

TASK FORCE MEMBERS' COMMENTS PROVIDED TO STERLING WHEELER FOR USE IN DEVELOPING DRAFT STRAWMAN PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE FOR APRIL 14-15 MEETINGS

In order according to length of comments (shorter to longer)

1. Kohann Whitney

Integrate the community comments summary (Perspectives) with PBPlacemaking's recommendations. Including the specifics mentioned as community benefits.

2. Stella Koch

Would like to see the Narrative for Tysons in the final document include written recommendations of the Environment/livability Committee. None of these were in the handouts in February to the General public.

Should include

- 1) Mention of new and innovative stormwater approaches including infiltration
- 2) Mention of reduction of impervious surface
- 3) Goal of having "Green" Buildings at Tysons....the County has adopted LEEDS silver standards for its own buildings as has the region thru COG.
- 4) Energy saving components in neighborhood, building designs and utilities
- 5) Focus on water conservation
- 6) Native Plantings whenever possible
- 7) Although the streams were shown as Park areas.... mention should be made of restoration as part of redevelopment.
- 8) Explanation of Park Goals and distribution of parks throughout Tysons,,mechanisms for how this might occur.

Also need to address the impacts of traffic on adjacent neighborhoods as Tysons grows.....and potential mitigation. This has the potential to be a real sticking point if we do not address it in our recommendations.

3. Stuart Medelsohn

Here are some broad comments. As we discussed at the last task force meeting, until we see the real map, we cannot comment very much. However, as I have argued in the past, there should not be any cap, such as the arbitrary 110 million proposed. This is supposed to be a long-term plan, and should be built from the ground up. If we place limits and try to artificially phase it as has been suggested, we will not get any grid streets or much of what we envision. It is not

like all of Tysons is under single ownership. It will evolve based on market conditions, possibly aided by incentives we provide. However, playing in the 1-2 FAR range will not cause the redevelopment necessary to bring the dramatic change necessary, even over time. If we initially limit growth to the transit stations, we will never solve the internal transportation issues and get grid streets. In addition, everything from housing to parks to streets is envisioned to come from density incentives, but there is not enough incentives to do this, except around the stations.

4. Sally Liff

I haven't been around much, and my internet blew up, but I have a few comments. First I would like to reiterate in writing my nitpicks:

- It is important to show the conservation and trail areas, such as the one next to the new condo development on Westpark.
- The HOT lanes should be shown on all maps because they are more likely than the Metro at this time to be there!
- There should be some verbiage and perhaps a sketch of plan for Pimmit Hills. I do know that it is not in our study area, but changes are happening there now. The same thing happened at West Falls Church Metro station, and the result could have been better if the fringe had been included in the plan.

GB's summary memo is helpful. I'll assume this and the work of the subcommittees were discussed at the meeting on the 10th, so I am flying a little blind. I don't know how they arrived at the 110 msf, but it seems reasonable, if accompanied by the balanced development plan.

They reference circulation once people arrive at Tysons, however, circulation must serve the residents, even providing for special services for access to grocery shopping, baby carriages, etc.

There will need to be access and parking at some of the parks. I question ball, but I know that is a contentious issue.

I would like to see some reference to an interim growth development, e.g.. when the employment or residential numbers reach x or y, then the plans should--, to allow for flexibility to make the full plan eventually work.

5. Keith Turner

WEST*GROUP COMMENTS ON “TYSONS CORNER: PATH TO THE 21ST CENTURY

Throughout The Land-Use Category on all land use maps called “Downtown / CBD Mix” should be replaced entirely by a combination of “Office Focus” and “Mixed-Use” categories. Tysons itself is the CBD of Fairfax and each of the station areas will have its own “urban” “business” character. Designating one station as the “CBD” implies that it would receive greater density than the other three stations and would somehow be handled differently. In any case, it does not make sense that the station with the least current (and least potential) road access would somehow be designated as the dominate “CBD” over all others. Also, the most recent land use maps show an equal distribution of FAR amongst the four stations and therefore contradicts the designation as the CBD. This is also not the best area in the Tysons Corner Urban Area to potentially put 30-story buildings.

P.24, 25 ~~“The Central Business District subdistrict of Tysons Central 7 adds new high-rise office buildings to appeal to tenants who desire identity headquarters buildings for a strong corporate profile. These buildings are the tallest in all of Tysons,” and “[t]he Central Business District has the greatest office concentration in Tysons with taller buildings.”~~ These statements should either 1) be deleted entirely or 2) apply both to Tysons Central 123 in its entirety and, on a case by case basis, to Tysons East and Tysons West. There are many other considerations involving height, corporate location, corporate identity, skyline, density and intensity, potential incentive trade-offs, proximity to the Tysons’ perimeter, etc.

P.9 ~~“Prototype B places most of the density around the rail stations but also allows additional layers of transit to shape the growth by placing additional greater density around the transit circulator that serves the majority of Tysons as well as around the four Metrorail stations.”~~

P.16 ~~“Rather than focus development almost exclusively primarily around the Metrorail stations, Prototype B also includes TOD (mostly residential) along the transit circulator.”~~

P. 13,17, 27, 29, 35 (Land Use Maps) For Prototype A – The Frederick Site should be “Mixed-Use” not “Office Focus” and the Westgate Kiss-and-Ride should be “Civic” not “Mixed-Use.” For Prototype B – the Frederick Site should be “Mixed-Use” not “Residential Focus”[; the Brunswick, Dickenson, and Warren Sites should be “Mixed-Use” not “Residential Focus”] [; and the Garfield, Westgate, and Van Buren Sites should be “Mixed-Use” not “Office Focus”].

