

TRANSCRIPT

Community Meeting No. 3

November 3, 2005

7-9 P.M.

INTRODUCTION:

The meeting began promptly at 7 p.m. in the basement club room of Sweet Mango Café on New Hampshire Avenue and was recorded to make a transcript of the proceedings.

REGISTERED ATTENDANCE: 61

PRESENTERS:

Tim Cox, COO, Armed Forces Retirement Home
Desa Sealy Ruffin, President, Gotham Enterprises

[NOTE: Some people in the audience who were asking questions are far from the microphone so that their questions cannot be heard. These were noted as "inaudible".]

TRANSCRIPT begins midway through introduction by Tim Cox:

Tim Cox: For some of you who have attended the other meetings, it's the same script so that part will be boring. About halfway through, Café Mango actually will pass out some food so we don't have to get up, which is nice. They'll just come down the aisles so you can eat from your lap.

Everything's being recorded. For past meetings, we received some transcripts, just yesterday, Read?

Read Scott Martin: Yes.

Cox: [inaudible] So, it's an important point to

remember because part of our asset is the land on which we sit, which we have to look at how that can help us produce income as well.

We've had meetings throughout the last month with several community groups. We have a planning process that's going on with some other community members. We have meetings with the advisory board SHPO, which is the State Historic Preservation Officers. So, all these things are going on simultaneously to be able to take input from several different areas, venues, your comments and feed them into what we're doing. So, I want you to know this is just another part of our process.

Male Voice: . . . On this road to St. Paul is the oldest continuously operating church in the District of Columbia. Abraham Lincoln spent a quarter of his presidency in a cottage on the property and wrote the Emancipation Proclamation (indiscernible) surrounding open space. The great abolitionist, Frederick Douglass, met with (inaudible). What a shame it would be if they saw row after row of town homes, developed tall buildings all behind barbed wire iron fences. Soldiers on land should be treated with no less care than space around Washington's Mt. Vernon and Jefferson's Monticello.

But, we're not here tonight to talk about saving

historic plans for future generations to enjoy. We're here to talk about Metropolis, or what you've now focused group as renewing our neighborhood. We are faced with development on a massive scale, more than 100 acres of development. There would be a six-story building on Rock Creek Church Road. There would be a townhouse development behind iron bars and yes, that is a gated community along Park Place. This is not to mention strip malls, parking lots, a hotel and such other buildings.

The Soldier's Home draft (proposal?) is a developer's dream, not necessarily a neighborhood renewal. This committee meeting means I have the chance to tell the Home what I think. The problem is I still don't know exactly what the details are that you're proposing. Information comes in small and seemingly ever changing snippets. Townhouses one day. Institutional buildings one day. Four-stories, six-stories, eight-stories. It's all over the place.

After months of following this process closely, in fact, I only learned a week ago that the six-story building is being proposed. What else have we not been told? These leaders did put together a community advisory group. This group has met in secret, so I don't know what they've been talking about. Some of our neighborhood organizations were excluded and only recently, after the process was already

half over where a few local folks were added after some of us vocally objected to it. They're still lacking representation for our community.

As far as I can tell, there's no one from D.C. Parks and Recreation, or someone that could advocate for the community's need for green space. Couldn't there be room for just one more person such as that? There's no one in the group as far as I can tell from the group of historians who are restoring Lincoln's cottage. These folks, if they were on the committee, could talk about the importance of preserving historic spaces. Isn't there room for one Lincoln historian on the group? And those are just a few examples of people I think should be included.

Who did get seats at the table? Metropolis Development (indiscernible). So did some of our surrounding institutions who need development space. One person who's worked with the Home on the master plan and who has even helped lead these committee meetings has been with a firm called Gotham Development. She previously oversaw construction of a 210 unit townhouse development. Her husband has been doing the community outreach for the Home on this project.

I hope that none of these people that are involved in helping with the Home decide whether to develop and what to develop, will later be in a position to profit from doing the

development. I don't think that would be fair. And I think on most people's levels, could be a clear conflict of interest.

All I'm asking is that the Home gives the community a fair shake, to have a fair process. The more I learn about this master plan, the more it looks like a one-sided rush to development. The Home wants to speed this plan to the National Capital Planning Commission this February. This simply is not enough time for community participation and a plan of this magnitude. That would be a big mistake.

Let's slow this process down and do the right thing. Please reach out to those of us in the community who are interested about our community. Work with us. Let's do the right thing for the veterans, for the community and for the nation. Thank you.

(Applause)

Tim Cox: Some of the points that you didn't understand from our last meeting, I appreciate your comments, but this is part of the process. There are no secrets and that has been consistent. And please don't yell back at me. I would appreciate it. What we are trying to do is that we can't sit a planning committee of 500 in one room.

What we do is have several meetings. Why you hear suggestions is because we don't have a plan yet because we

want you to tell us what to put in it. Alright? And some of you at the last meeting after we got over process and inclusions, understood that and gave us very good information. So, when we looked back at our nucleus team, we got together and we said, "Gees, you now what. We've heard buffer zones. We've heard some more green space." We need to work with our architects so when we blast that master plan to put out for your comments back to us in something more concrete, based on a sixth building or a four-story building or a town home. Those are examples.

There is nothing that says we're going to put a six-story building at the corner of Rock Creek Church and - what would that be - Upshur. So, this is part of the process to get to a draft master plan, which has concrete information which will be available in mid-December. This is difficult because we're asking you to give us your ideas of what to make it best. And we do need to work with the historical preservation people. They are part of the city planning.

All those meetings can't happen with everybody at the same time, so the process is moving along with several different groups. And that's going to go on the web so you see how all of this is moving together. I appreciate your comments, but I also want you to know that this is not something we're going to jam down your throat. The draft

master plan takes in comments about the open space, about (indiscernible), about height, about some of the earlier meetings that talked about when this area is developed that it mimics the landscape and the cross-sections reached there. Those are concrete examples of what we want and those are coming back to us. When the master plan is presented to all of you in mid-December, you will see all those comments incorporated in a plan.

Alright? So, it's really important that there's no smoke and mirrors, there's no preset determination of what we're doing. We're running these meetings so we can gain the feedback. It's fluid. We get that feedback. We give it to our planning group. We give it to the architects. We then feed it back so you'll see your very comments in that plan that shows you if this is developed, how it will be developed. If this is developed, what are the options there, what are the options of density, height, ground coverage here? Those are all part of the issues of - there was a comment about the landscape and the trees and follow the perimeter of the property of the existing tree allays.

It was talked about looking at, preserving some of the woodlands that are on the site that had become significant. All those are community suggestions. Through this process over the last nine months that we've had, when you see that

master plan, you certainly may not agree with all of it, but you will see all those comments in part of that. I can assure you that.

Alright? So, this is not a done deal. The deal is that we need to develop to get a source of income for us. We can't go to the government. We have the worst deficit that we've had in our lives. The government isn't here to blow us off. We're here to work together, meaning residents, us, the Home administration, the federal government, the city and our neighbors to be able to come up with something that is palatable to all of us.

It's not a win-lose. What it is is we have something to do. The fight isn't the same as it was in Lincoln. Outside the gate isn't the same as Lincoln. No one's talked about a gated community. For all those things you say -- no, no one has talked about a gated community - except for the Home, which the home is a private community. Yes. That's what we talked about.

Female Voice: . . . along Park Road (inaudible)

Moderator: Well, that historic gate can't come down, but we'll talk about that.

Female Voice: . . . more than 50 percent done so you couldn't add people to the thing. So, this dog and pony show about an open process is ridiculous.

Tim Cox: No. This is the open process. That's why we're here tonight. But, again, the fence is historic, so some of the historic area, if you're worried about the gated community, the historic preservationist from the city, from here, has said - excuse me - excuse me - may I finish? May I finish please?

The historic fence you've asked for historic preservation people to be part of it, the fence is declared historic. They want that to remain. That is not something that we said we want to remain. That's taking information from the state historic people, from the national clubs that they want to see that gate there.

Alright? So, when you read the master plan, you'll set that and it is correct. So, I'd appreciate you to believe me. I'm not lying. Alright? You can call Sophie Lynn (phonetic), you can call Dick Moe at the National Trust. You can call Tim Burnay (phonetic). The fence is considered historic to them. Alright?

