GOVERNMENT
OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY

MARCH 29, 2000

+ + + + +

The Public Hearing convened in Room 220 South, 441 4th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001, pursuant to notice at 9:45 a.m., Sheila Cross Reid, Chairperson, presiding.

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT MEMBERS PRESENT:

SHEILA CROSS REID	Chairperson
ROBERT N. SOCKWELL	Vice Chairperson
ANN RENSHAW	Board Member

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBER PRESENT:

JOHN G. PARSONS	Commissioner

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

Sheri Pruitt	Secretary, BZA
Beverly Bailey	Office of Zoning
Paul Hart	Office of Zoning
John Nyarku	Office of Zoning

OTHER AGENCY STAFF PRESENT:

Mary Vogle	Office of Planning

D.C. OFFICE OF CORPORATION COUNSEL:

Marie Sansone, Esq.

C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

AGENDA ITEM PAGE

PRELIMINARY MATTERS 4

APPLICATION OF THE MORRIS AND GWENDOLYN
CAFRITZ FOUNDATION/THE FIELD SCHOOL . . . 66

PHIL T. FEOLA, ESQ.
Wilkes, Artis, Hedrick & Lane, Chartered
1666 K Street, N.W.
Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20006=2897
202/457-7800

WITNESSES

ELIZABETH ELY 73
LOUISE MILLIKAN 77
DAVID COX 81
ELLIOT RHODESIDE 94

P R O C E E D I N G S

9:45 A.M.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. This is the March 29 public hearing of the Board of Zoning Adjustment, District of Columbia. My name is Sheila Cross Reid, Chairperson. Joining me today is Robert Sockwell and Ann Renshaw, as well as Mr. John Parsons, representing the Zoning Commission who will be joining us shortly. And also, Rodney Moulden, representing the National Capital Planning Commission who also will be joining us shortly.

The topics of today's hearing agenda are available to you. They are located to my left near the door. All persons planning to testify either in favor or in opposition are to fill out two witness cards. These cards are located at each end of the table in front of us.

When coming forward to speak to the Board, please give both cards to the Reporter who is sitting to my right.

The procedure for special exception variances cases will proceed as follows: (1) statement of witnesses of the Applicant; (2) government reports including Office of Planning, Department of Public Works, etcetera; (3) report of the Neighborhood Advisory Commission, the ANC; (4) persons and parties in support; (5) persons and parties in opposition; (6) closing remarks by the Applicant.

Cross examination of witnesses is permitted by the

applicant or parties. The ANC within which the property is located is automatically a party in these cases. The record will be closed at the conclusion of each case except for any materials specifically requested by the Board and the staff will specify at the end of the hearing exactly what is expected.

The decision of the Board in these protested cases must be based exclusively on the public record. To avoid any appearance to the contrary the Board requests that persons present not engage members of the Board in conversation.

Please turn off all beepers and cell phones at this time so as not to disrupt these proceedings.

At this time the Board will consider any preliminary matters. Preliminary matters are those which relate to whether a case will or should be heard today such as a request for postponement, continuance or withdrawal or whether proper and adequate notice of the hearing has been given.

If you're not prepared to go forward or you believe that the Board should not proceed, now is the time to raise such a matter. All right, just one second, sir.

For those of you in the back who cannot hear, apparently our PA system is not operating properly so that is why you are not hearing. However, what we try to do is to project our voices and for those of you who are having a particularly difficult time, there are some seats up here near the front and I would suggest that you kind of move up to the front so that you

can be able to better hear and in the meantime we will be trying to adjust the system so as to make it operable.

Okay, it was worked on yesterday, but the Board Members, we all will try to project our voices as best we can. But if you know that you have hearing problems, back there, that you can't hear us, then try to come up front and staff will accommodate you by putting additional chairs, if that needs to happen.

All right, now, preliminary matters, come forward, please.

MR. BOLOTIN: My name is Jeffrey Bolotin and I am here this morning to tell you that I don't think this hearing can go forward this morning. Unfortunately, what we have before us is the Field School BZA Application 16559 dated March 1, 2000 which I have in front of me. There have been major, major changes to the application that have not been afforded the general public knowledge.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Excuse me, sir, can you identify yourself?

MR. BOLOTIN: Certainly. I am a resident of Fox Hall Crescents. I am also representing my association of 22 members of that association.

CHAIRPERSON REED: What's your name again?

MR. BOLOTIN: Jeffrey Bolotin.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Okay, now, so you want to make a

--

MR. BOLOTIN: I just wanted to explain why I thought this hearing should not go forward this morning.

CHAIRPERSON REED: What do you want us to do?

MR. BOLOTIN: I think what we need to do is we need to get a chance to the public to react to the revised transportation plan that has been submitted this past Monday by the school. The neighborhood has had upwards of 12 or 13 meetings, the ANC meetings, Palisades meetings. Each one of those meetings over the last four months have involved the transportation plan as set forth in the March 1 statement and each one of those plans were that there would be no left hand turns in the a.m. rush hour except for shuttle buses and emergency vehicles.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Okay, so basically what you want to do is to request that the hearing be postponed or continued?

MR. BOLOTIN: The problem I have is that this is a major thoroughfare of Foxhall Road.

CHAIRPERSON REED: No, no, this is not the time to testify, sir. You will be given an opportunity. Right now, we're trying to ascertain what, in fact, what is your objective here, preliminary matter?

MR. BOLOTIN: Yes ma'am. I think the public at large has not had an opportunity to even know of the revised plan of the school with regard to its transportation.

CHAIRPERSON REED: So therefore?

MR. BOLOTIN: And therefore, since transportation has been the number one issue, this hearing ought to be continued for an opportunity --

CHAIRPERSON REED: That's what I want to find out, now wait a minute.

MR. BOLOTIN: Yes ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON REED: In order for him to make a request for a continuance he has to be granted party status.

MS. PRUITT: Correct, but there are also, I believe there is another person or another entity also has an issue of continuance based on the same issues. Is that correct? You might want to come forward.

MR. BOLOTIN: The problem, Madam Chairman, is there are so many people who don't know about the change--

CHAIRPERSON REED: Sure, I understand. I hear what you're saying.

MS. PRUITT: He has also your same issue, so --

CHAIRPERSON REED: Ms. Pruitt?

MS. PRUITT: You might want to do party status first.

CHAIRPERSON REED: My question was before this gentleman can make a request to put a motion on the floor he has to first be granted party status.

MS. PRUITT: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON REED: So that's what we have to determine first and then we go to --

MS. PRUITT: Issues from the applicant.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Then we go to your motion.

MR. BOLOTIN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Just hold there for one second and let me listen to this gentleman and I will come back.

MR. AGUGLIA: Good morning. My name is Richard Aguglia, an attorney, Hunton & Williams, representing Neighbors Against Foxhall Gridlock. We would request party status.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Okay.

MR. AGUGLIA: You will notice on the first page of the handout for the parties in opposition, excepting Mrs. Shagrue who is represented here by separate counsel, all of the parties on this sheet and you see the yellow markings, including Mrs. Shagrue border the Cafritz estate and are directly impacted from the proposed school in terms of noise, emission, fumes, the lighting for the parking, drain off from the school and also traffic that will be coming down their street and their ability to get out.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Okay, where is Mrs. Shagrue's property on this diagram?

MR. AGUGLIA: It's 855, it's in the left hand corner.

CHAIRPERSON REED: And the other sites that you

have indicated in yellow --

MR. AGUGLIA: All the other persons I'm representing.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Are the ones that you are representing, okay.

MR. AGUGLIA: I'm representing, that's correct. And they all are, obviously within 200 feet since they border the property and are directly affected by the proposed school site, as I said in terms of the noise from the school, emissions, there's going to be parking, lights, fumes, environmental runoff, also, their ability to get out to Foxhall Road from W Street which is a heavily traveled road and also people who will be coming down W Street and making a U turn in the circle to come back out to get into the school, if, in fact, left turns are prohibited.

CHAIRPERSON REED: And your question is?

MR. AGUGLIA: I am just showing you who I'm representing in my request that you grant party status.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Party status, okay.

MR. AGUGLIA: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Okay.

MR. AGUGLIA: On the next page you will notice also the yellow markings of the other people I represent who border on W Street or are, for instance, the Griffin property is on Foxhall Road, literally between the G.W. Mount Vernon campus and the

proposed school site, as I say, sort of in a cross fire. The other persons who are farther north on Foxhall Road, their only access would be to Foxhall Road where the proposed school is and will have to encounter the traffic congestion there and especially at Dexter where the proposed morning is only right turns out would affect the neighbors on that corner and block their ability to come out under a normal basis.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Okay, Mr. Feola.

MR. FEOLA: Madam Chair, Members of the Board, for the record, Phil Feola with Wilkes, Artis on behalf of the Field School.

Maybe we can help cut this short a little bit. The Field School, the applicant in this case does not object to Mr. Aguglia's clients from being afforded party status. I think they meet the test set forth in the zoning regulations, at least with the ones that are adjacent to the property and that's enough under court precedent to allow his clients to achieve party status.

Likewise, with Mrs. Shagrue, we believe that she could and should be afforded party status, so we object to neither of those requests for party status.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Okay, now typically in requests for party status it is not sufficient that the persons requesting party status be within 200 feet of the subject site. What we have to ascertain is are those persons that you're representing, both of you, are they more aggrieved than the other residents right

there in that particular vicinity, right there in that neighborhood. Is there something that is unique or unusual that makes them more aggrieved than anyone else who happens to be similarly situated? I ask Mr. Bolotin first.

MR. BOLOTIN: Yes, our homeowners' association while it does not front directly onto the property, the chief means of ingress and egress from our 22 homeowners is through Foxhall Road. Foxhall Road is our local street. That's the only way we can get in and out of this.

CHAIRPERSON REED: See, that's the thing. By virtue of the fact that 22 homeowners who have the same problem, that in effect, nullifies the position of them, the base of their party status and there is no one who is more aggrieved than the others. They all are basically on the same plane, correct?

MR. BOLOTIN: Yes, all 22 of us are on the same plane, but that is our local street as opposed to some of the other people who don't use Foxhall Road, don't have any necessity of using Foxhall Road. We must use Foxhall Road and we're also faced with the situation that a number of people who would otherwise have been here, persons don't know about the change of the lefthand turn and second, a number of neighbors who have joined it have basically been compromised because the school has agreed not to have access to 44th Street. My people haven't received any favors, therefore we are here in opposition because we have a legitimate situation with regard to Foxhall Road.

That's our local street.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Okay. But again, there is no special circumstance, the situation that you are proffering to us that makes any of these particular individuals, 22, more aggrieved than anyone else who lives in that neighborhood or that community.

MR. BOLOTIN: That neighborhood is vastly impacted.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Yes, the whole neighborhood.

MR. BOLOTIN: I'm not sure there's anybody here speaking for that neighborhood.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Well, excuse me for cutting you off, but you will have the opportunity, they can speak in opposition to party status as a specific category which gives the recipients the right to (1) cross examine.

MR. BOLOTIN: Exactly.

CHAIRPERSON REED: And to receive all correspondence germane to this particular case.

Now, needless to say, I hope that you can understand that if we were to grant party status to 22 individuals, then we would be here all day.

MR. BOLOTIN: We're only asking it for myself as representative of those 22 people. We're not asking for 22 people. I have a resolution appointing me --

CHAIRPERSON REED: Let me finish.

MR. BOLOTIN: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON REED: And as such, the 22 people that you are representing have to qualify individually for party status for it to be granted as such. Do you see what I'm saying.

MR. BOLOTIN: I've asked for --

CHAIRPERSON REED: So we'd have to then query each individual or maybe they can just tell us how it is that they are more uniquely impacted than anyone else who lives close to this particular Field School, the proposed Field School site.

MR. BOLOTIN: I've asked for party status for myself and my wife as well as representatives of the homeowners association. The answer to your question is that these residents and myself and my wife use Foxhall Road as our local street and we think that is a unique circumstance that needs to be taken in consideration and we do want to cross examine the experts for the school.

CHAIRPERSON REED: But it's not unique when you have 22 people who are similarly affected. Excuse me one second.

(Pause.)

Staff was telling me that at the condominium associations that your asking for representation of are all -- they're in one particular location and as such they can be taken as one entity.

MS. PRUITT: Sir, you have authorization from your condo association to represent them?

MR. BOLOTIN: I do. I have a resolution I'd be

glad to pass out.

MS. PRUITT: So he has the right to speak on their behalf.

MR. BOLOTIN: Yes, I do, no one else will speak.

CHAIRPERSON REED: So --

MS. PRUITT: So he's requesting party status for them, for the entity itself, the condo entity and then as an individual.

MR. BOLOTIN: Yes ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON REED: All right.

MR. FEOLA: Madam Chair, on behalf of the applicant, we have objected to Mr. Bolotin's request for party status on two fronts and I think the chair

--

CHAIRPERSON REED: I thought you did not object.

MR. FEOLA: I did not object to Mr. Aguglia's request on behalf of his clients, nor Mrs. Shagrue's request.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Okay.

MR. FEOLA: To be party. Mr. Bolotin timely filed the request to be party status on behalf of himself and his wife in reference this association. There was no documentation submitted in a timely manner that indicated he had any authority to represent the association. He now brings something today, almost four weeks late, to suggest that he represents more than himself and his wife.

Secondly, and probably more importantly, what the chair has suggested is exactly true. Mr. Bolotin claims that Foxhall Road is his neighborhood street, but you can't get to his house without traversing either 48th Street and W Street to get to Foxhall Road or vice versa, so you need to get to two separate public streets before you can even get to Foxhall Road. He's almost 900 feet as the crow flies across the Belgium Embassy property. I'm going to turn in this map to show that he isn't, nor is his association, affected any differently than pretty much anybody who lives in this corridor from MacArthur Boulevard to Foxhall Road.

I don't think he has established party status under either case law or this Board's guidelines.

MS. PRUITT: Just for reference, Madam Chair, Exhibit 32 is Mr. Bolotin's request in your file.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Ms. Renshaw.

MEMBER RENSHAW: Yes, I would just like to comment that I do believe that Mr. Bolotin should be accorded party status because Foxhall Place, N.W., that's what we're talking about?

MR. BOLOTIN: Foxhall Crescents.

MEMBER RENSHAW: Foxhall Crescents is an area where the homeowners are literally trapped. You get down in there and you have no other recourse but Foxhall Road. And so I would say it is within bounds to accord this association party status so that Mr. Bolotin can represent those affected homeowners who as a

group are going to be impacted by the traffic, the increased traffic on Foxhall Road.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Ms. Renshaw, can you indicate for us where on this map that has been outlined that particular condominium --

MEMBER RENSHAW: Association. It drops down. It's on the other side of the street.

MR. FEOLA: Madam Chair, the map I just submitted, staff is copying, has that picture on it.

MR. BOLOTIN: It's directly off of 46th Street, N.W.

(Pause.)

CHAIRPERSON REED: Are you within 200 feet? Is your building or your -- is it a single building or is it --

MR. BOLOTIN: It's 22 individual single family houses. It's more than 200 feet.

(Pause.)

CHAIRPERSON REED: While we're waiting, is there anyone else who is requesting party status?

MS. HEUER: I am Ann Heuer and the ANC Commissioner. I have automatic status.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Correct.

MS. HEUER: When you finish this party status I would like to speak briefly. Thank you, about continuing this case.

CHAIRPERSON REED: You mean as a preliminary matter?

MS. HEUER: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Okay.

(Pause.)

