GOVERNMENT
OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

THURSDAY
NOVEMBER 18, 2004

+ + + + +

The Public Hearing of the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened at 6:30 p.m. in the Office of Zoning Hearing Room at 441 4th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20001, Carol J. Mitten, Chairperson, presiding.

This transcript contains the minutes from the Public Hearing held on Thursday, November 18, 2004.

ZONING COMMISSION
District of Columbia
CASE NO.04-19
EXHIBIT NO.37A

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

CAROL J. MITTEN	Chairperson
ANTHONY J. HOOD	Vice Chairperson
KEVIN L. HILDEBRAND	Member
GREGORY N. JEFFRIES	Member
JOHN G. PARSONS	Commissioner

ZONING COMMISSION STAFF PRESENT:

ALBERTO P. BASTIDA, Secretary, Zoning Commission

SHARON SCHELLIN, Office of Zoning

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

MAXINE BROWN-ROBERTS, Office of Planning

JENNIFER STEINGASSER, Office of Planning

INDEX

	PAGE
Preliminary Matters	5
Presentation of Case	8
Report by Office of Planning	37
Reports of Other Government Agencies	38

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

(6:39 p.m.)

MS. MITTEN: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. This is a public hearing of the Zoning Commission of the District of Columbia for Thursday, November 18, 2004. My name is Carol Mitten and joining me this evening are Vice Chairman Anthony Hood and Commissioners Kevin Hildebrand and John Parsons and Gregory Jeffries.

The subject of this evening's hearing is Case No. 04-19. This is a request by the District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority for approval of a consolidated plan unit development and associated variance for property located at 5000 Overlook Avenue, SW, and known as the Blue Plains Advanced Wastewater Treatment Plant.

Notice of today's hearing was published in the D.C. Register on October 1st, 2004, and copies of that hearing announcement are available to you and in the wall bin near the door.

This hearing will be conducted in accordance with the provisions of 11 DCMR, Section 3022, which are the Rules of Procedure for Contested Cases. The order of procedure will be as follows: Preliminary matters followed by the presentation of the

applicant's case, report by the Office of Planning, reports of other Government agencies, report of the effected Advisory Neighborhood Commission, in this case it's ANC 8D, organizations and parties in support - organizations and persons in support, organizations and persons in opposition.

The following time constraints will be adhered to in our hearing. The applicant will have 60 minutes, although we - if you could abbreviate that somewhat, we'd appreciate it. We've read your materials, and we'd like you to hit the highlights for us. Organizations will have five minutes, individuals will have three minutes.

The Commission intends to adhere to the time limits as strictly as possible in order to hear the case in a reasonable period of time, and the Commission reserves the right to change the time limits for presentations if necessary and notes that no time shall be ceded.

All persons appearing before the Commission are to fill out two witness cards. These cards are on the table near the door. Upon coming forward to speak to the Commission, please give both cards to the reporter who is sitting to our right.

Please be advised that this hearing is being

recorded both by a court reporter and is being webcast live. Accordingly, we ask you to refrain from making any disruptive noises or actions in the hearing room. When presenting information to the Commission, please turn on and speak into the microphone, first stating your name and home address. When you're finished speaking, please turn your microphone off so that the microphone is no longer picking up sound or background noise.

The decision of the Commission in this case must be based exclusively on the public record. To avoid any appearance to the contrary, the Commission requests that persons present not engage the members of the Commission in conversation during a recess or at any other time. Staff will be available throughout the hearing to answer any procedural questions that you may have, and you can direct those to Mr. Bastida or Mrs. Schellin.

Please turn off all beepers and cell phones at this time so as not to disrupt the hearing, and at this time the Commission will consider any preliminary matters. Mr. Bastida, anything?

MR. BASTIDA: Madam Chairman, the staff has no preliminary matters.

MS. MITTEN: Mr. Giordano, anything?

MR. BASTIDA: Oh, excuse me, I'm sorry. The preliminary matters is we need a waiver of the submission of the posting affidavit that was submitted 14 days late. The maintenance - they were posted timely, but the affidavit was not filed timely, and we have received the maintenance certificate of the posting that it was done in a timely fashion. Thank you.

MS. MITTEN: Thank you. Any problem with waiving the Affidavit of Maintenance? Okay. Thank you. I'd ask now that all individuals planning on testifying this evening rise now to take the oath, and Mrs. Schellin with administer the oath.

Whereupon:

ALL WITNESSES

Were called for examination and, having been first duly sworn, assumed the witness stand and examined and testified.

MS. MITTEN: Thank you. Please go ahead.

MS. GIORDANO: Good evening, Madam Chairwoman, the members of the Commission. For the record my name is Cynthia Giordano with Arnold and Porter Law Firm. We're going to try and expedite our presentation, but it is on PowerPoint, so it's a little harder to really truncate it.

