

	ORIGINAL DRAFT POLICY	TASK FORCE COMMENTS	STAFF RESPONSES	REVISED POLICY	GENERAL AGREEMENT
	<b>LAND USE</b>				
LU1	Attain an ultimate build out in Crystal City Planning Area with a target use mix of approximately 60% residential (including hotel) and 40% commercial building areas, to reach an evening population at least half the daytime population and to steadily improve the resident to employment balance.	Define what makes up the percentages. Is the relationship person to person, resident to office space or just sf to sf? The goal should be 1 resident per 1 employee. Is hotel considered residential in current zoning? Also, why is hotel being counted towards residential? This works against the goal of allowing people to live close to where they work.	<p>This policy is intended to steer the balance between daytime and nighttime populations closer to that in the Rosslyn-Ballston corridor. (*Daytime population includes 100% of the office and retail employees, plus 30% of residents, plus 50% of hotel employees, while Nighttime population includes 100 % of residents, plus 100% of hotel visitors, plus 50% of hotel employees.)</p> <p>A question arose about how the Daytime and Nighttime populations are traced to square feet by type. Using the above method, residential and hotel square feet largely correspond to nighttime population, while office and retail square feet largely correspond to daytime population. This is the rationale for grouping residential and hotel together. The plan provides opportunities for people to live and work in Crystal City, but the Plan can not ensure that more people choose to do so. The other goal is to achieve a better modal split with a more balanced number of people going in and out on Metro at peak hours.</p>	<i>No changes proposed</i>	NO
LU2	Establish recommended land uses for each block in the Crystal City Planning Area as shown on the Land Use Map. Recommend some blocks to have specific minimum percentages for certain land uses.	There should be some level of flexibility around the exact minimums identified for several of the categories. Use mix should be reconfigured to allow for more residential.	<p>Some of the categories establish minimum percentages of uses to support the plan goals. Where they exist, the minimums are target levels to encourage more residential in some areas or to concentrate office space around major transit nodes. Categories that have no target minimums can be whatever balance of use-mix helps support the primary goal outlined in LU1.</p> <p>Also, the Phased Development Site Plan for an entire block is where the proposed use mix would be evaluated against the Plan's Use Mix goals for both policy LU2 and LU1.</p>	<i>No changes proposed</i>	YES
LU3	Designate specific areas in Crystal City for ground floor retail uses that are accessible from sidewalks, the "underground", or both, as shown on the Retail Street Frontage Map and Proposed Underground Map, to provide for an ultimate range of retail square footage between 1.0 and 1.3 million square feet.	Might define % of red line in diagram. Add caveat that retail allowed everywhere at ground floor but would be required at red lines. Some requested the underground be much more specific with more circulation patterns shown and more retail uses adjacent to circulation. Need to clarify that not 100% of frontage shown would have to be retail, in order to allow for lobbies, service, etc. Specifying 1.0-1.3 msf of retail seems pretty specific. One suggested potential conflicts between street level retail and intermodal transit center.	<p>The intent of this diagram is to illustrate where on-street retail would be required, recognizing that retail may not occur along the entirety of the frontages shown. Space is needed for building entrances, lobbies, etc. that could occur within these retail frontages. The legend will include a new note to clarify that proposed retail would be permitted, but not required, along all other street frontages. Staff supports removing the specific 1.0-1.3msf range, as the intent of the policy speaks to retail location, not necessarily quantity.</p> <p>As the Plan document is developed, language will be included that identifies which types of retail are appropriate or encouraged at street level, and which types are appropriate for internal space. Also, it should be noted that the previous retail study suggests that demand for net new retail space in Crystal City is for "hybrid" space or entirely above-ground space, and notes that internal spaces may continue to support convenience and service retail).</p>	<p>Designate specific areas in Crystal City for ground floor retail uses that are accessible from sidewalks, the "underground", or both, as shown on the Retail Frontage and Underground Map.</p> <p>(Diagram will note that frontages shown as required retail frontages shall comprise mostly, but not completely, retail uses. All other frontages would permit retail if proposed, but would not be required.)</p>	NO (underground element)
LU4	Engage critical county service providers on an ongoing basis to strategically plan for and implement community infrastructure necessary to accommodate the increased demand on service provision as Crystal City continues to grow.	Need to require cultural and civic uses in plan such as school, theaters, medical, etc. Need clarification on services we are talking about here. One noted that policies LU4 and LU5 could be combined due to their similarities	This policy intends to address future planning needs for police, fire, emergency response, etc. The policy will be revised to clarify this. Staff will continue to work with these community service providers to help plan for their needs.	Engage critical county service providers, such as police, fire, and emergency response services, in planning for and implementing infrastructure necessary to accommodate demand for service provision as Crystal City grows.	YES
LU5	Capitalize upon opportunities to improve the geographic distribution of cultural and community-oriented	If these types of amenities are important then the plan should address them in some way.	The plan could include general incentives (e.g. bonus density, etc.) to encourage the inclusion of these desirable uses into site plan developments. Staff will continue to look at identifying areas where community-oriented uses	Create tools and incentives to improve the geographic distribution and presence of desired cultural and	YES

