

Planning Committee Meeting No. 1  
October 5, 2005  
4:30-7 P.M.

INTRODUCTION:

The meeting began at approximately 4:30 p.m. in the 2nd Floor Conference Room of the Sherman Building at the Armed Forces Retirement Home and was recorded to make a transcript of the proceedings.

Presentations and discussion on the recording were approximately 1:08 minutes and, due to a taping error, pick up midway through presentation of Powerpoint slides at the beginning of the meeting. The balance of the meeting was taken up manipulating model buildings on a model landscape of the site.

Attendance:

Tim Cox, AFRH  
Nancy Czapek, GSA  
Pam Wessling, RSM McGladrey  
Giles Morris, Koetter Kim & Associates  
Emily Eig, EHT Traceries  
Carrie Albee, EHT Traceries  
Ben Lamb, AFRH Resident  
Desa Sealy Ruffin, Gotham Enterprises  
Paul Brooks, Catholic University, counsel to president  
Merrick Malone, Metropolis Development Co.  
Giles Morris, Koetter Kim & Associates  
Gene Keller, Natonal Capital Planning Commission  
Maybelle Taylor Bennett, Howard University Community Association  
Mimi Rivkin, Resident Advisory Council Chairman from the AFRH  
Bill Jentarra, Resident Advisory Council, AFRH  
Al Mori, Ombudsman, AFRH Resident  
Read Scott Martin, Gotham-WIT  
Commander Tim Burns, AFRH  
John Thompson, RSM McGladrey  
Timothy Jones, ANC4c08  
Tony Norman, Pleasant Plains Civic Association  
Lenwood Johnson, ANC1A  
Rosalyynn Taylor, DC Office of Planning

Before the transcript begins, Tim Cox welcomed the group to the Home, then introduced the consulting team and Home officials at work on the project.

TRANSCRIPT:

[Note: Certain areas of the recording had low volume, and comments/words could not be heard or heard clearly.]

Tim Cox: -- That we need to do for our fiscal responsibility at the Armed Forces Retirement Home as well as what we want to do to make sure that we remain a community partner. We want to go through a series of community planning sessions. And we wanted a core group of persons who were able to meet, discuss, talk about the presentation, talk about information within the presentation, talk really about why we need to look at master planning here, how we're looking at master planning and be able to be really the advocates of our process, not necessarily what we're doing within that process but why we're doing it. And, you know, through our series of slides today we'll give you background justification, things like that too. I just wanted to thank you for participating. And at the end of the day, it's hard to come yet to another meeting, but this is really vital for us.

We're an independent agency of the federal government. I report to Secretary Rumsfeld. And we really are showing the government how you can change one agency at a time to be self-fulfilling, self-reliant, except for national disaster since we are self-insured we don't look for federal money to help us. And we'll go through that today on the slides.

But personally I live in Old Town Alexandria. I have been in retirement housing for 20 years. I started in 1985, and all but two years of my professional career were in that. Mainly it has been in the for-profit and non-profit side before coming to government. But I was recruited to this position and the home, which we have this home and we have a home in Gulf Port, a home in Gulf Port that was just decimated by Katrina. But fortunately with the staff that we have there and some of the agency staff I had there, we were able to get all the residents safely out of there. And we have close to 400 of them here now, and it's really been a great success story to the residents here.

So with that, I'll turn it over to Nancy.

Nancy Czapek: Well, I think what we're going to do now is an introduction, so let me introduce myself first. My name is Nancy Czapek, and I'm with the General Services Administration. We're here to help Tim and the residents and keep this place as great as

it can be. So Tim can focus on his resident care. I'm helping with the real estate strategy. And I pulled together a team of consultants through Pam Wessling at what is now RSM. She's had a couple of company changes there. And I guess I should let her maybe introduce her team.

Pam Wessling: We have a team of consultants who can handle all aspects of advising on the real estate strategy, many of whom are here tonight. We have the best master planners, Koetter Kim and Associates, Giles Moore with us. And they've been doing a lot of master plan variations and studies of the site to get a sense of what this site could reasonably accommodate and still be respectful of this character and the character of the adjacent neighborhoods.

We also have EHT Traceries. We have Emily Eig and Carrie Albee over here, who are really terrific experts in historical preservation. And they've done an inventory of the site down to I think every cannon ball and every brick. So that's been a great basis as well coming up with a master plan. And they're helping to advise on the historic aspects of the guidelines.

We have Gotham Enterprises and Desa Sealy Ruffin is leading that group. And they're helping with the community outreach process and with consolidating work with this planning committee and have done a wonderful job of getting the word out far and wide in the community. And we'll be having a number of community meetings established by Desa and her people, but as well they're making sure that we've touched base with all the appropriate agencies and associations in the coming months. And we have other consultants, environment consultants and the like that have been advising on the environmental impact process.

We've completed a draft, environmental impact statement that's available on the web. We'll be addressing comments from Steve on that and ultimately concluding with a final environment statement later in the project.