MS. MITTEN: Just push that button fast.

MS. GIORDANO: I just want you to note for the record that we have a number of WASA officials here this evening. The new Deputy General Manager and Chief Engineer, John Dunn, is seated behind me, and WASA's new General Counsel, Ms. Avis Russell, is here as well. Mr. Benson to my right is going to present WASA's testimony, and following Mr. Benson is Tom Saddick to my far right. Mr. Saddick is a consultant to WASA and an engineer, and he is overseeing the project development, and then Sue Monsour, of course, from Sorg and Associates is going to make the architectural presentation.

Mr. Gross from my office is prepared to go through the variance criteria with you if you want and some of the more technical details, zoning flexibility issues. If you want to get into that level of detail, we can decide that later.

MS. MITTEN: The way we'll proceed now is we'll assume that Mr. Gross will just be available to answer questions.

MS. GIORDANO: Okay, that's fine. He's not anxious to speak, so --

MS. MITTEN: He wants the highlights to be the biosolids management we're talking about, so --

MS. GIORDANO: Unless there's any further questions at this point, we'll go straight to Mr. Benson and the presentation.

MR. BENSON: Good evening. My name is Len Benson. I'm the Director of Engineering and Technical Services at DC Water and Sewer Authority. I'm here tonight representing the General Manager of DCWASA, Jerry Johnson. He had hoped to be here tonight to discuss this very important project. Due to an emergency he's not able to be here this evening.

He requested that I express to the Commission how important this project is to the Water and Sewer Authority and to the people in the District and to the Washington region. It is important to WASA in that it is a key component of the infrastructure that WASA thinks is necessary to accomplish its mission, that is serving the people and protecting the environment.

As we'll show in this presentation, this project will enable WASA to reduce operating costs at the wastewater treatment plant by about 16 million dollars a year, allows better stewardship in the environment, both better water quality and clean air, and 16 million dollars is about 25 percent of the operating cost of the plant. It's about three dollars a month for residential customers, about forty dollars a year.

It's fairly important to us.

With that, let me get started with the PowerPoint here, and the first one we've got is we provide wastewater treatment services for the District and neighboring jurisdictions at Blue Plains. The neighboring jurisdictions are in Maryland, Montgomery and Prince George's Counties. We provide wastewater treatment services to the large majority of the populations in those jurisdictions. We also provide wastewater treatment services to a substantial portion of the population of Fairfax County and Loudoun Counties if Virginia as well as the City of Vienna in Virginia.

The plant at Blue Plains has been operating since 1938, and we're still going at it. Blue Plains is the largest advanced wastewater treatment plant in the world serving two million people in the jurisdictions we just spoke of. Average annual rated flow is 370 million gallons a day. We've noted here it's enough to fill Lake Erie in about a year.

It does have a capacity to handle over a billion gallons in a single day in wet weather. It is the single source of - the single most significant source of protection for water quality in the Potomac River in the Chesapeake Bay region.

Part of our capital program right now, about a billion dollars' worth, is related to programs at the Blue Plains Wastewater Treatment Plant. We'll be refurbishing, replacing aging infrastructure, and I say some of it's been in service since 1938. We're working on new treatment demands and regulatory requirements, a lot of them put in place specifically to protect the Potomac River, the Anacostia River, and the Chesapeake Bay. About a half of the billion dollars that we're looking to spend down there will go to the solids processing part of the plant. The other half of a billion dollars will go to the liquid side of the plant.

In 1990 - now WASA was - I guess came into being in 1996. By 1997 we were kind of up and running. By 1999 we had a new master plan for solids handling. The plan was to provide a road map to provide the capacity to meet our current and our ultimate needs, to replace our aging facilities, and a couple of the real big ones here - to improve our biosolids characteristics to enhance the management options and ensure regulatory compliance with the disposal of the solids coming from the treatment process as well as to reduce long-term risks and costs. The risks are - generally what we're talking

about here are costs risks and trying to contain costs and know what it's going to cost to run the plant, dispose of the solids over the long term. We think we have a program that will do that.

The egg-shaped digesters in this project we're talking about tonight is the key component of that plan. We've been aware as we got into this and began thinking about how big it was and just how massive a project we had that we needed community involvement. We've been very active in seeking community input into the project, began a roll-out program in the fall of 2002. It continued through September of '03, presentations to advisory neighborhood commissions, other community groups, went to local administrators, regulators, other stakeholder's adjacent jurisdictions. We were looking at presentations to city officials, regulators, community leaders.

We did prepare materials including project brochures, frequently asked questions. I think those have been distributed perhaps.

