

Option C: Abram Street with 4 Thru Lanes

Comment Card #	What I like most about Option C	What concerns me about Option C
1	N/A	Does not enhance the streetscape.
2	N/A	Should not be considered given impact on traffic. Will not create a "great street."
3	N/A	Not an option. No street appeal.
4	N/A	N/A
5	This option offers minimum traffic calming situation which is some improvement over the existing state.	Creates the least opportunity for pedestrian based economic growth.
6	N/A	No streetscaping.
7	N/A	I don't like it. To repeat the same thing over and over again and expect the same results is the definition of insanity.
8	N/A	Not an option at all! City leaders need to make a tough decision and approve Option A.
9	N/A	N/A
10	N/A	N/A
11	Still 4-lanes.	No left-turn lane.
12	Nothing.	Sidewalks on the street side with no buffer. Nowhere to go if turning and parking cars are in the outer lanes.
13	Most consistent with the flow of traffic.	Still getting rid of a turn lane.
14	N/A	I don't like it at all! We will continue to have traffic speeding through downtown and our downtown will continue to die without the excitement of new businesses and entertainment options.
15	N/A	This seems least conducive to pedestrian traffic
16	N/A	N/A
17	N/A	The lack of parking for many businesses would hurt the businesses in a significant way.
18	N/A	N/A
19	N/A	Slowest traffic flow and smallest pedestrian space, therefore it is the worst option.
20	N/A	There is not a good alternative street for diverted traffic. New road with four and five lanes might be best option.
21	N/A	Do not like! Safety issues when cars decide to turn. Minimal streetscape. Needs bike lanes. Too narrow sidewalks. Parking needs more spaces. Not pedestrian friendly.
22	N/A	Don't see any advantage. Traffic flow not improved. No benefit for foot traffic.
23	N/A	What's the point? The city's image does not benefit and a lot of work with little benefit.
24	N/A	N/A
25	N/A	Not enough of a change from existing conditions.
26	Quite a few lanes still going in each direction.	Not conducive to traffic flow or pedestrians. More difficult slopes for disabled. No turn lanes will cause unnecessary hold up in traffic. Takes away parking opportunities - people may be less willing to stay. Harmful to students who want to walk from campus.
27	Parking after hours.	Increase in traffic.
28	Nothing	I am opposed completely to this option. Years ago the center turn lane was added, which improved traffic flow. Eliminating the center turn lane now will cause large traffic back ups. Leave Abram Street the way it currently exists.
29	Reduces number of lanes to cross Abram Street.	Lack of a turn lane. It is not safe for pedestrians. Lack of amenities for future downtown development. The parallel parking isn't as safe as the back-in.
30	N/A	It seems to defeat any purpose. Much longer wait times.
31	I don't like anything except the reduction of lanes.	The street lights are backed away from the curb. I would rather see street lights at the curb. No trees means more heat island effect.
32	N/A	The outside lane being used for parking in non-peak times is a bad idea. Not unique enough of an area.
33	N/A	N/A
34	N/A	This option destroys any hope of creating a viable downtown for the generations to come - perhaps forever. No good. What we have now doesn't work. This is just a variable and it's not good to have Abram as a through road.
35	N/A	N/A
36	N/A	N/A
37	More traffic lanes.	No left-turn lane. Leave it as is.
38	Nothing.	The center-turn lane should not be removed. I prefer Option D - do nothing except fix the sidewalks.
39	Nothing.	The center-turn lane should not be removed. I prefer Option D - do nothing except fix the sidewalks.
40	N/A	No opportunity for landscaping. No change. No turn lanes.
41	N/A	Not as pedestrian friendly
42	N/A	This is too much like the existing structure and we need change. It doesn't solve the issue of traffic calming. I don't care for the parking aspect of the plan. I think it's confusing to new visitors especially
43	N/A	N/A
44	Nothing, other than ADA improvements	Traffic problems with no, little improvements for downtown design, businesses, or pedestrians. Off peak parking seems like a poor idea for only 1 road downtown.
