

Planning Committee Meeting No. 2
October 19, 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.

Taped presentations and discussion picks up halfway through presentation of Powerpoint slides at the meeting's beginning. These are summarized before the transcript begins below.

The balance of the meeting was taken up by manipulation of model buildings on a model of the AFRH campus site.

Attendance:

Desa Sealy Ruffin, Gotham Development
Tim Cox, AFRH
Merrick Malone, Metropolis Development
Lenwood Johnson, ANC1A10
Frank Smith, Afro Am Civil War Foundation
Rosalynn Taylor, Office of Planning
Mona Khechen, Koetter Kim Associates
Giles Moore, Koetter Kim Associates
Maybelle Taylor Bennett, Howard University Community Association
Bill Jentarra, AFRH
Mimi Rivkin, AFRH
Emily Eig, EHT Traceries
Nancy Czapek, GSA
Roy Cogle, AFRH
Steve Schwartz, GSA
John Thompson, RSM McGladrey
Tim Denner, DC Office of Planning
Al Mori, AFRH
Joseph Woo, AFRH
James D. Berry Jr., ANC5C
Tony Norman, Pleasant Plains Civic Association

Before the transcript begins, Giles Moore more began the meeting with a Powerpoint presentation. Giles read from the "Master Plan Objective" slide, the "Existing Conditions" slide, noting the current single entrance to campus, and shaded areas for development while maintaining the majority as open space. Views are all key elements in the guidelines we must respond to - the highest priority to the south, the Capitol and

Washington Monument.

Giles Moore continues, the Master Plan encourages reuse of the buildings, and keeping Wooded areas historically intact.

Open lands with the highest priority are in yellow.

A community representative asked, What do you mean by priority?

Giles Moore responded, They are intact from the earliest days of the Home and did not change. He noted further that the golf course was not original topography, the yellow areas were areas that did remain intact. The Scott statue was intact and has historical association with the Home to "look over" the Home. The meadow where cattle pastured was the same topography as before. Trees intact are on green lines on the map, indicating old trees or their replacements. Some old trees marked in yellow are not as old.

Historic roads are the purple lines. He also indicates the Irving Street Gate is not original.

He proceeds to read from the slides, "New Development," "Relation to context," "Building topologies," "Built forms" "Access and Security" and "Streets and Streetscape."

The transcript begins at this point, during the discussion of Zones 3 and 4, with a question from a community member of the Planning Committee:

TRANSCRIPT:

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

Planning Commission

10/19/05

Nancy Czapek: In Zones 3 and 4, we do not anticipate the sale of anything. It will be long-term [indiscernible] is what we're anticipating.

Male Voice: Thanks.

Czapek: We might have a little more discussion on this sale factor on the

residential portions just because residential development, depending on the market for rental buildings or ownership buildings, can affect their value. And so, that section we might actually entertain the idea of a sale.

Male Voice: Exactly, it's finance. It's finance.

Czapek: Yes.

Male Voice: It's financing, I guess, is what it comes down to.

Female: That would mean that those places closest to on the western side?

Male Voice: Yes.

Czapek: Yes, which we are holding off on, but the western side. This one in particular we anticipate to be residential. The lower one, we anticipate residential, but it could be a medical or institutional type use or office -- medical office -- use, but those are a little bit longer term. This is probably the one that has the most likelihood of other sale.

Female Voice: Sale. And therefore it will [indiscernible].

Czapek: But the intent is this will be a long-term ground lease because the object, which I think we talked about last time, is to gain an income stream.

Female Voice: Sure.

Female Voice: And the income stream is best --

Female Voice: You have to keep the ownership.

Female Voice: Yes.

Czapek: I'm more than willing to step back and let somebody who wants to get a little closer.

Male Voice: Is one of these presentations going to involve the issue of security?

Czapek: Well, okay, security is one of the guidelines, yes, and he had a -- there was a slide up earlier sort of showing where the fence line would be.

Male Voice: Okay.

Czapek: And so, it will be in the package if you want to look at it again, but we do need -- that is one of the things that you need to address.

Male Voice: And one of his packets today showed that?

Giles Moore: Yeah, we'll go back for a moment.

[indiscernible; cross talking]

Female Voice: One is here. It's the one that looked like this.

Male Voice: [indiscernible] north.

Female Voice: North.

Czapek: And you're going to get your own.

Tim Cox: It's good to get a frame of reference.

Giles Moore: So this shows a version on each of the areas that we're talking about of the potential development. The north campus will be buildings that can be inserted within that picturesque campus or these orange pieces. We made them orange just so they can see which ones are new in that particular zone. Those buildings would be for the use of the armed forces themselves; whereas, these areas -- 3 and 4, Zone 5 and Zone 6 -- would be -- this one is subject to the RFQ right now and these ones in the future presumably. So this starts to show the scale of the buildings we're talking about. This is 65 feet.

This, in this case, would be the primary north-south connecting street with a system of secondary streets running between the buildings. And in some cases you'd get an open space adjacent to the partner street, a large one there, smaller ones here. The line of Pershing Drive is starting to get depicted here. And the taller buildings in the area that we said could have a limited footprint for new buildings, but because of the relationship to the open space we feel that these points could be allowed to go to that higher height limit.

Female Voice: You are not concerned about maybe framing the pasture differently? Where is the pasture? That pasture was --

Moore: That kind of comes in like that through there. These are illustrations of how the guidelines could be interpreted. They're not the final plan because our final plan won't come until there's a developer at least being talked to. I'm not quite sure of the selection process, but there's little point getting into an absolutely detailed master plan until there's somebody who wants to take that on.