The next slide is presentations to the ANCs we made over that one-year period, some other community meetings. We can go on from that one, I think.

The general manager and some other senior men - people in WASA did discuss the project with Mayor

Williams, City Administrator Mr. Bob, Office of Planning, DC Council Member Allen, Department of Consumer Regulatory Affairs, Commissioner of Fine Arts. As a matter of fact, that project went before the Commission today around noon. I understand it was received very favorably.

We talked a lot to the Prince Georges County representatives. They are the jurisdiction immediately south of the plant. They are less than a mile from the south edge of the plant. As well we talked to the people in Alexandria. They are directly across the river from us. We were active with Ward 8 Advisory Neighborhood Commissions.

The project was well received by all who saw it. I don't recall any negative comments on it.

With that, I'd like to move a little more into the technical background of what we've got here and what the project is, and I'll turn that over to Tom Saddick. He's with CH2MHill Engineers, and he is the project manager on this project for DCWASA.

MR. SADDICK: Thank you, Len. First of all I'd like to talk a little bit about what solids are. Everything that's put into the sewer is really removed down at the wastewater treatment plant, and it results in solids. For example, as we go through the

various types of treatment. We produce about a ton of residual solids, dry residual solids, per million gallons treated, so that's about 330 dry tons a day or 1300 wet tons a day. It's a huge amount.

Right now what they do with the biosolids is they try to reduce the volume by thickening them several ways, then they put the solids in centrifuges to dry them to about 25 percent dryness. They add lime, and they send them to trucks, and they send it out to the fields in Virginia and Maryland for land application for agricultural purposes. We send out about 65 to 70 trucks per day.

This is a really huge undertaking. It's 24/7. This operation keeps going. Seventy trucks per day haul to Maryland, and it really is about three to four million truck miles annually to reuse this material. About half of the operating budget is for solids handling.

Mr. Benson mentioned the new Solids Management Plan, well the key her is digestion, and I would like to explain a little bit what anaerobic digestion is. It's solids that get degraded by microorganisms in a heated, mixed oxygen-free, which is the definition of anaerobic environment. About half the solids are converted to gas, mostly methane. So this is kind of

a cutaway diagram. We mix the contents. The temperature is raised to somewhere above 100 degrees, raw solids come in, gas goes out, and the stable biosolids are ready for use.

What are the benefits? Well, it reduces volume by about 50 percent. That saves about 15 million or more per year in O&M costs. It reduces truck traffic and pollution. We have 35 to 40 fewer trucks per day. Up to two million truck miles are saved annually, and a huge amount of emissions along with that. It reduces odor on-site and off in transit and application sites. Another benefit in terms of risk management is if the bottom falls out so to speak on any type of biosolids management plans, we only have half of what we would have dealt with. When New York got hit with the Ocean Ban, their price went from about $50.00 a wet ton to over one thousand, so it could be just a tremendous impact.

One of the best things about this, this is resource recovery at its best. It produces a stable agricultural product that farmers really want for fertilizer, and it produces gas, methane gas. It's a renewable energy resource. There is enough energy produced by this gas in day to light ten thousand homes per day, and it's about a quarter to a third of

Blue Plains electrical needs.

Most large cities use digestion. It's been in practice for literally hundreds of years. There are all sorts of types of digesters, and we are going to hopefully have the egg-shaped digesters. This is really state of the art. They are very easy to mix. They minimize heat loss because the surface area is minimized. They have a very large volume on a very small footprint, and it doesn't accumulate the unsavory grit and scum on the top and the bottom of the digesters which is a problem with certain ones where you have to clean them out every five years at a million dollars a piece.

It just lowers operations and maintenance costs. Now I'm going to give you just a - are you okay? I'm sorry, this is my wife.

(Laughter)

MR. SADDICK: Pretty bad, isn't it? This is the best project yet.

(Laughter)

MR. SADDICK: This is the Baltimore Back River Plant, and you can see what they tried to do with these. They kind of have this geodesic dome with actually gold panels. This is some digesters in Los Angeles, eight digesters in Terminal Island. These

are digesters being constructed in New York City right now at the Newtown Creek plant, and this is about the same size as Blue Plains, and these are steel digesters. You can see them being welded up. It's quite an undertaking.

These are digesters in Germany. Most of these egg-shaped digesters come from Germany, and they have literally hundreds and hundreds of them there.

This is Dinslaken, Germany. This is about the size of the digester we're going to have. This is also another German egg in Bottrop. These are the oldest eggs in Germany. These are in Mannheim, and this is what it looks like when you bury these halfway. It's kind of like a dirigible stuck in the ground, and these are just other digesters.