Male Voice: One question here.

Tim Cox: No, not the whole property. There's a chain link fence on this side, not historic. The fence line here is. Next question.

Male Voice: Yes. My question is is there going to be a mandatory minority development involved in the - I know you

have asked for our (indiscernible), is there going to be a space for minority development firms too to participate in that process?

Tim Cox: We'd like everybody to participate to it. As a federal agency, we look at small business, we look at minority in business. So, yes, that's part of our process. Correct.

Male Voice: How many RFPs have you gotten back so far?

Tim Cox: They're not due until December 7th.

Male Voice: Oh, okay. One last question. What is the acreage of lot three and four?

Cox: Pardon?

Male Voice: What is the acreage of lot three and four?

Moderator: Lot three and four is 77 acres together.

Male Voice: (Inaudible)

Male Voice: I can see the value in the development of this land, but my issue is that there seem to be a lot of people in the community that are concerned about this development and why even go forward with the development? Why not, as a federal agency, ask for an appropriation from Congress? You've mentioned that we're in a deficit and etc., etc.

But quite frankly, we're spending money everywhere. We're spending money abroad in Iraq to rebuild that area.

We're spending billions of dollars in Louisiana and Texas and Mississippi. I'm kind of curious how much it would take to sustain this facility on a yearly basis and why that couldn't be appropriated rather than selling some of this area or leasing it for development.

Tim Cox: Good question. And part of asking for an appropriation. Appropriation is a one-time hit. So, what happens then if you become dependent because you can't say for the next ten years we're going to get this money. So, what happens is planning to be able to say, you know what. It doesn't make sense to have people an eighth of a mile 200 people living here and 400 people living here, 400 living here, who all are friends to have a bus route that has to take them here because it's just so far away. We can't do anything about that here and here if Congress doesn't give us that money, we can't relocate that closer up here so that it's resident friendly. If Congress decides not to give us any money one year, we couldn't afford the bus to go there.

Alright. So, appropriations, as you see, we don't know where the \$200 billion that the President asked for for Katrina, which is now down to \$20 billion, from where it will come. I have staff in Mississippi that are still living in tents because FEMA hasn't delivered trailers for them. So, to me, as a steward as a federal official, I really take

seriously my charge which was to look at how to make this self-sufficient because we have to show government - I'm government - we have to show that the money's not coming from your pocket. You don't want to pay more taxes. What I have to do is figure out how to serve it for ourselves.

Male Voice: I understand what you're saying in terms of self-sufficiency, but once again, as I mentioned, it seems like the community as a whole is kind of concerned about this whole process. And I'm in government too. I would be willing to give up some of my hard earned money to keep this area that way if that's what necessary. Have we even gone down that road of approaching the government to say, "Hey, we need X dollar amount to sustain this. Is that something that can be worked into the budget?" Or was it you need to just figure out how to develop this land and either sell it or lease it so that you can be self-sufficient.

Tim Cox: There is no option to go and ask our government for more money. In '02 Congress said, you have to figure out how to do this yourself and use your asset base to do that. So, we've been told. And we've discussed that with the (indiscernible) and the SASA and the Armed Services Committee and the House Armed Services Committee and they really want to see what we can come up to sustain ourselves.

Before I came, the government was going to probably

close up the place in seven years. It's federal. They could have done anything they wanted to it. They could have sold it to a developer with some of the proceeds. Some of the proposals we've seen in the past, in ten years has been 3,000 town homes on the property. Yet, they had interest because it is one of the largest parcels in D.C. But that wouldn't have been the right thing to do because it has not been just Lincoln's sanctuary.

It's been a federal veterans' home since inception. It's been a retirement home since the inception. And that's what we can't lose face of and sight of. And Congress is making us do the harder things that every agency should try to figure out how to get themselves out of a hole when they have a trust fund, rather than to reach into Uncle Sam for more money. Yes.

Female Voice: Yeah. I just wanted to ask a question. I went on the web site to look at the project schedule and I guess I'm echoing the gentleman that had such an eloquent speech. I stood up. I am concerned you have this master plan coming in in December and your schedule says you'll be developing the team presentations the 14th through the 21st in December. There's only four months, well really five months. In summer of 2006, right after may, you plan to select someone. So, sometime between January 1st and May 30th,

you're saying we're going to have an opportunity to really impact what's going to happen in this design for this master plan?

Cox: Correct.

Female Voice: I find that a very small part of time. I work with the city. I work with master plans. I mean, if we have something very serious in that master plan like traffic analysis. That's my concern. On Rock Creek Church, Irving (phonetic). If you put parking (inaudible) those areas, they can't hold the traffic they take now. No analysis has been done. And I'm really concerned, as an engineer and a planner, there's not enough time.

(Applause)

Moderator: I agree with you.

Female Voice: There's just not enough time. This is your (indiscernible). This is what you planted. If you are going to adhere to this, you are going to force feed us this plan.

Cox: No, we're not. If you look at the draft EIS - again, I appreciate your comments. But if you look at our draft EIS, there are actually ranges of traffic analysis done from (audio stops for 4 seconds) four different alternatives that we propose there. You'll actually see in the draft EIS, there are traffic analyses to show how each one of those

based on each one of those development centers would be impacted in those areas.

Female Voice: (inaudible) long-term planning that they plan to use (inaudible).

Cox: 100 percent. We have not looked at mitigating those things at this point, but we have coordinated with planning, with zoning and with NCPC. So, somewhere communication . . .

Female Voice: I don't think that you set down with them to discuss this plan and have coordinated effort to (inaudible) government agencies (inaudible) that's what you guys do. And then they look at it to see if it can stand it. And there's a conversation, a dialogue. That's how it goes. I do this for my living and I don't see it happening. I don't see the time.

Cox: Well, I appreciate your comment.

Female Voice: . . . and the gentleman back there. We need to slow this down. If you can make the money, but you need to slow it down.

(Applause)

Cox: Appreciate your comment. Yes.

Female Voice: I have two questions. One is has there been consideration to affordable housing in terms of people who are already in the neighborhood? And also, I'm wondering

how this will impact property taxes in the neighborhood. But, I'm more concerned about affordable housing because I don't think what this neighborhood needs is more places that only people from outside the area can afford to live.

Cox: Actually we have close to 1,300 people that live in affordable housing already. So, I don't want you to lose that sight. That is very much affordable housing already. Our residents' average income is \$22,000. They couldn't really afford to live outside of the gates and buy some of the new properties a couple blocks away. One sold for half a million dollars recently. So, yes, we have affordable housing on our site already. And part of our RFQ is looking at again what that residential component will be. So, it is on our radar screen to be able to evaluate. Yes.

Female Voice: (inaudible) property taxes (inaudible).

Cox: I mean, our goal is to improve where we are. Not to diminish. We're a neighbor. We're not moving out to be able to do something that we live off of in Mississippi. So, it affects where our residents go and if our census dies because people don't want to come there, we have a problem with being able to sustain ourselves. So, property value is very important to us. I don't know how it will affect it. Our goal is to affect it positively.

Female Voice: I need to make a comment just about the

affordable housing piece and the fact that you spoke about your retirement home. My grandfather, who is a World War II veteran, is living with me and we live in a house around the section between zone five and six. And basically, with any major changes, affordable housing will mean that we will also have to move out 'cause we won't be able to afford even the property taxes where we are. He is retired, but he is being taken care of by family.

So, the fact of the matter are, talking about the residents there, you're missing the residents that are on these zones that will not be able to afford the property taxes that raise when the changes take place. So, I think realistically that's something that you really need to think about as you talk about this in terms of this development. And even in terms of where some of these properties will end up being because they will impact the people who are living there and the values of the homes that they have there.

Cox: Yes. I think this gentleman (inaudible).

Male Voice: You know, I want to say thank you to you for putting the house in order financially within the organization. It sounds like you've done a good job with that. The piece that I don't understand is if you have an existing trust, which you have limited access to admittedly, and if you have put kind of the financial house in order so

your expenses are not exceeding your revenue, I don't understand why 77 acres of development, which is zone three and four, would not be plenty. In the District of Columbia, that's a lot of money worth of development. So, I don't understand why so much of the property needs to be developed.

