

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ARMED FORCES RETIREMENT HOME (AFRH)

PUBLIC HEARING ON CAMPUS MASTER PLAN
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Washington, D.C.

Wednesday, June 22, 2005

SPEAKERS:

TIMOTHY COX
AFRH Chief Operating Officer

JOAN GLYNN
Greenhorne & O'Mara, Inc.

CRAIG WALLWORK
General Services Administration

ALSO SPEAKING:

SHERILYN ADAMS

AVIS ANDERSON

JACQUELINE ARENDSE

GEORGE BAILEY

CATHY BOYLIN

JIM CALDAS

JAMES CARSTENSEN

BILL CRANDALL

TIM DENNEE

DAVID DOUGLAS

MARK EWERT

MICHAEL GEORGE

LAURI HAFVENSTEIN

JOHN HANLY

SANDRA HOFFMAN

DEAN KERN

ALSO SPEAKING (CONT'D) :

JANET LUGO

LEWIS MAIDEN

TED MARIANI

TOM MAYES

ROBERT O'BRIEN

LINDA PERKINS

THOMAS ROONEY

SHERI STEPHANSON

ARLUS STEPHENS

LISA SWANSON

JEFF TAGGERT

CLIFF VALENTI

ALEXEY VOLYNETS

JANICE WILLIAMS

JOHN ZOLTNER

* * * * *

P R O C E E D I N G S

(7:11 p.m.)

MR. COX: If people in the back want to take seats there is plenty of seats on the sides, plenty of seats in the front, so please come down.

Good evening and welcome to the Armed Forces Retirement Home public hearing on the environmental impact statement for the Armed Forces Retirement Home Campus Master Plan. I'm Tim Cox, the Chief Operating Officer for the Armed Forces Retirement Home. With me presenting tonight are Craig Wallwork with General Services Administration, Craig, and Joan Glynn, a consultant from Greenhorne & O'Mara.

Before I begin the official part of our program I just want to say personally that I'm really pleased to see all of you here. You will learn more about AFRH, Armed Forces Retirement Home, and why we're here, why we are looking at this development, and this is just a start of our collaborative process with all of you and I hope many more too because we want to do what's best not just for us and the residents, which is most important to me, but we also want to be the best neighbor that we can be to all of you and that's very important to us too.

We're first and foremost a retirement home. You'll find out in my presentation how long we have been here, what we do, but we also want to be able to continue to be a neighbor like we have for the past 150 years. This process tonight is a formal hearing so you'll give your presentation and we'll go through what goes on tonight. But I do want you to know that my team, the team you meet here, are here to make this a collaborative process and do the best we can for all of us involved so we really appreciate your interest, your patience

tonight in waiting a little longer for everyone to come in, and then your contributions that you will give us tonight. I really appreciate that.

AFRH is an independent establishment of the executive branch of the federal government which provides residences, nursing home, and related services to former military enlisted personnel at two locations, Washington, DC, this site, and Gulfport, Mississippi, is our sister home. AFRH in Washington, DC, was established in 1851 as the Old Soldiers Home and it currently serves nearly 1,000 military veterans.

The campus features private rooms, bank, chapels, convenience store, post office, laundry, barbershop and beauty salon, dining room, golf course, fishing ponds, 24- hour security, and staff presence. The 272- acre site is currently developed with over 100 structures including the United States Soldiers' and Airmen's Home National Landmark District.

AFRH is currently in the process of preparing a master plan to guide future use of the AFRH Washington campus. In carrying out our social and environmental responsibilities AFRH is committed to ensuring that proper consideration is given to the environment when undertaking such a major project. As part of that consideration this meeting is an important opportunity for you both as a vested community member and an individual citizen to provide your comments on the draft EIS. We appreciate you making time in your evening to participate with us.

The following presentation will explain the purpose and the need for the proposed master plan and the findings of our draft EIS. During the presentation you will also be given an update on the Section 106 consultation process for historic preservation. Following this presentation you will have the opportunity to provide comments on the draft EIS and Section 106 process.

All comments received either through oral comments tonight or through written comments received during the comment period will be addressed in the final EIS. After the 30-day public review period of that final EIS AFRH will

issue a record of decision identifying the alternative it selects for implementation.

AFRH will not be answering questions or addressing your comments during this meeting. The written comment period ends 6 July 2005. Comments on the Section 106 process will be accepted through the Section 106 consultation. If you have not already done so you may sign up to speak at the welcome table in the back of the room. Please note tonight's meeting will be recorded so that we have a complete record of all the comments given.

Before we begin I'd like to go over tonight's agenda. We will be talking about the NEPA process, Section 106 process, purpose and need for our action, objectives, master plan alternatives, impacts, next steps, and public comments. The public hearing is being conducted in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act, commonly referred to as NEPA.

NEPA provides for the consideration of environmental issues in federal agency planning and decision-making. NEPA states federal agencies including AFRH must prepare an EIS for actions that may have significant environmental impacts and consider a reasonable range of alternatives, use a systematic interdisciplinary approach in analyzing environmental impacts, and factor environmental considerations into decisions.

AFRH will use findings in the EIS as we prepare development guidelines for the site. Throughout the development process AFRH will continue to look for ways to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts on the human and natural environment. This chart outlines the NEPA process. To date we have published the notice of intent August 18, 2004, held a public scoping meeting September 9, 2004, published a draft EIS May 20, 2005, and tonight we are holding our public hearing. We anticipate the final EIS will be distributed for a 30-day public review period in late August 2005 and the record of decision will be final in September 2005.

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 requires that federal agencies including AFRH take into account their effects of their actions on any district, site, building, structure, or object listed in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historical Places. Section 106 review ensures that preservation values are factored into federal agency planning and decisions. AFRH is in consultation with Section 106 with the DC State Historic Preservation Office and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

Section 106 requires that AFRH provide the public, agencies, and other interested parties the opportunity to comment on the AFRH actions impacting historic properties. AFRH is combining the public environment processes for Section 106 and NEPA in line with Section 106 regulations. Though comments on the draft EIS are due by 6 July comments on the Section 106 process will be accepted throughout our consultation process with the DC State Historic Preservation Office and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

Since the home's beginning operational funding has come from active military personnel. A permanent trust fund was established nearly 150 years ago and is renewed monthly by active duty payroll deductions. Fines and forfeitures from the armed services and the monthly withholding have provided the principal support for the home throughout its history.

In recent years the principal of the trust fund has been shrinking. Congress through the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 gave the AFRH with approval of the Secretary of Defense authority to sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of property that is excess to the needs of AFRH. Proceeds from such transactions will enable the AFRH trust fund to be replenished. These additional revenues are needed to support a sustainable retirement home for our retired military personnel.

To implement this authority and plan for its own facilities, AFRH is currently preparing a master plan for the DC campus that will guide the long-

term use and development of the site by AFRH and others. The objectives of the AFRH master plan alternatives are to preserve and improve the essential components of the AFRH for the residents and the community, to provide sufficient revenue to support the AFRH's goal of resident-focused care while replenishing the depleted trust fund, to grow the trust fund to not only meet the needs of today's residents but also the need for future generations of heroes as well, to attract development at fair market value that is compatible with the mission of the AFRH, and to ensure an open participatory process with the AFRH residents and the community at large.

I will now hand the presentation over to Craig Wallwork from General Services Administration, which is advising AFRH on the redevelopment process. Craig will be talking to you about the master plan alternatives which have been developed and studied in the draft EIS. Craig.

MR. WALLWORK: Thank you. Good evening. Several alternatives for the AFRH master plan are studied in the draft EIS. Potential development under each alternative was defined after taking into consideration compatibility with the AFRH mission, compatibility with historic resources and existing environmental conditions, compatibility with surrounding land uses, and analysis of real estate market conditions in the area.

Development zones as shown on the slide were defined to guide development of the master plan alternatives. It should be noted that private or governmental development on the AFRH site would occur primarily through leases or sales. The decision to lease or sell would be based on economic analysis and is not part of the EIS.

As required by NEPA, the EIS also studies the impacts of no-action alternatives. Under the no-action alternative or alternative 1 a master plan for AFRH would not be adopted and no new construction on the site would occur; therefore, there would be no additional revenue from development on the site so would not meet the financial needs of the Armed Forces Retirement Home.

Under alternative 2 approximately 8.7 million gross square feet of new development would occur on the AFRH campus. It has the greatest density of any of the alternatives. As with all the build alternatives it has a mix of uses but has more medical and educational space than the other alternatives.

Development in Zone 1 would consist of institutional uses compatible with the AFRH operations or AFRH facilities. Zone 2 would be developed with new residential units for AFRH use, lease, or sale. Zone 3 would be designated for educational use while Zones 4 and 5 would be developed with compatible medical uses and Zone 6 would contain residential development compatible with the residential developments west of Rock Creek Church Road. This zone would also potentially include small-scale retail development to serve the residential areas.

Under alternatives 3A and 3B approximately six million gross square feet of new development would occur on the AFRH. This alternative has a similar mix of uses as is found in alternative 2, is less dense, and has a greater emphasis on office and research and development space as compared to alternative 2. As with alternative 2 development in Zone 1 would consist of institutional uses and Zone 2 would be developed with new residential units for AFRH use, lease, or sale. Zone 3 would be designated for residential, office research, retail, and hotel uses and Zone 4 would be developed with compatible medical uses.

There are two developments under options for Zones 5 and 6 under alternative 3. Under alternative 3A Zone 5 would contain residential development while Zone 6 would contain residential and institutional uses. Under 3B Zones 5 and 6 would be developed for embassies in support of foreign missions and international organizations element of the comprehensive plan for the national capital developed by the National Capital Planning Commission.