Now we want to start focusing on what we're going to do. This is the site plan for Blue Plains, and this is the area we're going to build the digesters in, and this is a site plan where you see the eight eggs and the four silos, the solids processing building, gas building, flares and gas holders.

Why did we put it here? Why do we need this height? I'd like to talk a little bit about that.

First of all, it was the only available on-site

area. The proximity of the solids handling building is crucial. There is a big effluent conduit very near it. That really affected where we put it. There is high ground water, and there are particular subsurface conditions that are very critical to us, and they are space constraints because of the layout.

This is the solids processing building, and these are the digesters. They are four and one-half million gallons each, and we keep the solids in there for about 20, 25 days before they're ripe, and then these are the silos, and we have an effluent conduit that goes underground here that's very, very important to us, so we have to build the tanks on either side.

This is a picture of the effluent conduit in section. This is quite a large structure. It's about 50 by about 20, and the other factor I'd like to mention here - so this is why we kind of have to locate them physically on the site. We were bound by the actual constraints of the site itself. There is a very, very high ground water table, and one other thing I would like to go on - talk about is the digesters themselves. If they are to be buried more, it would squeeze the room down here. They are just about an optimum place here for a number of things - the location, the height, the ground water, and

maximizing space in the equipment house.

That's really a summary of what I have and let me get someone's -- Any questions while we get this?

MS. GIORDANO: I didn't realize this was going to be so entertaining.

MS. MITTEN: We didn't either.

MS. SORG: Good evening, Madam Chair and Commission members. The - we started on this project almost two years ago, and one of the things we did was look at how to treat the egg-shaped digesters and their walkways as well as the silos and adjacent building. That was our scope of work.

It's located as you know in Ward 8. It's about two and one-half miles from Reagan National Airport, five miles from the U.S. Capitol, and we believe quite a significant impact of the skyline as you would fly into the City and/or drive either across Wilson Bridge to 95 or across from Alexandria, and I have some perspectives that show you the view of these once they will be constructed from all those points.

Right next to it, as I said, is National Airport. They're near St. Elizabeth's. There is quite a rise of the ground to the east. As you go up towards St. Elizabeth's, the highway you see down the

middle is 295.

The site itself occupies about eight acres which will have eight eggs for sludge storage silos, two gas tanks, and a future Co-Generation Facility. Of course, the important thing to remember is Number 9 and 10. Number 9 is the Operations Building, an existing building approximately 95 feet in height. Number 10 is the site, and the site needs to be right next to the Operations Building because they will be connected with piping to the Operations Building.

The zoning is C-M-3 with a 6.0 FAR and 90-foot height limit which gives you an industrial use, but we consider these atypical structures of a non-residential type, and we believe that the design and the plan and the use of the site is consistent with a comprehensive plan and I'll let Cynthia and Nate go over the details of the zoning relief that we are asking for in this PUD.

Here is zoning next to the C-M-3 along Blue Plains is C and 1 across the highway and Government on the south and north of the site.

We looked very closely for inspiration on the existing buildings on site. Some are extant original "Art-Deco Style" Buildings that are still there which are all clad in a very nice "Buff Brick" and I must

say that even the newer buildings that are have been built since that time have also used this "Buff Brick" cladding. The windows in all these older buildings are metal standard panels that are decorative Here is an example of an old laboratory building right in the heart of the site showing the "Buff Brick."

Another building that's there, the lower building, which also dates back to the 1930s, you can see those simple "Art-Deco" ornamentation.

The building to the right you can see of the this older building is probably a building dating to the 1960s which also attempted to keep the original "Buff Brick" design which we hope to continue as a tradition. I won't bore you with the digester eggs except to say that they can be very industrial looking and cramped and looks sometimes quite unsightly, but here we are in the heart of the Washington - in the Nation's capital, and so we have to be sensitive to what they look like here.

Basically the design is to locate the rock raise that are elevated at the very top of the eggs on the perimeter. We've designed the walkways in the fashion that's reminiscent of 19th Century bridging, although based on some comments from the Fine Arts Commission we hope to make them more along the 1930s tradition

which I show you where the inspiration of the 1930s came from.

There will be two access towers. One of those towers will have an elevator. We hope to clad the eggs in - we will clad the eggs in stainless steel. The original design was - the eggs are also connected to the - originally were connected to the silos, but they will not be connected any more for costs reasons. The design we chose of the circles of the bridges are actual trusses, supporting trusses, that can be in an "Art-Deco" style as well.

We also looked at how the cladding might be delineated. Originally we had looked at gaps in the cladding, and I'll show you that in the model, for lighting purposes, but it became clear that you cannot have lighting because it's a very flammable condition right around the egg, so you can't have that, so we will be perhaps looking at simplifying the grooves in the cladding.