Cox: Again, it's a master plan. I appreciate your comments. It's a master plan so what we want to say is the development is 16-17-20 years. Okay. But we want to make sure is if in our master plan you want to say, you know what, we really don't mind if this is eight million square feet here instead of eight million square feet all over.

Okay. So, what I'm saying is we need to look at what that income stream is because our income stream fluctuates. Yes, we have our house in order, but that's because we were able to get 55 million in revenue because fines and forfeitures are so high. The moment we get out of war, if I look through our past history, that goes down to 22 percent. That is actually less than the 57 we spent. So, that's when they get into the interest and the principle spending that.

So, if we see that you would prefer, you know what, instead of having a five acre green buffer all along this built to standard setbacks and we can make this make money for us because one, the diversification and two, the income potential from it, that is something to talk about. But, we

can't say, gees - 'cause there are some in the city that say we don't want buildings that are more than eight stories here. You know, there's 170 foot drop.

So, you wouldn't see a ten-story building from Lincoln's cottage. You wouldn't see a ten-story building from this area over here. You'll see it from coming up north Michigan. You'll see it from Irving. You'll see it from North Capitol. But because of the slope, the trees and the hills here, that would be protected. But the less dense we get here because of feedback we're hearing, the more it becomes a necessity to make sure we plan for other areas to supplement that income.

So, it's a give and take. What we've tried to do is say, okay, this can be the larger parcel. Forget this is - six acres and 16 acres or something like that. This is clearly the largest bulk. But, part of what we've heard from when we went to MCPC with the plan over a year ago to say okay, we're looking at this. They said, well you know, embassies need a place to go, the State Department. We don't want that to be over here and that's institutional. We want you to put that here. That's why that's institutional for us, residential. State Department now doesn't have an interest to move here.

So, when you look at that draft master plan and we're able to see what are those uses here, what are those values

that when the market tells us what it can bear here, what will make sense for us in that income possibly could stop there. That's why, truthfully we stopped here. This is where we see the biggest bang for our buck. But, it's sciatic. It's not staying, it has to, but if we don't plan out somebody will come in in ten years when some of us aren't here and say, "Gees, we want to relocate the golf course now and just have a par four, par three holes. Put it up here and now we want to develop this whole section too."

What we want to say is this is part of the National Planning Commission's design. This is what we are proposing. Is it the end product? No. It really is based on the density that we see here. (indiscernible).

Female Voice: I have a couple of comments here regarding that. On Saturday when I was driving over to Catholic U, which I often do, I was driving by and the traffic triangle, the low section side, there are a bunch of our middle school kids really happy tossing a football, in the traffic triangle with cars speeding around the traffic triangle.

When the system was (indiscernible) and the city was planned, Soldier's Home was open to the public and parkland was not developed in this area of the city and if you look east of Rock Creek Park, there is no federal and there is

very little city park. And it wasn't put in place because this land was explicitly viewed as being part of the parkland system in the city.

Well, today it's closed and today we have kids in our neighborhoods playing on traffic triangles. When you're talking about zones three and four, when I look at the plan that you're currently putting out, you're talking about pretty dense ten-story buildings on a lot of that property. It's very dense. The city planning office calls it density comparable to what is downtown. Why couldn't we, if we're going to have that and we're going to have the traffic and we're going to have the noise, and we're going to have the pollution and the heat and everything that goes with that, why can't we have this western strip as parks. Because that would be a huge mitigation for that density.

(Applause)

Cox: And it's some of the suggestion with the city that we need to talk about because we have to talk about who funds that park, who cleans it, who patrols it, will there be a special assessment on the Rock Creek Church Park area. On our side and on your side to pay for that. Those are some of the questions that we have to discuss in mitigation because the federal government can't pay for it. We can't pay for that park from our . . .

Female Voice: At the last Historic Preservation Committee meeting, the National Park Service indicated that they have a strong interest in the preservation of that area and in maintaining that when it's transferred. So, I think that there is room here for discussion. It'll also save you some money if you don't have to maintain that land because it can be transferred to someone who can maintain it as a park.

Cox: Thank you. Yes. Joe. I'm sorry. You've been waiting. I'm sorry.

Male Voice: Well, I'd like to first say I thank you all for coming out here and talking to us 'cause unfortunately I wasn't able to make it to the other meetings. And that the fact that you have to go through this process to fund this facility is pretty shameful to this country that we have to do this.

(Applause)

To just take care of our soldiers who took care of us when we needed them. So, that being said, I'm a real estate professional and I put a lot of rumors about what's going where and who's doing what and there is this going in and that going in, embassies and what not. And I'm wondering if, and also retail, have you had any concrete ideas on what's going to be in these facilities? Do we have specific companies, specific facilities that are buying at this point

to come in and take over this phase?

Cox: No, not at this point. That's why we have the RFQ out, which is due December 7th. Some will see the types of suggestions of from retailers to institutions, to educational, to residential that want to participate.

Male Voice: The developments of zones six and five, the medians in between, are those going to be open to the public as you were saying earlier on park space? Is that going to be accessible to the public? Just the entire area or is it going to still be cordoned off?

Cox: Currently these are activity ponds for our residents. It's a fishing pond for the residents. So, it's the wish of the Home, of us and the residents that this be retained as part of our facility. So, it would be open space that people could see, but not necessarily gain access to.

Male Voice: (inaudible)

Male Voice: Well, that's 'cause I've heard a lot of people complaining about open space, open space, and I agree with that, but you know what? If you can't use it, it doesn't seem very open to me.

So, I mean, I respect that this is going to have to be done in one form or another to maintain the old Soldier's Home, but what I'd like to be able to see that if this is going to happen that there are park spaces and that kind of

access to the community still available. Or it becomes available because it is not available now.

Cox: Yes, some of it like we talked with Rosalyn from DCOP yesterday, some of those like if you live towards Howard University and you see McMillan Reservoir. Can't use McMillan Reservoir, but it's pleasing 'cause it's not developed. You see it as open space even though you can't get to it. It keeps the value of those properties higher because it's a water view that you can't use for recreation 'cause it's a reservoir. But it's still there. Similar idea.

There again, looking at what the residents do, looking at liability issues, if people start using the ponds to fish in and somebody drowns there, the first thing they're going to do is sue the federal government. We have to make sure that we balance those.

Is it a good thing to have open? Is it not a good thing to have open. Where are the residents that use these ponds for fishing because we've got them and I tell you, they're used pretty regularly. What happens to them when there's a bunch of kids down there that intimidate the older residents because they had a stroke and can't speak that well to tell them, you know what, you're making me nervous 'cause you're standing too close. I don't want you to fall in. Those are

some of the real life issues that we want to deal with, which are true.

Again, a retirement home and that's part of their activity, just like the golf course. It's not going to become all public. It's like that woman over there said, where can we put open space without infringing on the rights of the residents who live there. Just like you have rights. They have rights too. We want to make sure there's a balance. (inaudible) balance.

Male Voice: No, I agree. I was wondering. The other question I had for you real quick is the development of the old water filtration plant on Mass and North Capitol, are you coordinating with that at all with the city because that's already been approved from my understanding. Is that being taken into account?

Cox: That's why we had someone at our planning meeting. No matter what meeting we have, someone from planning is there. We keep zoning up to date so they know what we're planning, as well as what's going on (inaudible) coordination. Thank you.

Male Voice: How much money do you need?

Cox: The money is not a set amount because again when you look at right now, we have 45 percent of our revenue coming from fines and forfeitures, if and when fines and

forfeitures go down, I have to make that up. If it goes down...

Male Voice: If you're doing this to sustain the home operation, how will you know then what your goal is?

Cox: Our goal is looking at what we want to do to be able to sustain in very lean times when we have a capital improvement. Right now we're looking at what buildings need to be thoroughly renovated. I told you Sheraton costs close to \$20 million to redo the piping in that building. Right now that money comes out of the trust fund.