Under alternative 4 approximately 6.4 million gross square feet of new development would occur on AFRH. This alternative places a greater emphasis

on residential uses than do alternatives 2 and 3. Again, as with other alternatives, development in Zone 1 would consist of institutional uses and Zone 2 would be developed with new residential uses for AFRH use, lease, or sale. Zones 3, 4 and 5 would be developed with residential, office, and retail users. Zone 6 would contain residential development compatible with residential development west of Rock Creek Church Road.

Joan Glynn, our environmental contractor, will now present the alternatives and findings of the draft EIS. Joan.

MS. GLYNN: Good evening. Each of the master plan alternatives studied in the EIS would result in impacts to the human environment. The alternatives would all disturb soils and topography on the site through site grading and excavation. Existing ponds would not be directly affected by the new development; however, concrete storm water channels may need to be realigned.

Development will increase impervious surface or hard, nonporous surfaces on the site by 34 to 37.5 acres which would increase storm water runoff. Best management practices for storm water management would be incorporated into the site design to mitigate for storm water impacts.

Under all of the master plan alternatives forested areas, mature trees, and meadow habitats could be replaced with developed areas but guidelines can be put in place to mitigate these potential impacts. Because the site is located in an urban area impacts to wildlife would be minimal.

The social impacts from the master plan alternatives would primarily be beneficial. The master plan alternatives would be for the most part consistent with the comprehensive plan for the national capital. The alternatives are consistent with the federal environment, parks and open space, and natural features components of the comprehensive plan.

Alternative 3B would support the foreign mission and international organizations component of the plan. All of the alternatives would impact historic features including the historic landscape. These impacts would be

mitigated through a programmatic agreement with the DC State Historic Preservation Office, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and other parties. Because the AFRH is federally owned it is not subject to zoning by the District of Columbia.

The alternatives would result in beneficial increases in housing stock within the District of Columbia resulting in long-term increases in the city's population. The increase in population along with the increase in office and commercial space would result in increased demands for community services. There is adequate capacity in neighborhood schools to handle the increase in population and development under the master plan alternatives would result in increased cost for service from police, fire, and EMS services.

Implementation of the master plan alternatives would result in short-term beneficial gains from construction spending and construction employment. Long-term beneficial impacts would occur from new jobs for local residents from the plan development. The master plan alternatives could accommodate between 3,000 and 16,000 employees on the site.

Implementation of the master plan alternatives would have long-term beneficial impacts to city revenues through the increase in real property, personal property, franchise, sales and use, and individual income taxes. It is estimated that the alternatives could generate between \$31 and \$47 million in real property taxes.

In addition implementation of the master plan alternatives would provide revenues to replenish the AFRH trust fund. Impacts to low-income and minority populations were assessed in accordance with the Executive Order 12898. Adverse impacts from air quality, traffic, noise would occur and could be felt by area residents; however, these impacts are not anticipated to be disproportionately high for low-income or minority populations.

A phase 1A archeology survey was prepared for the site. The survey concluded that the AFRH has a moderate potential for prehistoric and historic

archeological resources. A phase 1B archeology survey would be needed prior to any site construction to determine the presence or absence of archeological resources.

The master plan alternatives would not alter or destroy buildings associated with the President Lincoln and Soldiers Home National Monument, the US Soldiers' and Airmen's Home National Historical Landmark, and national register listed historic district. New construction could alter the viewsheds (?) to and from these resources.

In addition new construction could adversely affect the historic landscape of the national register-eligible AFRH historic district. In addition the historic context of individual buildings or building groups could be altered. New construction on the AFRH could affect the views to and from the historic properties outside the site including the Harewood Gate Lodge and East Grounds, the Petworth and Park View neighborhoods, and the United States Soldier's and Airmen's Home National Cemetery.

AFRH has initiated consultation through the Section 106 process with the DC State Historic Preservation Office, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and other parties. AFRH is working with the State Historic Preservation Office and Advisory Council to identify consulting parties to participate in the consultation process. As a result of this consultation a programmatic agreement is being developed that identifies mitigation measures to be implemented as well as preservation design guidelines for the defined character areas in the AFRH.

A detailed transportation analysis was also undertaken to determine the effects to the local transportation network and associated traffic levels from new development on the AFRH. The traffic analysis looked at future roadway conditions without the proposed development and then conditions were assessed with the new development. The master plan alternatives would generate between

3,700 and 11,300 peak hour trips and would have major impacts on intersections in the vicinity of the AFRH.

Under the master plan alternatives the North Capitol Street-Michigan Avenue intersection, the North Capitol Street- Harewood Road intersection, and the Irving Street and First Street intersection across from the Washington Hospital Center could operate under unacceptable conditions. Impacts could be mitigated through roadway improvements, signal modifications, and transportation management plans.

The Washington, DC, metropolitan region is a nonattainment area for ozone which means the level of pollution is higher than government standards. Based on the air quality analysis performed for the EIS mobile sources or traffic would not exceed national ambient air quality standards.

Under all of the alternatives new stationary sources such as boilers would require a formal general conformity determination under the Clean Air Act. Alternative 4 would exceed the new source review thresholds for nitrogen oxide and would therefore require a nonattainment area permit. Air quality impacts could be mitigated through emission controls on equipment.

Construction activities would have short-term adverse impacts on air quality and noise levels in the area; however, long-term impacts to noise levels from increased traffic and site operations would be negligible. The master plan alternative would require new utility connections and would result in increased utility usage. Once complete the new development would generate solid waste and possibly medical waste. All waste would be handled in compliance with local, state, and federal laws.

With that I'll now hand the presentation back to Tim Cox, who will explain the procedures for commenting tonight.

MR. COX: Now we will open the floor to those of you who would like to make formal comments. I will call people to speak in the order in which they

have signed up to speak. Again, if you have not done so you may sign up at the welcome table at the back of the room.

In order to accommodate everyone tonight, the 40 people thus far that have signed up, I ask that you limit your comments to three minutes, please. We have a timer set up in front to let you know when you've reached that three-minute mark. When you come forward please state your name. Spell it slowly for the record. Remember, AFRH will not be addressing your comments this evening. All comments will be responded to in the final EIS.

We also have written comments that can be made to us through 6 July 2005. With that we have our portable microphones. Yes? Okay, I see one there, Steve, and one over here. Good, John, thank you. Council members had signed up and I see Councilmember Vincent Orange. He may not be here yet.

MS. PERKINS: Good evening. My name is Linda Perkins. I'm here from the Office of Councilmember Vincent Orange and, as I stated at the side there, we are here to participate and to assure that this would be an open process with input from all persons that are interested in making sure that whatever happens at this site is compatible with the needs of the residents as well as the environment.

So I will not be able to speak on the Councilmember's behalf other than to say that we are here. Any assistance we can provide, please do not hesitate to contact our office. Our number is 202-724-8028 and we look forward to being here throughout the entire process. Thank you.

MR. COX: Thank you. Council- member Jim Graham. Thank you for coming tonight. Appreciate it.

MR. GRAHAM: Delighted to be here. Hello, everybody. I've just arrived, as you could probably tell, but I'm very, very pleased to be here. I'm very pleased for the opportunity for all of us to be here tonight. If you're a resident in the neighborhoods surrounding this great home could you raise your

hand if you live not on the grounds here but you live around? Forgive me. Some of you will understand. If you live in Ward 1 would you raise your hand?

I want to especially thank all of our residents for coming out here tonight because they make the point that I'm just simply going to repeat but your presence here tonight makes the point that whatever happens here we must be assured meaningful, bona fide community neighborhood engagement on these issues.

And people who live in the District of Columbia have gotten accustomed to the sometimes uneasy relationship that we have with our great federal government and we know there are times of ebb and flow between the District of Columbia and the issues that we care about and the issues the federal government cares about. But what we have here tonight is a dramatic and very, very significant show of this message, that what happens on these grounds is important for a number of reasons but one of the key reasons for the significance of these actions is the impact on our neighborhoods. And I'm privileged to represent the great neighborhood of Park View, which is adjacent to this development.

I know my distinguished colleague Mr. Fenty is on the way and he will talk to the issues of Petworth and other neighborhoods that are in Ward 4. But that's the message, include us, involve us, give us meaningful engagement, and you'll find us to be responsible partners in what will be appropriate use of these lands.

Thank you very much.

MR. COX: I've received word that Councilman Fenty is on his way so we'll just put him one or two people back and the next person after that is Jim Caldas.

MR. CALDAS: Good evening. My name is Jim Caldas and I am the president of the Washington Hospital Center, your neighbor across the street. Washington Hospital Center is owned by MedStar Health. I have some general comments and then some specific comments related to traffic impact.

MedStar and the Washington Hospital Center fully support the concept of development of the property being proposed in this plan. As the owner and operator of the medical complex on land immediately to the south across Irving Street we believe that appropriate development compatible with AFRH and neighboring uses is important for the efficient use of land to benefit the community and city as a whole.

This city has limited large tracts of land for development. When large parcels become available for use a variety of possibilities should be considered that maximize the benefits to the community both financially and substantively. Because of the character of the land use south of Irving medical, educational, research, and other related institutional uses should be considered.

The major street arteries adjacent to the site such as North Capitol and Irving Streets and Michigan Avenue provide excellent access to the site. A relatively high density could be accommodated so long as residential areas to the northwest are protected. The characteristics of the site with large open spaces lend themselves to appropriate high-density development and counteract urban sprawl.