**Note:** Policies shaded in green reflect the most current version of each proposed policy.

	ORIGINAL DRAFT POLICY	TASK FORCE COMMENTS	STAFF RESPONSES	REVISED POLICY	GENERAL AGREEMENT
	facilities (such as theaters, large format grocery stores, and medical facilities) by strategically siting such amenities in Crystal City.		may be encouraged.	community-oriented facilities (such as theaters, large format grocery stores, and medical facilities) in Crystal City.	
	<b>BUILDING FORM AND HEIGHTS</b>				
B1	Establish build-to lines for the Crystal City Planning Area along the perimeter of development blocks as demarcated on the Built- to-Lines and Rights of Way Map.	Questions were raised about some of the ROW dimensions, particularly about the widths.	Some street dimensions are subject to change based on selected surface transitway alignment.	No changes proposed at this time; potential changes pending outcome of transitway alignment study.	YES
B2	Establish absolute maximum building heights (in feet) for all blocks in the Crystal City Planning Area, as shown on the Building Heights Map.	Some believe heights at east side of Crystal Drive are too tall. One questioned the 110' height at northwest corner of 23rd and Eads.	Majority of proposed heights east of Crystal Dr are 200 ft, approx. 50 feet greater than existing Crystal Park buildings and may allow for some additional floors on top of existing buildings (similar to Crystal Plaza II). The 2 areas east of Crystal Dr planned for 250 ft correspond with the planned density and height zones around 18th and 23rd Streets. Considering heights up to 110' at northwest corner of 23rd and Eads St may support a scale of development that could provide community amenity such as parking to support 23rd St retail. Heights allowed in current courts east of Crystal Drive will be 60' unless combined with rebuilding of Crystal Park buildings, and then they will be allowed at the 200' or 250' height as indicated.	<i>No changes proposed</i>	NO (as they relate to density and economics)
B3	Require proposed development projects in Crystal City to obtain a written statement from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) that the project is not a hazard to air navigation before accepting site plan applications for county review.	FAA issue must be resolved to make this plan viable. Some legality questions were raised on this short term policy. Perhaps the proposed policy would work in the long-term, with a 3-party agreement on acceptable heights, but in the short-term this is way too restrictive. Status quo should be continued into the short term future.	Per the discussion, staff recognizes the potential timing impacts of requiring developers to achieve FAA approval prior to submitting site plans to the county. In looking at a revised policy, requiring concurrent FAA and county filing/review may be a better alternative in the short term, with the expectation that a project receive notice from FAA before a County Board hearing is scheduled. The recently approved 1812 N. Moore site plan provides precedent for this model as being a workable approach.  *It should be noted that Arlington County is pursuing a 3-party agreement between AC-MWAA-FAA to provide clarity on acceptable heights at specific locations to help resolve the confusion that exists during the site plan process. The conclusions of this analysis may ultimately impact some of the proposed heights in the Concept Plan. Once such an agreement is reached it may result in a revised protocol for how the FAA address proposed building heights. In the interim, current established practices for hazard review and mitigation will continue.	Require proposed development projects in Crystal City to submit their projects for review by Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) when they file site plan application with the county, and secure notice from FAA that the project is not a hazard to air navigation before a County Board public hearing is scheduled for formal action on the site plan application.	YES
B4	Establish maximum building tower coverages for all blocks within the Crystal City Planning Area, as shown in the Maximum Tower Coverage Map.	Should there be some flexibility with this policy.	The coverages recommended in the policy diagram are generally based on and would allow for the level of development shown in the illustrative plan.	<i>No changes proposed</i>	YES
B5	Require minimum horizontal separation of 60 feet between building towers above the fifth floor to ensure light, air, relief, and respite to outdoor and indoor spaces.	Can we have precedents of different separations that can be shown to the Task Force for review? (e.g. Continental and Westin in Ballston). One commented that we need policy for separation between buildings at podium level.	Staff will prepare materials illustrating examples of tower separation and present to Task Force. A policy for separation between buildings at the podium level would be contrary to the goal of using effective building bases to define streets, sidewalks, and public open spaces.	<i>No changes proposed</i>	YES
B6	Adhere to shadow requirements that prohibit any new building from casting a	Vornado questioned 45% versus another percentage. Need to make clear the setback dimension is per block not per parcel. This policy needs	45% was derived from the plan iterations and the maximum building heights and bulk plane requirements. Increasing the amount of park area not in	Apply bulk/plane controls, as shown in the Bulk Plane Map, near identified	NO (as they relate to