P. 28 *“Educational facilities essential to attracting creative class families are located near existing educational facilities, and along Scotts Run, as are professional education, recreational health, and sports amenities.”*

P. 34, 35 *“Located primarily between West Park Drive and the Dulles Access Road, North Central is an established residential area and an established corporate employment center in Tysons a transitional area between Tysons Central 123 and the adjacent community north of Tysons (with the Dulles Access Road as an additional buffering element).” “Prototype A envisions North Central maintaining its existing residential areas and continuing the development of as more of a commercial office park, with a superblock road network, lower density and limited local serving retail.” “The circulator serves ~~as a connector to the other parts of Tysons and the metrorail stations, bringing existing residents and the employees to and from~~ who work in this corporate employment center.” “The intensity of development is lower than ~~the other parts of Tysons closest to the Metrorail, providing a transition between the TOD at Tysons Central 123 station and the adjacent communities north of Tysons.~~” **North Central is definitely not a transitional area . . . it is the largest existing residential area in Tysons and a very important employment center in Tysons w/ two major Fortune 500 firms – two of the largest employers.***

6. Clark Tyler

This is to comment on what we need to do/have prior to our meetings on April 14 & 15.

Our goal must be to first have answers to most of the questions that Doug listed on the "consensus document." Some of these have been answered by Cambridge Systematics and by the Task Force (after considering the workshop comments), but most still need to be resolved.

For my part, I think the following points need resolution:

1. Clearly the thought of 30-story buildings put a lot of people off. Since there are none in that category in Tysons, we need to be very careful about how these may be sited, and maybe 25-stories is a better cap.

2. The concept of a circulator system is a winner, but we need to specify exactly what criteria will be employed to draft any present or future alignments. From Robert Cervero's presentation, I would also accept that a "starter" circulator must be in place before some densities are even instituted. The circulators must move on dedicated ROW for most of their route (as far as is possible), but the system must be frequent, free and visible/convenient to those using Metro. The phasing of these vehicles is very important, and their routes will undoubtedly affect some redevelopment decisions. Access for such areas as the Old

Courthouse South district and areas where substantial redevelopment is being considered (the Avalon Bay parcels near the toll road & Avalon Crescent the WRIT property at 7900 Westpark Drive, and the Post property on International Drive up to Jones Branch for instance).

Some of the concerns about walking distances and properties on the edge of the circles around the stations need to be resolved so our decisions are consistent.

3. I really like the way PB characterized the 8 districts, and we may need to plan for an educational campus site which I have been working on with GMU and NOVA for over a year. This would be an important addition as it puts these institutions exactly where their prime market is. I know that both West Group and Art Walsh have been involved with this as well.

4. Parking is a major sore point. My estimate is that there is at present about 40 million square feet of parking (both surface, underground and in the 79 major parking structures now in place). If Metro ridership, the circulator and other trip reduction measures have full impact, then as much as half of these spaces will be vacant. This will involve serious parking management measures, pricing, shared parking, as well as parking maximums, but it might take even more creativity -- such as putting 4-story stick-built affordable housing on top as has been done elsewhere. Getting rid of a lot of the non-mall surface parking should be a goal just to relieve the impervious surface problems that the stormwater folks told us about.

5. Parks : We have had several meetings with both Park Authority Board and with staff. They seem to be insistent about this 10 acre central park idea, but not phased by the cost of land problem it would entail. Somewhat smaller parks in each of the 8 districts seems a reasonable answer. Providing for active recreational activities (NOT baseball or soccer fields) but basketball courts, volleyball and less expansive activities would be appropriate. Lately some TF members have gotten into the fact that Tysons may end up overloading parks & fields in the non-Tysons ring. This is unreasonable and I think stretches the point. The TF should insist that the Park Authority provide sensible and complete design criteria so we don't end up with a lot of green spaces that no one uses. They have some of that in Ballston.

6. We need a clear and quantified goal that Tysons have completed sidewalks along every road, street and thoroughfare. Right now we have a hyphenated system with no clear plan to make it any better. Obviously VDOT must be pressured into making this happen, both with sidewalks and streetscapes.

7. I agree that a major omission seems to be comprehensive environmental considerations - not just preserving open spaces & parks, but conservation measures, green buildings and all the rest of that menu.

8. The latest HOT lanes plans show the addition of bike lanes and pedestrian access. This should be included and provided for in the Network we choose. I'm not sure which of the two networks descriptions is the latest, but if Network 2 is the choice, then including the ramps onto both the Beltway and the Toll Road are a must - as is the mostly dedicated ROW for the circulator.

9. The TF will have a major recommendation for Implementation, to include an entity to act as overseer and a critical adjunct to County staff, as well as detailing a transitional component so that all the APR landowners don't just give up and submit under the current comp. plan.

10. We can make an honest attempt to cost out such things as the circulators and other elements of the infrastructure, but this may depend on getting federal funds set aside for such a purpose. The public facilities providers have been asked for their part of this. Of course the road improvements are a separate category.

11. I have told the TF members that this is the last shot at achieving consensus on a Preferred Alternative. No widows and orphans or requests for more data & analysis after April 15th. The intercessory prayer team will be dealing with that insistence!