Metro's red line is sufficiently close to the site that shuttle bus services benefiting all in the immediate community would reduce traffic. The clinical and research components of MedStar Washington Hospital Center's plan have the unique compatibility with the mission of the home and could assist in providing or coordinating development for this important site.

In addition the site would allow the expansion and renovation of the Washington Hospital Center's facilities, which can become a model for the delivery of medical services. MedStar Washington Hospital Center has the capacity and will pursue the opportunity to develop the entire property in an integrated and intelligent manner respectful of both the neighboring community

and the community of residents at AFRH and will be guided by the leadership of AFRH.

With regard to the traffic analysis we believe that the environmental impact analysis of alternative 2 overestimated total peak hour trip generation by a factor of two plus. Am I out of time?

MR. COX: You are.

MR. CALDAS: Let me just summarize by saying that we will submit the points which indicate, we think, that the traffic impact is overstated as outlined in alternative 2. Thank you very much for the opportunity to comment.

MR. COX: Thank you, Jim.

MR. COX: Next on our list is Mr. James Carstensen.

MR. CARSTENSEN: You have to forgive me. As a federal employee it was hard enough to write my comments for a five- minute speech. Now I've to go down to three so I'll try and make my point and get away quick. I'm speaking for several people in the Petworth and Park View communities who have taken great interest in this project. We know that we have to make one thing clear from the outset, that this proceeding, this proposed land lease, is about money.

The Armed Forces Retirement Home Trust Fund in recent years has been depleted. The people of the Soldier's Home want a revenue stream and they deserve one. The people who live here have served and sacrificed for our country and for that they deserve our thanks, our dedication, and our commitment to ensure that they continue to get the kind of retirement lifestyle that they deserve.

The ground we stand on today is precious ground not only for the Armed Forces Retirement Home but for the entire community and indeed the nation. President Lincoln spent a quarter of his presidency here. He walked these grounds. He saw graves being dug for Union troops, he shaped thoughts about the Emancipation Proclamation here, and he talked with soldiers who lived here at the time.

The impact study talks about having no impact on historic monuments. Considering the historic value of these grounds, we ask what is the rush. What is the rush to lease this precious surrounding land for eight-story condos, massive buildings with huge asphalt parking lots, and the accompanying traffic jams and smog? Once the land is developed it's gone forever.

We believe there is a better way. There are ways to generate revenue from the land without destroying it. There are ways to get the Armed Forces Retirement Home the money it needs without building upon one of its most precious resources. Some would have us to believe that this debate is about whether to erect six-story buildings or four-story buildings or to put condos here or there. That's a false debate. The issue is this. We need to make sure that the Soldiers Home doesn't fall under further financial neglect. Let's get the home the financial resources it needs but let's not sacrifice this great asset.

We examined the plan for this land drawn up by a few executives and consultants. We don't see anything in the document that talks about national parks. We don't see anything in reference to recreational trails or recreational areas or even parks for the performing arts like the Virginia's Wolf Trap or Chicago's Ravinia. We don't see the talk of the need to preserve open space for the retired soldiers, the entire community of Washington, and the nation.

What we see is a rush to development. This issue is far too important to take the expedient way out. If we do our children and grandchildren will never see the land as Lincoln saw it. There is a better way. Working together we can do the right thing not only for ourselves, for our community, but for the entire nation and all generations to come. Thank you.

MR. COX: Next speaker, Mark Ewert and after Mark it will be Thompson Mayes.

MR. EWERT: My name is Mark Ewert and I appreciate the chance to speak and I appreciate this process. I want to start by honoring the thousand men and women who served in the Armed Forces that live here and also the military personnel for decades and decades who contributed to the upkeep of this home out of their military paychecks.

I also respect the need to raise additional funds to continue supporting this home. I want to talk chiefly about problems that I find with the EIS document but I want to start by talking a little bit about problems that the EIS document finds with the master plan. I would encourage all of you to read the document. It's full of warnings and cautions. If you just skip the executive summary and actually read the document it's very illustrative.

But I also found that the EIS does not account for a huge amount of people that might be on this property. The people who might be patients and visitors to the medical facility, the people who might be visitors to the hotel and conference center, the people who would be shoppers in the proposed retail spaces, and the visitors to the national monument are not accounted for. I created some formulas for those. They are in the letter that I have sent so I won't go over those formulas for the interest of time but there could be up to 50,000 people on this piece of property. That's the size of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, so if we think that our surfaces around this area can withstand this environment, can withstand 50,000 people all at once, I would be very much surprised.

I'll limit my comments there except to say that I certainly hope that the master plan will be reconsidered, that there will be a new EIS, that the public and the residents of this home will be involved, and with this new plan especially the national monument and its surrounding will be respected. I certainly hope that everyone understands that part of the concern of everybody in this room is the best thing for the AFRH, for the residents, and the surrounding community. Thank you very much.

MR. COX: A brown Ford, Maryland license plate NNK 693, your lights are on.

Tom, thank you.

MR. MAYES: Well, I'm relieved that's not my car. I am Tom Mayes. I am with the National Trust for Historic Preservation. The National Trust is a congressionally chartered nonprofit organization dedicated to the preservation of our nation's resources.

We have a special relationship with the Armed Forces Retirement Home because we are the co-steward, restorer, and operator of the President Lincoln and Soldiers Home National Monument. In that role we just celebrated together with the Armed Forces Retirement Home the restoration of the exterior of the cottage.

We applaud the commitment of the Armed Forces Retirement Home to the preservation of these critical resources, particularly the national monument. We do, however, recognize the critical need of the Armed Forces Retirement Home to raise additional revenue for its residents which they do so greatly deserve. As steward of the President Lincoln and Soldiers Home National Monument, however, we are deeply interested in the future of the site as a whole particularly as the master plan may affect the development and the historic character of the national monument over time.

We therefore urge the Armed Forces Retirement Home to very carefully consider the impacts of the master planning process. In earlier master plans changes were made to the property that we now know dramatically changed the property and affected its historic character. We would not want to see that happen again. In that regard we have three particular concerns about the draft EIS.

First, as you all know, the draft EIS makes it very clear that there will be under these development alternatives long-term direct, major, and adverse impacts on the historic resources. We think the draft EIS needs to be

looked at and modified to address those a little bit more carefully. For example, most of the alternatives that are proposed propose a great level of development and we think that alternatives should be looked at that can achieve some of the goals the Armed Forces Retirement Home is trying to achieve but reduce the level of development and therefore can reduce the impact on historic resources.

Particularly in that regard are the views from the Armed Forces Retirement Home. Many of you know that President Lincoln enjoyed those views and was undoubtedly inspired by those views as many of you all have been. We want to make sure that the development alternatives that are looked at are done in a way that they will minimize the impact on those views over the long term.

We're also concerned about the level to which the draft environmental impact statement looks at mitigation efforts to try to protect these historic resources. And we'd like to see it explore in more depth so that the public can have access to that information, some of these mitigation efforts. Some of this will be done through the Section 106 process but typically in the Section 106 process when it's combined with the NEPA process those mitigation efforts are disclosed so that you all and we can be aware of them and participate in talking about them.

Finally we are also concerned about the cumulative impacts of the development that's proposed and we don't think the draft EIS goes quite far enough in looking at what those cumulative impacts would be. For instance, the cumulative impacts are things like parking needs over time, street construction, and things like that that over the long term will have even greater impacts so we'd like to see the EIS address those.

In closing let me just say that we appreciate the Armed Forces Retirement Home's commitment to the preservation of its historic resources and we look forward to working with you all and with the State Historic Preservation

Office as we look for ways to protect these important historic resources. Thank you.

MR. COX: Thank you, Tom.

Next on my list, Cliff Valenti, runner up, then Lauri Hafvenstein. Welcome, glad you're here.

MR. VALENTI: Nice to meet you.

MR. COX: Thank you, you too.

MR. VALENTI: Hi, I'm Cliff Valenti and I'd like to say that I read the master plan. I hope you guys did too. It's very interesting. It will put you to sleep. But anyway I found that there were a number of contradictions in the plan. For example, in Section 19 it says that minority low-income populations could be disproportionately affected yet in 2-17 it says low-income and

minority populations would not be disproportionately affected.

Someone had said that the traffic considerations were understated. I think they're overstated if anything. Traffic considerations do not include increases from the Lincoln Cottage or the hotel plan for the site, not to mention that it's far enough away from the Metro Station that most people aren't going to walk. Additionally it does not include an assessment of how traffic will be impacted from the new projects already slated for Georgia Avenue like a four-story condo building that's going up there and other projects in Columbia Heights and Petworth. These need to be considered for the area roads around here.

Many sections are too general to have any real meaning. When you look in the detail sections they really don't tell you anything more than what the summary sections say. Under the No-Action Plan it says there will be an adverse economic impact on the retirement home; however, I think this is an

intellectually dishonest statement. A no- action option would have no effect on the current financial situation.

Now, other alternatives for generating revenue need to be considered. Our federal government and American citizens in general have a responsibility to make sure our soldiers are adequately funded in their retirement. Giving up their gardens and green space or prescription drugs, for that matter, should not even be an issue.

Granted, this proposal is the easiest out but it's a Band-Aid. All of the impact summaries show a negative impact on the existing community, more traffic on roads that are already congested. It says that routes would fail, Capitol Street would fail, removal of matured trees, adverse effects on aquatic life, adverse effects on topography, increased noise level, decreased air quality, decreased green space, increase in city and federal services, direct long-term adverse impacts on archeological things. It says the cottage views would be adversely affected.

