FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
TYSONS CORNER COMMITTEE
THURSDAY, MARCH 19, 2009

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:
Walter L. Alcorn, Chairman, At-Large
Frank A. de la Fe, Hunter Mill District
Jay P. Donahue, Dranesville District
Kenneth A. Lawrence, Providence District

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:
Rodney L. Lusk, Lee District

OTHER COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:
James R. Hart, Commissioner At-Large
Timothy J. Sargeant, Commissioner At-Large

FAIRFAX COUNTY STAFF PRESENT:
James Zook, Director, Department of Planning and Zoning
Fred Selden, Director, Planning Division, Department of Planning and Zoning
Sterling Wheeler, Planning Division, Department of Planning and Zoning
Matthew Ladd, Planning Division, Department of Planning and Zoning
Pamela Nee, Planning Division, Department of Planning and Zoning
Noel Kaplan, Planning Division, Department of Planning and Zoning
Dawn Dhavale, Planning Division, Department of Planning and Zoning
Joe Gibson, Dranesville Supervisor John Foust's Office
Barbara J. Lippa, Executive Director, Planning Commission Office
Linda B. Rodeffer, Clerk to the Planning Commission

TYSONS LAND USE TASK FORCE MEMBERS PRESENT:
Irfan Ali
Jim Edmondson
Jo Hodgin
Janyce Hedetniemi
Sally Liff

OTHERS PRESENT:
Elizabeth Baker, Walsh, Colucci, Emrich, Lubeley, Walsh
Janet Caldow
Roger Diedrich, Sierra Club
Dave Edwards
Lori Greenlief, McGuire Woods
Jane Kim
Tod Kolankiewigz
Matthew McCulloch, Dolley Madison Apartments

Shane Murphy, Cooley Godward Kronish
Evan Pritchard, Walsh Colucci, Emrich, Lubeley, Walsh
John Rinaldi, Christopher Companies
Stewart Schwartz, Coalition for Smarter Growth
Dean Smith, VHB, Inc.
Bob Stoddard, WRIT
Mark Zetts, McLean Citizens Association

ATTACHMENTS:
(A) Task Force Comments
(B) Green Building Issues and Recommendations
(C) Summary of Public Comments, Introduction and Vision Chapters of Plan Text
(D) Meeting Schedule and Agenda

//

Chairman Walter L. Alcorn called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m., in Conference Rooms 4/5 of the Fairfax County Government Center, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

//

Commissioner Lawrence MOVED THAT THE TYSONS CORNER COMMITTEE MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 5, 2009 AND FEBRUARY 19, 2009 BE APPPROVED.

Commissioner Donahue seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

//

TYSONS LAND USE TASK FORCE DRAFT REVIEW COMMITTEE COMMENTS ON STRAWMAN PLAN TEXT

George Barker, Chairman, Tysons Land Use Task Force Draft Review Committee, reviewed the committee's comments on the strawman text, pages 1-34, as shown in Attachment A.

Responding to a question from Commissioner de la Fe, Mr. Barker said although the committee recommended deleting "40 years" from page 6 of the Plan text, it had been left in the introduction to indicate that although the planning horizon was a long-term perspective, the number of years was flexible.

Chairman Alcorn and Mr. Barker discussed putting infrastructure in place, beyond specific commitment proffers, particularly for transportation.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Lawrence, Mr. Barker said the committee was well aware of transportation access issues and their impact on development.

Mr. Barker, Chairman Alcorn, and Commissioner Lawrence discussed granting additional density based on trip reductions associated with the circulator system.

Mr. Barker responded to a question from Chairman Alcorn about granting density bonuses for the provision of community benefits. Mr. Barker added that the committee had discussed transfer of development rights although no specific recommendations had been made.

GREEN AND SMART BUILDINGS

Mr. Barker stated that the Review Committee had two issues relating to the amount of density bonuses granted for LEED certification. He pointed out that because most new buildings were attaining Silver certification, a reduced bonus or no bonus might be appropriate with stronger incentives for Gold and Platinum. Mr. Barker said the second issue was whether to go with a percentage bonus or an increase in FAR. He said a percentage would allow increased development around the Metro stations whereas an increase in FAR would provide increased density of the outer edges. He said this issue had not been fully resolved.

Commissioner Donahue noted that attaining the highest level of LEED certification could justify a bonus.

Commissioner Lawrence commented on benefits of green building, the need for evening parking, and stormwater management.

