

Q1. How people travel in to and out of Tysons

a. Limit parking and increase its cost

Total comments = 30

Limit parking after transit & housing built (9)

- 1 If parking is sharply curtailed before dense clustered housing is built, it will kill retail businesses in Tysons.
- 2 Not until public transportation is in place & convenient
- 3 You need to make the alternative attractive first. If take parking away & make it difficult to drive w/out attractive alternative, you are asking for trouble. You need flexible alternatives. Bus Rapid Transit is that; Metro alone will NOT cut it. Learn what BRT is & make a valid proposal, not like the one you made for Dulles corridor. You have professionals (transit pros, not politicians) working on this, yes? If so, then you should be able to get a credible BRT proposal. Call me if you need help finding a BRT professional
- 4 To reduce parking you need good transit & more people living in Tysons. Enough multifamily housing will reduce traffic & provide a level of activity that will attract residents to Tysons. Long term planning is very important. If you create a real, functional city center with sidewalks, Metro, vehicular arteries off of and connection to 123 & 7, then large-scale growth can happen in a controlled manner. Instead of digging a bigger traffic hole in Tysons, build your way out of it.
- 5 Any restrictions in auto access need to be coupled w/ increases in housing, unless objective is to have area vacant after work.
- 6 Make it easier to get to Tysons from nearby communities via public transportation. After transit is well established, then discourage auto use.
- 7 Restrict # cars for Tysons residents; force them to walk or use transit
- 8 W/ regard to "a," initial approach should be to provide adequate & efficient pub. Transportation; once this is up & running, increase cost of parking in Tysons.
- 9 Make it very difficult and expensive to commute to Tysons.

Low cost or free parking at malls (4)

- 1 Must deal with shopping trips
- 2 Needs to be some free or low priced parking for 2 malls, but not too much free parking.
- 3 One should not have to pay for parking to shop at the 2 malls.
- 4 Adding Metro is important mainly for people to get to & from work, not necessarily for shopping.

Public Parking near Metro (4)

- 1 People who live outside of Tysons must be able to use Metro. If auto access to Tysons is limited, Tysons will be strangled.
- 2 Focus of redevelopment should be on pedestrianization & transforming Tysons into a dense & truly urban environment that is not just conducive to walking, but actually makes people want to walk. Walking around Tysons should be an enjoyable experience, not simply a necessity. This means deemphasizing highways & removing vast quantities of surface parking in favor of traditional urban design w/ mixed use retail, office & housing, as well as public space, rising in lieu of underutilized parking space. Key to good urban planning is to allow for a variety of transportation options. NO one size fits all. I love public transportation & use it whenever I can & it is convenient to do so. However, there are times when I need my car too. Tysons needs to have parking garages available so that people can access & use public transportation at times when bus will not suffice: going to airport w/ luggage; handicapped access (permanent or temporary); young children in tow, etc. Right now Metro garages are completely full early in AM. Visitors can't use Metro to get to DC or monuments because no room to park unless they arrive at garage at 6:30 am - so they are forced to drive into DC. W/out increasing garage space, people will not be able to get to Metro. Minibus system won't be running during late hours when we're coming back from Kennedy Center. So if it's not more convenient to drive to Metro & park my car when I need to, I will drive and forgo using Metro. WE NEED MORE PUBLIC PARKING GARAGES NEXT TO STATIONS if Metro is to be more fully utilized!
- 3 Addl. Driving should not be encouraged in Tysons. Have parking lots set up right off 495/Toll Rd exits where cars can park centrally & then ride into Tysons on buses.
- 4 Need to have parking near Metro stns. Public transit will not work to get there & there is not enough parking at Falls Church West.

Don't Chase Away Current Office Tenants & Other Businesses (3)

- 1 Don't chase away current office tenants in Tysons. Keep parking competitive w/ other markets.
- 2 Limiting parking & increasing parking fees will have a substantially adverse impact on the service industry & residential growth.
- 3 Adequate parking important for business & merchants and can't be discouraged. Parking may go underground &

become more expensive, but developers should be encouraged to add parking.

People Will Still Drive Cars (6)

- 1 Traffic will always be mostly in single cars.
- 2 Not realistic to think people who live in/near ped friendly, urban blvds will limit car usage. Try walking w/ groceries a long distance. I don't think it will happen.
- 3 Needs to be a recognition that transit may not always be the best way to get into Tysons. Metro won't work for me so I'll still need efficient rd network to get me to & from work. Some consideration should be given to limiting parking & other demand mgt tools so people will at least consider other options to getting in & out of Tysons.
- 4 Whether housing or office, closer is better to Metro, but still won't carry most people there.
- 5 In "a" because Tysons is both a destination and a crossroads, limiting parking is not necessarily going to discourage SOV.
- 6 Promoting shared ride commuting not considered an option in this survey. In 1993 my co. partnered w/ GMU on an FTA funded study which found a private sector svc plan would reduce SOV commuting by roughly an equal % as rail. I am a strong supporter of rail plan, but construction phase & increased density following completion require broader solution.

Redevelop Surface Parking Lots into Mixed Use Centers Where People Will Want to Walk(3)

- 1 There is virtually zero pedestrian support now. Sidewalks were not designed w/ Tysons in mind. They only meet zoning ordinances which are grossly out of date. MOVE dev. To the sts where parking is now & bulldoze the older buildings. Make MIXED use bldgs.
- 2 People want to drive to a place where they can walk to food & shops, like Bethesda.
- 3 Ped communities are livable communities. Need to create reasons to get people out of cars & enjoy being out of them. Need to create a sense of place & opportunities for integration & involvement.

Don't Make Our Neighborhood A Parking Lot (1)

- 1 I live in Amberwood community off of Gosnell (almost directly behind Rte 7). Strongly disagree w/ limiting parking & increasing its cost because I have grave concerns that our neighborhood will become the local "parking lot."

b. Make Rtes 7 & 123 pedestrian friendly

Total comments = 40

Facilitate Traffic through Tysons (27)

- 1 Street grid yes; 7 & 123 not necessarily
- 2 Limit access to 7 & 123; use them to move cars through or into Tysons where they can exit onto local grid
- 3 Not realistic
- 4 Through traffic on 7 & 123 should be routed around or UNDER Tysons
- 5 Auto or bus into Tysons will continue to be dominant commuting mode.
- 6 I believe 7 & 123 should remain transit-oriented (auto & rail) in order to ensure adequate traffic flow.
- 7 Ped. Experience should be focused primarily on secondary sts., which can be designed in a ped-friendly manner.
- 8 7 & 123 should be redesigned to facilitate traffic *through* Tysons rather than only serving Tysons.
- 9 In determining level of density in Tysons, traffic impact on travel lanes (7 & 123) is important. I find it completely arrogant & a waste of funds to propose a design that would slow traffic that has to use the Rte. 7 corridor to reach other destinations. This design would be trashed by County officials if a neighborhood wanted to present a plan that would impact traffic. When vehicles go speeding along a roadway and citizens want to put a stop sign or traffic light at a dangerous intersection, the answer is no. Now you are telling the public that the redesign of Tysons will slow traffic passing through. Where is the fairness?
- 10 Build main arteries for 7 & 123 through traffic w/ parallel service access roads.
- 11 Many opportunities for ped friendly blvds in Tysons besides 7 & 123. Easier to move people over or under those rds than to convert them to urban blvds. 7 & 123 critical to avoiding gridlock; can't be slowed unless alternative bypasses constructed.
- 12 Don't forget about people who travel thru Tysons & for whom transit would NOT be a car-substitute. For many, Tysons lies on their way to somewhere else, & rds that bifurcate Tysons should remain as efficient movers of traffic & people.
- 13 Incongruence in County's thoughts on ped friendly & widening 7 & 123. Roads should not be widened but SHRUNK!
- 14 123 & 7 get people THRU Tysons. Making these rds slower will only increase congestion & use of side sts.