Only short-term interests of developers seem to be served by this plan. The long-term interests of the residents of DC, the residents of Petworth, and the residents of the Old Soldiers home do not seem represented.

Every option except the no-option plan is huge in scale and 3B shouldn't even be on the table because I read a newspaper article that said the foreign missions and the embassies the State Department isn't even interested in those.

Well, I'm out of time but anyway I think everybody knows my position. Thank you.

MR. COX: Lauri Hafvenstein. Next up then is Sandra Hoffman. Glad to have you tonight.

MS. HAFVENSTEIN: Thank you very much.

Hi, my name is Lauri Hafvenstein and I appreciate the opportunity to comment on this important issue. I'm a resident of the neighboring community

and I would like to disclose up front that I own property that faces one of the parcels for proposed development and as such I obviously share the concerns for traffic and for quality of life in the neighborhood.

But I prefer to focus my comments tonight on my concern for the preservation of the historic value of this property. I think that anyone who had the opportunity, as I recently did, to visit the Lincoln Sanctuary, and I encourage anyone who isn't aware of this book by Matthew Pinsker that talks about the historic significance of this property, I encourage you to get it and read it. You can get it at Amazon and any number of bookstores.

I'd like to echo the comments that Mr. Carstensen made that we are standing on sacred ground and once the cement is poured it can't be brought back. I have read the EIS and I do not feel that enough attention has been given to the adverse impact to the historic landscape. I think that this

impacts not just the neighboring community but the city and indeed the entire nation. Are we developing this land for the nation? It appears that we are not.

There are untold hundreds of thousands that have not yet discovered Lincoln's Cottage. Nor have they yet found the first Arlington Cemetery behind the cottage where soldiers from the First Battle of Bull Run and other conflicts are buried. We should think of the land surrounding these sacred sites no differently than the space around Washington's Mount Vernon or

Jefferson's Monticello. Thank you.

MR. COX: If I could ask Sandra just to hold on a second I see Councilman Adrian Fenty is here so, Councilmember, if you would come please, I'd appreciate it.

MR. FENTY: First of all I want to say I am glad to be back on campus. Most of you may recall that this area of DC was actually in Ward 4 when I was first elected and I was very proud to represent the veterans here at the Soldiers' and Airmen's Home. I want to thank you all once again for your service to the country. After redistricting I no longer represent the area on campus but, of course, Rock Creek Church Road is squarely within Ward 4 so I obviously still have an interest.

And most people who are off-campus don't realize that most of the people who live here at the Soldiers' and Airmen's Home vote right here in the District of Columbia right over on Harewood Road at Precinct 44 and are very active members of the District of Columbia local community. So I want to thank everyone first of all.

I have a formal written statement, which I will submit for the record as follows. My name is Adrian Fenty, District of Columbia Councilmember representing Ward 4. I appreciate the opportunity to testify on the proposed future development of the Armed Forces Retirement Home, Washington. Upon reviewing the draft environmental impact statement and discussing the proposed development with community leaders in the surrounding neighborhoods it is clear to me that any development of the campus of the Armed Forces Retirement Home will have a large impact on the communities around the site, especially those in Ward 4 where I represent.

As you are aware, there is a number of very active community groups which have weighed in on this proposed development and since the likely footprint is so large, perhaps as large as eight million square feet, it's imperative to continue to not only welcome community input but really to ensure the comments and concerns of those affected are incorporated into the final version of the environmental impact study and ultimately the master plan for the project.

I am particularly concerned about the possible impact the new development may have on traffic flow in concert with our existing infrastructure and the historic preservation issues associated with the property which were just so eloquently addressed. Development of this property provides a rare opportunity to create and make available open park space for community use as well and it could influence the economy by incorporating some of those values.

I therefore firmly believe that any successful project at the Armed Forces Retirement Home hinges on buy-in from the community inside the gates and also buy-in from the surrounding communities. I look forward to working with all parties to facilitate this involvement and to ensure the formation of a true partnership as this very important project moves forward. Thank you very much and I'll be happy to work with the Armed Forces Retirement Home and certainly the community as this goes forward. Thank you very much.

MR. COX: Thank you. Sandra Hoffman and on deck is Robert O'Brien. Welcome, thanks for coming.

MS. HOFFMAN: Thank you for allowing me to testify this evening. I have specific questions that address many of the similar concerns that have been raised already tonight. My name is Sandra Hoffman. I live at 7th and Taylor Northwest, about six blocks west of Soldiers Home. I have some very specific things that perhaps are examples of how the home could impact us.

Because of the significant lack of

recreational park space in this area children throughout our neighborhood frequently are using our streets as places to play, to ride their bikes. It's a significant recreational resource. This is a neighborhood of single-family homes with many children and many families who are expecting children as well.

The proposed development plan on this site will significantly increase traffic which I would expect will remove the use of streets as a

relatively safe place for recreation as they are being currently used and I'm interested in hearing how the plan expects to replace that recreational resource that will be removed from our community.

The second question I have is the federal elements of the comprehensive plan for national capital provide the guiding criteria for this development from what I understand from the EIS. One element of the federal elements is to enhance park and open space system of the national capital region and to ensure adequate park and open space for future generations.

We are currently seeing very dense

residential development throughout Columbia Heights. We are very soon going to be seeing groundbreaking on two large projects on Georgia Avenue and we hope and expect to see much more of that along Georgia Avenue and Sherman Avenue and I think the neighbors very much welcome that kind of dense residential development. I may be speaking for myself but so far we've been able to work things out with planning. Everyone is going to work for the neighborhood.

Those developments are within two to six blocks of this space. As I said, we are already experiencing a lack of parkland for recreation in this part of the city. This is one of the few large remaining open spaces available in central DC so my question is why isn't a sizeable park part of the development plan for this site and in particular I would think that Area 6 looks like it would be particularly appropriate.

Among the alternatives that are considered, like prior speakers, I'd like to urge the Armed Forces Retirement Home to work with the DC government and federal government to find alternatives for funding or for land use including

possibly exchanges of land with other federal agencies where perhaps you can find a site that would be more appropriate for development and then perhaps this can become a park. Maybe that's a way to work things out.

MR. COX: Robert O'Brien. Next up then, Ted Mariani.

MR. O'BRIEN: I'm Bob O'Brien, and I'd like to talk a little bit about this thing. We seem to have four proposals on the agenda, all of which have been developed with little or no input by the residents. As I see it, this meeting and the previous one on the same subject only summarize the proposals being submitted to EPA. At the first meeting I attempted to have it clarified as to which proposal the administration was favoring or was more in favor of than others. I was not successful on that. But I find it difficult to believe that they do not have a distinct opinion about which of these plans should be the one to be accepted.

The next remark I was going to make, when I look at it it appears to be too derogatory. I will not make it; however, I do think it's premature to submit these proposals without residents having had the opportunities to become more familiar with the plans and the effect it will have on their lives here at Armed Forces Retirement Home. Thank you.

MR. COX: Ted, then next up is Michael George.

MR. MARIANI: My name is Ted Mariani. I'm an architect and engineer here representing MedStar Health Institution just to the south of the home and they have an interest in developing the property. We have a great deal of concern that the EIS dramatically overstated the transportation impacts of the development in alternative 2.

As Mr. Caldas said, it was a factor of two times what it will really be. The principal reasons for this were the study indicated that the land that is indicated for educational purposes, which is graduate medical education, was treated like it was a community college. This gives you a factor of six times of what you would really have. Also it failed to account for the fact that a lot

of the uses would be moved over from the Hospital Center so you're double-counting the traffic which would be taken away from the streets because of that.

They failed to recognize the fact that in a medical facility shift changes occur at nonpeak hours. People come to work before 7:00 and they basically leave before 3:00 so you do not have the peak hour impacts.

Another issue was the parking that is indicated in the EIS calls for over 16,000 parking spaces. Now, that's really more than twice that you would ever really need on this campus for the development under alternative 2. Just to give you an example, the NIH, which is significantly larger than anything that would be developed on this campus, only has 8,000 spaces.

So I just want to suggest that before the master plan proceeds much further there should be a much more rigorous transportation analysis and this is good for everybody, not only the potential users of the site but for the community to understand the real impacts of the transportation and the parking requirements. And that should be undertaken, I think, as soon as possible because right now what you're seeing is something that is so dramatic that it just frightens people and that's not the reality of the situation. Thank you very much and we will submit a written statement for the record.

MR. COX: Thank you. Michael George and then D. E. Douglas.

MR. GEORGE: I'm a home resident and I'm against getting rid of our land. They tell us it's for the trust fund. Nobody ever sees this trust fund. If they want to do something with the land make a national cemetery out of it. If they got to take it from us make it a cemetery for the Soldiers Home. They're running out of cemeteries. That will work.

MR. COX: D. E. Douglas.

MR. DOUGLAS: David Douglas.

MR. COX: I have D.E.

MR. DOUGLAS: David, right, thank you.

MR. COX: You're welcome. Thomas Rooney up next. Thank you, Mr. Douglas, glad you're here.

MR. DOUGLAS: More than welcome. I'd like to thank the soldiers for coming out. My name is David Douglas and, talking about a neighbor, I am a neighbor. I'm 40 feet from the Soldiers home and the young man from the Hospital Center that said he was a neighbor, that was part of Soldiers Home. That was the apple orchard that I played in.

They had another meeting here when they put the three hospitals down there. Veterans and the Hospital Center, and they said that they were going to move the orchard and now that's the parking lot for the cathedral. That's where the orchard was supposed to be. So let me tell you once they start they are not going to stop.