Czapek: But the intent is to develop a set of guidelines that we're going to feed to the developers, so they know what we're expecting so that we can define the field. And what we're looking for today is input, so your comment about how the meadow might work is something we need to work through and how we might address it in the guideline.

Moore: What's clear on the model anyway is the difference between these different areas, the armed forces campus which is more picturesque, this area which is certainly more urban, this zone, this Zone 6 has this relationship to the existing housing. We've lost some houses here.

Female Voice: But you would intend to continue the streets?

Moore: The streets or certainly the views of the streets would be allowed to come through. Whether we allow access there, I don't know at this point because we're only talking about a gate at this point and at this point. So this housing could be served from an internal street or driveway.

Female Voice: But the alignment would be --

Moore: The alignment -- a visual connection or a pedestrian connection could relate to the existing street there. So we've said here in this zone -- the heights -- we didn't talk about this on the slides, but the heights in this zone would be four-story and eight-story potentially, and we're showing a building there at eight stories high just to give an idea of that scale.

Czapek: Now, the reason for the eight-story was working with Scott and having the alignment with Scott, and that's an important building so that you might want a signature building there. Or you may want to keep the view corridor, and we might address it in a different way.

Male Voice: So just in the street vernacular here, are these little houses?

Moore: Yes.

Male Voice: Okay.

Female Voice: Have you determined on Zones 3 and 4 how the uses -- I mean, we're talking about 8-, 12-, 13-story buildings, and I understand it's going to be a mix of uses.

Male Voice: Uh huh.

Female Voice: Have we determined where those uses are going to be located? Do we know at this point are there going to be --

Moore: We haven't, but we can certainly suggest a distribution of uses across the site. But it'll really depend on the individual developers. I could say, for example, these historic buildings could be residential, maybe these being residential buildings within the park. But there's a whole other way of articulating parts of this part of the site as

residential [indiscernible], rather. These particular buildings look more like office buildings than residential, but they don't have to be like that.

I'm going to put another version of this in the model. Let me get this out. This one is very regular in its arrangement with the north-south and east-west streets.

We have another one somewhere that illustrates a slightly more relaxed approach to those guidelines where there's still a north-south connection between the two gateways, but the buildings, how they relate to the landscape, don't form that hard rectilinear edge that is demonstrated on the other model. The buildings to the south also open up more to the existing streets. The principles of the guidelines are still there. There's a series of connecting open spaces along that connecting north-south street, maintenance of existing open space here and an open space requirement maintained within that sub-Zone 3 -- 3b it was -- in this area.

Female Voice: Across Irving Street, what's the height relative to what's there?

Moore: Well, these buildings we think are four-story buildings.

Female Voice: [indiscernible]

Male Voice: Here?

Female Voice: Yeah.

Female Voice: But that's the VA.

Male Voice: I think this building is --

Czapek: VA is four-story, I think.

Male Voice: And those are 12 stories because it's medical, so those might be 60-foot tall buildings. They're four stories.

Czapek: And I think Washington Hospital Center there was a -- I was going to say the front part of the lot -- I just drove by there today. The front part of the lot had a parking structure that looked like a four-story parking structure, and then it stepped back to five stories, and it looked like it stepped back to a higher. So there was sort of a step effect. But I think that's at further --

Cox: Right, further in the site.

Female Voice: Further in the site.

Male Voice: And the four stories out on Irving Street are lower floor-to-floor because it's parking, so that's probably about 40, 50.

Moore: These ones here.

Czapek: But they're big structures. You get the feeling of a big structure there because they're --

Female Voice: These structures in the model, they look pretty massive. Maybe if you can give me some square footage. If we're talking 9-, 12-, 13-story buildings, these footprints look rather large.

Czapek: I don't think we had anything over 10 stories.

Moore: No. Where is that --

Female Voice: I had 130 feet.

Moore: If it was residential, it could be that.

Female Voice: You could get 12.

Female Voice: You have another scheme?

Female Voice: Those are the only two.

Moore: We have another one, but it's a bit similar to the first one.

Male Voice: I take it that you've had some developer interest in this already?

John Thompson: We've recently sent out an RFQ to solicit interest and determine what kind of interest we have in the project, so we have not -- it just went out like --

Female Voice: Last week. And then there is a lot of interest, and over the course of the past five or so years there's been a lot of developers who have called at various times. So yes, there is developer interest in this site.

Moore: This is another one that's more rectilinear.

Female Voice: And you bifurcate this clean space.

Moore: Exactly, yes, and add a more defined edge to this more urban area.

Male Voice: Do they all give you relative same amount of mass?

Moore: They do, yes. These three that were demonstrated just now are within the confines of [indiscernible] this scale. They're about the same area.

Male Voice: Are you all anticipating a single developer to develop this or are you - ?

Moore: I don't think that's normal at this point. I think it could easily be -- Ted, am I right in saying that? It could be a number of developers.

Cox: At this point, what we wanted to do is really not get too prescriptive to say, well, we think, based on all the experts that are here, that this is exactly what it should be.

What we want to do is now test the market through the RFQ, and there may be somebody who comes in with some residential which we all determine that we really like. We don't like their institutional or commercial. We may then say, geez, we prefer these three groups to look at what could be done on the site.

So at this point, we just want to see what all the ideas are out there. Like we said, you see a lot of new stuff now, especially in Adams Morgan, where a commercial is what you see eye level, but then it's residential about -- yeah, so instead of saying, okay, this has to be a retail strip and this has to be residential over here.