- 15 Due to elevated rail & existing thru traffic volumes, 7 & 123 should provide grade separated intersections to avoid lts on these sts & to keep traffic moving through Tysons.
- 16 Through traffic on 7 & 123 should be routed around or under Tysons.
- 17 This question is simplistic. Increasing travel times on 7 & 123 will cause traffic to divert to other roads. Where is Q dealing w/ that issue? How does this address the issue of through traffic.
- 18 Myopic set of questions. You can't take a crossroads of several important traffic routes & virtually eliminate all consideration of that traffic to create a "dreamscape" of urban/pedestrian lifestyle. Creation & acceptance of mass transit alternatives into & out of area lags WAY too far behind this "dreamscape" concept so cut and dried. Metro is NOT going to be end-all to your quest.
- 19 I just need to get THROUGH Tysons!
- 20 Roads are 10-15 years behind demand. Growth in surrounding areas has not been noticed by Tysons planners. Roads feeding Tysons must be upgraded.
- 21 2 lanes each (like Arlington), w/ a route to circumvent Tysons; i.e., toll-free access from Route 7 to Route 66.
- 22 Connecting Scott's Crossing Rd to Jones Branch Dr. will reduce traffic on Internatl. Dr. & Tysons Blvd./123 intersection. Drivers will use R hand turns to get to 495 & avoid lts by using this rte. Drivers heading to McLean & GW Pkwy will use this route. Drivers heading to McLean & GW Pkwy will also use this rte to avoid lts & traffic heading to 495 & Malls.
- 23 People should travel around city centers and not through to make them more walkable & bikeable. Will also create gathering places.
- 24 And in "b" there is no real comparison between 7 & 123 and ped-friendly sts. In DC, Bethesda & Arlington. There are very ped-unfriendly sts. In those communities too. 7 & 123 are not Wilson Blvd., Wisconsin Ave. or K St.
- 25 Large number of companies based in Tysons makes travel during business hours almost impossible. County should seek ways to limit lights & provide better flow through Tysons. This could mean more overpasses, jug handles, & stopping development of other businesses in Tysons.
- 26 Tysons is an ugly, strangled area right now. I live in the Fair Lakes area, & it has its congested moments. But it is nicely landscaped & there are plenty of alternate rtes in the area so I can get around w/ relative ease. Tysons is a far cry from the Fair Lakes area which also boasts pathways and more parking. Tysons needs to be walkable, & the no. of intersections w/ lts needs to be dramatically decreased so that cars can get in & out of Tysons fast!
- 27 How are shoppers expected to travel into Tysons w/ little or no impact on surrounding communities? And how are peds expected to traverse the highway when Metro is building high walls in the median for aboveground rail?

Put Metro Underground (13)

- 1 Support tunnel for Metro; aboveground rail will create blight.
- 2 Very unhappy w/ elected leaders at Co., St. & Fed levels for not supporting tunnel. I will never vote for any of these individuals again unless they admit their mistake and start working to see that the tunnel happens...Leaders only care about big business & the money they get from these companies. They do not care about the owners of small homes in McLean near planned Metro.
- 3 Metro should go underground, or Rte 7 will never be a "great street."
- 4 I believe the Metro should be underground.
- 5 New Metro stns should be located underground, like in Arlington.
- 6 Go under, not over.
- 7 I fail to understand that in this rich county & country we cannot afford to put Metro underground.
- 8 An underground Metro (not exposed to the weather) would also be useful.
- 9 Unfortunately, an aboveground train line will discourage walking, due to noise & the fact that the main arteries will need to be wide to accommodate the rail ROW.
- 10 Still strongly believe that everyone will benefit more from having a tunnel through Tysons than building public transportation aboveground. I look at many beautiful areas around Washington & wonder how ugly they would be if instead of the nice view we had, there were elevated rails instead.
- 11 Would like to see Metro run under Tysons. Can't imagine how Co can reconcile having aboveground Metro AND growth of Tysons.
- 12 If we must have rail, put it underground. I absolutely do not want to see it. I don't care how much more it costs to put it underground.
- 13 Develop Tysons to very high density throughout. Only an underground Metro will allow Tysons to meet its potential. Metro w/ tunnel all the way through. Commuters from MD are cutting through neighborhoods taking 193 to Swinks Mill, Spring Hill & Towlston Rds.

c. Majority of transportation funds for transit

Total comments = 22

Need Road Improvements (12)

- 1 No matter how successful public transit is, most people will still be in cars - road improvement very important
- 2 Traffic is hell here. Build more alternate routes to help people travel in & out of Tysons efficiently. Make it a goal to reduce traffic!
- 3 Public transportation can't reach everyone. People are going to drive no matter what. Roads need to be improved.
- 4 Frankly, it would be better to spend on roads than to spend on Metro.
- 5 Money should be spent to widen & improve roads. People will drive whether we like it or not, & rds need to be able to accommodate more drivers.
- 6 Very few people w/ families are going to give up driving no matter what. Flexibility is just too important.
- 7 Road system will have to be improved. Most workers in Tysons can't use rail since no lines where we live (e.g., south of Tysons - Springfield line would take hours).
- 8 Discouraging SOV not the answer since I can't HOV & won't take bus. Tired of gridlock on 123. Not enough ways in & out of Tysons.
- 9 Won't remain biz hub of DC if road system not fixed & soon. Use the rail \$ to fix rds. Rail terrific but won't help most get to work & back.
- 10 Efforts should be made to reduce traffic on 495 & thru Tysons by creating alternative rtes around Tysons; e.g., more Potomac River bridges, such as at Rte. 28 North extended, & via both western & eastern corridors around DC that would use new Potomac River crossings.
- 11 They try to drive, get locked in traffic, get frustrated, & get "road rage." Bus is good, but not always great in bad weather, & has same gridlock problems that cars do. Don't dare try to walk or ride a bike, unless you have a death wish. Gerry Connolly knows how I feel about the lack of ped friendly areas in Tysons. And I haven't seen him do anything to improve the situation in last 6 yrs. Since Metrobus almost killed me while legally crossing street.
- 12 If I had no car, I would ride public transportation. Public transportation has to be cheap and convenient for it to be effective. Otherwise people pay high prices just to have convenience. There should be a beltway around Tysons so no one has to pass through Tysons.

All Modes of Transit (5)

- 1 All modes including ped, bike, circulator
- 2 Tysons is a focal point for commuters in No. Va. The more rail & buses, the better.
- 3 We all know that widening roads is a temporary fix that quickly produces more congestion, leading to more widening, etc. Need frequent & inexpensive bus service; also ped & bike paths
- 4 Increase investment in rail & buses & focus on reducing no. of cars in area. Less traffic, buses will move faster, making them another attractive alternative for short-distance travel (as opposed to rail).
- 5 What about HOV lanes for buses?

Need Both Roads & Transit (5)

- 1 It's hard to predict how Americans will commute in the future. Despite efforts to provide public transportation & HOV incentives, majority still commute in SOV. Trying to engineer Tysons to change that is wishful thinking. Still, accommodating transit, bikes & HOV is reasonable.
- 2 Funds should be split approx. 60% roads/40% transit/bus/bike/ped connections. Funds for rds should include designing ped friendly roads
- 3 This is a false dichotomy: money is needed for roads & transit.
- 4 Important to continue to upgrade rd. network & invest in transit options.
- 5 Transportation comes in many forms & all these forms can be important to the success of the system. Europeans have become very accustomed & comfortable using motor bikes & mopeds. In Barcelona they have a network of bike racks w/ city owned bikes that residents can rent & return to any rack in the city. They are very heavily used. By the way, people also like to walk!

d. Transportation more important than housing

Total Comments = 32

Need More Housing (14)

- 1 Increasing high density residential development in Tysons fundamental to maximizing street network and reducing traffic.
- 2 Provide affordable housing
- 3 Providing close & convenient housing for Tysons workers is also a priority.

- 4 Creating more options for people to live in a ped friendly Tysons will support better jobs-housing balance.
- 5 More housing would be nice but it's unaffordable.
- 6 People who live & work in Tysons travel in & out less. Consider increasing planned density way beyond current cases; say to 1 million or more. Try for a real urban environment (e.g., Manhattan) rather than a hybrid.
- 7 Other solution - provide more affordable housing or incentives for living in Tysons.
- 8 If you provide affordable housing & jobs all in Tysons, less travel & use of auto.
- 9 The Arlington experience has shown that increasing residential uses dramatically & providing shops & svcs can reduce vehicle travel.
- 10 Need better balance between jobs & housing (esp. affordable) in Tysons.
- 11 One of the most important approaches IS to encourage residential dev. w/in commercial core of Tysons. This was done in Ballston area of Arlington over past 20 years & generated little change in traffic while density increased dramatically. In Tysons commercial & office density is already there, so an EFFECTIVELY MANAGED residential growth plan, coupled w/ intro. of Metro, should substantially decrease existing traffic TO & FROM Tysons over time. Thru traffic along Rte 7 will not be attenuated as much. Substantial resid. Dev. & Metro combined will greatly mitigate existing traffic & parking woes, & is a much more logical and palatable long term solution.
- 12 Available housing near work centers (along w/ public transit & ped friendly sts) in itself will decrease traffic congestion.
- 13 Getting rid of cars to & from Tysons should be #1 priority.
- 14 I suggest that affordable housing be available for all blue collar workers that service/work in/for Tysons.

Need Both Transportation & Housing (9)

- 1 Both are essential
- 2 Build transit systems & street grids before housing.
- 3 Need both housing & transportation
- 4 Tysons needs to function equally well for more residents & workers. What needs adjustment is those who are now forced to move through Tysons on their way to other destinations.
- 5 Both affordable housing (NOT low-income housing) & travel are important. To maintain level of commerce, you will need reasonable road/transit connections. You will also need reasonably priced apts/condos so moderate income people can live in area.
- 6 Should not be either/or but both.
- 7 Focus should be on creating self-sustaining community, but can't ignore Tysons' role in regional transportation.
- 8 For ex., in "d," whether more housing is provided, how people move in to & out of Tysons still must be considered.
- 9 W/ respect to "d, " moving people in & out of Tysons must be done along w/ housing.
Providing housing w/out understanding how those people will travel to & from home will cause additional problems.

