

**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Sara Bardin, Director, Office of Zoning  
**FROM:** <sup>JLS</sup> Jennifer Steingasser, Deputy Director, Historic Preservation and Development Review  
**DATE:** January 23, 2017  
**SUBJECT:** Zoning Commission Case No. 16-02  
District Agency Responses to ANC 6D Testimony

---

**BACKGROUND**

At its December 14, 2016 Public Hearing, the Zoning Commission requested that District agencies respond to the testimony of ANC 6D, which was provided by ANC 6D Chair Andrew Litsky (Exhibit 100). The Office of Planning (OP) response is below. Responses from the District Department of Transportation (DDOT), Department of Energy and Environment (DOEE), and Department of Health (DOH) also are provided under this cover.

**ANC 6D Concern:** *Proposed DC United Soccer Stadium should positively impact adjacent community*

**OP Response:** The proposed soccer stadium is a District initiative to allow for construction of a new soccer stadium in Buzzard Point through a public-private partnership. Development of a new soccer stadium at Buzzard Point would serve to accelerate redevelopment, promote economic development in the Buzzard Point and Capitol Riverfront neighborhoods, and enhance economic vitality in the District. Through its approval of the District of Columbia Soccer Stadium Development Act of 2014, the Council noted that, “improvements in the physical environment of Buzzard Point catalyzed by the soccer stadium would connect Buzzard Point to the emerging Capitol Riverfront area to create a vibrant, mixed-use neighborhood with improved pedestrian circulation and continuous public access to the water; offer new development opportunities that could promote mixed-use development and increase the inventory of affordable housing through inclusionary zoning; and provide ways to improve the environmental health of Buzzard Point.”<sup>1</sup>

The Council also found that the proposed “improvements and infrastructure investments represented by the development of a new, state-of-the-art soccer stadium project at Buzzard Point would leverage other nearby District investments such as the South Capitol Street Bridge project and the parking facilities for Nationals Park and, along with the successful and planned development at the Yards and the Wharf, combine to anchor a new, mixed-use neighborhood that would reconnect residents to the waterfront, enhance the natural environment, and establish an attractive gateway to the District while improving conditions for nearby residents.”<sup>2</sup>

Furthermore, as described in the OP Setdown (Exhibit 9) and Hearing (Exhibit 42) reports, the proposed project is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan and with adopted public policies (§ 2403.4). The Property is located in the Lower Anacostia Waterfront-Near Southwest Area Element of the Comprehensive Plan. The use and density are not inconsistent with the Future Land Use and Generalized Policy Maps and would further objectives of the Land Use, Economic Development, and Lower Anacostia Waterfront-Near Southwest Area elements and their related policies by allowing for the redevelopment of obsolete and underutilized industrial sites and revitalizing the Buzzard Point neighborhood.

The Generalized Policy Map indicates that a change in land use from what exists today is expected and encouraged for the site. This designation is consistent with that of other properties in this square and surrounding squares in Buzzard Point; and there are other properties in Buzzard Point that are the subject of approved or pending Design Review applications. The proposed project would facilitate new development on vacant and underutilized land.

The Future Land Use Map (FLUM) indicates that the site is appropriate for high density residential and high density commercial mixed use development. This denotes a mix of uses on the site. Section 225 of the Comprehensive Plan text identifies corresponding land uses and zoning districts:

<b>High Density Residential</b>	This designation is used to define neighborhoods and corridors where high-rise (8 stories or more) apartment buildings are the predominant use. Pockets of less dense housing may exist within these areas.	The corresponding Zone districts are generally R-5-D and R-5-E, although other zones may apply. (225.6)				
		FAR		Height		
		MoR	PUD	MoR	PUD	
		R-5-D	3.5	5.04	90'	90'
		R-5-E	5.0	5.0	90'	90'

<sup>1</sup> Finding No. 6, Soccer Stadium Development Amendment Act of 2014, D.C. Act 20-556, December 30, 2014

