

December 8, 2016

VIA IZIS

Chairman Anthony Hood
District of Columbia Zoning Commission
441 4th Street NW, Suite 200S
Washington, DC 20001

Re: Z.C. Case No. 16-02 – Applicant’s Responses to Questions and Issues from
November 28th Hearing

Dear Chairman Hood and Members of the Commission:

At the November 28th hearing for the above-referenced case for the proposed DC United stadium, the Commission asked a number of questions and identified several issues to which it sought responses from the Applicant. The information below and attached hereto provides such responses. The Applicant is providing this information before the continued hearing on December 15th so that the Commission, the agencies, and the ANC have the opportunity to review it before the conclusion of the public hearing.

1. Transportation

The memorandum attached as Exhibit A addresses the Commission’s questions concerning: (i) *parking*, including the distance of the parking spaces from the stadium, staff/team/media parking, and parking for disabled visitors; (ii) *transit access*, including comparable walking distances from transit stations, Metrorail versus bus service and shuttle service, and accommodations for disabled visitors using transit; (iii) *bicycle accommodations and planning*, including anticipated routes, location of the bike valet, coordination with the Washington Area Bicyclist Association, and Capital Bikeshare; and (iv) the *transportation operations and parking plan (TOPP)*, including a detailed framework and timeline for its implementation.

In addition, the letters of intent (LOIs) that have been executed thus far with owners of parking lots to be used by visitors to the stadium are attached as Exhibit B.

2. Operations Planning for Simultaneous Nationals/DC United Games

Regarding the potential for simultaneous events at the Nationals Stadium and the proposed DC United Stadium, the Applicant compared the schedules of both teams for the past three seasons. In three seasons, there have been only *two* instances of simultaneous Nationals and DC United games: one, in 2014, was a Nationals playoff game, and the second, in 2015, was a regular season game that could have been scheduled differently. Therefore, *the likelihood of conflicting Nationals and DC United games in the future is very small, and schedules between the teams can be coordinated with great accuracy to avoid conflicts.*

Nevertheless, in the very rare instance that there are conflicting Nationals and DC United games once the proposed stadium opens, the Applicant commits to coordinating with DMPED and the Nationals to schedule game times, to the greatest extent possible, so that they do not conflict and to develop an operations plan to minimize the burdens that such a scheduling conflict may have on neighborhoods and city services. Indeed, it is common in other cities to have sports/entertainment districts with multiple stadiums or arenas in close proximity with shared parking, such as in this case. The chart in Exhibit C provides examples of other cities with such conditions, and in all cases, the cities are able to successfully accommodate potentially conflicting games. Based on the empirical evidence in other jurisdictions, there is no reason that the District of Columbia will not be able to devise a plan for the potentially rare occurrences of scheduling conflicts between the Nationals and DC United.

3. Benefits and Amenities

The final list of benefits and amenities is attached as Exhibit D.

4. Construction Management Plan

A construction management plan is attached as Exhibit E.

5. Architecture and Design

The plans and drawings attached as Exhibit F include the following information:

- A map of the expanded PUD boundaries to include all of the new 1st Street (page 2);
- An updated PUD overview plan (pages 3 & 4);
- Tables of project data (pages 5 – 7);
- Plan and elevations with dimensions (pages 8 & 9);
- A lighting plan, including illustrations of light dispersion (pages 10 – 15);
- Illustrations of roof run-off piping (pages 16 & 17);
- Examples of white porcelain tile on other projects (page 18);
- Design for pocket parks (pages 19 – 21); and
- A detailed signage plan, including locations, dimensions, and basic materials (pages 22 – 34).

The Applicant looks forward to answering questions from the Commission about this information but believes that it responds to most of the questions and issues raised during the November 28th hearing.

In the meantime, if you have any additional questions, please feel free to contact us.

Sincerely,

/s/ Phil Feola
Phil T. Feola

/s/ Cary Kadlecek
Cary R. Kadlecek

Attachments