Because of High No. of Regional Commuters, Focus on Transportation (9)

- 1 Would like greater connectivity among 495, 123, 7 & DTR & reduction of Vienna traffic betw/ I-66 & Tysons
- 2 Remove as many cars as possible that drive daily through Falls Church.
- 3 Though a balance is needed, the "in and out" has greater value based on nos. of commuters & the regional impact.
- 4 Tysons dual use area: shopping magnet & office magnet. These 2 must coexist. No conceivable reason must be residential magnet. My company located there; my employees deserve to be able to get to & from work, like tens of 1,000s of other people who work here, while others want to go shopping. That is challenge enough.
- 5 Unless traffic infrastructure improved, future housing projects should be eliminated. Before construction commences, traffic workarounds established so no impact to commuters.
- 6 Cost of living in Tysons so high that most people who work here live outside the area. Important to focus on how best to accommodate commuters.
- 7 Need to provide rapid ingress & egress directly to business sectors so that workers can get in & out as fast as possible.
I'd be more inclined to stay & shop in Tysons if I could have a better workday experience.
As it stands now, I hate Tysons because it takes me forever to get in & away from work every day.
- 8 As long as Metro remains crowded, w/ ltd. Parking at stations, & serves only a small proportion of area residents, it's inappropriate to spend public funds to reduce auto access to any area, including Tysons. Increase density will require INCREASED hwy capacity regardless of ltd addl capacity provided by rail. While addl housing may be of benefit, such housing is likely to be unaffordable to the vast majority of people who work in the area, so long as far more office space than housing is permitted by zoning rules, & areas surrounding Tysons remain ltd to very low (R4&R3) densities.

9 Improving how people get around w/in Tysons is desirable, but in my view secondary to moving workers in & out of the area.

OTHER

Total Comments = 3

Morning No Left Turn Lanes

1 Commuters from MD are cutting through neighborhoods taking 193 to Swinks Mill, Spring Hill & Towlston Rds.
There should be a morning no left turn on these three roads.

Stop People from "Blocking the Box"

1 How can we stop people from "blocking the box?" That in itself is one of the worst offensives.

No Tolls on 495

1 I just returned from a trip to the Northwestern states. No tolls on roads or bridges there. County is planning a high-density toll road on 495. Traffic in NW never stopped moving. Try for different source of revenue than tolls on roadway. Paying tolls slows down traffic. Fees will be too high for average commuter; will free up road for those who can afford it & crowd remaining lanes w/ traffic. I live <1/2 mi. from Tysons. Can't walk there - no sidewalks.

Question 2. How people travel within Tysons.

a. Focus growth near transit stations

Total comments = 7

Focus growth without taller buildings (1)

1 Growth in Tysons should be focused near transit stns; however, that does not require taller bldgs. Density can be lessened.

Let market decide where tall buildings go (1)

1 Tall bldgs should go wherever anyone wants (subject to normal zoning limits); market forces should handle this.

Decrease densities beyond 1/4 mile of stations (2)

1 Current plan maximizes amt. of traffic on existing roadways and rail options. In new plan, if higher densities granted w/in 1/4 mile of stations, decrease densities outside of this radius.

2 Proposed growth should not creep outside the 1/4 mile radius from proposed Metro stations

Increase densities w/in 1/2 mile of stations (1)

1 Plan for higher density throughout - w/in 1/2 mile of each station.

Add facilities for bikes & peds (1)

1 If & only if walkability (bike access too) is maintained.

b. Improve ped & bike connectivity

Total comments = 17

Would bike or walk if paths & sidewalks were there (10)

1 I work in Tysons. I think priority is encouraging development as ped friendly. I would bike to work if there were sidewalks & bike paths.

2 Too many barriers to easy ped movement in Tysons. More sidewalks, easier & safer ways to cross sts., and a "sense of place" will make walking a more appealing mode of transportation for short trips. Many trips in Tysons area are short, < a mile.

3 Be sure to include bike paths & sidewalks!

4 Ped & bike access must be provided.

5 Walking, riding a bike, or using a PMD has been determined to be hazardous to your well-being. How about some sidewalks, synchronized traffic lts, ped friendly crossing of major arteries, etc.

6 We definitely need more sidewalks w/in the general nbrd & w/in Tysons specifically. Need sidewalks along 123 & under 495. I often see people walking along 123 where it is EXTREMELY DANGEROUS to do so. These sidewalks/ped over/underpasses should be part of the master plan to make Tysons a viable urban nbrd.

7 The bike-ped features are essential. In fact, it's conceivable that w/ the right bike-ped features AND a north-south transit, a transit circulator would not be necessary.

8 Tysons needs to have ped & bike friendly means for transit w/in & thru Tysons.

9 Maintain walkability & bike access

10 Putting in wide sidewalks/pathways will allow for increased usage.

Extend bike trails out 3 miles (2)

1 Bike trails should also be available from 3 miles outside of Tysons to Metro station areas.

2 Need to be able to get to Tysons on foot from Pimmit & other areas.

Put bikes & peds on local streets (1)

1 Bikes & peds should be on local grid, separated from 7 & 123.

Make it easier to go from 1 bldg to another (1)

1 Making it easier for people to cross sts. or go from 1 bldg. to another would cut down on a lot of traffic.

Connect Tysons to W&OD bike trail (1)

1 Lack of connection between Tysons & W&OD bike trail needs to be fixed.

Put trails & paths beneath overhead transit (1)

1 Underneath the overhead rail is an ideal location for trails and paths. We should take advantage of that feature.

Service workers at Tysons have to walk (1)

1 Remember the many "little people" - those people who due to choice or poverty walk or ride bikes to service-sector jobs w/in Tysons need to be considered too. Pedestrianism is not just about office workers & affluent resid. Landowners,

but also about those working low-paying private sector jobs.

c. Functional grid of streets

Total comments = 10

Break up suburban oriented streets (5)

- 1 Street grid provides multiple routes, reduces travel distances & breaks up suburban-oriented streets; makes them function better for peds and bikes.
- 2 St. grids should be dev. & incorporated based on urban planning & uses for contiguous parcels, not designed in isolation of the land planning, the impact to peds, open space, access to office/retail/housing. The proposed "grid" does not address land use.
- 3 A grid should be laid out that anticipates a very large & dense city in 2100.
- 4 Tysons needs a st grid to best function. Outside of support of Metro, this should be the priority.
- 5 More grid streets; don't worry about "cut-through."

Keep commuters from dominating street grid (2)

- 1 Commuter vehicles should be funnelled into the "back door" or underground garages & not dominate the circulation grid
- 2 Focus on moving people around Tysons, not in and out of it.

Create overlay zone & require land dedication to make street grid happen (2)

- 1 No addl. Density should be allowed beyond that in the current Comp Plan unless an official everlay zone is created that requires dedication by each landowner to make the grid of sts happen. This will require enabling legislation from Richmond.
- 2 Granting of addl. Densities in Tysons should be conditional on developers proffering to create a more livable environment by donating significant money & land for schools & parks (land donation by itself is insufficient). Dev. Should be mandated to be phased w/ creation of a grid system of rds. W/out these amenities, there should be no addl. Granting of densities.

Need traffic flow analysis & mitigation of choke points (1)

- 1 A traditional grid is not nearly as important as establishing & routinely updating a flow dynamic model that identifies choke points & illogical flow patterns, then takes measure to mitigate and/or correct those flow problems. In some areas, establishing a grid may be a logical conclusion of this analysis. However, establishing a clear coupling of traffic flow analysis & fluid dynamics should have remarkable consequences over a relatively short period of time.

d. Metrorail will be enough transit

Total comments = 26

Need Circulator or Bus System in Addition to Metro (18)

- 1 Internal transit is essential - buses or people mover
- 2 Inexpensive, safe, comfortable, frequent service is essential
- 3 Frequency of service is most critical
- 4 Bus shelters must be improved - safety, lighting, enclosed but see-through
- 5 Need a transit or bus circulator system to link stations to rest of Tysons
- 6 Light rail or trolley needed.
- 7 I won't take public transportation if I can't get around easily once I get there.
- 8 Moving within Tysons very important
- 9 Public transit must be convenient and inexpensive to encourage people to use it.
- 10 Preposterous! Heavy rail, like Metro, serves to get large nos. of people into & out of an area, but you need something else to get people around an area. Some sort of circulating transit system like It rail or trolley would be immensely popular.
- 11 Dev along this transit way is inevitable, but it makes sense to do it that way vs. scattering dev about the area w/ no other way to gt around but by car.
- 12 4 transit stns do not serve 1700 As adequately. There must be other mechanisms.
- 13 As for addl public transportation, it is self evident that all areas of Tysons will not be w/in easy walking distance of the 4 Metro stns and addl local circulation will be needed.
- 14 Gotta have good bus/shuttle services, to work it.

- 15 Need additional transit like a feeder system for the Metro stns & principal Tysons area development nodes.
- 16 Need internal circulation system - buses or people mover system
- 17 Rail will not be sufficient. The projection that 80% of peak hour trips will be by auto is unacceptable.
- 18 Need frequent & inexpensive bus svc to encourage people to leave vehicles - also ped & bike paths.