MR. SWENDIMAN: Good morning, my name is Alan Swendiman. I'm appearing on behalf of Sylvia Shagrue. Mrs. Shagrue's house is located immediately adjacent to the proposed site, her property line is contiguous with that of the Cafritz property. Her house would be closest to a proposed southern entrance to this site as well as proposed parking and lighting for that parking lot. I believe that counsel for the applicant has indicated that he has no objection and concurs with Mrs. Shagrue being granted party status in this matter.

CHAIRPERSON REED: All right, looking at the map that's been submitted.

MR. SWENDIMAN: It's 855.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Yes, we can see the proximity of where her property is located to the proposed site and her contention is that her being close to or adjacent to the proposed southern entrance is what makes her more impacted than anyone else?

MR. SWENDIMAN: I think, Madam Chair, that without being presumptuous, I think that Mrs. Shagrue is more impacted personally than any other party in this proceeding, not only from

the standpoint of traffic, but in terms of pollution, noise and a number of other environmental conditions.

CHAIRPERSON REED: So you're saying that the southern entrance is closer to her -- the proposed southern entrance would be closer to her --

MR. SWENDIMAN: Her house --

CHAIRPERSON REED: Than any other properties that are similarly located on that particular tract, right there?

MR. SWENDIMAN: Correct. And the proposed parking lot would be closer to her property than any other residence adjacent.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Okay, then the applicant has no objection to your request and I have no problem with Mrs. Shagrue being granted party status unless there is objection by any other Board Members? Okay.

MS. PRUITT: Madam Chair, I do have a point of clarification from staff's point. She is represented by individual counsel and then also by Mr. Aguglia. Will she be part of the Neighbors Against Gridlock or on her own?

MR. SWENDIMAN: She'll be represented by separate counsel, Ms. Pruitt. The reason why she signed that particular matte that was filed here was that there was a question as to whether our initial filing had been received. It was subsequently located, but just as a protective measure we had signed.

MS. PRUITT: That's clear for the record. Thank

you.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Thank Wi very much.

MR. AGUGLIA: Ms. Reed, since Mr. Feola has no objection and set under case law that my clients are all considered to be party status, do you need anything more from me?

CHAIRPERSON REED: Yes, your clients, Mr. Aguglia are -- how many people do you represent? There are five persons?

MR. AGUGLIA: There's 11.

MS. PRUITT: Madam Chair, you have a chart in front of you with all the individuals actually delineated.

MR. AGUGLIA: Eleven, excluding Ms. Shagrue.

CHAIRPERSON REED: The parties against gridlock?

MR. AGUGLIA: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Okay, the parties against gridlock. All right, now the question was how are these parties any more aggrieved than everyone else that lives on that cul de sac.

MR. AGUGLIA: Obviously, from the diagram they are adjacent to the school. There's going to be significant excavation of the site in order to put in the ball fields, significant excavation. There will be environmental run off into their lots. They will also be subjected to the noise from the school and the playing fields, the lights from the parking lot. There's going to be a proposal for some 128 parking spaces on the site with lighting. What I consider to be the only valid proposal

on traffic would be no left hand turns into the project, except for shuttle buses, which will mean that people will make left hand turns down W Street, come through the neighborhood, come around the cul de sac and then come back out so they can make a right hand turn on Foxhall to get back into the school because of what I say is the last valid submission from the school that only -- that traffic coming north down Foxhall Road, except for shuttle buses cannot turn left into the school, so where are they going to go? They're going to come down and they're going to take a left into W Street, come down my neighbors' already crowded street, make a U -- circle around and come back out and make a right on Foxhall to get into the school.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Wait a minute, that's a given, the fact that they will be affected, and I'm not disputing that. But my question was how is it that they are more impacted or more affected than anyone else who is similarly situated in this cul de sac?

MR. AGUGLIA: Because the general public, because this will one of the main arteries for people to get to the school.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Everyone in that cul de sac will have the same problem, right?

MR. AGUGLIA: That's correct.

CHAIRPERSON REED: That's the whole point I'm making. What is it that makes them uniquely impacted or

aggrieved?

MR. AGUGLIA: But they also back up to the school as I've said. I think you're being narrow in your definition of -- under that definition, no one will qualify.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Just one moment.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Madam Chair, I think our previous decision with Mrs. Shagrue would apply here. You see on the same map the houses that he represents abut this property. They are differently affected in that not only the traffic issue that Mr. Aguglia just mentioned, but the fact that they abut the property seems to be the same circumstance as Mrs. Shagrue. So I would support the party status.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Mr. Parsons, apparently, in terms of true abutting conditions, only three of the listed properties truly abut.

CHAIRPERSON REED: 40 and 844, is that one property?

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I'm sorry?

CHAIRPERSON REED: Lot 40 and 844, is that one property?

MR. AGUGLIA: No, those are two different properties. But --

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Apparently, of the properties that were shown, 40 and 844 are considered separately. They are just colored the same. Because they are not shown with

the houses colored. They're just shown with the lots highlighted. So it looks like one highlight. That's where my count and your count didn't match up. Now I understand.

MR. AGUGLIA: There's only one, excuse me, there's only that may not touch and that's 844. The school property winds all the way around down.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: It does?

MR. AGUGLIA: It comes right down. So 872, 38, 852, 41, 40, 844, I can't quite tell.

MEMBER RENSHAW: Mr. Aguglia, does the property of the school come down between 843 and 844 on the map?

MR. AGUGLIA: I think it does.

MEMBER RENSHAW: Because it's that curving line and it seems to penetrate down into those lots so I'm wondering is that school property?

MR. AGUGLIA: It would appear from the map that 844 does not touch, but it's within a matter of feet.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Mr. Feola?

MR. FEOLA: Yes ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON REED: This site plan that you gave us, this is the actual configuration of the site?

MR. FEOLA: Yes ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Including this area here?

MR. AGUGLIA: It goes all the way down to 44th Street.

MR. FEOLA: Yes ma'am. What's shown as an outlock.

CHAIRPERSON REED: We understand.

MR. FEOLA: It goes all the way to W and actually goes all the way to W Street.

(Pause.)

CHAIRPERSON REED: All right, what we have to determine is looking at the siting of these particular persons in relation to the proposed site for the Field School, it is the general consensus of the Board that we will grant them party status through you and that you would be their spokesperson and that you would be the one who would do the cross examination only. And that communications and what have you that would be submitted throughout this case would also go to you.

Now we have just Mr. Bolotin. Now with your particular submission, number one, we have to waive the record to allow you to submit your affidavit in which you have been delegated as the representative of the condominium association and I have no problem with waiving of the records to allow that to come into the record.

MS. PRUITT: Waiving the filing time?

CHAIRPERSON REED: Yes, waiving the filing time to allow it to come in.

Now in regard to your request for party status, your location -- you're contending that while your location is not within 200 feet, but the impact comes as a result of the -- your

location proximity to the subject, the proposed property even though you're not within 200 feet you still contend that you are going to be impacted because of the traffic flow, circulation?

MR. BOLOTIN: Yes, the ability to ingress and egress on Foxhall Road.

CHAIRPERSON REED: So in order to get in and out of that --

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Mr. Bolotin, your portion of Foxhall Crescents has no access to Foxhall Road directly, does it?

MR. BOLOTIN: No, it does not.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Yes, because you're behind, your the ones that are accessed through the W Street, 46th Street and then you go off into your various little cul de sacs and dead end corridors?

MR. BOLOTIN: That is correct.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Okay.

MS. PRUITT: Mr. Bolotin, do you have your -- we can copy and give to the Board?

MR. BOLOTIN: Yes.

(Pause.)

CHAIRPERSON REED: Mr. Bolotin, now that we can visually see where you are in proximity to the property, given the fact that we now have a map, can you explain to us again about how the change in the left turn and the right turn affects you?

MR. BOLOTIN: Certainly. My homeowners, when they leave their property to go either downtown or north, need to access on Foxhall Road. They go down 46th Street, make a left on W Street and proceed to Foxhall Road where they're free to make either a left or right hand turn.

Some of the --

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Mr. Bolotin, if your residents make a right onto W Street, where do they wind up?

MR. BOLOTIN: They would wind up on two blocks going to MacArthur Boulevard as opposed to Foxhall Road.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: And from MacArthur Boulevard they would have an alternative way to get out of the neighborhood?

MR. BOLOTIN: Indirectly, that's correct.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: As well they can access Whitehaven Parkway and then --

MR. BOLOTIN: They have no access to Whitehaven.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: They have no access to Whitehaven from --

MR. BOLOTIN: No sir, they do not.

(Pause.)

CHAIRPERSON REED: Those are the only two means of ingress and egress that you have?

MR. BOLOTIN: No, we can go back through 49th Street and Garfield which is going to impacted by the no left hand

turn policy. That was our point. Wherever we turn we're impacted, the 22 homeowners are impacted by the additional traffic that will be created by the Field School relocation.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Okay, so you want to get -- to obtain party status to represent the association.

Now I have no problem with granting that party status for the association and your being the representative being the one who would do the cross examination as well as the one who would receive the correspondence and what have you. However, I do not think that you would be -- you should be granted party status individually. I think that that -- granting it to the association should take care of whatever your concerns are, as well as the fact that you still have the right and opportunity to be able to testify individually, if you so desire.

MR. BOLOTIN: That would be satisfactory if party status was given to the association.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Okay, Board Members?

MR. FEOLA: Madam Chair, I'd like to reiterate our objection for really a prime reason and Mr. Bolotin has been at public meetings that this case has been discussed ever since the first one. He's probably been to all of them. He's been very attentive to these things. Never once have we been invited to the association that he now represents which shows up today with a resolution. It doesn't seem terribly fair to the applicant. We've known Mr. Bolotin's position as an individual and we

certainly respect it and he has a right to state it, but to show up March 29, six months after he first saw this project and say now he represents as association who opposes this project who hasn't seen this project, that the best of our knowledge, I think is not terribly fair.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Are you not aware of the submission, Mr. Bolotin, that is within the public -- the record that we have in which he requested party status?

MR. FEOLA: No, I am, but we oppose that because he doesn't live close enough.

CHAIRPERSON REED: But I thought you were saying that you were not aware of that -- his position, you said individually, but not as an association until today, that it has been in the record. We have --

MR. FEOLA: He had no authorization filed until today.

CHAIRPERSON REED: That is true and --

MR. FEOLA: He made a false statement that he represented them, but --

CHAIRPERSON REED: I suppose that somewhere along the line it was made clear to him that he needed to have some type of written authorization and then he submitted that this morning and then it is up to us to decide at our discretion whether or not it is appropriate and whether or not we would accept it or waive it, which we did.

MR. FEOLA: I understand. I'm just reiterating our objection.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Thank you. Okay, now, Mr. Bolotin, now that you do have party status, you can then make a motion.

MS. PRUITT: Excuse me, Madam Chair, just for clarification, the name of your homeowners association, Mr. Bolotin?

MR. BOLOTIN: Foxhall Crescents Southgate.

MS. PRUITT: Thank you.

MR. BOLOTIN: Homeowners Association.

MR. AGUGLIA: Madam Chair, if you would please, I would like to start the motion.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Is that all right with you, Mr. Bolotin?

MR. BOLOTIN: Yes, it is.

MR. FEOLA: Madam Chair, before we get past where we should be I think counsels are going to oppose something that's not before the Board yet and it's probably more appropriate and maybe staff can help to first decide what we're going to offer to propose today, then I think they may have at least grounds to oppose that.

MR. AGUGLIA: If you hear my motion, I can set the stage.

MR. FEOLA: I'd like to make a motion to introduce

the plan.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Mr. Feola, why don't we hear the motion first and then if you have some discussion of the motion we can certainly entertain that.

MR. FEOLA: Madam Chair, he's going to object to going forward with -- he said it before, to object to going forward with the hearing because we are going to submit alternative plans which we gave to the parties on Friday, but you haven't accepted those plans. You may say forget it, Feola, stick with what you filed in your pre-hearing submission in which case his whole motion is a waste of time.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Well, quite frankly, I don't know about the other Board Members, but I don't know what you're talking about because what I have --

MR. FEOLA: That's my point.

CHAIRPERSON REED: What we have is one submission, does anyone else have another submission? This is all that we have. And so we need to get some clarification as to what, in fact, we're dealing with here. Then we can proceed.

MR. FEOLA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Ms. Pruitt?

MS. PRUITT: The three of us have discussed this so I think between the two attorneys they can actually clarify it.

MR. AGUGLIA: I'm trying to strike a reasonable balance here, because we're all assembled here today. My motion

is to exclude a new traffic design plan that was submitted to me this past Friday around 7 p.m.

CHAIRPERSON REED: That we don't have.

MR. AGUGLIA: All right, which forms the basis of OP's, Office of Planning's recommendation to you to approve this project with conditions. You do have the OP plan which we got yesterday at 11:30, so please, give me a minute to set the background.

The application that was filed on January 10th of this year by the school had a traffic impact analysis. All right, at page 10 of that report, their traffic engineer stated the existing northern entrance on Foxhall Road is the safest location for vehicles to turn left into and out of the site because the site distance at this location is adequate. Therefore, it is recommended that left turns into this relocation site be allowed only if the existing northern site entrance on Foxhall Road. So that was the traffic analysis submitted with the original application.

On March 1st, with the applicant's pre-hearing statement, there was another traffic analysis submitted. That traffic analysis on page 10 reiterated that the existing northern entrance on Foxhall Road was the safest location for vehicles to turn left into and out of the site because of the site distance at this location is adequate. All right, the difference between the two reports was that during the peak a.m.

rush hours only shuttle buses and emergency vehicles would be allowed to turn left into the site. Other cars will have to continue down Foxhall Road and go through the neighborhood as I've already explained to get back up on Foxhall Road going towards the north. I'm sorry, cars coming south to the school would not be allowed to turn left in the a.m. peak hours, would go through the neighborhood to come back to go north to get into the school, only shuttle buses. So that was the major difference.

All right, now at the ANC meeting on I believe it was March 13th Mr. Feola stated in the presence of everyone who was there, in fact, is quoted and I will give you this from the newspaper. He was asked about the possibility of turning left at the southern entrance into the school. The prospect of a third lane through a stacking lane, there would be a third lane turning left into the school. Mr. Feola stated that the traffic engineer hired by the school looked at the possibility and concluded that the twist and turns in the road rule out a left turn entrance into the school anywhere but the northern end of the parcel. And let me -- if you wouldn't mind passing up copies.

MR. FEOLA: Madam Chair, we're getting way past the motion. He's testifying. He's entering this as evidence. He's reading from a newspaper which isn't exactly a quote and I'm not a traffic engineer. I'd like the record to show that.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Mr. Feola, I do agree with you. I was wondering when he was going to get to the end of it.

Typically, a motion -- he's right, it doesn't really take that long to very succinctly make your statement.

MR. AGUGLIA: My point, let me finish, please. On Friday at 6 o'clock I get a new traffic design plan, well past the 14 days that the applicant is supposed to submit it before the hearing which now has a third lane, stacking lane, which allows less into the school after the first traffic reports that say that's unsafe. His first report -- after the second report submitted by his traffic consultant says that's unsafe, after he testified and there were many people here who will testify that Mr. Feola at that meeting said that that was an unsafe condition and therefore they weren't going with that.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Okay.

MR. FEOLA: Madam Chair, wait a minute. I didn't say that. I said I was told. I don't know, I'm not a traffic engineer.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Okay, Ms. Pruitt, do we have that, that change that they received?

MS. PRUITT: No, and that's what -- this is part of the problem. The applicant has 14, their pre-hearing submission is due 14 days prior to the hearing. Mr. Feola has indicated that the Board needs to waive the filing time in order for the Board to receive. Only Mr. Feola served it on Mr. Aguglia I think with the understanding that probably he would be granted party status and to -- but he also received it very late.