Dawn Dhavale, Planning Division, Department of Planning and Zoning, made a presentation on green and smart buildings, as shown in Attachment B.

In response to a question from Chairman Alcorn, Ms. Dhavale said because it would be easier to attain LEED Silver certification in Tysons than in other parts of the County, staff recommended that LEED Silver, or an equivalent rating, be set as the minimum expectation.

Responding to a question from Chairman Alcorn, Ms. Dhavale said a higher FAR project would get a higher rating and that currently staff proposed a cap of 10 percent for a Platinum rating.

James Zook, Director, Department of Planning and Zoning, commented that LEED-ND (Neighborhood Development), a rating system for larger developments and neighborhoods, was not appropriate for Tysons because it incorporated many of the same concepts in the current Plan recommendations.

Ms. Dhavale and Mr. Zook responded to a question from Commissioner Donahue about the fairness in applying green building standards due to possible changes in market conditions and rating systems.

In response to a question from Commissioner Lawrence, Ms. Dhavale said staff had not specifically addressed use of energy efficient construction equipment, such as trucks and cranes. Commissioner Lawrence suggested researching this issue.

Irfan Ali, member of the Tysons Task Force, said the Task Force had put language in its recommendation that LEED certification, "or equivalent" be used. Chairman Alcorn said this was consistent with Plan language on green building.

Ms. Dhavale responded to questions from Commissioner Sargeant about setting goals for measuring energy efficiency to facilitate the use of another rating system.

Commissioner de la Fe said he thought Fairfax County should investigate establishing its own green building certification program. Mr. Zook recommended gaining experience using the LEED rating system before the County considered developing its own system.

In response to a question from Mark Zetts, McLean Citizens Association, Mr. Zook said it was unlikely that the County would reevaluate the certification level to which a developer had committed after the zoning process; however, a developer might voluntarily commit to a higher level to remain competitive.

WATER CONSERVATION

Chairman Alcorn suggested that a new bullet be added under Implementation Authority, pages 19-20 of the draft text, related to water conservation. He said although there was not enough information at this point to set water conservation goals for Tysons Corner, it might be appropriate to have a process by which goals could be established and measured against a baseline. Commissioner Lawrence commented that perhaps the forecasts received from Falls Church Water and Fairfax Water could be used as a baseline. Chairman Alcorn asked staff to develop language for future consideration.

PLAN INTRODUCTION AND VISION

Sterling Wheeler, PD, DPZ, said comments received from the public had been summarized, as shown in Attachment C.

The committee recommended that the following changes to the Plan Introduction, Pages 1-11 be made:

Page 1

- First paragraph, first sentence: change "grocery" store to "general" store.
- First paragraph, last sentence: change "three" Fortune 500 companies" to "several…".
- Third paragraph, first sentence: delete "40 years" and make it less specific such as "over time."

Page 2

- First line at top of page: change "more urban" to "urban."
- First line: change "suburban place" to "a set of urban transit-oriented communities…".

Page 3

- First paragraph, second sentence: change "intersections" to a more descriptive term.
- Last paragraph, first line: change "Annual Plan" Review to "Area" Plans Review."

Page 5

- Second paragraph, first line: verify number of task force members or do not state exact number

Page 6

- First paragraph, first line: leave out 2050 until decision is made about length of time for planning horizon.
- Second paragraph, first line: defer making a decision about defining the planning horizon as 40 years to later in the process.
- First bullet: Revise to read for the time being: "(Blank) percent of all development within walking distance of transit.

Page 7

- Box: revise after the first two bullets on page 6 are resolved.

Page 8 (FRAMEWORK TO TRANSFORM TYSONS)

- First paragraph, second line: add visitors after residents and employees.

Page 9

- First line: replace "you choose to not have a car." With "owning a car may be unnecessary and certainly not essential."
- Number 3: add "maximizing efficient use of energy and energy conservation."
- Number 5, second sentence: consider deleting "In fact" and revise to read:
- "Tysons is one of the nation's largest office and retail centers."

Page 10 (ACHIEVING THE VISION)

- Refer to communities instead of community and mention tourism in this section.
- First paragraph, next to last sentence: delete "new" before Silver Line."
- Second paragraph, second sentence: revise to read: "People will be able to walk or bike safely within Tysons to nearby businesses."
- Third paragraph, first sentence: add "composed of eight districts."
- Last paragraph, third sentence: change each "street" to each "district."
- Last paragraph: Ensure it is not implied that square footage equals density/activity and will drive the character of the place.