Pam Wessling: Shall we go around the table and introduce ourselves so everyone knows?

Paul Brooks: I'm Paul Brooks, I serve as counselor to the President at Catholic University.

Male Voice: My name is Merrick Malone, I'm a principal on the development firm of

Metropolis Development Company.

Giles Moore: I'm Giles Moore from Koetter Kim and Associates. We're architects and designers.

Emily Eig: I'm Emily Eig, EHT Traceries from D.C. We're preservation consultants.

Carrie Albee: I'm Carrie Albee with EHT Traceries.

Ben Loud: I'm Ben Loud from the Armed Forces Home.

Gene Keller: I'm Gene Keller with the National Capital Planning Commission and I'm serving as the project review officer for this project. Our commission has oversight pursuant to the National Capital Planning Act on federal facilities in the District of Columbia, and as Tim has alluded, the Home is a federal facility. And we also assist in the development of the master plans to meet the purposes of that planning act compliance.

Maybelle Taylor Bennett: I'm Maybelle Taylor Bennett, Howard University and a close institutional neighbor.

Female Voice: I'm Mimi Rivkin, advisory council chairman in the Armed Forces Home.

Male Voice: Bill Jentarra and also resident of the Home on the resident advisory council.

Tim Burns: Good afternoon, I'm Commander Tim Burns, the Deputy Director here at the home.

Al Mori: I'm Al Mori, the (unintelligible) here at the home.

John Thompson: I'm John Thompson. and I'm with RSM McGladrey as well, working on sort of coordinating efforts.

Read Scott Martin: Read Scott Martin, and I work on the Gotham team.

Female Voice: -- with Catholic University.

Pam Wessling: We have two new members so you're jumping in but could we ask you just to introduce yourselves.

Timothy Jones: Yes, my name is Timothy Jones. I'm the ANC commissioner in district 4CO8.

Tony Norman: Tony Norman with the Pleasant Plain Civic Association.

Tim Cox: Great. I'll go through a little bit about who we are, what we are, why we're here. And first of all, you can see the site, we're established in 1851. There's just a vacation [sounds like] in your packet, so I won't go through all of the details of how we're set up.

Our mission is to provide retirement housing so we have independent living, assistant living and long term here for our nation's heroes, for either retirees or people who have served in active duty, combat theater or they may be disabled as a result of their service or the fourth category is women who served prior to 1948, and women can also be here because of the other categories too. Those are the categories of people we serve here.

We also have the existing buildings here of over 100 structures, and it's important to note that we have been a retirement home for all this time, so that is one continuing use that we've had here on the site, even though the site has changed throughout our history, larger or smaller, uses of buildings. We have been a retirement home since our inception.

It's important to understand our funding source. We are a federal agency, but as other agencies, such as Social Security we have a trust fund that we operate from. Our trust fund was established back in the early 1850s by General Winfield Scott by bringing booty back rather than burning Mexico City. And that money we still live off of today. He brought back the equivalent of \$150,000, and now that trust fund has grown to about \$118 to 121 million.

Back in the 90s we had some expansions that went on, and we also from an operations' perspective spent interest and principal for about a dozen years. So what happened is our trust fund was, at a high in 1995 of about 156 million, and when I was hired in '02 came, down to 93 million. Legislation actually created the position I hold. So I was hired by the Secretary through national search. And our job is to make the trust fund viable so we can be here for the next generation of heroes to give quality retirement housing and health care related services to our residents within our means.

So you see our funding comes from active duty enlisted personnel. It's a 50 cent charge that each active duty military pays into our trust fund. Fines and forfeitures, which is the largest, if somebody comes back late from leave they get fined. That fine comes into our trust fund. And that's about 45 percent of our trust fund fees at this point in time. That's gone up from 37 percent when we went to war with Iraq and Afghanistan.

Resident fees, our residents pay on a sliding scale, and it's 35 percent of their income up to a maximum of a little over a \$1,000. It goes up with the cost of living here. And residents get three meals a day, activities, health care clinics, and if they need to move to assisted living or long term care those go up to 45 percent and 65 percent and they have caps as well of \$1,500 and \$2,500.

So we really are such a bargain, because we're able to run fiscally responsible, you know if people had to live outside our gate and for instance pay for long term care the average price now is \$6,000 a month for nursing home pay outside of our gate. So you know, we really feel that we have a duty as our residents knew, that they had a duty to protect our freedom and the world's freedoms. We have a duty to make sure that we give them the best quality service by spending the dollars most wisely.

We get a small amount of our funds from interest on that trust fund. We're only allowed by law to invest in government securities. So with the economy doing so well over the last couple of years government securities have had a low interest rate.

So I'm trying to go back, not trying, I have gone back to Congress to ask them to look at other investment vehicles for us.

