Catalog of Community Meetings and Correspondence

Date	Meeting	Mode
12/13/2024	OP HPO Meeting	Virtual
3/19/2025	OP Meeting	Virtual
6/20/2025	OP HPO meeting	Virtual
8/11/2025	OP DMPED meeting	Virtual
10/3/2025	OP DMPED meeting	Virtual
4/10/2026	Meeting with Kirby Vining (MAG Chair)	In-person
4/20/2026	Meeting with Teri Janine Quinn BCA and Alice Thompson SMD	Virtual
5/5/2026	Email to SMDs to inform them of upcoming BCA and MAG meetings	Email
5/18/2026	BCA Meeting	Virtual
5/21/2026	MAG Meeting	Virtual
6/1/2026	Issuance of NOI	N/A
6/1/2026	Correspondence to SMDs requesting to appear before the ANCs during NOI period to provide notice of upcoming PUD modification application	Email
6/2/2026	OP Meeting	Virtual
6/8/2026	Correspondence with Randolph Warren Re: NOI	Email
6/10/2026	ANC 1E ZED Meeting	Virtual
6/10/2026	Correspondence with Carl Schonander Re: NOI	Email
6/10/2026	Correspondence with BCA and MAG Re: NOI	Email
6/10/2026	Re-issuance of NOI	N/A
6/11/2026	Correspondence with Carl Schonander to share ANC 1E slide deck	Email
6/16/2026	ANC 5E meeting	Virtual
7/8/2026	Correspondence with MAG, BCA, and ANC reps Re: Parcel 1 SOE repair and installation of pond aerator	Email
7/9/2026	Phone call with Parcel 5 townhome HOA management company (Christina Theoharis) to discuss HOA meeting	Phone
7/10/2026	Meeting with Parcel 5 townhome HOA management company (John Theoharis and Christina Theoharis) to discuss HOA meeting	Virtual
8/4/2026	McMillan Reservoir District Parcel 5 townhome HOA meeting to discuss proposed PUD modification	Virtual
10/12/2026	Phone call with Kirby Vining (MAG Chair) regarding status of PUD modification application	Phone

Summary of the Applicant Presentations and Comment Responses to Affected ANCs and Community Organizations

The following is a detailed summary of the input that the Applicant received during its pre-filing community outreach and engagement, wherein the Applicant provided the Affect ANCs, community organizations, and interested stakeholders an initial presentation of the proposed PUD modification and requested flexibility, and the initial timeline for filing the application. The Applicant summarized the significant investments it has made to date to advance the approved plans for Parcel 1. However, the Applicant explained how the anchor tenant that was

going to occupy a large portion of the Parcel 1 Building unfortunately cancelled its lease shortly after the Applicant closed on the land from the District. Since then, despite diligent efforts, the Applicant has not been able to find another healthcare-focused anchor tenant for Parcel 1 or Parcel 3. The Applicant stated that it is pursuing the PUD modification and flexibility in order to be able to meet market demand for these two parcels through a different use and/or design without having to first invest substantial resources into developing plans and go through the full PUD modification process. The Applicant stated that currently there is no market for what is currently approved for Parcel 1, and it is unlikely that anything will get constructed without the requested flexibility.

Meeting: Bloomingdale Civic Association
Date: May 18, 2026

Comment/Question: A BCA representative noted that they would like to have further discussion on the range of uses that will be included in the modified PUD, and to discuss specific use "carve outs." Specifically, they noted that they may have concerns about certain entertainment / assembly uses such as a night club.

Applicant Response: The Applicant responded that it was open to further discussion on what uses the community favors and disfavors and is open to making commitments to not pursue certain uses.

Comment/Question: A BCA representative asked whether the range of use categories being requested by the Applicant is enough or are there more potential uses that could come about.