**Note:** Policies shaded in green reflect the most current version of each proposed policy.

	ORIGINAL DRAFT POLICY	TASK FORCE COMMENTS	STAFF RESPONSES	REVISED POLICY	GENERAL AGREEMENT
	shadow over 45% or more of the surface area of any public park or plaza (except as otherwise obstructed by vegetation and landscaping within the space) between the hours of 11:00 am and 3:00 pm on both the vernal and autumnal equinox.	additional/different language to clarify how it's to be applied. A similar policy should also be applied to restrict shadows on interior office and residential space.	shadow would significantly impact permitted heights and associated development potential. Applying a similar policy to interior living and working spaces would preclude much of what is proposed in the plan.  In terms of the Bulk Plane Angle Diagram, bulk plane angles along 18 <sup>th</sup> Street are continuing to be studied at this time.	parks and plazas to prevent shadows from being cast over 45% or more of the surface area of such spaces (except as otherwise obstructed by vegetation and landscaping within the space) between the hours of 11:00 am and 3:00 pm on both the vernal and autumnal equinox.	density and economics)
	<b>DENSITY</b>				
D1	Establish base densities for each block in the Crystal City Planning Area, as shown on the Base Density Map.	There was strong feeling that base density should be more than what is allowed today within zoning or GLUP in order to encourage buildout of the plan and to try to achieve the 2.5 density replacement factor.	The current interpretation of base densities is the most established measure of an area-wide 'base' from which to start. Since development in the plan occurs on a mix of redeveloped, undeveloped, and found sites, preemptively adjusting the base density per block would not factor in the specific characteristics of each site. Policy D3 is intended to offset and acknowledge the significant cost involved in demolishing major buildings and present a mechanism to preserve economic feasibility of the plan, on a site-by-site basis.	<u>No changes proposed</u>	
D2	Allow for optional increases over the base density within the maximum building height limits on sites in Crystal City, in return for extraordinary community benefits, at the County Board's discretion.	There is a fear by some landowners and others that they need to achieve 2.5 times density before they can pay for amenity benefits. It was noted that AED economic studies did not factor in purchasing density through community benefit.	The policy is intended to ensure that community benefits are established as an expectation throughout redevelopment. Related to D1 and D3, this policy does not stand alone and specifically is tied to D3, where a tear-down credit mechanism may be used to offset expected community benefits. However, community benefits are needed as an expectation for those sites that do not require tear-downs or where the development potential granted exceeds the reasonable costs of demolition.	<u>No changes proposed</u>	
D3	Utilize a tear-down credit (or similar mechanism) in select instances to encourage redevelopment of properties in a way that furthers Crystal City Planning goals while recognizing the significant cost of demolishing existing major assets and retaining overall economic feasibility.	This credit needs to be explained better in terms of how it helps address the economics of the plan. Other incentives also need to be explored such as TDR's, expedited review process, etc.	The intent is to offer credits where there are existing high-rise buildings proposed for redevelopment.  Since the level of credit would vary between potential projects, at this stage it is too early to establish an across-the-board standard or fix a value to the credit. The main point is that redevelopment in Crystal City entails demolition of sizeable, value-laden assets, and thus requires an incentive of the variety enumerated in this policy.	Utilize a tear-down credit (or similar mechanism) to encourage redevelopment that furthers Crystal City Planning goals and achieves public improvements, while retaining overall economic feasibility by recognizing the significant cost of demolishing existing major assets.	
	<b>PUBLIC OPEN SPACE</b>				
P1	Provide all public open spaces as indicated on the Public Open Space Map in accordance with the general size outlined in the Open Space Inventory Table on the map.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Difference between "Preferred" and "Required" open spaces needs to be clarified.</li> <li>Are there dimensions to the "Required" and/or "Preferred" Parks?</li> <li>Some flexibility is needed to allow for final design solutions in the future.</li> <li>Open spaces do not need to be defined by retail to make them great, active spaces.</li> <li>The difference between a Park and Plaza must be defined.</li> <li>Further reductions in open space are not welcome.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff concurs, and will clarify that all planned open spaces are expected. The "preferred" and "required" related to placement, and will be addressed instead with/without build-to-lines to convey the desired level of flexibility.</li> <li>There are no exact dimensions to the parks, and the size (area) listed states a general goal.</li> <li>Staff concurs, but recognizes that some spaces should have less flexibility to ensure the spirit of the space is achieved. There are also concerns about cumulative impact with flexibility over several spaces.</li> <li>Staff recognizes that retail is just one but not the only way to activate parks or plazas.</li> <li>The differences between parks and plazas are something that will be characterized in more detail the narrative of the plan.</li> <li>The only reductions in the policy document/diagram as compared with the</li> </ul>	Changes will be made to the policy diagram to clarify the overall intent.	NO