So we want to be flexible at this point to say what really would be the best, what would be most diversification for us. We have some developers 10 years ago say, well, geez, we're going to put 3,000 housing units throughout your campus. That really probably made economic sense at the time, but it doesn't really make economic sense for the long term if we're looking at an income stream and an independent revenue source that can go for the next generation of people we want to serve. So that's why we're at that RFQ stage now to really see what the market wants to propose and what the market then would be able to bear.

Czapek: Are there other thoughts or other concerns?

Male Voice: I have one. Excuse me for being late, tied up on the time. But I don't know if you all discussed this, but my concern is I don't know if you all have a requirement for affordable housing. I know you're looking for revenue stream and that sort of thing, but you can still get that with some component of affordable housing within that. I don't know if you all put that in your planning.

Czapek: I don't think it's a requirement, but I think we do need to investigate that a little bit more. And I know that there are some tax credits for that, so we do need to investigate that.

Male Voice: So I would strongly recommend that because I think that would be -- you could get a revenue stream, and you could provide a service that's much needed in the community, particularly for that area.

Female Voice: If you are going to put that requirement in there, it should be earlier than later, sooner than later, because as you as a developer who is going to come in and base their financing and their scheme on what they can finance and what will make sense

-- because that's the good thing about this process. You're going to get some people that I'm sure are going to -- there's a special kind of developer out there that's going to come, and then you're going to get a combination of developers who will come together to do this.

The clear thing is that, if that is going to be in the requirement or discussions, it's got to be on the table now, as opposed to later, because when you start to put these kinds of things together -- and they are costly to do -- you want to make sure that you have all of those requirements very clear because to put together a proposal to come forward like this will not be cheap. I've done it. If you're going to have those requirements, you put them in there now.

Female Voice: Well, wouldn't that be part of the RFP that you would issue? It would outline all of the site requirements, and if that's one that you decide you want to impose on the site, then it would be included at that point.

Czapek: That's true. The RFP --

Cox: Because there may be some people who are looking in the RFQ that will suggest that as part of their plan because they'll get tax credits for that to be able to put money there.

Male Voice: Right.

Cox: And that's why at this point with the RFQ, we'd rather see what the market sends to us because we've heard your comments from developers before, too. And especially in a larger site, they're able to use those tax credits if they do affordable housing to be able to get cheaper money to build on a commercial site, as an example, or another residential site.

Male Voice: But then you've also got to make sure, too, that it works for your programmatic and financial objectives that you're trying to do.

Cox: That's right. That's exactly right.

Male Voice: Ultimately, they have to mesh.

Cox: They do.

Moore: One other piece that we didn't look at, which is the larger Zone 6, which again has the four-story maximum in this zone, but the potential for a higher zone adjacent to the existing road. The other side of the tree should be on this model, but it got

lost in the mix.

Male Voice: This one does give you more density.

Moore: Yes, it does a lot there. That's why there's a range of densities indicated for each of these zones, and what we're trying to do is illustrate how that would actually be on the site.

Desa Sealy Ruffin: [indiscernible; away from microphones] institutional, embassies, some conclusion of the desire to have an option for embassies, I thought, in Zone 6. Is that what that shows?

Moore: Yes, it could be. This is really residential in this zone. This could be more institutional. It could be apartment buildings.

Czapek: Although State Department is not showing a lot of interest in coming forward.

Male Voice: Are any of these institutional uses that we talk about here uses that are related to the home itself?

Moore: Zones 1 and 2, which is this area, this would be the uses that are related to the home.

Czapek: Well, but the uses down in Zones 3 and 4, I think we would like to see things that are compatible with the armed forces retirement home. So would a cancer clinic or medical doctors' offices or something along that line be preferable? On some level, it might be, versus something we would not want is a big box retail. So from that perspective, the answer is yes. But are we going to prescribe it? No, I think we are trying to see what the market is out there and can we get there.

Male Voice: Well, I don't know, is this the kind of thing that institutions try to help ginny up merit or is it something that a developer himself has got to go around and try to find some medical facility or maybe some government agency that wants to lease some space?

Male Voice: Sometimes it works both ways. Sometimes you're lucky enough to understand that there are some people out there you can talk to about bringing that use and incorporate that use as part of your submission if you find that and you think that would work. Generally, you go out there and you look for that, if you have that in mind, to see how that would work.

How do you get the two things to be -- what's the word I want to use -- that work together. I can think of some things now and some synergies that you would have -- development synergies -- but you've got to go look for them. Every now and then someone will come to you. Now and then, you'll have people come to you and say I'm looking for a use, and you try to see if this meshes with that.

Thompson: And there very well may be -- Georgetown University and Medstar right across the street may be looking for sites to supplement their operations. So they may be one of the people that respond to it.

Male Voice: And the Hospital Center certainly has built its campus up. They've hardly got room to turn around up there now.

Cox: And pretty landlocked, yeah.

Male Voice: I would hope they would look someplace else.

Czapek: And we know we do not want their parking garages.

[laughter]

Male Voice: Well, you've got to have parking.

Czapek: We need parking to address our own needs. We don't need their parking garages.

Cox: We're parking here, a lot of underground. We're not going to have a lot of surface parking. We really want it to be underground, part of a building requirement.

Czapek: Right.

Cox: Because as you see it, we want it streetscaped from the outside. We want -- one of the slides in the beginning was an entry point, so it's clear it's not you're walking through the cars to get to entry of each building. Parking is around sides or the rear of the building, not in the front. So it gives more - even if it's commercial or institutional, office, whatever -- that it gives a more residential approach to it, even in an urban setting.

Female Voice: So are we assuming underground parking or --

Czapek: A parking structure or underground.

Cox: In some parts, yeah.

Female Voice: I think there's --

Female Voice: A combination?

Cox: A combination of both.