The system of the cladding - we looked at other ideas before this idea was selected by our client, DCWASA. We looked at ideas of different patterns in the cladding, different spanning of the bridges as well. Some were more attractive than others. This is like the beehive look.

We were interested in looking at a three-dimensional bridge rather than just a flat truss, so on both sides of the walkway is the bridge-supporting truss that flows out, and you can see that in the plan here.

The towers have to be protected from weather. Both the elevator tower and the stair tower will be - the stair tower will be clad in the "Buff Brick", and the elevator tower will be enclosed is glass. Here you can see another section of the digester.

The height which is an issue in this case measuring from grade just adjacent to the eggs, the walkways are 101 feet. The top of the dome of the digester is 107, and because of the elevator over on - which has to go to the very top, is 118 feet.Just some details on the walkways. The railings are also curving in, as you can see, on the walkway.

Also part of the design is a Digester Gas Building to the south of the eggs which you can see right here. This building right here is the Digester Gas Building. The eggs are right there, and then these are gas flares, right? Holders. This will be the future side of the Co-Generation Facility, and those are the silos. The walkways.

Now there are two other building that we've

designed, one story buildings that are necessary. In the middle of the eggs, one is an operations kind of building which is actually a building where visitors will come, school kids, to look at - and it has an assembly space to get a tour of the facility and get a sense of how it works. This is an electrical building which we also designed. I'm going to show you. Oops, sorry.

The Digester Gas Building that I showed you is approximately 36,000 square feet. It will be clad in "Buff Brick" and metal in a modern way. It will have storefront windows. It continues the 1930s style as do the two smaller buildings that I showed you.

The plan of the Digester Gas Building is very simple. It's made up of two different forms, and then outside it's clad in brick in these areas and then behind it you can see the higher forms of metal, and the back is predominantly metal. It's sort of a modern interpretation of the metal and brick that's used throughout the sides.

The triangular buildings, as I said this is kind of the visitors' building. You come in to a lobby on the corners, and then there is a big meeting room and bathrooms, and another - the operations room back here. The corners of these buildings are cut out

because a major pipe is running above them, and you can get a sense of that in the elevations. They kind of criss-cross the building, and here is the entrance. You set it back a little to create a lobby - a vestibule.

Now what will these digesters look like from a distance? This a view looking from above. 295 is right here. The river is back there. Airport is going - planes landing into the airport. This is the site right here. That's the Operations Building right there that we have to connect to, and then after the digesters are built and the silos are built. That's what it's going to look like, and there's that other building that needs to connect to. Looking from National Airport, there is the Operations Building adjacent to it is the site and this is what it will look like once the egg digesters are put in on a beautiful Spring day.

This is from Alexandria itself. The - there is the Operations Building, and then next to it will be the egg digesters just like that.

I just want to turn on the lights and show you a little bit detail on the model and the finishes.

As you can see here cladding is a diamond-shape. Approximately each panel is about four feet by six

feet. The reason for the diamond on the eggs is because it's a two-way curve, and it's easier to hang it on. This is actually a rain screen type of system where the inner shell would either be steel or concrete. Information on the outside and waterproofing and then a metal panel system that's actually porous so the water can get through and be drained at the bottom.

A similar system will be used for the silos as well but in a simpler pattern. You can see there are two towers. The elevator tower and the stair tower. We only need one elevator, and the other one is just a stair tower, but we need two means of egress for the silos. The diamond-shaped buildings are in the middle over there all clad in brick. Back here is the digester gas building, and this is the site for the future Co-Generation Plant. The height of the silos is approximately the same as the eggs, and that is a larger model over there to the left of the first site. You can see the eggs and the whole structure and the white building just the rest of it is the Operations Building. That's all I have for now.

MS. MITTEN: Thank you.

MS. SORG: Okay, I need to show you just one more little thing. The materials board. What you

see are the actually the "Buff Brick" that you saw is actually not one brick, but a composition of all these bricks is 50 percent that, 25 percent that ten and five percent. That's how it's achieved. This will be the color of the windows to match in the buildings, clear glass.

I am sorry this lighting is not very good. You are looking at two different colors of stainless steel which are in our price range at the lower end being darker, and the upper end being lighter, and then that will be the color of the upper part of the Digester Gas Building.

Do we have the landscape architect here? I'd like to have an opportunity to have him talk to you a little bit about - there can't be much landscaping here, but there is an opportunity to do some hardscaping and if that's okay, we can get the landscape architect, Jon Fitch.

MR. FITCH: Good evening. Good evening. My name is Jon Fitch. I am a principal with the Fitch Studio in Washington, D.C. As Suman said, the opportunities for planting on the site are limited, we'll say, both because the site is an industrial plant and is being fully utilized by the program, and also there are constraints in terms of organic debris.