So, I can't say, gees, we need X million for this year because what we need is we might need that for seven years because we have a pot then that we need tens of millions in year ten to spend on one of those buildings.

Male Voice: That's fine. You've answered my question. You mentioned this was being recorded. I just wanted to be clear on the record that the COO of the Soldier's Home has no idea how much money he needs from this process that is designed to raise money. Thank you.

(Applause)

Cox: So, I mean, this is sad. That was rude. That was rude. That was rude. That was rude and inappropriate. Now you're getting really aggressive, which is not appropriate. So, if we can still run civilly, I'm happy to stay as long as

we want, but when it becomes attacking, that's not courteous, it's not polite. I'm going to somebody else. Thank you very much. No.

Voice: (Inaudible)

Cox: It was. It was a slur. And what we're trying to do is make a process work. You're not really helping by making a titillating statement like that. What you're saying is you want a figure. I'm not going to quote a figure today because that figure isn't static. Alright. The process is what we talked about. If we can look at this density and look at what it can bring to help us sustain and grow our operation. That is not a number that we're going to say today is this, next week is this and the following week is that.

We want to look at okay, in relation to what our capital programs are, but we haven't really developed that yet because we're doing that as part of the master plan with getting appraisals of properties, looking at what needs to be replaced, how to fund depreciation. Those are part of this master plan process to make it all work. So, the question will eventually be answered. It's premature at this point because we need to develop this as we go forward.

Female Voice: I'm looking at this plan that's submitted on the back. How did you all come up with these names back

here? Tell me how'd y'all come up with some of these names. That's all I want to ask.

Cox: We've talked about that at the other meetings.

Female Voice: Yeah, but this is another meeting. So, I want to ask. I'm not being ugly or nothing. I'd appreciate it if you could tell me.

Cox: That's fine. Let's go through our process one more time.

Female Voice: Yeah, I got to hear that. How all these folks come into being on this thing here, man. I ain't being ugly. Come on baby.

Desa Sealy Ruffin: We talked to a process to the people from the community in the neighborhood surrounding from government, from development, from the Armed Forces Retirement Home, and from the neighborhood (inaudible) that surrounds the area.

Female Voice: Did you ask anybody about some of the name or you all just went on and picked them yourself? I just want to know.

Ruffin: We talked to (inaudible) members from the surrounding area.

Female Voice: Yeah, that one right there. He's the head of all four C.

Male Voice: (Inaudible)

Female Voice: Yeah. And it's not fair.

Male Voice: (Inaudible)

Female Voice: Wait a minute. I'm talking. Now don't go off ugly. I'm talking. Be cool. We're together. Go on and tell me 'cause you ain't - come on.

Ruffin: We talked to single members (inaudible).

Female Voice: But you said it didn't so.

Cox: Again, we want to focus on we're here with you tonight and we've had some really good comments. Alright. So, I don't really want to waste this time to talk about our process.

Female Voice: I just want to say can you put some more on here because we need two or three more competent, like the chairman of four C, he's with all of them. Why can't you put him on there?

(Applause)

Male Voice: (Inaudible)

Female Voice: We didn't say he was. Wait a minute. I didn't say that, but I'm saying . . .

Cox: You have an avenue though with people that are represented for you to work with. You have me here to work with you to give us comments. This is all part of the - no one will ever be satisfied with who was chosen.

Male Voice: (Inaudible)

Cox: And you've been here at every meeting to be able to help us and I really appreciate that.

Female Voice: Yeah, he does. So, I feel like we should put him on there. Come on now here.

Cox: Next question.

Female Voice: Okay. I'm not trying to be ugly.

Male Voice: (Inaudible)

Cox: No, it's not - well, right. But it's not an excuse, it's what the state historic preservation officers have requested. It's what the . . .

Female Voice: (Inaudible).

Cox: And you need to go back to the SHPO to ask that because some of their comments are they want the fence retained. Okay. The historic preservation people want the fence retained. Okay. Those are part of the comments that come through. Yes. Thanks for your patience.

Voice: (Inaudible)

Cox: I can repeat the question.

Voice: (Inaudible)

Moderator: Are the residents and businesses going to be required to pay city taxes? Depending on what - business taxes are paid . . .

Voice: (Inaudible)

Cox: Well, (inaudible) there would be surcharges for

that, whether it's condo association fee or something like that, it would be real estate taxes that are at issue there. But service fees would be saved like you do in a co-op but community organization development would have a service charge affixed to that. There wouldn't be a drain on the city. That's again part of the MCPC planning process due to come up with those costs. So, it's not born by the people of Round Lake (phonetic) Community. Yes.

Male Voice: Can you talk a little bit about the densities in zone three and four and the development because 77 acres is a lot of development. That is a neighborhood unto itself. And I think the environmental impact statements says something like four million to seven million square feet, which is thousands of units, hundreds of thousands of square feet of retail and let's just assume that that can be done well.

How does that relate to and in your RFQ, how does that market force relate to the development of the Georgia (inaudible) corridor. And in your discussions with OP, what are those discussions about the potential competition or the relation between that level of development there and the viability of the redevelopment of the Georgia Avenue corridor.

Cox: Good question. What we looked at for the site

here was, I think the low was four something, the high was almost nine. Here we're waiting for that RFQ to come back because this could support a nine phase (inaudible) ground coverage.

So, what we're trying to figure out is okay, what type of uses first because some of the discussion has been with these. It's nice to have office or retail above eye level - office or institutions above eye level and then put the retail on eye level because then people come in, they see more of a retail feel. (Inaudible) is better. Not with parking garage under it. This is the parking garage entrances around the back. Those are some of the ideas from planning and zoning and some of the other meetings that we've had that have come up about that. So, we're not sure yet how dense we want it.

One of the meetings yesterday with planning and zoning and the state historic preservation officer was could we concentrate on a feel of having a few high, mostly low so it actually is more attractive and not all four-story or six-story or eight-story. And how dense could you get it with a few buildings up so you could have some other open space that's available to the public. One of the questions they ask.

So, that's what our planners are going back say okay, so

in the master plan we want to try to give an alternative based on the RFQ that comes back, but there probably would be okay, in order not to do these areas, C needs to be followed. Yet if we do these areas, A needs to be followed. Because planning and zoning are at the meetings, they're looking carefully, but they want to see who responds to us too before they say exactly what needs to be here.

We prefer to have it open ended like this right now to say okay, it can be a mix because they don't want to say okay, just retail or just residential because of that Georgia Avenue corridor. They want to see what developers are developing over there and maybe interested here, what they say the market will bear. But those specific ideas will be in that draft master plan in the middle of December. Yes.

Female Voice: We care very, very much about what happens to this property and I just wanted to ask if you would make it really, really, really clear so that when I leave I know exactly what it is that we're going to have the opportunity to do that. Because we attended a meeting in June that was like five months ago and honestly when I saw this, I was shocked. It's like nothing's changed. And so maybe you can talk a little bit about if something has changed from five months ago, what it is and when we're going to have the opportunity if what we see when you finish this

process and when you incorporate all our feedback, when will be have the opportunity and how much time will we have to comment.

And then the other thing I was going to ask is just physically about parcel six (inaudible) institutional, could you talk a little bit more about what that means specifically?

Cox: Yes.

Female Voice: Thank you.

Cox: Thank you. All of the comments that have come and why the presentation hasn't changed is because we want your comments back. So, if we show something different each time in development, we can't get consistent comments. It doesn't mean that your comments aren't being incorporated into our planning process. So, when you see that draft master plan from June to now, which includes comments on the draft ERF, all those comments will be addressed in that draft master plan.

So, you'll be able to see, gee, people didn't like an institutional use here so we've not gone after embassies mainly because Department of State didn't want that. So, maybe there is a back off of more residential here rather than institutional based on comments in the master plan as a suggestion. Institutional here was, for instance, besides

embassies, the - why can't I think of their name - Special Olympics was interested in having their world headquarters somewhere on the site.

They talked about that with past administration here. They always talked about having it located here with zoning and planning because they wanted to look over the golf course. So, that stuck in mind planning, zoning. And we said, well gee, we could have some type of office here, but keep all this residential because this will all be tucked into by (indiscernible) drive by the golf course. That really hasn't flourished with any meeting we've gone to. So, people are basically saying okay, it could be residential.

