

**Crystal City Planning Process
Task Force Meeting Summary
05-13-08**

Task Force Discussion on Draft Policies

The following are comments and questions from the members of the Task Force shared at this meeting:

Transportation Policies (DRAFT)

T1

- What does the definition of street types mean?
- What about northern stretch of Fern St approaching 18th Street?
- How do we know where bicycle elements would be?
- Is the primary physical difference between A and B sidewalk widths?
- Perhaps a new policy upfront is needed to note that street network needs to be revised to cope with future growth in Crystal City?
- Need information that is understandable for how development will impact traffic counts above existing; specifically the percent change along Crystal Dr.
- Perhaps a new policy is needed that speaks to “multimodal transportation system w/ x% of transit trips to accommodate planned growth.
- Does the typology itself imply 1-lane or 2 lane?

T2

- No specific comments

T3

- This policy includes a lot of elements
- What exactly is meant by narrowing of travel lanes? Or narrowing of streets?
- On street parking as a buffer against moving traffic is contrary to users perception
- We need an illustration of how all this can fit, for example, on Crystal Dr
- Policy needs to acknowledge being balanced with efficient operation of transitway; nubs may not be possible in all areas
- Office tenants have stated they like nubs at crossings because it does act as a buffer, parallel parking does not make crossing any longer

T4

- No specific comments

T5

- Is the goal to have a connection from 12th to 23rd Street?
- It is fine to state that changes in location may occur, this is understood. But the policy statement should be reworded to say something about “avoiding/minimizing or best managing temporary disruptions should they occur”; or something like accommodations during temporary disruptions

- There are going to be interruptions during redevelopment; we can attempt to re-route, detour folks in the meantime, but cannot have people walking under/through construction zones
- What about existing connections to the street? How are they being addressed in the plan?
- Connections to on street retail are important, and should be supported; perhaps state something like “increasing the number of connections to the street”.
- Some of the retail areas shown are too deep to be viable.
- How does the plan address pedestrian bridges
- Suggests a new transportation policy on bridges and under grade crossings is needed
- Existing bridge effectively connects to retail concourse across street
- While bridges are being removed in Rosslyn, there are instances where some bridges were retained for good reason
- Perhaps statement is: no new bridges, but consider the value of those that exist

T6

- No specific comments

T7

- More clear wording is needed on the interim alignment, to ensure stations, wayfinding and the overall network is emphasized as permanent, not just temporary

T8

- Needs clarity to state that the interest is in expanding the presence of Metrorail to Crystal Dr.
- The underground is at grade, which can be confusing. Perhaps referring to it as Interior Pedestrian Concourse would clarify.
- Comment that 2nd entrance would only be effective if it bypassed existing faregates, since the bottleneck is at the mezzanine level, not at the platforms themselves
- What is the current and future projected ridership at Crystal City Metro?
- “Underground” should be removed from T8.

T9

- No specific comments

T10

- Why is there a range for parking ratios? How is the range to be applied?
- The policies should include a range since other factors will come into play on a project by project basis

- Policy would provide flexibility
- Perhaps some clarification could be added to the intent of the range: such as projects further from Metro or in the near term should have more spaces, while closer to Metro and long-term should have less spaces
- What are doing to accommodate parking for retail
- Maximizing sharing between users does not accommodate retail parking
- How much detail should we get into a high level policy statements
- Retail does not sufficiently exist between 11 and 2
- Something should be added to address how retail parking will be accommodated, or what short term on street parking can do to accommodate short term visitors
- This is a shift from minimum to maximum, which is supportable because we all want to build minimal parking needed. But, needs clarity that maximum parking ratios are for new projects, not blended average. Would also like flexibility to look at new/existing projects where it can be used/dedicated.

T11

- No Specific Comments

Other General Comments

- Some policy comment is needed that speaks to improving the intersection of 23rd Street and Route 1
- Addressing the change in character of Route 1, to an urban boulevard, should be addressed as a policy
- Don't see anything specific about phasing transportation improvements to avoid horrible traffic conditions
- We need a new policy that speaks to pedestrian bridges
- There is neighborhood support nor exiting pedestrian bridge over Crystal Dr
- How will community benefits be expected or applied between infill buildings and whole redevelopment buildings