Leaves are a problem here, so we have very few trees. There are no trees on the site itself adjacent to the gas plant. There may be a few, and those would be we're planning to put in a deciduous conifer ball cypress so that the leaves when they fall are a minimal problem for the industrial plant itself. What we do have an opportunity to do, however, is to build what we think is an innovative hardscape pattern. This is a project which at least on the ground is going to be visible almost entirely from the air. At ground level, the area of the digester is actually lifted up off the ground several feet, so from the street you won't be seeing the area directly beneath the digesters themselves, but visitors and workers on the catwalks above will be looking down as will travelers arriving into and out of National Airport.

For that reason, we devised a graphic pattern based on the circular footprints of the digesters themselves and a series of overlapping concentric circles in gray colors that are compatible with and similar to the colors of the digesters themselves, and also pick up on the intersecting patterns that are on the surface of the digesters.

MS. MITTEN: That concludes our presentation. Thank you. Any questions, Mr.

Hildebrand.

MR. HILDEBRAND; You made - this is for Ms. Sorg. You made a statement that the Fine Arts Commission ask for some further consideration of some of the detailing. Could you explain what aspects they might ask you to reconsider?

MS. SORG: The two areas they wanted to look at were the bridging and the cladding design, and as I told you the grooves that you see, the dark lines, originally were lighting which is not going to happen anyhow, so we agreed that it could be simplified and perhaps the grooves be eliminated, and then the bridging also in terms of detailing it more with a lighter hand, more towards and "Art-Deco" style. If you look at the details that we've submitted to you on the bridge components themselves, they are composite parts. They are not simple, and so one thing they suggested was to simplify that design.

MR. HILDEBRAND: Interesting.

MS. SORG: I was music to WASA's ears because that will save a lot of money.

MR. HILDEBRAND: Yes, because I think what you've presented is so beautifully crafted as a piece. The curvature of the railing and the dome structures themselves. It's so nicely woven. I would hate to

see that patterning sort of simplified too far so that you lose a level of interest that it certainly has achieved right now. I think you've done a beautiful job.

MS. SORG: Thank you.

MS. GIORDANO: I could just add that because of the Fine Arts' further review that we would be requesting some flexibility to make minor design changes to accommodate further changes requested by Fine Arts, so the plan that you have now, the design, is not going to be a final design.

MS. MITTEN: We understand, thanks. Anyone else have questions? Mr. Parsons.

MR. PARSONS: Nothing worse than having two panels disagree with each other. I've been there. What did they say about the cladding? I think the design that you've come up with for the cladding, the detailing of that is very special. Are they objecting to that?

MS. SORG: Yes. Basically they felt that the form of the egg is so powerful that it should be left simpler. I was kind of breaking it down, and even further defining it and weaving it back into the other lines I had on the design at the bridges, and they felt that - it's hard to say what some people

felt another way, but David Charles' feeling was that the egg shape could remain pure than breaking it down. Also - and we didn't have a lot of - I didn't have a lot of heartburn over that because those we had to do usually for lighting which we're not going to use anyhow. So I'm sorry, the finished board that you saw, as here pointed out shows the two different colors of stainless, so it could go back to one color of stainless.

MS. GIORDANO: I think one of the comments was let it be itself. That was --

MR. HILDEBRAND: It may just be me, but there seems to be sort of a reference to Key Bridge in the was it's detailed, and I think that sort of book ending of the city with those two very dramatic structures is a very interesting concept, and I'm not disturbed by the fact that it's not strictly Art Deco in its conception. I think it adds a degree of elegance to it to have those subtleties in the skin. Perhaps they don't need to be quite so dramatic, but I don't think they should be lost as I think it adds to the scale of the whole piece to have that sort of tripartite system.

MR. PARSONS: I just think it's so special the way you've designed it. I'm disappointed in our

colleagues across the street here, but I guess we can give you some flexibility and wish you well. Is there any lighting to be included in this? In other words, what is --

MS. SORG: Yes, there will be lighting on the walkways all night long. It will be on permanently, but at one point there was thought of - there is a 10-foot sphere in which you can't be close to it with any kind of light - actual electrical lighting, so I let Paul talk about that a little bit, I mean, Tom, but basically we were going to put a light on them, but so far that hasn't been incorporated into the --

MR. PARSONS: So the effective gap with the projector is not contemplated? I mean light the egg.

MR. SADDICK: From groundlighting.

MS. SORG: From groundlighting.

MR. PARSONS: Do you intend to light these so that they become a landmark upon coming into National Airport tonight? I think that would be a mistake, that's why I'm asking.

MS. SORG: So far --

MR. PARSONS: The only lighting I can understand --

MS. SORG: There is no design right now to light them per se from - I don't have anything like that in my design right now.