Need Only Metro (2)

- 1 Public transit circulator sounds like a bad idea in the making.
- 2 Bus & Lt rail might help w/in Tysons but it's more important to get Metro there already. I like Scenario C, similar to Ballston-Rosslyn corridor. It seems to be working.

Need More Metro Stops Outside of Tysons (3)

- 1 There is huge support for a Metro stop at Wolf Trap Farm Park. It would be a great addn to the area & improve traffic conditions considerably.
- 2 A Metro stn to serve Wolf Trap will provide access to this facility for guests & staff, eliminating parking.
- 3 Many people today would ditch their cars if Metro was available closer than Dunn Loring or Vienna. Those are just too far to expect people to walk.

Do Not Need 4 Metro Stops at Tysons (3)

- 1 We do not need 4 Metro stops in Tysons - this just rewards developers at the expense of other users of Tysons.
- 2 Bringing Metro to Tysons is a disaster in the making. It will only bring the "unwashed" into an area that's a criminal's dream come true.
- 3 It is an absurdity to continue w/ the plan for 4 Metro stops in Tysons. Who does this benefit? Each Metro stop will be a congestion concentrator. So many Metro stops is a budget buster. We need efficient bus transportation w/in the Tysons area.

e. Transit circulator with band of growth adjacent to it

Total comments = 30

Need circulator - make it frequent & inexpensive, preferably free (11)

- 1 I like Scenario A's design w/ circulator routes connecting all of Tysons to 4 stations.
- 2 People need frequent, readily accessible transportation from rail stns to their offices, homes & shops.
- 3 This is key to providing necessary flexibility for Tysons to grow & prosper w/in current boundaries.
- 4 Circulator should be frequent & inexpensive, preferably free
- 5 Addl. Elements of a transit network, such as a north-south route & a circulator, need to be factored in, even if it is long term.
- 6 Transit should include not only 4 Metro stations, but circulator system that serves all areas.
- 7 Lt rail w/in Tysons & surrounding areas would be great. In Portland, OR & Seattle, WA they have "no toll" areas w/in the inner core area to encourage people to ride the free transit.
- 8 Ensure there are enough connectors/shuttles that go between the various major Tysons areas.
- 9 Moving within Tysons very important.
- 10 A BRT system is essential w/in Tysons & the surrounding area.
- 11 Provided the circulator is frequent & inexpensive - preferably free.

Circulator doesn't require higher density outside station areas (6)

- 1 Growth around circulator should be much less dense than growth around stations
- 2 These transit bands are just another catchphrase for increasing density beyond the Comp Plan for 1/4 mile from Metro. Suddenly buses work in Tysons, but would not work when the Draft Environ. Impact Statement was underway. Go back & look at the DEIS findings. BRT in Tysons will not work. Suddenly it does. Go figure!
- 3 Much of the growth should occur around the stns, but a circulator should be included to allow addl (albeit lower) density further from the stns. The stn radius currently appears to be based on a 5 min. walk - this is TOO SMALL!
- 4 Possibly in area bounded by 123 & 7 & Toll Rd if it does not clog up the rds. No addl. Growth due to bus systems w/in 1/4 mile adjacent to nbrds.
- 5 A public transit circulator w/in Tysons is necessary but it does not mean higher density outside stn areas. One does not require the other.

6 At significantly less density than at the TODs near the stns.

Will need pockets of density throughout Tysons (4)

- 1 The entire area of Tysons should be considered a high density, urban environment w/ great connectivity.
- 2 Development along circulator is inevitable.
- 3 Idea of "focused near transit stns" is very tricky. I think you are going to need to have various pockets of density throughout Tysons in order to have multiple job/housing ctrs & provide multiple centers of focus. You really don't want to have everyone concentrated along one spine. I think you need to spread out the traffic flow so there are alternatives throughout the Tysons downtown & not just in a relatively small area. A public transit circulator can effectively serve this type of dev pattern & keep people out of their cars once they get into Tysons.
- 4 Please be careful not to load up too much at the stations - create gateways or areas of mixed-use density throughout the grid system.

Would like monorail (2)

- 1 A monorail type system should be considered for moving people around & through Tysons.
- 2 Consider monorail type system.

Don't understand question (5)

- 1 Who worded question E - must have been an attorney or government person looking to confuse.
- 2 I'm not sure I understand the Q. A properly designed circulator system would allocate resources based on demand, whether close to rail or adjacent. And the public transit sector does not allocate resources effectively.
- 3 I'm not sure I understand what you are asking in question E.
- 4 Don't understand question E.
- 5 The answer to question E depends on the magnitude of growth adjacent to this hypothetical circulator.

Provide shuttles to Metro from 3 miles out (2)

- 1 Shuttles should be provided to areas at least 3 miles surrounding Tysons, leading directly to Metro.
- 2 I also like the idea of a bus rte thru Tysons to help get people further from the stns to their homes/work/shopping.

OTHER

Total comments = 3

Connect Tysons I & Tysons II

- 1 On 123 betw/ the 2 shopping centers, there should be an underground passage w/ shops & food courts.
This all-weather passageway is much better than an overhead bridge & the rental income would be added revenue.
- 2 Connect Tysons I & Tysons II via walkway or bridge.

Travel within & travel into & out of Tysons should receive equal emphasis

- 1 Equal emphasis should be placed on how people move w/in Tysons & how people travel to & from Tysons.

Question 3. Creating Active Places

a. Add parks and open space throughout Tysons

Total comments = 27

Design for a sense of place (15)

- 1 County need to think in terms of urban scale development & urban open space.
- 2 We need to walk more - in a pleasant setting.
- 3 Need to create reasons to get people out of their cars and enjoy being out of them.
- 4 Need to create a sense of place & opportunities for interaction & involvement.
- 5 Parks & open spaces are important in cities.
- 6 Open space should be linear (emerald necklace in Boston) for most part w/ small parks (or parking lots) that can support events (farmers market, music, art shows, etc.)
- 7 I very much like the "green space" concept.
- 8 How you design density makes all the difference betw/ a very attractive place & an undesirable one.
- 9 Include good quality architecture & urban design.
- 10 More urban open spaces are important; large suburban parks make no sense.
- 11 There should be open parks w/ grass so people can play w/ friends, pets & children & have access to some nature!
- 12 Important to have sense of place & create places that people feel comfortable walking to, & to have a reason to go to Tysons, other than shopping or working.
- 13 Design stds for urban dev. key: see Rosslyn vs. Ballston.
- 14 There are plenty of "art" places w/in an easy Metro ride so no need for more. Make Tysons livable; don't compete w/ DC. Make Tysons unique, a metropolitan suburbia; we don't need another modern, urban, boring chic place - we have Ballston, Clarendon, etc. Make it unique!
- 15 Future of Tysons depends upon ped friendly & active streetscape rather than auto focused. Trend MUST be reversed. I lived in Battery Park in NYC pre 911 & experienced lack of parks, shops & meeting places. Yet Hudson River Park had children's park better than what you are proposing. World Financial Center had green space for summer performances. Green spaces w/ easy food retail in the CENTER of urban work place very important. Also important are evening st bars & restaurants that used to line the WFC. Years ago I also lived in Davis Sq., Cambridge/Somerville, MA prior to its being developed. I like how it was dev. Around new transit w/ restaurants & green space. *You are proposing an ugly canyon that maximizes transit time and jobs. Don't do it. Build parks & amenities & pervious drainage to make it livable & families will want to raise their children there.* Make big high rises w/ small parks on exterior & you have high mobility rate - young adults move out as soon as they want to raise children. TRANSIT IS NOT EVERYTHING. Make a space where people want to to be out of their cars & more people will choose to walk. Your tiny little boulevards are pathetic and will not create the urban center you dream of. *You can do better than DC, Bethesda & esp. Ballston. Shame on you for not dreaming bigger and better.* How many people do you know complain about how slow it is to drive north of the river in Chicago on Lake Shore Drive? *People value the parkland.* I personally don't mind going slow and smelling the hot dogs cooking on the grills.

Want parks without taller buildings (5)

- 1 Why is provision of more parks conditioned only on taller bldgs? Why not less profit for developers?
- 2 Keep the taller buildings out. Why can't we have more parks w/out tall bldgs?
- 3 Clearly this "non-survey" wishes to get concurrence to build tall bldgs.
- 4 I support adding parks & open spaces but w/out too many highrises. You want sunshine & flowers, & tall bldgs block sun & make places gloomy. We could use more playgrounds also.
- 5 Adding parks & open space is necessary but does not require dev. On smaller sites w/ taller bldgs. Density can be adjusted downward. Growth should be concentrated near Metro stations.

Need central meeting places (3)

- 1 Tysons should have 1 public park w/ ballfields (soccer & baseball) & a playground. A lot of offices have teams that will want to use fields, as well as families. This will prevent overcrowding other nearby parks. Large public park can be adjacent to natural area; best if 1/3 mile from a station & w/in easy

walking distance of many offices & housing. Current location near Cap One not very accessible by walking, bike or bus.

- 2 Nice if new park were designed as central natural meeting space for Tysons residents.
- 3 Creating parks, entertainment venues & other social sites near new resid dev will encourage people to spend more time near home, reducing local traffic. Take care not to create too much of a destination site that will encourage substantial new outside traffic except in core areas designated as "entertainment zones."