Nancy Czapek: So what we're looking to do is use the real estate based on the legislation that Tim's talked about to develop another revenue stream that can assure that this place stays here and is healthy and viable. And in doing so, though we want it to be able to fit within the right context of the community, of the historical structures here, and that's why we've convened this meeting. It's to help with the master plan.

And I'm going to turn it over to Pam and she'll go over some of what we're hoping the objectives of the master plan will be.

Tim Cox: Just one more comment about funding. A lot of people at a community meeting that we had in the past talk about well, why aren't you just a line item in the federal budget. Because we have a trust fund and we have this property, we have the property in Gulfport, we want to be able to have that specific income stream so we don't have to go and keep on asking for appropriations. We have the biggest deficit in the history of all of our lives here as a nation, and we don't want to add to that deficit.

So when Congress passed the law in '02, it gave the Secretary the right to lease and/or sell property in order to support our operations. So rather than saying well, gee,

you don't have that authority, which many agencies don't have that authority you need to come back to us to get funding, Congress expects us to look at how we can take care of ourselves. The swing-like I told you when I came 37 percent of our revenue was coming from fines is now up to 45. Look at the history of the home, sometimes that has been as low as 22 percent. So when we're as low as 22 percent then we dig into interest and in fact maybe some principal.

We want to make sure that that never happens again. So you know we needed to develop a plan that fit with our intent of being able to take care of ourselves figuratively and literally and financially but also how we could fit it in our neighborhood, and how that makes sense to be able to utilize some of our property to be able to gain an income that we can count on year after year.

Pam Wessling: We're doing a master plan for the entire 272 acres. But there is only about 100 of those acres that might be developed by developers, and certainly not all at once. And we'll go through the areas that we're talking and each will have its distinctive character and a historical character or a character relating to the adjacent properties outside of the gates. But as well, Armed Forces may build some additional itself and guidelines would pertain to that.

The master plan formally gets submitted to NCPC and your input will help us to formulate a plan with guidelines and those guidelines, subject to NCPC's approval, would be then the direction that goes both to the home for future facilities and to developers as the home decides to go forward with a competitive process for different parts. And they are contemplating that for several zones going out seeking qualifications next week and going later in January short listing, those qualified developers, and issue very specific guidance about what they could build here to only that qualified group of developers. So your input here will be very helpful to have thoughtful guidance both sent to NCPC but to give to potential future developers.

So Tim is extremely grateful that you are spending your time and it's probably not what you want to do at the end of the day, but this is valuable for us and for the home and for other regulators who will be involved in this.

Nancy Czapek: And for making this truly work for the community.

Pam Wessling: The bullets up here talk about the objectives that Tim and others here

have for this development. So as Tim's pointed out that needs to maximize development for revenue generating purposes, but they also want to preserve historic character and retain significant existing open space. And you'll see that we're intending to do that.

They want development uses to be complementary to the purposes of the home. So we aren't expecting any major retail malls here. You're not going to see big industrial uses. We're like development to be at best a nine, and above that to have uses that residents here would enjoy, so small retail that they might want to go to, maybe opportunities for employment, medical uses that they could use and things like that.

Nancy Czapek: We want to ensure that the facilities that they build are conveniently located so you'll see that we're going to try to concentrate any future AFRH development close to the northern portion, which is where we are right now and where most their facilities are. You'll see one is considered down the hill, and we'll talk some about that.

Pam Wessling: We want to provide for the security of the residents. This is a secure campus which has a lot of benefits for the people living here. And so you'll see that some of our guidance will deal with, but if that slide may need to move to accommodate something that's more public, we want to make sure that both that fence is sensibly developed, that the residents are able to come and go without too much difficulty but that people can't easily get in.

Nancy Czapek: There are a number of buildings on the site that are eligible for listing on the National Registry of Historic Places and we'll be getting into that, into the extent possible that the home would like to be able to have adaptive use of those buildings.

Pam Wessling: You can tell it's a beautiful landscape, either you've seen it from the outside or toured it inside. And so the intention is to have buildings that complement the landscape and don't overtake it.

To build on this site to the extent that we describe here will take a very long time, probably at least 20 years. So the change won't come all at once. And it's likely that things will change over time, either what uses are feasible in the marketplace, what goes on around you will change, and so there needs to be some flexibility in the plan and its guidelines to accommodate those sorts of future changes. Even within the first round of developer competitions, developers may come in with ideas that seem like, sound reasonable once that we may not have contemplated. It's hard to imagine what that

would be. But we want to have the flexibility to sort of put out here are the things that are hard and fast rules and here's where there's flexibility.

So it's a long list, but we're hoping that you'll embrace these objectives as well and will keep them in mind as we move forward. Thank you.

Nancy Czapek: I think that you all know where we're located. But one of the really striking things about it when you look at the map is just how big this is. It's almost half what it used to be. It was over 500 acres at one point in time. But what's around it is incredibly diverse.