7a. Bruce Wright

Below are comments I sent to Jay Evans of Cambridge Systematics regarding the need for better non-motorized access into Tysons. While I think we all agree that the grid of streets will be designed in such a way that bicycle facilities will be included, I'm concerned that the grid does not extend beyond some significant barriers for non-motorized travel into Tysons. I have suggested the need for plans for non-motorized bridges across the Beltway and Dulles Toll Road, and recognition of an entrance into Tysons behind the Sheraton near the Ashgrove Historic site. While there are plans for bridges for motorized traffic that include facilities for bikes and pedestrians, bike/ped only bridges would be much less expensive and could be built if the motorized connections are not built. Also, a connection along Route 123 from Tysons north to McLean is critical and there seem to be no plans for such a connection.

I was not able to attend the recent Transportation Committee meeting where this was discussed although I did send a similar message to Keith Turner.

Jay,

I didn't get a chance to introduce myself at the last Tysons Task Force meeting. I am a member of the task force representing bicycle and pedestrian issues. I'm a former member of the county Trails Committee and current chairman of Fairfax

Advocates for Better Bicycling (FABB). I sit on the Tysons Transportation subcommittee and worked with Don on the transportation modeling. Don also joined our group for a bicycle tour of Tysons.

In the past I mentioned to Don the importance of non-motorized transportation access into Tysons. As I'm sure you know, there are very few places currently with non-motorized access for residents of McLean, Pimmit Hills and points north and northeast. There is very little access in the southwest as well. I suggested to Don that he include new access points into Tysons that are non-motorized only. While there are new crossings of the Beltway in the proposed transportation network, they are primarily for motorized traffic. Ped/bike-only crossings are much less expensive and can be built in the near future. Unfortunately these were not included in the modeling as an alternative to the motorized crossings.

There is currently a ped/bike-only connection into Tysons from the southwest that is also not included in the network. It is located behind the Sheraton hotel on Route 7 near the Dulles Toll Rd. If you follow Ashgrove Lane to Northern Neck Dr there is a former paved roadbed that is used to access the neighborhoods in Vienna along Old Courthouse Rd. You can see this and other bicycle access points into Tysons on a draft bike route map that FABB has created:

<http://tinyurl.com/yx2r4z>

This entrance into Tysons is in jeopardy and needs to be included in the current network of routes into Tysons. The current general management plan for the Ashgrove Historic site located nearby suggests that the road be abandoned. Search for the phrase Teets in the plan at:

<http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/parks/gmpashframe.htm>

It contains a reference to the connection which is currently only used by the Teets family under a special agreement: "Once the Teets agreement is honored, it is recommended that the bridge and roadway be removed for safety purposes."

I suggest that this route be added to the network as it is a critical connection for bicyclists and pedestrians. This will be a suggestion that I will make at future meetings.

Also, when future modeling is conducted on the Tysons road network, I believe that non-motorized crossings of the Beltway and other barriers into Tysons should be considered. If you would like to discuss these issues, please contact me at this address.

I've copied Keith Turner, chairman of the Tysons task force Transportation subcommittee, on this message.

7b. Bruce Wright

As per Clark's recent email message, the following are comments on GB Arrington's memo due to you by March 17:

From the memo: "D. Roadway, Bike and Pedestrian Connections, What we Heard: The ability to walk around Tysons is important. Pedestrian environment must be friendly. The transportation network needs to include both moving around within Tysons and getting into and out of Tysons. The adjacent communities and Tysons need to be linked."

We also heard that the ability to bike around Tysons is important and that the bicycle environment must also be friendly.

In an earlier message to you I noted the importance of non-motorized connections into Tysons. While we have seen a proposed street network for motorized traffic circulation, we have not seen the same for bicycle circulation. As GB stated under D, Consultant Recommendation: "Include street cross section recommendations that address separated bike and pedestrian lanes. Include a circulation and street design element in the urban design guidelines based on best practices." Cambridge should develop a bicycle circulation diagram that outlines how bicyclists will enter and exit Tysons and circulate within Tysons. This level of detail should be possible once the allocations are refined and the grid of streets is finalized. Without the circulation diagram, it will be difficult to develop a comprehensive, connected bicycle network.

I am willing to work with Cambridge to help refine the bicycle circulation diagram.

8. Wade Smith

GENERAL COMMENTS

Maps shown need to be larger.

Need to discuss Rt. 7 separately somewhere as a linear feature that crosses several districts. The discussion should focus on the unifying element for this linear feature (significant urban boulevard?) and describe how it would be achieved across several districts. The description of each district that includes Rt. 7 should discuss how Rt. 7 will be treated in that district plan.

Are there other plan features that cross several districts? If so, they should be identified and discussed.

Need to discuss how major streets will be made more pedestrian friendly to cross, especially Rt. 7 and Rt. 123.

Need to define Complete Streets somewhere. Perhaps in a footnote or an appendix.

The Rt.7/Rt.123 interchange is still a major barrier in the plans. This is a waste since it is right next to a major rail station and is in the heart of the downtown section of Tysons Corner. This interchange should be turned into an urban diamond or an at-grade intersection and the area around the intersection used to much better advantage.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Tysons West District

The text states that the areas north and south of Rt. 7 are different in character, but the conceptual plan maps are only different in Prototype B.

