

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC INPUT TO TYSONS LAND USE TASK FORCE JULY WORKSHOPS AND AUGUST QUESTIONNAIRES

A. Background

At the public workshops July 16-18, 2007, table dialogues were held around a three-page questionnaire developed by the Tysons Land Use Task Force and its consultants. A total of 256 citizens participated in the three July workshops. At each table a County staff person served as a notetaker. The notes from the 33 table dialogues during the workshops were summarized in a document entitled "[Highlights from Analysis of Table Notes.](#)" that will be posted at the [Tysons website](#).

As participants left the workshops, they were given copies of the [questionnaire](#) and asked to fill them out and return them by mail, fax or email. In addition, the questionnaire was posted on the Tysons website for three weeks after the workshops. The more than 500 citizens whose names are in the database maintained by the Task Force's outreach consultants received an email regarding the online questionnaire.

A total of 235 completed questionnaires were received in August 2007. These responses were totaled in a document entitled "[Tysons Questionnaire Results.](#)" that will be posted at the Tysons website. Results from these individual respondents were compared to the highlights from the workshop table dialogues. This [comparison](#) is attached; please note that the responses from individuals are referred to as "Web Input" on pages 7 and 8. Also note that after the workshops, the Task Force received group comments from several organizations; these group comments will also be posted at the [Tysons website](#) but are not incorporated in the summary below.

On the 235 questionnaires, individuals provided a total of 468 comments. The number of comments per questionnaire item ranged from 7 to 40, or fewer than 20% of respondents (40 out of 235). All of the comments have been assigned to a questionnaire item and grouped into general topics. The analyzed comments are displayed in a [worksheet](#), and the analysis is also shown in a document entitled "[Detailed Analysis of Questionnaire Comments.](#)" Both the worksheet and this document will be posted at the Tysons website.

The questionnaire contained 21 items. The attached comparison shows that both participants in the table dialogues and individual respondents were in agreement on 16 of the 21 items, or 76%. Items on which there was consensus are listed in Section B. below.

For the questionnaire items on which there was disagreement between individual respondents and table dialogues, some of the relevant comments are quoted in Section C below. Finally, Section D includes some noteworthy comments on paying for growth (item 5).

B. Issues on which there was consensus

- 1.c. **The majority of transportation funds should go for improvements to transit.**
- 2.a. **Growth should be focused near transit stations.**
- 2.b. **Tysons' neighborhoods should be connected to station areas by pedestrian and bicycle facilities.**
- 2.c. **A functional grid of streets should be created throughout Tysons.**
- 2.d. **Metro will not be enough; additional transit will be needed at Tysons.**
- 2.e. **Tysons should have a public transit circulator system in addition to Metro.**
- 3.a. **There should be parks and open space throughout Tysons.**
- 3.b. **There should be public amenities such as educational facilities and meeting centers at Tysons.**
- 3.c. **There should be a mix of housing at Tysons.**
- 3.e. **Most new development should be located within walking distance of Metro.**
- 4.a. **High rises should not block significant views or be located on the edge.**
- 4.b. **Surrounding neighborhoods should be connected to Tysons.**
- 4.c. **Mixed-use centers should be dispersed throughout Tysons' neighborhoods.**
- 5.a. **The public sector should pay for police, fire and rescue stations, schools, libraries, and water and sewer facilities to accommodate growth at Tysons.**
- 5.b. **Developers should be required to contribute toward the cost of public facilities to serve growth at Tysons.**
- 6.b. **Allocating funds to community needs other than transportation.**
Both individual respondents and tables ranked amenities in the same order: first, parks; second, affordable housing; and third, streams & open spaces.

C. Issues on which there was disagreement

1.a. **Limit the amount of parking at Tysons and increase its cost.**

57% of individual respondents did not want to limit parking, versus 23% of tables.

Of the 30 comments on this item, 9 recommend waiting until transit and housing are built before limiting parking; 4 want low cost or free parking at the malls; and 4 want public parking near the Metro stations.

1.b. **Design Routes 7 & 123 as pedestrian-friendly, urban boulevards.**

56% of individual respondents liked this idea, versus 19% of tables.

There were 41 comments on this item, of which 27 want limited access to 7 & 123 to facilitate traffic *through* Tysons, and 14 want Metro to be underground.

1.d. **Focus on moving people in to & out of Tysons, rather than on housing.**

54% of individual respondents agreed it is more important to focus on transportation than housing, versus 4% of tables.

Of the 32 comments on this item, 9 stated their beliefs that, because of the high number of regional commuters driving *through* Tysons, we need to focus on transportation.

3.d. **Distribute growth evenly throughout Tysons.**

41% of individual respondents disagree that growth should be evenly distributed, versus 92% of tables.

There were 6 comments on this item, all recommending that growth be concentrated within walking distance of Metro.

6.a. **Allocate \$100 to Transportation**

On the average, individual respondents allocated \$20 to the grid of streets, versus \$30 for the tables. For the other transportation choices (bike & pedestrian amenities, widening roads, transit into Tysons, and transit within Tysons), individuals and tables showed similar rankings.

Respondents were not asked to provide comments on question 6.

D. Noteworthy comments on paying for growth

5.a. Regarding the public sector's paying for growth, 8 respondents suggested using the revenues generated by new development, and 4 recommended exploring creative financing options.

5.b. Regarding developer contributions, there were 28 comments with a very strong consensus that *the County should require developers to pay more than they do now*.

There were another 27 comments that **both** the public and private sectors should pay for new facilities. One respondent summed things up this way: "There should be a partnership. All or nothing serves no one."

Finally, there were 22 "other" comments showing that respondents understand that the facilities to serve new development at Tysons will require significant investment, and that the County is in the process of trying to decide how much growth there should be at Tysons.