Female Voice: (Inaudible)

Cox: Alright. In mid-December that draft master plan will be out on the web. We'll set up meetings again to be able to go through it once you're able to read it to be able to talk about what you see being developed. Height, density, ground coverage, open space. Tot lots have been suggested.

Female Voice: (Inaudible)

Cox: Yes, correct.

Female Voice: (Inaudible)

Moderator: We're trying to go to NCPC in February. NCPC is a public process. They may take that and say you know what, we'd like you to come back in two more months.

So, we're not expecting it to be done in February. You're welcome. Yes.

Female Voice: Yes, sir. I've lived in this area for over 40 years and I have two sons, with the folks outside of the fence, which are all elderly folks. What is the price range of your homes inside the gate? I want to know if they're going to get taxed out pretty much. And the kids in the area sound like they're not going to be able to come in the gate.

Cox: Inside the gate. We don't know what homes will be developed or what price . . .

Female Voice: You don't have no price range whatsoever?

Moderator: No. Because we took that . . .

Female Voice: \$200,000?

Cox: No.

Female Voice: \$800,000?

Cox: We put a request out there for developers to give us that information. That's due December 7th.

Female Voice: So you couldn't tell me 800 or 200?

Cox: No.

Female Voice: Because I want to know. The seniors on my block are they going to be able to keep their homes 'cause they've been there quite some time. And if the kids that live in that area - 'cause it is the elementary school one

block up - are they going to be allowed inside the fence. Because if they not, they're going to get in there somehow someway and enjoy themselves too. So, you need to consider that 'cause these folks have been around here for a very long time and do not want to see this happen.

Cox: Thank you.

Male Voice: Good evening. My name is Steven Baldwin. I'm a recent resident of Petworth and I know you said you don't really want to speak to the process, but I do have a process question. It appears that a lot of the members of the community are concerned that some of your committee members, either because of current business relationships or past business relationships may have a conflict of interest being on your committee.

And I guess one way you could assist us in getting over that apprehension is, is it going to be made public the names of the developers who have responded to your RFQ. And also if you could speak to the criteria that these developers will be evaluated on before being formally invited to the RFP, would be helpful.

Cox: You know, based on our process, based on what we show to NCPC certainly we're not going to publish every piece of information that comes into our agency. But we're going to publish the information to allow people to be able to

react to what we're doing. So, I don't want to say every developer comes in because some of the developers won't be chosen because they don't have bond capacity, they don't have the capability to - there may be somebody who wants to do this all residential. We don't want it all residential because we talked about the diversification that we need for income potential here.

So, we'll throw a lot of developers out based on their response even before they get to the RFP, but my hope between RFQ and RFP is looking at the people who are eligible. Those will be people through NCPC that we actually say these are the plans we like from these groups. What do you think about and then that becomes public.

Male Voice: So you will make available the names that are selected to be part of the RFP?

Cox: Yes. Yes. Not all the developers who apply, but who go from RFQ to RFP.

Male Voice: And the criteria that they will be evaluated on before a selected contract.

Cox: Correct. Yes, sir.

Male Voice: Thank you. I would just like to make certain that I'm clear and that everyone else is clear. My understanding that what you're attempting to do by December is to develop a draft master plan.

Cox: That's correct.

Male Voice: At the same time, you are requesting responses from developers with respect to the ability and the appropriateness of what they might propose to develop with regard to three and four I believe. Okay. In other words, that the process, there is little that is cast in stone at this point and that the contingencies of money be it what somebody is prepared to do under what terms or what you're prepared to accept in terms of remuneration for the development rights, is still all uncertain and will be uncertain for some time like this.

Cox: I think it's uncertain today. You are exactly correct how you described the draft master plan coming out is a draft. We could see December 9th after the deadline is the 7th to give us our proposal that we have three people responding. Highly unlikely. But, and the three plans don't make economic or compatibility sense to us. So, we could start all over.

So, I don't anticipate that because of where we're located, the interest we've seen for the tours that are being given now and the range of teams that are coming through. Because they're mixed. There's some retailers with housing. There's some institutional look. There's college look. There are many different groups evaluating it.

When we see what they give, then we're able to - in-depth draft master plan - actually give some definition because we have developers' response that says, you know what, X amount of square foot should be small retail, X amount of square feet should be residential on what they propose. We then take that to all of you and say, you know what, we don't really think the retail's going to fly there. MCPC says something different. Planning says we'd like to use this. Then that comes back to you all to be a final master plan that we present to MCPC again that is also public that you could come to.

Male Voice: In light of that, could I perhaps make this comment and recommend that you consider the prospect of scoping down the immediate master plan or the immediate plan such as to be able to be on a better playing field to evaluate the potential, right, for what is likely to be the biggest - as you say the biggest bang for the dollar. Okay. So as to permit some greater, broader community involvement with respect to those things that are more immediately or more likely to impact the immediate residential area. Okay. Five, six, the northern part of one and two. Okay.

Cox: And one and two would be developed for our purposes so you won't see a significant change here. This isn't going out to developers. This is to be used by the

Home. So, that's by the Home.

Male Voice: Oh, okay. Alright.

Cox: That's really here and potentially here. It's really three, four, five and six. It's just divided that way so you understand this is (inaudible).

Male Voice: What happens when one and two is all dependent upon essentially what you believe you're going to be able to recognize in terms of development value. Am I correct?

Cox: Uh huh. That along with the national trust. We do have to worry about parking for the visitors that come in here. So, part of that we're trying to say okay, that's right in our thick of things here. We want to make sure that parking isn't all surface parking, which none of us would like from neighbor to inside.

So, some of it might be, geez, we need a parking garage that's two stories under and two stories above by 2008 as this develops. So, I just don't want you to say nothing would go here in that time.

Male Voice: Well, you see, that's part of my concern also. Alright. And something that I would hope my recommendation or my suggestion might make us better able to feel comfortable. Alright. That you go ahead, right, and try to get a real sense of what can be accomplished vis a vis

reinforced. At the same time, see if there's a possibility of a broader community involvement with regards to five and six and one and two from the standpoint that what happens next is dependent upon the bottom line is what.

Okay. I think that what you do is lessen the uncertainty and hold the potential to have more proponents as opposed to people feeling threatened by what you're talking about here. Alright. I think also what you learn in terms of three and four exploiting the development potential of three and four gives you a better sense of what realistically might be achieved or realized with regard to the (inaudible) park.

I, myself, am extremely concerned because my understanding of master planning and all the rest of it, the federal government has used master planning with regard to urban renewal areas and all the rest of it. It is not unlikely or uncommon for those master plans to be amended hundreds of time, hundreds of time. As the financial fiscal realities come to bear. You can have all the plays you want, but if somebody comes to the table and says, I've got to have this, this, this and this in order to make this feasible for me to develop it, that master plan's going to be changed. That's reality.

So, the thing that concerns me and causes me the

greatest bit of concern is that really, we have nothing to evaluate because there's nothing that is certain yet. Okay. And to the extent that you can lessen that uncertainty and also give people a greater security with regards to the potential for the community involvement - and I'm not saying necessarily have these people sitting on committees, but be able to share information on a more definite basis, I think you'll have the greater prospect of success with regard to the overall project. Speed while it has its benefits, particularly when you're in a situation where fiscal realities are coming to bear can appear to be a wondrous thing, but I find that frequently it leads to greater difficulties.

As a young man, I used to think that everything was best when it was fast. It has taken me years, (inaudible) come. I now recognize the (inaudible) of that.

Cox: Thank you. Appreciate it.

Female Voice: Hi.

Cox: Hi.

Female Voice: Okay. Now I have two questions 'cause I want to build on what he was just saying. I think if I'm interpreting that right what you were saying is concentrate on three and four right now and leave five and six to be a little bit more involvement of the community and why does it

have to be on the master plan right now. Why do we have to rush to five and six already. That's kind of my point of view. I think ...

Cox: What we want to try to do is we're not saying we're developing that. We put out an RFQ. What we want to try to say is these are the possibilities. So, we want to get that on the record so we don't have - I mean, we don't want an FBI here.

