

Transportation Committee Meeting

July 10, 2008

7:30 pm; Agenda Item heard beginning 7:35pm (appx.)

Arlington County Board Room

TC Members in Attendance: Peter Owen, Steve Sockwell, Essie Wagner, Franz Gimmler

Topic: Crystal City Planning Process

At the beginning of the agenda item discussion, Anthony Fusarelli, Crystal City project planner with CPHD, Planning Division, provided introductory remarks and shared a brief presentation that provided a background on the Task Force process to date. This presentation included a very brief presentation on the Revised Illustrative Plan, focusing on transportation related policies under development.

Questions and comments that arose by TC members during the meeting included the following:

- ✓ In Policy T1, the use of the title “Street Typology Map” may be a bit misleading or confusing because the map actually shows where streets exist (or will exist), not just the typologies. Perhaps an alternative or expanded title could help clarify this.
- ✓ Also in T1, the sentence ends in accordance with the County’s Master Transportation Plan. This may benefit from a rewording that says something like “...and to be reflected in the County’s Master Transportation Plan” to indicate that perhaps the MTP should be amended to reflect any specific recommendations for street modifications that come about as part of the Crystal City Plan.
- ✓ Congruency with concepts in the Master Transportation Plan in most of the policies was noted. However, it is unclear as to why some of the policies that seem like general excerpts from the MTP were included in these Crystal City (CC) specific policies, while others were not. Hopefully, it is not the intent to only apply these specific ones noted and ignore the others.
- ✓ Perhaps the phrasing of the policies can be revisited to create more distinction between CC specific policies and the MTP policies. (e.g., “There is a Loading and Service map that should be implemented to reflect the MTP’s general principles regarding building loading and service”). If there is anyway to make it more clear that these policies are specifically included in the CC list because of their heightened relevancy to overall planning goals and objectives, that should be considered.
- ✓ Does the interim transit system exist today? When policy T7 speaks about alignment modifications, what is that referring to? Would they be temporary? In the longer term, it is to be understood that the move is towards a streetcar type system that is tied into the Columbia Pike system?
- ✓ There were two exceptions where a lack of congruency appears to exist between the CC policy language and the MTP. In T10 and T11, both policies, as they read, are inconsistent with the

MTP. In fact, parking maximum's were presented and rejected as part of the MTP review process. With regard to T 11, the rationale for the TDM is inconsistent with adopted policy in the MTP that discusses diverting resources saved by reducing excess off-street parking to other community benefits (Parking Policy 6). CC policies T10 and T11 appear to be departures from the MTP; this should be addressed or explained more fully in the future. Alternatively, these could be replaced with the policies in the MTP.