Czapek: Although the very beginning, as things are starting to be built, we might get some above-ground parking in the transition phase, I would expect. But that is -- we want to limit that.

Male Voice: Yeah.

Female Voice: And are there no commercial uses anticipated?

Czapek: Some commercial.

Cox: Yeah, some commercial.

Czapek: More support retail and some office. Definitely office.

Male voice: I think the ideal that you have to take that, a complementary retail and whatnot, one that works for the residents and outside and inside and works for the armed forces also.

Thompson: And they can also supplement. Across Irving Street, you've got a lot of hospital workers.

Male Voice: Right.

Male Voice: And looking for those --

Female Voice: For those complementary uses that will yield income to --

Male Voice: Things that can afford to pay us rent.

Female Voice: Right. Exactly right.

Czapek: To organize the comments, do we want -- we had the seven guideline areas that we wanted to sort of go through then a little bit and talk about those issues. The first one were the historic features, the views, the buildings, the open space, the wooded areas, the open land, tree lines, roads. Are there specific characteristics or defining features that you all see in that area on that design?

Male Voice: One comment I would make is definitely the vista from the site seeing the Washington Monument and US Capitol, to preserve that.

Female Voice: Right.

Male Voice: I think it is central. In fact, not even just on the site, but even any building that would obstruct that view, which of course includes the McMillan [phonetic] site. But the view is very important.

Czapek: Right. [indiscernible]

Female Voice: In line with that, some language ought to capture what Mr. Norman

[phonetic] talked about, but I also thought that your purpose for showing us landscape that had not been tampered with -- how do you use these in different language -- landscape that is pretty much like it was back in the day -- the pasture and there was some other --

Czapek: Meadows.

Female Voice: You called it intact.

Female Voice: Intact.

Female Voice: To the extent that you want to keep that because it still echoes the origins of the site, you may want to require or recommend -- I don't know how strongly you want to make the language since you're not trying to prescribe too much. You want the developer to come in with an opportunity to use their own creativity, but you might want to ask for it to be framed in a way or disturbed as little as possible or using some language that lets them know that you really treasure those intact --

Czapek: Because that is part of the [indiscernible] character on the site.

Female Voice: Okay.

Female Voice: It's hard to find the resemblance between a lawn and a meadow. This is so open, free, and here it's completely built around [indiscernible]. It's just the space itself.

Czapek: Well, in this area in this particular model, you're anticipating that this would remain in its natural state.

Moore: Yes.

Czapek: As opposed to being flattened.

Moore: It would be contoured. This is a shorthand on the model. It doesn't show the contouring, but this one does. It's not intended to be a flat plain through the -- the existing contouring would be maintained.

Female Voice: Yeah, I see.

Moore: This is really shorthand for this.

Czapek: But one of the comments made -- one you had made -- was the flow of the meadow area.

Female Voice: Right. If that is one of those areas that has not been altered and you want to keep that, you need to say that. And the little signs -- I don't know how much

you want to -- what you had in mind as you were talking about the full development of the site, but to the extent that there can be little markers that said this was once the pasture and some of those historic features you may still want to communicate to the new users of that area so that they know, (a) how far down the soldier's home lands went, (b) what those areas were used for.

You might want to do the same thing where there used to be gardens and so on, little historic markers. There's still an opportunity to teach folk about the history of the site even though it's going to be built up, and you do that in part by maintaining some of those -- by maintaining the vistas, by maintaining the pastures or framing the pasture area some way, by giving them markers and given them information about the site.

Otherwise, if you don't say it, it won't happen.

Female Voice: Right.

Male Voice: Interpreting.

Female Voice: But interpretation, right, interpretation, I guess.

Male Voice: Also, I would, at least in this model, just looking at it from my point of view, it looks like you may have one or two or maybe several buildings that may protrude very far into the sky as a result of trying to meet this little objective or getting some density, as well as trying to retain the --

Female Voice: Open space.

Male Voice: - the openness. I think that what you don't want is to have these things sticking up like smoke stacks here if you can help it. So as you evaluate these proposals as they come in, I think that's something that you ought to keep in mind, that part of what you want to retain is the sort of open and pastoral integrity of the area as much as you can trying to meet all these objectives.

Czapek: One of the tradeoffs one could have on this is to maintain the most amount of space is to have a small footprint but a higher building.

Male Voice: Right, I understand that.

Czapek: But then there's the tradeoff potentially where you place that building to where the views are potentially.

Male Voice: And working with this significant grade change as you -- you have to work through it. It's huge. And so, I think keeping in mind what you just said is that

you've got to -- there'd be areas where you're going to have to work with that grade change to keep those buildings from doing exactly what you said.

Female Voice: And yet, when we went on the tour it was real clear that you could really get some height there because the drop is so steep.

Czapek: Right.

Female Voice: You just have to place it properly.

Czapek: And one of the other things, you do have quite a tall building here, which that angle --

Moore: It creates an edge already.

Czapek: An edge already, so you might have the ability to put something a little higher on that site. It doesn't impact the views in the same sense.

Moore: I think the key to the height is establishing a datum for the zone, and that isn't -- it's not necessarily a singular -- in each building the datum is measured from the topography in front of that particular building. The buildings don't get higher as you go down the hill. The datum relates to the topography, and then the buildings that appear above that datum level have their own requirements in terms of how they relate to open spaces, how they mark points in the plan, how they relate to views in and out.

There's so many ways of doing it, it's incredible. Somebody this morning was moving this building around. It looked quite good, I thought, and then somebody took that one away, as well, so you started to get the landscape coming in this way. And perhaps having a taller building there that related to a view out between these two buildings. That's what the guidelines are going to do, really somehow describe these relationships that we're trying to thread through with the whole design.