You can come in any gate in this place. I taught my son how to run cross-country right in this park. Security got bad and instead of trying to solve the problem they locked the place up. And you can't keep fear out. You have to face fear. You can't just keep locking yourself up. And that's what you have to do. And if you let them start pouring the concrete you are going to lose this place and you need it. Thank you.

MR. COX: Thomas Rooney and then Lisa Swanson. Hi there, glad to have you here.

MR. ROONEY: My name is Thomas Rooney. I'm a long time resident, 50 years plus, of Brookland, which is just down Michigan Avenue from here. I've been involved in a lot of things in the city here, including McMillan Park across the way, our Metro stop, and a number of other things. What I'd like to talk to here is a few comments about the traffic that's listed in the EIS statement.

First of all the DC Office of Planning has stated there will be no major highway. This is from some of their own propoganda. DC will have no

major highway improvements to 2025, and that's from the Regional Plan to 2025, the year 2000 update to constrain long-range plans.

So the long-range plan is there is

no money to improve the roads. Well, back in 2001 when we got this information some from workshops they were doing on McMillan the North Capitol and Michigan Avenue intersection was a level of service D in a range going to F, failure.

The Office of Planning's solution to the coming traffic crisis was, "The developers will have to coordinate mitigation with other major traffic generators to solve traffic issues." From that gobbledegook it seems that DOT is not responsible for the traffic and the developer is going to be responsible for the traffic but how does a developer be responsible for the traffic when in the EIS statement they admit that North Capitol and Michigan, Harewood Road and Michigan, and First Street and Michigan all will be rated F? Currently they're rated D so we are only one step from F.

So all of this additional traffic will have a humongous impact. On page 441 labeled "Trip Generation" is expected from the development AM peak hours 11,310 vehicles. That's per hour. PM peak hours, 9,960 vehicles, that's per hour. So that is not workable. Everything will clog down.

Interestingly enough, the DC DOT put out a little pamphlet the other day, mailed it around to residents about what to do when we get attacked by terrorists or whatever, how are we going to get out of the city. Well, I happen to notice on the map on the back that if you live in this area of Brookland or any place in between on North Capitol and Michigan you either go out Georgia Avenue or Rhode Island Avenue and somehow North Capitol is left off. You don't go out North Capitol.

And I guess they're recognizing from their own propaganda here that it will be completely unusable and that's now, not in the future sometime. I

just wanted to point out quickly that this EIS is not in a development vacuum. There is a development proposed for the McMillan Reservoir which is horrendous. It doesn't take into account the current development going on or expansion on the campus of the Medical Center and they're building a 1500-car parking building right now on the corner of First and Michigan.

It doesn't take into account the six or seven acres that were up for development at the corner of Irving and Michigan and they are still up for development. The Hilton outfit was going to build a convention center and hotel there but now it's up for grabs, six or seven additional, and Catholic University owns two or three city blocks that are up for development. So I just wanted to point out the traffic here is going to be a huge and unsolvable issue.

MR. COX: Lisa Swanson and Arlus Stephens. Thank you for coming.

MS. SWANSON: Thank you. Hi, I'm Lisa Swanson. I run, I bike to work, I recently acquired a dog through marriage who likes to walk around here. I'm a member of the executive committee of the Sierra Club in the District of Columbia although I'm not speaking for them today. We'll prepare a statement later but I live across the street on Illinois Avenue so I'm here in that capacity.

I can't talk about everything in the environmental impact statement, of course, so I'm glad other people are talking about other parts of it but two things stand out. If you look at the map of the District of Columbia this is huge. This is a huge, prominent green space that needs a lot of attention.

Anything that happens here will have a lot of effect not just on the perimeter neighborhood, on the Chesapeake

Bay, the Potomac River, all of the greater environment that we're not really talking about tonight, so we can't forget about that.

And the second thing that jumped out at me was this number that's come up a couple times, 17,000 parking spaces. I think the Home Depot maybe has 500 or 800, something like that, so 17,000 is phenomenal and that to me is a huge problem. The statement mentioned that there are three Metro stations close by. I think they're walkable, not everybody thinks they're walkable, but this area is completely underserved by buses, as the previous guy mentioned or someone else did, two near the hospital, one on Rock Creek Church, zero buses on North Capitol.

So if somebody is planning on needing 17,000 parking spaces they are thinking about a lot of traffic and I know that's the maximum. Today's Washington Post has a story that I hope everybody would look at. The title alone is exciting to me, "Mini-city Plan Discourages Use of Cars." There is a plan underway right now in Vienna, Virginia, to completely rethink the use of cars in an urban area.

I'll just read you one little section of what the planners had in mind there. To invite the potential residents not to own cars include showers in offices for bike riders, personalized traffic trouble-shooters for residents, handy Zipcars or Flexcars, these very short-term rentals that the District has available, free smart cars, free company cars. Instead of assuming 1.6 parking spaces per condo they're going to cut that down to 1 and basically force people to think about getting out of their cars.

I bring this up because I think not to think like that in any kind of development that will impact such a huge area on the map would be a missed opportunity to think differently about how space is developed. I know some people think there should be no development here at all. I'm with the Sierra Club. You might think I'd say that too but sometimes development in an already developed city area if it's done well, if it's done ecologically and with the people in mind, is better than creating a sprawl elsewhere and knocking down trees in a lot of other places.

Thanks.

MR. COX: Arlus is next and then on deck is Vonnie Cruel. Thank you.

MR. STEPHENS: Hi, good evening, everybody. My name is Arlus Stephens. I'm a neighbor. I'd like to thank Mr. Cox and I'd especially like to thank all the men and women who are residents here at AFRH Washington not only for their welcoming us here tonight but also for their service to our country.

I have a couple of quick points. First all of this could be remedied very quickly if the Defense Department found it in their hearts to put a line item in their budget which would just fund the home. The last I heard they were getting quite a lot of money. Secondly I want to speak to the environmental impact statement. I believe the methodology was flawed in that there was not enough input from residents and also from the neighbors to the home and I'm speaking in particular with respect to Parcels 5 and 6.

Abraham Lincoln, when he would come up here rode up Rock Creek Church Road, which, if I'm not mistaken, actually bore that name back in the 19th century, and he rode up right where you ride up today. I don't know if Park Place and Randolph Street were there but Rock Creek Church Road was there.

Destroying that parcel, which all of these alternatives except for number 1 do, is a shame but short of that I think the environmental impact is great and better alternatives could be proposed if there was a dialogue with the community which I respectfully submit there really has not been any such dialogue.

One of those possibilities discussed earlier is to maintain some kind of green space and I personally support that. I understand that parts of Parcel 6 still have an agricultural use and they've had that use dating back to the 19th century when the residents here were self-supporting food-wise and I would submit that that should be protected. Thank you all very much.

MR. COX: Vonnie Cruel and then next up Frances Clarke. Vonnie Cruel? Is Vonnie here? Okay, I'll circle and just come back. Frances Clarke?

Frances Clarke? I'll circle that one too. Andrew McGluray? Andrew? Thanks for coming.

MR. McGLURAY: Evening, everyone, and in particular good evening to the residents of this Soldiers Home who are here. As everyone else has said, we really value the service that you've given to our country and those of us who live in the neighborhoods adjacent to the property really feel that we have an awful lot in common in terms of our interest in seeing this property not just blindly developed with only an eye towards the short-term gain of some money that really doesn't solve the long-term problem that the AFRH is facing.

I just wanted to make a couple of points and I'll be actually submitting many more points in writing but it seems to me that one thing that has not been done is to consider the impact of the Lincoln Cottage as a coming tourist attraction, which apparently is what the National Trust has in mind for it, and not just in terms of looking at overall traffic and then averaging it out over a year but the fact that that traffic may be concentrated on a certain number of weekends a year, a certain number of times on Saturday mornings, or whatever that would significantly increase traffic volume. And then if you add into that the number of cars from new residents for condominiums or apartments that are also going to be feeding out on to Rock Creek Church Road or Park Place you could have a very bad situation for the existing neighborhoods nearby.

In addition I think the EIS really doesn't consider seriously enough the impact on what they call the historic character areas and Arlus was speaking about one of these earlier. And what's really bizarre to me, if you look at the map of the parcels proposed for development in the EIS and then you look at the map of what are considered the historic character areas, it's almost a perfect overlap.

It's like they've picked essentially the areas with the most historic significance as those to sell off and I realize there may be some reasons for some of that but it doesn't seem like something that's very wise and they really

ought to look at at least avoiding the areas that are considered to have historic character.

In addition there is a factor I don't think has really been considered which is something I think is called the heat island effect that in cities you have buildings and concrete that absorb the sun's rays and then basically hold heat and keep an area hotter than what otherwise would be. And, as Sandy was saying to me earlier today when we spoke, her plants bloom two weeks later up here than they did it when she lived in Dupont Circle because it's cooler up here in part because the Soldiers Home is here with all this green space and if you pour the amount of development that this plan talks about into that green space that is potentially a huge impact on the climate of this little part of Washington, DC, potentially a lot more heat and more intolerable summers. And I'll wrap it up very quickly but I think the EIS has to address that.

Finally let me just read you a quick quote from the comprehensive plan for the national capital area which supposedly guides this development process. And it says that, "The federal government has to manage property in a way that promotes the national capital region as a leader in environmental stewardship and preserves, protects, and enhances the quality of the region's natural resources, providing a setting that benefits the local community, provides a model for the country, and is worthy of the nation's capital," and I submit to you that the plans that we've seen do not do that.

