

Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Andy Litsky and I am chairman of ANC-6D representing the communities of Southwest, Ballpark/Navy Yard and Buzzard Point. I believe that this is the 14th time that I've come before you to present our ANC's thinking on a particular PUD. As you know, our seven member ANC has more development than any other in the entire District of Columbia. We take our responsibilities – to our residents and to the city – very seriously as we weigh each aspect of what any particular applicant puts before us. And we have done so here once again.

So let me make it clear: ANC 6D has generally supported the *notion* of a DC United Soccer Stadium on Buzzard Point. Let me clarify that – I said the NOTION of a soccer stadium. But we are quite reticent to provide our advice --- our imprimatur – with the lack of detail currently before us. For it's the details that always require further analysis and it's the operational details to us that clinch the sale. What we have also said –from the very beginning -- is that we needed to ensure an operational plan is contingent upon three factors:

- (1) A clearly defined and absolutely unambiguous transportation plan,
- (2) A plan for this stadium enhances the residential neighborhoods that it borders – not only the entertainment zone to the East from where everyone is purported to be arriving but also the existing residential neighborhoods directly to the North, and
- (3) A strong contribution to the well-being of all the adjacent communities to warrant the request for constructing this particular site above and beyond what is allowed by zoning.

However, after much thought and discussion ANC-6D still find that those contingencies have not been met. And so, it was at a duly noticed meeting of ANC-6D, held on October 17, 2016, at which a quorum was present (a quorum being four Commissioners), and by a vote of 7 - 0 - 0, the Commission opposed the approval of the DC United Consolidated PUD until numerous issues as stated our resolution (Exhibit 29) were sufficiently addressed by the Applicant and District Departments in coordination with the ANC and the Community.

Now this does not mean that the PUD itself, has not improved over the course of time, for it has. ANC 6D is pleased that a number of adjustments have been made since the first iterations. We are particularly delighted with the reimagining of the previously ill-defined plans for the adjacent site and green space which had only a one or two year lifespan at best, and enhanced activation and incorporation of retail and commercial spaces on the eastern edge of the stadium that will lessen the original dead zones on non-game days.

But while the ANC is pleased with a number of adjustments that the Applicant has made to the PUD as a result of our initial objections, they are vastly outweighed by the concerns we continue to address in the areas of transportation, environment and lack of attention to the needs of the adjacent neighborhoods. We urge that the members of the Zoning Commission and the relevant District Agencies to give our concerns great weight.

ON TRANSPORTATION

ANC-6D continues to express strong concerns about vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian routing and access, parking insufficiency, proximity of the stadium to mass transit and lack of planning thereto, faulty assumptions and contradictions within existing transportation plans, ill defined planning to direct patrons to the site, inappropriate access and egress through local streets to the East, North and West, an insufficient plan for mass transportation, a lackluster plan to address emerging transportation options such as Uber/Lyft, lack of binding and written LOIs regarding access to parking facilities as well as binding LOIs prohibiting contemporaneous scheduling of events in or adjacent to Nationals' Park and the proposed DC United Stadium. In addition, although the plans provided by DC United -- and buttressed by OP and DDOT -- show contingencies for how transportation will be managed pre-construction and post-construction of the Frederick Douglas Bridge, there is absolutely no written plan for how 19,000 patrons are going to cross South Capitol Street during construction when the stadium will be operational. Again, this is another one of those pesky details where our lead District agencies continuously seek to deflect our attention. Well enough with the bluff and bluster --

Our ANC has been asking for answers to some very hard questions for a really long time and we're still waiting. It would be one thing if we were simply ignored -- and in some cases we are. It's quite another to be provided contradictory answers over the course of time and then have the latest version of traffic and transportation plans presented "as fact" to buttress their latest contentions.

ANC-6D believes that the DC United PUD must be reviewed and evaluated in the context of the larger Buzzard Point discussion especially considering that the SW Small Area Plan, which enjoyed widespread community support -- (more than 800 Southwesters participated -- and **that** plan enjoyed Council review) whereas Buzzard Point had no such supervisory discussion by the Council. Therefore, the DC United PUD both stands alone as an independent PUD but as also the predicate of a larger Buzzard Point Vision Framework, to which ANC-6D has expressed extremely strong, point-by-point objections and to which after seven months, the Office of Planning has provided neither acknowledgement of those concerns nor a response. Consequently, ANC-6D addresses this PUD independently but also contextualizes the DC United Stadium Plan within the so called Buzzard Point "Vision Framework."