So looking to the west Rock Creek Church Road and Park Place, a densely settled strong neighborhood, row houses. On the Irving Street side very different kind of development with medical centers, VA, Washington Hospital Center, Children's Hospital. And then the North Capitol Street to the northeast which wasn't there when the home was first here, and in fact the home used to go across North Capitol Street and there's no property that's any longer in the inventory of the home, and then to the north a cemetery. So very different types of uses and types of design and types of considerations that we'll need to keep in mind as we're developing the guidelines.

Carrie Albee: I probably don't have to tell you all that this site has a lot of historical significance. And during the process of looking at this property and helping with the master planning efforts, EHT Tracery actually came out here, looked at the site in depth from a historical perspective. As you know the military asylum, was called the "Military Asylum" when it was established in 1851, and it was one of three established at that time. It's the only one still in operation, and as Tim has mentioned, it has been in continuous operation since that time.

The property is eligible for the national register in its entirety under three criteria, and they are listed here. And most of you are probably familiar with the national register criteria. Criteria A is eligible for military history. For Criteria B is eligible for political history.

I'm sure many of you also know about the traditional association in the 19th Century between the Armed Forces Retirement Home and the Presidents of the United States who would come out here to sort of escape from the city and collect their thoughts, Most famously Lincoln was here during the Civil War and actually drafted the Emancipation

Proclamation. He stayed in what is now known as Lincoln Cottage, which was formally known as Anderson Cottage, and before that was known as Corn Riggs, and it was actually a residence that was present on this site before the establishment of the military asylum. And it's also eligible under criterion C, for architecture and landscape architecture.

Throughout the period of significance at this site through World War Two, numerous significant buildings have been constructed by nationally and locally famous architects. And we'll see some of these building when we go out on site and hear who these architects are.

Also the landscape, when the Armed Forces Retirement Home began to expand really in the 1860s and 70s ultimately it was over 500 acres of land. And at that time they began to look at how to organize the landscape and how to plan the landscape. And in the 1870s here on the site was developed a picturesque landscape, you know very romantic with trees and views and forests and open lawns. And we'll see that as we proceed throughout the site.

As many of you may know the national registry requires a period of significance for historic districts. And due to the history of the site we established the period of significance to be 1851, the establishment of the home to 1944. Now, 1944, that date is associated with master planning efforts, which actually took place before 50 years ago and resulted in some significant changes to the grounds and to the buildings on site that were in a different direction to what they had been for the first century, the history of the home. So the closing date for the period of significance is 1944.

The Armed Forces Retirement Home is actually designated on several historic lists. The earliest was in 1964 it was established as a D.C. historic landmark. Now the D.C. Historic Landmark is only a portion of the site, and it's the oldest portion of the site, including this part of the Sherman Building that we're in, as well as the Lincoln Cottage and the two oldest officers' quarters which we will see.

And 1964 was the first year in which D.C. landmarks were designated locally. So this is obviously, you know, was recognized as a very significant site as early as 1964. It was also designated a natural historic landmark in 1973. The national historic landmark boundaries are more or less the same as the D.C. historic landmark boundaries.

In 1974 a portion of the property, the same portion, the oldest portion was placed on the national registry of historic places. And I think that we've already discussed the eligibility of the entire site for the national register which is an expansion of what's actually been listed in 1974. The property was determined eligible by the State Historic Preservation Office in 1988. So the entire site is not actually listed on the national register, but is recognized as eligible and it is treated as such.

And in the year 2000 the Lincoln Cottage was established, designated a national monument Clinton. And I know that that was very exciting for everyone here at the Armed Forces Retirement Home. And the national monument boundaries include the Lincoln Cottage, of course, and the water tower and some significant landscape elements in that area.

Nancy Czapek: It should be noted that the national monument, specifically the Lincoln Cottage is being run by the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and they're planning to make that one of their house tours. They are renovating it and will be opening it to the public.

Carrie Albee: I mentioned before that when this process started, EHT Traceries came out to the site and tried to get a fuller understanding of the history of the site and how that related to the physical components of the site. And in doing that we developed what we called historic character areas. And because it's such a large site, depending upon where you go on the site the landscape and the buildings may relate to one another in a different way, they may display different characteristics as opposed to say a smaller landmark or a smaller area which may have one primary characteristic. So we established what we thought were appropriate eight historic character areas, which we'll talk a little bit more about as we go throughout the site.

Here you can see, actually -- this area here is central grounds and it includes the oldest buildings on the site associated with the Armed Forces Retirement Home. We are right there. And we'll see, we'll sort of get a sense of central grounds but it's really the historic heart of the Armed Forces Retirement Home, and in many cases also the functional part of the home.

This area here we are calling the Formal Meadow. It's been an open space, an open meadow space since at least the 1870s here on the site. And prior to that it was an

orchard, and it was cleared in the 1870s as part of this landscape effort to create this picturesque planned, park like landscape of the home. And we believe that this areas was probably cleared not only to create, to frame this historic area of the campus, but also to frame the views out of the campus to the Capitol and the city of Washington. And we'll have the opportunity to see those views.