<sup>2</sup> Finding No. 7, Soccer Stadium Development Amendment Act of 2014, D.C. Act 20-556, December 30, 2014

<p><b>High Density Commercial</b></p>	<p>This designation is used to define the central employment district of the city and other major office employment centers on the downtown perimeter. It is characterized by office and mixed office/retail buildings greater than eight stories in height, although many lower scale buildings (including historic buildings) are interspersed.</p>	<p>The corresponding Zone districts are generally C-2-C, C-3-C, C-4, and C-5, although other districts may apply. (225.11)</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="954 279 1463 472"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2"></th> <th colspan="2">FAR</th> <th colspan="2">Height</th> </tr> <tr> <th>MoR</th> <th>PUD</th> <th>MoR</th> <th>PUD</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>C-2-C</td> <td>6.0</td> <td>8.640</td> <td>90'</td> <td>110'</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C-3-C</td> <td>6.5</td> <td>9.36</td> <td>90'</td> <td>130'</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C-4</td> <td>8.5</td> <td>10.2</td> <td>110'</td> <td>130'</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C-5</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>130'</td> <td>160'</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		FAR		Height		MoR	PUD	MoR	PUD	C-2-C	6.0	8.640	90'	110'	C-3-C	6.5	9.36	90'	130'	C-4	8.5	10.2	110'	130'	C-5	-	-	130'	160'
	FAR			Height																											
	MoR	PUD	MoR	PUD																											
C-2-C	6.0	8.640	90'	110'																											
C-3-C	6.5	9.36	90'	130'																											
C-4	8.5	10.2	110'	130'																											
C-5	-	-	130'	160'																											
<p><b>Mixed Use</b></p>	<p>The general density and intensity of development within a given Mixed Use area is determined by the specific mix of uses shown. (225.19).                  A variety of zoning designations are used in Mixed Use areas, depending on the combination of uses, densities, and intensities.” (225.21)</p>	<p>The Applicant has committed to bring the ancillary development to the Zoning Commission for review. Given the mix of uses and the corresponding anticipated heights and densities of the FLUM designations, in combination with Comprehensive Plan policies noted in the OP reports, the applicant’s stadium proposal with its corresponding PUD height and density is generally not inconsistent with this direction:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="954 747 1463 867"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2"></th> <th colspan="2">FAR</th> <th colspan="2">Height</th> </tr> <tr> <th>MoR</th> <th>PUD</th> <th>MoR</th> <th>PUD</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>CG/C-R</td> <td>3.0</td> <td>4.0</td> <td>90'</td> <td>110'</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proposed</td> <td></td> <td>0.94</td> <td></td> <td>110'</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		FAR		Height		MoR	PUD	MoR	PUD	CG/C-R	3.0	4.0	90'	110'	Proposed		0.94		110'										
	FAR			Height																											
	MoR	PUD	MoR	PUD																											
CG/C-R	3.0	4.0	90'	110'																											
Proposed		0.94		110'																											

For the above-stated reasons, the proposed soccer stadium and anticipated ancillary development should prove to be an asset for the Buzzard Point neighborhood.

**Buzzard Point Vision Framework**

**ANC 6D Concern:** *Buzzard Point Vision Framework document is still in draft form*

**OP Response:** The Office of Planning is committed to the completion of a final draft of the document by the end of February. Much of the content that was shared at the February 2016 community meeting continues to be in the document that is under review.

The stadium-related design principles and streetscape guidelines were shared with stakeholders and Development Review staff for reference as staff reviewed the project. Although the Framework document continues to be in draft form, the vision for the neighborhood and the guiding principles are still relevant to the review of projects in Buzzard Point.

**ANC 6D Concern:** *Buzzard Point Vision Framework outreach and public involvement*

**OP Response:** Over the past two years, numerous meetings were held with Buzzard Point property owners, the Capitol Riverfront BID, ANC officials, Fort McNair representatives, the National Park Service, local community leaders, and several District government agencies.