ANC-6D vigorously disputes the contention of the OP Final Report on this PUD that the Buzzard Point Vision Plan states on p. 17 that "revitalization is consistent with the aspirations and needs of nearby residents and the city as a whole with a focus on roads and public spaces." In direct contravention of that assertion, ANC-6D points out that Ops "vision" is purely aspirational -- at least in this aspect -- and so is their willingness to address and respond to direct criticism and inquiry. And, Commissioners, we need you to also understand that the Buzzard Point Plan is still in **Draft** -- and you can't plan with a moving target. Everything cannot BE fungible. Not when public safety and public funding is involved.

So ANC-6D continues to assert there exists no reliable Transportation Plan for the Stadium & Buzzard Point in that much of what has been put forward by the Applicant may be informed by -- but frequently contradicts --- a number of transportation proposals advanced by DDOT, team consultants, Office of Planning (each of which is currently in the Case File), and most specifically, the Buzzard Point Vision Plan itself which purports to present Half Street as the "Transportation Spine of Buzzard Point." In addition, and in answer to specific questions about the current Buzzard Point Plan, we have also heard statements made in public meetings from both the Directors of Transportation and the Office of Planning that contradict the recommendations of their very own departments in this matter.

So, a few examples:

Southeast-Southwest Special Events Study, Final Presentation on March 6, 2014 made a number of disturbing assertions in their "Project End Game" portion of the report that runs directly counter to DDOT's own claims about what is necessary to make this stadium work. That report states (underlining is by ANC-6D):

"Transit System Needs: One of DDOT's main goals for the District is to increase the use of reliable and convenient transit modes. The roadway capacity is constrained, and there are very limited opportunities to add capacity to the network. As such, it is critical for the entire area that reliable and convenient transit options are available. **One major improvement needed in the transit system is the implementation of a North-South Streetcar line that could provide transit service into Buzzard Point, allowing for direct transit access to the Soccer Stadium.** If the North-South Streetcar is delayed or does not go south of M Street, the implications could be a lower transit share, since the only option for rail transit is the Green Line (Waterfront, Navy Yard-Ballpark, or Anacostia). Walking distances from the Green Line Metro stations to the Soccer Stadium are close to a mile and beyond what is considered "walkable." To ensure the target transit share of 45 percent or higher can be achieved, it is critical that the streetcar to Buzzard Point be implemented."

"5.6 Transit Improvements

Transit service to Buzzard Point is currently provided by two modes: Metrorail and bus. The Metro Green Line would carry the largest proportion of transit trips to the special events, either to Nationals Park or the D.C. United Stadium. As described in Chapter 3, WMATA operates several Metrobus service lines that pass along M Street and South Capitol Street and into Buzzard Point to P Street on the 74 bus route. **The Study assumed the development of the North-South Streetcar line providing service into Buzzard Point. It was assumed that the streetcar service operated at a ten-minute headway, providing a total capacity of 960 passengers per hour.**"

The Southeast-Southwest Special Events Study is the very study that itself is put forward by the District Government to provide the guidance for transportation planning and impetus for growth and development of our entire ANC – Maine Avenue and M Street from The Wharf to the Eleventh Street Bridge. Well, if the entire premise for development a Soccer Stadium is based upon having a North-South Streetcar providing service into Buzzard Point then why is this even in evidence in the case file? We now know that a streetcar is no longer planned for this site. Again, DDOT has spoken ... unfortunately out of both sides of its mouth.