Finally the community both inside and outside of the Soldiers Home gates has to have a substantive role in the planning process for any development. Thank you very much.

MR. COX: Tim Dennee, next up then, Angela Washington.

MR. DENNEE: Good evening. My name is Tim Dennee. I am an architectural historian with the DC Historic Preservation Office and our role is related to the Section 106 process. To summarize very briefly what Section 106

is all about, the Congress at some time in the past decided that it didn't make a lot of sense to have federal projects destroying or otherwise adversely affecting historic resources unnecessarily.

And so the National Historic Preservation Act now has a process by which federal projects, those carried out by federal agencies or with federal funding or federal permits, go through a review process. This process puts the responsibility of compliance on the federal agency and it makes the agency responsible for, first of all, seeing if historic properties are present and how they might be affected and then considering how those effects, if adverse, can be avoided, minimized, and/or mitigated. And it gives the federal agency a certain responsibility for self-criticism in review. Also, though, every state and Indian tribes and some of the territories have preservation offices. The District of Columbia is essentially a state for the purposes of Section 106.

So we review projects and we're reviewing this master plan which we received a couple of weeks ago. In addition, particularly on a project of this magnitude and this significance, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, which is the overarching federal agency responsible for Section 106, is already involved and will undoubtedly be involved in depth. This is really just the beginning of the public consultation process. This is the agency saying here's generally what we want to do.

In the master plan the agency has acknowledged that there'll be significant adverse effects by any of the alternatives but the no-build alternative. And what that means is that we will have a consultation which means essentially working meetings.

And I encourage the audience to request as you're making comments about the EIS or in lieu of or in addition to to request being a consulting party. Typically consulting parties are groups because they end up being working meetings. It's hard to get all your questions asked and answered in a forum like this.

But typically in DC the consulting party sessions and the consulting parties usually include ANCs and other neighborhood groups, historic preservation groups. Certainly in this case the residents both of the home and beyond the boundaries of the home and the National Trust will obviously be involved as will probably the National Park Service and any other groups that see themselves being affected.

That's essentially the procedure and we'll get that underway. I don't mean to hold you up but I got a couple other things. I think at first glance we certainly see the home's need and desire to gain more revenue and it does seem like there are avenues to place more development on this property.

I appreciate all the comments that were made earlier very eloquently about the significance of this property because it is really a significant campus with remarkably significant buildings, not to mention the adjoining neighborhoods, and I think that whatever happens here has to be seen in the context of placing new construction within an existing campus.

And what we would really not like to see is that campus becoming something other than a campus or being reduced to a much smaller campus with something else that's completely unrelated. And so at the outset I have to admit that we have some concerns about the bulk proposed.

And it seems like if you look at the alternatives you go from a no-build option up to 6 million to 8 million square feet, which is quite substantial, and it seems like there's a lot of daylight between the no-build option and 6 million square feet. And I say that simply by way of suggesting that there are probably other alternatives that should be considered within at least the Section 106 process to see if we really covered all our bases, and that's what Section 106 is really about.

So my final comment is that I think a further step, perhaps the next step, is to have the consultants for the home suggest how at build-out this might be masked essentially in two dimensions try to present three-dimensional

axonometric picture of the campus with the bulk of the buildings and how the parking facilities would lay out. And that would give everybody a pretty much better picture of what's actually being suggested. Thanks.

MR. COX: Angela Washington then next up is Alexey Volynets.

MS. WASHINGTON: Good evening. I'm Angela Washington and I'm a resident in the Park View area and, of course, I have a bias and interest in this development. I live on Park Place and I have a bird's-eye view of Zone 6 basically. And for many years, about 10 years, I have watched the soldiers garden every summer from spring to the fall in that garden and I love to watch that.

And I'm quite sure everybody along that street who drives down the street and lives on Princeton, Otis, whoever you are, you enjoy that also. I've also been given fruit, watermelons, what have you, from soldiers. I've also watched deer, wildlife, run through there. I've watched raccoons, you name it, run through that park. So there is wildlife there, not even minimal.

Also my problem is you have in your master plan you want to respect the character of the adjacent community. And I'm really concerned and I'm concerned with the whole plan but in Zone 6 from your map you have alternatives of do nothing, residential, and you want it compatible with the area. And I hear condos. That area from Park Place to, I guess, Georgia Avenue and beyond is basically single-family homes, maybe town houses. You're talking about putting eight-story, four-story condos. That doesn't fit in with the structure.

Also we have alternatives for institutional and embassies. That doesn't fit in with the structure. I can't imagine having an embassy across the street from me, at night parties, noise, large parking lots, lights. It's unconscionable. And I just want that put in the record. Zone 6, a park sounds great. If you have to develop develop something useful for the community. That's my view; I think that's your view also, not embassies, not institutions, not condos.

Because I want you to also know if you go to the top, because I've had tours from the residents here, where we are right now, and you look west what do you see? The best landscaped view in the world. You can see clear to the cathedral. That will be gone with embassies, condos, for you all, you residents. That beautiful view will be gone.

So please consider what you're doing to the community to the west. I can understand developing to the south and to the east. Nothing's on North Capitol. You're not facing residents. You're facing a commercial or medical on that side. Maybe that's fine if you have to build and raise revenue. But, please, Zone 6 reconsider.

Thank you.

MR. COX: Alexey? Next up then is Joseph Martin. Thank you, glad you're here.

MR. VOLYNETS: Hi, my name is Alexey and I'm a Petworth resident, and many speakers discussed ways in which this development can negatively affect the neighborhood. In other words basically this development will decrease the overall quality of life in the neighborhood and potentially even impact the property values and the rejuvenation of the neighborhood that recently has been developing pretty quickly.

So I believe that this plan has to have something that tries not only to mitigate the negative impact but to bring some active benefits to the community and a park would be one of those things and a park with a nice playground for kids and others. And I believe that this park actually would be beneficial for the home as well because in any city you can see that if there is a nice, good park, you can look at Rock Creek Park or Central Park in New York, it increases not only the quality of life but it will help you to increase the price that you will get for your new developments as well.

So at the end I believe that a park will be beneficial for the home and will be beneficial for the neighborhood. Thank you.

MR. COX: Joseph Martin?

MR. MARTIN: I'm going to pass.

MR. COX: Okay, thank you. Alfred Napfloat and then next up Thaia Grace. Alfred Napfloat? Did Vonnie Cruel come back? Frances Clarke? Thaia Grace. Suzanne Welch? Suzanne Welch? Jacqueline Arendse? After Jacqueline I have Bill Crandall.

Thanks for being here.

MS. ARENDSE: Well, I've been very impressed by all of the prepared remarks and all of the thoughtful comments that everybody's made. I don't have any prepared remarks or probably as thought out a response as a lot of people have had but I just would like to echo the neighbors in the Old Soldiers Home as well as the neighbors outside that we might be losing the forest for the trees here.

Everybody has been talking about the number of parking spaces and the amount of traffic and, I mean, they're not small when you get to that point but I'm not sure that we as a group have even considered the value of development at all except in terms of getting money for the Old Soldiers Home and I think that's fine but perhaps there is another way to think of that need for revenue and ways to fulfill that need for revenue and think about what we want to do with this wonderful resource before we even get to the number of parking spaces and the number of cars. I mean, that seems to be so far in the minutiae that this community hasn't even had input yet on whether we want that at all.

And I for the record would just like to echo the majority of neighbors in that we're not convinced yet that this is the best thing for the larger neighborhood as well as the immediate neighborhood of the old Soldiers Home. And we hope that this input period will help the developers to rethink the whole idea and to reconsider such large development and perhaps consider parks and more gentle ways of using the space and, to quote my punning husband, we want parks, not parking spaces. Thank you.

MR. COX: Bill Crandall? Next up then is Jeff Taggert.

MR. CRANDALL: Thank you. My name is Bill Crandall. I don't really have any prepared comments. Everyone else has articulated many things very well. But I did want to say that I think that in this case as in a lot of cases the argument is often framed as open space, meaning do nothing, versus big bad concrete development, which is often what we get, especially when the process is driven by money and by the interests of the people doing the building.

And I just think that the answer is to me obviously somewhere in the middle. It's unlikely that there will be no building and it would be a real shame if there was clumsy blunt instrument over-building and thoughtless building that only served the developers. So I think that the real key is the quality of any development that comes and the diversity of that development and how well integrated it is into the community, how well it serves the residents of the home and also the residents of the communities around the home, and how thoughtful in design it is, how nice it is to look at.

I mean, if it's a bunch of parking lots with big buildings no one's going to be very happy about that except the people who built it. So I think that one of the best ways to ensure a better outcome is to make sure that the community has their say, which they're having tonight, and I hope that they'll continue to have over time. And I think that'll just bring us to a better result and so I hope that continues and that's about all I wanted to say.

Thank you very much.

MR. COX: Jeff Taggert?

MR. TAGGERT: I'm going to pass and then make a written submission.

MR. COX: Thank you, Jeff. Drew Toldrin (?).

MS. STEPHANSON: He left but he's my roommate so can I speak in his place?

MR. COX: You take his place? Yes. You just can come up, and spell and state your name for me, please.

MS. STEPHANSON: My name is Sheri Stephanson.

MR. COX: Thank you, Sheri, for coming here.

MS. STEPHANSON: Hi, there. I wasn't planning on talking either but I've been pretty compelled by the comments that I've heard so far and decided I needed to have a little input. I actually haven't read the EIS yet but I will and I appreciate the thoughtful comments of everyone who's come up so far and raised so many important issues.