Page 11

- Consider defining boundaries.

COMMITTEE SCHEDULE

After discussion, Commissioner de la Fe MOVED THAT THE COMMITTEE ENDORSE THE PLANNING COMMISSION'S TYSONS CORNER COMMITTEE MEETING SCHEDULE AS DISCUSSED TONIGHT. (Attachment D)

Commissioner Lawrence seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

//

Commissioner Alcorn noted that the Planning Commission's Tysons Corner Committee recognized the competing demands of concluding these planning efforts expeditiously while "getting it right" and needed additional time for completing development of proposed Comprehensive Plan Text. He MOVED THAT FAIRFAX COUNTY ALLOW FOR CONCURRENT PROCESSING OF PLAN AMENDMENTS AND REZONING APPLICATIONS FOR ONE OR MORE APPLICATIONS AT STATION LANDING SITES AS DEMONSTRATIONS OF THE TRANSFORMATION OF TYSONS FROM AN AUTOMOBILE-ORIENTED AREA INTO A SET OF TRANSIT- AND PEDESTRIAN-ORIENTED COMMUNITIES. TO FACILITATE REVIEW OF SUCH DEMONSTRATION APPLICATIONS, THE PLANNING COMMISSION'S TYSONS CORNER COMMITTEE PROPOSES THAT A SET OF SCREENING CRITERIA BE DEVELOPED IN APRIL/MAY FOR CONSIDERATION OF ONE OR MORE DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS TO BE REVIEWED BEGINNING IN EARLY SUMMER 2009.

Commissioner de la Fe seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

//

The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 p.m.
Walter L. Alcorn, Chairman

An audio recording of this meeting is available in the Planning Commission Office, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Suite 330, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

Minutes by: Linda B. Rodeffer

Approved: April 22, 2009

_____
Linda B. Rodeffer, Clerk
Fairfax County Planning Commission

ATTACHMENT A

TASK FORCE COMMENTS: "Straw Man" Plan Text

March 19, 2009

The Tysons Land Use Task Force Draft Review Committee is engaged in a review of the February 6, 2009 Straw Man Plan Text as submitted to the Tysons Corner Committee of the Fairfax County Planning Commission. This submission covers pages 1 though 34 of the Straw Man document.

The review is organized chronologically by type of comment, either Substantive or Other.

SUBSTANTIVE

Page 6: Paragraph 2: Drop "40 years" and add a bullet as follows: A redesigned Transportation System with circulator routes, community shuttles, and vastly improved pedestrian and bicycle routes and connections.

Page 7: The following comments address the Staff Comment on the Planning Horizon as delineated in the boxed text:

- The George Mason Study is treated in the staff comments as directing the Plan. It is not meant to be defining but rather as guidance. The projections are not meant to be limiting but are what GMU projects the market would support by the dates specified.
- Paragraph 2, third line—delete the phrase "can be reasonably" and replace it with "the market is projecting or capable of producing".

Page 19: Relocate all bullets under the sentence "The specific powers and responsibilities of the implementation entity may include:"

Page 21: The narrative on Regulatory Framework is not clear as to VDOT's role. "(E)xpedited permitting process" should apply across the board and not be limited to affordable/workforce housing.

Page 23: How phasing is to be accomplished remains to be defined. Once the transportation analyses are completed, information will be there to help plan phasing. There must be a careful balance established to ensure that infrastructure is put in place to support the development but that development is not inappropriately restricted. The language used will be critical and the issue can be addressed from both areawide and district perspectives.

Page 28: Under Office Mixed Use, the Task Force recommends that the commercial component should be 65% to 85% of total development; staff has changed this mix to 60% to 80%.
There needs to be some flexibility in the percentage distributions of uses, consideration of what those percentages mean for both individual projects and districts, and how situations are dealt with when one sector of the market is doing better than another.

Page 29: Third paragraph under Tiered Intensity: Rather than attach intensity to only "walk distance", there should be some flexibility in how that distance is determined, with the decisions at the district level trying to apply a commonsense approach.

The document states: "Within 400 and 600 feet of a circulator route, increased intensity may be planned. Achievement of the highest intensities will be contingent on reductions in single occupancy vehicle trips in areas closet to Metro and the circulators" The "may" should be "will" and density **is** to be associated with the circulators. While the goal of the circulators is to reduce single-occupancy vehicles and there may be TDM requirements, there do not need to be reductions in single-occupancy vehicle trips along the circulator routes prior to approval of projects.

