

Rosslyn Process Panel (RPP) Meeting #11, Summary

July 10, 2013; 7:00-9:30 pm

2100 Clarendon Blvd., Third Floor, County Board Room

Panel Members in Attendance: Brian Harner, Tim Helmig, Paul Holland, Stan Karson, Andy VanHorn, Jennifer Zeien

Staff in Attendance: Gabriela Acurio, Kellie Brown, Kelly Cornell, Anthony Fusarelli, Scott McPartlin, Claude Williamson, (Ben Carlson, Brandon Nevers, Elliot Rhodeside)

1. Welcome

- Brian Harner, Chair of the Rosslyn Process Panel, gave some opening remarks and asked staff to walk the group through the next several agenda items.

2. Updates/Follow Up from June 26 Process Panel Meeting

- Rosslyn Process Panel/Community Walking Tour Date: General agreement to stick with the July 18 date. Starting at 5pm could be hard for some people, should consider later start time. Monday Properties and JBG can provide access to the tops of its buildings, but if 1812 N Moore St. is included, should do at front end of tour. Panel interested in having event focus on seeing views from buildings, with some brief discussion about draft framework elements on walk between buildings. Maybe consider building sites providing views looking to northwest and west as well; Consider RSVP format - get folks to register and RSVP for the tour to keep it to a limited, manageable size;
- Next Rosslyn Process Panel Meeting Date: Confirmed for July 24, at 7pm;
- Status Checklist for Work Plan Items: Staff shared a checklist to be used for tracking status of analyses in the work plan. One panel member commented the checklist is a helpful tool, and hopes we can discuss at start of each of meeting to touch base on where we are at and how we are doing with each task;

3. Transportation Framework Elements, Follow-Up Presentation

4. Panel Discussion on Transportation Follow-Up

- Appreciate the tremendous amount of material, and clear demonstration of goals, analysis, concepts, and evaluation methodology;
- In the future, would like to see more emphasis about the vision for Moore Street. In terms of importance to Rosslyn, Moore Street may be more of a priority than Ft. Myer.
- Some uncertainty about value of dispersing bus stops away from Moore Street – a concentrated approach may make more sense and be easier to use. Do not see a long term solution in what was shared.
- Given the grade/accessibility issues, how do we evaluate potential for new connections? Is the plan to show alternative street connections, routes or configurations? If so, how?
- From a County perspective, do we have specific superblock rules, or maximum block lengths beyond which we require new streets?
- It's important to remember the need to balance circulation capabilities for both pedestrians and cars;
- In general, when analysis and alternatives are presented to public, it will be important to have clear metrics and materials to help them through these issues;
- The VPH (vehicles per hour) data is very helpful to see; should consider comparing VPH data with other appropriate places, perhaps including M street in Georgetown;
- In terms of transit, we should keep notion of what Metro is planning in our minds. Also need to consider if we can have consolidated bus service/station with new station infrastructure. For next meeting, would like to have update on status of WMATA Metro planning and DDOT planning for streetcar;

- A presentation has recently been made on WMATA's near term goals and objectives, has good information, such as specific funding request for Rosslyn and such – would be good to share;
- If we've had conversations with WMATA on busses, it would good to know what their perspective is on future bus operations in Rosslyn;
- It's also important to consider the existing and potential future role of shuttle buses – we haven't talked much about this yet;
- We should think of how we can take advantage of plans for eliminating the Fort Myer Drive tunnel, future plans for WMATA, and now the interest in potential air rights;
- The panel would like a regular status report of WMATA and DC STREETCAR planning efforts related to Rosslyn, on an ongoing basis. The question involving land use balance related to transit capacity seems to be an increasingly important question. Should consider that if Metro's capacity might increase by 50% in the future, how does that inform land use and density planning for Rosslyn;
- Georgetown BID - potential gondola connecting Rosslyn to Georgetown -something that we might think about;
- In terms of ped/bike, some suggested text changes: for walking, should recognize them as walking corridors. Frame the issue as "more effective block lengths" instead of shorter block lengths; and not "more crossing opportunities", but "safer crossing opportunities";
- On the Bicycle slide, when referring to connections to Roosevelt Bridge, should explore with a combined Esplanade Concept...might merit looking at how those pieces all together;
- We should be talking with DC about connections to bridges with the District;
- It appears with Esplanade, we have a great opportunity to address issues in the bike survey responses;

5. Parks and Open Space Framework Elements, Follow-Up Presentation

6. Panel Discussion on Parks and Open Space Follow-Up

- Appreciate the work on level of service analysis, using the best data available. This is a good analysis to have, and concur with the position it's more about quality of open spaces than quantity;
- Park and Recreation Commission struggles with Rosslyn as an underserved area in the County - glad you looked at NY and SF as good examples;
- It seems timely to get Realize Rosslyn on the PRC calendar/agenda in September if possible;
- The analysis looked at existing populations, we also need to project out the future populations to see how the numbers and percentages shift in the future with additional growth; also need to consider likely demographic trends, and consider the type of housing (mostly high rise) that will be built, housing more youthful people; Also need to consider local users, and hopefully park users who come to Rosslyn as a destination since the parks will be high quality;
- Interesting to think about needs of Gateway Park – the vision for this space needs to be one that can be advanced in a timely manner;
- Some of comparative analysis is really useful - appreciate introducing the notion of the value of open space, beyond just a community amenity – there is economic benefit in parks as well;
- There's a lot in this presentation that's useful in framing the conversation;
- Need to consider and clarify what are the boundaries – be clear on what's in and what's out; some tweaking of the numbers may be merited; panel may provide suggestions off line for the right set of #s;
- Important to consider whether we can achieve whole vision or just portions; can we achieve some parts earlier, and others later? Panel interested in having project team put concepts out there for the next meeting that address these questions;
- In Rosslyn's case, not sure open space in Rosslyn has same impact as other places because of the open space's perimeter location - even though the overall numbers look pretty good;

- Esplanade idea clearly deserves some level of concept plan for September, would like to see some alternatives sketched for this;
- Also would be interested as to whether previous studies of Gateway Park hit the mark, or did it miss it?
- Esplanade is critical component as well; NYC is grabbing every single inch of space they can get access to on the waterfront; hope we are not so timid on considering ways to connect to waterfront;

7. Initial Assumptions for Building Form/Height Modeling

8. Panel Discussion on Initial Assumptions for Building Form/Height Modeling

- Didn't hear considerations on what happens to ground plane when buildings become shorter/wider; this needs to be discussed when looking at the alternatives;
- Need to include views to the monument core;
- Need to be careful about statements on what you can and cannot see from observation deck. It is a 360-degree experience; during entitlement process, exhaustive studies were done to show if something was blocked from one vantage point, it may not be from another; there also seems to be inconsistencies on the view studies done for Central Place and what was shown here;
- Need to consider how we can demonstrate continuous views around the deck;
- As we walk some of these sites on 7/18, we need to be thinking about what we are seeing on site and how that might inform additional views of the alternatives we may want to see at the 7/24 Rosslyn Process Panel meeting;
- Also need to consider how prescriptive will this plan be in regard to heights;
- Related to VA's OTP3 RFI, we should incorporate massing of potential air rights above I-66; also, it would be good if we could get a brief presentation from OTP3 to hear from them their interests in the RFI that's been released and any potential outcome;
- Haven't seen a lot on transitions to lower heights adjacent to neighborhoods; would like to better understand difference between maximum planned site plan densities and the potential 10 FAR through C-O Rosslyn;

9. Adjourn