The planning process was carefully coordinated with the Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Development (DMPED) who was leading the soccer stadium project.

Stakeholders provided input for the Vision Framework through a variety of opportunities, including:

- Three meetings with community leaders;
- Four meetings with property owners;
- One public open house related to the Buzzard Point Vision Framework and the Soccer Stadium;
- Numerous meetings with a wide array of District agency staff; and

- Multiple public meetings, including District of Columbia Council Roundtable and public hearings that included presentations on the Vision Framework.

**ANC 6D Concern:** *Buzzard Point Vision Plan states on p. 17 that “revitalization is consistent with the aspirations with the aspirations (sic) and needs of nearby residents and the city as a whole with a focus on roads and public spaces.”*

**OP Response:** OP believes this statement was taken out of context. A goal of the Vision Framework document is to ensure that revitalization of the Buzzard Point neighborhood is consistent with the aspirations and needs of nearby residents and the city as a whole; however this is an aspirational and not declarative statement. OP recognizes that each stakeholder may not fully embrace the vision, but this framework document aims to establish expectations and a shared plan for stakeholders, including property owners and nearby residents. Through the Comprehensive Plan and subsequent adoption of the Capitol Gateway Overlay, the District recognized the potential for development and growth in this area of the city.

Building on this anticipated growth, the Vision Framework provides guidance to the public and private sector regarding development and improvements envisioned for Buzzard Point. The Framework establishes design parameters for the soccer stadium, guidelines for the public realm, and specifications for the Anacostia Riverwalk Trail. The intent is to facilitate the creation of a cohesive and connected neighborhood that takes advantage of its proximity to the waterfront and grows in a well-designed, sustainable, and resilient manner.

**ANC 6D Concern:** *Half Street will be The Transportation Spine of Buzzard Point*

**OP Response:** The Buzzard Point Streetscape Guidelines designate Half Street as the central place of Buzzard Point and the primary pedestrian link to neighborhoods to the north and south. The Guidelines contemplate Half Street accommodating ground floor retail with pedestrian-scale street furnishings, as well as low impact development streetscape elements to reduce stormwater runoff but does not call it out as a “transportation spine”.

### **Potential Future Density**

**ANC 6D Concern:** *6,000 new housing units in Buzzard Point, in addition to the stadium project and ancillary development*

**OP Response:** The growth of the Buzzard Point community has been contemplated since the adoption of the Capitol Gateway Overlay District in 2005. The Capitol Gateway Overlay (CG Overlay) was the result of detailed planning studies for the area that were completed in 1988 to 1992. Follow-up actions included rezoning the lands from industrial to mixed-use and providing special provisions to encourage new development, particularly residential development. The CG Overlay was established to provide use, height, density (including incentives for bonus density and height), combined lot development, and design requirements to ensure an appropriate mixture of residential and commercial uses and suitable height, bulk, and design of buildings.

The potential for 6,000 new residential units that is cited by ANC 6D is a reasonable estimate for future residential density throughout the overall neighborhood. These are, however, estimates based on FAR and lot size and not guarantees of future development.

### **Preservation of Housing**

**ANC 6D Concern:** *Existing housing could be removed under the power of eminent domain to facilitate construction of the stadium or to provide transportation access to Buzzard Point*

**OP Response:** The site for the DC United soccer stadium and ancillary development parcel was assembled through a Purchase and Sale Agreement with Rollingwood Real Estate, LLC (Mark Ein), Super Salvage, Inc. (Super Salvage), and Potomac Electric Power Company (Pepco). On September 30, 2015, the District did initiate eminent domain for the remaining portion (Akridge) of the soccer stadium site, but there was no housing on that portion of the site or on any portion of the soccer stadium site. The District does not anticipate additional property assemblage for the soccer stadium project.

### **Signage**

**ANC 6D Concern:** *Zoning Commission order should reflect DC United's commitment to not install digital signage*

**OP Response:** OP supports including this restriction in the order, but notes that the team could, in the future, apply for a modification to the PUD to include digital signage. The modification request would provide an opportunity for ANC and public input.


**GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**



**d.** Office of the Director

**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Sara Bardin  
Director, Office of Zoning

**FROM:** Sam Zimbabwe  
Acting Chief Project Delivery Officer 

**DATE:** January 23, 2017

**SUBJECT:** DDOT Supplemental Report – ZC Case No. 16-02 – DC United Soccer Stadium

---

This supplemental report responds to written and oral testimony from ANC 6D, which raised questions about stadium-specific and neighborhood-specific transportation planning. This report identifies the ANC concerns and DDOT’s response. For clarity, DDOT has combined related concerns in order to be able to provide comprehensive responses succinctly.

**ANC 6D concern:** *A clearly defined and unambiguous transportation plan is lacking.*

**DDOT response:** As detailed in DDOT’s report to the Zoning Commission (Exhibit 43), Buzzard Point has been the subject of extensive study and deliberate planning by DDOT as we work collaboratively with other District agencies on the redevelopment of the greater neighborhood.

To date, several DDOT studies have concurred that the DC United Stadium will be manageable and compatible with the long-term build out of the SE/SW area as long as there are not simultaneous weeknight high attendance events at both venues that overlap with the PM peak travel period.

Of note, the ANC expressed concern that the M Street SE/SW Transportation Study (2012) did not fully envision the implications of entertainment uses within the study area. As stated in DDOT’s report to the Zoning Commission, the M Street SE/SW study predated the expansion of entertainment uses in the corridor, including the concept for a soccer stadium. DDOT completed the follow-up M Street SE/SW Events Transportation Analysis in 2014 after the potential for a soccer stadium in Buzzard Point had been identified, but before detailed programming was available. This study was completed in response to the community’s desire to better understand the implications of entertainment and events uses within the M Street SE/SW study area.

Stadium-specific studies have supplemented DDOT’s studies to provide more fine-grained analysis of the short- and long-term implications of the anticipated development within Buzzard Point. These studies made suggestions for multimodal improvements to be phased in as Buzzard Point develops such as street

configuration, sidewalk widths, circulation patterns, and intersection controls (e.g. traffic signals). Many of these recommendations are being implemented as part of the District's \$150 million investment in stadium-related infrastructure to improve streets and sidewalks adjacent to the stadium. Over the past two years, DDOT, DGS, and the Applicant have coordinated closely to develop precise, permitted plans for physical improvements adjacent to the stadium. Discussions are underway to adjust the permitted plans to accommodate the altered 1<sup>st</sup> Street through the site as well as finalization of the pavement marking and signage plan.

**ANC 6D Concern:** *Event operation plans are not defined, and could impact surrounding communities.*

**DDOT Response:** While the District-funded physical improvements will help support the stadium, accommodating DC United Stadium transportation needs is largely an operational task. Having developed successful event-day operations plans for the Nationals Stadium, the Verizon Center, and the Walter E. Washington Convention Center, DDOT understands the importance of determining a thorough and multi-faceted Transportation Operations and Parking Plan (TOPP) to manage events and is committed to working with the Applicant to ensure that a robust TOPP is in place prior to the opening of the DC United Stadium.

A TOPP is a detailed event-day operations guide to stadium transportation operations including curbside management, temporary signage, temporary turn restrictions, placement of Traffic Control Officers (TCOs), MPD and other staging areas, and traffic signal timing plans. TOPPs respond to on-the-ground conditions and are therefore assembled in preparation for seasonal operations in order to reflect the most current conditions of roadways and other transportation elements. This is doubly important in a dynamic area such as Buzzard Point where DDOT's South Capitol Street Corridor Project, infrastructure improvements adjacent to the stadium site, and private development are expected to dramatically change both physical transportation infrastructure and multi-modal transportation operations in the vicinity. As an example, it is not possible at this time to finalize the exact location of for-hire vehicle pick-up because infrastructure changes will realign existing streets in the vicinity thus altering existing curbside availability and construction-related closures are likely to alter the allowable curbside uses along some blocks. A clearer picture of the available curbside space will be known closer to the opening of the stadium, at which point a defined and detailed curbside management plan can be developed. Furthermore, although the ANC questions DDOT's commitment to working with Transportation Network Companies (TNCs, such as Uber and Lyft), DDOT in fact collaborates with these companies on both day-to-day and special event operations, including service management during the 58<sup>th</sup> Presidential Inauguration.