Need useable open space, not surface parking (3)

- 1 Concentrate growth to allow for useable open space, not surface parking.
- 2 Tysons is already too low of density! There is too much unusable open space as it is! Useable open space makes sense.
- 3 People should walk out from Metro into gathering spaces & not more parking lots or bldgs. Bldgs. Should be around those gathering spaces.

Tysons is an urban core (1)

- 1 Tysons is an urban core, not an open space site

b. Support public art, etc.

Total comments = 9

Don't need performing arts space or cultural center (5)

- 1 Don't build a major performing arts space when Wolf Trap is so nearby. Circulating shuttles are quick & easy way to get there. There's green nearby: use it!!
- 2 Don't forget there are several performance spaces close to Tysons: Wolf Trap, the Barns, Alden Theater. Why not make it easy to get to them via public transit from Tysons?
- 3 Green spaces are wonderful additions to a resid. Or commerc. Environment. This does NOT mandate creating a cultural ctr.
- 4 If mass transit is good enough, availability of arts via DC/WolfTrap, etc., will support this concept. You don't want to create an end in itself - you should be trying to create functionality for a population that is going to be on the move, not stagnant. Being everything to everyone waters down any quality of lifestyle you're attempting to achieve.
- 5 Schls & libs good. Co. arts facilities a waste.

Invest in transportation first (2)

- 1 Adequate investment in transportation infrastructure must come before any investment in luxuries such as public art & performance spaces.
- 2 I believe there are more important investments for public & private funding, such as transportation systems.

Let new residents decide (1)

- 1 The uses of new buildings should grow from the residents' interests & needs.
I shudder at the vision of government-planned "artsy" facilities.

Implement public spaces through proffers (1)

- 1 Growth will happen as people & bus. Explore ways to improve status & profits. Public spaces can't be grown in same way. Must be planned by govt forces & implemented by proffers.

c. Provide a mix of housing

Total comments = 11

Don't want more residential development at Tysons (5)

- 1 Tysons is already busy enough so I don't agree we should build more active places. It's already ACTIVE enough.
- 2 Idea that Metro stops should be resid. Hubs is insanity. We need Metro from Dulles to downtown DC.
- 3 If I wanted to live in Manhattan, I'd move there. The high rise condos that have been approved will create far worse traffic than the so-called traffic engineers have predicted. Do you really think that someone who pays \$1 million for a condo will rely on Metro? Wise up!
- 4 I do not want my nbrd to become any higher density in housing.
- 5 Higher density housing is the main problem. Stop approving proposed developments. It is the fault of the Board that we have this mess to begin w/. I think you forget Metro was built first & then the urban dev along the Orange line. Fairfax is not Arlington, nor do we want to be. Fairfax Co. residents moved here for trees, land, you know,

suburban living!!

Housing will not be affordable (2)

- 1 Doubt that affordable housing is viable in such an expensive area as Tysons.
- 2 Even if you build homes, it would be too expensive for people to live in this area anyway.

Don't want subsidized housing (2)

- 1 I agree w/ "mix of housing" if it means a variety of housing types (townhomes, condos, apts, etc.) I DISAGREE if it is intended to mean a variety of income-targeted housing (Section 8, affordable).
- 2 There should be a cap on amt. of new housing. Also, don't want overpopulated area w/ low rent condos & apts.

Want more residential development throughout Tysons (2)

- 1 More residential in Tysons is important, not just at Metro.
- 2 Need residential development throughout Tysons.

d. Distribute growth evenly throughout Tysons

Total comments = 6

Concentrate density near transit (3)

- 1 Growth should progress at a similar pace both close to and away from Metro, although density should be much greater near Metro.
- 2 Make enough transit stations and you can do both D and E.
- 3 Density should not be concentrated too far from transit, as this may encourage greater auto use & mitigate the effects of redevelopment efforts in Tysons.

Not a good question (3)

- 1 Not a good research question; really 2 questions. Tricky Q to get at the answer to have density beyond 1/4 mile.
- 2 Shame on the makers of this questionnaire. They should know better & not construction Qs in this manner. Did they miss the class in Research 101?
- 3 D & E appear to measure the same thing. I must be missing something.

e. Concentrate growth in walking distance of Metro

Total comments = 8

Keep Area East of 495 & Dulles Toll Road Residential (4)

- 1 Keep the growth near Tysons mall & away from anything east of the mall. McLean is a functioning town w/ great schools & we do not need more growth. I oppose any development that will impact McLean High School. Recent reports of our Co officials taking \$ from large Tysons corps. Make me think that they only care about developers & big business, not about owners of small homes such as myself.
- 2 We like the fact that family-owned business in "downtown" McLean seem a million miles away from the mess at Tysons. This modest small town should be preserved & Tysons growth kept away from anything east of the Mall. McLean is a quiet, safe, livable community w/ great schools, locally owned shops, & green space. Allowing any Tysons growth to impact the "real" McLean would be a huge mistake. People who want to live in an area ruined by growth can move to Arlington!
- 3 Leave McLean alone. It is a treasure. People need to breathe.
- 4 I represent an HOA in McLean
We are most concerned w/ preserving the residential nature of McLean & esp. western McLean near the DTR, Anderson Rd, Great Falls St & Lewinsville Rd. W/ great dismay we have watched as office bldg after office bldg is being constructed on Lewinsville Rd. The traffic density on Lewinsville Rd has increased enormously & will only get worse when these new bldgs are completed. We don't particularly like any of the 3 scenarios because we do not think that properly address the 2 different nbrds that now exist around the proposed stns. The Anderson Rd (Tysons East) stn. Is very near substantial resid dev while the other 3 stns are predominantly retail/commercial environments. Yes, there is commercial office space near Anderson Rd but w/in 1/4 mile there is substantial resid dev & we would like to see that resid focus maintained. Therefore, we think the

Anderson Rd. stn needs to be handled completely differently than the other 3 stns. Your 3 scenarios do not make this distinction & we think that is a mistake. We would like to see a focused effort at resid dev around the Anderson Rd stn & either Scenario B or C for the other 3 stns. If you are unable or unwilling to make the changes we suggest, then we see Scenario B as the least offensive of your proposed plans. There is a natural barrier to Tysons & high dev. & the area bordering Spring Hill Rd. & Lewinsville Rd. The Toll Rd. makes a good barrier to ensure that high density and mixed use stay on that side of the road. Keep Tysons on the west side of the Toll Road.

Let the market decide (1)

- 1 Market forces should handle this, not zoning or "management."

Growth will follow the circulator (1)

- 1 If Scenario A is adopted w/ circulator routes connecting all of Tysons, there will be some growth outside 5 minute walking goal to get to station.

Extend walking distance to 10 minutes (2)

- 1 Yes, areas w/in walking distance should accommodate much of the growth. BUT the definition of walking distance should extend to at least a 10 minute walk.
- 2 I agree so long as it is an extended walking distance; i.e., far greater than the 1,000 ft or 1,500 ft which is mentioned. People easily will walk 10 mins. to get to stn., esp. once side sts have been dev. & walk becomes more interesting.

OTHER

Total comments = 9

Doubt that County can create an active place (3)

- 1 Ask Mr. Connolly what I think about his lack of planning for parks & rec areas w/in Tysons if the intention is to create another Crystal City or Ballston type environment. Of course, if you had them, you'd have to be able to safely get to them.
- 2 Creative & innovative ideas are interesting to talk about, but Ffx Co govt has shown no ability, willingness or even interest in making anything happen that's been promised. The Comp Plan is serving as merely a "first offer" for today's developers who come to the Co w/ "exceptions" becoming the rule. Based on that experience, we should expect every developer to ask for exception (beginning w/ very first one), that every green space will be filled w/ dead grass & 2 ft. tall "trees," & that every "active place" will be active only for lawyers to parse words into hollow exercises in make believe. The Co's inability to accomplish even underground transit illustrates this to a T.
- 3 Create an environment people actually want to be in. Tysons doesn't offer a ped friendly environment. Along w/ the rest of this outdated land use, if around the Nation's Capital things were planned right the first time, we wouldn't have this problem. It's the fact that the citizens think they know, the County thinks it knows, developers think they know ... just get someone from Europe or some college that does know a thing or two about planning combined w/ some common sense & get out of this boring 1950s stalemate!

Add density where it will reduce traffic (3)

- 1 While dev. Should be concentrated at Metro, it is more important to provide more resid. Options & ped friendly improvements to maximize the non-auto options in Tysons.
- 2 Add density where it will reduce traffic.
- 3 Most intense growth should be targeted for areas w/in easy walking distance from transit hubs w/ gradually attenuated density as you get farther from hubs to take advantage of Metro stns & other circulators. Failure to do so will result in reintensification of any traffic that might have otherwise been lessened.

Not realistic without funding for Metro (1)

- 1 Again, Metro is not built & is in question of receiving federal funding. How about actually waiting until we have final approval before building? You people are living in a TV dream land if you think "creating active places" is realistic. Perhaps we can have a reality show on your "creative" idea.