I have talked to both applicants and one of the -- I know Mr. Aguglia is either requesting that it be excluded or else that the hearing be continued. Because we do have everybody here today a possibility may be to have a further hearing on just the traffic part, but allow on the new part of the traffic, to allow the community and the ANC and everybody to respond to it and still go on with the rest of the hearing today.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Mr. Feola?

MR. FEOLA: Madam Chair, and let me set the stage just a little bit in opposition to Mr. Aguglia's motion.

Your rules require that all materials that the applicant is going to rely on at a public hearing be filed 14 days prior. That's this big book dated March 1st. Of course, the hearing was continued from March 15th until today, but our deadline for filing anything was that day. On March 9th, 8 days after we filed this, the Department of Public Works issued a report in this matter and this is after months of meeting with them. They requested or made a recommendation in that report, eight days after this was filed that the applicant create a left turn lane on Foxhall Road in DPW's right of way. Up until then, DPW had taken a position they didn't think it was necessary, they didn't want the right of way tampered with. So we didn't do that.

In response to that motion, in response to that report by the way with Mr. Aguglia quoted extensively at that March 13th ANC meeting, read from it, quoted it, and urged the ANC

to adopt a similar thing, the ANC said we should look at doing a left turn lane. Now this is March 13th, two days before the hearing was supposed to happen. In the time from March 13th until now our engineers and our architects have worked hard to develop this left turn lane on Foxhall Road to allow traffic from the north to enter safely into the proposed campus for the school.

This change is a direct response, direct response to DPW's request and supported by the Office of Planning and suggested by Mr. Aguglia's traffic expert as may being needed. So that's all we're talking about is the creation of a third lane for left turn only on Foxhall Road in the public right of way. The rest of this book, the size of the school, the configuration of the buildings, the size of the parking, the runoff from storm water, etcetera, is all the same. He wants to postpone the hearing on a left turn lane which his own traffic experts suggest might be necessary. I don't get it.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Okay. Now Mr. Sockwell, were you going to say something?

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Yes. I don't want to get into the substance of the issue, but where is this right of way to be acquired?

MR. FEOLA: From the now Cafritz property, from what will be the Field School property. Field would give up about 15 feet of its frontage.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Okay, so you said it

was in the public right of way which wasn't quite correct.

MR. FEOLA: Well --

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: It would be acquired right of way based upon the highway planning incumbrance of the property anyway, right?

MR. FEOLA: Right, changing the configuration of the street would require public agreement, DPW -- it's DPW's road.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: But there is a highway plan incumbrance on the property if it hasn't been lifted anyway.

MR. FEOLA: I don't know.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: It's 15 feet.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Let's try to move this on and make a decision.

Mr. Bolotin, let me hear what he has to say and then we can bring some closure to this.

MR. BOLOTIN: Yes. Let me state that Mr. Feola is correct. I have attended each and every meeting that the Field School has had and the most important issue that has surfaced in the last 120 days was the school's agreement not to allow left hand turns into the school except for shuttle buses. So when Mr. Feola says he doesn't understand what the big deal about is, it is just a simple change, if you would look at the letters you have received, if you looked at the various community groups, they are all based upon their realization that there will be no left hand turns into the school during the morning rush hour. That is a

matter of life and safety.

The DPW report doesn't say they recommend this. If you look very carefully, they tell us that it's not their job to say yeah or nay. They were unconvinced with the school's traffic proposal that would wind up with 60 percent of the traffic coming north to the school and their statement was if, if you were to approve this, then you ought to look at certain road improvements, not that this is something they recommend. It's an if.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Okay. Now your contention that the hearing be postponed today is so that you can do what?

MR. BOLOTIN: The reasoning to be postponed today is the fact that the left hand turn is the linchpin of the school's traffic plan.

CHAIRPERSON REED: We understand that.

MR. BOLOTIN: The community at large does not know, as we sit here today, that the school has changed its linchpin and will now allow left hand turns into the school. The community whose interest is being represented needs to know that. They need to have an opportunity to be heard, to file their letters in protest, to amend the letters that you've received, where they base it upon no left hand turns. The community can't be excluded because at 5 o'clock two days before a hearing a major change is undertaken by the school that the community is unaware of. This is not due process for the community.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Okay, wait a minute.

(Pause.)

CHAIRPERSON REED: Excuse me, we have to have these sidebars sometimes to get some clarity among ourselves as to what, in fact, we're dealing with.

Now before we make a decision, let us hear from the ANC chair on her position in this matter.

MS. HEUER: Thank you, Madam Chair. Can you hear me?

CHAIRPERSON REED: Yes.

MS. HEUER: The ANC would like to request a continuance because the ANC has reviewed all the previous plans. We've had probably over 300 people in attendance of the various meetings. This traffic plan that was presented to me yesterday at noon with no traffic management and I was asked if we would like to comment and perhaps accept it is impossible. We have to hear from the public and you should give the ANC great weight, so therefore I respectfully ask that you continue this case.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Thank you.

MR. FEOLA: Madam Chair, may I respond to that? The last paragraph of the ANC's letter to you all says that if the BZA decides to proceed against our advice which is to oppose the project, we recommend that the approval be conditioned on the reduction of the size of the parking and a traffic plan, blah, blah, blah, which should include consideration of a vehicle population cap and a third left turn lane on southbound Foxhall

Road. We're doing what they ask and we're doing it in response to DPW's request as well as Mr. Aguglia's client's request. I don't see how the school should be penalized for trying to accommodate concerns we hear after the book has been filed, after DPW is late with its report. They had plenty of time. You can hold the record open for two months for them to respond to what they hear today. They haven't seen the plan. They can listen.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Well, well, Mr. Feola, I think that --

MR. FEOLA: Or the alternative, we can go forward with our application. We don't think, as Mr. Bolotin said that it's the linchpin of our traffic management plan. He thinks it is.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Okay, given the fact that we're all assembled here today, ready to go a compromise would be perhaps that we proceed with the case today with the exception of the traffic aspect of it in regard to the traffic reports and that we then continue to a day certain the presentation by both sides of the traffic issue. There are other kinds of issues that we can consider and listen to today, and that would be in regard to the environmental impact or the parking and what else? The runoff and lighting and things of that nature, so that we won't waste this day today and then given the fact that we do have the objection from the ANC and from the two parties in opposition that it would allow them the time to then have community input and then when we

have the hearing, continue the hearing for that particular portion, they would be able to adequate respond and cross examine because at this point it kind of puts them at a disadvantage because they're not prepared to be able to do that, given the fact that they don't know, and another thing is we don't have it. So we haven't had a chance to look at it as well and that does not give us the opportunity to be able to take that particular information into consideration at all. (Pause.)

So that would be our proffer as a compromise. Let's go ahead with what we can today and hold off on just the traffic portion and set aside another date certain to have the traffic portion be presented by both sides and allow testimony on just that issue by both opposition and the applicant, support and opposition.

MS. HEUER: Could I ask a question, Madam Chairman?

CHAIRPERSON REED: Yes.

MS. HEUER: Since my testimony includes both traffic and the other, what should I do, just read what doesn't relate to traffic?

CHAIRPERSON REED: Well, the thing about it, if, in fact --

MS. HEUER: It's a little difficult.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Yes. If your testimony today is predicated upon the old traffic report, then that would not be applicable, so therefore I would just hold off on that portion of

it until you've had an opportunity to review and to present and to have dialogue on it with the community and when we reconvene for the traffic part, then -- we probably, you may revise what you were going to testify here today to.

MS. HEUER: I guess I have a problem with the report of the Office of Planning, because that report is all predicated on one thing.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Well, I can understand that. Nonetheless, again --

MS. HEUER: In fact, I just saw it yesterday.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Again, as you can see, we're now groping with trying to revamp, giving the fact that we now have new information and I don't know if that would then cause the Office of Planning to modify their report in any way, but this is the reason why we have stated it may be in all of our best interest to continue that portion until a later date.

MS. HEUER: I agree.

MR. FEOLA: Maybe Madam Chair, we can accommodate the ANC and just hold the whole ANC's full position until the further hearing. If Ms. Renshaw --

CHAIRPERSON REED: If you --

MR. FEOLA: As opposed to having her try to --

CHAIRPERSON REED: Ms. Who?

MR. FEOLA: The chair of the ANC, I'm sorry, Heuer.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Ms. Renshaw is --

MR. FEOLA: Sorry.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Okay, that might be -- would you rather not give your report today and hold off your report until after having heard the traffic portion?

MS. HEUER: No, I'll give, I'll just be abbreviated.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Okay.

MR. AGUGLIA: Madam Chair, I think your compromise is a fair one. I would ask that the applicant during his presentation or at some point tell us which traffic report they're going to rely on so we know what to prepare for.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Who tells you what?

MR. AGUGLIA: If the applicant at some point before we end the hearing today, tell us which traffic design they're going to rely on so we can prepare for it and that we be given specific cut off dates so we don't go through this 11th hour charade where we have no idea what's going on and find a report with a new design we've gotten 11th hour notice.

MR. SWENDIMAN: Madam Chair, on behalf of Mrs. Shagrue I would ask that if the portion dealing with traffic analysis be deferred that that also include their proposed southern entrance. I think that in the plans that were delivered to me Friday evening, there looks like there has been a change to that as well so that it goes just beyond -- this goes beyond just traffic on Foxhall. There seems to be some other changes as well

which has an impact on traffic, but I would ask that that be included as well.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Why don't we just simply say then that anything that was not submitted germane to the traffic or to any changes that were not in by the date, timeline date that was supposed to be in, that any changes or modifications to anything that the applicant has submitted to us, anything that's germane to those particular items would be the things that would be postponed to the next hearing date when the traffic part is heard. I agree with you that if you didn't have that information in regard to changes in the entrance which is a major piece, we need to address that then rather than now.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Madam Chair, may I? Madam Chair, if modifications that would normally be accepted by this Board such as maybe a realignment of an entrance are not specifically predicated on the third lane, then I think that we should deal with them and hear them as part of the site development description.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Well, they have asked that -- they've been given the opportunity to determine, I think, that's what I'm understanding, how this change impacts upon the overall impact to Mrs. Shagrue's property and I don't think that that can be done fairly, that that needs to be done today since we're going to be reconvening anyway and they have requested the time to look at it and analyze it and to determine what the impact is, then I

have no problem with them doing that at that time as well.

MR. FEOLA: Madam Chair, I guess I'm getting confused now. What I just heard you say then is you'd like the applicant to present the plans as they were submitted in the prehearing submission, ignoring the request from the Department of Public Works and the Office of Planning and the ANC that we incorporate a left turn lane into the property? Is that --

CHAIRPERSON REED: No, we're not even going to have -- we decided that we were not going to consider the traffic portion.

MR. FEOLA: I understand that, but affects the site plan if you have a lane and you have a different entrance, the plan changes.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Okay, now what's your question?

MR. FEOLA: I'm just trying to figure out what then today's proceeding would involve. It seems to me --

CHAIRPERSON REED: I see, so you're saying they're all interrelated?

MR. FEOLA: It's a small piece of this application, it's a 10.5 acre piece of land. The entrance, the southern entrance that everybody has been talking about is the only thing that has changed. And the size of the landscaping in front of the proposed school has narrowed some. That has a lot of ramifications as you've heard on traffic. It has, we think, a pretty minor ramification on the site plan because the entrance --

there was always a southern entrance, has moved now further north on Foxhall Road for safety reasons, etcetera.

I'm not sure what we're supposed to present today, I guess. I guess that's my question.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Madam Chairman, I am really torn on this. It seems to me that we don't want to conduct an ANC meeting here today. And that's what we're being asked to do by the applicant, that is, to me you've got some homework to do. You've got to go back into the community and explain to them what it is at an ANC meeting and any other citizen organizations that you may want to meet with in hope for your case that you'll bring back support rather than opposition and for us to engage in any kind of discussion like that today is not helpful, I don't think. But it seems to me there are other aspects to this site plan, parking and other things that we could discuss today that everybody is up to speed on. Admittedly, your only issue or your major issue is traffic, but for instance, if we were to allow you to present your new plan and not impose cross examination on those that are uninformed, what value would that be? We would be providing you the opportunity to share with the citizens what it is you've developed on Friday, but is that what you'd suggest, that you be allowed to show us this plan, but nobody should be talking about it certainly.

MR. FEOLA: No, I think that the cross examination on the plan, not on the traffic aspects of the plan would be

appropriate,

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: But do you want the opportunity to present your new idea today?

MR. FEOLA: We think that given the ANC's suggestion that we consider, that DPW's request that we, that you consider it if you consider this application, the Office of Planning support of that request would be prudent upon the applicant to try to accommodate that request.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: But not at the 11th hour. I mean that's our dilemma.

MR. FEOLA: We didn't file the DPW report, Mr. Parsons. It was filed by them on March 9th.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: What I mean is yes, you're responding to the ANC. You're responding to DPW, but nobody has seen it.

And it just doesn't seem productive to us today to be doing your homework for you.

MR. FEOLA: Well, I wouldn't characterize it as doing our homework for us. We've spent almost a year and a half in this community hearing their concerns and quite frankly they're not going to like this plan any better than the one that was in this book. They've made it pretty clear that the people that are here as opponents are opposed to a school locating on this site. I think quite frankly this is kind of a ruse to just put it off for a while and I guess we can. If, in fact, it's the Board's

decision that we should go back and do our homework, as you say, then we should not even conduct this hearing today because it seems to us we should give you the best plan that we can come up with based on comments from the public agencies, the ANC and others. So if, in fact, we can't show you the DPW, let's call it the DPW plan, which again just changes one aspect of this book, then maybe we should just put the whole thing off to another day.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: So you don't think there's enough substance in the rest of the plan or proposal to discuss today?

MR. FEOLA: Well, it is, but it's like a crossword puzzle. It starts with there's an entrance, there's parking off the entrance, there's queuing, there's buildings, there's storm water runoff. Which plan do we put up there, if in fact the entrance is different I guess that's the problem. We won't talk about traffic. We won't talk about how the cars will come in and out off of Foxhall Road, but the landscaping plan changes because the entrance is different. The buffers change.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Yes.

MEMBER RENSHAW: Madam Chair, I would suggest very quickly here that we can move ahead with some elements of this case while removing traffic entrance discussion and queuing until another time. But we could have the scene set for us, in other words, the student count, a description of the activities, the number of employees. We can talk about buffering, landscaping,

the noise, the lighting, the parking within the grounds and the environmental matters and that would take up a number of hours and we could get a move on that and again traffic, the entrance discussion and the queuing could be removed for another meeting.

MR. MOULDEN: The traffic impacts of this project seem to be the major issue at hand. I almost see that it's impossible not to even -- even if you don't even mean to talk about the old proposal and the new proposal. If we do have discussions on this project, it seems to me that we'll sit here and talk about what is at hand today and then we'll come back at another meeting and almost repeat some of the same information.

So I'm trying to weigh the worth of even going through this today and going through it in another meeting. It seems impossible to me not to get into some of the traffic issues even though you may not want to.

MS. PRUITT: Madam Chair, may staff recommend maybe a compromise that the applicant give their presentation including their new traffic today. There would be no cross examination today, but at the further hearing the parties in opposition then would have the opportunity to cross examine them on what was testified after you've had the opportunity not only to hear it, but to read it and to prepare a case so that you would then, we would have the whole project today, but then you would have the opportunity to cross examine the new information after you have had a chance to study it and after you have had a chance to take

it back to the community. That's just a thought.

MR. AGUGLIA: Madam Chair, this is no ruse, please. We've hired a traffic engineer who is here, a planner, we have testimony, we have many witnesses here. Our problem again is one of fundamental due process and that is a whole new plan at the 11th hour has been proposed, but more importantly it's the linchpin and the key of the Office of Planning's report to you. I'm still stuck with the Office of Planning report that said this new third stacking lane makes the day and therefore we approve it. That's fundamentally unfair to us because we have no opportunity to meet with them and discuss our maybe support or opposition to it. It came totally out of the blue.