The area adjacent to Old Courthouse Spring Branch should be more residential or mixed use to take advantage of the stream valley green space as an amenity to the residences. The conceptual map shows this area as office focused.

Boone Blvd. where adjacent to the Old Courthouse Spring Branch stream valley should not become a busy-street barrier to this natural amenity. The stream valley side of the street should have characteristics that make it an attractive place to walk and sit. A better alternative would be to switch Boone Blvd. with the street one block to the north.

The hotel focus areas shown are the current areas that have hotels. These areas are fairly far from the Metro station. Will there be hotels also in the areas nearer the station.

Need a discussion of how Rt. 7 will be treated and integrated with Rt. 7 in the Tysons Central 7 district.

Tysons Central 7 District

It makes absolutely no sense to have a major highway interchange with two clover-leaf ramps in the middle of this important district! This is the most valuable real estate in Virginia, and possibly in the Middle Atlantic region.

The area north of Rt. 7 and west of Rt. 123 should take advantage of the topography. This is the high point in Tysons Corner and the highest point in Fairfax County. If heights have to be restricted at Tysons West because it is on the edge of Tysons Corner, maybe there could be added height here. This area

gives a very nice skyline when approaching Tysons Corner from the east on Rt. 123 after the Lewinsville Rd/Great Falls Street intersection, especially at night.

Boone Blvd. where adjacent to the Old Courthouse Spring Branch stream valley should not become a busy-street barrier to this natural amenity. The stream valley side of the street should have characteristics that make it an attractive place to walk and sit, especially with a residential focus across the street.

The area adjacent to Gosnell Road will need to transition to the existing townhouse residential on the west side of the street.

Need a discussion about how this district will be integrated with the Tysons Central 123 district in order to connect better with the Galleria Mall and to attract people into and out of the mall.

Need more breaks in the super blocks in the area between Greensboro Drive and International Drive. Breaks could be pedestrian only, which would complement the adjacent mall environment.

Need a discussion of how Rt. 7 will be treated and integrated with Rt. 7 in the Tysons West district.

Tysons Central 123 District

Need to discuss how to break down the barrier created by the wall of parking garages that line the north, west, and south sides of the Galleria Mall. These are ugly and create a major barrier to connecting the mall to the Tysons Central 123 Metro station and to the central business district to the west.

The area of Watson St./Fletcher St. could be a nice café district. It has hard boundaries of Rt. 123, Rt. 7, and International Drive. It should be fairly quiet and mostly free of any major traffic because of its location and boundaries. It could attract people out of the mall.

The area along West Park Drive doesn't seem well integrated with the adjacent North Central district. West Park Drive in this vicinity could be a local commercial and restaurant street with businesses that serve the significant residential development in the North Central district.

Need to discuss how Rt. 7 will be treated and integrated with the rest of Rt. 7 to the west of Rt. 123. Need to discuss how Rt. 7 will be made pedestrian friendly for crossing.

Need to discuss how Rt. 123 between the Beltway and International Drive will be made attractive. Current plans will make it an ugly canyon of heavy and fast traffic.

Could a deck be built over Rt. 123 on the eastern portion adjacent to the rail station? This would create a plaza and use this space productively. If Rt.123 was grade-separated under International Drive, the deck and plaza could extend all the way to International Drive.

Tysons East District

Streets shown adjacent to the Scotts Run stream valley should not become a busy-street barrier to this natural amenity. The stream valley side of the streets should have characteristics that make it an attractive place to walk and sit, especially given the residential focus of this district.

Need to discuss how this district will be connected across the Beltway to the adjacent districts. There needs to be a connection in the vicinity of the Beltway overpass of Rt. 123. These could be pedestrian- and bicycle-only connections given the significant topographic differences on the east and west sides of the Beltway.

North West District

The Old Courthouse Spring Branch stream valley probably cannot become a park with “active recreational facilities” since it is a floodplain and is a resource protection area. It is also likely that there would be objections to clearing areas for active recreational facilities from the adjacent neighborhoods to the west. However, the stream valley can have pedestrian trails and would be a major amenity to the residents and office workers on the northwestern side of Tysons Corner.

Old Courthouse South District

This district should be “a mixed use neighborhood village that includes residential and employment” as in the second bullet on page 32. This rectangular district is conducive to a complete street grid and is likely to be a very quiet area.

Need to discuss how Rt. 7 will be treated and integrated with the rest of Rt. 7 to the west of Rt. 123. Need to discuss how Rt. 7 will be made pedestrian friendly for crossing.

Need to discuss how Rt. 123 frontage will be treated.

North Central District

This district should be developed as in Prototype B.

The eastern portion of West Park Drive doesn't seem to be well integrated with the adjacent Tysons Central 123 district. West Park Drive in this vicinity could be a local commercial and restaurant street with businesses that serve the significant residential development in the North Central district.

East Side District

Need to discuss how transition on Magarity Road will be implemented.

9. Irfan Ali

March 14, 2008

To: Tyson's Task Force

From: Irfan Ali, Member Sully District

Subject: Comments on Consultant's Reports & GB Arrington March 5th Memo

In October of 2007 following back to back meetings of the Liaison Committee, a document referred to as the decision rules was produced from which the two current "Prototypes" emerged.