But I can tell you one of the first weeks when I was here three years ago, the FBI wanted to get out of the Edgar Hoover building because they wanted to be like the CIA that had a huge buffer to protect them. They wanted to come and plop right here in the center of our property. Except for our tenacity to say, you know what, FBI and a retirement home really doesn't mix. The use of that property takes away their enjoyment of their home. There was reasonableness there thank goodness.

But, what we don't want is another federal agency to see, oh, they haven't touched this part so that's up for grabs. When you look at a map as other federal agents do, as the city does every day, they see this big part sticking out. We want to make sure that through our discussions we have some written documentation that it was thought out of what could go there so we avoid saying, you know what, we need to

put 20 ten-story buildings to house the neighbor yard because the neighbor yard is going to be more developed for the waterfront.

We don't want them to be able to do that 'cause as a government, they could just flip and tell us, you know what, you're going to lose 40 acres to that. That's what we're trying to balance is show a potential use, not necessarily that it will be the end use.

Female Voice: Okay. Are you going to put that in your master plan?

Cox: Yes.

Female Voice: You're going to actually put that in writing that says we're concentrating on three and four and we're going to get more input about five and six or?

Cox: You will see in our draft master plan because we haven't asked for any information here. We've only asked for information here. That this is what we're trying to concentrate on based on your feedback. It's not to say we're not going to consider development here. That is important. We're not there yet.

Female Voice: I understand what you're saying. My other question, which was the original question that I was going to ask. I'm sorry. Have you already considered how you're going to get people in and out of number six? Because

(inaudible) how are people going to get in - have you considered that yet?

Cox: Yes. And part of what we've talked with and which you'll see in the draft master plan is they'll cut here and they're opening here. So it flows into it here and then out here.

Female Voice: There one ways?

Cox: It could be here, as well as here too. I'm sorry. Not there. Where's? Right here. Right here. I'm sorry. Irving Street. That's Irving Street.

Female Voice: Okay. So, okay, so there's a gate there on Park, but you said that was historic and you're going to cut through it?

Cox: Some of it's historic and haven't been able to finish much of those comments about the gate. Right. The historic preservationists want the gate to stay. It doesn't mean that they won't be cuts or where these street gates come in there's a big opening to make it available so it gives the appearance of a gate, but that it would be cut open. That's some of the mitigating circumstances I want to talk about to make it so people don't have to go all the way up here to get in. Yes.

Male Voice: (Inaudible)

Cox: Right. There is a gate, an open gate here, yeah.

Female Voice: Okay. That was my question actually. Is there something that's already existing . . .

Cox: There's one already there. There's a gatehouse right here and there was an opening. Not open now.

Female Voice: Thank you.

Cox: You're welcome. Yes.

Female Voice: I just want to follow-up on that specific thing about three and four and then six and five. My concern on this is that if we move to a point where we're doing three and four. And five and six, well, we're just going to worry about that later. If we then are agreeing to dense development on three and four thinking we're going to get park space and you're saying, well, we'll lose that four, four or five years from now when people have forgotten that that's what had been agreed to and that's what we were supposed to get in return for three and four, I am concerned that we may be giving up something real if we don't do this in a coordinated way.

Cox: That's the point I was trying to bring up is that we want to be able to have a plan that addresses these. It may not be what exactly goes there, but it can be looked at as development potential by where does the public space come in as well. Right. 'Cause if we drop it off we could all not be here in five years and then someone says well, you

didn't address it.

Female Voice: (Inaudible)

Cox: That's correct. That's right. That's correct.
20 years is actually what we're doing.

Female Voice: (Inaudible)

Cox: Yeah. That's right. That's why I said we're not addressing that initially because we want to look at what this role holds, but in the draft master plan you're going to see these areas identified. And that's where we have to continue the discussion. Yes, sir.

Tom Rooney: My name is Tom Rooney. Came down here in 1951 as a student. At that time, the old Soldier's Home, well I still call it that, Soldier's Home went all the way down to Michigan Avenue.

My understanding for that part of it went down around the reservoir. So, this looks like more than a nibble taking away from what the old Soldier's Home used to be. I went through the whole EIS statements that were put out earlier and the proposals and every proposals, the three proposals all had massive tens of thousands of traffic (indiscernible) a day after this is built. That doesn't take into account the fact that the NCRC is about to get control of McMillan Reservoir, the 25 acres of McMillan. And Mr. (inaudible) the developer, is breaking ground in '06 at the corner of Irving

and Michigan to build his hotel, convention center and restaurant, which will compete with your stuff up here.

My question is, given all the increase in this traffic, which is now rate E at North Capitol and Michigan and admitted in the EIS at both First (phonetic) Street, North Capitol and Harrywood (phonetic) on Michigan will be rated F as failure as far as it goes, how then are we going to meet EPA requirements - it was an EIS statement.

Cox: Right. Because in the EIS we want to show what the impact will be.

Tom Rooney: So, how in the world can we meet environmental requirements or air quality?

Cox: Part of what we do when the developers respond to that is that traffic plan to say are they going to shuttle people from a metro, where is the bus being used. That comes as part of our process to MCPC and how do they do that plan now to show how we mitigate those so we don't have a C&S.

Tom Rooney: Some of us were involved in this McMillan bit and trying to save McMillan Park as a park and the usual arguments in the (indiscernible) planning was the developer would mitigate the traffic. Well, there's no way that you can mitigate the traffic that's being proposed here. There's no way and you have to admit it.

Cox: I just have a real quick question four five and

six, and I guess zone four because if it is turned into a residential area. Will they have access to like the pond and the golf course and that kind of stuff? Just because I can only envision that they are getting some kind of benefit from living on that side of the fence. It would be kind of awkward, just to me, I don't know if it's any other residents, that if they got access to that area and that land and there have been people here 20 years and they don't have access to it.

Cox: Right. It's like you live against the Army/Navy club, like a colleague of mine does in Pentagon City. She can't use that unless she was a member, but she can see it. It would be the same here that this is really for the private use of the residents who live here and who it's their activity. Right. Because this is part of the Armed Forces, the residents of the Armed Forces Retirement Home, not the residents of any homes that would be here.

Female Voice: (Inaudible).

Cox: In the draft master plan, you'll actually see some scenarios.

Female Voice: That's my front door. So, I look right across the street at the pond and I don't see where it's beneficial to me. I think it would be detrimental to me, actually.

Cox: Okay. Thank you.

Male Voice: Thank you. I have a couple quick questions and then a quick comment. One question is what plans do you have in place now or what thought have you given to rezoning the property?

Cox: We're not rezoning it because it's leased and it's federal property. So, as a federal property we don't look at rezoning for that use. It goes to MCPC as a National Capitol Planning Region to be able to tell us that these uses are acceptable. They're actually not going to be zoned.

Male Voice: Okay. But that would be under a (indiscernible) scenario. If you sold property . . .

Cox: It'd have to be zoned. That's correct.

Male Voice: There'd have to be zoning.

Cox: Just like with Catholic University. When it was sold they went to zoning to be able to get it zoned like the original zoning across the way.

Male Voice: Okay. Next question is really two parts. How long is the record going to be open? And two, if we want to provide additional written comments, who do we address them to?

Cox: You can address them to me at the Armed Forces Retirement Home and our address is right on the web site, 3700 North Capitol Street. The record will be open until the

MCPC approves the final plan. So you have an ability to comment through (indiscernible) Preservation, 106 Section, or our master plan until that record of decision is recorded.

Male Voice: Okay. And then a couple of quick comments. There have been a couple people that talked about McMillan and open space and park land. I think there's a couple things that maybe a lot of people are aware of that I think need to be reiterated and put on the record.

The map you have is really interesting because if you take a look at it, the 106 acres of McMillan Reservoir, including the sand filtration site, plus an additional parcel of land that at one point was sold to Howard University, including all of Washington Hospital Center and the 272 acres that you currently own now and hold on to, including the 49 acres that was recently sold to Catholic University and the spaces in between, including Irving Street and the interchanges there, was designed as open space and they were public reservations.