CHAIRPERSON REED: But what is wrong with Ms. Pruitt's suggestion that we proceed, you hear the report, there is no cross examination and then you still have the opportunity when we reconvene to have had your meetings and public input in the interim and then you would have an opportunity to put on the opposition case and hear the opposition. We at least will not completely waste today.

MR. AGUGLIA: I understand. I think it's a reasonable suggestion, however, I would ask Office of Planning not be permitted to give their report until they have had an opportunity to get input from us.

CHAIRPERSON REED: I think that's fair. I have no problem with that request. The Office of Planning Representative,

Mary Vogel, will you please speak to this? Would you have any objection to the request that has just been put on the floor and then I think we can move forward.

MS. VOGEL: None whatsoever. We would be happy to meet with the opposition once again.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Okay, now, Ms. Pruitt, summarize for us exactly what we're doing because we've gone back and forth and around so many different scenarios, so let's just for the record, have everyone on the same page.

MS. PRUITT: My understanding is today we will hear the applicant's case in chief including the new traffic analysis plan, whatever it is. We will set a new hearing for another date certain, a continuation of this hearing for another day certain. At that time the parties in opposition will have the opportunity to cross examine the applicant on the traffic plan. They'll be able to cross examine the applicant today on everything else but that. At the new hearing they'll be able to cross examine the applicant on the traffic plan. OP will then give their report and you will then be able to at the new additional hearing, cross examine them on the new report after you have had a chance to read and study it and we will continue with the hearing from there or rather we will have testimony today also, but on what was testified today. Is that --

MS. HEUER: Excuse me, I thought I heard the Chairman say we would not be discussing the traffic.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Not.

MS. PRUITT: Not discuss it, it would just be presented.

MS. HEUER: I really have to object to that. I feel that at this last hour as it is supposed to be done, it should be presented to the ANC before it's presented to this BZA.

CHAIRPERSON REED: All right. Well --

MS. HEUER: I have no objection to the rest of it.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Well, the only change was that as Ms. Pruitt had suggested we hear the traffic report, but nonetheless, you're saying that you want the ANC to hear it first before they let us hear it. Okay. And that being the case, we'll just proceed with everything, with your case with the exception of the traffic report and also we will not hear the OP report. They can cross examine you on everything but things that are germane to the traffic report.

Yes.

MS. PRUITT: Then we need to set a time certain. Could we do that now so we can --

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I'd like to hear from the ANC before we do that.

CHAIRPERSON REED: On.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: When their next scheduled meeting is.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Yes, that's what I think Ms.

Pruitt is --

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: To get a feel if they need 30 days, 45 days before we pick a day.

MS. HEUER: The next scheduled meeting is the second Monday in April.

MS. PRUITT: The 11th?

MS. HEUER: Yes.

MS. PRUITT: That's April 11th. We have a hearing on the 18th that -- a hearing scheduled already. We could put it to the end of that. It's only a week, I don't know if that gives you enough time to have a hearing and then get us a report within a few days.

MS. HEUER: It's difficult to say the least. You would, of course, have to waive the requirements because --

MS. PRUITT: Well, right now we're in a little different situation because I don't know even if you'd even have a filing requirement because this is the actual hearing date.

MS. HEUER: All right, so if we have the hearing on the 11th and then the traffic consideration will be on the 18th?

MS. PRUITT: That's what I'm proposing at this point right now. I don't know how that works for everybody else.

MS. HEUER: That would be acceptable.

(Pause.)

MR. FEOLA: Madam Chair, our traffic consultant just advises me that he will not be in the country on April 18th,

so we couldn't present out --

CHAIRPERSON REED: What's the next best date. Mr. Slade will not be in the country, Ms. Pruitt.

MS. PRUITT: We're getting a little difficult here --

CHAIRPERSON REED: When are you available?

MS. PRUITT: What are your parameters?

MR. SLADE: I'll be done the week of the 10th and -- two weeks, the 10th and the 17th.

MS. PRUITT: So you'll be back by the 24th?

MR. SLADE: Yes.

MS. PRUITT: You have G.W. Master Campus Plan on the 26th. I'm just -- Hilton was canceled on the 10th.

CHAIRPERSON REED: 10th of May?

MS. PRUITT: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Then that would be a reasonable date for everyone concerned.

MR. SLADE: I'm sorry, what was the date?

MS. PRUITT: 10th of May.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Mr. Parsons will not be able to be here. He will then be out of the country, so -- but he's agreed to read the record regarding that particular aspect of the case, so we can then proceed.

MS. PRUITT: So are we scheduling it for May 10th at 9:30, is that correct?

MR. AGUGLIA: I just want to check with my experts, please.

(Pause.)

MS. HEUER: Is that a Wednesday?

MS. PRUITT: Yes, it is, ma'am. Are we then requesting that the ANC and any submissions from the parties in opposition be in a week before since there is more time to allow that?

CHAIRPERSON REED: Sure, I have no problem with that.

MR. AGUGLIA: Our reports are due?

MS. PRUITT: That would be May 3rd. And so your ANC revised report would also be due May 3rd.

MS. HEUER: That's no problem.

MS. PRUITT: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Okay. All right, I think we're all on the same page, so now unless there are any other preliminary matters, Mr. Pruitt,

will you call the case, please?

MR. FEOLA: One last thing, what about supporters who are here to testify today? Are we going to stop after the applicants' truncated case or will they be allowed to --

CHAIRPERSON REED: Persons in support?

MR. FEOLA: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON REED: I see no reason why. I see no reason why they would not be allowed to testified.

MR. FEOLA: I'm just asking so that --

CHAIRPERSON REED: They can't testify in regard to the traffic part, nonetheless, from reading the voluminous amount of letters that we received, both in opposition and in support of, the basis of their support is not predicated upon traffic considerations.

MR. FEOLA: I just wanted to make sure they didn't have to hang around.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Sure, and once they have testified that unless they particularly desire, they would not really have to come back on May 10th, so as much as we can dispose of today, we'd like to do that.

MR. FEOLA: Okay.

MR. AGUGLIA: And you're permitting cross examination except for anything on traffic?

CHAIRPERSON REED: Sure, there will no testimony on traffic, but yes, we will, absolutely.

MS. PRUITT: Excuse me, Madam Chairman, there will be testimony on traffic from the applicant. No, I'm sorry, excuse me.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Ms. Pruitt, Ms. Pruitt, we got it, we kind of got things straightened out. Let's not go back there.

There's been so much time in just the preliminary matters, the Board has requested a short five minute break and

then we'll proceed. Let's -- we'll come back and we'll talk about time lines and what time we'll take lunch and what have you and we'll try to get through as much of this as we can possibly today.

(Off the record.)

CHAIRPERSON REED: The hearing will come to order. The hearing will now come to order. Please take your seats.

Ms. Pruitt, can you call the case?

MS. PRUITT: Application 16559, Application of The Morris and Gwendolyn Cafritz Foundation/The Field School, pursuant to 11 DCMR 3104.1 for a special exception to establish a private school under Section 206 for a maximum of 320 students and a maximum of 74 faculty and staff in the R-1-A District at 2301 Foxhall Road, N.W. (Square 1341, Lots 856, 861, 878 and 879).

All those planning to testify in this case, please stand and raise your right hand.

(The witnesses were sworn.)

MS. PRUITT: Thank you. Please be seated and have the applicant start.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Ms. Pruitt?

MS. PRUITT: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON REED: We need to do time lines.

MS. PRUITT: Yes. I believe over on the table there was a little handout, but there is a time the Board has established three times. The applicant gets an hour for their case. The parties in opposition combined get an hour. Five

minutes for individuals and 10 minutes for organizations.

CHAIRPERSON REED: No, it's not. It's 3 minutes for individuals and 5 minutes for --

MS. PRUITT: Well, it goes back and forth. So which one would you prefer?

CHAIRPERSON REED: With so many people, 3 minutes for individuals and 5 minutes for organizations. It was brought to our attention during the break that there are people who have to leave, for whatever reason and if you have to leave and you had intended to testify and cannot, then you can submit your written testimony for us to consider as part of our package. And we're going to have the staff, staff will be keeping time, so when you start to testify, those people who are testifying either in opposition or -- individuals in opposition or in support of, please don't be redundant or repetitive. If somebody has already said what you wanted to say, you can just simply say I ditto what they said and I agree and I am in opposition. Unless there is something specifically different or unique that you want to tell us, but please don't keep saying the same thing over and over and over again. We have stacks of letters, both in support and in opposition we have read through so we have a general understanding as to what the situation is.

Mr. Feola, in the hour that you have been granted, are you going to utilize part of it today and then remainder when you do the traffic aspect of it? How are you doing to divvy your

time up?

MR. FEOLA: Yes ma'am. We had timed it out to be an hour with the traffic. I'm not sure exactly how much was set aside for that, but we will keep it to 60 minutes total, this session plus whatever we do on --

CHAIRPERSON REED: That's not what I'm asking. You have 60 minutes total.

MR. FEOLA: That's what I said. And we'll stay to that. I just don't know today to tell you that it's going to be 40 minutes today and 20 minutes or 45 minutes. We didn't break it out.

CHAIRPERSON REED: How much do you think that you need for the presentation of the traffic?

MR. FEOLA: My guess is that it's a third of it, so it's about 20 minutes. I just don't remember.

CHAIRPERSON REED: I think the bulk of it is going to be in the cross examination anyway.

MR. FEOLA: Right. We won't need more than an hour total. I think today we're probably looking at about 40 minutes, 40 to 45.

CHAIRPERSON REED: That's good. Thank you. I just wanted to get some kind of time frame.

MR. FEOLA: Right. Before we get started, Madam Chair, should we, collectively, Mr. Aguglia and I have our experts qualified now?

CHAIRPERSON REED: Yes.

MR. FEOLA: So we can get that piece out of the way. At Tab L of our prehearing submission we have the résumés of those pers who we intend to ask that the Board recognize as experts and I'll just briefly run through them. The first is David Cox who is our architect with Press Cox Associates. Second is Elliot Rhodeside who is our landscape architect with Rhodeside and Hairwell. Third is R.J. Keller with R.C. Fields and Associates who has done the land planning, I'm sorry, the storm water runoff and environmental issues. Of course, Mr. Slade who did the traffic analysis; Steven Scher, our urban planner and I think that's the extent of those who we have asked the Board recognize as experts.

CHAIRPERSON REED: What's the total amount, total number?

MR. FEOLA: Well, they're not all going to testify directly. They will be here for questions. Let's see, I don't know, one, two, three, four, five. I believe five.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Cox, Slade and Scher and who was the other person?

MR. FEOLA: Slade.

CHAIRPERSON REED: I have Slade.

MR. FEOLA: Elliot Rhodeside, the landscape architect.

CHAIRPERSON REED: All right. I have no objection

to either of those persons being proffered to us as expert witnesses and I would accept them as such unless there's any objection by the Board Members.

All right, is there any objection by the opposition?

MR. AGUGLIA: No.

CHAIRPERSON REED: All right, then proceed.

MR. FEOLA: Thank you, Madam Chair. On behalf of Field School, with me is Paul Cummins who is helping on this case. We're here with the request before you today to establish a small private school on a 10.5 acre tract of land in a R-1-A zone on 2301 Foxhall Road. The project, as you'll see today, takes a former estate and while retaining a vast amount of its open space sensitively develops a site plan which respects the adjacent national park, the site's natural topography and landscaping and we believe the adjacent residential community in a very respectful manner.

What we'll show today is that the application can and should be approved based on the standards set forth in the zoning regulations. As you know, and I think it might be helpful just to reiterate those, they're in Section 206 of the regulations that private schools are permitted in a residential zone provided that it is not likely to become objectionable to adjoining or nearby properties because of noise, traffic, number of students or otherwise objectionable conditions. And second, that ample

parking, but not less than that required by the zoning regulations be provided to accommodate students, visitors and the like.

I'm going to take those in reverse order because I think in this case, although we're not allowed to talk about it today, the issues have been narrowed significantly. Ample parking, which is 206.3, not less than the zoning regulations. There's been no issue that the proposal before you doesn't have enough parking. In fact, both the Office of Planning and the Advisory Neighborhood Commission have suggested a reduction in the parking. The zoning regulations would require 90 spaces for this site. Our demand analysis shows 98 and the site plan provides 128.

Going backwards to 206.2, that the project is not likely to become objectionable due to number of students. This is a very small school, 320 students could fit in this room. The entire school at its maximum population could fit in this room. It is significantly smaller than schools that have been approved by this Board, for example, Maret, Georgetown Day, Gonzaga, Washington International, Edmund Burke, just to name a few, all on smaller pieces of property than the 10 acres we have before us.

Noise. We don't think that this project will create an excessive amount of noise. The buffers on the property range from 100 to 300 plus feet, from activity centers. There are no lights proposed for the athletic fields or outside events. We just don't see noise as a major concern here and the Office of

Planning concurs with that.

Other objectionable conditions. We typically find when we come before this Board for private schools, the height of a building, the bulk of the buildings, the blocking of views to be issues with neighbors. That has never been raised and in fact, you'll see that buildings are fairly modest and tucked away, away from the residential neighborhoods.

Environmentally, you'll hear testimony today how the site does much to protect the adjacent environmental concerns and of course then traffic which we are leaving until next time.

So we are here today and we think the evidence will support with the implementation that the school is proposing to establish a private school within the confines of the zoning regulations and we think our evidence will show that this project should and can be approved.

We really have four direct witnesses today since Mr. Slade won't be testifying and I'd like to introduce our first. Ms. Elizabeth Ely, the Director of the Field School.

Ms. Ely, please state your name and address for the record?

MS. ELY: My name is Elizabeth Ely. I live at 2205 California Street, N.W. in the District of Columbia.

MR. FEOLA: Would you kindly explain to the Board a little bit about the school and why we're here today?

MS. ELY: Okay, in 1972, I founded the Field School

over the Regina Cleaners, now La Tomate Restaurant at 1711 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. We began with 44 students in grades 7 through 12. Two years later we moved to Wyoming Avenue where we presently reside in two large townhouses plus two small carriage houses, a total of about 20,000 square feet on less than one acre housing 212 students.

We live in a very congested area, just two doors off Connecticut Avenue. The townhouses are on opposite sides of Wyoming so that the students have to cross from one side to the other. Yet, in this extremely difficult situation we have coexisted peacefully with our neighbors as many of them have written to you to say.

It is satisfying to see the sense of community that we have established among ourselves and with the wider world. And to see our students grow in their understanding of civility, kindness, integrity, in effect, their love of neighbor.

A central fact of the philosophy of Field is about the need for a network of relationships for adolescence, beginning in the family, school and beyond to the larger community.

Over the years we have fostered special relations with public schools, for example, the Raymond School on Spring Road, N.W. and recent partnership with the Meridian Charter School at 1328 Florida Avenue.

For 25 years, we have had a strong work internship program which requires that all students work for two weeks in

February in jobs of their choice. Our students have reached out to many, many parts of the city, to nursing homes, schools, hospitals, day care centers and more. We are a part of the District of Columbia. We love it and we wish to remain here.

The Field School is profoundly committed to diversity, ethnic, economic and social. We accept students with a wider range of academic abilities than many other college preparatory schools. We actively pursue diversity in our faculty, staff and student body. During my years at the Kingsbury Center for Remedial Education I saw the need for a small school where students could be a part of a community of learners working in small schools, yet receiving a great deal of individual attention, so necessary in the learning process.