Although premature to fully develop a TOPP at this time, DDOT has requested that the Applicant commit to the following TOPP commitments to ensure that a robust TOPP and necessary updates are provided:

- Coordinate closely with DDOT on the development of the TOPP and incorporate lessons learned from the Washington Nationals TOPP. DDOT approval of the TOPP is required.
- Enter into a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with DDOT to define the process for TOPP development including key deliverable dates, review time periods, and community engagement processes.
- Fund and complete an initial TOPP in coordination with DDOT.
- Commit to funding annual updates to the TOPP to allow the TOPP to reflect changing conditions to parking locations, transportation network, and land development in the vicinity. The need to update the TOPP is at discretion of DDOT.
- The TOPP should account for different event sizes, event timing (weekday versus weekend, overlapping with peak periods versus non-overlapping, etc.), same day Nationals Stadium events separated by adequate time, and overlapping events with smaller venues in the vicinity (e.g. Yards Park, Arena Stage, and the future Wharf Hall).

The Applicant and DDOT have coordinated to determine a comprehensive list of TOPP components. In addition,

start dates for commencing each component of the TOPP will be determined based on the lead times required for planning and implementing each component.

**ANC 6D Concern:** *Additional transit service—especially expansion of DC Circulator—is necessary for stadium operations.*

**DDOT Response:** DDOT concurs that enhanced transit service will be an important component of stadium operations. Bus service is another area where detailed planning is appropriate to occur closer to the opening of the stadium and will therefore be part of the TOPP. As is stated in DDOT’s report, Metro is expected to carry the vast majority of patrons taking transit to the stadium. Although the 0.7 mile walking distance from either the Navy Yard-Ballpark Metro station or the Waterfront Metro station to the stadium gates is a relatively long walk, DDOT expects this distance to be a reasonable walking distance for stadium patrons and is a comparable distance to a majority of the off-site parking locations. Demand for additional bus service to supplement the existing Metrobus 74 line which services 2<sup>nd</sup> Street/P Street is expected.

DDOT is committed to adding bus transit service to serve the stadium. DDOT has identified three types of bus transit service that could be utilized: expanded Circulator service, enhanced Metrobus service, and private shuttles operated by DC United. However, the exact means by which to expand service requires additional information that is not known at this time. The appropriate transit service depends on a variety of factors including ability to procure and store/maintain Circulator buses, timing of Circulator route expansions identified in the 2014 DC Circulator Transit Development Plan, and delivery dates of pipeline developments relative to the stadium opening. Because of this variability, DDOT will require that the TOPP evaluate how best to provide service to Buzzard Point in conjunction with stadium events. Contrary to the ANC’s concerns that the District lacks authority to make changes to Metrobus routes, DDOT regularly coordinates with WMATA to enhance Metrobus routes to respond to changes in demand for routes. WMATA service changes take about one year to plan, program, and implement. DDOT has held preliminary discussions with WMATA about service enhancements to the Metrobus 74 line and the appropriate timelines for these discussions. Transit service enhancements will be the longest lead time item for the TOPP, and will start at least 12 months prior to the anticipated opening of the stadium.

