

Mark Zetts  
Testimony before the Planning Commission's Tysons Corner Committee  
June 21, 2012

I want to thank the Tysons Committee and county staff for all their work over the last 13 months. An enormous amount of effort goes into planning Tysons and it's not readily apparent to the public.

I'll touch on several issues in my testimony, the first of which is providing all cost estimates in 2012 dollars instead of inflation-adjusted 2050 dollars. Ordinarily, expressing costs in current dollars would be fine, but these projects cover a 40-year planning horizon. Although the future is unknown, we do have some idea what 40 years of inflation does to the cost estimate because staff ran the numbers and published them and, in doing so, put the cost of Table 7 into perspective. The draft financing recommendations should retain the 2012 cost estimates, but provide a sidebar that projects the cost to 2050 using 3 and 4% inflation and assuming the growth rates in the Comp Plan.

In a similar vein, the post-2030 transit costs are not disclosed. This is worrisome because these costs are a major liability for the public sector. The draft recommendations state phase 2 transit analyses are still in progress and I accept that. However, if these transit costs are going to break the bank, so to speak, the public needs to know because the Tysons Plan is premised on this Phase 2 transit system generating very high mode splits in Tysons.

As for financing Tysons, there should be no caps for either the private or public sector. We don't want a commitment from the private sector to raise \$1.37 billion, which, after all, is a

soft, 40-year planning estimate. What we want is a commitment to complete the required road projects in a manner that keeps pace with tangible redevelopment. It's all about the projects, not the money. The total costs of these improvements will not be known for decades but, in the here and now, the costs are irrelevant. Whatever the bill comes to, it needs to be paid and that applies to both the private and public sectors. Furthermore, whatever type of tax district is formed in Tysons to generate a private sector revenue stream, the tax rate needs to be sufficient to retire the debt in 40 years.

As to the Tysons Partnership request that no new projects be added to Table 7, this is a reasonable request for any road improvement deemed to be needed in the post-2050 time frame. However Table 7 was a product of transportation modeling and planning that did not account for the maximum densities approved in the 2010 Plan Amendment. As a result, the East Tyson Consolidated Traffic Impact Analysis has identified a need for a super street intersection on Rt. 123 to accommodate the projected traffic volumes on this critical facility. Given its benefits, it is a relatively inexpensive project, but that is beside the point. It is a necessary project that needs to be added to Table 7 and the draft recommendation text on line 467 appropriately recognizes the need for such additions. I would point out that the public sector is more exposed than the private sector when it comes to Tysons-wide improvements because the Dulles Toll Road ramps are still an unresolved issue and, as I have asserted before, the planned widening of the Dulles Toll Road is the Achilles Heel of Table 7.

Interim parking at the Metro stations in Tysons is important to the local community. It is a winning proposition for all parties as it puts existing surface parking to good use generating revenue and increasing Metro ridership. Interim parking is something Arlington County managed quite successfully and it should be thought of as a natural step in the progression from a suburban environment to a dense TOD area. The recommendations beginning at 510 propose an RFI for Interim Parking, however the implication is it would be a one-time RFI and if no responses were received there would be no interim parking. The ability for landowners around the Metro stations to submit interim parking proposals should remain open. If it becomes apparent these potential parking areas will remain fallow for several years, a landowner might very well reconsider the option to propose an interim parking use.

Concerning the recommendations on Transportation Funding Monitoring and Review, on line 476 the committee recommends the *'The Board review the construction schedule and funding mechanisms on a periodic basis...'* and *'This review should include members of the community and the Tysons Partnership'*. This recommendation should firstly be changed to read, *'The Planning Commission review and comment on the construction schedule...'* as it has been aptly demonstrated over the past 4 years that PCTC meetings are an excellent forum for 1) presenting detailed information and concomitant issues and, 2) facilitating open participation with members of the community and Tysons Partnership. If open participation is the goal, this is how to do it. Secondly, the draft should further be amended to recommend the Planning Commission forward its comments to the Board for its review.

Lastly, I oppose the committee's recommendations on lines 594 through 599 to increase or remove the current IDL of 45 MSF of office use. The justification states the PC draft recommendations address the financing of the increment beyond 2030, when clearly it does not. There are well over \$1.5 billion in 2050 dollars of transit improvements needed after 2030, and this does not include regional bus rapid transit and an additional rail line needed to further reduce vehicle trips. If phase 2 of transit isn't implemented as envisioned, it will have tremendous repercussions on Tysons' growth. Moreover the Comp Plan criteria for considering an increase in IDL hardly seem to be met. The market demand for office is non-existent now and in the foreseeable future with vacancies rates at elevated levels. Nothing has been built and no new use established in Tysons under the new Plan, Metro won't be operational for 18 months, and the last attempt at establishing a bus circulator was a dismal failure, yet the county is comfortable that the TDM targets outlined in Table 5 can be achieved? Based on what? Although significant progress is being made towards the realization of the vision for Tysons, it is progress at the politic and bureaucratic level. Vital, in every sense of the word, but it's not tangible progress made evident by new structures, uses, improved infrastructure or an increase in jobs or residents, and it is certainly not progress that would indicate the Tysons Comp Plan got everything right.

Only FPD approved office space should be tallied when computing net new office space towards the IDL threshold. The IDL should be revisited after there has been significant, demonstrable progress made in each of the TOD areas and Plan guidance can be validated.