I believe that the absolute maximum number of students that we can handle doing what we do is 320, still a very small school, a school based on intensive dialogue between student and teachers. We know each student's learning style and care for each one very, very well.

We are confident that we can manage a total of 320 students, making sure that we have enough programs to meet the needs of today's student. We will start at 260 along a slow growth curve to an enrollment of 320 which is optimal from the point of view of offering students a broader program and a wider pool of friends and co-workers from which to draw.

About 7 years ago when we went through the

accreditation process of the Middle States Association of Schools and Colleges, the first recommendation was that we find larger facilities. In order to meet our programmatic needs, the design for Field on the Cafritz estate will enable us to have a gym, playing field, science lab, adequate arts facilities and meeting space for the entire school. Almost 100 percent of our graduates go to college. We take great care to assure that they attend a college where the process begun at Field can continue. This means that they go to a broad range of schools including the most competitive.

Our students have confidence in the ability to study, work hard and become vital and active members of whatever community they join. They already have a sense of gratitude for what they have received and a commitment to give back.

I have been in education for over 50 years, 41 of them in the District of Columbia. Field parents, the Board of Trustees, the staff, students and I have worked as a team for 16 months with our architect, David Cox and staff, zoning and traffic experts, engineers, landscape architects and others, while consulting our neighbors at every step of the way.

We have produced a plan of great beauty and high purpose. It is respectful of the land and of the neighbors. It is beautifully situation, a village on a hill for children.

Having given this project my most informed consideration I believe that it is reasonable and feasible. It

will not harm, but rather enhance the neighborhood and the city. As we outline our plan for your consideration, I hope that you will approve our vision for Field. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Thank you.

MR. FEOLA: Madam Chair, if it pleases the Board, maybe we could run through our next three witnesses in one piece so you can then ask questions.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Okay.

MR. FEOLA: Our next witness, Ms. Louise Millikan who is with the Board of Trustees.

MS. MILLIKAN: I am Louise Millikan. I live at 1873 Newton Street in the District of Columbia, Mount Pleasant neighborhood where I have lived for 25 years. I'm President of the Field School Parents Association and a member of the Board of Trustees.

My son, a sophomore, has been at Field since 7th grade. The Field School is a special place, a place where miracles happen. We were a small school and our size is part of the secret of our success. There is no dearth of applicants for our school, but we have understood for 28 years that our school is special because it is small. We know it is important to stay that way.

During accreditation Field began to understand that we needed more space for our academic programs as well as our sports program. A little over two years ago we began to search

the District of Columbia for a new site for our school. We have looked at more than 80 sites in the District where we want to stay. We are proud to be a District of Columbia independent school.

The Cafritz estate on Foxhall Road is the best location to serve the overall needs of Field. In fact, it is the only one that we have found in the District that will truly serve our needs.

Once we identified this estate, we immediately began to meet with neighbors. Since February 1999, we have had 24 meetings with community members and organizations. In addition, we have a Board Member who since the beginning of the process has worked closely with all our neighbors. We have sent three letters to all the neighbors, keeping them abreast of our plans during the design process. We have heard their concerns in individual meetings, small groups and at the ANC. We have worked at every step of the way to incorporate the neighbors' concerns into our final plan because they will be our neighbors. We want to be a part of this community and enrich it just as we have the Kalorama neighborhood where we have been for 28 years.

We are responsive to community concerns. We understand and especially appreciate the concerns about traffic. While our burden will not be significant, we understand neighborhood concerns and feel support of public transportation. Because we feel support of public transportation we have made

accommodations. There will be no entrance from 44th Street. The southern entrance to the property on Foxhall will be located as far from the adjacent property line as possible, consistent with safety for everyone. A shuttle bus will operate from both the Tenley and Foggy Bottom Metro stops as well as other remote pickup points to minimize the traffic on Foxhall Road.

We parents especially applaud this accommodation, not only for the neighbors, but for us and for our children. This encourages the use of Metro, carpooling and certainly will reduce the number of us coming to the school.

There will be no lights on the athletic fields. There will be no outdoor athletic events, beginning after 6 p.m. There will be no rental of our facility to outside groups. The school is for our use, not for the outside. We are a school, pure and simple, but we are always available to our neighbors should they need a meeting place. There will be a sidewalk on our property built for public use.

While we are certainly aware of opposition, we have been gratified by the support of individuals in the neighborhood and the support of the Wesley Heights Association for Preservation of Residential Streets and neighbors on 44th Street as well as the Palisades Citizens Association.

We also are gratified by the more than 230 supporters who took time to write for our cause.

Field School on Foxhall Road brings many benefits,

not only to the neighborhood, but also to the District of Columbia. Our design maintains the large open parklike space of this beautiful property with buildings occupying only 7 percent of the total space, a wonderful use of this land.

Neighbors can walk on our property, enjoy the green space. We welcome their use of the athletic field and the tennis court. This move will keep the Field School a small, high calibre college preparatory school in the District of Columbia where it belongs. The presence of this remarkable institution in the Foxhall neighborhood will enrich us all.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Thank you very much, Ms. Millikan.

MR. FEOLA: Madam Chair, I'd like to introduce David Cox who will walk us through the plans for the school.

MR. COX: My name is David Cox, principal of Press Cox Architects. I reside at 5115 Cathedral Avenue, N.W. in the Palisades neighborhood of the District.

I'd like to show you a series of slides. We thought the slides would probably be the easiest way to convey the general design and the site plan issues we have been studying for many months. This first photograph is an aerial photograph of the immediate vicinity of the site and just to orient everyone, the orange element in the center is the Cafritz house, surrounded by a number of different kinds of land use. On the east of the site

this very large area here is the Glover Archibald Parkway, 44th Street with single family residences on the west side only, terminates at the mouth of the Glover Archibald Park where it then proceeds as a pathway down past W Street and on down to the south. Immediate north of the site is the Kreiger Museum property, directly across Foxhall Road which bisects this photograph roughly running north and south. Directly west of the site is the new residence of the Spanish Ambassador and south of that and directly west, across the site, is the Belgium Ambassador's residence. A single family residential area, Foxhall Crescents in the area just to the west and north of the site. Dexter Street just up at the northern end of this photograph. W Street running to the south of the site and then the Mount Vernon campus of G.W., occupying the southern portion of the site. White Haven Parkway is just off the area photograph to the south.

The property itself is approximately 10.5 acres and again just for orientation, Foxhall Road runs north and south just forming the west border of the property. The Cafritz house is shown in orange on the hillside, the highest elevation of the property at the northwest corner. The Krieger property shares the northern property line, 44th Street residences share a portion of the east property line. The Glover Archibald Parkway shares the remainder of the east property line of the site. The entire southern edge of the site abuts the rear yards of single family residences on W Street and Foxboro Place. So it's a very

irregularly shaped piece of ground. The frontage on Foxhall Road is about 710 feet. The depth in the east-west direction is about 760 feet. The property slopes approximately 100 feet in elevation from the high point at the northwest corner, sloping downhill to the east to the Glover Archibald Parkway and in roughly a south and east slope. The lowest portion of the site being the piece that abuts the W Street and Glover Archibald Park. There's very heavy tree cover, roughly adjoining the site. In fact, there has always been a cyclone fence that the Cafritz' fenced off that portion and have left it pretty much remain in a wild state.

Contrasting with the rest of the property which has a very manicured quality to it, the house itself and the immediate vicinity of the house is very beautifully landscaped. The house was built in 1937 in an art deco style by Morris Cafritz with a semi-circular drive with two points of access onto Foxhall Road. The house is 14,000 square feet. It is three stories. Two stories face the Foxhall Road to the west. As the land slopes in the back, three stories of the house become exposed which lead directly out on to landscaped terraces, very interesting, beautiful set of terraced gardens with very significant views off to the city to the east.

Most of the site is characterized as an open grassy meadow sloping downhill with individual trees. As you can see, specimen trees in various areas in the middle of the site, but primarily the woodland on the east edge of the site, as I

mentioned and a fairly heavy tree cover along the southern boundary. The Krieger property to the north also has a very, rather dense woodland area which forms a rather thin edge of trees along our north border.

This is a view looking at the front of the Cafritz house from the driveway to the Belgium Embassy. The house is set back from Foxhall Road approximately 100 feet, 110 feet. This gives you some idea of the architectural character of the house and the landscaping in front of it facing Foxhall Road. One of the unfortunate things that we feel is the edge of Foxhall with these utility lines, it virtually is just a matter of a few feet off the edge of Foxhall Road and Foxhall itself, as you can see here, a row of just bushes and most of it is open landscape back to the house. Quite a different story on the east face of the house as it faces the Glover Archibald Park and the city. It's a different world back there with the terraces, this red brick retaining wall that has a grassy terrace and formal boxwood gardens on it. The quality of the house here becomes much more apparent. White painted brick and a Spanish clay tile roof, really quite a beautiful house.

This is a view of some of the boxwood gardens. We're looking northward toward the Krieger property and a great curving bay of the Cafritz house with the dining room in a part of this curving bay element.

From the terraces looking east toward the house we

get an unobstructed view of the Glover Archibald Park and the city beyond. Here's the Washington Monument off in the distance.

And then the meadow, the open meadow which characterizes most of the center part of the site. The proposal organizes the site with the new campus buildings clustered around the house in its position here at the northwest corner of the site. Basically, the attempt here is to keep as much of the site, the open quality of the site as open as possible with parking and circulation kept very close to the Foxhall Road and running parallel to it. The architecture arranges itself into two academic wings, one along the north side as an extension of the north end of the house, stepping down the hillside and terminating in the gymnasium. A second wing, academic cluster, extends outward from the southern end of the house and terminates in a 400-seat all school meeting house.

The playfields, as you can see in this site plan, are located roughly in the center of the site, well buffered on all sides, along the southern edge and maintaining the tree cover to the parkway. The site circulation, I won't get into this in any great detail, but we are proposing a southern entrance at roughly at the point where Foxhall Road makes a slight bend about 200 feet up from the southern boundary, maintaining the north entrance into the site, pretty much in the same location that the existing semi-circular driveway exists. Connecting these two points will be a two-lane frontage, a

two-directional frontage road including a separate drop off lane and parking.

Parking will take place in this so-called south parking area and in a linear fashion along the frontage road and then in a third area downhill behind the gymnasium primarily for the shuttle buses that the school has.

There will also be a tennis court here adjacent to the gymnasium, as well as a playfield in the center of the site. The existing terraces behind the house will act as the school's quadrangle and allow the students to walk outside from one of the academic arms northward to the others. So most of the site circulation will be happening outdoors as a college campus would be.

And in this site model, we are looking at an aerial view, looking down over Foxhall Road on the foreground with the house here in the center, the academic wing to the south and the academic wing running parallel to the northern edge, giving you some three dimension qualities of the architecture of the buildings.

You can see with the contours, the house and the buildings sit uphill from the playfield. This is the area that will require leveling out because the site as it currently stands, it slopes continuously in this area and to create this level area we are using excavated material from the buildings, stockpiling it on the site and using it to create a fill condition, together with

a retaining wall at the back end of the site.

And again a view, looking along the north edge bordering the Krieger estate, the academic wing stepping down the hill gently in a series of stair steps that culminate in the gymnasium with a curving roof set into the hillside to minimize its height.

Again, the view from the eastern facade of the house as it overlooks the terraces, the many projecting curving bays of the house and chimneys, this is a half octagon porch. We're looking at the house very carefully. We've studied it, its architecture and admire it very much and are using it as the basic influence in the design of the new buildings. All of the new buildings will take their queues from the house, the scale will be kept residential, three stories, two and three story buildings made of light masonry with hipped roofs with curved bay projecting bay elements. Here is the existing Cafritz house in this rendering of view looking eastward across Foxhall Road in the foreground. And directly across the southern end of the house with its existing porch we are creating the main entrance for the students on a daily basis, a plaza that connects the new buildings with the old building. This will be the main arriving point for the students. The students will then enter the buildings into their locker area and hub.

The house will be fully utilized for academic and administrative spaces and will retain the ceremonial front door to

the whole campus as it should be.

And again, just various views of the model, sort of depicting the same view in this particular case and a view looking at the academic, the southern academic wing from the south, culminating in the 400-seat meeting house and a downhill view roughly standing where the playfield is looking up at the Cafritz house, surrounded on both of its southern and northern end with the academic wings and the gymnasium. This also gives you some idea of how we've tried to minimize the bulk and height of the gymnasium, actually setting it into the hillside one full story.

And then the elevations of the building. The lower levels of the building will be made of a terra cotta masonry with the upper portions retaining the light colored masonry that the house, the Cafritz house itself is made from and this is a way of breaking up the scale and extending the horizontal quality of the house into the landscape.

The zoning, I just want to cover real briefly, the R-1-A single family residential zone has no FAR, but we do have setbacks, of course, and lot occupancy. The lot occupancy permitted is 40 percent. We are covering 7 percent of the site. Ninety-three percent of the site will remain as open space. If you take together the total of the impervious asphalt parking areas, sidewalks, plaza areas and buildings together it totals about 27 percent of the total site. The remaining portions of the site are permeable in terms of groundwater.

The setbacks as Mr. Feola has mentioned earlier are quite considerable. Approximately 300 feet from the south residential property line and even further from that to the actual houses themselves to our nearest building. The southern entrance is approximately 200 feet from the southern property line. The buildings are spaced roughly the same distance from the existing house from Foxhall, about 100 feet or so. The gymnasium is approximately 100 feet set back. Where we really get closer to the property line is along the north side where the Krieger is also roughly about the same distance back from that property line. We're at 35 feet. R-1-A permits an 8 foot side yard setback.

The heights are all below 40 feet, the required height limit. The gymnasium is the highest building and it is measured, its highest dimension is at the eastern edge which measures about 37 feet from grade at the center point of building to the ceiling height.

We've already mentioned parking. The total parking count is 128 spaces. The required parking is 90 split among several different portions of the site, but all kept as tight as possible to Foxhall Road. There is a requirement for loading and service and we are utilizing the existing garage on the north side of the site for our service in the north area as a small service court. The garage itself would become the service bay.

I want to just talk a little bit about, to culminate this presentation about storm water. We have been very

carefully coordinating our work here with the National Park Service. Their primary concern has been, of course, the impact on the Glover Archibald Park, primarily with how we are handling surface water and storm water runoff.

This is a diagram that depicts the proposed buildings with the Cafritz house shown in red. All of the roof water contained by the buildings and the parking lots will be directed to underground leaders and piping which will force the water through two points, one at the south parking lot, one at the area behind the gymnasium which will be sand filters, a two stage filtration process. All storm water will run through this. From there it will run downhill to detention area. Most likely it will be a pair of five foot diameter pipes that will be buried below the playfields. From here the water will be detained and released incrementally downhill to the right of way of 44th Street where we will run southward in the area of the existing pathway so as not to cut trees. And we'll tie it into the existing W Street storm water outfall which currently falls into Foundry Creek, but by that time the water has been completely treated and detained.

The geotech analysis of the site, we have taken a grid of 12 soil borings. The soil is very good in terms of construction and it will allow 3,000 pound per square foot bearing capacity, nothing unusual in that. The soil is generally fill on the surface, but has good quality clay and silts below it. We found no presence of underground aquifers or any underground

water, no underground water showed up in any of our 30-foot deep soil borings.

And then lastly, just to touch again on any other environmental impacts, the entire project has been designed to minimize the adverse environmental impact on our neighbors. We have significant buffering and landscape and Elliot Rhodeside will continue to talk about the detail of the landscape buffering.