**Note:** Policies shaded in green reflect the most current version of each proposed policy.

	ORIGINAL DRAFT POLICY	TASK FORCE COMMENTS	STAFF RESPONSES	REVISED POLICY	GENERAL AGREEMENT
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If it is the intent, the expectation that "Preferred" open spaces should be achieved needs clarity.</li> <li>• Too much flexibility may yield undesirable cumulative impacts in open space reductions.</li> <li>• Would like to see more Parks and Open Spaces at mid-block points between Eads and Route 1, north of 23rd Street, and also along Fern St if possible.</li> <li>• Existing Crystal Park open space should remain.</li> <li>• What is the difference in area between existing open space, the vision plan open space, and the policy diagram open space?</li> <li>• Open spaces # 3, 6, and 7 are all problematic.</li> <li>• What is the anticipated use of open space #13?</li> <li>• Parks and Plazas are likely locations for Transitway or transit stops, and need to be designed to accommodate them appropriately. This is especially true for open space #6.</li> <li>• Retail Plazas do not work.</li> <li>• Retail plazas do work, and become great neighborhood centers.</li> <li>• There is both support for and positions against the Center Park #7.</li> <li>• Staff needs to find and present a formula that pays for the parks (such as Center Park) and other amenities in the plan. There needs to be a balance.</li> <li>• How does this plan relate to the County's Urban Forest Master Plan?</li> <li>• Reductions in the size of open space #2 are not welcome.</li> </ul>	<p>January illustrative plan is the removal of an open space at the south end between Eads and JDH, and a slight reduction in size of Gateway Park.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff concurs, and will clarify the intent.</li> <li>• Staff concurs and believes the proposed policy provides a balanced approach for flexibility across various open spaces.</li> <li>• We will investigate the potential for inserting mid-block plazas between buildings to help increase the presence of such spaces between 15<sup>th</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup> Sts. The challenge is that 2 of the 3 blocks are not anticipated to undergo major redevelopment under this plan.</li> <li>• The plan proposes that low-scale buildings be situated there to enhance Crystal Drive's overall retail vitality and urban form.</li> <li>• In terms of existing parks/plazas, the analysis from last fall tallied 10.6 acres. The draft 1.5 plan proposed 13.4 acres, while the January vision plan had proposed 15.3 acres. The policy diagram currently proposes 13.7 acres, due primarily to the removal of open space #27. It should be noted that these figures include the general sidewalk areas around the perimeter of such spaces, whereas the table in the draft Public Open Space map diagram only tallies area within the build to lines, and thus does not include the approx. 2.2 acres of streetscape associated with such parks (11.5 acres net open space + 2.2 acres associated streetscape= 13.7 acres, or almost 30% increase above existing conditions).</li> <li>• As proposed, spaces #3, 6, and 7 would all add value and diversity to the overall open space network for Crystal City.</li> <li>• The plan document will describe the general character and functions for the planned open spaces.</li> <li>• Staff concurs and the plan supports this concept.</li> <li>• See fourth bullet above.</li> <li>• See fourth bullet above.</li> <li>• Staff recognizes the various viewpoints on the Center Park.</li> <li>• Specific funding mechanisms and tools to fund parks and their improvements are to be addressed in the implementation stage of this plan. The findings of our economic studies suggest that not all community amenities in the plan will be achieved through developer contributions.</li> <li>• Staff is currently analyzing the potential impact of the plan on existing urban tree canopy coverage conditions and how it relates to goals in the County's Urban Forest Master Plan.</li> <li>• The slight reduction in #2 is a result of reconfiguring B1's conceptual building footprint while reducing the planned height by 3-4 stories.</li> </ul>		
P2	Ensure that existing public open space displaced by future development is replaced with new public open space in a timely manner or is balanced by immediate improvements to existing, nearby open space, as part of the Phased Development Site Plan	Is the qualifier "immediate" necessary in this policy statement or does it preclude flexibility?	Based on this and other comments, staff revisited the wording of this policy to determine the best and most balanced approach to ensure that any loss of existing parks or plazas.	Develop implementation strategies that link the displacement of existing parks or plazas with: new parks or plazas; public access easements for existing spaces; or improvements to existing spaces.	