ANC-6D also questions the mitigation measures proposed by Gorove Slade July 17, 2014 that “DC United Stadium, situated near major transportation facilities, has the *potential* to have a quality transportation experience on game days.” ANC-6D expects that during the intervening 24 months DDOT, Gorove Slade and DC United would have moved the ball beyond simply “potential.” More precise plans *should* have emerged – and in writing, not just in intent. ANC-6D insists that the Applicant and DDOT must stop kicking the can down the road when it comes to transportation planning for this site. ANC-6D asks that the Zoning Commission require that the Applicant provide transportation details far in advance to a time when the stadium will become close to operational. You see, by then it’s way too late. While this may have been the way it was done in other instances, this is the wrong way to go about it now. Waiting for critical details to emerge at some point in a Transportation Management Plan is a very poor way to proceed with so many variables in such a constrained space. Please, Commissioners, require the Applicant to provide significantly more detail on how this stadium will actually operate.

The M Street SE/SW Transportation Plan section in DDOT’s report on this PUD admits that “it did not fully envision the implications of entertainment and events uses within the M Street SE/SW study area.” No kidding. That’s what we’ve contended all along. The ANC-6D has significant on-going concerns regarding access and egress for emergency vehicles and personnel to this tiny peninsula located on the most geographically isolated section of the District of Columbia with Fort McNair to the West and the Anacostia to the South and East, and upon which Office of Planning envisions, in addition to a soccer stadium with 19,000 seats, the inclusion of 6,000 units of housing – equal to the amount of housing now in existing new Southwest. Has HSEMA reviewed these plans? Has the District has put plans in place should such limited roadways be foreclosed by natural or other disaster? ANC -6D *strongly* suggests that the Zoning Commission make such planning compulsory -- pre-decision.

ANC-6D is insistent that identified mitigation measures are necessary to reduce the impact the stadium has on the surrounding neighborhood. Guiding patrons to efficient transportation modes must be incorporated with the plan *prior* to construction. ANC-6D notes on p. 18 of DDOT’s Report that although “they aim to provide a safe and efficient roadway network” that DDOT acknowledges that the Applicant shows 18 intersections within the study area that are expected to be significantly impacted. ***Significantly impacted.***

As you know, a large portion of residential Southwest is comprised of superblocks a number of which border on Fourth Street Southwest – the communities of Tiber Island, Harbour Square, Edgewater, Riverside, Riverpark & Carrollsburg are among them. There is only one way in and one way out for the residents in living thousands of units along Fourth Street south of M. There is no Great Circle Route.

The impact of failing intersections is not sustainable under any circumstances. Moreover, with an aging population – and with some housing complexes approaching NORC (Naturally Occurring Retirement Community) status -- they increasingly depend upon EMS services and failing intersections are simply contrary to acting in the interests of public safety. ANC-6D insists that the Applicant develop a more effective plan for Fourth Street, SW. We cannot simply allow the mention of such a problem in the DDOT report go forward without further comment and without insistence on a resolution.

ANC-6D is further concerned that the last time that Fourth Street, SW was addressed as the sole subject of a traffic study by DDOT was in March, 2003. That was prior to the redevelopment of the old Waterside Mall, prior to an award of redevelopment rights at The Wharf, and a full year prior to site

selection for a new baseball stadium, let alone one for DC United. The transportation weaknesses inherent along Fourth Street, South of M cannot continue to be addressed peripherally by allowing DDOT and transportation consultants to cobble together portions of old traffic studies sponsored and paid for by various developers and then pick out those portions of what they choose to fold into a “new” study to buttress the ideas that they now want to support. The time has come to call them out on this on the record. **It’s time for cut and paste planning to cease.**

It is also remarkable is that the Buzzard Point Vision Plan -- although still in draft after nearly a year, yet held up as one of the foundations upon which the DC United Stadium is based -- speaks boldly (although irrationally) about how Half Street will be “The Transportation Spine of Buzzard Point.” Yet neither the Applicant, nor DDOT, nor OP has bothered to raise that point in their reports to Zoning. It is also peculiar that of the 18 intersections expected to be significantly impacted by the new DC United Stadium not once is Half Street, even mentioned. It is as though each of the proponents are happy to recognize Half Street once it emerges *below* P Street, but none care to acknowledge precisely how cars magically arrive at those coordinates. Perhaps by drone.