In the fourth paragraph, last sentence, the Task Force and the consultants define TOD, transit-oriented development, as being within ½ mile of a metro station because people have been shown to walk ½ mile to and from the Metro.

Of even greater concern to the Task Force Committee is the statement at the end of the fourth paragraph "In areas beyond ¼ mile of the stations, maximum intensity can only be achieved if secondary transit such as a circulator system is available to link development to Metro" This statement/interpretation only allows for development around the station areas and within ¼ mile of the station and tries to too closely control development which is controlled by the market and economy. The Task Force report proposes densities for development in the TOD areas of ½ mile from the stations.

Page 31: Proposed Intensities Map

In the development of land use models, the issue of splitting density allocations when a parcel extends beyond more than one "distance zone" needs to be resolved with flexibility and actions at the district levels.

Page 32: Staff Comment on Intensity

The staff comment says "These intensities and bonuses are not supported by staff at this time." Also, "The Task Force established the maximum FARs with the understanding that they were to include land needed for such things as the proposed street network, transit circulators, and public parks and open space. Therefore land dedications for these purposes should not be eligible for density credit during the consideration of development applications and this should be made clear in the Plan text."

The Task Force Report did not eliminate density bonuses for the provision of community benefits and strongly disagrees with the staff statements on this issue. The Task Force did not intend for dedications to be subtracted from eligible land for calculating density. The Task Force believes that land owners should be incentivized to dedicate their land for public use.

Page 33: Table 1: Maximum Allowable Floor Area Ratios by Distance Category

The staff includes a footnote (2) Beyond ¼ mile of stations, maximum intensity can only be achieved if secondary transit service such as a circulator system is available to link development to the Metro. The Task Force **did not** recommend that TOD densities be limited to ¼ mile unless the circulator system is available. The staff statement means that no development in the TOD areas between ¼ and ½ mile will be allowed without the circulators being operational. In order to get the ROW and possible funding for the Circulator system, development between ¼ and ½ mile **should be encouraged immediately**. Development along the proposed circulator routes (possibly with interim shuttle buses or partial systems) which will result in the necessary ROW and some portion of the funding will make the Circulator system possible and should be encouraged immediately, not precluded until the entire, final system is up and running.

OTHER

As a general guideline, where reasonable and appropriate, the committee recommends that references to "could" be replaced with "would", "should" with "shall" and "will" with "must".

Page 1: Paragraph 2, line 1: The word "transformation" is replaced with the word "development". While this change is editorial in nature, the fact remains that Tysons over the past 40 years developed; its transformation begins with implementation of the Vision for Tysons as proposed by the Task Force.

Page 3: Paragraph 3: Add the sentence: "These communities have also experienced substantial retail, office, and residential growth in the last fifteen years".

Page 9--

Item 2 (beginning on page 8): Add a fifth bullet as follows: Vastly improved pedestrian and bicycle access

Item 4: Insert the word "urban" before "recreation" in the second bullet and change the third to read "Meeting the community's needs for cultural, arts, and civic facilities. Add a fifth bullet as follows: "Addressing the imbalance of housing and jobs"

Item 5: Last sentence, insert the phrase "current rates of" before the words "real estate . . licenses.

Item 6: The implementation strategy is not an "approach"; it is an "entity" and the text must be changed accordingly.

Page 10, top of the page, last sentence is changed to read: The tiers of implementation strategy **should** include. Under Achieving the Vision, the first line in the second paragraph is changed to read "The auto-oriented streets of Route 7 and Route 123 **must** be transformed . . .

With reference to the transformation of Routes 7 and 123, the Task Force is concerned that the VDOT plans for these roads is not consistent with the Task Force vision and every effort must be made to work with VDOT before plans are implemented that would negate or compromise the Task Force concept.

The reference to the circulator in the second paragraph under the Vision section talks about the circulator routes. References to the circulator in the plan needs to include that the plan is to link the circulator routes to Metro in terms of scheduling and marketing. Further, the plan must make clear that the Circulator Routes are intended to be in place when the Metro is operational.

Page 15, Second paragraph, first sentence, is amended to read: Transforming Tysons necessitates a departure from past **suburban** approaches to planning and implementation. In the second sentence, insert the words "and frequent" between abundant and transit.

