

**Option A concerns:**

Why are the taxpayers making a major dollar investment along Abram St to the east, only to have the city and its special interest buddy decide to then bottleneck that investment at downtown?

I do not understand why the citizens were not told of this bottleneck plan during the 2008 city bond campaign when the city officials seeked the funding for this project.

Why didn't city officials, the Arlington Chamber of Commerce executives pushing that bond, and Downtown Arlington Management Corporation (DAMC) tell the public the whole truth?

In fact, it is my understanding that main Arlington Chamber of Commerce executive pushing this thing in 2008 even got bond money contract(s) for his company. How much 2008 bond money did he receive? My understanding is we are talking seven digits.

Gee, doesn't this whole thing smell of corruption?

This option is far worse than the current 5-lane option. It is disgusting that the BEST OPTION, the current 5 lanes, is not listed as an option.

My understanding is the council has approved several high-density projects all south of the railroad tracks in the downtown area. They are along Center, Abram, and Border, and they are also looking to add more high-density apartments where our current Central Library sits (Center and Abram). Does this not suggest more traffic flow along Abram St? Why in the world would any logical person (other than obvious purpose of taking care of a corrupt special interest buddy) be talking of taking lanes away from Abram St?

Since the consultant has done his traffic study the council has added the above projects. Estimates might be 600+ additional student housing beds (over the current count) and about 600 new additional nonstudent apartments. This would seem to increase traffic counts within two years. Does this throw off the consultant's projections?

This just goes to shows you can pay so-called "experts" to say anything you want, including taking traffic lanes away from THE major street of the area even though a gigantic increase in traffic coming. That pretty much tells the story of the other studies already done for the downtown area; get the "experts" to say anything you want for later use.

If having a pedestrian-friendly area is of such great importance, why not make that area along South? The majority of the restaurants along Abram back to South. South is scheduled to be downsized for bicycle lanes by the hike and bike plan. South is not Abram Street, the THRU street of downtown. South is one block from Border, where one of those new high-density approvals by the council is located (right at that Abram/South restaurant area). I do NOT understand the great desire to downsize Abram Street, the THRU street of downtown area just for the benefit of some special interest buddies that want it that way.

On the fact sheet was a LIE. Part of Number 4 stated, "This project [of reducing lanes on Abram St] was also in the 2011 Thoroughfare Development Plan." The vote did NOT include this project. The vote left Abram Street as it is.

Part of that presentation describes the Abram Street Concept Design Process, which listed the six major priorities of the process. Amazingly, none were "traffic flow." A major thoroughfare and "traffic flow" does NOT make the top six evaluations to generate the Final Design Concept. That, by itself is why this process is a sham and should be thrown out/voided.

Where has this type of downsizing the most major street failed before? How will failure be avoided?

During the questioning, someone actually brought up the Grand Prairie situation. The Grand Prairie situation seems to very much apply. Grand Prairie is very similar in the railroad tracks parallel the dieted roadway on the side of the tracks where most of the municipal activities occur. Why does someone want to set up Arlington for failure? (Oh yeah, I forgot, a special interest buddy wants to make a buck.)

Option A contained extremely misleading traffic times. Since it appears there were be major transferring of traffic to other roads, it is extremely misleading to say this option will only increase traffic flow time by some amount, and make no references to how much it is affecting traffic flow on other streets.

Sidewalks of 12' are extremely wasteful, especially considering what this option has done to traffic flow.

Reverse angle parking interferes with traffic flow of the only flowing traffic lane in that direction.

**Option B concerns:**

Why are the taxpayers making a major dollar investment along Abram St to the east, only to have the city and its special interest buddy decide to then bottleneck that investment at downtown?

I do not understand why the citizens were not told of this bottleneck plan during the 2008 city bond campaign when the city officials seeked the funding for this project.

Why didn't city officials, the Arlington Chamber of Commerce executives pushing that bond, and Downtown Arlington Management Corporation (DAMC) tell the public the whole truth?

In fact, it is my understanding that main Arlington Chamber of Commerce executive pushing this thing in 2008 even got bond money contract(s) for his company. How much 2008 bond money did he receive? My understanding is we are talking seven digits.

Gee, doesn't this whole thing smell of corruption?

This option is far worse than the current 5-lane option. It is disgusting that the BEST OPTION, the current 5 lanes, is not listed as an option.

My understanding is the council has approved several high-density projects all south of the railroad tracks in the downtown area. They are along Center, Abram, and Border, and they are also looking to add more high-density apartments where our current Central Library sits (Center and Abram). Does this not suggest more traffic flow along Abram St? Why in the world would any logical person (other than obvious purpose of taking care of a corrupt special interest buddy) be talking of taking lanes away from Abram St?

Since the consultant has done his traffic study the council has added the above projects. Estimates might be 600+ additional student housing beds (over the current count) and about 600 new additional nonstudent apartments. This would seem to increase traffic counts within two years. Does this throw off the consultant's projections?

