

Option B: Abram Street with 3 Thru Lanes

Comment Card #	What I like most about Option B	What concerns me about Option B
1	Compromise between pedestrian friendly and vehicular circulation.	Smaller sidewalks.
2	N/A	Should not be considered given impact on traffic. Will not create a "great street."
3	Streetscaping	Change from two to one lanes
4	N/A	N/A
5	This option has some traffic calming features and offers an improvement over the current state.	It cuts pedestrian-based business growth.
6	N/A	N/A
7	Semi-good	N/A
8	N/A	N/A
9	Pedestrian friendly	N/A
10	N/A	N/A
11	Nothing	Too confusing. Still blocks at some manholes.
12	It provides 2-lanes of thru traffic and turn lanes. Even when 2-lanes narrow to one, the opposite direction has 2-lanes. Sidewalks have a buffer between them and the street.	N/A
13	N/A	It is confusing to the driver. Wrecks will occur due to confusion.
14	N/A	I don't like it. No buffer created between traffic and pedestrians.
15	This one seems to be the best balance of pedestrian and vehicle traffic flow	People using the back-in parking as head-in; this would need to be tightly watched until peoples' paradigm of head-in parking is changed
16	N/A	N/A
17	N/A	I think motorists would tend to be more confused about the lane changes, and there would likely be more rear-ending type of accidents.
18	N/A	N/A
19	N/A	N/A
20	N/A	Road diet will divert more businesses to other areas (not to downtown)
21	N/A	Less parking. Need bike lanes. Creates confusion in traffic patterns. Don't like rear "back-in" parking. Curb cuts are a problem.
22	N/A	Possible confusion with number of lanes. Less sidewalk area. No significant traffic time improvements over Option A.
23	N/A	It is wishy-washy. It could be a grander long-range vision.
24	N/A	N/A
25	A happy medium if there is too much resistance from car owners.	Traffic changing lanes to alternate from thru to turn lanes.
26	Seems like great compromise of other two options. Good balance of pedestrian traffic. Great improvements of current pedestrian and parking challenges.	No mid-block crossing options. Time increases in traffic flow.
27	N/A	N/A
28	Nothing	I am opposed completely to this option because of: (1) Increased congestion due to reduction in thru lanes and (2) motorists will be confused when 2 thru lanes in one direction changes to only one lane in that same direction. dangerous traffic condition when switching the center lane from one direction for traffic to the opposite direction. I think there will be danger of head-on collisions when the center lane changes from one direction of traffic to the opposite direction.
29	Still provides a turn lane with pedestrian amenities.	Less room for pedestrians/patio seating.
30	It seems to balance between Options A and C.	Longer traffic times.
31	Both Options A and B shade pedestrians from campus. College students currently have to dodge cars and these plans improve that experience.	The switch back and forth bothers me and that's why I prefer the two thru lane option. I would like to see mid-block crossings.
32	The trees and larger sidewalks.	Not unique enough for a big change.
33	N/A	N/A
34	It is pedestrian friendly and can handle more traffic. It is a better option than Option C or existing. It is capable of handling events and festivals. Beneficial to drive-ins. It would also drive traffic to Division Street.	N/A
35	Second best choice, but a distant second.	N/A
36	N/A	N/A
37	Turn lanes	Fewer traffic lanes.
38	I don't like it.	It reduces traffic flow and harms the businesses on the street.
39	I don't like it.	It reduces traffic flow and harms the businesses on the street.
40	N/A	Doesn't address new development that encourages people
41	N/A	not as pedestrian friendly
42	more space for sidewalks and landscaping. Like the lane flexibility during special events.	I think this is a reasonable option but possibly more confusing than Option A
43	3 thru lanes option which Arlington needs and wants; a city of 400K+ whose CBD is peaceful, low-altitude, and somewhat pedestrian friendly, but is ready to make the pivot to national-class particularly given its close proximity to a national class volume of pedestrian traffic in the nearly 1 million/year AT&T Stadium guests (and another 3 million/year at the ballpark)	N/A
44	It is similar to "A" in style	Not as good as "A". 2 vs. 1 through lanes.
45	N/A	Impact to local businesses both during and after construction. Hopeful that the redirect of traffic is to adjacent parking not adjacent alternative business. Huge issue to consider with reverse back in spaces, since they are not anywhere else, fear of education on how to use outweighing usefulness.
46	Nothing	Unrealistic for how this area is traversed
47	Nothing	I have seen this area of Abram St congested all throughout the day. I do not believe this area needs any improvement. If the money has to be spent, spend it on fixing the area between Collins to New York. That area is one of the worst areas in Arlington.
48	N/A	N/A
49	N/A	N/A