The playfields are kept to the center portion of the site as far away as we can from the residential areas as we are able to. There will be no night lighting for the playfields. Sound impact will be minimized. The buildings themselves are designed as energy efficient and insulated as we can make them. The ambient noise level, I should say, of Foxhall Road is already a noise level that will shield any additional noise from these buildings. The students themselves are off the school campus by approximately 4:30, but we have taken great care in all respects to try to maintain the -- to add the school buildings so that they form a kind of hilltown village, clustered around the house itself, away from the existing residential areas on the south and west parts of the site.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Mr. Feola, time-wise you now have approximately 25 minutes left to complete the entire case.

MR. FEOLA: Yes ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Including the traffic. How many

more witnesses do you have?

MR. FEOLA: Mr. Rhodeside is our last witness.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Okay, and how long do you think this --

MR. FEOLA: Five minutes.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Okay, and then that will reserve your 20 minutes for the traffic.

MR. FEOLA: Yes ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Good, thank you. Mr. Rhodeside?

MR. RHODESIDE: My name is Elliot Rhodeside. I live at 414 Crownview Drive in Alexandria. David spoke really clearly and well about the existing site conditions, so I won't go over all of these, but we worked very hard throughout the whole process to preserve and protect the existing vegetation throughout the site and I'll show how we've accomplished that.

The next slide shows the garden areas around the Cafritz house and it shows the original garden walls and original garden features that were designed by Rose Greeley in the 1930s that we've worked very hard to protect and incorporate into the overall development.

The next slide shows the elements that are an important part of the original setting and these elements, both the material and the form have been inspirations to us as to how the overall site plan should be developed.

The overall landscape plan is divided into six

different areas and the six different areas are the Foxhall Road landscape. There's the buffer --

CHAIRPERSON REED: Excuse me, do you need a --

MR. RHODESIDE: That would really be helpful. What a time to have it go out.

There are six different zones. The Foxhall Road landscape buffers on the north, the east and the south. There's the parking area and the associated entrance ways. There's the landscape around the buildings and the core of the landscape, the athletic fields and then the woodland. That's an important part of the extension of Glover Archibald Park.

We have worked very carefully to preserve existing trees and all of the dark trees illustrated in the plan are trees that we've worked to protect. The overall plan for the landscape along Foxhall Road is to protect the existing trees and to extend the landscape of Foxhall Road properties along the western boundary of the Field School property so that it fits in. The intent is to be residential in scale and to utilize native materials.

On the north, we've protected plants. On the east, we have protected existing vegetation. On the east side also we have stepped back from the existing woodland vegetation and protect that and have augmented that with new buffer plantings. On the south, we have done the same and have added extensive plantings along the southern portion in order to create a buffer

along with a proposed bermed area.

In the parking areas, there are three major terraced areas and we've heavily planted each one of those terraced areas and the final terraced so that views up from the athletic fields into this area will be shielded by both walls and planting and by grades of the terraces.

We've worked to preserve the existing trees in front of the Cafritz mansion and have aligned the roads so that it protects those. There will be a deep planted buffer along the edge and a sidewalk that would be constructed inside the property line that would go approximately in this locution to meet up with the proposed sidewalk south of the property so that the sidewalk is not adjacent to Foxhall Road, but within the property and buffered by landscape. There would be low walls that would separate the parking areas from Foxhall Road and that would further be buffered by the planting between the parking area and the street and there would be signage at the entrance way both in the north and in the south areas.

We've worked to protect several large trees on the inner courtyard area. We've protected the extant garden elements. Those would remain as grass slopes and then continued sloping areas with new walls that would create an informal amphitheater that would serve as a major viewing area for the athletic fields. New planting would be residential in scale, to be compatible with the architect that David has developed so that it again fits the

overall school concept, but also fits within the residential character of the neighborhood.

At the bottom, the east side, we've done new native plantings that blend in with the existing vegetation along the edge for the Glover Archibald Park.

The next slide is a series of cross sections that show next to the gymnasium planting that would shield small bus parking areas and then retention of the existing specimen trees from the adjacent residential property with the addition of new planting to create buffers. Cross Section A is a cross section through the new Field School building, the existing terraces and then Wyoming Avenue which is a main student gathering area with the sloping area that would be heavily planted in low vegetation that would enable major views out to the vista to Georgetown University and to the Washington Monument with lower curved wall that would frame the athletic field. This is a view of Foxhall Road with the buffer, the sidewalk area, parking, drop off and the building with planting adjacent to the school building.

And then finally, the building on the south, Ms. Shagrue's property, there's the proposal to have the lane about 110 feet from the northern facade of her home with preservation of existing plant material adjacent to the property line and the development of an 8 to 10 foot high berm that would shield the parking, shield the asphalt area with new plantings that would augment the existing vegetation.

The next series of slides is a vegetative analysis and if I'm running too long I can cut it down.

CHAIRPERSON REED: You need to, you are running over. How long --

MR. RHODESIDE: Four slides. I'll do it quickly. This slide shows all the existing vegetation. It shows the 29 specimen trees. It shows the savannah landscape of specimen trees and the lawn landscape, but a continuous canopy and then the dense woods next to 44th Street. The total amount of coverage of the canopy is approximately one half of the site, about 5 acres.

The second slide shows gray areas which indicate the vegetation which would be removed and we're removing in order to create the Field School campus, about 2.5 campus, leaving green vegetation of about 2.5 acres. That includes the dense woodland as well as the specimen trees.

And then third slide shows the proposed landscape development plan which shows the dense wooded areas to remain, the lightly wooded areas to remain, the 200 additional trees, plus shrubs, plus the 10 trees, specimen trees that would remain, giving a total canopy coverage of approximately 4 acres.

And then finally we have understood that there's some concern about whether there would be an effect of either underground or above ground water. We went back and looked at historic maps and this map which was part of the coastal and geodetic survey in 1888 shows adjacent streams which still exist

in Glover Archibald Park. The red outlined area indicates the Field School property, but it doesn't indicate any stream, either intermittent or continually running streams. So we thought it was important to show that with the record.

That's the end of the presentation.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Thank you, Mr. Rhodeside.

MR. FEOLA: Madam Chair, that ends our direct short of traffic.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Thank you. Board Members, questions?

MR. FEOLA: Madam Chair, we have all those slides on boards if we can turn the lights on and go to --

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: One question about the massing with regard to the slopes' views to the south. The vegetation to the south is fairly substantial along the southern property line. It appears that from the south the massing will probably have more of a five story appearance all tolled because the buildings are basically allocated to the slopes in such a manner that while they do tuck into the slopes, the view from the west would probably give more of a two or three story appearance. The view from the south would probably give more of a five story appearance, based upon the drawings that were shown. And yet it appears that the landscaping will somewhat cover that. Am I correct in what I'm looking at, that final landscaping once it actually matures should hide a lot of that bulk?

MR. RHODESIDE: Our intent for the landscape overall adjacent to the buildings has been not to hide the buildings. We think that the architecture is going to be significant and beautiful, so it's our intent to create pockets of landscape at the base of the building that's complimentary to the facades that David has designed and that trees are strategically placed so that they will help provide screening of sun that comes in.

We have done several things. We've located stairways adjacent to the buildings so that we can maintain the open lawn area and the open vistas with the cascade of terraces, but overall, the goal is to compliment the building with the landscape.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: I guess I should have been a bit more specific. With regard to hiding the buildings, not from the on-site perspective but from the off-site perspective, you are providing a very different view from the south across the site and the neighboring properties to the south would be the most affected by that because they will be looking at the hill as it slopes upward and away from them.

MR. RHODESIDE: I think the illustration that David presented which was from Foxhall Road which I think is the question you're asking me?

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Really from the south.

MR. FEOLA: Elliot, you can't speak without a

microphone.

MR. RHODESIDE: Okay, we've worked very hard to -- our goal in the overall development tends to remove as little vegetation of the woodlands in the adjacent property as much as possible. And where we had to do that in order to develop the athletic fields, we've created -- we've utilized walls to build up the elevation so that we can preserve trees and then have also augmented the existing woodland with new woodland plants so that we create a thicker buffer in this area.

We've also worked hard to preserve the existing topography on the south and the existing woods which are shown in dark green and then where grading was to be done or where no existing vegetation exists, we have worked to both protect existing trees and then augment those existing trees with very densely planted trees and shrubs and then also have established new grades in 8 to 10 foot high mounded area so that there would be dense vegetation between this property and the school. Also, the terracing with densely planted areas also provides shielding and also shading of the parking lot area and then the planting next to the building serves as a further screen and shield of these structures to the properties on the south.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: So you feel that the density of existing vegetation which will be altered by the construction, in particular, the south area of the site will be replaced with an equivalent level of buffer to prevent the view

from being significantly changed to the residents?

MR. RHODESIDE: I think that's correct. And I also think we are adding more, we're adding --

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: It's probably on the bottom.

MR. RHODESIDE: We'll be adding more vegetation than what exists in the south side of the property. It's an open lawn landscape and we're developing multiple levels of planting so that it provides a greater shield to the properties on the south side.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Thank you.

MEMBER RENSHAW: Madam Chair?

CHAIRPERSON REED: Commissioner Parsons.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Thank you. Ms. Ely, this probably is very evident to you, but I would like to explore the need for the playing fields.

MS. ELY: We have a very active physical education program. That's part of our whole program, that is to say that we have at any one time as many as 90 percent of our students playing in competitive sports and so we have to get on buses and we have to travel all over the city and get fields and the fields have become scarcer and scarcer, so if we have a field that is available to us we can schedule use of it and believe me, as our faculty has become -- we started out -- we're only 28 years old and we have many faculty who have been with us now for 15, 16, 17

up to 22 years and as they've become older they haven't wanted to wrestle with those buses and the inner city becomes very, very difficult. We really need a field and we just need a field that children can go out and play in after school as well as our competitive sports. I don't know if I've answered it or not.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Almost. Does your accreditation rely on these fields?

MS. ELY: Yes. Well, we have to have access to fields.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: But not necessarily on the site?

MS. ELY: Not necessarily on the site. If we could get fields off-site, but it's becoming almost impossible. I think you probably know that in the District.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Yes.

MS. ELY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: And how many competitive activities with other schools would occur on these fields in the course of a year?

MS. ELY: I think we have a complete list of that and I would refer to Lea to give me that list so that I can tell you.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: In round figures.

MS. ELY: Oh, in round figures. Sports events would be -- is that what you're asking about the sports events?

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Correct, yes.

MS. ELY: Okay, I would say, let me see, I really hate to guess --

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Don't guess then. Don't guess. Let's talk about them.

MS. ELY: Yes, because I'd rather not guess.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Are these baseball and hockey and soccer?

MS. ELY: About 20 games per season, I'd say, 20 games per season.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: And that would be --

MS. ELY: Fall home sports events, weekday afternoons approximately 20 games and then winter home sports events, that's just basketball, 20 games. And let's see, spring home sports, that's baseball, track and cross country, which we won't do there, lacrosse and tennis which we won't do there. We'll have a tennis court, but that isn't going to be adequate and that's as much for the neighbors and occasional uses, anything else, that would be 20. So we'd have 60.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: And these are all weekday afternoons, is that correct?

MS. ELY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: You would not be using these fields on the weekends?

MS. ELY: Let me see now. We never use them on the weekends. We use track and cross country on the weekends and we use Catholic University for that. Do we use anything on the weekends?

Definitely nothing on Sunday and occasionally, I'm stumbling here because occasionally maybe something on Saturday, but certainly never on Sunday.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: And I think it was either you or Ms. Millikan that said you would not rent your facilities?

MS. ELY: No, no, no, I don't want to rent anything out.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: So you would not be allowing the Little League to play or other activities that might be obnoxious on Saturdays or Sundays?

MS. ELY: No, but we are allowing the immediate neighbors' children to use those fields on the weekend when we're not using that.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: But not for competitive --

MS. ELY: No, not for competitive sports.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I am sure that soccer organizations and others would love to use your facilities all weekend, sunrise to sundown.

MS. ELY: Absolutely not.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: And the neighbors probably wouldn't appreciate that.

MS. ELY: I wouldn't appreciate it either because they tear up the fields, just use in general, not necessarily renters, but the other thing is, you know, we have very crowded facilities and believe it or not, people come all the time and want to rent it and when we were first there I thought oh, we can make some money and I tried renting, never again, believe me. No rentals.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: All right. Mr. Rhodeside, I wanted to talk about the section, section L-1-2 and Section A shows us the slope that's going to separate the playing field from the school or the school buildings proper and I thought you mentioned people would be sitting and viewing these sporting activities from the slope?

MR. RHODESIDE: Not from the slope, from the wall at the bottom of the slope.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: You mean that's a seating wall?

MR. RHODESIDE: Seating wall.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I'm sorry, I misunderstood.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: It did sound, Mr. Rhodeside, it did sound like the statement was made that there would be amphitheater, the word amphitheater was used and I wanted to understand that myself.

MR. RHODESIDE: I'm sorry if I was unclear. This wall was the wall I was referring to for the amphitheater seating.

It's not all -- we have planted shrubs and ground covers on the slope and this intermediate wall has a way of lessening the gradient in this overall area, but it's our expectation that seating will occur along this area as well as in this area for soccer events and then for baseball events on the side. But it's just a casual gathering area where there can be amphitheater like events.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: How many students or individuals do you think would sit along that wall, perhaps? Do you know how long the wall actually is?

MS. ELY: Excuse me, maybe I could answer the question in another way. We have ordinarily maybe an average of 25 to 45 spectators for our games. We don't -- it's just -- it isn't in the culture of the school to have great big spectator sports. There are certain moments when if we're in a tournament and that could be once a year and we usually don't -- wouldn't have that there if it's more than what the gymnasium holds.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Mr. Rhodeside, I wanted to go to the eastern slope, I guess I'll call it which I think is more troublesome, at least for me.

I'm curious about the view that is going to remain for the residents who live along 44th Street and there are only two or three of them. But it appears as though you're grading right to the property line on that corner and then treating it in some fashion that isn't clear to me, that whole slope. That's

kind of a second question. How are you going to treat that, what kind of plant material that says ground cover and shrubs, how will you maintain those slopes, a little bit more about the slopes, as well as going over to those folks who live on Foxboro Place. What are they going to be looking at when you're done?

MR. RHODESIDE: The dark green shows the existing vegetation to remain and we have stepped back the fields in this area so that we can create a buffer, maintain the existing wooded buffer. Starting from the --

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Go down to -- there you are. That's fine.

MR. RHODESIDE: This is about a six foot high wall with flowering trees and shade trees that are listed in the plant list, crab apples, cherries, maples that would be planted along this area. We have stepped back the grading so that there's the natural edge along the rear of their property line.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Can I interrupt you? I'm looking at the grading plane, maybe I'm looking at the utility plan. It's the only one I seem to have with grading on it and I don't see the wall that you refer to and I'm looking at C1.2 and it's on the landscape plan, but the grading plan doesn't indicate that there's a wall.

It might help me if I'm in the wrong place, but -- because I think it would be helpful, but the engineer didn't show it, I guess.

MR. RHODESIDE: The landscape plan shows it. I don't think it shows up -- it doesn't show up on this plan.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: So how high a wall would that be then?

MR. RHODESIDE: It's a six foot high wall with a four foot fence on top of that.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I see, so it wouldn't -- I know you don't have the grading plan in front of you, but that is what I was reacting to is you've taken some of that grading, the harshness of it and pulled it back with a retaining wall there.

And the material on the rest of the slope would be grass?

MR. RHODESIDE: It would be grass.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: So how would you maintain that?

MR. RHODESIDE: It would be mowed. It would either be mowed or it would be meadow where it would be mowed once or twice a year.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Okay, so the ground cover you speak of in the labeling is grass.

MR. RHODESIDE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Would you imagine that going to forest in the future then?