Subsequently, Prototypes A&B were presented to the Task Force as the two scenarios to be tested going forward. I voiced my disagreement to the approach and among other things, shared my concern that the two Prototypes may not allow us to do "what if" analysis. This concern was also shared by several other members of the TF. However, we were assured by the Chairman we would indeed have an opportunity to do "what if" analysis.

We now find ourselves up against time, a dwindling budget and pushing along a path with which I continue to have trouble. As many of you already know from the multiple times I have raised this issue, my main concern has to do with what I believe is the most critical aspect of our deliberations: the allocation of future growth in Tyson's.

It is not only my concern, but one voiced repeatedly by citizens at the outreach meetings as well as members of the Board of Supervisors. We have heard repeatedly from experts and citizens alike; future growth should be concentrated around the station areas. Yet in our decision rules document, we asked the consultants to test a scenario which spreads as much as **19 million square feet** to non station areas by adding a "form giving" circulator". I strongly share the opinion of many experts I have spoken with; this amount of square footage away from Rail will result in significantly higher auto dependant traffic within Tyson's. Higher number of autos will undoubtedly result in a significant negative impact on the immediate surrounding areas.

CIRCULATOR

With regards to the circulator, we need to take a step back and ask; what is the “form giving circulator”? Other than pretty pictures of street cars provided by the consultants, we have no plans, design, cost idea or right-of-way for such a service. Who is going to pay for it, how will it be “inexpensive” and yet environmentally friendly, will it create noise and pedestrian impediments, etc?

As an example of the challenges facing a “form giving” circulator one needs only to look at the experience of an Arlington based coalition’s efforts to bring a “Street Car” running along a 4.2 mile section of Columbia Pike. This effort is into its 8th year since it was first conceived and still no concrete signs that it will happen.

Keep in mind, the Columbia Pike corridor in Arlington is already well populated and the proposed route has high bus utilization. Ironically, that has been one of the main challenges; while a street car would certainly be esthetically more pleasing, the cost/benefit analysis over an enhanced bus service does not allow the “street car” concept to be economically feasible without significant subsidies on top of taxes proposed by a Business Improvement District (BID). This conclusion is also borne out in Cambridge Systematic’s analysis of Tyson’s under the two prototypes where they did not see any significant improvement between the “form giving” and in traffic circulators. A point of interest: when plans for the Metro were being developed nearly 40 years ago, it was intended to bring a line out on Columbia Pike but the right of way could not be secured.

URBAN FORM

In Prototype A the highest density within 1/8th mile of the station is 4.5 FAR and in Prototype B this goes to a 5 FAR. This level of density will likely prove inadequate to achieve the goals of a grid of streets, public spaces, underground parking and public amenities. We have been told by the consultants and staff, the actual buildings may end up being built to a higher FAR once the streets and open spaces are accounted for. This needs to be clearly understood. What they are saying may be true; however, the underlying economic value of the land is directly tied to the FAR which is allocated to it. It is from this underlying economic value that the developers are able to justify granting of proffers and rights of way.

I spoke with Jim Lynch who was one of the expert panelists at our outreach meeting at Capital One last year. Jim who spent over 30 years at Arlington County as a planning official in various capacities remarked that looking back he wishes they would have had allocated a lot more growth around the station areas than they did. He pointed out that Arlington now has a 10 FAR in some station areas but lower density older structures stand in the way. This impacts overall tax revenues for Arlington and pushes the demand elsewhere.

Granting a 6 or a 7 FAR to the station areas would be the visionary thing to do. This does not mean that dozens of 30 story buildings will start popping up overnight. It will take market forces to determine the timing of when these projects will be delivered. However, as we have discussed in the implementation committee, this extra FAR will be tied to specific timing of proffers that will require the owners to participate in the granting of rights of way for the grid of streets within a certain time frame. Without the extra economic inducement, it is unlikely we will be able to jumpstart the transformation process or achieve our collective vision of a grid of streets and the amenities we all desire.

There seems to be a bias towards political and public perception when dealing with density. Early in the testing process we were told, without any specific details, that above 130 million square feet, Tyson's begins to fail. The assumptions going in to this "fail" case were never adequately explained. As an example, what were the standards; urban or suburban causing this "failure"? I bring this up because it drives many subsequent decisions we will be making that will impact Tyson's and citizens for decades to come. Once concrete is poured and buildings erected, there will not be an opportunity to go back for a redo. We must make some bold decisions while at the same time keep in mind the impact on the surrounding areas of Tyson's. I believe strongly that we must refocus growth around the Metro Stations for reasons described above.

As for the specific uses around the station areas cited in the PB report, while having some goals about the general ratios between commercial, retail and residential is desirable, to get into detailed designations at this stage seems premature. Property owners will respond to market conditions and need maximum flexibility in street level decisions about where what goes, of course within overall guidelines. Therefore, we need to be careful not to pre-designate any particular area with any specific use. If any documentation is put out showing specific uses, it should be made abundantly clear that it is only for depiction purposes.

Roadway, Bike and Pedestrian Connections

The desirability of achieving an interconnected Tyson's is a given. In order to get there I would like to re-emphasize the importance of incentives and inducements to make the grid of streets a reality. In the process of individual site plans as they come in to the County for consideration, there will be opportunity to gain proffers for pedestrian/bike bridges and rights of ways for the desired interconnections. However, this assumes there will be sufficient economic value for the developers in the underlying land that will justify the proffers while retaining finance-ability of their projects.