**ANC 6D Concern:** *Previous DDOT studies have assumed streetcar service to Buzzard Point, but streetcar is no longer part of DDOT plans.*

**DDOT Response:** The ANC questioned the consistency between the M Street SE/SW Special Events Transportation Analysis, which assumed the creation of a streetcar line that terminated in Buzzard Point, with the Environmental Mitigation Study (EMS), which did not. The Special Events study was completed prior to a defined proposal for the soccer stadium and when a North-South Streetcar line was considered a likely future transit improvement. As plans for the stadium and transit expansion plans evolved, assumptions were updated for later studies to better reflect future conditions with the proposed stadium. A summary of the stadium and analysis assumptions between the Special Events study, EMS, and the current DC United Stadium proposal is shown in Table 1.

Table 1 Stadium and Transit Assumptions

	Special Events Study	EMS	DCU Proposal
<b>Stadium Capacity</b>	25,000	20,000	19,000
<b>Assumed Streetcar?</b>	Yes	No	No
<b>Transit Mode Split</b>	45%	40%	40%
<b># of Transit Trips</b>	11,250	8,000	7,600



Although the Special Events study assumed that a portion of the transit demand for the stadium would be met by the streetcar line, the lion's share of transit capacity was assumed to be accommodated by Metro with the streetcar providing supplemental service. The study assumed streetcar to carry 960 peak hour passengers, roughly 8.5% of all transit trips, which is the same capacity as one 8-car Metro train. Because the current stadium proposal is projected to have almost 4,000 fewer transit trips than the stadium analyzed in the Special Events Study, existing Metrorail capacity is anticipated to serve the demand, along with the enhanced bus service described above.

DDOT finds that in the absence of a streetcar, the assumed 40% transit mode split used in the EMS is achievable for the stadium given the lack of on-site parking, the relative comparable walking distances of Metro compared to off-site parking locations, the proposed TDM plan, and the planned supplemental bus transit service.

**ANC 6D Concern:** *Bicyclists and pedestrians will not be able to safely circulate to the site.*

**DDOT Response:** As part of the District-DC United stadium agreement the District is installing high-quality pedestrian facilities and two cycle tracks surrounding the site. Two-way cycle tracks will be constructed along the north side of Potomac Avenue and R Street from South Capitol Street to 2<sup>nd</sup> Street and on the west side of 2<sup>nd</sup> Street. These cycle tracks will be located on the opposite side of the street from the stadium, thus avoiding conflict points along the stadium frontage. It is also expected that TCOs will be placed around the perimeter of the stadium on event days to further manage multimodal traffic flows. Locations and times for TCOs will be elaborated on in the TOPP.

**ANC 6D Concern:** *Transportation improvements may remove existing housing.*

**DDOT Response:** While the District has acquired right-of-way as part of the South Capitol Street Bridge Project, all parcels are currently in process and no parcels contain existing housing. There are no current transportation improvements related to the DC United Stadium or planned transportation projects in the vicinity that are anticipated to remove existing housing. Any potential right-of-way acquisitions needed for future transportation projects would be subject to stringent and transparent local and federal processes. No such acquisitions are expected at this time.

**ANC 6D Concern:** *Broader transportation and access issues, such as emergency vehicle access, and neighborhood circulation in the Buzzard Point area are not specifically addressed in the DC United Stadium PUD or DDOT's report.*

**DDOT Response:** In 2012, DDOT completed the M Street SE/SW Transportation Study, a neighborhood level long-range transportation study. The plan recommended infrastructure changes to improve safety for drivers, pedestrians, and cyclists, increase mobility, provide better local connections to the regional network, and support planned development. These recommendations are expected to be refined, planned, and implemented by DDOT and the private sector as Buzzard Point builds-out over the coming decades. DDOT is committed to working with ANC 6D and the community to ensure successful rollout of these recommendations.

