

Comments on the Commission's Tysons-related Recommendations  
Roger Diedrich

June 21, 2012

I have no particular concern over the division of costs among the parties, but there is concern about the adequacy and reliability of the funding, especially the public sector share. I will say that to extract some funding through a parking district as a separate source is a fine idea

I supported the 2030 planning horizon, because I thought 2050 was too uncertain, so if it is to be changed, it is not good enough just to say the plan will be flexible. For example, on line 63, it says "the Commonwealth has a responsibility . . . to contribute, etc.", but they are not responsible and why would we expect them to change? Same for the federal gov't, lines 72-73. So yes the county should press for these funds, but also have a plan for what happens if that fails.

So regarding the planning horizon, transportation project phasing is minimally addressed, first for the grid of streets (lines 152-156) and Tysons wide (lines 318-320). It could be strengthened by adding criteria, as you had (and now would drop) for reviewing the Initial Development Level. Some of the same criterion (market development, forecasts, trip reduction) would apply. You might also include planning within large approved developments. Many of these have numerous buildings spread over a decade or two, and their intentions could inform the process. As discussed during your deliberations, once a transportation project has started, it cannot easily be stopped, so we need to have the necessary data to be sure each major project is needed and timed right when it is approved. The goal would be just-in-time infrastructure. Finally, all projects, including additional transit and other new projects needed by 2050 should be included in the cost estimates. The idea that technology may change is not a reason to avoid it.

The document would retain Table 7 "for planning purposes", but there are elements of that table that deserve more scrutiny. In fact, some of the same corridors are being studied in various planning efforts, such as the County transit study and the NVTA 2040 plan.

One example that disturbs me is #15, the widening of Gallows Road. We should not provide more access for cars to a place where we cannot accommodate cars. We need access for people, which can be provided by a form of transit, or bicycles. The NVTA study does suggest transit on Gallows Rd. Other projects of concern are:

- # 4, widening of Rt 7 from the Dulles Toll Road (DTR) to Reston Ave
- #9, DTR ramp to Boone Blvd extension (indeed, the BB extension deserves a closer look)
- #12, Rt 7 widening from I-495 to I-66. It might make sense as a dedicated bus lane.
- #s 1, 10 & 11, Tyson's wide Boulevards (Rts 7 and 123). Have we done all we can to make

these safe for pedestrians?

The most recent COG Household Travel Survey was encouraging by showing some areas getting walking plus biking mode shares in the 50-60% range. Our plans may have been too timid in that regard. Perhaps this would be part of the process of prioritizing, but I would urge that transit and neighborhood access projects receive priority over roads at least in the early years.

This set of proposals is not likely to be taken up by the Board before September, so I would suggest we have another iteration, so we can see the effect of some changes and be able to comment again.