Frankly, our ANC continues to believe that this inconsistency is based upon a very strong desire not to engage in a full and complete discussion about how one arrives at DC United Stadium. Part of that is it is simply a bold insistence that the preponderance of fans will get to Buzzard Point emerging from the Navy Yard Metro, walking just shy of a mile around Nats Park, darting across six lanes of South Capitol Street traffic down Potomac to DC United – and then back again. The other part, frankly, I believe is a callous disregard for the population living North of P Street and South of M between Second and South Capitol Streets, SW. How else could the Office of Planning allow their Buzzard Point Vision Plan to show “the new” Half Street as a transportation solution when DPW leaders have told us that “the now” Half Street is not even wide enough to tow illegally parked cars during Nationals games? This is not a solution – it’s a scam. If you draw a pretty picture and put it in spiral binding, it’s as good as gold. Just don’t expect anyone to question how that picture comes to fruition. Well, our ANC is asking.

When ANC-6D and Southwest Neighborhood Assembly co-sponsored a July 18, 2016 meeting at Arena Stage to discuss transportation issues in Southwest 175 people attended in addition to Directors Dormsjo, Shaw, and top officials from DPW and the First District Commander. When confronted with this “Half Street as Transportation Spine into Buzzard Point” dichotomy and shown pictures demonstrating the extreme difference between what is planned and what exists now, Director Dormsjo noted the dramatic difference but had no explanation. OP Director Shaw simply smiled at the photographs and stated that he could not account for the dramatic differences other than to say, “My employees are visionaries.”

This blue smoke and mirrors approach would *never* be pulled in a community that held some modicum of political power – one that is not economically disadvantaged. ANC believes that there is intent behind the Buzzard Point Plan that presumes forced removal of housing in order to construct this stadium and most assuredly, the remainder of Buzzard Point. ANC-6D is universally opposed to the imposition of eminent domain in order to construct this stadium **or** provide transportation access to Buzzard Point. However, when making direct inquiries to the top leadership of DDOT and OP, none would go on the record to confirm that the transportation recommendations within The Buzzard Point Plan presumed a de facto plan to remove any existing housing. Our Commission strongly urges the members of the Zoning Commission to clarify the intent of this Administration before moving forward and embracing the aspects of the Buzzard Point Plan put forward by the Applicant, DDOT and OP. Is this City advocating for the tacit removal of people or are they not? Have they made a conscious decision to

embrace the interests of large property owners on Buzzard Point south of the planned stadium over the interests of those people now living to the north? Are we going to allow those questions to remain unanswered until this PUD is approved? Could those uncomfortable questions simply be postponed to a later date – maybe answered in a TOPP a month or two before the Stadium is to open. Only the Zoning Commission can make that determination now. Please, we need an answer.

ANC-6D has long contended that operating two large stadiums separated by less than a mile require much more than simple attestation by this Applicant that everything is in order. ANC-6D is in agreement with the DDOT report that requests additional levels of commitment and detail to ensure that contemporaneously scheduled events do not occur at both stadiums. Where are the letters of agreement/commitment between the Nationals and DC United? Where are the letters of agreement/commitment between MLB and MLS? The Zoning Commission must insist that they be produced now and not wait for a TOPP.

Parking insufficiency is a continuing challenge to our entire ANC and to the success of this PUD in particular since this 19,000 seat stadium is built with no public parking at all. ANC-6D is encouraged by plans to have the majority of patrons take public transport, walk or bike but this also requires the firm commitment and expectation that there will be sufficient parking spaces provided off site for DC United to properly carry on their operations. Over the course of time, the Applicant has produced maps illustrating where agreements exist for 3,900 off-site parking spaces. At present, that Applicant claims that they have 3,750 spots, but no LOIs have been presented to back up that claim. This became particularly apparent after we last questioned The Nationals in early October about agreements that DC United claimed to have for access to parking at two venues owned by the Lerner. Nationals officials informed us at that time such agreements did not exist. So, how do we nail this down? And also how do we devise a plan for identifying replacement parking slots when the existing lots are developed?