OPEN SPACE AND COMMUNITY BENEFITS

A careful and creative use of density and height guidelines will help encourage developers, County planners and citizens to work together to ensure that each individual neighborhood in the future Tyson's has public spaces, amenities and streetscapes to foster the live work environment. While the 55 and 89 acres cited in the test analysis may be mathematically correct, it is the underlying economic values created by the density allocations that will help create "urban" design opportunities and determine how much open space and public benefit is realized going forward.

CONCLUSION

Raise the density around the station areas to a 6 or higher FAR and if we are going to allocate any additional density around a "form giving circulator" it should be: 1) a lot less than the 2.5 FAR currently in Prototype B, and 2) clear that any such density will be only attainable once a form giving circulator is in place.

10. Irv Auerbach

Comments on 2/27/2008 draft summary of findings

Irv Auerbach

3/17/2008

GB's memo dated 3/5/2008 indicates that the Preferred Alternative narrative [which, presumably, is his terminology for PB's final report] will use the Draft Summary of Findings as the starting point but will otherwise be substantially different. My comments on the Draft Summary are aimed at ensuring, first, that the final report does not repeat what I see as errors in the Draft Summary and, second, that it is understandable not only to the Task Force but also to the many interested citizens who may have attended few, if any, Task Force meetings and public workshops. In my mind, the citizens who live in and around Tysons Corner are a big part of the audience for the final report. They will influence the Board of Supervisors' decision on whether to adopt the Task Force's recommendations. It therefore is in everyone's interest that the citizens make informed judgments.

The Draft Summary purports to be the consultants' report to the Task Force. One would expect such a report to be couched in objective, analytical language. One would also expect it to make recommendations that can become reality only after the Task Force, the Planning Commission, and the Board of Supervisors takes action on them. In a great many places, however, the report presents needed, desired, or recommended changes in Tysons Corner as accomplished facts. It is disconcerting to read on Page 5, for example, that the 'new parks and open space system creates gathering places...' What I would expect such a report to say is that there's a need for parks and open space that would create gathering

places...’ Throughout the report, there are many other passages that reflect an assumption that certain things will happen, instead of offering recommendations together with appropriate justification and analytical support.

Executive Summary

Base Case is described as ‘continuation of the current Comprehensive Plan with minor modifications.’ If such a statement is to appear in the final report, it should describe exactly what modifications were made, including how many square feet were added, where they were added, and so on. Citizens are entitled to know.

What does the phrase ‘a circulator that gives form to the development’ really mean. GB and others have used this term many times, but nobody has asked for clarification. All I know at this point is that it means that additional density can be allowed. Again, citizens are entitled to know. A report such as this one should not rely on terms that the average person cannot be expected to understand.

In the Comparing the Prototypes bullets, the draft says that the ‘transit oriented transportation network better supports the land use vision proposed for Tysons Corner.’ Which network? Better than what? In any context, the word better is meaningless without answering the ‘better than what’ question. Same goes for the ‘more parks and open space’ phrase in the next bullet. More than what?

Also in the Comparing the Prototypes bullets, the draft says that the two transportation networks results in ‘similar congestion levels to the Base Case.’ But the caption below the illustration on the very same page says that the ‘new Tysons’ will have ‘lower levels of congestion than under the base case.’ Both statements cannot be correct. And judging from the data cited below, such a statement is erroneous.

The Vision

I recognize that the authors of the report are trying to put the reader into the Tysons Corner of the future and describing what he/she sees. Nevertheless, I object to this approach. To start with, it doesn’t identify whose vision is being described. If it’s the Task Force’s vision, as expressed in the Guiding Planning Principles, then it should say so, and the first four paragraphs should be expressed in terms of implementation of the Principles. Also, readers should be told that they can find a full recitation of the Principles on Page 8 [or wherever they are in the final report].

Transforming Tysons

Page 3: In the first paragraph, the draft says that growth in Tysons Corner would ‘make the Dulles Rail project an even better idea by significantly increasing the

potential ridership of the extended Metrorail system.’ Again, better than what? More critically, where does the report provide any analysis to support the statement about increasing Metrorail ridership? Perhaps that’s implicit in some of the results presented by Cambridge Systematics, but it needs to be made explicit. If it cannot be made explicit, it shouldn’t be said.

Page 4: The draft says that ‘The ability of Tysons to maintain its existing regional market share in the future may be another significant challenge.’ That statement is a huge red flag. Market share of what? What exactly is the challenge? What has to be done to meet the challenge? Surely, just building more commercial space does not guarantee that there will be a demand for it. What if demand diminishes? What will happen if Tysons Corner loses market share? The statement quoted above implies that there are risks. What are the risks? The draft is full of rosy statements about the benefits. Surely, it is the consultants’ responsibility to tell the Task Force [and the general public] about the risks, as well.

Page 5: As much as possible, the report should include all the relevant information, as opposed to sending readers to the web site. In this regard, the decision rules should be included in an appendix.

Page 7: Regarding parking, GB’s 3/5/2008 memo says [top of page 4] that the ‘availability of parking impacts...the financial feasibility of new development.’ Is that going to keep Fairfax County from reducing parking ratios? And if so, will that thwart any effort to reduce reliance on automobiles as a means of getting to and around in Tysons Corner? The consultants’ final report should address these issues. Also with respect to parking, the report needs to address concerns expressed by citizens living outside Tysons Corner that the lack of parking will inhibit their use of Metrorail. What about providing for public parking within walking or circulator distance of the Metrorail stations at the east and west ends of Tysons Corner? What do the consultants recommend? GB’s memo says nothing about the pros and cons of making such parking available.