MR. PARSONS: So it's more of a utilitarian lighting system - safety on the walkway.

MS. SORG: On the top - exactly, and there will be lighting in the stairwells. I don't know what the other lighting requirements are inside the - on the groundplain on there.

MR. SADDICK: Just for safety purposes.

MS. SORG: It's not the intent to kind of make them into --

MR. PARSONS: A basket of eggs.

MS. SORG: Yes, at night.

MR. PARSONS: Let's talk about odor a minute. I'm intrigued by the comment made about odor reduction. What do we really mean there?

MR. SADDICK: Well a couple of things. First of all, the solids that are produced right now are really raw sludges that are stabilized by adding lime, so there is a lot more volatile material in there that could lead to odors. It could be on-site odors, it could be in trucks going off at the application site. What happens in the digesters is that volatile material is consumed so there is less

potential to have odors. The material is much more stable. It's kind of decayed if you will in those tanks, so there is a lot less potential to have odor.

MR. PARSONS: So you can't predict 50 percent reduction --

MR. SADDICK: Well there's more - well everything is kind of relative. You have - from what measuring point are you talking about? If you just had raw sludge and digested sludge, the raw sludge would - the orders of magnitude more odorous. The digested sludges have a musty odor to them, slightly ammonia odor to them too, but the material that makes odor by and large is removed.

MR. PARSONS: Is there any relief from this lovely model over here? Are any of these facilities able to be eliminated as a result of these digesters? They are rendered obsolete or is the same plant that there's now just --

MR. SADDICK: In that large solids processing building right now there are conveying trains that convey the raw sludges that have been de-watered and mixed with lime in huge mixers, so that whole operation is no longer needed.

MR. PARSONS: So the building would be removed?

MR. SADDICK: No, we still need equipment in the building -

MR. PARSONS: Oh, come on.

MR. SADDICK: - in the building to de-water it.

MR. PARSONS: So nothing is going to be eliminated on the current site as a result of this?

MR. SADDICK: No physical building will be eliminated.

MR. PARSONS: Thank you.

MS. MITTEN: Anyone else? I just want to ask, and I know you touched on this in the presentation, but we understand why you can't go farther into the ground because of the high ground water, but can you just speak more specifically about why the digester itself has to be so tall.

MR. SADDICK: Yes, we need a certain --

MS. MITTEN: Would you turn on the microphone for us.

MR. SADDICK: I'm sorry. These are designs based on how long the sludge is held, and so what that means is that if we have to hold the sludge for 20 or 25 days that's a certain volume that we need, so we have to make this volume in egg shapes, and this - we didn't have enough room to put more

digesters on, so to optimize that space, we had to go with a volume that was four and one-half million gallons in eight containers, and so to get that four and one-half million gallons you - and you want to keep the shape as long to horizontal as possible so that it does mix so you have those good attributes of an egg. Does that answer your question?

MS. MITTEN: Yes, it did. Is the stuff that comes into this coming from the Metro area or just DC?

MR. SADDICK: It comes from all of DC which makes up about 45 percent roughly and then the other 50 or 60 percent mostly comes from Maryland. About 10 percent comes from Virginia. It's a big regional plant.

MS. MITTEN: And just looking ahead to the future and the power generating potential, it would only generate enough power to power Blue Plains itself, a third of the --

MR. SADDICK: A third of Blue Plains. It's a huge power user. What Blue Plains does is does what a river can do in a thousand miles, so it has to put oxygen into the water - very, very expensive. There are a lot of processes. It uses approximately 25 to 30 megawatts per day. It's a very big power

consumer. It's putting the energy nature would have put in to clean the pollution.

MS. MITTEN: Okay. Thank you.

MR. HILDEBRAND: Did your projection of a 25 percent savings in the treatment plant operation include the cost reduction generated by the power plant paying for a third of your electric bill?

MR. SADDICK: No, and that's a very variable cost right now. The 16 million dollars that we show there was calculated about in 2002 when staffs were what they were and the staff has come down a bit now, but the cost of power has gone up, so the value of the gas is increasing almost daily, but the original 16 million was not - did not include gas.

MR. HILDEBRAND: Does that mean that the citizens of the District of Columbia will see a substantial decrease in their WASA bill when this feature comes online in four or five years?

MR. BENSON: No, I think is what it means is you won't see rates rising as rapidly as they otherwise might.

MR. HILDEBRAND: Is that on the record? Thank you.

MS. MITTEN: Anyone else? Thank you. It's a very interesting project. Okay, now I think

we're ready for the report by the Office of Planning.

MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Thank you, Madam Chairman and members of the Commission. In the interests of time, I hope we have the report in the record, and, therefore, I'm just going to summarize our recommendation, and I don't know if you wanted me to address the variance.