ANC-6D encourages the Zoning Commission to require that Applicant to produce signed LOIs for each of the lots where DC United has assured us that such agreements exist so that we all can be quite clear about the amount of DC United parking that will be actually be available on opening day, how long those agreements will be in effect, how long those street grade lots where agreements may exist are anticipated to remain unbuilt and which, if any, of the LOIs they have included in that count may have flipped from office to residential which has already happened in once instance. We recognize that these agreements will require constant negotiation over time, because circumstances change. But it is incumbent upon Zoning Commission to ensure that what is presented as fact now is, indeed, fact. This data cannot wait for a TOPP.

ANC-6D has spoken out from the beginning of this discussion about the lack of a specific plan for curbside management to ensure accessible drop-off and pick-ups for taxis, charter bus and *especially* Uber/Lyft and other hired vehicles which do not have the same regulatory constraints. They can – and do – stop anywhere and are not under the jurisdiction of the Hack Office. Curbside space in the area is severely limited and we are depending upon the Zoning Commission to instruct the Applicant that these accommodations must not impact the adjacent neighborhood. **No plan** assures that they will. The Applicant contends that this can be addressed by the TOPP. We totally disagree. Indeed, in the “Roadway Configuration and Curbside Management” chart produced on September 16, 2016, the Applicant shows no fixed plan, but a series of “maybes.” While signage decisions and wayfinding may be delayed to a TOPP, the precise areas for hired vehicles must be planned ahead of time, not left to be filled in at a later date – especially since there will be great numbers of patrons who will find it easier to call for private carriage than cram onto the Green Line and walk $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mile to the stadium. **A lot** of fans

are going to be taking Uber. “Pick me up at Potomac and First. I’ll be wearing a black and red scarf.” Isn’t going to work.

ANC-6D is also unconvinced that the levels of support that the Applicant is providing for bike valet is also insufficient. We believe that many more DC United patrons will choose to bike to this stadium than to the Nationals because DC United is not on top of a Metro Station, but $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mile away. In addition, ANC-6D also points out that the Stadium sits right on the Capitol Bike Trail so it will be all the more convenient for patrons to get there on two wheels. Let’s make certain that we can accommodate them with expanded bike valet services. We also agree with DDOT’s suggestion that the Applicant ought to fund the capitol costs and one year of operations for a Capital Bikeshare location adjacent to the stadium. We also believe that the Applicant should fully commit to covering all costs associated with bikeshare corrals – certainly beyond simply an initial period.

ANC-6D remains unconvinced that either the Applicant or the City have made specific overtures to Metro to encourage additional bus service in the area. The 74 bus line runs along P Street but does not connect the stadium to either the Navy Yard or Waterfront Metro stations. Regardless of intent, with Metro’s almost insurmountable difficulties we believe that the 74 bus rerouting is not at the top of their “to-do” list. And it’s not going to happen by itself. It’s going to take planning and budgeting – **and that takes time.**

A plan to resolve transportation options from the Green Line into Buzzard Point cannot wait for the TOPP, as DDOT suggests in their report. Again – kicking the can down the road. How long will it take for a study to be completed? Why has this study not already been called for? Councilmember Evans is the leading supporter of this Stadium. He’s Chairman of Metro. DDOT Director Leif Dormsjo has a seat on the Metro Board. Why is a plan for the 74 bus not already underway? For instance, shouldn’t a broader study seek to evaluate which streets will be suitable for bus operations, turning widths, etc. Wouldn’t those answers directly influence major infrastructure planning efforts for Buzzard Point and elsewhere? Talk about putting the cart before the horse – and at that, a cart with a potentially inadequate turning radius.

Moreover, ANC-6D vigorously disputes the contention on p. 26 of the DDOT report where they present a gibberish response to our neighborhoods continued requests for answers about the promised return of the Southwest Circulator. Yes, indeed it **was** promised to return in 2017. However, at July’s Transportation Forum at Arena Stage, Director Dormsjo made it clear that the Circulator was not going to return on that route for a number of reasons. We appreciate his honesty. We wish that his staff would similarly level with the ANC, the Southwest Community – and this Zoning Commission.

And so, ANC-6D also concerned that the DC United Community Benefits Agreement provides allocated funding for purchasing busses to specifically reinstate the North/South Circulator route from Southwest to the Convention Center. But it also appears that DDOT has already discounted that very significant benefit because DDOT claims that the existing 74 bus --- over which they have no control mind you – will better meet that need. The benefit was promised in the CBA. ANC-6D expects that will be adhered to. But we’d also like more detail to ensure **precisely** what will be delivered and when.