The third character area is the Chapel Woods, here, which is named for the (unintelligible) Chapel which is right there. The Chapel Woods, the chapel actually sits on a knoll and is surrounded by a wooded area. And this has been the character of the Chapel Woods for over 130 years. It remains intact. So this is a very well-defined area.

Four, is the Hospital Complex. And I think most of you can see forward building from outside the site, so that's where the Hospital Complex is. This is sort of a south campus, if you will, at the Armed Forces Retirement Home. The hospital was actually established in this location; the original hospital is no longer there, in the 1870s, and the Hospital Complex has grown from that original hospital building. So that's a very well-defined area.

Five is the Pasture. Now as some of you may know when the Armed Forces Retirement Home was over 500 acres, including land over here, and over here the pasture was larger. And there was a dairy farming facility here, and the pasture land for the cows included this particular area. Now we selected that as a character area in itself because it remains an open pasture land, although there are no cows on the site but it does retain many of the defining characteristics from the 19th Century. And we'll see that as well.

This area here is the Lakes. And I think many of you are familiar with that from driving by. The Lakes are actually a sort of picturesque feature in the landscape. They were a planned landscape to provide you know some relief from the fields. And the lakes themselves have been present on the site since, one of them since the 1860s. There is also some forested areas that are related to the Lakes.

Seven is the Cultivated Garden. And that character is defined by the area where the residents tend their gardens. Many of you may be familiar with. It has been, that particular area has been cultivated since the 19th Century.

And then the Modern Impact area, which is the largest area, this is the area where the mid 20th Century master plans have been either partially implemented or have resulted in

a change, a significant change in the landscape. Now there are historically significant elements within the Modern Impact area but this area represents significant changes that depart from the 19th Century characters.

Nancy Czapek: We have two primary objectives at this planning process. The first is to obtain input and feedback from the large cross section of people here, represented here on the design guidelines for the re-development of the Armed Forces Retirement Home. You collectively represent community, business, institutions, government and a real estate industry representative, so we value your input and your feedback. We also want to assure that the design guidelines are comprehensive and provide an appropriate framework for the re-development of this very special center.

Carrie Albee: The design framework category and really we're building the context in which the re-development, the appropriate re-development will take place. So the framework will include the objectives of the master plan, the property types and their locations. We'll be focusing on open space and streetscape which is so important on this site.

We'll be looking at building heights and building setbacks, building entrance locations, parking, and building service, historic views, actually historic features and then view corridors as well, and we'll see much of this as we go out on the tour, and then the issue of security.

Giles Moore: These are some diagrams we prepared really to summarize the key characteristics of the site as they exist. It's obviously an enclosed campus today with one point of entrance here with this perimeter fence addition, which is something that we'll develop with the master plan. And really the most striking piece of the site is the topography and how the site reveals itself as you move around it.

So what we've tried to do here is show some of these key views from the upper campus and across the lower campus, east, south, views to the west, to the National Cathedral and to the east. And there is something like 140-foot grade change across the site. You don't appreciate that from this drawing, but we're going to be making a model and we're going to see that as we go around the site.

Each of the development areas have different relationships to the surroundings. On the west side, it's residential. On the east and to the south is institutional uses. So there's

different scale relationships to take into account on each part of the site.

We've highlighted some of the existing landscape, the heavily forested areas around the Chapel Woods; the avenues of trees that align the roads through the site. The black buildings are the historic buildings; the significant buildings. The orange area that contain some of the buildings are areas where new development could occur within the overall (unintelligible).

And then this diagram starts to show some of the opportunities within that framework. That hatched areas largely show the development zones, in the southeast corner here, small area of the southwest corner, an area to the north of the lakes on Park Road, and then also development on the north part of the campus. But the green, the Golf Course, the Lakes, these heavily wooded areas would be maintained as well as to some extent, we're not sure to what extent but to some extent the existing Pasture.

Male Voice: You wouldn't save the Gardens?

Female Voice: What we hope to do with the Gardens for the residents is move it closer to the residents. Right now it's a bus ride away for most of the residents. And maybe you guys can talk a little bit more to that but it's not used as much as we think it could be if we moved it a little closer. So what we're hoping to do is in the development portions in the northern part of the site, is find a location.

Tim Cox: You can actually see that when you go down there that it was Garden much more acreage wise. And now just as I've been here in three years we've seen, when I came we had close to 30 people, I think we're down now to 12 people who go down, because again you have to get on our bus. It's really not within walking distance for somebody who has breathing difficulty or has suffered from a stroke; it's too far. And then the problem is there there is no other support structure for them either. So we want to be able to continue to garden here but relocate it closer to where the residents live probably is much more appropriate for them.

Nancy Czapek: One thing to understand when Giles was talking about development, sometimes you're talking about development that would be by Armed Forces itself and that would be in these areas here. So that the development areas that become available for private or non-profit development would be here, here and here.

Male Voice: Yes.