Applicant Response: The Applicant stated that it does not currently have a user that it is trying to get approved without revealing the actual user. The Applicant reiterated that the only thing they know at this point is that due to major structural changes in the healthcare industry since the PUD was approved in 2014, there is no longer a demand for the amount and type of healthcare use that is currently required on Parcel 1 under the approved PUD. The goal is to obtain flexibility for a range of other potential principal uses so that it can meaningfully engage in discussions with interested users and provide them with a degree of certainty that their potential use can be established on the site without significant entitlement or appeal risk.

Comment/Question: A BCA representative asked whether the Applicant will make potential future users first sign a letter of intent or make a capital commitment to the site before moving forward with plans.

Applicant Response: The Applicant stated that they will follow their typical process when they are discussing a development deal with a prospective tenant or purchaser, which typically begins with an initial non-binding letter of intent. The Applicant stated that requiring tenants or purchasers to make an upfront capital commitment despite the outcome of their negotiations is not something they typically require, nor is it something they will require for these parcels.

Comment/Question: The Applicant was asked whether the expanded medical care uses that are being requested could include a cannabis dispensary.

Applicant Response: The Applicant stated that it has no intention to pursue or allow a cannabis dispensary on either parcel.

Comment/Question: An attending member of the public submitted multiple questions regarding recent change to traffic patterns around the PUD site and requested clarification on whether the amount of parking on Parcel 1 is going to be increased or decreased.

Applicant Response: The Applicant stated that any recent traffic pattern changes around the PUD site have nothing to do with the proposed PUD modification that will be submitted to the Zoning Commission. The Applicant stated that any traffic pattern changes that may have been made could be related to improvements that were already included or contemplated in the previously approved PUD transportation improvement plan, which DDOT has been implementing over time. The Applicant confirmed that it would not be seeking to increase the amount of parking on Parcel 1, and in fact is seeking flexibility to allow a decrease in the amount of parking that is required in accordance with the minimum parking requirement under zoning for the development program that is ultimately established on the parcels.

Comment/Question: A BCA representative asked the Applicant to address the standing water issue on Parcel 1 as the summer months can give rise to concerns about mosquitoes.

Applicant Response: The Applicant responded that the PUD site, including Parcel 1, percolates at a very slow rate due to the high clay content of the soils. As such, there is a good chance that water will continue to stand in the excavated Parcel 1 until it is redeveloped and proper stormwater management is installed. However, in the meantime, the Applicant has already taken steps to treat the standing water to help prevent mosquitos from forming. Additionally, the Applicant said it would work with its site maintenance team on other interventions that could be implemented to further address the issue, such as a solar powered aerator or fountain to circulate the water.

Meeting: McMillan Advisory Group
Date: May 21, 2026

Comment/Question: A MAG member suggested that the Applicant set up a project website.

Applicant Response: The Applicant stated this was something they could look into.

Comment/Question: A MAG member inquired whether the Applicant had an idea of when development on Parcels 1 and 3 would be complete.

Applicant Response: The Applicant responded that it did not since currently they do not have a user / tenant for either parcel, nor do they have any reliable expressions of interests.

Comment/Question: A MAG member express support for medical use to continue to be located on Parcel 1, even if a reduced amount.

Applicant Response: The Applicant agreed that healthcare use could be beneficial to the community.

Comment/Question: A MAG member noted that the NOI that will be sent out by the Applicant should clearly state that the PUD modification and flexibility will not result in development being bigger than what is currently approved, and that the Applicant should get as specific as possible in terms of uses that will not be pursued for the site (such as a disco and liquor store)

Applicant Response: The Applicant reiterated that it is open to further discussion on what uses the community favors and disfavors and is open to making commitments to not pursue certain uses.

Meeting: ANC 1E Zoning and Economic Development Committee Meeting
Date: June 10, 2026

Comment/Question: A committee member expressed that they supported the potential for reduced density on the site, and that they were encouraged by the possibility of additional affordable housing. They also expressed appreciation for how the Applicant has reached out to the entire community and encouraged them to continue to do so. The committee member stated they were pleased to see that some of the scholarship contributions required under the PUD order were starting to be distributed to qualifying students.