I want to highlight a couple of things that I'm not hearing. One thing is, I don't know if anyone read in the Sunday's editorial of the Washington Post they were talking about development, some activities that are happening in or near Seattle, Washington. I used to live out there.

There are lots of really innovative ways being proposed in Seattle and other places around the country to preserve land while simultaneously raising revenue in this case for maintaining the Soldiers Home. The things that haven't been brought up tonight are land trusts. There are things called conservation easements where they pay farmers to preserve open space and agricultural land.

I don't have an exhaustive list but the point is there are lots of really innovative mechanisms out there for preserving land and raising money at the same time and I would like to see that considered in this plan as an option. As other people have mentioned, the options go from nothing to lots of development and there really are lots of spaces in between where we can still see preserving some of the open space values of the land.

The other thing I haven't heard at all, only a couple of times has there been any mention of the impact to the low-income residents of the neighborhood. No one's really talking about that and I think it's something that we need to talk about and, like I say, I haven't read the plan so maybe this is in there. I don't know but anywhere in the proposed residential

development does it state that a certain portion of that has to go towards low-income housing?

I'm new to this area but I imagine that some of the older residents are feeling the increased value, the dramatic increase in value, of housing which is of a benefit but also we all know it tends to push people out. So I think that's something that if housing does end up in the final plan there needs to be some consideration for providing low-income housing for residents. I'll leave it there. Thanks.

MR. COX: Avis Anderson? Avis Anderson? Dean Kern? Dean Kern then next in line. Thank you for coming tonight.

MS. ANDERSON: Good evening. My name is Avis Anderson. I actually hadn't intended to speak tonight but I feel the need to speak as a native Washingtonian and a member of this neighborhood from all of my life. I recognize that there is a funding shortage. Much of what I have to say will mirror comments that have been made before but I feel they need to be emphasized again.

The funding shortage, I certainly agree with the gentleman that spoke earlier that said that this administration needs to simply add a line item that addresses the funding shortage. If we can send our family and friends off to war we can certainly fund a place for them to retire.

I mean, there are creative means of funding these shortages. They can utilize the current funds for our soldiers that are in the armed forces now. And I don't know why I'm speaking to this because I'm actually a real estate agent and so it's speaking against me but I'm more concerned about the people at large.

I'm concerned about the impact that it will have on the real estate here and the people here. The heat, I can't stand the heat and you're talking about an abundance of redevelopment here on this site. That doesn't include the

site that's planned at Kennedy Street or the one planned at Lamont Street where the old Linens of the Week was. That's more condominiums.

It's only 64 miles radius, the District of Columbia. What are we going to do with all these people? The traffic, the congestion, it just makes absolutely no sense to me. What it does not address in any of the plans is the positive interaction between young people and the retired veterans that are already on this campus or that will come to this campus. If they're going to put something on this campus that includes young people bring the young people together with the elderly so that we can benefit from what the elderly have to give to the young people. That's why this country is on its way down.

MR. COX: Dean Kern then Joyce Covington. Dean, thanks for coming tonight.

MR. KERN: Thank you.

MR. COX: Welcome.

MR. KERN: My name is Dean Kern. I'm a resident of Luray Place over by the number five development. I've only been here for a year. I grew up outside of DC but moved in last year. And I'm not afraid of progress. I want to see this area developed. I would love to see much of what has been discussed here and I have a lot of trust and faith in the process and that a lot of the details will get worked out.

And I doubt I'll be involved in that but I figured at least one person ought to come up here and say that this development ought to happen. I think it would improve a lot in this neighborhood in regard to the resources available to police the neighborhoods. Well, I don't know but there are a couple of things I would like to see, and number one is when I first moved here I'd jog around this property and was able to do so because one of the lanes of North Capitol was blocked off for construction.

But I thought it was such a pity that the place is barb wired off and fenced in and I remember seeing some of the soldiers and thinking to myself I

would love to just run over there and say hi to them and being fenced off from being able to do that.

I'd like to see a place to walk a dog because I have one and I love her and I love walking my dog. I'd love to see a park. I'd love to see a place for kids to play and if it's an improvement to go from the streets to a parking lot so be it. I'd love to have a place to have a beer, to buy some sundries, and I think that it's fun to live in this city. I would love to have a place to walk to rather than have to drive wherever I'm going in order to buy some things. So bring it on. Build it.

MR. COX: Joyce Clovington? George Bailey and on deck is Sherilyn Adams after George. George, thank you for coming tonight, pleasure to meet you.

MR. BAILEY: And nice to meet you. Hello, my name is George Bailey and I came to Washington because I enjoy the great community here and it can be a greater community. I hope that this potential development will make it a greater community and not a lesser community. I'm plain spoken here so I don't have prepared remarks but there are some things that I think should be questioned or we need answers on some possible problems with the environmental impact statement or potential developments here.

First as a general principle I believe this is public land, all public land, we're discussing here and that public land should be used for public purposes. I agree there is now presently a problem with the financial endowment for our great veterans who have retired here and I give you compliments and thanks for your services.

There are also many in my family who are veterans and will be retiring soon or are in that age. There actually should be a plan that includes more facilities for retiring veterans here and increasing services for veterans.

I would hope that that would be some option that they look into that is possible to be financed and to be responsibly financed while also being a good stewardship for the land here in DC. We're all important citizens here

that have a right and responsibility to speak up for a good stewardship of the land in our neighborhoods. I am also a neighbor in this area.

I have a vision that there could be smart growth in this area which includes green buildings. If you have to take away green space, and there's a question whether that's really necessary, but if it is necessary do build green buildings, buildings that are environmentally responsible, both environmentally and ecologically and energy- efficient buildings. What better compliment could you give to our retired veterans that we are now responsible for having a clean environment and energy independence right here in DC as much as possible.

Another thing I would have to say is there has to be caution with the vision. Be very cautioned that there are not sweetheart deals in such types of potential developments. There have been things that have an appearance of bad stewardship, bad in that there are deals that could be construed to be not in the public interest but in private interests. I'm very much for public and private cooperation. Yes, we need to use both public goods and private initiative to meet our great needs.

One thing that also is very obvious with the plans is that if you all look at your maps they have parcels, one, two, three, four, five and six. All the alternatives seem to be you do all of them or none of them. An alternative could be you can do one or two or three or four or five or six but not all of them, just sufficient to meet the needs for the future, to have a strong stewardship for our veterans' homes here. So I hope that can be looked into better. Thank you very much.

MR. COX: Thank you, George. Sherilyn Adams? Next on deck then is Lewis Maiden. Sherilyn, thanks for coming.

MS. ADAMS: Thanks. I live right next to the cemetery and I've been living there for about 10 years. I learned about this meeting through a community e-newsletter and this meeting right now is my second source of information about this so I have not read the report. I didn't know that there

was a report. In fact my questions primarily surround the question about how open is the process.

In the e-mail that was sent around it talked about conversations were being had with unnamed developers. My question is who are these developers? How come they're not named? Have they already been promised some stake in the development? How will the final alternative be determined? What are the criteria to select the plan? What are the criteria to select the developers?

Have the developers had any kind of success doing this kind of development in the past? Is it the reason that we're having all six of these plots developed because these developers have come together and they say this is the way to do it and if we don't do all of it we're not going to do any of it?

How will this affect the property values of the existing properties around the area that's to be developed? How will this impact the taxes that the homeowners pay? Will the campus be a gated community? Will you all be creating a gated community within a community which would definitely have a negative impact on the surrounding community?

Once whatever is created is created will people have easy access to get into the retail facilities or will it be just for those that are living inside the gated area? And what is being built into the plan to benefit the residents of the wider community? Like people have talked a lot about parks and recreation. I live right next to graveyard. I walk around the campus a lot to exercise.

It's beautiful, it's green, and I have to be honest. I've never been on the campus. And when I drove in today I was amazed at how beautiful this place is. I said no wonder developers want to get their hands on this thing. I understand. What I'd really like to see is more members of the community having an opportunity to see what it's like and get on it.

And I think my problem, the reason I never came on it before, is because I do drive up and down North Capitol all the time and I see the barbed

wire so it doesn't look like as an inviting place for me but maybe it could be. So I really hope that this isn't a done deal and this meeting is just a formality, step one, two, three, four, five, six, okay, this is the step where the community gets to hear what's going on. We did that, check. Next? I hope that's not what the case is. So that's my two cents. Thank you.

MR. COX: Lewis Maiden? Next up then is John Zoltner. Thanks for coming. We appreciate it.

MR. MAIDEN: I was born in Washington, DC, and my grandparents and great-grandparents all played around here. We should think about this place like this. Washington, DC, is America's jewel box. This is one of the jewels. Think about the children that are going to be coming home real soon with no legs and no arms that should see this place the way it is. Forget our view but think of what it is. Give those children something when they come home like the soldiers that we honor that have it now.

Make it better. Maybe there should be a cemetery on the other side but it stinks. I haven't read the plan, don't want to see the plan. I think the plan look good in the trash. Protect America's jewel box, Washington, DC, and the gems that are in it. This right here is one of them. And put your greed in your pocket and go on home. God bless you and thank you all for coming out.

MR. COX: John Zoltner? After John Cathy Boylin. John, thank you for coming. Appreciate it.

MR. ZOLTNER: Hi, I'm John Zoltner. I'm a 20-year resident of the District. I'm new to Petworth but started working with youth on juvenile probation in Petworth out of St. Gabriel's Church in 1987 and a lot of people have talked about the financial resources and maybe there are other ways to get those resources for AFRH.