MR. RHODESIDE: I think that would be desirable.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: All right, so it's

regeneration then you imagine in. So this grass slope won't be the views from these homes 20 years from now, probably?

MR. RHODESIDE: I think that's correct.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: On the site plan is shown two bus parking facilities at the east edge of the parking crescent, I'll call it, although our friends from across the street may not want me to refer to it as that.

What are they for?

MR. COX: Mr. Parsons, I'll try to answer that. Most of our buses, the school will have up to ten buses of different sizes. Most of them will be, approximately 8 of them will be of a mid-sized to small bus, used for the shuttles. We think two of the buses will be a regular, normal, larger size. We are indicating the two large buses potentially to park in the south parking lot where there is considerably more room. If that is not for reasons of impact considered to be an appropriate thing, we're quite able to park all the buses behind the gymnasium in the area that we're showing the other eight buses being parked. It's tight and it's downhill. It's a little harder to maneuver the larger buses to that area.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: What the proposal has shown would be permanent parking, in other words, they would be there Saturdays, Sundays, all the time they weren't in use --

MR. COX: With the alternative as I suggested. We could easily put them on the north part of the site. For the

purposes of this site plan, when we drew it, we wanted to accomplish two things. One was to show that this was a destination point for the morning drop off, the shuttle buses coming in from Foxhall arriving at this point, the curving portion of that plot for drop off area and then continuing on their way. So just to give a sense of the scale of the bus, but also if possible to have this parking lot be the home for two out of the ten buses, correct.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I guess in my opinion they belong up near the gym. Maybe you can work on that?

MR. COX: We'd be happy to work on that.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Now I guess my problem is I played a lot of soccer many, many years ago and I know what happens when you miss the goal, the ball goes over the fence and over the wall and down into the -- and this may seem to be a detail, but I know I've chased a lot of balls down the hill. So what kind of provision -- is there a stairway of some kind in this wall that the players can get down and retrieve the balls? I think it's something you ought to think about and I don't want to waste the public's time with it.

MR. RHODESIDE: I agree with you, John. I think that that can easily be incorporated at the north end of the wall so that there's stairs that go down when you can get the ball.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: That's all I have, Madam Chairman. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Thank you, Ms. Renshaw?

MEMBER RENSHAW: Yes, a collection of several questions. First of all, would you go over again, please, the distance to Mrs. Shagrue's property and talk about what controls you are going to have for erosion and water run off and also noise control?

MR. COX: The distances as shown on this site plan, Mrs. Shagrue's house is located approximately here, directly abutting the south property line of the site. From her house, from the edge of her house we have to travel about 325 feet northward, due north to hit the southern most building which would be the meeting, proposed meeting hall. The distances as I mentioned before we are proposing moving the southern entrance to the parking lot approximately 200 feet northward as opposed to the previous plan which had it about 80 feet north, so we are proposing that as an improvement to what Mrs. Shagrue had originally.

There is a buffer strip that varies in width from about 80 feet at Foxhall as it moves eastward toward the rear of Mrs. Shagrue's property. This dimension starts to narrow down to about 50 feet.

Now in addition to the -- just the physical dimension, here again is a section cut through looking eastward with Mrs. Shagrue's house just to give you some idea of the scale, her fence line, her property line right here. Of course, it's

quite an uphill slope, the existing topography done starts rising significantly. We are altering that to collect water runoff from the parking lot with the creation of this berm that does not now exist. Right now there is a continuous slope downhill so that -- we are actually, we think that we are proving the water runoff situation considerably to Mrs. Shagrue's property. Currently, there is nothing stopping 300 feet, 400 feet of water runoff going directly toward her house and to all the other residences. What we are proposing doing as part of the buffer and the landscape is to create this five to six foot high artificial berm, using some of the excavated material on the site which contains all of the water runoff in the parking lot, prevents it from ever going in this direction. Within that parking lot area there will be a series of catch basins with all of the grading of the asphalt parking area directing it toward those catch basins where it will then become managed as part of the overall storm water system. Here is that parking lot, series of catch basins that will be filtered, that will head first of all into this filter trap and from there downhill to the storm water management area. This is the area of the berm that I was talking about, but this is one of the things that we have been, in our many meetings with Mrs. Shagrue and her attorney, this has been a consistent concern of theirs and we have consistently said yes, we hear you, we are doing everything we can to help your storm water runoff situation.

I think your last question had to do with noise?

In the design of the overall site plan, we have tried to keep the buildings to the north close to the Krieger which is a museum institution, not a residence and close to Foxhall Road. As opposed to putting the buildings down along the south end of the site. The hill, the topography itself keeps these buildings separated, they are considerably uphill about 70 to 80 feet higher in elevation than these buildings. We've talked at length about the landscaping. The noise generation that might happen within the gymnasium also is kept to the -- as far away as possible on the north end of the site. The buildings themselves are all designed as heavily insulated, double paned windows.

MEMBER RENSHAW: I want to know about the noise from the parking area, that's what I want to know. How are you buffering the noise from the parking area?

MR. COX: The parking area itself is located here where we have the -- our best opportunity is to use plant material and the berm. I guess that's my most immediate answer. We have also tried to distribute and disperse the parking on the site so that it runs northward along Foxhall Road where noise impact will be minimized. But primarily through the site sections that we just looked at with the berm and the landscaping.

MEMBER RENSHAW: And the time that the parking lot would be most impacted would be what hours again, for the record, would you review that? Cars coming in in the morning?

MR. FEOLA: We're not allowed to talk about

traffic.

MEMBER RENSHAW: It would be between 7 and 9 and 3 and 5?

MR. FEOLA: 7:30 to 9 --

MEMBER RENSHAW: 7:30 to 9 and 3 to 5 or 4:30 to 5?

MR. FEOLA: 2:30 to 4.

MEMBER RENSHAW: 2:30 to 4. That's all right for now.

Now on the sports, Ms. Ely, I just want to make it clear that there's going to be no football?

MS. ELY: No.

MEMBER RENSHAW: No football. No baseball?

MS. ELY: Yes.

MEMBER RENSHAW: Yes, on baseball.

MS. ELY: Yes, on baseball.

MEMBER RENSHAW: Yes, on soccer?

MS. ELY: Yes, on soccer, yes, on lacrosse.

MEMBER RENSHAW: And lacrosse, okay, and basketball is inside. Track and field is another location.

MS. ELY: Yes.

MEMBER RENSHAW: What about band practice, do you have a band?

MS. ELY: We don't have a band.

MEMBER RENSHAW: So no outdoor noise?

MS. ELY: No.

MEMBER RENSHAW: All right, that's fine. Now Mr. Rhodeside, you maintain, you said earlier Wyoming Avenue is a main student gathering area. What did you mean and would you point it out?

MR. RHODESIDE: The terminology Wyoming Avenue comes from the street that Field School is currently on and the school wants to retain some sense of connection to its current environment. It's just a new walkway that would link the buildings in the north to the buildings on the south and be a place where there would be benches and chairs and lawn where students would gather. It's not a street.

MEMBER RENSHAW: It's not a street.

MR. RHODESIDE: It's not a street.

MEMBER RENSHAW: But it will be called Wyoming Avenue No. 2?

MR. RHODESIDE: Yes. But only in parentheses.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: I have a question with regard to the bus parking as predominantly located on the east side of the gymnasium. If that is correct and if the section which is section B, is that correct?

MR. COX: It is section B.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: The way section B reads there is a slope downward to the east from the area of the bus parking. Generally, buses, especially larger buses are noisier vehicles and also the particulate emissions from buses tend to

flow down and would follow the slope of the hill to the swimming pools and backyards of the adjacent neighbors to the east when they're all cranked up and ready to go in the morning or when they're all sitting there idling.

And because you provided a berm up buffer to the south, more as a visual barrier, I think that because of the typical issues that surround buses and the fact that all over this city there have bene problems with bus idling, bus fumes voices by the committee at large that perhaps a low vertical wall, any wall is vertical I guess, could be provided as a more efficient buffer against both the noise and the travel of the fumes into the community to the east.

MR. COX: I think that is exactly what we are proposing, Mr. Sockwell. It's difficult to see it on this slide, but to create this edge here we will have to create a wall, a small retaining wall on the order of a 4 foot high wall to solidify that embankment so that we're not just relying on the grading itself.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Because I didn't see it indicated on the L1.1 drawing. I did see a chain link fence indicated and I guess, well, actually I do see some reference to a retaining wall now that I look at it.

MR. RHODESIDE: This part could be raised up.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: I think that it needs to be raised up high enough to be an effective barrier to noise

and to the travel of those fumes because on warm summer days in this city when people are outside trying to enjoy themselves, to have that coming at them with no relief is a bad thing.

MR. RHODESIDE: I think it's a good suggestion.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Thank you. Let's see. I guess Mr Rhodeside, my question is in relation to -- can you put the site plan, please, back up?

Now, the southern, the initial southern entrance was right there by Mrs. Shagrue's house, right? Now my understanding is that is now being moved, the proposed entrance is now there, which is on the other side, that's Foxhall Road, right? So now, the southern entrance is not a southern entrance anymore?

MR. COX: We still refer to it as the southern entrance as opposed to the northern entrance which has always been shown at this location. The southern entrance change, as a part of this revised traffic proposal that we will speak to you about in detail next time includes the repositioning of this southern entrance about 100 feet further north than it originally was.

CHAIRPERSON REED: So now the southern entrance is really on the west, isn't it?

MR. COX: No, no, no, no.

CHAIRPERSON REED: That's where I'm confused.

MR. COX: This is the east side of Foxhall Road.

CHAIRPERSON REED: I mean east and it is no longer -- the southern section --

MR. COX: It never was. It was always on the east side, just further side than it is now.

CHAIRPERSON REED: All right, show me where it was going to be initially because my understanding was that it was -- okay, I didn't understand that. When you said southern, I was thinking that it was more directly southern to right abutting Mrs. -- behind as actually where the road was. So now that you're moving it up more northern, this is to excuse the negative impacts that would be on Mrs. Shagrue's property?

MR. COX: That's one of the reasons for it. We'll get into it next time, but it had to do with creating the left hand turn movement, that this was thought to be the most visible point in the downhill viewing, the safest place for it. It's really tied into with the traffic study.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Okay. Now the other question, my other question was in regard to parking. Now are we going to do the parking and the traffic at the same time, Mr. Feola?

This is specifically parking.

MR. FEOLA: If it relates to something that's late looked at, we can defer it, but I think Mr. Cox can answer the physical --

CHAIRPERSON REED: Let me try it. Now in your submission you stipulated that there were areas that had -- where you had the parking area and that there were going to be rules that were going to be imposed ont eh students regarding the

parking such as in order to get a parking sticker they had to have more than one person in their car? Correct? And I wonder how are you going to monitor that? How are you going to ascertain whether or not every day someone has another person in their car?

MR. FEOLA: That really is part of the transportation management program. We could answer the question, but it's sort of out of context with the bigger picture, so it might be better to save that for next time.

MS. MILLIKAN: Excuse me, as a parent, I would like to note that Field School students know the rules and they abide by them. They are all well aware of whatever rule there is, be it a sticker on the car, be it whatever, they know the rules, they know if they don't obey them, they're out of there. There is no question about trying to slip and slide around. That's not tolerated. What ever rule that might apply to, carpools or anything.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Again, my question is and you can answer this at the next session if you like, my question is how are you going to monitor, that's my question. I don't have any doubt that the rules are in place and that the students are always in compliance with the rules and regulations, don't have that problem. Nonetheless, the question I have is how are you going to monitor it and the other thing is in regard to parking, when you have special events, even though it's stipulated you had shuttle buses that would be provided, I guess you have a place

where they come to and shuttle them in and that there will be no parking permitted in the neighborhood. How are you going to control that?

MR. FEOLA: Maybe I should let Mr. Kaufman describe that a little bit.

MR. KAUFMAN: Again, I think it's probably more appropriate to save for the whole picture. My name is Clay Kaufman. I live at 1919 Locust Grove Road in Silver Spring. I've been a teacher at the Field School for 15 years. I coach and I've been heavily involved in the design process. I think we can address that in detail next time, but in terms of monitoring, we will have traffic control officers who will be situated at each entrance to the school who will be there every day, every morning, every afternoon and when, again, with the small number of kids that we're talking about coming in, we know exactly who those kids are. We know which kids drive and we will see them come in. We'll have a person at the entrance every morning, at each entrance, watching the students arrive.

CHAIRPERSON REED: I have to preface my question with whether or not you all would feel more comfortable answering these questions about parking in the next segment and we got into it. I still feel that one the special events, and you may want to address this when you do make your presentation in special events like what?

MR. KAUFMAN: Occasionally, we'll have, for

example, well, most of the special events we'll have enough parking on campus, for example our PTA nights are split up so that only a small group of parents come and we should have ample parking on campus. I think we're only anticipating, is it no more than three events a year that would have -- we wouldn't have the capacity actually to park on campus.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Where I'm going with this is that --

MR. KAUFMAN: Sure, like our holiday open house.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Holiday open house or you may have a school play?

MR. KAUFMAN: School play, we'll have ample parking on campus.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Some activity, would the public be invited, some type of -- would the open house, for example --

MR. KAUFMAN: We don't currently have open houses other than just for our students and certainly, if possibly, the neighbors would be invited, but we don't currently do anything like that.

CHAIRPERSON REED: So you're saying that your school is self-contained to the point that you don't have activities where you have persons who would be with the general public who would be coming to a special event at the school. You don't have those kinds of events?

MR. KAUFMAN: We do not have them.

MR. KAUFMAN: There are three school events, for example, the holiday open house.

MR. FEOLA: I think, Madam Chair, it really is disjointed without hearing the whole picture and I'd prefer to wait until next time.

CHAIRPERSON REED: All right, we'll do that. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I'm sorry, I should have covered this earlier. I want to compliment you on your storm water extraordinary measures that you're taking to hold this water back and treat it. Do you have an expert in that area or are you, Mr. Rhodeside?

MR. COX: Yes, we have Mr. R.J. Keller from the civil engineering firm, R.C. Fields here today.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Oh, so that's the graded drawing we're looking at. Gosh.

There's a line on this drawing that I don't understand and it's a dashed line that goes from the school due east across the page. It must be an existing line of some kind and then parallels the property lines with your neighbors and heads on to 4th Street.

What is that?

MR. KELLER: For the record, my name is R.J. Keller. I'm a senior project engineer with R.C. Fields and Associates. I reside at 6004 St. John Drive in Alexandria,

Virginia.

That dashed line is an existing sanitary lateral and storm outfall that was serving the Cafritz estate.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: So you're going to replace that?

MR. KELLER: Yes, we'll connect all storm and sanitary lines serving the existing structure to our new facilities.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: That would be good. Now you show a line down 44th Street.

MR. KELLER: Yes sir.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: And is that something that the Department of Public Works has agreed to or where are you in that process?

MR. KELLER: Yes, in our discussions with DPW, actually running the storm sewer up 44th is preferred for a number of reasons. First of all, it would provide a storm sewer in 44th that doesn't exist now that would afford the District the ability to tie into that in the future for run off in other areas.

In addition, there's an existing trail located in there that's utilized by members of the neighborhood and people utilizing the park. Running the sewer up that existing trail, we can minimize the amount of impact on vegetation and improve that trail condition.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: So are you going to oversize

this pipe in 44th Street so as to accommodate future drain inlets or whatever?

MR. KELLER: That would be the prudent engineering practice would be to size that pipe based on the drainage shed that it could potentially serve and since it is in a public right of way, Public Works would typically ask and review it for the potential runoff that would be directed towards that pipe.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: So there's no storm water collection system in 44th Street at this time? Not there --

MR. KELLER: Not there, that's correct.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: It's just runoff down the gutter or whatever.