Applicant Response: N/A

Comment/Question: A committee member expressed frustration with how long and drawn out the process has been to redevelop the McMillan site. They expressed some concern with the amount of time it has taken the Applicant to determine that it cannot build the approved plans and that the proposed PUD modification is needed. They also expressed some concern with the lack of specificity of the proposed modification.

Applicant Response: The Applicant stated that it was preparing several documents that would provide additional specificity while maintaining the flexibility that is critical to being able to advance redevelopment of Parcel 1 and attract a user for Parcel 3 so that this parcel can move forward to a Stage 2 PUD. The Applicant stated that the application will include: (i) a comprehensive set of conceptual massing diagrams that will be representative of the range of uses sought in the requested flexibility, (ii) an economic impact study that will support the evaluation of whether the proposed PUD modification and flexibility will have any impact on the PUD's balance of development incentives, public benefits, and potential impacts, and (iii) a transportation

study that will look at whether the proposed PUD modification and flexibility will have any additional transportation impacts compared to the existing approved PUD, including whether any additional mitigation is necessary.

Comment/Question: A member of the public expressed appreciation for the Applicant clarifying that the application will not have any impact on the grocery store in Parcel 4. They also asked the Applicant why it has taken them so long to come forward with the application.

Applicant Response: The Applicant stated that it closed on the land in late-2022 and was immediately focused on advancing development of construction drawings for the anchor-tenant at that time. When the anchor-tenant cancelled its lease, the Applicant immediately focused on trying to find a new anchor-tenant that would occupy enough space within the Parcel 1 Building, as currently approved. At that time, it was broadly assumed that shifts in the healthcare industry brought on by COVID would shift back to pre-COVID patterns after the pandemic. Unfortunately, the shifts in the way healthcare providers locate and deliver services have proven to be more permanent, and there is no longer a market or demand for the size of healthcare facility that is currently approved on Parcel 1. Upon this realization, the Applicant made significant efforts to find other user types for Parcel 1, including users interested in occupying the Parcel 1 Building, as approved, or modifying the building design through a PUD modification process. Unfortunately due to the harsh market conditions in nearly every real estate sector (elevated interest rates, lack of private capital, increased construction costs, uncertain regulatory environment), users that expressed interest in the site were unwilling to take on the additional costs and entitlement risk associated with advancing a specific project through the PUD modification process. At that point, the Applicant initiated a lengthy discussion with the District on potential options, which eventually concluded with the PUD modification / flexibility approach being taken by the Applicant in this application.

Comment/Question: A committee member asked whether the Applicant has done any market research that supports what is being requested in the application. They also asked whether the Applicant would return to the Zoning Commission to get rid of the PUD if, for example, redevelopment of Parcel 3 moved forward but Parcel 1 did not.

Applicant Response: The Applicant reiterated that it does not have a specific development plan or user for either parcel. They repeated that they have already searched for a specific user and the uncertainty and risk around real estate markets and the PUD process on the McMillan site have been significant obstacles that will not be overcome for a significant period of time. As a result, the Applicant is casting a wide net with the proposed PUD application while striving to provide as much specificity as possible around the range of flexibility being requested. As for getting rid of the PUD in the future, the Applicant stated that it is solely focused on this application and is hopeful the requested flexibility will generate development interest in these parcels.

Meeting: ANC 5E Meeting
Date: June 16, 2026

Comment/Question: An ANC member expressed disappointment in the lack of creativity of the PUD modification application and indicated they were surprised to see the request for flexibility to reduce building height. They encouraged the Applicant to pursue more density.