Male Voice: On the residential again, you want to -- I think this ought to be placed in the guideline. I know you all make reference to it, but whoever designs the residential units, it ought to look like a continuation of the residential units present day, the architecture, the personality, something that is continuing that character of the community, rather than something completely outrageously different.

Male Voice: Right.

Czapek: I think the description of Zone 6 is going to be very different.

Male Voice: Yes.

Czapek: Than the descriptions of Zone 3 and 4. You're right, we have to capture that.

Moore: Yeah, you're talking not just in terms of scale.

Female Voice: Right.

Moore: You're talking in terms of materiality.

Male Voice: That's right and width of the units.

Moore: Right.

Male Voice: And the architectural personality.

Male Voice: Right.

Male Voice: The character, the way the units across the street are made, that time and period.

Male Voice: Absolutely.

Male Voice: I don't think it's a great economic cost to just get the image preserved where the new housing units are.

Female Voice: I think you do want to -- you want to have some continuity with the neighborhood. I think, and I don't know whether you -- I think that's really important. At the same time, I think that at least I would understand as a developer that, if I look around the market and I look at what I can do and what I'm trying to do, the surrounding neighborhood is very important. So I'm not going to get on the edge financially to do something that's outrageous. I think you need to say it, say that it would be preferable.

But believe me, as a developer, you look at the area around you and decide what it is that you're going to do. To be very candid with you, there'll be some people -- for instance, based on what I see, I wouldn't do this. This is not what my company does, what it's going to do in certain areas. But you're going to get, let's say, a couple of people I can think of right off the bat nationally and locally that that's bowling right down their alley, that part of that kind of development that is like the community.

They've done it before. I could name -- so I could almost - depending on how you do that -- I can almost tell you who's going to come in here. But at the same time, I think you do at least want to say something about your preferences to certainly blend in the housing with the surrounding neighborhood around it without being restricted. I think give them the guidelines. That's what they are, guidelines.

Male Voice: Now, this is inside the federal enclave, I presume. If this were a development on city property, one might assume that with some of this infrastructure the government would do some of the streets and curves and roads and sewer and whatever. But this is on the federal level here. Is this all going to be done privately?

Czapek: We expect that the developer will be building the streets and the infrastructure, and we will be requiring them to build it per DC and NCPC -- National Capital Planning Commission -- requirements. But for those, I think [indiscernible].

Female Voice: And they'll all be private streets?

Czapek: Well, we probably need to work that out, but, yeah, they very well could be private. But that's something we have to work out. I know at Southeast Federal Center the streets are actually going to be dedicated, I think, to DC. So that is an option to investigate.

Female Voice: Because that would significantly affect budgets. We'd have to -- the city is going to take responsibility of maintaining it, we'd have to budget for that.

Czapek: But there is also the anticipated revenues you'll be receiving from these.

Male Voice: We've got the ground lease.

Czapek: The ground lease -- it's a ground lease, but there's still a tax on the buildings that DC has got, so there's a substantial --

Female Voice: The city wouldn't dedicate streets for public use on a ground lease [indiscernible].

Female Voice: That's true, that's true.

Male Voice: No, never.

Female Voice: At Southeast Federal Center they chose to do [indiscernible; cross talking].

Female Voice: No, it is not. It is not offset. It is partial ground lease processing.

Female Voice: Exactly, and that's what --

Female Voice: It's probably something that we have to investigate.

Female Voice: And that's what --

Female Voice: Again, we're not -- but we need to investigate.

Female Voice: And get those answers.

Czapek: And we have a meeting with DCOP, and that's one of the agenda items we

wanted to open up with them, just the thoughts on how to approach that.

Male Voice: Well, that could be significant, especially if a substantial portion of this is going to be for residential use. If it's institutional and commercial use, it poses a different problem.

Czapek: Yeah, you're right.

Male Voice: For you and for us. But that is -- it could be significant for you as the operator trying to maintain it and police it and secure it. But I think that's -- maybe you all are going to resolve that later.

Female Voice: It's going to have to be resolved.

Female Voice: Yeah, it's going to.

Female Voice: And how you handle jurisdictional issues.

Female Voice: Are you going to define this as you --

Moore: As we go on through this process, absolutely.

Female Voice: - the weeks, as different ideas come in and your developers come in with ideas?

Moore: Not when the developers come in with their ideas, but through this process of defining the guidelines in the next I guess it's six weeks. Most of this month and next month, we'll be refining these illustrative options for each zone. They're not the master plan, and they're not a definitive scheme. They're an illustration of how the guidelines might be interpreted.

Female Voice: Will that include any of Zone 1 and 2?

Moore: Yes.

Female Voice: I was looking at the heights, and it is so difficult to establish that. Look at this building, which is, what, three, four stories, and this one is seven, but they're different heights.

Cox: And different location. It's amazing when you're in this building and you look at the top of the floor, you actually look into the top floors of Sheraton just because of where they're located. It is amazing.

Male Voice: Grade changes.

Cox: Just the grade changes, right.

Female Voice: And these buildings will be more defined as you go along?

Cox: The ones we had on our part? Based on guidelines that we talk about, perhaps. This is just options.

Thompson: Basically, we're just trying to show the massing of the buildings.

Male Voice: Right and location where they could be.

Male Voice: But not to define the form of the buildings.

Male Voice: And to be perfectly honest with you, we don't know that all these would ever be built, but you need to be able to build the flexibility where, as the home grows, where is there potential to handle the different needs.