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 do not feel as though this option is much different than what is currently in place. This option is only an adjustment or improvement to the current street. I do not believe this is pedestrian friendly	There is no turn lane in the middle of the street and this could be very unsafe for drivers and pedestrians. No turn lane would greatly impact travel time as well for drivers. This option is unsafe and is not an improvement from what it currently in place
51	Will create too much congestion due to people turning off the street	N/A
52	N/A	This option does not represent an improvement to the current cross section. Multiple lanes promote higher traffic volume and speeds. This discourages pedestrians and bicycles.
53	This option is not appealing at all	This project is a great opportunity to make Abram Street better, but this option does not provide any benefit except for drivers. Additionally, I worry that the switch from 4 thru lanes to 2 thru lanes with parallel parking will be very confusing.
54	N/A	N/A
55	Nothing	The parking off peak option and lack of user friendliness for pedestrians
56	This option is wasted opportunity for downtown	Doing nothing is not an option
57	N/A	N/A
58	No center turn lanes (safer). Street parking at off peak hours would be nice & provide buffer zone for pedestrians on sidewalk. This option would be safer for bicycles on street.	Not as good as "A" or "B" above with wider sidewalks but would accept this option over doing nothing. Would require larger enforcement regime to prevent parking at peak times=more money. Second Choice
59	Nothing, leave the street as is	Parking during off peak hours and no turn lanes would definitely cause issues, it would cause too much friction.
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	There are 4 lanes to let traffic move. It is more citizen friendly than developer/business detailed	I really prefer Option D-leave it as it is. Stop the on street parking-let people park behind or in other lots in the next block.
62	Less damage to business & traffic. Less waste of taxes.	Why not just repaint the street & add lighting that will allow star watching?
63	Keeps traffic flowing!	I voted for the 1/2 sales tax to improve the streets for auto traffic. I didn't vote for improvements to ease bicycle traffic.
64	Maintains the current configuration. Keep the turning lane. Get rid of on-street parking	Nothing
65	I guess I like the 4 lanes, but I don't like the parallel parking in the "off" hours, that will eat up 2 lanes; we're back to square one with traffic flow issues!	Here's my concern with all of the options: Where is the study that maintains all 5 lane? ADA issues can be solved while still maintaining all 5 lanes. It just takes a few more brain cells, and a little less insanity. Do not reduce the number of lanes!
66	N/A	Traffic will tend to move faster which reduces pedestrian safety
67	N/A	This leaves no turn lane
68	Not a preference for the same reasons as Option A. Would limit modernization. Love the photo from the 40's. If those people decided not to modernize like some residents are fighting today, we would still have tracks down Abram, and get water from the well!	Evolution and Extinction are not that far apart in the dictionary. Failing to find the first will almost certainly lead you to find the second
69	I like this option. This option is not the way to.... Sidewalks and resurfacing will be..... Ultimately this would only hinder..... I drive this road everyday to get to.... Bc perfectly happy turning this portion of Abram.... And removing all lanes for traffic. This would provide the creates benefit to the area.	No turn lane concerns me the most. By not having the turn lane would dramatically impact the travel time, and not enough space is given to pedestrians
70	Keeps 2 lanes both ways	N/A
71	N/A	N/A
72	Do not like at all	N/A
73	N/A	Still unsafe for pedestrians
74	N/A	Bad for traffic and for business
75	N/A	N/A
76	N/A	N/A
77	N/A	N/A
78	N/A	Not pedestrian friendly. No parking. I do not support this option.
79	N/A	N/A
80	N/A	N/A
81	It moves cars! Favorite option	All options: The mixing of pavers & tree. The visual additions will make it harder for those driving at night & those with vision problems to see the lanes, curbs, etc.
82	N/A	a waste of money
83	N/A	Current configuration is best
84	I don't like this at all!	"parking allowed/not allowed" at different times will cause confusion. No turn lanes will cause traffic problems and angry drivers.
85	N/A	During periods of high traffic volumes the uses of parallel parking on street seem confusing and will bring on many issues.
86	Nothing	Current 5-Lane is better!
87	N/A	N/A
88	N/A	everything
89	N/A	N/A
90	N/A	Just resurface Abram & leave well enough alone. Don't screw up something else!
91	Nothing, absolutely nothing	see attached