Applicant Response: The Applicant stated that the requested flexibility to reduce height and density is not a guarantee that less development will be constructed on Parcel 1. The Applicant stated that if a potential user of Parcel 1 came forward today that was interested in the approved plan they would happily proceed with that plan. However, after significant efforts the Applicant simply has not received any interest from healthcare users or any user in the plan that is currently approved. The flexibility allows the Applicant to respond to current market demand for Parcel 1 and to engage with other potential users that might be interested in developing Parcel 1 with a different use or development program without the financial and entitlement risk of having to prepare development plans and go through the PUD hearing process.

Comment/Question: An ANC member recommended splitting up the retail into smaller retail spaces rather than a single large retail space.

Applicant Response: The Applicant stated that they are not reducing the amount of retail that is currently required on Parcels 1 and 3, and that the retail spaces shown on the PUD plans just shows areas that will be devoted to retail and not the actual size of retailers. These retail spaces will be able to be divided into smaller retail spaces based on demand once development proceeds on either parcel.

Comment/Question: An ANC member expressed an "overwhelming desire" for density and height on the site. They expressed support for the PUD modification to allow flexibility for use. They expressed concern about the potential to "under develop" the site and inquired whether the minimum development threshold being proposed by the Applicant needed to be adjusted.

Applicant Response: No response given.

Comment/Question: Another ANC member expressed support for maximum density and more uses on the site. They asked the Applicant to re-state the reasons for the proposed PUD modification.

Applicant Response: The Applicant stated that when the Parcel 1 healthcare building was originally approved, the healthcare market was much stronger, they had an anchor tenant that was going to occupy a substantial percentage of the building, financial markets were far more favorable than they are today, and they were comfortable proceeding with a speculative development of the Parcel 1 Building with confidence they would secure other tenants to occupy the remainder of the

building. Unfortunately, since the PUD was approved and cleared the extensive litigation that occurred, major structural changes have occurred in all real estate sectors, including the healthcare sector, which were accelerated by the global COVID pandemic. In the healthcare sector, providers no longer seek to co-locate in large medical office buildings. Rather, healthcare providers and services now look to decentralize in smaller facilities that are closer to the populations they serve. As a result of these factors, the Applicant cannot get any traction on getting commitments from a healthcare users, or any other users, for the current plans that is approved on Parcel 1. Additionally, users that have expressed interest in the site are unwilling to invest the time and resources into a specific set of development plans and then take on the risk of having to go through the PUD modification process.

Meeting: Reservoir District Parcel 5 Townhome Homeowners Association
Date: August 4, 2026

Comment/Question: An attendee asked whether the Applicant had any update on development of the grocery store on Parcel 4

Applicant Response: The Applicant stated they did not own Parcel 4 and did not have any updates on its development. The Applicant did make clear that nothing being proposed in its PUD modification application will have any impact on the Parcel 4 grocery store.

Comment/Question: An attendee asked how serious the Applicant was about establishing a hotel use on Parcels 1 or 3, and asked what market research has been done that shows support for a hotel. They also asked whether the Applicant is pursuing Children's hospital for expansion space on the site.

Applicant Response: The Applicant stated they are not pursuing Children's given their size requirements for a new hospital, noting that Parcel 1 is not big enough. The Applicant stated that they are not specifically proposing a hotel for either parcel, but rather requesting the flexibility to be able to establish a hotel if they receive interest from a hotel operator after they obtain the requested flexibility.

Comment/Question: An attendee asked whether there could be a padel use.

Applicant Response: The Applicant stated they are not opposed to an entertainment, assembly, or recreation use as part of a larger development. The Applicant stated they are unable to commit specifically to a padel use but can confirm that such a use is not allowed under the current approved plans.

Comment/Question: An attendee stated they are interested in developing an athletic recovery and longevity center in DC and think Parcels 1 and 3 would be a great location.

Applicant Response: The Applicant expressed appreciation of the comment and stated such a use could be a good fit as part of a larger development on either parcel in the future.

Comment/Question: An attendee asked whether data centers are an option for either parcel.

Applicant Response: The Applicant stated they do not intend to pursue a data center for either parcel, nor is such a use allowed under the MU-10 PUD zoning of the site.