As Buzzard Point builds out, DDOT will monitor all projects to ensure that they are effectively coordinated in all phases. To manage construction-related transportation impacts of developments, DDOT requires all developments and construction projects to develop traffic control plans (TCPs) to manage construction-related multimodal transportation impacts. DDOT reviews TCPs and coordinates TCPs with other construction projects in the vicinity to ensure a coordinated approach to managing transportation related impacts that facilitates

circulation for local traffic and routing construction traffic out of neighborhoods to District truck routes. DDOT also works through the development review process to ensure that impacts from new developments are manageable within and take advantage of the District's multimodal transportation network. DDOT requires developments seeking zoning relief to complete a CTR to determine the action's impact on the overall transportation network. CTRs can also be required for matter of right projects through DDOT's public space permitting process when there are non-standard conditions that may require more detailed analysis. An applicant is expected to show the existing conditions for each transportation mode affected, the proposed impact on the respective network, and any proposed mitigations, along with the effects of the mitigations on other travel modes. Finally, DDOT employs design and engineering standards to ensure that transportation infrastructure improvements provide safe and efficient facilities for users, including motorists, pedestrians, bicycles, and emergency vehicles.

The ANC expressed specific concerns about Half Street SW becoming the "transportation spine" of the Buzzard Point community. DDOT does not envision creating a new vehicular traffic spine on Half Street between M Street and Buzzard Point. No changes to Half Street between M Street and P Street, including direction of travel, are planned as part of the stadium project or buildout of Buzzard Point. Improvements to Half Street south of P Street are included as part of the South Capitol Street Corridor Project and the District-funded physical improvements supporting the soccer stadium to connect Buzzard Point vehicular traffic to South Capitol Street and minimize impacts on existing residents between M Street and P Street.

SZ:jr

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
Department of Energy and Environment



**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Sara Bardin  
Director, Office of Zoning

**FROM:** Daniel Conner, DOEE  
Special Assistant to the Director

**DATE:** January 23, 2017

**SUBJECT:** Zoning Commission Case No. 16-02 DC United Stadium  
District Agency Responses to ANC 6D Testimony

---

This supplemental report responds to written and oral testimony from ANC 6D, which raised questions about stadium-specific and neighborhood-specific environmental concerns. This report identifies the ANC concerns and DOEE's response. For clarity, DOEE has combined related concerns in order to be able to provide comprehensive responses succinctly.

**ANC 6D concern:** *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.*

**DOEE Response:** As with any large construction site requiring environmental remediation, DOEE has worked closely with DC United throughout the regulatory process of preparation, review and approval of a Voluntary Cleanup Program (VCP) plan. The VCP has been approved and remediation and construction activities will commence as planned.

During the process, we requested detailed information on the environmental characterization of the site and have reviewed Phase I and Phase II Environmental Site Assessments for each of the parcels included in the DC United site. All site assessments adhere to the standards published by the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM).

We have also directed the applicant to submit a Cleanup Action Plan (CAP), along with four supplemental documents:

- Health and Safety Plan for workers;
- Human Health Risk Assessment;
- Dust and Odor Control Plan; and

- Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plans.

These supplemental plans detail the process by which the applicant will ensure all chemicals and contaminants are remediated on site or transported off the property in a manner that protects the health, safety, and wellbeing of onsite project personnel and neighboring residents. The CAP (including the supplementary plans) have been reviewed and approved.

Cleanup activities have now begun and are ongoing. Reports and documentation are publicly available on both the [DOEE](#) and [DMPED](#) websites as soon as it is available.

DOEE, DMPED, DGS, and DOH have met regularly with neighbors and community representatives and will continue to do so until the project is completed.

DOEE posted all VCP notices in the DC Register to inform the public of the proposed projects and to solicit comments and feedback. We responded to several inquiries received through our FOIA officer and assisted a number of direct inquirers who came to the agency to review the documents. Within 48 hours of receipt, we provided copies of all Phase I and Phase II Site Assessment documents to the ANC.