Don't overdo it on parks (1)

- 1 Tysons already has a rec ctr (Spring Hill) & some parks might be nice but don't overdo it. A shuttle from Metro to rec ctr is fine.

Add schools & libraries if there is a need. McLean & Vienna serve as the districts now.

Not planning for people under 30 (1)

- 1 I am under 30. I don't think you are asking the people who will use this who are in my age group what we think needs to be there. I already use transit to get to work & could never afford both a house & a car. And I am looking for nightlife & see no evidence that there will be anywhere in this complex to actually walk to!

Question 4. Being a Good Neighbor

a. No high rise bldgs. on edge or blocking nbrds' views

Total comments = 22

What Views? (6)

- 1 What views?
- 2 I can't think of any significant views of Tysons that are worthy of protection.
- 3 What significant views? Tysons doesn't have anything to look at.
- 4 Significant views of what? It is already the high point.
- 5 There are not many key viewsheds in Tysons.
- 6 This is only an issue to the side that borders Vienna. McLean & Pimmit Hills already have a lovely view of a freeway.

If they don't like high rises, let them move. (2)

- 1 If people want to live far away from tall bldgs., perhaps they should give Burke or Leesburg a try.
- 2 If existing neighbors don't like living near a city, they could move.

Maintain the edge; taper height down from Metro (6)

- 1 Maintain the edge; avoid "density creep"
- 2 Look to Reston for a model of growth.
- 3 I prefer the Reston model to the Ballston model of growth.
- 4 Taller bldgs should be near 4 stations w/ size tapering down as you reach nbrds.
- 5 By & large the edge of Tysons should be a hard edge to prevent density creep.
- 6 High rise bldgs MUST be located near transit hubs in order to be effective, even if it means blocking someone's view.
While unfortunate, this is a clear example of doing good for the many at the expense of the few.

Encourage quality architecture & signature buildings (5)

- 1 High quality architecture can create vibrant skyline & interesting views.
- 2 High rises should be the view, the skyline, the magnetic center of surrounding communities.
- 3 Quality architecture & varied skyline is more important than nominal height of bldgs. I think the tallest bldgs. in the entire DC Metro area should be in Tysons.
- 4 It's not about the views. It is about the quality and functionality of the new dev. Density should be put where it does the most good.
- 5 Want to make the point that the study should not rule out heights that might permit making signature bldgs & places at Metro stns. We should encourage bldgs as art, not stodgy 15, 20 or 30 story high bldgs. Think of the skyline, the view from afar. Near & Far Eastern cities are getting spectacular architecture. Tysons should have stns that are the jewels along the necklace that is the elevated rail. Also, provide much landscaping around the elevated sections. See part of the line at Reagan Natl. Airport, which are lavishly landscaped & the airport structure itself which is seamlessly integrated into the rail station. Vienna showed at the Monday mtg that they want to keep Tysons traffic from them. (How they plan on cleaning up 123 I have NO idea.) As has already been discussed, keep the density near the stations & most will be happy.

High rises will increase neighbors' land values (1)

- 1 High rise bldgs in Tysons will significantly increase the land values of the "neighbors." I think more money in their pockets will silence them.

Depends on the site (2)

- 1 There should be no litmus test in this regard.
- 2 Some height on the edge of Tysons may be appropriate - I don't think there should be a hard & fast rule, but take it site by site.

b. Limit connectivity between nbrds & Tysons

Total comments = 28

Neighborhoods need connections to Tysons (12)

- 1 Surrounding communities want to be connected with Tysons but not overwhelmed by traffic passing through - difficult balance
- 2 An urban core needs to have transportation arteries radiating out into the surrounding communities.
- 3 Need better connectivity w/ surrounding nbrds - more ways to get in and out of Tysons.
- 4 People outside Tysons should be able to get in via frequent, inexpensive public transit (bus, minibus, etc.)

- 5 A comprehensive network of non-motorized transportation corridors, trails & sidewalks, & bus routes should link neighborhoods surrounding Tysons w/ Tysons & its major destination points, i.e., Malls & Metro.
- 6 Do not limit access to/from surrounding areas.
- 7 While there needs to be a good circulator system w/in Tysons, also needs to be better connectivity w/ surrounding neighborhoods to give more ways to get in & out of Tysons.
- 8 Ped & bus connections should be strengthened.
- 9 These neighborhoods should be connected to Tysons - it is not a ghetto! In Arlington there is no separation. Surrounding neighborhoods should benefit from the new Tysons amenities & new & old should be integrated so that they both work together. Capitol Hill & other residential areas around DC work well w/ the CBD.
- 10 If one does NOT provide the connectivity, established neighborhoods outside Tysons will become even more isolated than they already may be.
- 11 Access to & from neighborhoods should be handled on a case by case basis & should primarily involve the wants & needs of the residents of those neighborhoods. In evaluating those needs, overall traffic flow in the area must also be considered.
- 12 Residents outside Tysons should be able to access Tysons thru frequent & inexpensive public transit (bus, minibus, etc.)

Need more access to 495, I-66 & Dulles Toll Road (2)

- 1 Need more ways to cross 495 & DTR but not too many crossings - would change characters of surrounding communities. They don't want to be part of new Tysons grid.
- 2 Make sure neighbors can pass by Tysons w/out being bogged down by traffic. Make a local lane for exits only & add a few exits off of Dulles Toll Rd. or Rte. 66.

No traffic cutting through neighborhoods (3)

- 1 I do not want people cutting through my neighborhood.
- 2 Traffic should not flow thru neighborhoods to get to Tysons.
- 3 Vehicular connections should be limited to discourage cut-through traffic.

Don't back traffic up on 123 (1)

- 1 I don't want the limitation to be such that people can't get into Tysons on 123, so as to back traffic up into Vienna.

Prepare for major life change (1)

- 1 Older neighborhoods near Tysons need to be prepared for a major life change. This is a benefit & pitfall of living so close to such a desirable area. The current way of life needs to make way for a better way of life, & I know it will be painful, but the change is for the better of ALL who need to get to work in Tysons.

Don't understand question (1)

- 1 Again a very bad Q. What is connectivity - roads, trails, paths?

c. Mixed use centers located throughout Tysons

Total comments = 33

No retail or employment in surrounding neighborhoods (8)

- 1 Don't buy New Urbanist insistence that every corner needs a corner store.
- 2 Yep - just go ahead & wreck the surrounding area, too!
- 3 Mixed use centers should be dispersed throughout Tysons w/out employment & retail intruding into residential neighborhoods outside of Tysons.
- 4 Absolutes are very hard for this section. I think you can disperse mixed use centers w/out putting them in the middle of existing neighborhoods - adjacent or nearby would provide the neighborhoods w/ desired amenities w/out having them right in their midst.
- 5 Residential single family home neighborhoods should be protected against mixed use!
- 6 Enough of the mixed-use development. People paying hundreds of thousands of dollars for a condo/townhouse do not want a BIG BOX in their back yard.
- 7 Do not change or undermine the character of the surrounding neighborhoods.
- 8 Needs to be retail w/in walking distance. If so, don't place it on residential streets.

Limit density & growth outside Metro stations (5)

- 1 Don't want too much growth outside station areas.
- 2 Too much growth in this area tends to cancel out #3 (Creating Active Places).
- 3 Allowing mixed use developments outside the Metro station areas should not mean granting addl. Densities w/in these areas.
- 4 Here come the exceptions: if a developer offers mixed use, then can they over-develop in other areas? No!
- 5 Mixed use centers should be concentrated near Metro for the most part (including possibly taking away part of one of the malls as retail & adding housing or office (i.e., converting Macy's in Tysons II to office or hotel). Some retail should be scattered around housing & office to allow people to be able to access daily needs quickly.

Need local-serving retail (11)

- 1 Need mixed-use centers with local serving retail.
- 2 We need more shopping options to serve residential (e.g. grocery store & dry cleaners) located near office.
- 3 Explore differences between regional oriented working & shopping areas & nbrds that are more locale specific & oriented toward providing needs of local inhabitants.
- 4 While we know dev. must be economically viable, the market may not provide a proper mix of uses, so we need to look for mechanisms to guide us to a good mix, within a range that can succeed.
- 5 Places to eat, get a haircut, take dry cleaning, buy groceries should be incorporated into ground floor retail spaces throughout Tysons. Schools should also be integrated into similar ground floor or dedicated high rise spaces.
- 6 Small shops & restaurants can be a worthwhile thing adding to a neighborhood feeling. Dept. stores, warehouses, office bldgs., etc. do not belong in a neighborhood if a family-type nbrd is to be retained.
- 7 Residents will only move to Tysons if they can get to the retail easily.
- 8 There is a great need for little stores & such located around the area that can be walked to or a short drive, but the density has to support the new businesses.
- 9 There is currently a HUGE lack of retail w/in the resid nbrds of Tysons.
- 10 Well designed offices & shops in resid areas could enhance the quality of life for workers & residents.
- 11 Incorporating retail into resid nbrds in some form is the key to bringing a true measure of urbanity to the area. Where is your planned farmers' market where I can walk to work & pick up breads from wonderful home baked bakeries & organic produce from outside the DC area? When I walked from WFC to the NY Federal Reserve, I had a farmers' market to buy produce & sandwiches ON THE MAIN DRAG to take to work & daycare for lunch & after work snacks. Make a place where apt. dwellers want to centrally meet to basically live outside. Look at the Hudson River Strip Park pre 9/11 to see how vibrant green space could be. Add in more retail food establishments & you have something better than WFC & Battery Park.