You talked earlier about you can look into McMillan Reservoir. And that's true. Until 1942 I believe you could actually get on to the property. It was open. It was park land. The reservoir itself was a boating lake and people used that for recreation space. Now, you can probably tell me more than I can tell you, but I believe at one time the

Armed Forces Retirement Home was actually open to the public as well and it was thought of as public reservation.

What we see, with the closing of McMillan Reservoir, the potential sale of land to NCIC for economic development, the development of the entire Washington Hospital Center complex and North Capitol Street and Irving Street and the interchange, and now the development on the Armed Forces Retirement Home is a piece meal taking of public land.

Now, I realize some of that may be necessary for your resolution. I'm not qualified to comment on any of that, but getting back to the issue of park land and open space. While there is some open space left in this part of town, there is very little open, accessible park land for the residents. And I would hope in terms of developing this, that that is a major component of the master plan. And, if for nothing else, if you're proposing residential development on parcels of land that you own, I would think those people - you're essentially adding or exacerbating the problem by that kind of development.

(Applause)

Cox: Thank you. Yes.

Female Voice: I have a couple questions. One is I know we talked about zones three and four being more commercial and five and six being sort of residential, but you mentioned

a couple times about condo association fees which suggests sales and not lease. And I just would like to ask a question about that and that if, per se, condos would be in the sections of five and six and this is theoretical 'cause you don't know that yet, that those condos would be on the other side of the fence, which then would give the perception of gated even though the fence will be cut in certain sections. So, that's my first question.

Cox: The example for condos was just that there's a fee charge for utilities. So, when this is developed, the developer will have fees associated with water hook-up, with sewage, with fire. So in the example was just paralleling it. Not to say that there will or won't be condos. Condos can be developed on lease properties because when a lease is more than 50 years, you can actually purchase part of that lease to build a home on. It's a little more difficult to do through a developer, but still could be done. So, there could be ownership potential of a lease to be able to have a condo on that property, rather than just all rental homes.

Female Voice: Is that 50 years or three years?

Cox: It can't be three years 'cause the lease wouldn't hold to be able to develop it for that. You couldn't get financing for that.

Female Voice: Okay. So, the leasing fees will

basically pay into the water and sewage, which is the other question.

Cox: All of the areas here will have water and sewer charges.

Female Voice: Okay. And the five and six?

Cox: Yes.

Female Voice: Okay. And then my other question was just about - I'm sorry to go back to this, but the question has to do with the committee again. There are three people that are in A&C 1A, 5C and 4C. I just wanted to be clear. Are these residents or A&C commissioners?

Male Voice: (Inaudible)

Female Voice: Planning committee members.

Male Voice: (Inaudible)

Female Voice: These are residents of the surrounding communities.

Female Voice: They're all residents? All these people are residents?

Female Voice: Not of the home. They're residents of the surrounding community.

Male Voice: (Inaudible)

Female Voice: He's a commissioner - they're commissioners that reside in the . . .

Female Voice: They are commissioners. I just need

clarity on that. These are all people who are in some kind of government positions.

Female Voice: They're advisory neighborhood commission.

Female Voice: Okay. I would just like to recommend that there would be - this is where the conflict of interest issue was sort of brought up and that I understand the need to have A&C commissioners as a part of this, but it would really be helpful if there were people who actually just had no other interest but live their or own there and would be more inclined to give some real feedback about what's going on. I think that's the part of looking at this committee that makes people feel uncomfortable.

Male Voice: (Inaudible)

Female Voice: Well, I'm saying that because I think that what you see out of the frustration that people have is that when you look at this, this for us does not represent any interest of people who live here and would live through this development.

Male Voice: (Inaudible)

Female Voice: Those were those three people out of 17, right? Okay. I'm sorry, but commissioners have their own political situations that they have to deal with. So, I'm saying that to say people who tend to be elderly senior citizens who live here, who own here - I would say that would

be my recommendation. Okay. And one more thing. The zoning five and six. Even if residential doesn't go up there -

I'm sorry - if buildings go up there, I guess the question that the young lady brought up over there was about you can see the pond, but if the buildings go up, you can't. And my question is, is that if something goes up along these lines like you have here, does that mean that all of that park space that could be seen from Park Place, all the way around is going to be gone?

Cox: Doesn't. You see this opening here. This means developable area, but it doesn't mean we're going to have solid concrete from here to here. Alright? I mean, if it's homes like that are across the way, you can see yards. You have a view scape. Those are important to look at. It doesn't mean we're going to have a six-story building from here that goes all the way through and swings to here. Yes.

Female Voice: (Inaudible) the plans that we saw at the Section 106 meeting on Wednesday, in section five call for six-story buildings along Park Place, as well as Irving.

Cox: Okay. I thought the six-story was here and it was more the 40 foot four-story buildings along this way, if I'm not mistaken.

Female Voice: I think that that was not settled.

Cox: And that's part of the draft master plan getting

these comments back saying that I heard from the meeting, which gives an evidence to the feedback that we're getting, which I'm sorry some of the people that were here can't hear that, but that's exactly what we heard at the meeting that people wouldn't prefer six-stories here. They would prefer to mimic the house height that's across the way.

Female Voice: But what we did see was not like small row houses. What we were presented at that meeting were large apartment or condominium style blocks.

Cox: Right and that was to get feedback to say is this something that goes there or doesn't go there. And we clearly heard that it might be an area that may not be as desirous to do that.

Male Voice: I have three questions. My first is, I guess I'm kind of confused on the whole fence concept. You guys have been saying it's a historical fence. Other people have made comments about that. At some point in the past maybe well before there was a fence, there was no fence. So, I guess I'm trying to say what's the basis of saying it's a historical fence and for keeping it. It seems like it's a barrier to the community.

Cox: Yeah. I mean, the basis was that when Lincoln drove up there was a gate that he came through. And so some of the preservationists are arguing that they want to retain

that look. . .

Male Voice: Around the whole perimeter?

Moderator: On this side, Rock Creek Church Road.

Because he actually came this way from where the White House was. Again, that's the comment from the state historical preservation officer, as well as the National Trust. It's not something the Home is advocating one way or the other. There has to be access to this area so obviously some of the gate has to be taken apart. Don't know how that will be yet.

Male Voice: Was there a time period before that when the Home was opened that there was no fence?

Cox: I don't know.

Male Voice: I mean, other people have mentioned there was a time period when there was no fence. When did that happen? After that or (audio stops for 6 seconds) June and all (indiscernible) night, there have been a lot of people who have commented on the fact that the community really does need green space, it needs parks and it needs a way to access them. And especially with the impacts of development here, increasing traffic on streets the kids play on. Right now where would you envision green space that the public can access being?

Cox: We don't have that yet. Some of the comments we've talked about and what they've showed at the meeting

with the planning group yesterday that that woman was at, that they had a buffer zone that came all the way down this way and a buffer zone that came up that way with a walking trail or a biking trail.

Male Voice: That the public can access.

Cox: Correct. But the city has to agree to that because as you've seen the city has given development rights-of-way because they don't want to pay to take a park. You have to worry about will there be drugs in that park, do they have to pay police at that park. So, some of what the city does is says, you know what, to have a developer do that is better economics for them because it doesn't take money out of their pockets to preserve the park. And that's reality.

So, what we have to do is work with the city and say okay, if we want to make these park spaces so there is a walkway, bikeway, pathway to be able to participate in this land, doesn't have to come up with the funding part.

Male Voice: This is not really a question, but just sort of add the comment there that there is presumably going to be a lot of revenue generated by this development. And I don't criticize you for needing revenue. I respect the residents who are there and the need for financial support, but there are some externalities, some impacts that are being imposed on the community surrounding it and some portion of

that revenue being dedicated to offsetting those impacts would be appropriate.

Cox: Right now by law we're not permitted to do that, but if you read the National Defense Authorization F02, the proceeds from any type of development on our properties shall only be used for the Armed Forces Retirement Home.

Male Voice: Okay. My third question is were the ANC representatives who are along the perimeter of the home invited to participate on the committee? And I just want to add to that to just the comment that I think the ANC representatives are important people to have there because they are elected officials.

Now, I went out and voted for my ANC rep and everybody else did and they're not paid. They're there doing this as volunteer work and they know a lot about what's going on in the community. Were they invited to participate? To have that seat at the table?