One other issue we’d addressed in our ANC Resolution has to do with Signage -- electronic signage, more precisely. ANC-6D is also concerned about the potential placement of video signage outside of the DC United Stadium, light pollution from which would significantly impact the surrounding neighborhood. ANC-6D would request that the Applicant eschew any such signage in the future

regardless of impending Council legislation, and also urge the Zoning Commission to put in their Findings of Fact and in the final Zoning Order that such signage is specifically forbidden.

Some background: As some of you on the Commission may recall, when the PUD for the Baseball Stadium was before you in 2006 we engaged in a very vigorous discussion about how signage was to be placed on that site. We discussed size, area of coverage, the fact that logos would be disallowed and there was universal agreement that the iconic view of the US Capitol wasn't to be marred by competing advertising signs hung on what is now Nats Park. That was in the Findings of Fact. That was addressed in the PUD Zoning Order.

Well, the DC Council seems to think that they can trump Zoning. And that they know better. In legislation that Councilmember Allen introduced several weeks ago – on behalf of the Lerner organization and the billboard lobbyists, that bill specifically allowed for full motion video signage – 10 signs as a matter of fact, some as large as 25 by 40 feet high, -- all around Nats Park – PUD and Zoning Order be damned. It was the way “they interpreted it.” In your face.

Well, here's the point. My ANC strenuously objected as did a number of other civic associations who learned of the bill. Now the bill has been amended to narrow the scope to five signs. It also prohibits signage from impacting the Highway Beautification Act of 1965. And it also – very specifically now states – that such signage must not run counter to any PUDs. (Nice that they belatedly acknowledged that they did not have that right in the first place). But it is still on a very fast track. They want this passed before Christmas. The fewer eyes on this the better. So here is our chance to prevent this plague from further infecting our city. Please also include in your recommendations as this PUD moves forward also a prohibition on electronic signage advertising sign – full motion video or otherwise – to be placed anywhere on the outside of this stadium.

ON THE ENVIRONMENT

The cascading impact of the construction and eventual operation of the DC United Stadium to the communities to the north are palpable in areas other than transportation. And none of those issues is more contentious than those related to environmental safety.

ANC-6D recognizes that the near Buzzard's Point residential community is a close knit neighborhood currently facing definite health consequences as a result of the excavation and remediation of the soccer stadium site. Although a great deal of preliminary work has been on-going for months to prepare this extraordinarily contaminated site for future development, including tearing down and removal of structures that contained asbestos and other hazardous materials, little or no effort has been directed toward preparing community residents to deal with the enormous environmental impact that the removal of all of the chemicals and contaminants may have on their health. Significant vapor contamination from dust, gases and fumes is inevitable on site since the clean-up plan includes removal of such contaminated soil both on and below the surface.

ANC-6D is extremely distressed with the paucity of information contained in the report of the Department of Energy and Environment in this case. DDOE reviews PUDS for environmental issues that the Applicant needs to be aware of during early stages of planning, as well as to identify opportunities

for increasing environmental and urban sustainability benefits during development. As such, our ANC had presumed that DOEE would have provided significant guidance to the Zoning Commission about what is widely acknowledged to be the most environmentally degraded building site in the entire District of Columbia – and one which barely escapes declaration as a brownfield. What DDOE provided instead were four paragraphs on Greenbuilding & Renewable Energy, and three paragraphs each on Stormwater Management, Air Quality and Resilience and Flood Preparedness. There are no words.

ANC-6D believes that DOEE should have prepared a report for this record to assess how they expect the Applicant will operate in coordination with the District, nearby Buzzard Point residents and other stakeholders together in a timely manner to prevent, assess, safely clean up and sustainably use this portion of Buzzard Point to achieve greater economic development. They missed that opportunity. That is not to say that they have not been active, for they have. They just stealthily manage to put precious little in writing. For the better part of a year, ANC-6D has attended meeting after meeting – most held at our insistence – to plead with the Applicant, their consultants, DOEE and other District Agencies to acknowledge the severity of the levels of toxicity on site and to encourage them to **put in writing** plans to address these exigencies. Well, you’ve seen what’s now on the record.