**Note:** Policies shaded in green reflect the most current version of each proposed policy.

	ORIGINAL DRAFT POLICY	TASK FORCE COMMENTS	STAFF RESPONSES	REVISED POLICY	GENERAL AGREEMENT
	process.				
P3	Establish County control over all public open spaces shown on the Public Open Spaces Map through either public dedication/acquisition or public-use and access easements set in perpetuity.	<i>No specific comments</i>	<i>No changes proposed</i>	<i>No changes proposed</i>	YES
	<b>SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT</b>				
S0	New Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do we need another policy in this area that speaks to desire for Energy Efficiency in building design?</li> </ul>	Staff concurs, and believes a new policy can also speak to the greater opportunity of Crystal City evolving over time in a way that reduces its effective carbon footprint as well to enhance the neighborhood's competitive advantages as part of its repositioning in the regional market.	Capitalize on the planned redevelopment of Crystal City to maximize the energy efficiency and minimize the carbon footprint of this mixed use neighborhood in order to align with County goals and to enhance its overall economic and environmental position in the region.	
S1	Establish high environmental sustainability standards throughout Crystal City, whereby all new commercial and residential buildings meet a minimum certified 'Silver Rating' under the United States Green Building Council's LEED rating system.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Different institutional standards often change over time and could become obsolete. The Policies need to be more general and possibly connected to County Guidelines on Sustainability rather than a specific institution's.</li> <li>Maybe we say 'Highest and Best Environmental Standards' rather than tying it to a specific program.</li> <li>If Silver Rating is not a County Standard or Goal, then why would it be required in Crystal City?</li> <li>Need to be general.</li> <li>How will sustainability standards apply to renovations?</li> <li>Economics of higher Sustainability standards needs to be factored into this Concept Plan and implementation process, as they were not in RCLCo's analysis.</li> </ul>	Staff recognizes that institutional standards will evolve over time, especially with regards to LEED and similar rating systems. Staff concurs with the concept of developing a more general policy that upholds the County's current highest standards at a point in time. Sustainability generally should be a goal for all projects, new and renovations, and will be clarified as such.	Uphold the County's highest and best environmental sustainability standards for renovation and redevelopment project throughout Crystal City, as they evolve over time.	
S2	Design, construct, and manage all public and private spaces, streets, infrastructure, and buildings to help Crystal City meet a minimum of "certification" standards under the United States Green Building Council's (USGBC) LEED Neighborhood Development program.	<i>No specific comments</i>	Wording was reformatted to improve flow and clarity.	Design, construct, and manage all public and private spaces, streets, infrastructure, and buildings to help Crystal City meet minimum certification standards under the United States Green Building Council's (USGBC) LEED Neighborhood Development program.	YES
	<b>AFFORDABLE HOUSING</b>				
AH1	Establish, as a minimum, that 20% of the net increase in residential units be provided as committed affordable units for moderate- and low-income households within the Crystal City Planning Area, while allowing such units to be provided in existing building stock.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should create a Policy that strives for a mix of unit sizes to promote more family units rather than just efficiencies and 1 bedroom units.</li> <li>Is the 20% level a county goal, or is it only for Crystal City? How does it compare with what is being planned/achieved in the R-B Corridor?</li> <li>How will you define the qualifying standards for Low Income vs. Moderate Income?</li> <li>How was the 20% figure derived?</li> <li>High-rise construction is the most expensive, and therefore the most</li> </ul>	All comments on this topic are duly noted. The challenge is being able to achieve the plan's vision of a mixed-income community given the economic circumstances surrounding future redevelopment in Crystal City. Staff has more work to do in this area in researching what we're achieving elsewhere in Arlington and what may be the best strategy to use for achieving affordable housing in Crystal City. Further analysis is also needed to determine if other innovative strategies could be employed to help create affordable housing in Crystal City beyond typical site plan development contributions.	<i>Potential revisions to this policy are under staff discussion</i>	