Cox: We've talked about that before and yes they were, so at this point . . .

Voice: (Inaudible)

Cox: Okay. That's a difference of opinion.

Male Voice: Do you have a copy of . . .

Cox: That's a difference of opinion.

Male Voice: (Inaudible)

Cox: The important part to realize is this is where we're gaining feedback from. So, you will see your feedback. You will see Joe's feedback.

Male Voice: (Inaudible)

Cox: I'm not repeating a lie. I know what we did.

Male Voice: Would it be too late at the break to . . .

Cox: . . . continue that conversation after. Okay.

But ANC members - this is a fluid process. No matter how many people we have at the table, someone would be pissed off if they're not sitting at the table. I can guarantee you that. I can guarantee you that. You will never please everybody. So, what we're trying to do is say we have all these different tracks, all these different special interest groups.

We're giving multiple venues for people to speak out of because I can guarantee you no one will ever be totally pleased with that outcome. We took a stab. You don't like it. I appreciate that, but we need to move on and get your comments, get that draft master plan out to you so we can continue to have meetings like this to get our (inaudible) about it. Having two or three people at that table really will not make a difference because this is the difference I want. This is the difference that we want. We want to talk neighbor to neighbor with representatives, yes, but also with

you.

Male Voice: I understand your frustration with the fact that there's always going to be people who aren't happy, but I don't think it's fair to say that an ANC representative is a special interest. I think the developer is a special interest. I think the institutions who stand to benefit from the development that goes on there are special interests.

Cox: They're neighbors.

Male Voice: Elected officials should have a seat at the table. There's a reason why they've been elected and they're elected to be a voice.

Cox: But those institutional groups are neighbors as well. So to exclude them really wouldn't be fair in the process. Yeah, they pay a lot of taxes. They employ a lot of people. You have to balance that as well. Catholic University has about 1,200 faculty. There are a few thousand health care professionals across the way. We don't want to also just say, you know what, we're going to cut you guys off because this also affects them. It really does.

Male Voice: I'm not faulting Catholic University. I think it's fine for them to have a place at the table, but the ANC representatives who are immediately adjacent to the park I think also have a place.

By the logic that you're asserting, the mayor is a

special interest group. Adrian (indiscernible) is a special interest group. They're not. They're elected officials. It's very different from special interest group, but I just think that's an important point. I want to thank you for hosting this meeting and for having us here and for taking the time to listen to us too.

Cox: You're welcome. Yes.

Female Voice: I have a question about (inaudible). What percentage (inaudible) original plan (inaudible).

Cox: It is very fluid. Again, we didn't come with a preconceived notion. And that's what - I don't know why I'm not doing a better job explaining that. It's frustrating to me and I apologize. But we didn't come with a preconceived notion except that we need to be able to have an independent source of revenue. That's the premise that we started.

So, then we hired GSA. GSA has a group of experts from historical preservation to traffic analysis to an urban planner group, Kotter Kim out of Boston who put together okay, in urban areas that have large tracts like this, these ideas have worked. So we can gain information back. And I can tell you, it's been never a process where we said we're not going to do this, we're not going to do that.

The only thing we said is we don't like all one type of use because that doesn't help us. Everything else is - and

you'll see in the master plan from people who have followed us from June forward, there are comments about the landscape design, the view (indiscernible) which we've heard several of them here tonight. And you will see all of those comments addressed. Some of them addressed not to the full point of no development, which we've had dozens of comments of that. We don't have that luxury.

Female Voice: (Inaudible)

Cox: I'd say 100 percent of the time. All of the comments are considered.

Female Voice: (inaudible) out of all the comments that have been made, what percentage of your original plan has been changed based on all these meetings they've had?

Cox: The whole concept continues to change. Tonight it'll change some more with the feedback that we've received. To look, okay, what can we do? A little more dense here to look at some definite park space that these neighbors are interested, you all are interested in being able to gain access to not just look at.

Female Voice: Okay. You can't answer the question.

Cox: I can't because it's not a concrete term saying - I mean, really 100 percent of the comments are evaluated to see how they affect us.

Female Voice: I'm not talking about the comments being

evaluated. I can listen to anything anybody says and saying I'm evaluating it, but in the final analysis, I'd make no change in what my original plans were then I would say you have the most (inaudible) impact. So you're saying it has an impact, but all I see is I see me and I have input, but I'm not seeing you make the change in the plan and so I'm saying you know what changes you've made, what percentage have you made?

Cox: You'll see that in the master plan when you get the draft master plan.

Female Voice: . . .

Cox: I can't give you a percentage.

Female Voice: So, the fact that you can't give me a percentage then it's probably negative so there's none.

Cox: No, I totally disagree. You're making an assumption. No. Totally disagree. You're making an assumption based on a worst case scenario. . .

Female Voice: . . . say what percentage, so I assume that it's negligible.

Cox: I don't want to give you a percentage because it could be 80 percent, it could be 90 percent, it could be a 100 percent. What I don't want to give you is something that's not reliable. Now, I'm sorry you feel that way 'cause that disappoints me.

Female Voice: (Inaudible).

Cox: Well, then I think I'm going to close it down. I appreciate all your help tonight and all your information to us. But I appreciate it.

Female Voice: (Inaudible) five minutes.

Cox: I know. But we come to a point where . . .

Male Voice: Excuse me. For the record, I'm a founding member of the Petworth (phonetic) Action Committee and that is a very action group in the Petworth area. They weren't notified. Also, I'm the chair of the ANC four C economic development committee. I have not been notified from any member of your group about seeing what else is going on. And I'm the ANC four C06.

Cox: You didn't get a door hanger about any of these meetings on your door?

Male Voice: I haven't received anything. E-mails, nothing.

Cox: Hm.

Male Voice: (Inaudible)

Male Voice: And I don't think that the commissioners should receive a door hanger to notify them of any meetings.

Cox: I appreciate it. Thank you.

Male Voice: You appreciate it.

Moderator: Yes. Comment.

Female Voice: In response to (inaudible) tell anyone other than (inaudible) . . .

Cox: That's correct.

Female Voice: I assume that you have written bylaws that explains or what constitutes for the benefit of the Armed Forces Retirement Home. Is that right?

Cox: Actually we have law. We don't have the bylaws. It's in the National Defense Authorization Act of 2002 that specifically tells us . . .

Female Voice: Okay.

Cox: Call this law 170.

Female Voice: Could you actually cite that on the web site that you've been referencing. Like, point out where your rules and regulations are written.

Moderator: You just go to the National Defense Authorization Act of 2002. . . .

Female Voice: Okay. I'm going to say like make that available and point it out on your web site so that those of us who aren't going to remember that can go look it up and see what your rules are. 'Cause it seems to me that something that is for the benefit of the community, which you've been saying the residents are, may also benefit those residents.

So, there might be some flexibility in terms of how funds could be used, revenue could be used that could benefit both the residents of the home and the residents in the neighborhood outside the home. So, just make that information available transparently so we can go look it up ourselves.

Cox: Sure will. Easy to Google, but I can give it on the center.

Female Voice: Easy to Google the name of a law that I just already forgot.

Cox: NDAA 2002. Piece of paper you can write it down and then you can be in charge of it too. So, thanks.

Female Voice: Thank you very much to Sweet Mango for providing that wonderful meal.

(Applause)

Male Voice: (inaudible) Now that they (inaudible) right here. Say it before the record. Stop lying about that, okay.

Male Voice: The one thing that you all the people didn't really understand is that this is not finalized yet. It's just kind of like a (inaudible). They're speaking as this is something you're about to do.

Male Voice: 'Cause they're convinced that they're not.

They're so used to people coming and telling them what they're going to do versus saying even though you say it to them, (inaudible).

Male Voice: Right. And then it's like, they really are saying we got a choice. (inaudible) got a choice.

Male Voice: Bottom line. Bottom line again, say this is our property, we will do this and that's it.

Male Voice: The question, you have residential use there, you can't just do that 'cause people will be going back and forth.

(Gentleman speaking - inaudible - not part of the focus group).

(End of Audio)