Don't understand question (4)

- 1 Does mixed use mean employment, retail, recreation? Another very, very bad question.
- 2 I don't know what a mixed use center is.
- 3 Does this Q refer to existing nbrds near Tysons, or to (new) nbrds in Tysons?
- 4 This Q is hard to answer. There needs to be service retail in carefully selected sites & amts outside the stn. areas.

Allow a mix of uses throughout Tysons (3)

- 1 Don't zone; require first-floor retail on key sts, but allow any mix of resid., commercial & retail in most space.
- 2 Mixed use has to be a part of the new resid. areas which should be part of the new commercial areas.
- 3 Distribution of mixed use means creating "cores" of housing & commercial/office dev w/in a ltd area that will reduce the need to travel. Keeping high density resid & commerc/office dev separate will result in more traffic.

Other (2)

- 1 Show how these changes will benefit the neighbors financially & convenience-wise & you can win them over. If you force a bad solution on them, you are again asking for trouble.
- 2 No campus schools inside Tysons.

Question 5. Paying for growth

a. Public sector

Total comments = 17

Use revenues generated by new development (8)

- 1 Commensurate with new revenue generated
- 2 Well-planned development should generate more in revenues than the cost to serve.
- 3 If growth is for Tysons, then residents of Tysons should pay for this.
- 4 The addl tax revenues generated by growth in Tysons should be reinvested in making Tysons a vibrant place to live, work & visit.
- 5 I should not pay for your facils. Do not put the burden on others for your schls, fire, etc. If Tysons is growing, Tysons must pay for itself. The use of the word invest or investing is misleading.
- 6 Taxes pay for svcs & there will be huge taxes generated by growth.
- 7 Make new growth pay its own way, esp. if such new improvements are installed to primarily or only benefit new growth.
- 8 Increased tax base should pay for schls, etc. If it doesn't, then there's a problem. Devs will pass costs incurred along as increases in cost of housing, retail & office space.

Explore creative financing options (5)

- 1 Tax Increment Financing could be used to fund ROW for st. grid & enhance the circulator.
- 2 Use a tax district. Set the rate to pay for the services.
- 3 All public financing options should be considered.
- 4 Need to consider other ways such as Development Authorities, grants, etc.
- 5 Consider a range of funding mechanisms & incentives.

Public sector responsible (4)

- 1 Public pay for services & maintenance.
- 2 Benefits of urban Tysons will also be received by surrounding communities & therefore public sector has responsibility to provide pub svcs fairly.
- 3 Why punish devs when they are the ones who have always put in whatever the Co wanted which never worked in the 1st place & got us inthis mess? Devs aren't to blame! Use all the \$ we are all paying the police for speeding or something. The entire public sector should pay. The govt. should pay.
- 4 Public facils are the responsibility of local govt, not devs. Local govt. has responsibility to public for basic, universally needed utils & facils. If costs/work is forced onto a dev due to govt's inability to provide it, that dev. Should be fully compensated in some manner & end result should become responsibility of govt to maintain. If a dev is responsible for paying & developing these facils, the dev should reap the financial reward just as for a commercial undertaking.

b. Private sector

Total comments = 28

Require developers to pay more than now (28)

- 1 Don't rely on negotiations w/ developers - that will end up w/ costs being shifted outside Tysons.
- 2 Here is where "new" zoning requirements should come in. You can build but you must also do the following.
- 3 Developers pay for acquisition & construction of facilities.
- 4 Developer's location in Tysons allows for increased prosperity on their part. Unless salaries increase, public should not be responsible.
- 5 This is another pair of Qs designed to polarize, instead of seeking realistic alternatives. Sadly, today's Ffx Co land use operates w/ heavily publicized lip svc to pub facils, but a hidden set of actual practice subsidies that make developing here a license to print \$. The Qs in the survey are very weighted toward "pro-growth." Of course devs should contribute & they should be contributing more NOW w/out further growth.
- 6 We should raise taxes if we must, but let's definitely put more of the burden on the devs.
- 7 Current Ffx Co supervisors have not been diligent in requiring proffers to assure public facils. When Franklin Farms rezoned, devs were reqd to dedicate land for intermediate schl & other facils as well as provide funding for rd improvements.
- 8 Devs should pay towards svcs, schls & pks like any other dev fee in liberal minded communs. See Colo. & OR & Lincoln, NE for exs. & go one step further. Otherwise you are building an unlivable canyon for a transient pop. Look at how people in NYC want to live up by

Ctrl Pk & the museums and NOT live in Battery Pk. Look at rents & how transient the comparable pops are.

- 9 Why should I be taxed for density dev that I know will impact the infrastructure that I now pay for? A better Q would be:
Do you agree that there should be high density land use that will negatively impact your nbrd & infrastructure? Do you agree that citizens outside the proposed dev area should pay to rebuild this infrastructure? Do you agree that your taxes should increase while the devs waltz to the bank w/ millions of dollars?
- 10 Nothing is free. If someone is gaining then they pay for that opportunity. If it is done right they will come out ahead.
- 11 The devs can pass along the infrastructure costs & the Co. should not pay for these svcs while the devs are getting richer.
- 12 Devs must accept the burden for new svcs & not accept a free ride from the taxpayers.
- 13 No one benefits more from the growth of Tysons than the private sector. They should be held accountable for new svcs & infrastructure needed to support growth.
- 14 Devs who profit handsomely from this growth must support it to their fullest ability. To force surrounding communities & neighbors who are retirees to fund their profits would be criminal.
- 15 Devs are the only ones who benefit from growth in Tysons. No one else benefits. Taxpayers must pay for new schls & pub svc infrastructure, while devs reap profits from forcing multiple Metro stops near their boondoggles. Who benefits? The hypothetical increase in tax base is a mirage, compared to the infrastructure costs. Ffx is behind every other area in making devs include the costs of infrastructure in the costs of their projects. Doing so will reduce their ability to sell these projs, because the price would include more of the true cost, now being forced on others who will not benefit.
- 16 The real key should be attracting devs. But if the market will bear, devs should have to sign stringent proffers.
- 17 An expert from FL speaking at Montgomery Co's Annual Growth Policy Forum recommended a 90/10 split on infrastructure/pub facil pmts (90% dev & 10% public).
- 18 Let's face it. The devs are going to make a killing. Make them pay.
- 19 Devs should do more than contribute to pub facils; they should pay for any pub facil that dev brings a need for.
- 20 Devs have been reaping finan. Reward for their devs in No. Va. For decades w/ minimal proffers. It's time they paid up & contributed to fixing the damage down by their sprawl.
- 21 Each new living unit should have a fixed price added to it to go toward pub facils, etc.
- 22 Devs should bear majority of cost for public needs; e.g., schls, libraries, parks
- 23 Devs & commercial interests will make so much \$ off the proj. & res will be putting up w/ so much construction crap, it's just not fair for them not to pay their fair share which in a 70/30 split would be the 70%!!!
- 24 Dev. Impact fees should be used to pay for the public facilities listed.
- 25 Significantly increase all fees & proffers.
- 26 Devs make money (& deals w/ the "approvers"), make promises called "proffers," & then bolt w/ the profits & leave the residents holding the bag. Enough is enough. Just say no to tall bldgs, higher density, mixed use, or any other
- 27 Those who benefit the most should pay the most.
- 28 Proffers should focus on immediate vicinity issues (e.g., w/in a block), not Tysons area at large.

BOTH

Total comments = 27

Both public and private sectors should pay (27)

- 1 Cost of new facilities should be balance betw/ public & private. All users should pay fair share.
- 2 Govt. should pay some, not all.
- 3 Devs. Should be responsible for only a portion of the total improvements.
- 4 Businesses that have an interest in Tysons should contribute, as well as the public sector.
- 5 There should be a sharing of the cost burden.
- 6 The public sector should pay for most of it, but the developers should also contribute.
- 7 Both should pay.
- 8 The public will pay to maintain commun svcs, but land acquis & construction of these facils has to be pd for by devs.
- 9 You can't just drop 50,000 people into a commun. & expect to absorb them w/in baseline svcs.

Costs should be divided among the public & devs.