Page 16/17: The bullets are reordered as follows: First bullet: Implementation Entity; Second bullet: Funding Strategies; Third bullet: Public-Private Partnerships; Fourth bullet: Private-Private Partnerships; Fifth bullet: Regulatory Framework; and Sixth bullet: Phasing.

Further, Private-Private Partnerships is amended to read: Unprecedented levels of cooperation among landowners **is one tool** to obtain . . and Regulatory Framework is amended to read Regulatory tools **will .** . .

Page 17: References to the Circulator Routes must include text that makes clear the intent to have the circulators in place when the Metro is operational.
Page 18: The narrative on Parks and Open Space, Environmental Stewardship Strategies, and Civic Infrastructure is tentative and implies an ad hoc and piece-meal approach to implementation. The intent is that the Implementation Authority will ensure that the approval process is accomplished in concert with the vision, market situations, opportunity, and demand.

Land Use Section beginning on Page 25:

Second paragraph, first sentence: Amend the sentence to read "The pattern of land use in Tysons focuses growth **within walking distance** of the Metrorail stations and along the circulator route (s), tapering down to be compatible with surrounding residential neighborhoods."

The Task Force wants to review the statement "The area within ½ mile of Metrorail will be expected to capture over 75% of all development in Tysons". The Task Force believes that, due to existing and future ROW, parks, resource protection areas, and open space requirements, this statement may no longer be accurate. The committee recommends that the land use map be layered with the intensity map and the concept of captured development recalculated.

Page 26, last paragraph, last sentence, revise to read Housing can also be successfully co-located with public **and private** facilities . . .

Page 27: The map must be revised; it does not take into consideration current land owner plans under consideration. Examples of this include, in Tysons East, West*Group's development

plans identify the Garfield building as residential but the land use map identifies it as mixed use: Westgate and Van Buren buildings should be residential, not office mixed-use; Johnson II should be mixed use, not office mixed use. There are many more instances where the map must be revised in order to be accurate.

Page 30: Second sentence, top of the page: "Areas beyond the influence of transit, as well as areas adjacent to the residential communities outside Tysons, will be consistent with existing intensity, or as described in the District and Subdistrict recommendations."
The meaning of this statement is unclear. The focus here should be on reasonable transitions at the edges, not on maintenance of an existing condition.

Page 30, after last full paragraph, before "Table 1 shows…": The text should add the paragraph from the Vision document that follows the paragraph included to provide better context.

Page 31: Proposed Intensities Map

The Task Force committee believes that there must be a review of what uses and parcels would most likely remain unchanged to determine their impact on the total vision and actual expected density levels. On the map, Levels 1, 2, 3, and 4 intensities seem arbitrary. They should be established by actual circles centered on station entrances. Areas that are served by two crossing or parallel circulators should get higher intensities than those served by only one circulator.

ATTACHMENT B

Tysons Strawman Plan Text—Green Building Issues and Recommendations

1. Task Force Recommendations
    - Expectation of LEED Certification/Silver for all new construction in Tysons.
    - Expectation of LEED Silver by 2013 for all new construction in Tysons.
    - Density bonuses of 6% FAR for Silver, 8% for Gold, 10% for Platinum.

2. Staff Perspectives on the Task Force Recommendations
    - Are density bonuses/incentives necessary? The County has been successful in obtaining LEED commitments for both Certified and Silver level buildings without density bonuses. Silver level certification is current policy for most public buildings in the County. In addition, many federal agencies that build or lease buildings have already committed to a certification level of LEED Silver.
    - What are appropriate density bonus percentages; what rationale should be used to determine the percentages? Development in Tysons is locationally advantaged. The site-specific features of Tysons make five LEED-NC (New Construction) or CS (Core and Shell) points very likely and an additional five to nine points much easier to obtain than buildings in the rest of the County. Under LEED-NC, to move from the minimum points needed to achieve Certified to obtain LEED Silver, a building needs an additional seven points. Over 70% of this point spread can come from points that are almost certain, based on location. Therefore, staff does not feel that a density bonus is needed as an incentive for LEED Silver certification in Tysons.