Nancy Czapek: Another example of what Armed Forces want to redevelop in their portion of that northern half that Pam just showed was the -- I'm drawing a blank -- the Key Health Center. That currently we'd like to bring up closer and develop it up here, so that the nursing home is closer to the rest of the facilities. That if a person has to move from their apartment to the nursing home, it's not as big a change; people can visit them more, you know all of that. So we'd like to bring it closer.

Tim Cox: It's not very resident focused and friendly. The intent when they built the nursing home down there was to secure the lower campus, because we didn't have major buildings that we were using down there, so they built that down there. One, it's too big. We need about half the size for skilled nursing care and then it also costs us a lot of money to have buses go down every hour to pick people up to take people to visit, and you can't stop by for five minutes. And when you have a friend who maybe is suffering from stroke and recovering or has dementia and doesn't remember you from day to day to spend a whole hour down there to wait for the bus to come back up doesn't really facilitate an interaction among all of our residents.

The residents do a phenomenal job now going back and forth to visit their friends that are in the nursing home. But it really is like, you know, a ten-block difference. That's not really fair if they are really part of the retirement home on the northern part of the campus.

Nancy Czapek: And then the other area maybe to point out that needs development on the northern part is the Grant Building. This is an absolutely glorious building up at the top part. It's historic; we have to find a way to reuse it, to heat it and maintain it without a user is just not --

Female Voice: It's huge.

Male Voice: Right, it's huge.

Nancy Czapek: So we need to find a way to reuse that building, because it's -- but again this is primarily other than maybe the Grant Building, primarily is going to be Armed Forces. There might be some other, you know the National Trust is up here; you know we might have a few other leases to help support. But they are not the primary focus of the re-development, the re-development is here. And then this area I where the RFQ is going out on.

Giles Moore: So these diagrams start to highlight some of the objectives and principles which we will be defining more closely through this guideline phase over the next couple of months. The next slide shows the site broken down into development zones with zone one and two here being for the Armed Forces themselves, zones three and four being subject to the first RFQ, and zones five and six to either side of the ponds on Park Place.

Each of those zones has a different relationship to its surroundings and a different potential use or mix of uses on that site. Zone one is seen as institutional uses, zone two is residential use, zone three a mixture of residential, office, R&D, research and development space, some service retail, maybe even a hotel within that zone. And then on the south side, medical uses, primarily because of its relationship to the south of Irving Street --

Female Voice: But it could be any --

Giles Moore: It could be. Residential on the southwest corner and residential or institutional on this location and what we're showing on the right is a range of potential floor areas associated with the development in each of those zones.

This is interesting. This shows how those development zones relate to the character areas that Carrie was talking about. Some of them relate quite closely, like development zone two is essential character area three, Chapel Woods. Northern zone three includes character area four and most of the Pasture. They don't all tie in exactly but there is a relationship there that's being developed.

And as the Armed Forces draws itself closer to the north campus, the issue of security fence, of maintaining that secure campus has to be addressed. This is a thought about how that security fence might develop to limit the Armed Forces campus to align something like this, but these areas would be outside the security zone. That's all.

Female Voice: By the way, that center area on that previous slide is a golf course. And under a portion of it is the old reservoir. And we are not planning, it's a nine-hole golf course, and we may realign a couple of the holes but the intent is to keep that open and available, and it will still be open space.

Tim Cox: So the agenda that we had set for this evening, what we would like to do now is to go out the main first floor door of Sherman and walk across the Plaza. There is

a bus waiting for us out there. Fourteen of us can get on the bus. And that 14 is going to include two of our sort of consulting team being Giles and Carrie, because they're going to be sort explaining features of the site as we drive around. We'll probably be taking another car or so for those that can't be accommodated by the bus.

So we should probably head out now because we've got about an hour worth of this tour. We're going to get off at several points and look at the different views and get a better feel for the site. But we've got about another hour of light.

Female Voice: And then we're going to reconvene here, go over a little bit of the schedule and what's next so that you will be prepared and then you have a draft of the master plan so that when we meet hopefully in two weeks we can be able to dive into the next part of this.

[End of Track Two.]

[Track Three begins]

Pam Wessling: We don't want to keep you here too much longer but did want to give anyone the opportunity to ask any questions that they might have.

Planning Committee Community Representative: I guess what are the expectations of the planning committee itself? Most committees like this have a set of tasks that have a beginning, a middle and an end. I don't know to what extent that you are expecting to generate recommendations or any of that. And then when you move to requesting qualifications, selecting developers and all of that are we a part of that, are we not a part of that? Will our function have terminated by that time? I just want to know what the breadth and scope of our role is.

Desa Sealy Ruffin: We will be, at the next meeting we'll talk about the meeting dates to make sure that that works with everyone. For the next meeting we'll have an initial set of draft guidelines for your review and comment. We will also have a model that shows you what the site could look like within the envelope with some of the development options.