**ANC 6D concern:** *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.*

**DOEE Response:** DOEE reviews Planned Unit Development applications for environmental impacts and to ensure they are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.. In addition to standard permitting requirements, all development projects in the District of Columbia are required to meet regulatory requirements related to the remediation of hazardous materials and stormwater management. As such, DOEE uses the PUD application process to identify opportunities for increasing environmental and sustainable design benefits, consistent with the ambitious goals of the Sustainable DC and Climate Ready DC plans. Contamination does not preclude a site from development, but it does trigger a series of regulatory requirements and approval

In the case of the DC United parcel, the applicant engaged with DOEE in that regulatory review process prior to submitting their proposal for Zoning Commission approval, and that information is made publicly available.

**ANC 6D concern:** *DOEE should have prepared a report to be included in the Case File that assesses 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.*

**DOEE Response:** All development projects are expected to be coordinated with neighborhood stakeholders and are required to comply with the District's regulatory requirements during construction and subsequent operation. DOEE worked closely with the Office of Planning and other government agencies in the framing of the Buzzard Point Vision Framework Plan, which is intended to guide development in the overall Buzzard Point neighborhood.

DOEE ensures the environmental conditions of the area will be comprehensively characterized and, if necessary, safely remediated. The Voluntary Cleanup Program is a site-specific regulatory tool and doesn't provide the authority to require an applicant to go beyond the property line of their particular project. The objective of the program is to address site-specific contamination and to ensure the site's source of contamination is permanently removed and no longer poses threats to public health and the environment. Buzzard Point comprises several separate parcels, each with different owners and individual plans; therefore, evaluation will be conducted on a site-by-site basis, through a multi-agency collaborative effort working in conjunction with all nearby residents and other interested stakeholders.

**ANC 6D concern:** *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.*

**DOEE Response:** Acknowledged



Government of the District of Columbia  
Department of Health



Office of the Director

**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Sara Bardin  
Director, Office of Zoning

**FROM:** C. Anneta Arno, PhD., MPH  
Director, Office of Health Equity, Department of Health

**DATE:** January 23, 2017

**SUBJECT:** Zoning Commission Case No. 16-02 DC United Stadium  
District Agency Responses to ANC 6D Testimony

---

**Background:**

The mission of District of Columbia Department of Health (DOH), is to promote health, wellness and equity across the District, and protect the safety of residents, visitors and those who do business in our nation's Capital. DOH undertook the Buzzard Point Community Health and Safety Study (CHSS) in 2016 in partial response to resident concerns with respect to health issues associated with redevelopment of Buzzard Point, especially potential health risks for the surrounding community.

**Findings: Buzzard Point Community Health and Safety Study (CHSS) 2016**

The CHASS analysis indicated some differences in health outcome status for Buzzard Point in comparison with the rest of the District, the overarching assessment concluded that there were no statistically significant elevations of cancer or other health conditions within the Buzzard Point Community Health Status (CHS) Assessment Area. More dramatic differences were observable, however, in terms of social wellbeing for residents in US Census Tract 64, which approximates the resident defined Buzzard Point Neighborhood. This underscores the elevated historic and contemporary vulnerability of Buzzard Point community residents by comparison with their immediate neighbors on the rest of the Peninsula, as well as with the District of Columbia as a whole. With these findings as context, the final report made a total of five (5) recommendations, including the need to *“Conduct continued monitoring of Community Health Status through the construction period”*, to include monitoring of four (4) health outcomes – Asthma; Acute Respiratory Diseases; Heart Disease; and Stroke. Full details of the process and findings are presented in the final report *“Buzzard Point Community Health & Safety Study (CHASS), August 2016.*

## **Ongoing Role & Responsibilities**

DOH core responsibilities include identifying health risks, and is firmly committed to ongoing health surveillance and monitoring programs for the District, including Buzzard Point. DOH is also committed to promoting effective community collaborations. Since publication of the CHASS Report, DOH has been in frequent communication with ANC representatives and others on the appropriate role for DOH, in addition to our traditional scope. As an example, moving forward, DOH is supportive of proposed community led data collection processes. DOH is working constructively in an advisory capacity with an academic partner that the community has engaged to conduct a baseline health assessment, with the goal of promoting survey design validity and the generation of meaningful results.