3. Staff Recommendation
    - LEED Silver, or equivalent, should be set as the minimum expectation in Tysons to reflect locational advantage in Tysons and the increased density provided under the redevelopment options.
    - Bonus densities should be provided for certifications at the LEED Gold and Platinum levels based on cost to achieve LEED certification and also to provide incentives for achievements above LEED Silver.
    - FAR bonus densities for LEED certification should be up to the following amounts:
        - 0% Silver.
        - 3-5% for Gold (to be determined after further research).
        - 10% for Platinum.
    - Plan language should be incorporated to reflect that the FAR density bonus is to be negotiated based on considerations of the specific site and the overall environmental objectives for Tysons.
    - Plan language should specifically discuss green building certification for individual buildings within Tysons using LEED-NC and LEED-CS, or equivalent; the use of LEED-ND (Neighborhood Development), a rating system for neighborhoods and larger developments, is not appropriate for Tysons because it incorporates many of the same concepts as the recommended Plan concepts for Tysons and would not represent a significant achievement within Tysons.
    - Plan language should be added to identify areas of emphasis for LEED credits, including such areas as air quality, water and energy conservation, and alternative transportation strategies.
    - Density bonuses should be revisited periodically to gauge their effectiveness and adjust for changes in market conditions and rating system.

Summary of Public Comments on Introduction and Vision Chapters of Draft Plan Text, 3-17-09

Section/ Page No.	Summary of Comment	Source
Intro., Page 4	In last paragraph of discussion of Planning History, mention that 20 or 21 Tysons APR nominations were subsumed by the Tysons Land Use Task Force (TLUTF) effort.	Mark Zetts
Intro., pp. 4-5	Emphasis should be placed on planning for parks and recreation, consistent with item #6 of the Task Force (TF) mission: "Provide for amenities and aesthetics in Tysons, such as public spaces, public art, parks, etc."	GTCC
Intro., pp. 4-5	Emphasis should be placed on the goal of protecting and preserving neighborhoods adjacent to and in the vicinity of Tysons.	GTCC
Intro., pp. 4-5	Work of Task Force should be summarized in one paragraph as in 1994 Plan. TLUTF's should be acknowledged, not heralded.	Mark Zetts
Intro., p. 5	"By pushing the envelope to 220 million square feet and the time frame to 2050, the TF went beyond anything presented to the public, and in fact beyond the charge given by the Board of Supervisors."	Amy Tozzi
Vision, pp. 6-10	Would prefer sections of current Comprehensive Plan, such as "Planning Issues: Opportunities & Constraints" and "Concept for Future Development: Vision for the Urban Center." Would maintain some continuity between 1994 Plan and this one. "The first five pages of this section read like a dreamy sales brochure.,,"	Mark Zetts
Vision, p. 7	Agree with Staff Comment on Planning Horizon, especially the sentence, "Upon adoption of this Plan, the County can expect many property owners to seek development approvals based on the 2050 vision."	Amy Tozzi
Vision, p. 7, Item 3	Tysons will not be 24/7 with Metro only running 18 hours a day. (*Staff note: This is one of the TF's Guiding Planning Principles."*	Mark Zetts
Vision, p. 7, Item 4	This Principle mentions transit connections but not circulators.	GTCC
Vision, p. 9, Item 3	May be more appropriate to refer to "stream *remediation"* than to "stream restoration."	Mark Zetts

Section/ Page No.	Summary of Comment	Source
Vision, p. 9, Item 3	Need a map showing the proposed green network, including pedestrian connections outside of Tysons. Would like the Plan to state, "Tysons should be connected by uninterrupted trail to the Potomac River and to points west via the W&OD Trail."	Mark Zetts
Vision, p. 10	Under "Achieving the Vision," the second paragraph says, "People will be able to walk or bike safely along Route 7 and 123 …" However, no bike lanes are shown in the cross-sections for these streets.	GTCC
Vision, p. 10	Think the term "auto-oriented streets" is slyly derogatory and should not be used in the Plan.	Mark Zetts
Vision, p. 11	Delete the first paragraph on page 11. Comparing the districts at Tysons to different rooms of a house is condescending and unsuitable for the Plan.	Mark Zetts
Vision, p. 11, Continued	The substantial breadth, station/rail mass and vehicle traffic on Routes 7 and 123 will make them de facto district boundaries. I continually hear staff, the PC committee and the public refer to Tysons Central 7 as two separate entities, north and south, with the implication that each needs to be planned differently. The same is true of Tysons West. The separateness of these split halves will be exacerbated when the pedestrian bridges are closed off at the end of operating hours. In addition, the conceptual circulator routes show only one crossing of Route 7 between Route 123 and the Dulles Toll Road. Will local bus routes provide the needed connections between these intense subdistricts?	Mark Zetts
Vision, p. 13	The south subdistrict of Tysons Central 7 is "envisioned as a Civic Center." Should include recreation center. White Flint has the Aquatic Center in its urban downtown. Tysons should have an indoor pool, preferably two separate ones, one for children and one for lap swimming.	GTCC
Vision, pp. 13-14	Pimmit Hills is mentioned, but Vienna and McLean are only referred to as "neighboring communities." Should use the names Vienna and McLean.	GTCC