MS. MITTEN: Sure, that's fine.

MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Okay. It is OP's belief that the applicant has met the requirements of the PUD and that the flexibilities requested are consistent with the benefits that will be derived from the proposed digester system. The Office of Planning supports the flexibility requested that the applicant and in making any changes that may result and recommends and supports any changes that may be as a result from the Fine Arts Commission. OP also believes that the applicant has demonstrated that they have met the variance test. The Office of Planning concludes that the proposed digester facility will provide significant financial and environmental benefits to the District of Columbia and is an important and needed public facility. The Office of Planning supports WASA's effort to improve the treatment facility functionally, economically, and visually and

recommends approval of the consolidated PUD for the project except for the proposed future Co-Generation Building. We recommend that the future Co-Generation Building be approved as a first-stage PUD. Thank you, Madam Chairman. I will take any questions.

MS. MITTEN: Did you want us to talk about the variance specifically or - no, okay. But we do have a second report that deals with that.

MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Yes.

MS. MITTEN: Thank you. Any questions for Ms. Brown-Roberts? Any questions? Okay. Thank you.

MS. BROWN-ROBERTS: Okay.

MS. MITTEN: Is there anyone here from Transportation? Okay. I would note that we have in the record that Exhibit 19, a memo from Ken Laden of DOT who endorses the project and notes the significant reduction in truck traffic that will result. Is there anyone here from ANC 8D? Okay. I would note for the record that we - I don't know what the exhibit number is on this one but that we have a letter from ANC 8D that appears to meet the requirements for great weight that - does it meet the requirements for great weight? No, it doesn't have the vote. Okay. Well it does urge us to act favorably on the PUD application but

does not meet the requirements for great weight. Is there anyone who would like to testify in support? Anyone else who would like to testify in support? How about any opposition? Okay. Any last requests?

MS. GIORDANO: No, I would just note that if the Commission is comfortable with the project at this point that a bench decision would be appreciated. WASA would like to go ahead and release their engineers to complete the design and feel comfortable in so doing.

MS. MITTEN: Can you just tell us when you are all scheduled to go back to CFA?

MS. GIORDANO: I don't know if next month is feasible, Suman, or maybe two months?

MS. SORG: I'd say in the January meeting. January meeting.

MS. MITTEN: Okay. Are you guys comfortable proceeding tonight? Okay. Anytime? We're ready to go right now. Okay. Well then I would move approval of the Case No. - the application in Case No. 04-19, and I would just qualify it as recommended by the Office of Planning that the site of the future Co-Generation facility be granted for first-stage approval, but we want to see the building itself in a second-stage application.

MR. HOOD: I'll second the motion.

MS. MITTEN: Thank you, and I guess what I would just like to encourage is based on what Mr. Parsons said and Mr. Hildebrand said is that you resist at all costs just making this thing plain. It's really - it is elegant. That's what it is, and these things are - it is industrial, but there is an opportunity here to do something that's special too, so I just don't just go all the way to get it over with. Fight a little further.

MS. GIORDANO: Can we just note for the record also that probably the second stage application for the Co-gen may not come in within the prescribed timeframe. That we may need an extension on that because that project - when would you say that might be designed?

MR. SADDICK: Probably not before two years from now.

MS. MITTEN: I think we can build flexibility and we just basically don't want to give card blanche to the design and when it comes in --

MS. GIORDANO: Of course, and we were thinking a PUD modification might be a simpler way to go.

MS. MITTEN: That's possible.

MS. GIORDANO: That gives us a more open-ended timeframe.

MS. MITTEN: Okay, then we just won't include anything. We'll just - there won't be any reference to that facility --

MS. GIORDANO: We don't have the first-stage order that really doesn't say much.

MS. MITTEN: That's fine.

MS. GIORDANO: Okay.

MS. MITTEN: Okay. So then we would eliminate any reference to the Co-Generation Facility. We would have flexibility for whatever alterations, hopefully few, that would be required to meet the CFA - to get CFA approval, and was there anything else that we were going to add for any kind of flexibility? I guess not, so just to add that into the mix. Any discussion? All those in favor, please say aye.

UNANIMOUS: Aye.

MS. MITTEN: I believe we have a unanimous vote, Mrs. Shellin.

MRS. SHELLIN: The staff will record the vote five to zero to zero to approve Zoning Commission Case No. 04-19. Commissioner Mitten moving. Commissioner Hood seconding. Commissioners Parsons, Jeffries, and Hildebrand in favor. Approved as

discussed.

MS. MITTEN: Thank you, and thanks for expediting the presentation tonight. It was great. Thanks. Our hearing is now adjourned.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter was concluded at 7:36 p.m.)