Base Case

Page 10: In Parks and Open Space, the statement that 65 acres are needed is not very meaningful without comparison to what’s in Tysons Corner now.

Advanced Prototype A

Page 14: Switching back and forth between households and residents is confusing. The draft should at least explain the mathematical relationship between the two.

Page 14: Transportation: The second bullet says that 55,800 jobs are in areas

served by the circulator. By my calculations, they represent 35 percent of the 159,000 jobs expected under Prototype A. The fourth bullet says that 20 percent of the jobs [31,800 by my calculation] are within an easy walk of the circulator. The two sets of figures seem in conflict unless 'areas served by the circulator' are not the same as 'within easy walk of the circulator.' Either way, an explanation is required.

Page 14: Transportation: The fourth bullet says that the circulator is 'able to increase daily transit ridership by 6%.' Compared to what? What's included in 'transit ridership.' And what's the basis for the 6% figure?

Page 14: Transportation: The fifth bullet says that TDM will reduce auto trips by up to 11.4% in the station areas? Compared to what? Also, the figure of 11.4 implies a degree of precision that I suspect does not really exist.

Page 14: Transportation: In the mode split figures, what's included in the transit figure? Presumably, Metrorail is included; anything else? And what's included in 'other?'

Page 14: Transportation: The following table reflects what is said on the indicated pages about the percentage of trips occurring under highly congested conditions. These data suggest that there is little or no difference between the Base Case and Prototype A. What, then, is the basis for the statement on Page 11 that congestion is high under the base case or the statement on Page 14 that congestion is less under Prototype A than under the Base Case ?

	AM TRIPS	PM TRIPS	OFF-PEAK TRIPS
BASE CASE-Page 11	10%	38%	18%
PROTOTYPE A-Page 14	10%	38%	19%
PROTOTYPE B-Page 18	10-11 %	29-38%	18-19%

As comments made at the public workshops indicated, many citizens intuitively doubt that the growth levels contemplated by the advanced prototypes can be achieved without significantly increasing traffic congestion. The draft does not really explain how that's possible.

Advanced Prototype B

Page 17: Land Use Mix: It appears that the jobs-housing ratio is based on the relationship between jobs and dwelling units? Wouldn't it make more sense to base it on the relationship of jobs to residents? If it's the latter, the ratios given in this section are erroneous. I am pretty sure that the ratios cited in BG's

presentations were based on jobs to residents.

	JOBS	RESIDENTS	RATIOS	
			Jobs to residents	In the draft
BASE CASE	161,500	35,500	4.5 to 1	9.2 to 1
PROTOTYPE A	159,000	72,000	2.2 to 1	4.4 to 1
PROTOTYPE B	203,000	99,500	2.0 to 1	4.1 to 1

Delivering the vision

Page 39: The draft says that the final Preferred Future will include several implementation strategies, which are then identified. The Task Force has not made a decision on the content of an implementation strategy. The most that can be said about the 11 items in this section is that the Task Force is considering them. Do the consultants have any recommendations on this issue? Can the consultants provide any insights on what has or has not worked elsewhere?

11a. Brenda Krieger

Comments on Path to the 21st Century

Just some brief comments:

1. The Implementation section is a good start but there are conflicts with the consensus of the Implementation Committee. I will coordinate our work directly with GB for the final product.
2. Tysons East neighborhood:
 - a. See my comments on the Memo regarding the proper FAR allocation on Old Meadow Road.
 - b. I also think there needs to be more flexibility on Old Meadow regarding residential/commercial, ie. More ability to get mixed use rather than total residential, especially on the north side and along the Beltway.
3. Transportation
 - a. I think we need some further discussion regarding some of the street sections. This is the first time we have seen these – especially associated with specific streets. Roads also need to be directly associated with the land use alongside it as well as building

heights etc. Again, a good example is page A-5 where Old Meadow is shown as a Minor arterial. It seems like there is too much going on for Old meadow Road to actually achieve a “community”. Too many traffic lanes, medians etc. I’m assuming it is showing street parking during the day, but I can’t tell. I think we need a better understanding of what we are proposing for these streets!

- b. As with land use, I think we need a clear, understandable “straw man”/draft of a proposed transportation/street plan so that we can have a “overarching” understanding of how it might work. Otherwise, I, for one, don’t know if there are any grade separations or where they are. Where are the Beltway crossings and ramps and how do they intersect/work (or not) with the proposed land uses and “neighborhood” visions. Then we can make some intelligent comments?

11b. Brenda Krieger

Comments on GB Arrington Memo to Clark Tyler – March 5, 2008

Preface: Just to comment that I think we have come a long way, and I think we all appreciate the work PB (and GB specifically) has done to date to get us so near to closure. I think your guidance will help get us on the right path to the new Tysons. My comments are meant to be constructive.