**Note:** Policies shaded in green reflect the most current version of each proposed policy.

	ORIGINAL DRAFT POLICY	TASK FORCE COMMENTS	STAFF RESPONSES	REVISED POLICY	GENERAL AGREEMENT
		<p>difficult for affordability standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Even the existing res. buildings have high (opportunity) costs associated with them.</li> <li>• Economics of this Policy need to be factored into the implementation equation of the Concept Plan. RCLCo did not factor a 20% into their analysis. Vornado's draft analysis of 20% requirement indicates the cost would be roughly twice current cost to meet the ADU Ordinance.</li> </ul>			
	<b>TRANSPORTATION</b>				
T 0	New Policy	Some introductory statement is needed that identifies the street/transportation network will be revised/improved to cope with density increase.	Staff concurs	Address and manage the Crystal City multimodal transportation system to accommodate and support future planned growth in the area.	
T1	Establish a revised street network for Crystal City as shown in the Street Typology Map.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the definitions of the street types shown on the Map? How were they developed? What are the differences between various types?</li> <li>• Should the segment of Fern Street south of 18th Street shown in red (Type B) actually be shown in green (Type: Neighbor Minor)?</li> <li>• Are these street type assignments taken from the existing Master Transportation Plan (MTP), or are they taken from the master plan?</li> <li>• Do these type designations accommodate bicycle lanes?</li> <li>• Do the types shown for Crystal Drive allow the reduction in the number of traffic lanes proposed in the plan (which the residents have strongly protested)?</li> <li>• Please explain the relationship between the assignment of street types and the traffic flow projections.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The CC Street Typology map is based on the classifications used in the County's adopted Master Transportation Plan (MTP).</li> <li>• This segment is currently classified as Type B in the MTP, but staff can revisit this to assess if a change should be recommended.</li> <li>• It is a combination, some of the existing street classifications would be retained while others would include recommended changes to the MTP.</li> <li>• The Transportation Study indicates where ped and bike infrastructure elements are planned; however, the MTP typologies do correspond to general conditions for bicycle accommodation.</li> <li>• Under the MTP, the Type A and Type B streets typically include between 2-4 travel lanes, and turn lane as needed.</li> <li>• The MTP typologies speak to the character of surrounding land use and pedestrian connectivity, rather than traffic flow directly.</li> </ul>	Establish a revised street network for Crystal City as shown in the Street Typology Map, in accordance with the County's Master Transportation Plan.	
T2	Expand County control over all streets and right of ways through public ownership, dedication, or public-use easements set in perpetuity.	<i>No specific comments</i>	<i>No specific response</i>	<i>No changes proposed</i>	YES
T3	Improve the safety and quality of pedestrian travel through the following actions: provision of sidewalks with sufficient clear zones and adequate space for tree planting and street furniture; the reduction of crossing distances for pedestrians through the narrowing of travel lanes and incorporation of nubs; and the incorporation of street trees and on-street parking as a buffer against moving traffic.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This policy includes a lot of elements.</li> <li>• What exactly is meant: narrowing of travel lanes or narrowing of streets?</li> <li>• On street parking as a buffer against moving traffic is contrary to users' perception.</li> <li>• We need an illustration of how all this can fit, for example, on Crystal Dr.</li> <li>• Policy needs to acknowledge being balanced with efficient operation of transitway; nubs may not be possible in all areas.</li> <li>• Office tenants have stated they like nubs at crossings because it does act as a buffer, parallel parking does not make crossing any longer.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff concurs; will seek to simplify and generalize the intent.</li> <li>• The policy had originally noted narrowing of lanes, specifically.</li> <li>• Based on observations, it appears that different users may perceive either positive or negative impacts on pedestrians resulting from on-street parking.</li> <li>• Part of the transportation component of the plan will include typical cross-sections for locations throughout CC.</li> <li>• Staff concurs; will revise policy to address need for balance.</li> </ul>	Improve the safety and quality of pedestrian travel throughout Crystal City by implementing best practices in street and streetscape design in a balanced manner.	
T4	Maintain continuity and safety for pedestrians and bicyclists during all phases of construction.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The language on disruptions to the interior pedestrian concourse, rather than emphasizing that they will occur, should rather emphasize that steps will be taken to minimize their impact and duration.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff concurs, and has proposed adding motorists and transit users to the list of persons for which to minimize disruptions.</li> </ul>	Maintain continuity and safety and minimize temporary disruptions for pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, and transit users during all phases of construction throughout Crystal City, including in the interior pedestrian concourse.	