Sources & Dates Received (through March 19, 2009):

Greater Tysons Citizens Coalition (GTCC), 9 sets of comments, March 2, 2009

Mark Tipton, Trails & Sidewalks Committee, Fairfax Co. Federation of Citizens Associations, Feb. 23, 2009

Amy Tozzi, Member of the Tysons Land Use Task Force & the Board of Directors of The Regency at McLean, Feb. 28, 2009

Mark Zetts, March 2, 2009

ATTACHMENT D

<u>Planning Commission's Tysons Corner Committee</u>
Meeting Schedule and Agenda Items (subject to change)

<u>Thursday, March 19, 2009</u> – 7:00 p.m., Conference Rooms 4/5, Government Center
- George Barker presentation of Task Force Committee review of Straw Man pages 1 - 34
- Green Buildings
- Water Conservation
- Plan Introduction & Vision (p. 1-11) (review of staff and Barker Committee review)
- Review/Discuss Schedule

<u>Thursday, April 2, 2009</u> – 7:00 p.m., Conference Rooms 4/5, Government Center
- Affordable Housing
- Introduction to urban parking standards (maximums vs. current minimums)
- DOT presentation on Travel Demand Forecasting: Methodology and Assumptions
- Stormwater
- Green Buildings (discussion, including final Barker Committee review)
- Smart Buildings

<u>Wednesday, April 8, 2009</u> – 7:00 p.m., Conference Rooms 9/10, Government Center
- Existing Uses (issue of incorporating existing service and repair uses in to redevelopment)
- Urban Design section, excluding streetscape (addressed on 4/22)
- Transportation IT, IT for environmental stewardship and for telework/LAN amenities
- Acceptance criteria for concurrent demonstration project(s) at station landing site(s)

<u>Wednesday, April 22, 2009</u> – 7:00 p.m., BOS Conference Room, Government Center
- Parks urban standard & green network
- Urban Design Streetscape and Street type hierarchy

<u>Wednesday, April 29, 2009</u> – 7:00 p.m., Conference Rooms 4/5, Government Center
- Circulator (transportation, not intensity aspect)
- Non-SOV mode share objective tiers
- TDM (programs to assist achievement of Non-SOV mode share objective)
- Public facilities (p. 73-77) addressing land needs, not phasing; includes consideration of distributed generation

<u>Wednesday, May 13, 2009</u> – 7:00 p.m., Conference Rooms 9/10, Government Center
- Planning horizon
- Intensity and building height, including general strategy for growth around stations
- Continued discussion of demonstrations project(s) from 4/8 meeting

<u>Wednesday, May 27, 2009</u> – 7:00 p.m., Conference Rooms 4/5, Government Center
- Coordinating redevelopment, Parcel Consolidation to maximize internal trip capture and other Comp Plan goals, Concurrent Rezoning applications (alternative to consolidation)**

*** Note: Address general level, not specific amount of consolidation, which is addressed during review of District text.*

<u>Thursday, June 18, 2009</u> – 7:00 p.m. – BOS Auditorium

- Phasing and Implementation of transportation, public facilities and utilities

Topics for Future Meetings (not yet scheduled):

- District text review (specific consolidation, height, intensity); discussion identifies land use map/map category changes and other changes in Area-wide sections
- Environmental impacts (including noise and light)
- Results of neighborhood study
- Parking and TDM recommendations (at the 4/29 meeting DOT will not be ready to make recommendations, but will be able to present the methodology used to produce recommendations)
- Shorter term bus transit supporting Metrorail in Tysons.
- Long-term transportation infrastructure needs
- Implementation strategy, including zoning ordinance changes, standard proffers, implementation entity
- Review of Final Draft of Strawman (may be multiple meetings)
- Review of Plan Text for Advertisement
- PC Public Hearing
- PC Markup