This just goes to show you can pay so-called "experts" to say anything you want, including taking traffic lanes away from THE major street of the area even though a gigantic increase in traffic is coming. That pretty much tells the story of the other studies already done for the downtown area; get the "experts" to say anything you want for later use.

If having a pedestrian-friendly area is of such great importance, why not make that area along South? The majority of the restaurants along Abram back to South. South is scheduled to be downsized for bicycle lanes by the hike and bike plan. South is not Abram Street, the THRU street of downtown. South is one block from Border, where one of those new high-density approvals by the council is located (right at that Abram/South restaurant area). I do NOT understand the great desire to downsize Abram Street, the THRU street of downtown area just for the benefit of some special interest buddies that want it that way.

On the fact sheet was a LIE. Part of Number 4 stated, "This project [of reducing lanes on Abram St] was also in the 2011 Thoroughfare Development Plan." The vote did NOT include this project. The vote left Abram Street as it is.

Part of that presentation describes the Abram Street Concept Design Process, which listed the six major priorities of the process. Amazingly, none were "traffic flow." A major thoroughfare and "traffic flow" does NOT make the top six evaluations to generate the Final Design Concept. That, by itself is why this process is a sham and should be thrown out/voided.

Where has this type of downsizing the most major street failed before? How will failure be avoided?

During the questioning, someone actually brought up the Grand Prairie situation. The Grand Prairie situation seems to very much apply. Grand Prairie is very similar in the railroad tracks parallel the dieted roadway on the side of the tracks where most of the municipal activities occur. Why does someone want to set up Arlington for failure? (Oh yeah, I forgot, a special interest buddy wants to make a buck.)

Sidewalks up to 11' are extremely wasteful considering what has been done to traffic flow.

**Option C concerns:**

Why are the taxpayers making a major dollar investment along Abram St to the east, only to have the city and its special interest buddy decide to then bottleneck that investment at downtown?

I do not understand why the citizens were not told of this bottleneck plan during the 2008 city bond campaign when the city officials sought the funding for this project.

Why didn't city officials, the Arlington Chamber of Commerce executives pushing that bond, and Downtown Arlington Management Corporation (DAMC) tell the public the whole truth?

In fact, it is my understanding that main Arlington Chamber of Commerce executive pushing this thing in 2008 even got bond money contract(s) for his company. How much 2008 bond money did he receive? My understanding is we are talking seven digits.

Gee, doesn't this whole thing smell of corruption?

This option is far worse than the current 5-lane option. It is disgusting that the BEST OPTION, the current 5 lanes, is not listed as an option.

My understanding is the council has approved several high-density projects all south of the railroad tracks in the downtown area. They are along Center, Abram, and Border, and they are also looking to add more high-density apartments where our current Central Library sits (Center and Abram). Does this not suggest more traffic flow along Abram St? Why in the world would any logical person (other than obvious purpose of taking care of a corrupt special interest buddy) be talking of taking lanes away from Abram St?

Since the consultant has done his traffic study the council has added the above projects. Estimates might be 600+ additional student housing beds (over the current count) and about 600 new additional nonstudent apartments. This would seem to increase traffic counts within two years. Does this throw off the consultant's projections?

This just goes to show you can pay so-called "experts" to say anything you want, including taking traffic lanes away from THE major street of the area even though a gigantic increase in traffic is coming. That pretty much tells the story of the other studies already done for the downtown area; get the "experts" to say anything you want for later use.

If having a pedestrian-friendly area is of such great importance, why not make that area along South? The majority of the restaurants along Abram back to South. South is scheduled to be downsized for bicycle lanes by the hike and bike plan. South is not Abram Street, the THRU street of downtown. South is one block from Border, where one of those new high-density approvals by the council is located (right at that Abram/South restaurant area). I do NOT understand the great desire to downsize Abram Street, the THRU street of downtown area just for the benefit of some special interest buddies that want it that way.

On the fact sheet was a LIE. Part of Number 4 stated, "This project [of reducing lanes on Abram St] was also in the 2011 Thoroughfare Development Plan." The vote did NOT include this project. The vote left Abram Street as it is.

Part of that presentation describes the Abram Street Concept Design Process, which listed the six major priorities of the process. Amazingly, none were "traffic flow." A major thoroughfare and "traffic flow" does NOT make the top six evaluations to generate the Final Design Concept. That, by itself is why this process is a sham and should be thrown out/voided.

Where has this type of downsizing the most major street failed before? How will failure be avoided?

During the questioning, someone actually brought up the Grand Prairie situation. The Grand Prairie situation seems to very much apply. Grand Prairie is very similar in the railroad tracks parallel the dieted roadway on the side of the tracks where most of the municipal activities occur. Why does someone want to set up Arlington for failure? (Oh yeah, I forgot, a special interest buddy wants to make a buck.)

If off-peak parking was of such great importance, this could be done today in the current, extremely superior, 5-lane option in the areas where on-street parking does not exist today.

Option C makes Abram like all the headaches of Randol Mill. No thank you.