- 10 Police, fire, etc. are public sector responsibilities, but devs should pay a reasonable share of at least some of these costs.
- 11 Need both. Need to consider other ways to pay for new pub facils such as grants, indust dev authorities, etc.
- 12 The devs who are the recipients of large incomes from their investments should pay a larger share of cost of public facils than taxpayers do, but both should contribute towards growth. Tysons serves people from all over the county & public \$ should come from Co funds, not just an assessment on those who live near Tysons.
- 13 The public sector AND devs should pay for police, fire, rescue stns, schls, libs & sewer facils. There is also the Q of providing of medical facils that must be addressed.
- 14 These 2 Qs at first glance seem diametrically at odds w/ ea other. Bottom line, both devs & pub sector should contribute to cost of addl pub facils.
- 15 I think devs need to contribute land & public sector needs to build. We also need storefront libraries like Shirlington & schls that are more urban like NYC - put playgrounds on rooftops. Ffx Schls need to look at new models for Tysons. Put fire stns in basement levels of high rise bldgs. Put police in mall & give them parking in the structures.
- 17 There should be a partnership. All or nothing serves no one.
- 18 Both public sector & developers will need to contribute towards public facils & svcs.
- 19 Need to create a partnership of govt., bus & citizens & also a funding mechanism for arts facils & other desired amenities. Partnership operative word.
- 20 If we can get the devs to help w/ this, it would greatly benefit the community.
- 21 Public & private sector investment is needed for addl pub facils & svcs.
- 22 While responsibility for providing pub svcs clearly rests w/ govt., private devs in many jurisdictions routinely offer dev of pub use facils as an incentive to approval of their plans. Some juris even require proffers of such addl dev. I believe it's in best interest of all to get as much out of devs as possible to support these new pub facils instead of drowning the taxpayer in addl taxes & long term debt when dev inures the benefits of new growth.
- 23 Both public & private sources should contribute.
- 24 I am not a dev. I am a pt owner of land that has been in our family for over 100 yrs. Unfortunately, the Task Force lumps landowners & devs into 1 category & perpetuates the perception of developer as the bad guy. Devs already fund a disproportionate share of rds & now suggesting public safety, etc., is unreasonable. W/ smart bus. Incentives (vs. continuing the path of disincentives) the Co. has a once in a 100 yr. opportunity to attract world-class devs & architects who together create a Tysons that could be a model for the entire East Coast.
- 25 We should quit the war & just make a Metro! Something peaceful that cuts down on oil & gas use & helps people get form place to place together. Once transit is in place & if land was available for sale instead of those dead zones all around Tysons, people & devs would put in the ped friendly infra. Themselves. Transit is the key!
- 26 Fair share
- 27 The public should pay its fair share, but recent years make it clear that "willing to meet halfway" is tantamount to asking to be looted. I'm tired of it.

OTHER

Total comments = 23

Don't want more growth (13)

- 1 Increase in housing will require more svcs than increase in office space. Has anyone polled the people who already work in the offices surrounding Tysons?
- 2 Just say no to tall bldgs, higher density, mixed use, or any other "creative" way you describe overgrowth and the Co's poor planning to accommodate the new residents.
- 4 Tysons does not need more growth! Send the growth to places in the area that need it & do not ruin Tysons w/ efforts to attract more density. The most attractive thing about the Tysons area is the green space & campus-like communities & business space.
- 5 This question predetermines the answers. These Qs aren't about traveling w/in Tysons, or even about how current facilities w/in Tysons should be reconfigured. Instead, it's clearly about how DC & Arlington urban areas can move out to Tysons.

Growth to the Comp Plan is one thing, but opening up Tysons as an attractive place for DC & Arlington to expand makes no sense & is a bad idea.

- 6 I do NOT support anything that is going to require "significant" public investment. Are you all really trying to get all seniors on a fixed income out of Ffx Co? Increasing my taxes to support growth that is not needed is pathetic.
- 7 The 3 test scenarios are all high growth. The public should be asked if low-growth or reduced-growth is preferred.
- 8 These questions assume we want Tysons turned into Brooklyn. Or into 100 Ballstons crammed together. Travel in and out of Tysons is horrible; increasing the density by 1, 2 or 3 x the Comp Plan max is ludicrous.
- 9 Why change??? The desire to add more people to Fairfax County is simply beyond my comprehension. No matter which plan is chosen, there WILL be more traffic & more delays. Stop now.
- 10 Congestion in all 3 test scenarios too high. Public input should include low-growth or reduced growth scenario.
- 11 Trying to turn Tysons into ped friendly area is a nice idea, but as usual, the County has waited too long. The damage is done. Proposal to expand Mall is insane, but Gerry wants more tax \$\$\$ & the people who have to come here every day suffer. I can't wait to retire & get the heck out of Fairfax County. Serenity Now!!!!
- 12 Graduated uses should be built into the plan, and actually following the plan in one area shouldn't be a justification for not following the plan somewhere else. Being a Good Neighbor means providing for people who will arrive by car, it means not inviting crime (cf Dunn Loring rapes), and ultimately it means keeping the densities DOWN not up. Once again, the best neighbor is a Tysons that grows (i.e., Comp Plan), and not a Tysons that invites other cities to move their growth here.
- 13 There should be an opportunity to discuss these Qs. For the exercise that we were charged to do - look at density of development, these Qs were most inappropriate & were specifically designed to capture the answers that you wanted in order that results would reflect positively on the plan that is to "push the envelope." I am most disappointed the Task Force would endorse such a faulty survey questionnaire. But then, is the Task Force putting forth a level playing ground? I don't think so. By the time the answers fall thru the filter of "let's get at the high density focus," whatever is sad negatively will be eliminated or masked.

Tie level of development to infrastructure capacity (2)

- 1 Questions are loaded: public sector should "pay" or developers should "contribute" is asymmetrical. We should respect the limitations that infrastructure may place on levels of dev that can be supported.
- 2 Ensure road systems meet the existing Comp Plan before permitting higher density in Tysons.

Tie level of development to financial capacity (2)

- 1 Whatever plan is adopted must include a realistic funding plan. In fact, the extent of the funding available may drive plan selection. Imperative that adequate transportation & other public facilities are fully funded w/ a realistic plan that both public & private sectors buy into BEFORE any part of new plan is implemented.
- 2 The question is, where will the operating costs for a circulator come from - the Fairfax Connector?

Require green building standards (1)

- 1 Require energy-efficient buildings; install solar voltaics; apply LEED criteria at Gold level of higher to reduce awful environmental impact of development

Don't want urban park standards (1)

- 1 AMENITIES MATTER and devs only care about that first sale. I DO NOT AGREE that your so-called urban stds for reduced pk footage per res should be used.

Tie level of development to market feasibility/economic reality (2)

- 1 To continue this business as usual attitude lacks vision & suboptimizes the oppors before us. If MORE of the burden is shifted to devs (rds, pub facils & svcs) the Co will never realize nor will the public ever enjoy the kind of quality placemaking that is possible (i.e., Rockefeller Center) because the bus case is no longer there to invest in such dev scenarios. It is time for the Co to model future scenarios based on different underlying bus models (not just econ forecasts - but bus/dev forecasts). It is time to educate the public (including the Co) on basic bus concepts related to dev quality. That is MORE important than modeling housing & office scenarios. It is a serious oversight. I urge PB PlaceMaking to include such bus modeling in their final set of recommendations/

dev scenarios. The new Comp Plan must consider dev bus cases vis a vis dev expectations.

2 How do you know that demand for so much office space exists? I haven't seen any evidence of this.

Want More Growth (2)

1 Plan for 2050 metropolis. Go beyond "pushing the envelope."

2 Anti-growth activists should be made to feel like Tysons won't affect them, but it should be designed thinking of Tysons' future (2100).

If you had \$100 to spend on transportation in and around Tysons Corner, how would you allocate it?

a. Grid of streets

- 1 Make street grid ped friendly w/ st furniture & landscaping
- 2 Should be built by developers as Tysons is redeveloped, according to govt. master plan.
- 3 First 10 years, invest in streets & transit within Tysons; then sidewalks, roads & transit into Tysons

b. Sidewalks, bike lanes, other bike & ped amenities

- 1 Should be built by developers as Tysons is redeveloped, according to govt. master plan.
- 2

c. Widening roads into Tysons

- 1 Dedicated to through traffic, not internal circulation
- 2 Convert 7 & 123 to limited access, building ramps & bridges to separate from grid
- 3 Maple Avenue will never be widened.

d. Adding transit connections into Tysons

- 1 Need dedicated bus/HOV lanes
- 2 Transit connections should be part of new circulator system & grid of streets

e. Adding transit connections within Tysons

- 1 Need dedicated bus/HOV lanes; use shoulders during rush hour
- 2 Transit connections should be part of new circulator system & grid of streets

OTHER

- 1 Why no comments section for Question 6?
- 2 A comment section was needed.
- 3 D & E seem to be the same; does one double the \$ of the other?

If you had \$100 to spend on other community needs at Tysons, how would you allocate it?

a. Parks

b. Green corridors

- 1 Keep open spaces as natural as possible within an urban setting

c. Theatres & concert halls

- 1 Would like museums, stadiums, amphitheater

d. Schools

- 1 Special focus
- 2 School(s) could also house regional library, theatre, concert hall, rec center & meeting space
- 3 Build school first; then 10-15 years later spend more \$ on rec centers, libraries, concert halls, etc.
- 4 We need all of these to make Tysons a great place to live, work & play.
- 5 Need child care facilities & hospitals; university & NVCC would be nice

e. Libraries

f. Civic meeting spaces

g. Affordable housing

- 1 Especially essential
- 2 Need workforce housing