So you'll be able to go through the guidelines in specific detail, broken down into categories that we talked about. You want to look at them for whether or not they're complete, whether or not there is anything that's been left out, your thoughts and impressions on them, give feedback. And we'll take a look at the model because it's

helpful to see it in 3-D as well.

In the third meeting, we'll come back two weeks later, with guidelines that have been amended to reflect your input and comments and get feedback on that.

And by the fourth meeting, two weeks later, we expect to have a proposed set of final guidelines.

These guidelines our acute process is happening separately. These guidelines will be a part of the draft of the master plan that's going to go before NCPC early next year. They would be a part of the RFP that ultimately goes out in 2006.

After the developer is selected, we would like to reconvene the planning committee to review the concept that's come in to make sure that it's in concert with the guidelines. So we're not asking you to draft guidelines, we're asking you to provide input and feedback on guidelines that have been developed and make sure they're hitting all the points. We are working in a relatively truncated period; the first and most significant part of our efforts will be complete by the end of November.

(Audio too low) (All talking at once)

Pam Wessling: If you look up on the, we have a developer selection process and remember this is for zones three and four not the other zones and the buildings that we think contribute to the historic character. We're going to put out that Request for Qualifications next week. And then developers would be responding at that point, by the first week in December.

Then, of course, we will be reviewing those proposals to come up with a short list. And it could be one developer for all of it. It could be multiple developers for sub-parcels. There may be some compelling proposals just for someone -- so we're taking that all into account and advising Tim how best to proceed with that.

Planning Committee Community Representative: How big is the universe of the developers you will be sending this RFQ out to?

Pam Wessling: There's a website for the project and anyone interested is registered there. We have a very long list. It's not by invitation only. We have a long list just to give notice who are aware of it already, but it's not by invitation.

Planning Committee Community Representative: How long as that been out on the website?

Pam Wessling: The RFQ isn't on the website isn't on the website yet, but there's a website where people can register there.

Planning Committee Community Representative:: When will it go out?

Pam Wessling: It will go out next Wednesday. We'll be working with you and we're also working with (unintelligible) they met this morning and many of them are regulators who get involved in the historical side of things and are helping to develop the programmatic agreement of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. They're focused primarily on the historic character and protecting that, but obviously they look at all the (unintelligible) is represented there as well. (Unintelligible). They are working in tandem with you in comments from this group, and comments from that group will feed into a revised set of guidelines.

At the back of your books there is a first draft master plan that's Section six. We put that together. That gives us some comments in terms of the extent of guidelines that we're developing there. So we've expanded the list to address (unintelligible) and we have some comments also from some of the members of the agreement committee. So we've put this in here for your information so that you could read it at your leisure and get a sense of what we're attempting to accomplish.

When you're here at your next meeting it will be developed in greater detail than what you see here. This will be the base but they're will be additional guidelines with greater detail and put in a summary format so that it's easy for you to pick it up in the meeting and discuss it with us. And Giles and his people are coming up with as I mentioned a model to show some context so you'll get a sense of what does it look like if you live on Park Place and what will you be looking into it. And there will be variations so that we can talk about what are the implications so that you have (unintelligible). So it's pretty hard to address guidelines in the abstract I would imagine. But hopefully your memories of going around tonight will help as well.

So what we're hoping to do is with that input from this group and from that agreement committee, and also Nelson's team is setting up three major community meetings over the next month and a-half and has been meeting with all the ANC's and some associations and we'll be getting input from them as well. Not at all at the level of detail that you'll be paying attention to the guidelines but getting a sense of the general

community's responses to the guidelines. Those of you who are from the community we're imagining that you will also be going back and taking about what you're doing in here and getting feedback if you have time to do that.

We will need to submit a revised draft master plan to NCPC in early December. And we're going to be heard by the commission when they meet in early January, they meet at the beginning of every month, who will by then have heard from developers and get a sense of is there anything we haven't contemplated there.

We'll be using the guidelines to help shape request for proposals. The developers, there will be a short list of developers, they'll get their request for proposals and then they'll have three months I think it is to see that to get together proposals which we'll then be reviewing and making our awards to one or more developers, having determined how it should be parceled out.

And we'd like to reconvene with you at that point in time because you obviously will have had spent a lot of time and provided a lot of input so we can check back, say, here is where we are today, the guidelines work well in these areas, here are some things that you hadn't thought about. We want to get your feedback if we were needing to vary at all from those guidelines and also just to check back.

(Audio too low)

We will with your input be preparing the final master plan. We will be preparing the final environmental impact statement and going again to FCPC. (Audio too low) And the same thing you'll see programmatic agreement there are two blue bars. There is a hiatus (audio too low), and then we'll be checking back in with that group as well, finalizing. We'll have a draft programmatic agreement hopefully by early January and then come back and finalize it in the summer.

So we're looking back to your input in this earlier phase, but also we really hope you'll stay involved (audio too low)

(Audio too low)

Pam Wessling: The armed forces will make a recommendation.