Cox: We want the guidelines to be able to work in two years, but also in 20 years, where the need may be different in 20 years for us from the need we're projecting right now. So we want to make sure that those guidelines still make sense, so that's why we're showing some of those options.

Male Voice: I go back to on the second part - we talked about the design framework categories - the access and security. In those guidelines, which clearly they have to be in there, but I think that the challenge will be is a couple of things. One, you know there is - this is like a little bitty fort right now, to be very candid. The uses that we're talking about as you try to open that up to now we're trying to -- we're integrating the fort and the community in so many respects, that's going to be a real interesting challenge for anybody is to understand how you do that and make that work in this environment that we now live in.

And so, I think those guidelines, I think, will have to be a little fleshed out relative to how do you create this access and you open up this world, and at the same time -- keep the security level that you think you need. It's a different paradigm here, and you've got to think about that as you build, and developers need to understand that also. In fact, everybody needs to understand that.

Moore: And what's the quality of that security line? Is it fences or walls?

Male Voice: Exactly, because you're doing a -- this is a little different now.

Female Voice: Depending somewhat on the use.

Male Voice: Right, depending on the use.

Cox: In our investigations, we did some of our due diligence, which is touring other institutions that had developed some of the real estate asset. They actually had some

where it was very passive, where the buildings actually became the divider and then some fencing or parking went on from that. So again, it still kept a divider going so you couldn't get through there.

And then some places there was a clear delineated fence, but it was interesting to see based on the, just like you said, the use, that they were able to use some structures rather than structure with a fence, another structure with a fence, another structure with a fence, which can look really monotonous and boring if it's all going this way and looks haphazard. So yeah, it'll be interesting to see what comes back to be able to define where security is.

One of the biggest concerns that we've heard from our residents was traffic through, so that's what we've tried to show through our part of the campus. We've tried to show that traffic to the other parts of the development won't come through our campus because we still want to be able to retain that community feel and not have to worry about people coming through to get to work on time or grocery store or whatever else through it. So that's what we've tried to look at, too.

Female Voice: Well, is there anything more about new use types and their locations? I think we've touched upon that. Are there any thoughts on that?

Male Voice: Can I just raise one other?

Cox: Please.

Male Voice: I live at 4th and T Street down below this, and there is a considerable amount of talk about the inadequacy of commercial services. And there's some things being talked about. Howard has, I understand, something they're planning, a town center across from the university, and maybe the Macmillan Reservoir one day might get developed. Who knows? If Tony Williams stops objecting to every -- not Tony Williams, but Tony Norman -- stops objecting to every proposal that comes out. But is there any consideration to starting some of this commercial on this?

Czapek: I think commercial is -- we would like to see some entry.

Cox: We've put in the RFQ that that's a possibility, so to encourage people to think that. We'll see now when we get it back, then we'll be able to tell you more. But yes, we felt that that would be a possibility, too. We agree with you.

Czapek: And when you say commercial, you're looking more retail instead of

commercial office spaces.

Cox: Yeah.

Male Voice: I've seen market studies that show that between Howard University and this they employ 20,000 people.

Cox: Yes.

Male Voice: And so, there's a tremendous amount of economic potential up here, but there's very little commercial that's accessible.

Female Voice: Right.

Male Voice: And we can't solve everything here, but I just was curious about that.

Female Voice: And I actually think it would work for the residents, too, having some additional commercial [indiscernible] retail commercial [indiscernible].

Male Voice: But I don't think as large as he's talking about.

Female Voice: Well, it depends. If he's talking about a Wegmans, I don't think so. Wal-Mart, I don't know.

Moore: The buildings themselves can be designed to accommodate that over time, as the population grows on the campus. If you're talking about like a storefront articulation within a building that isn't necessarily a store day one, but over time it could develop into that.

Male Voice: Right.

Moore: That's a whole other level of thinking about this. It doesn't all happen at once.

Cox: I actually saw that at University of Pennsylvania where the use was just small, very boutique commercial on the first floor, and then as they developed the rest of their four-city block that whole thoroughway became almost like an indoor mall, but from the outside still looked exactly the same as the residential part that was above it. But because they had the density then, they just went all the way through, which was really fascinating to see because you would have never guessed all that was there from the outside. But it really was a response to actually the neighborhood that's outside of Penn, but also all the students now that live there.

Male Voice: Yeah, you've got to --

Cox: The mass was incredible.

Male Voice: You've got the University of Penn to start with and then all the other universities around there. So you've got -- the retailers will define who will come. If the market is there, they'll come.

Male Voice: Right, they [indiscernible].

Male Voice: If the market's there, they will come.

Male Voice: Did you ask, did that evolve?

Cox: It did evolve.

Male Voice: They didn't plan it that way, it just evolved?

Cox: Well, they designed it, but, just like Giles was saying, it was in steps. It was small to begin, but as they developed the other parcels. So probably this was -- because they're in their like 16th or 17th year of their 20-year development plan, and it looks so new. I would say it's probably three, four years old only, so that came eight years into the development of the site.

Male Voice: That would answer, I think, part of your question, if that was acceptable then as it evolves.

Male Voice: Yeah.

Male Voice: As the need arises and it evolves.

Cox: And some of the feedback that we expect to get from the developers who respond, at least that's what we anticipate. We may be disappointed, but I don't think so. I think we've been out there enough with what's going on and what we want and how we look, and I think we've got this out on the Web and through literature that developers look at. So I'm hoping they come back to delight us with a suggestion just like that.

Czapek: Is there a thought on where the different types of uses would be within that?

Cox: I just see for people across the street, people south of us, certainly commercial have it all the way in is less convenient.

Male Voice: Right.