Consequently, ANC-6D is putting on the record what **we** believe ought to have been included in the DDOE report to ensure that this most environmentally contaminated site is properly perceived, addressed, and managed throughout remediation and construction of DC United Stadium. The vulnerability of the near Buzzard Point residential community is fully explained in the health risk assessment that the DC Department of Health prepared called the Community Health and Safety Study (CHASS). CHASS is a risk assessment that was done because of the community concerns brought forward by ANC-6D to DOH, DMPED and DOEE about the overall health impact that the construction of the soccer stadium and other major construction projects (i.e. Pepco Waterfront Substation and the new South Capitol Street Bridge) would have on the residents who live near Buzzard Point.

The timing of these major projects combined with the vulnerability of the near Buzzard Point community and fact that the residents are already being negatively affected by Buzzard Point contaminants may lead to unforeseen and detrimental health and quality of life challenges that may forever damage and threaten these low-moderate income residents. The CHASS is the first risk assessment ever done in the District of Columbia focusing on a community **prior** to the construction of a major project. Yet, it has no mechanism or funding to implement any of the recommendations. It also has no one assigned from Department of Health to ensure that the recommendations are even implemented. But it does make very clear recommendations that ANC-6D hopes will be fully embraced and carried out by the District of Columbia and by the Applicant for this project and on others on Buzzard Point going forward. ANC-6D is entering the CHASS document in the Case File as a “Supplement A” to our own Report. We expect that its contents and recommendations will be viewed as those of ANC-6D.

ANC-6D also requests that the District of Columbia and the Applicant halt the Voluntary Cleanup of the proposed stadium site, slated to begin on December 1st, until we are assured that these efforts meet best management practices and the requirements outlined in the environmental concerns described in

the recent study Community Health and Safety Study (CHASS) conducted by the DC Department of Health [attachment A to this report] that makes the following recommendations:

- Improved program coordination to include all project components and construction projects to minimize impacts upon the surrounding community.
- Enhanced community engagement and notification with respect to program and project developments through regularly scheduled public meetings.
- Provision of proactive development, prevention and control measures as well as a written plan to enforce policies and regulations for dust control.
- Creation of on-going field monitoring of soil, water and air quality by an independent entity.

Further,

- ANC-6D recommends that there be a written agreement with DC DOH requiring them to monitor the health status of residents living adjacent to the stadium throughout construction.
- There be created a Health Advocate to conduct oversight of the implementation of the safety plan, with the vested authority to stop construction in the event of health and safety violations, provide real time monitoring and oversight of the site construction and report to the IG's Office to avoid conflicts of interest. This would create a standard going forward for all projects being developed on contaminated sites throughout the District of Columbia.
- There be immediate distribution of preventative remediation measures, including the distribution of air purifiers, HEPA (dust) mats and vacuums for residents living south of M St., east of Delaware, west of S. Capitol Street; and
- The District of Columbia, through its Department of Health or another approved FQHC, provide optional baseline health assessment for all residents living in the area adjacent to the proposed stadium.

ANC-6D believes that Best Management Practices Plan needs to be adopted to protect the health, safety and well-being of all individuals who will be exposed to construction on the DC United Stadium Site and who live near Buzzard's Point including community members and construction workers.

The plan should include but not be limited to the following:

- Full implementation of all 5 recommendations by DOH in CHASS risk assessment.
- Air quality monitoring done at the site and within the community to ensure that no chemicals/contaminants travel from the site through dust or vapor intrusion.
- Posting flag people and barricades to prevent trucks from deviating from approved truck routes and thus traveling through community with contaminated soil.
- Multiple truck washing stations and decontamination areas on-site to inspect trucks and ensure that no chemicals are carried on their tires and that truck beds are sealed completely with special material to prevent chemicals from seeping out onto the roads and highways.