I just want to call attention to the fact that I haven't seen anywhere any kind of analysis of what amount of money is needed to restore that trust fund to a level that would be sufficient to maintain a well- functioning

soldiers home and I think that's important because in the absence of any kind of amount or a goal then what we switch to is just trying to get as much money as possible and, looking at what we can tell of the master plan from the environmental impact statement, this is clearly a plan to get as much money as possible.

And I'm sure a lot of interests and a lot of people will make money off the implementation of that plan but I think a lot of people have said clearly today that we value the Soldiers Home, we value the soldiers, and this is a resource that is unlike just about anything else that's in the District and pretty soon it can be gone if the community doesn't get a chance to give our input into what can happen.

And one thing that's curiously missing, I think, in everything I've read is there's very little in this plan about the quality of life for the soldiers and airmen and there's very little that talks what that's going to be like besides taking parcels here and there and obviously they're going to be living in a much smaller space and I'd like to see some detailed planning, not seeing what I can judge from looking at the environmental impact statement but I'd like to see the direct master plan and hear a lot more detail from AFRH about what they plan to do.

And, again, I would second that I hope that this isn't just a checkmark being checked because a lot of people in the community and in the home itself have a

strong interest in this project and it's really going to affect our lives.
Thanks.

MR. COX: Cathy Boylin? After Cathy, David Janerone (?). Again, welcome. Thank you again for your time, appreciate it.

MS. BOYLIN: Hi, I'm Cathy Boylin. I live at 503 Rock Creek Church Road Northwest so I'm diagonally across the street from the beautiful garden that the soldiers here tend. We are the Catholic Worker. Ironically the Catholic Worker are pacifists and really in the long vision of pacifists our work is to make sure that there are never again any more old soldiers. We love the people but we're trying to abolish war. We think war is the crime, not the people who fought it or are being victimized in it or whatever.

One of the things that we do every Thursday is make a meal for about 100 people and we take it down to the parks right by Lafayette Park, by the church that President Bush attends, and lots of the people who line up every Thursday for food from us are homeless veterans. Then we go around the corner and we are at McPherson Square where about 70 people line up for food there and most of them are homeless veterans.

I would like you to remember that there are at least 10,000 seriously wounded young men and women from this current slaughter and they're talking about closing Walter Reed Hospital. I wonder if that is because they have development on their minds at the expense of the old soldiers and the young soldiers who are the victims of people's violence, mistakes, and I call it other things but anyway I'd like us to consider, and I don't know if there could be changes, how to make money for the old soldiers.

I agree with the people who say the federal government should have a budget allotment. If they can give Halliburton unbidded loans to build prisons in Guantanamo Bay they certainly can find the money to pay to keep this home open and to take in some of the veterans who are living in the parks or in the shelters that are closing down and then use their check. Whatever the check is that they get, that could be the rent to live here at the building and then they could have a stipend. I don't know but I'm sure there's a lot of things they could do.

We could fund the Old Soldiers Home by stopping the war. How many billions of dollars have we used? Bring the soldiers home, stop killing any more soldiers or anybody else, and I wonder if there's a lawyer here who could help us start a class action suit against the United States to save this property, to save the trees, to save the ducks and the deer and everybody else and the people who live here.

Also I want to tell you, I mean, if you're talking about increasing traffic I've only lived here since '93. I've had cars in our yard. Do you know the yard? We have a little garden. We're a shelter for the homeless, 503 Rock, you're always welcome. Come in and see us. Come in and see us but we've had cars in our yard because the traffic pattern on 5th running that way, I guess it's south, is so dangerous so they've landed right in, almost killed people.

And then they've run into the Old Soldiers Home wall lots of times on the corner of Rock Creek and 5th. So please don't do this. Please serve the needs of the victims, the soldiers who are being killed or injured today, and stop this and don't give the money to the developers and to Mr. Bush. Thank you. Bye-bye.

MR. COX: David Janerone? Latasha Jackson? Latasha Jackson? She's left? Janice Williams? Hi, Janice. Thanks for coming tonight. Get a little closer to the mic.

MS. WILLIAMS: I'd just like to say good evening to everyone. I'm Janice Williams. I'm the former ANC commissioner for 4C10, which includes the west side of Rock Creek Church Road. I want to thank the groups who are represented here tonight, community groups who have worked hard over the last few weeks to try to pull this together. I'd like to commend you. You did a good job in getting everyone out in numbers and that's very important.

I also thank the people who came before me, Mr. Harris and many of the other residents, who understand the aesthetics and the history of this

community. We don't have any green spaces. This is about it right here, as most of you know, even those who have come in lately.

But I really want to stand tonight to speak for our residents who have been here 50-plus years, some of which are probably in this home as residents or they know people who have come in as soldiers, thank the soldiers for their dedication and service but those people who've been here 30 to 50 years would love to see at least some of this facility preserved for the community.

That's very important to them. So they're not used to coming forth and speaking. I'm their spokesperson tonight and I'll make sure that they get written comments in this process. Thank you.

MR. COX: That's the end of my list. Is there anyone in the audience who would like to speak who didn't get the opportunity? Yes, sir, come on down.

MR. HANLY: I'm John --

MR. COX: Hanly?

MR. HANLY: Hanly, yeah.

MR. COX: Thank you.

MR. HANLY: Hi, John Hanly. One observation, it's interesting that right now they're talking about developing a facility here when it seems that in a lot of the other parks like Bull Run and some of the other outlying parks even around DC they're talking about taking out some of the developments that have gone in like the strip malls and stuff. So it's really interesting that

they're talking about developing something here right now when that seems to be the prevalent thought is to actually take development out.

The other question I would like to see more talk about was something that was mentioned by somebody else here which was the budget. Now, there has been no mention of, number one, the amount of money that is required to keep the

trust fund solvent and also there's been no mention of the expected income from all of this development. And also there has been no mention of the amount of money it costs to upkeep all the land here which I assume must be an appreciable proportion of the budget for the AFRH facility.

And if it is made into some sort of park and you get the Park Service or whatever to take it over how does that affect the budget of the actual facility here? There has been no in-depth look at like, why has the endowment been cut in half, I believe, from a couple of years ago. There has been no mention of like, where is the cost overruns, where have they looked at cutting costs, and et cetera.

So I'd like to see some discussion of those issues because those are the base issues that are why we're here in the first place because of the budget for the facility. So I'd like to see some more discussions as to where the thought process came that you would go, as a lot of people have said, from 0 to 50 percent, it looks like here, of the facility to be developed. So I'd like to see a little more discussion on the base budgeting and some of the assumptions that were made on where to get the money from, okay? Thank you.

MR. COX: Thank you. Good evening. Who are you?

MS. LUGO: I'm Janet Lugo.

MR. COX: Janet, first you need to just spell your last name before you start off.

MS. LUGO: Hi, my name is Janet Lugo and I live at 424 Newton Place. I'm a neighbor of David Douglas so I have about 100 feet in front of me on I think that's Zone 6. I haven't had a chance to look at the plan but I have a few things to say and I really would have to reiterate what everyone has said so thoughtfully.

I'm a native Washingtonian and I've had my house at Newton Place for about 13 years and we have another house on Kenyon. And my father is a World War II veteran. He is 88 years old. And as a child I used to come up here way

before we had our house and we would visit the soldiers. So I have a very emotional tie to the Soldiers Home and we would walk the grounds.

And I have two children and I actually work in Columbia Heights so I work with the CDC there, development cooperation at Columbia Heights, so I understand that there is a need for economic development and there's definitely a need for development in helping the Soldiers Home.

So I would really like to see that we find a way to address their needs. I think it's our civic responsibility to help the soldiers and I think it's also really important that we try to address the green space. I have children. I would like them to continue enjoying that space. I enjoy it when I come out of my home. I like smelling the fresh air when I walk out. I like walking out in the evenings and hearing the birds. I like seeing the geese.

I also think that development is important as long as it doesn't adversely impact a lot of communities, particularly the minority communities, and I'm concerned that I didn't see anyone even address the non- English speaking community. What outreach has there been done? Will there be some outreach for the Hispanic community, a lot of Ethiopians, and other communities that weren't addressed? And I'm all for working with the Soldiers Home and any other group that we have to come to some kind of fusion. So that's about it.

MR. COX: Thank you, Janet.

Would anyone else like to come up and make a statement, a comment? All right, first I just want to thank you all. As the chief operating officer my commitment to the residents but also to all of you as neighbors of us is starting the dialogue which we did tonight. It was very healthy. I really appreciate everyone's interest, support, to do what's best. We can. As Eleanor Roosevelt said, we always have to compromise but it's compromising upward and it's for the better of all of us here.

Equally important to that is the continued dialogue for your input from our residents to the community right outside of our gate to the community

of greater Washington, DC, So I really appreciate your participation and your continued involvement with us.

Comments are due by the 6th of July on the NEPA. Comments on the historical preservation go throughout the process. We have forms for you to fill out. We have a website, afrhdevelopment.com, that has the EIS on it. It has contact information on it. For those of you who are interested in our budget and what I've been doing here the last two and a half years you can go to our website, afrh.gov, and you'll see there it's called PAR, Performance Accountability Report, and that will get into our budget system, what we did, why we needed to. It talks about the Defense Authorization Act that hired such a person like me to come here.

So that will give you some of our history. We're committed to be here for the next generation of heroes. And with you we'll find an amenable way to be able to do that. Thank you again for your time and your energy tonight. I really appreciate it. Have a good evening.

(Whereupon, at 9:24 p.m., the PROCEEDINGS were adjourned.)

* * * * *