Cox: So to have it closer to Irving probably is better than not, although maybe North Capitol is better, but I would think some of that they're going to -- the developer is going to tell us anyway because that's the space they'll want to attract people to come onto the site. But yeah, I would hope no one would put it on the interior line next to the golf course because it just would make a nightmare to get people to come in.

Female Voice: And you won't have to worry about a retailer going in there.

Cox: That's what I think.

Male Voice: The market takes care of that [indiscernible].

Cox: That's what I would think. I mean I'm hoping, yeah.

Desa Sealy Ruffin: I think on that building height requirement, we heard some, but this has focused on creating large plots of open space, which is characteristic of the site, and then concentrating the density, particularly in areas 3 and 4, but the reaction when you see it [indiscernible]. It looks good.

Giles: Well, it's about this correlation between open space and building height and street widths and building height, and that's what we have to determine, not the exact location of every street.

Czapek: It's about the streetscape setbacks, that type of -- the idea of that north-south primary core. Any other additional thoughts on that?

Cox: It certainly goes with some of the grid framework that's already existing, which is nice.

Czapek: External.

Cox: External, correct.

Male Voice: This runs up North Capitol side?

Czapek: Yeah, Zones 3 and 4.

Cox: Yeah. There you go.

Czapek: Connecting the gates [indiscernible; away from microphone]. Our intent is to maybe develop the guidelines so that the approaching street that flow is kept because that is a character-defining feature of the site. But then Marriott moved the -- how does that - ?

Moore: Well, this one on the mall doesn't quite do that. It has this angle row to this point. It's not a sharp corner like that. That's very much a diagram of how it could be.

Female Voice: Right.

Czapek: This is an illustration of an intent to how that road starts to turn a corner and how the open spaces relate along that road.

Male Voice: I would just look at -- would like to see something along the character, if they develop it, with the buildings that are there, like how the medical center, that sort

of -- to preserve the flavor of what was -- the Old Soldier's Home if they're building commercial --

Czapek: The historical.

Male Voice: Yeah, the historic, they can build it within that framework.

Female Voice: You mean the new construction?

Male Voice: Yeah.

Female Voice: I don't -- yeah.

Moore: Well, when you're talking about kind of an architectural or a stylistic approach to the building design, that's kind of beyond where we are now. What we're talking about is the principles of the master plan, how to determine that and maximum building [indiscernible], if you like, so that we can control height and, by that, by controlling height, we essentially control density within a range. We can show examples of the type of character that we're talking about within each zone actually. This is obviously different to this. We can provide examples of what that might look like without getting into the actual detailed design of the buildings.

Male Voice: Do you know what Catholic is doing on the other side? Do you all have any idea?

Czapek: What they said in the meetings this morning was that they have got the zoning to match the rest of their campus, and, if they ever choose to develop it in a different way, they would have to --

Cox: Because right now, I think it's temporary, the mod housing they're putting on, because they're redoing some of their dormitories. So they're getting the modular housing to put 48 different modular parcels together on that site, have a -- because I went to the zoning meeting for them -- have their recycling center over on that side behind the large trees so you wouldn't see, and then just some additional walking trails to sort of make it connect with the other part of the campus. That's it currently.

Czapek: But they're still waiting, I think, to see what [indiscernible].

Cox: But they needed to zone it because it wasn't zoned because it's federal property, so that's primarily what they did it for, so they could ask to do something.

Female Voice: At what point in the process do you think that this part of Zone 6 will be decided, whether they're going to build a park within there or the golf [indiscernible]?

Isn't that what that is?

Cox: That is.

Moore: Yes.

Thompson: Well, our intent is to include that in the master plan, but the primary focus of the initial big developer solicitation is for Zones 3 and 4. So 5 and 6 would not be the initial part, although it would be included in --

Female Voice: And even within that context, we will be looking at phasing.

Male Voice: Right.

Czapek: You could phase each and every one of them, so we wouldn't have to go out for all at one time.

Cox: We won't be hitting into a net yet. We do have one. I know we have one. We do.

Female Voice: In terms of the internal street network, the main access for Zones 3 and 4 is this entrance here?

Female Voice: And North Capitol too.

Male Voice: To there.

Female Voice: So obviously, the developer would have to do their own transportation analysis in terms of number of cars they're putting on the roads, the internal traffic network and all of that. They would have to provide that? Or is that something that we need to put in the RFP?

Czapek: Well, we did do some estimates in our Environmental Impact Statement based on the different lot scenarios, and we will be requesting a transportation management plan from the developer. So I'm not 100 percent sure I understand the question. Are we going to direct them? We are going to be telling them that there's two access points, and I think we would be looking at defining we expect there to be a north-south street, and it's going to -- Giles, I don't know how we're going to -- how you're keying that description up yet, but there will be a description of what that primary road is and then where the secondary roads would be also.

Female Voice: Okay.

Czapek: And then there will be something in there about parking and the fact that we don't -- that we want sub service and parking garages.

Moore: I think what you're talking about is probably more the capacity of junctions, as I am imagining it.

Female Voice: That too.

Moore: Because I think the internal streets --

Female Voice: Internal and external, yeah.

Moore: There's a hierarchy of streets in the urban scale streets. It should work. I couldn't for sure give you the answer on capacity of that junction at this stage myself.

Czapek: But the EIS, I think, did look at the four scenarios you have, did have some traffic analysis. And so, there will --

Female Voice: But that wasn't on a specific development program.

Czapek: Well, not any specific, but we had hoped that the EIS would do would be capturing a certain range of different options that are reasonable and it shows a maximum and possibly the minimum type of development. So it will give at least a sense, and then the developer will have to do some planning because we do expect a transportation management plan that would help with the mitigation -- the specific mitigation factors - to that specific development.