**Note:** Policies shaded in green reflect the most current version of each proposed policy.

	ORIGINAL DRAFT POLICY	TASK FORCE COMMENTS	STAFF RESPONSES	REVISED POLICY	GENERAL AGREEMENT
T5	Maintain an "underground", as shown conceptually on the Proposed Underground Map, as a pedestrian system that horizontally and vertically connects development with stations servicing Metrorail, VRE, and the future surface transitway, while recognizing that disruptions in connectivity and changes in location may occur.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the goal to have a connection from 12th to 23rd Street?</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• What about existing connections to the street? How are they being addressed in the plan?</li> <li>• Connections to on street retail are important, and should be supported; perhaps state something like "increasing the number of connections to the street".</li> <li>• Some of the retail areas shown are too deep to be viable.</li> <li>• How does the plan address pedestrian bridges?</li> <li>• Suggests a new transportation policy on bridges and under grade crossings is needed</li> <li>• Existing bridge effectively connects to retail concourse across street</li> <li>• While bridges are being removed in Rosslyn, there are instances where some bridges were retained for good reason</li> <li>• Perhaps statement is: no new bridges, but consider the value of those that exist</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, the policy will be revised to state this.</li> <li>• Staff concurs and has addressed this in revised T4.</li> <li>• Understood, addressed in T4.</li> <li>• The intent of the plan is to encourage additional connections between the interior pedestrian concourse and streetscape areas, and will clarify this in the policy.</li> <li>• See bullet above.</li> <li>• The revisions being made to the diagram will generally show where underground uses will be permitted, but will not demarcate sizes of retail.</li> <li>• The plan will include narratives that address plan's intent on ped bridges.</li> <li>• See bullet above.</li> </ul>	Maintain an interior pedestrian concourse from 12th Street to 23rd Street, as shown conceptually on the Proposed Underground Map, to strengthen horizontal and vertical connections among: development; stations servicing Metrorail, VRE, and the future surface transitway; and on street retail areas; while recognizing that changes in location may occur.	
T6	Locate and consolidate building loading and service access points to secondary and tertiary streets and alleys where feasible, as recommended in the Building Service and Loading Access Map.	<i>No specific comments</i>	<i>This map is under development</i>	<i>No changes proposed</i>	YES
T7	In the short-term, implement the approved and funded interim surface transitway alignment recognizing that alignment modifications may be necessary to accommodate future development and roadway improvements. In the long term, implement the proposed alignment and enhanced surface transit technology (streetcar), as shown on the Surface Transitway Map, and design stations as integral elements of the built environment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These policies will depend on the final transit alignment.</li> <li>• Sufficient investment in the interim alignment should be made to insure that people use it.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>This map is under development</i></li> <li>• Yes, but some initial flexibility may be prudent should the interim alignment vary in location with the recommended future alignment, in order to not make substantial investments with a short life span.</li> </ul>	<i>No changes proposed</i>	
T8	Establish additional access points to the 'Underground' and Metro Station in the vicinity of the Crystal Drive and 18th Street intersection.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Needs to clearly state that the interest is in expanding the presence of Metrorail to Crystal Dr.</li> <li>• The reference to the "underground" is confusing in this instance; perhaps "Underground" should be removed from T8.</li> <li>• The 2nd entrance potentially would only be effective if it bypassed existing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff concurs; will seek to simplify and generalize the intent.</li> <li>• Staff concurs; "underground" will be removed from the policy.</li> <li>• Based on coordination with WMATA, staff is not aware of any existing</li> </ul>	Establish additional access points to the Crystal City Metro Station in the vicinity of the Crystal Drive and 18th Street intersection.	