- Utilization of sealed containers and water transportation for any chemicals that are removed that pose a danger to human health including those in high concentrations that can be inhaled, such as benzo(a)pyrene and arsenic.
- Sealing off of seriously hazardous portions of the site (such as the former Salvage Yard with tents that would keep airborne dust trapped within and prevent community exposure during excavation and remediation.
- A significant lowering of the threshold for acceptable risk to take into account the vulnerability of the near Buzzard's Point community as defined in the CHASS risk assessment conducted by DOH on the near Buzzard's Point community.
- A prohibition of overnight construction permits during the voluntary clean-up phase of the project to ensure that the highest standards and precautions are carried out with necessary visibility during the day.
- A halt of all construction activities for extended periods if air quality levels exceed adjusted necessary threshold for a community exposed to Brownfield's as in the case of the near Buzzard's Point residential community.
- A halt of all construction activities if community health monitoring shows an increase in or occurrence of health consequences that can be directed to of the voluntary clean-up.
- A consistent health monitoring plan for the residential nearby residential community throughout the voluntary clean-up and construction of the stadium by a Federally Qualified Health Center serving under the guidance of the CDC and DOH.
- Placement of silk fencing/netting around the entire site with the proper monitoring of the fencing to capture contaminants coming off site through dust.
- A phone number at DOH for near Buzzard Point residents to report health concerns/problems during the voluntary clean-up.
- Temporary relocation help for residents who experience reoccurring health consequences, such as frequent asthma attacks during the clean-up process.
- Hand health monitoring in addition to stationary monitoring around the site and in the community to take place several times a day and consistently throughout the voluntary clean-up on a daily basis and as long as construction occurs at the site.
- Hiring of a health advocate to assist with the monitoring and serve as a community liaison to ensure best management practices are carried out during the voluntary clean-up.
- Emergency training program to teach to inform workers of job hazards and instruct them about general work practices. The training should also provide translation services for non-English speaking workers.
- Proper precautions training and protective equipment and gear must be provided to every construction worker including the option for them to undergo health monitoring while working to assist with clean-up. The training should also provide translation services for non-English speaking workers.
- Placement of an on-site safety officer to monitor all on-site activities and makes sure that all steps in the Best Management Practices Plan is carried out. This officer should be a certified

industrial hygienist specializing in contamination exposure risk reduction and be independent of the construction companies working on the remediation and construction of site.

- On site safety coordination would also coordinate community meetings with D.C. United to keep the community up-dated about the on-site and offsite safety plan.
- Restricting on-site vehicles to prevent spreading toxic contamination beyond site.
- Preparation of a temporary evacuation plan for residents that will allow them to leave in the event of an accident or contamination spill.
- Indoor air monitoring of Q Street residential corridor including units along First & Q Street and 2nd & Q Street (closest residents) to monitor for vapor intrusion and in-door air contamination from any dust or vapors generated from the site.
- Real time air monitoring of entire site that can be accessed by residents through internet and a digital display in the community.
- Regular air quality monitoring reports provided to the ANC on a weekly basis and communicated by the health advocate.
- Information on where the contaminated soil from the soccer stadium site will be trucked and written assurance that the proper precautions will be taken to protect the community that lives where the soil will be unloaded to be cleaned or permanently disposed.
- A cap on the number of trucks that can transport contaminated soil in a given day during clean-up to make sure that the proper precaution are taken with each vehicle and that no requirements for safety are overlooked by workers or supervisors.
- A pause in the voluntary clean-up effort until a plan to implement the above steps and other recommendations and requests by ANC are implemented through written agreement developed through an MOU to protect the community from getting sick from toxic chemical exposure over the years from the soccer stadium site.

IN CONCLUSION

ANC-6D continues to believe that a soccer stadium can be built on this site in Buzzard Point --- but only once we've properly addressed the cornucopia of issues upon which we've elaborated in our Report and in testimony. The implications of delay on developing this specific site, with its extraordinary challenges, pale in comparison to adopting a plan that moves inexorably forward ignoring broad deficiencies in transportation planning, inattention to environmental concerns and the implications that ignoring each will have upon our community health and well being.

ANC-6D strongly urges that you step back from this precipice and instruct the Applicant to address the items that we've put forward this evening in advance of any decision in this case. Thank you for the opportunity to testify.