A. General:

1. The beginning of the memo and the “steps to create PA” request Task Force Direction needed prior to arriving at a Preferred Alternative. At our last meeting, the Task Force decided that we probably did have substantial input to give the consultants, but that it would not be productive unless we were reacting to an actual “Draft” of a Preferred Alternative with details on allocations, land use etc., rather than the generalized form of this memo. We requested, and expect, such a Draft/Straw Man be provided to us for our comment and for us to provide useful direction to the consultants **before** a final Preferred Alternative is produced.
2. It would be helpful to understand, by example, exactly what we will be getting from the consultant and what will have to be “filled in” during what is referred to as “next steps” in the memo. For example, what do you mean by “illustrative” maps? How these used and what else has to be produced in order to approve developments etc.? What are we getting from the consultants for Design Guidelines, circulator alignments and other topics which call for “next steps” in the memo and who and how do we then follow up with the details necessary in those areas?

B. Urban Form

The concept of “phasing” the development from prototype A to prototype B sounds nice, but I do not think it makes sense, nor will it get us where we want to go in terms of what kind of place Tysons becomes. Nor do I believe that the “consensus” was to go with a lower intensity than B and the 110m is an arbitrary number. I say this because we are talking about such large numbers in terms of development in either scenario, I don’t think many people really can grasp what that means in reality (and I probably include myself here), nor what the differences are between them. I also don’t believe that we are planning to have all this density “appear” within the 20 years we are talking about. Rather, I think the consensus among both the workshop attendees and the Task Force is that development needs to be adequate in order to:

- a. Create the kind of vibrant, urban PLACE referred to over and over again
- b. Be supported by infrastructure and civic amenities so that we are not overwhelmed and can enjoy the “Place”

That being said, we should look at what we ultimately need in order to get these things. Setting an arbitrary upper limit on development for Tysons as a whole may, in fact, be detrimental to achieving these goals. If we set up lower densities now in specific areas because either we don’t anticipate a circulator for years, want to “phase” development by some arbitrary benchmarks, or because we ran out of density to allocate within our “cap”, we run the risk of building the wrong things. Here is one example:

In Prototype A – and B without the circulator- the “intensity” boundaries for Level 2 (marked with a dotted line) are uneven around the station and exclude most of the area shown as “residential” on Old Meadow which is well within the ½ walking shed (as opposed to the area at the same distances off of Anderson). This does not make any sense for several reasons – and should be adjusted accordingly:

1. According to our the Decision Rules: Walking distance: “For residential we know people walk up to ½ mile”
2. Regardless of whether there is a circulator or not, most of Old Meadow within ½ mile of the station should be at the “Level 2” density. It is not currently shown as such. The topography on that section of the street is either relatively flat or a gentle slope that is very walkable.
3. In realistic terms, all of this area on Old Meadow is currently commercial. At least one building is relatively new. To expect any of this to redevelop into residential and also be able to help provide the grid of

streets and other desired amenities in the area, we have to realize this will not happen at an FAR of 1 or even 1.5. **This is not economically feasible.** Level 2 density, as I recall, will allow for higher FARs (2.5) which make the scenario doable. I would like to hear some discussion as to the rationale for the current allocations, or see an understanding that this will change for the preferred alternative.

4. I would also like some discussion regarding more flexibility in this area regarding “use”. As I noted earlier, the entire area is currently commercial and if we want to see development occur on an ongoing basis in order to “transform” the neighborhood as we visualize it, it might be useful to see a more “mixed use” possibility, so that some of the area, either on the Northern section or close to the Beltway, might be either residential or office – as the market might demand.

The same arguments can be made regarding density around circulator routes. You can tie the density to decisions regarding routes etc., but to talk about “phasing” doesn’t make sense.

My point is that we need to look at the different TODs and make sure we have the correct allocations to achieve the kind of neighborhoods we seek. We need to also realize that it is market forces which will ultimately determine *when* things get built. But if we don’t allow adequate density, we will either get more “suburban” development or none, and we definitely will not get the grid of streets, parks or other amenities.

Also, allocations in TODs - *for the same parcel* – should reflect different allowable FARs for commercial vs residential use.

I don’t think the issue is 110m or 120m. I think the issue is “quality”. We have to work out how we will “manage” the growth; how we will get the right infrastructure and amenities to go with the development and how we will get the kind of urban development we are envisioning. I believe that can be done. It is, in my view, just as important to make sure we don’t “kill” the vision by allocating *too little* density in the TOD areas (1/2 mile radius) necessary to achieve the urban forms we want.

C. Open Space

You reference using the standards arrived at by the Parks Dept. Can you tell us if you, as our experts, feel these reflect good urban best practices?

Also, what do you mean by “connecting” the parks? Urban parks are often small and related to their “neighborhood”. How, and why, would these “connect” to other parks? I understand the desire (and support it!) to have an integrated and connected bike path/lane/trail. So I would appreciate some clarification.

- D. Circulator: see comment above re: Next Steps
- E. Roadway, Bike: No comment
- F. Parking: We should also explore the concepts of shared parking in mixed use dev.
- G. Community Benefits: See comment re: Next Steps
- H. Implementation:
 - a. See comments above re: phasing. More exploration on what and how something like this can – or can't - happen productively is necessary.
 - b. I don't recall any *broad* agreement that the development community should pay for everything. I think the Task Force understands and agrees that this is not a feasible approach. I think we do agree that it will take a combination of developer contributions (often in return for benefits like bonus density, tax abatements etc.), public/private partnerships, public funding and new/creative funding mechanisms to achieve all of the desired and necessary benefits and infrastructure to support the urban vision.

Hopefully you will continue to work with the Implementation and Transportation committees so that we come up with clear and comprehensive Implementation plans.