Tim Cox: The Secretary of Defense.

Planning Committee Community Representative: And that's who will ultimately make the decision is the Secretary of Defense?

Tim Cox: That's correct.

Planning Committee Representative: I still have just a couple of questions just on the process. And this is the part that's going to be very important in terms of sharing information with the community, residents, I mean, they are very interested in just knowing about the process so they know what to expect and at what point in the process that they will have an opportunity to provide some input. So the community meetings I guess later this month, the purpose of those is to get feedback comments on the master plan?

Nancy Czapek: The purpose is to inform the community about what the (audio too low) and to get feedback on the outcome of the master plan to provide the opportunity for community members to raise any questions about the master plan process, about proposed development and to feedback back into this (audio too low).

Planning Committee Representative: If I could suggest. (audio too low) So I'm really very interested in how this affects the surrounding neighborhoods. And again just in terms of process and sharing information, I think that we can (audio too low) just developing a very simple fact sheet that kind of just simply lays out the process. I think a lot of concerns thus far is simply that we don't know what to expect. We don't know what's going on. So if we could just very simply just outline what's happening when, decision points, benchmarks, milestones, things like that, so that everyone has the same information and can anticipate again when they can give input or when decisions are being made.

Last question, the response for the RFQ will be due when?

(Cross talking)

Male Voice: December, right?

Female Voice: December 1st, okay.

Planning Committee Community Representative: Just a follow up question to the question that I asked I assume there will be a recommendation coming from the retirement home or a commission or committee to refer it to the Secretary of Defense.

Tim Cox: That's correct. That's why we're having you all here. We're gathering information on many different fronts, from the neighborhood meetings that we're going to have, from this planning committee, from the programmatic planning committee as

well so we get all of the best information and be able to give our recommendation on how we want to proceed in -- but it's a recommendation.

(Audio too low)

Planning Committee Representative: And will the RFQ be posted on your website?

Pam Wessling: Yes, it will. (Audio too low)

Planning Committee Representative: In relationship to the comprehensive plan for the National Capitol does this plan then become a part of the federal element?

Male Voice: The comp plan is a document developed by the commission and its policies. There are no specific plan aspects other than policies addressing particular qualities or aspects of the Capitol or the region. And they may apply to specific geographic areas if the commissioners have so identified, but generally that's not achieved under the most recent revision.

So policies will be reflected but this plan will stand on its own as a master, a federal facility master which will be on file at the commission. And all future implementations and any construction to occur here at the home will be measured and performance with that master, and deviations will be looked at in a more critical fashion versus any performance development that adheres to the plan.

Now the process of the master plan and implementation is fully up to the home as to how large a portion of whether it's one project or several projects that's at their full discretion, because they are the only ones that will know what the need is. But the plan will always be on file at the NCPC and would be the part of the measure and evaluation of those projects. Because again every federal project in the District of Columbia must come before the NCPC.

Desa Sealy Ruffin: We have scheduled here the meetings in October and early November. The first is in (low audio) it's on October 22nd, which is a Saturday at 3:00 pm at St. Paul's Rock Creek Parish on Rock Creek Church Road. Everyone here is invited to attend. If you'd like to attend I've got a sign up sheet. We'll be holding a Petworth meeting on October 24th at 7:00 pm at St. Gabriel's Church, 26 Grant Circle. And we'll be holding a meeting at Park View on November the 3rd, at 7:00 pm at Sweet Mango CafÈ, 3701 New Hampshire Avenue. We are working on (low audio).

Read Scott Martin: I think it's going to be tomorrow. It may be next Thursday. Their

deadlines are long.

Desa Sealy Ruffin: We'll be advertising in the Post.

Read Scott Martin: D.C. North.

Desa Sealy Ruffin: We're working with the Office of Planning on its contact list. We're setting up a website for registration so that people can let us know that they'd like to attend and we're going door to door and hanging door knockers. So we're doing very extensive, we're participation in ANC meetings to let people know about these meetings. So we're doing extensive outreach to let people know what it's about.

Planning Committee Community Representative: Do we have a list of that schedule in here, or could we get that e-mailed to us? Or is that in the book here?

Male Voice: The slide that's up here -- you mean for these meetings?

Male Voice: No, the ones that she just talked about. (Cross talking)

Tim Cox: Actually they are on the website. You go to [afrhdevelopment.com](http://afrhdevelopment.com) and there's a button for community meetings. We'll e-mail everybody on the planning committee.

Desa Sealy Ruffin: We actually need to think about our next meeting dates and we proposed two weeks from today at 5:30 pm, and then every two weeks at 5:30 for the next six weeks. I wanted to get a sense of the room about whether that worked folks.

Male Voice: The 19th of October, the second of November, and the 16th of November --

Desa Sealy Ruffin: If there aren't any other questions I wanted to get you guys out of here by 7:00, thank you very much for your time. And we look forward to seeing in two weeks.

(End of Track three)