Female Voice: Right, that was my point, about their specific development program.

Female Voice: There will be a TMP.

Female Voice: And the impact on the streets. And is GSA reviewing that, NCPC? I guess I'm asking because, if this is a ground lease and it doesn't get any review by the District, then who is reviewing it and approving?

Czapek: Our anticipation is that there will be review with the District. We'll be working with the District on this, and we have a meeting set up with DDOT or we're trying to get a meeting set up with DDOT. But there will also be a review, I think, through the NCPC license.

Male Voice: The meeting with DDOT hopefully you'll be able to get it fairly soon because there are going to be a lot of questions as a developer that I would come in and I would ask relative to the infrastructure of roads and how we're going to handle those things. Again, it gets back to cost when I'm trying to figure out what it is that I'm going to -- what am I going to have to pay for and I need to know it all upfront.

I can't -- so I think that you have a significant amount of questions to ask and

clarifications from DOT relative to how they interface with this project. Because when the developers come in, I can tell you that's going to be -- there's going to be a number -- those questions are going to be large, frankly.

Czapek: That's good insight.

Male Voice: Does this require a review by NCPC?

Czapek: Yes, the process we're going through is that because it's federal it will be going through the National Capital Planning Commission. Gene Keller was here last time. He's not here this time.

Male Voice: Does the NCPC review require a review by the District government?

Czapek: Well, DC sits on the Commission. We need Gene to answer that, and he's not here. I don't know exactly how they specifically look at master plans, but they do take those type of things into consideration. But how -- when Gene's here next time, we'll ask.

Male Voice: Well, some of the approvals require comments from the various agencies, and that may be a process by which at least DDOT will review this.

Female Voice: And I know that Washington Hospital Center has done a lot of things and DDOT to Irving Street and -- is that First?

Female Voice: First.

Female Voice: And North Capitol and Irving.

Cox: Lately going on here with Allison.

Czapek: It's very different riding up here.

Cox: Gosh, I was on leave, and now I can't get in. Just keep on going around until you find a left.

Czapek: I made a turn and got right on a one-way street.

Cox: Yeah, that's exactly right.

Czapek: And lots of different signals and new signals.

Female Voice: Anything else?

Desa Sealy Ruffin: We've got a couple of process issues with [indiscernible] and I think it was behind your agenda, in case you thought of something and didn't get a chance to talk about it, we'd love to get your feedback. We're going to go through for the next meeting, which is in two weeks on November 2, we're going to go through and

update the guidelines incorporating suggestions where possible and looking at them for -- this was focusing on areas 3 and 4.

We'll get more detailed guidelines for the other areas, but it's a short turn, and we need to get your comments, if we haven't gotten them back, pretty quickly. So if you could fill out this survey if you didn't get a chance to verbalize it. If you did, we've got it on record. And give this back to us, and/or if you walk out with it for some reason, fax it back to us. That would be great.

The second issue is we just want to check in. We wanted to make sure that 4:30 worked for everyone. It worked for everyone that's here. We're planning on meeting --

Male Voice: I apologize for that for you.

Female Voice: I had 5:30.

Female Voice: I had 5:30 also.

Male Voice: Okay.

Female Voice: Until a half hour before.

Female Voice: We tried to contact everyone by email and phone about that.

Cox: We made the change at the last meeting because a couple people had talked about that 5:30 was late because they had actually a commitment by 7:00, so they couldn't get home to get to the commitment. So we probably just didn't announce it loud enough, so I apologize.

Female Voice: But we did try to make follow up.

Female Voice: And the next meeting is November 2nd.

Male Voice: 2nd.

Female Voice: At 4:30?

Male Voice: 4:30, here.

Female Voice: Here.

Female Voice: So we'll stay [indiscernible].

Czapek: And we plan to take what we've heard today, what we've heard this morning and have more -

Cox: And we'll have two community meetings by then, too.

Czapek: By then. So we'll throw in some additional stuff, and we hope to have something that's a little more detailed and hopefully get more comments. And I also

want to invite people to look at the RFQ if you haven't already. It's on the website, so if you haven't seen it you might want to look at it.

Cox: These are just the locations of the community meetings.

Female Voice: This Saturday.

Male Voice: Okay.

Cox: Please pass it around.

Female Voice: If you live in the neighborhood, you should have gotten one on your door.

Cox: Should have got one on your door, right. We put door hangers out there.

Male Voice: The community thing we're going to on Saturday.

Cox: Right, that's the one --

Female Voice: [indiscernible; off microphone]

Male Voice: Right.

Sealy Ruffin: The first one is going to be held at St. Paul's parish right across the way in Rock Creek Cemetery next to the church.

Male Voice: Right.

[indiscernible; cross talking off microphone]

Female Voice: And I'm passing out a revised schedule just so you've got an updated schedule.

[indiscernible; cross talking off microphone regarding materials]

Male Voice: And the last schedule did not include the master plan as part of the schedule.

Male Voice: Right, it wasn't on there, so we added it. Thank you.

[indiscernible; cross talking regarding materials]

Female Voice: Okay, did everyone get a PowerPoint presentation?

Female Voice: No.

Male Voice: No, you didn't get one then. That was the old one. This is the one we went over today.

Female Voice: Did everyone get the one for today, the presentation for today?

Male Voice: Yeah, I think I got one to everybody.

Male Voice: That's it, good.

Female Voice: If there is nothing else, thank you all for coming. There's food, and we're not going to be taking it back with us. So please stay and join us as we finish.

Male Voice: Or grab something on your way out, too, please.

[end of meeting]