face automobile traffic. The trails we have around the Washington Metro area are therefore my main selling point for allaying their fears. Please do all you can to keep the present bike trails unhampered by traffic projects like the proposed I-66 widening...and please push whenever you can for expanding trails and creating new ones. It's a wonderful way to cut pollution, lessen congestion and promote health.

Thanks you,

Paul Strand
2826 Woodlawn Ave, Falls Church VA 22042
paul.strand@cbn.org