**Note:** Policies shaded in green reflect the most current version of each proposed policy.

	ORIGINAL DRAFT POLICY	TASK FORCE COMMENTS	STAFF RESPONSES	REVISED POLICY	GENERAL AGREEMENT
		fare gates, 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?	capacity issues at the CC Metrorail station.  • In 2005, station daily boardings were counted at 12,575 (25,150 trips), projected to rise to 16,475 (32,950 trips) by 2030.		
T9	Create a multi-modal transfer area in the short-term on 18th Street under Jefferson Davis Highway, while working to integrate long-term future development adjacent to the existing Metro Station entrance with an enhanced multi-modal transfer facility situated at the ground floor.	<u>No specific comments</u>	<u>No specific response</u>	<u>No changes proposed</u>	YES
T10	Establish a maximum parking ratio in the range of 1 space per 750-1,000sf for office uses and between 1 and 1.125 spaces per residential dwelling unit, that may vary based on proximity to transit and site-specific conditions, while maximizing the sharing of parking space by various users in Crystal City	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It would be better if you picked specific values for the max. parking ratios rather than a range.</li> <li>• The appropriate values for the ratios may change over time; they are dependent on the kind and pace of development.</li> <li>• How will this policy and these ratios be used by the county? Who will set the maximum values?</li> <li>• Perhaps those sites near the Metro have a lower parking max, while those further away have a higher max.</li> <li>• Future conditions are too uncertain to set specific values now.</li> <li>• How will providing parking for retail be addressed by this policy? Need an assurance that adequate steps are taken to provide retail parking during the day, particularly between the peak hours from 11am to 2pm.</li> <li>• The policy needs language on viable hourly parking during the day.</li> <li>• Perhaps the plan could provide for an expansion of on-street parking to help meet retail needs.</li> <li>• Customers often have trouble finding parking near the shops they want to visit. Policy should address that.</li> <li>• Part of the problem with this policy is the shift from the previous requirement to provide a minimum amount of parking to the new policy to cap parking at a maximum. The cap is going to limit retail parking first.</li> <li>• Perhaps first sentence should include “for new projects” to avoid blending with existing projects.</li> <li>• Will existing projects have to be brought up to new standards?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The range is intended to provide flexibility, and this is a draft approach in progress under analysis for site plan projects throughout the County.</li> <li>• Intent of the policy is to serve as a guide when working through parking details for specific site plan projects.</li> <li>• The intent of the county policy is to establish what the reasonable range should be, and then have the details worked out on a project by project basis.</li> <li>• This has been considered, and is accommodated within the proposed range approach.</li> <li>• The range would provide flexibility to account for this.</li> <li>• Policy will be revised to identify the need to address short term visitors and daytime retail parking needs.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See bullet above</li> <li>• Plan should provide guidelines on locating on-street parking where desirable.</li> <li>• See bullet above</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This needs further study, to determine if parking needs/requirements will be met at PDSP or final site plan level.</li> <li>• The intent is to address new projects, although it's very likely that most existing site plan projects have more parking than would be required under the proposed policy guidelines.</li> </ul>	Establish parking ratios for new projects that range from a maximum of 1 space per 750sf or minimum of 1 space per 1,000sf for office uses and between 1 and 1.125 spaces per residential dwelling unit, while maximizing the sharing of parking space by various users and addressing short-term visitor and retail parking needs in Crystal City.	
T11	Apply Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures that reinforce the use of a lower parking supply.	<u>No specific comments</u>	<u>No specific response</u>	<u>No changes proposed</u>	YES

**Note:** Policies shaded in green reflect the most current version of each proposed policy.