50	I like the turn lane remaining in this option and believe it is safer with a turn lane.	The alternating lane is a little concerning because drivers may not fully understand. In other words, with the alternating lane only running between Cooper & Collins Streets, drivers may not know when to merge until they have to, and this may cause risk of more accidents. Obviously, drivers would eventually get used to it (those who continue to use the road), but may still be unsafe.
51	N/A	N/A
52	An improvement to current conditions. Provides more room for pedestrian walkways and streetscape elements	Reversible lanes are not common and could cause confusion in motorists
53	I like the widened sidewalks & enhanced streetscape	I am concerned that the alternating direction of the lanes will be confusing to drivers, especially those from outside the area, and will diminish the viability and enjoyment of the area.
54	N/A	N/A
55	Nothing, we either have a downtown that equals or surpasses similar areas in other towns or we have a highway and an area dedicated to automobiles before anything else	Traffic volume will prevent it being user friendly part of downtown
56	This is a half baked option for pedestrians, but I understand the benefit of turn lanes.	N/A
57	N/A	N/A
58	Wider sidewalks than now but prefer Option A	Center turn lanes, would prefer center median with trees. Variable direction lanes are confusing. Would accept this option over doing nothing. Third choice
59	Nothing, leave the street as is	The alternating lanes would not work well during high peak hours. Parking would be another issue as most people don't know how to properly park as stated in the meeting.
60	N/A	I am for Option D which I do not see on here. Are you seriously spending tax payer money to increase traffic? Don't do it! Maintain the system we have now and if you spend money to do anything spend money to decrease traffic congestion!
61	Nothing-Because it takes space for trees, benches, tec. From the street	People will not go down Abram because of the reverse angle parking in the lanes causing traffic to back up
62	?	Poor traffic flow. Very likely to turn into another "Norwood" mess
63	Nothing	will slow and back up traffic
64	Nothing	This will create traffic and instead of dealing with the traffic I will avoid the area altogether. Abram St. is a major thoroughfare in a car centered city. Changing this street to a pedestrian friendly street is unacceptable. You can't change human behavior-we want to be in our cars. Creating a pedestrian friendly street should be done on a less important street.
65	Please see my response to Option A. Same thing here. I do like that bicycles were not addressed in any of the options. I grow weary of the City's fixation on bike lanes.	Please see my response to Option A. Also: reverse parking is terrible. People can barely parallel park, let alone maneuver their vehicles backwards! The large trucks (like the Ford F250) will have an even more difficult time!
66	Can't answer as I don't understand configuration	Can't answer as I don't understand configuration
67	N/A	This doesn't leave a turn lane
68	N/A	Not a preference for the same reasons as Option A
69	N/A	N/A
70	More space for pedestrians to walk. In all 3 options, there are medians to reduce turning into businesses from the other side...such as McDonald's @ Cooper St where it backs up constantly	Turn right only lanes cause back up. People realize last minute that they don't want to turn & they try to switch lanes. Reverse Parking-People will see a spot, stop suddenly, then try to reverse with someone right behind them.
71	N/A	N/A
72	Better than Option C	Not as good as Option A
73	N/A	Not enough pedestrian buffer throughout
74	N/A	Confusing to drivers & pedestrians
75	N/A	N/A
76	N/A	N/A
77	N/A	N/A
78	I think this option can also accommodate to students and their needs for safe pedestrian friendly entertainment venues	parking
79	N/A	N/A
80	This would allow the free flow of traffic with a turn lane as well as parking for the businesses	N/A
81	Least Favorite. It's not a walkable area or a street for cars. If you try to be all things to all people; you end up being nothing to nobody.	Tail end parking-too many accidents. Lanes are too narrow
82	N/A	A waste of money
83	N/A	Current configuration is best
84	I like this one too-would be ok with this or "A"	Less room for sidewalk amenities and green space
85	N/A	There does not seem to be enough of a buffer zone between the auto traffic and pedestrians. Option A looks to provide additional safety for these pedestrians.
86	Nothing	Current 5-Lane is better!
87	N/A	N/A
88	N/A	confusion about which lane is which, plus the extra lane
89	N/A	N/A
90	Nothing	Apartments on W. Abram & now proposed downtown. More traffic minus 2 traffic lanes = disaster!
91	Nothing, absolutely nothing	see attached