MR. KELLER: That's correct. Right now, that section of 44th Street is unconstructed. There's no pavement, it's just a trail.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: And then it continues on and goes to a pipe at W Street?

MR. KELLER: That's correct, that's correct. There's an existing city storm sewer that runs up the hill on W Street to about this point and then runs down the hill to right in here. There's a small catch basin that comes off Foxboro Place and then the pipes run from the intersection here of 44th and W down into the park, down to the bed and banks of Foundry Branch. The pipe system runs all the way down to the bottom of the hill and there's a head wall in Foundry Branch in the park that is at

the bed and banks of the creek.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Now what storm are you retaining on your site, in other words, how much water are you going to be delivering to this system?

MR. KELLER: The practice for the District is to retain the 2 and the 15-year storms so we'll provide adequate detention to attenuate those flows, the 2-year and the 15-year design storms and we'll provide an analysis of the 100-year storm flow through the system to determine that the system is adequate to contain the flow of the 100-year storm event for emergency purposes.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: You're not going to design for the 100-year, are you?

MR. KELLER: No, we're going to ensure that the system will have the outfall capacity for the 100-year storm.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I hope you get rid of it.

MR. KELLER: Right, exactly.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: You should need the tank the size of the soccer field -d-

MR. KELLER: No, we're not going to detain the 100-year storm, no, we're just going to ensure that we can cast that storm without any detriment to the system or any downstream properties or the storm sewer outfall.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Since we're -- I'm going to ask a quick question in conjunction with yours, Mr.

Parsons.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Oh sure.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Since we're on storm water, a subject near and dear to my heart, sometimes, what is the size of the pipe that will ultimately, the public storm sewer pipe that will ultimately be receiving your retained flow?

MR. KELLER: Are you talking about the storm pipe in 44th Street?

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Yes.

MR. KELLER: Probably, right now we're looking at something in the neighborhood of a 24 to a 36 inch pipe.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: No, I'm talking about the existing one that you're going to --

MR. KELLER: Oh, that we're tying into?

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Yes.

MR. KELLER: Currently, in W Street down here that is a -- I believe it's a 36-inch pipe that runs down the hill to the bed and banks of Foundry Branch.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Okay.

MR. KELLER: It has adequate capacity to handle the runoff from this area.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: What other flow is going into that storm pipe to the best of your knowledge?

MR. KELLER: Presently, the analysis that we've done to this point is it's only handling about a 9 acre area that

encompasses this area. There are structures in W Street. Presently, the ridge line is Foxhall Road. It's presently picking up an area that includes Foxboro Place, part of the Cafritz estate, down Foxhall Road and a small sliver of this portion just to the south of W Street and like I say, it's roughly about a 9-acre drainage area.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: But the Foxhall storm sewer system itself does not tie into that pipe?

MR. KELLER: Presently, there's no storm sewer in Foxhall Road in this vicinity.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: All the water that comes down Foxhall Road is likely at that particular point where it levels off to turn down W Street which is a steeply sloping street and then it will go into that pipe?

MR. KELLER: That's correct.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: And you're sure that that will not surcharge with the additional flow added to it?

MR. KELLER: That's correct. Like I said, the existing system here, when it was designed it appears to have been designed to accommodate the drainage, the full drainage shed in this area and it's like I say it's a 36-inch pipe that has significant slope on it, obviously, going down to foundry branch --

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: And just one other question, has the Park Service been consulted for the impact

because at the head wall or on the other side of the head wall, you have a generally a ponding and pooling of water and then when you add additional flow into the system, it does cause additional erosion and deterioration at the outlet point. And other projects that have been involved with the park have made some endeavor to accommodate the Park Service which has a somewhat limited budget on things like that.

MR. KELLER: Right. We have been in touch with the National Park Service. We've met with them a couple of times. We have had an opportunity to walk the area and look at it in the field. Right now, there is, as you mentioned a scour problem at the end of that headwall. Primarily, it appears to be the result of flood stage flows in the creek that have kind of gotten behind that headwall because the headwall is down at flood stage elevation. But yes, we have been in contact with them and discussed with them the opportunities that they present themselves in terms of providing some sort of energy dissipation and that kind of thing down in this area.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Depending on the age of that thing it's probably 3 foot 6 inch rather than a 36 inch pipe, there is a difference. You might want to make sure that you check that because we have had some problems with other projects.

MR. KELLER: Okay.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Not reading the DPW drawings correctly or misstating them and it does make a

difference in what you're getting.

MR. KELLER: Sure, absolutely.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Mr. Keller, the maintenance of a sand filter system, can you describe that to us and I'm just wondering about the accessibility of these two sand filters for that kind of maintenance.

MR. KELLER: Well, part of the reason we located them where they are located is because they would be adjacent to a parking area, some place where an evactor truck or other type of maintenance vehicle could pull directly up to them. Typically, with a sand filter vault it's a multi-stage filter. The first filter is primarily a sediment, oil grit type separator that requires at least a yearly maintenance schedule to be pumped out and have the sediment taken out and any oil skim or petroleum by-products that would accumulate in there.

The second stage of the filter is obviously the sand portion of it which is a filter that basically strains the water. Again, that's -- the sand filter portion provided that the sediment portion of the filter is probably maintained, has a less frequency of attention. Periodically, the way the District of Columbia standard is done now, the sand filters have a layer of gravel on the surface with a layer of filter fabric that actually acts as a protection layer, two inch protection layer for the actual sand filter so that the upper level of the filter can be skimmed off and replaced with only modest possible damage to the

sand filter itself.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: But you need to get a truck to it, don't you, a pretty hefty truck to do this operation?

MR. KELLER: You should. Obviously, like I say, we've located them in a location to get a vehicle too them.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Well, that's the reason I brought it up because I'm not sure you have. I think you've got it under one of Mr. Rhodeside's trees and I wondered if it could be pulled back into the parking lot itself. Is that something that's done that -- what is shown here is the plus parking area for instance.

MR. KELLER: The two sand filters, the first one below the lower parking area, the southerly parking area is located here. And the northerly one is right up here just off -- this is the tennis court and this is the bus parking or lower parking area here. There is a sand filter located right here.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: The one up there at the tennis court, when you look at the grading plan, I mean the -- I need to request, by the way, the grading plan be brought into conformance with Mr. Rhodeside's plan. I'm sure you'll do that. But on Mr. Rhodeside's plan -- I think it's Mr. Rhodeside's plan, L1.1, it appears as though he's provided for a turnaround or something there at the site of the tennis court that would be directly on top of the sand filter system and that's what I'm urging you to take a look at in the other parking lot, rather than

the planting area that Mr. Rhodeside has shown on that drawing. That's all.

MR. KELLER: Actually, most sand filters are located underneath parking lots or other paved areas, so that's not a problem.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: So there's not a grading or a slope problem that has to move that sand filter down the slope?

MR. KELLER: No sir.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Thank you.

MEMBER RENSHAW: Madam Chair? Ms. Ely, is this plan as presented, your 5-year plan or your 10-year plan, in other words, is this holding the line for a period of time or do you anticipate that what you have proposed to us today is going to change within 7 years or 10 years or 5 years?

MS. ELY: If I understand your question correctly, what we're proposing is not going to change. I think what I was trying to say in my talk that our maximum number and optimal number for the kind of work we do is 320. I'm satisfied that 320 is all we should ever go to.

MEMBER RENSHAW: All right, I just wanted to understand whether or not you are thinking in the future that there will be more buildings on this property?

MS. ELY: No. I am not.

MEMBER RENSHAW: So it's going to remain as you have --

MS. ELY: As right here.

MEMBER RENSHAW: Right here, all right, that's good.

I wanted to ask just very quickly the two driveway entrances that exist on the property near the main house or at the main entrance, are those two openings going to remain or is there only going to be one?

MR. COX: The north entrance of the two will remain. The semi-circular driveway has a northern entrance very close to the Krieger property line. That entrance will remain, but be widened. The southern most entrance of th existing semi-circular drive comes into Foxhall roughly in this location. That will be removed.

MEMBER RENSHAW: So that if the main building, that's your ceremonial entrance I would assume?

MR. COX: Correct.

MEMBER RENSHAW: Isn't there a need to keep the semi-circular driveway intact as it stands now rather than routing people through a parking lot, then up to the main entrance?

MR. COX: Well, to some extent this may be edging again on the parking and traffic.

MEMBER RENSHAW: You can answer it next time around if you want.

MR. COX: We don't think so, but this basically becomes -- we don't like the idea of having more than two

entrances onto Foxhall.

MEMBER RENSHAW: Okay, I'll discuss this with you at the time your management plan is proposed to us.

I wanted to talk about the buses again. Ms. Ely, in your present system on Wyoming Avenue, do you have any problems with buses idling in the neighborhood?

MS. ELY: No, we do not.

MEMBER RENSHAW: All right. They do not stack up on a side street waiting 5 or 10 minutes to go off to the Metro?

MS. ELY: We have six buses and I would say much of the time only one or two are in use. These buses are used to transport our people to games, foreign games, and also used for field trips and many times, many days go by they're not used at all. So they don't -- no, we do not have that problem.

MEMBER RENSHAW: And now one last question, back to Mrs. Shagrue's property, have you thought in terms of a high stone or brick wall that would be in addition to the berm?

MR. RHODESIDE: We had obviously thought about that, but we thought it would be most attractive to have densely planted sloping areas as we have shown in the cross section in order to minimize any close by wall type structures. I think that could be attractive, definitely, but we thought that primarily landscaped and graded condition --

MEMBER RENSHAW: I'm just concerned about whether or not that berm effect would also become a little path into the

school parking lot, a foot path. It's tempting. I just want to say there is a private school in my neighborhood that has walled off the parking lot for th students and faculty from the community and that is a very necessary barrier between the community and the school, so I just advance the thought that you might want to consider it, of course, with Mrs. Shagrue giving her input.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Was there, I didn't see in my package with your submission, Mr. Feola, a construction management plan or is that something you wanted to address --

MR. FEOLA: There was not. We are prepared to deliver one today if the chair so desires.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Today? When.

MR. FEOLA: Whenever you request it.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Are you saying there is one that you plan to --

MR. FEOLA: We have one if the chair --

CHAIRPERSON REED: Oh, I see, you've done one, but you have not submitted it.

MR. FEOLA: We did not submit it. Your question had we submitted it, and the answer is no.

CHAIRPERSON REED: But you will submit it today?

MR. FEOLA: If that's the Board's position, yes.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Well, certainly we'd like to see that. That's always a major concern as well as -- were you going to make a presentation on it to give us the highlights of how you

are planning to manage the construction?

MR. COX: I'd be happy to.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Please.

MR. COX: The proposed construction time, first of all, let me just say is estimated at between 12 and 14 months once construction starts.

CHAIRPERSON REED: And would commence approximately?

MR. COX: It's difficult for me to hazard a guess at this point, but later on at the end of the year of this year, for instance.

Here again, the orientation is the same as we've been looking at the site, Foxhall Road running here and the property consisting here. What we propose to do is to keep the existing north driveway entrance of the house as the only point of access for construction vehicles. There will be no construction of this so-called southern entrance until the very end of the construction, so that all of the vehicle activity will arrive at a single point. The edge along Foxhall Road will be fenced off with protective chain link fence for the duration of the construction and then, of course, removed.

The contractor's staging area and trailers will be stretched along Foxhall in this general area and they will be building a temporary access loop road, as you see in this red dotted line that will connect all parts of the site for

construction activity.

The sequence of construction is at this point estimated to start in the northeast corner with the gymnasium area and this wing and generally move toward the house and then the southern academic wing as a second stage.

All of this area concerning the playfields will probably be the last portion of the site to come on line on construction.

But basically, as I said before also, we are estimating now, we have done an analysis of the cut and fill required on the site and we think that it's very close to a balance. In other words, all of the earth needed to excavate the buildings themselves will be stockpiled roughly in this area where we need the fill. It's this east end of the playfield that needs the largest area of fill and the calculations have been that we can pretty much use everything that we excavate so that we do not run large trucks with fill through the neighborhood.

MEMBER RENSHAW: Could I just ask a quick question.

CHAIRPERSON REED: I just wanted to conclude this and then you may. The time that the construction would begin daily would be approximately what?

MR. COX: The question of time on the contractor side always comes up on these projects and I think I would best state this as something that we would be most happy to work out with the neighborhood. If the time -- if it's the neighborhood's

desire to keep the hours limited to certain hours then we would be happy to adjust it to that. Generally, I would say the construction industry likes to get started early in the morning, about 7:30 and work until about 4 in the afternoon.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Have you discussed this construction plan with the ANC or the community to get their input or to get some type of --

MR. COX: Just in a general way, but traffic issues have taken up most of the discussions.

CHAIRPERSON REED: And the staging area, there will be along Foxhall Road, that you indicated?

MR. COX: That's correct.

CHAIRPERSON REED: There will be space provided for the vehicles, as well as -- I guess the trucks and the heavy duty vehicles as well as for the construction workers on site?

MR. COX: That's correct, Madam Chair. We have enough site area available to keep all of the contractor's vehicles on site. There will be absolutely firm control over this construction site the same way the school is proposing, the ability to keep all vehicles on the site and this is something that we have had good success with at Georgetown Visitation, for instance, and our work in a very difficult neighborhood, keeping all the vehicles on the site.

I think one of the things that we would also propose is that we designate a single point of contact throughout

the construction period on the school site so that there is community contact person at the school in case there are problems that we can work them out immediately.

CHAIRPERSON REED: That would be included in your construction management plan?

MR. COX: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Okay, good.

MR. COX: I'd be happy to do that.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Ms. Renshaw?

MEMBER RENSHAW: Yes, I'd like to know why on this service road, temporary road, why is it necessary to come so far down south toward Mrs. Shagrue's property and then the second question is are you building her berm and possibly a wall prior to the start of construction?

MR. COX: We have not taken it into that level of detail, Ms. Renshaw. If the concern is how do we buffer the construction noise during that period, I think that's also something we could do.

MEMBER RENSHAW: Why is it necessary to bring that road down so far?

MR. COX: Generally, it's to allow access to points of the site that are relatively graded in such a fashion that we can develop this access road without adjoining the steeper slopes are up in this area. Again though, this is something that i snot difficult for us to readjust. We can bend this road around and

have it go further north if that is of great concern.

CHAIRPERSON REED: You may want to, in the interim, before the actual traffic presentation is made, confer with her attorney to see, if in fact, that would be something that would be more amenable to her.

If there are no more questions of Board Members, then we will recess for lunch to reassemble at 2 o'clock and then we will proceed with the cross examination and persons and parties in support and then the opposition and hopefully we'll try and get through as much of the case as we can today and at the designated time we will then make an announcement as to what remains for today, if we can't finish today and that will be put on the same day of the traffic presentation.

Yes?

MR. FEOLA: Madam Chair, there is one supporter who came back on vacation. I was wondering if he could have five minutes prior to the break and then he can go back with his family in South Carolina.

CHAIRPERSON REED: He has to leave?

MR. FEOLA: It would be beneficial.

CHAIRPERSON REED: All right, Mr. Sockwell has a quick question for Mr. Cox.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Yes, Mr. Cox, the drawing that we're looking at that shows the proposed construction service road actually shows the south entrance to the site in its

previous location, does it not?

MR. COX: That's correct.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: So that service road would quite naturally probably be moved north to match the proposed south entrance location or something like that perhaps.

MR. COX: This was done considerably a while ago and just has not caught up.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SOCKWELL: Right, because it just appears it's on the drawings and not coordinated this way. Okay, I just wanted to make that. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Okay, unless there's nay objection by any of the parties in opposition, then I have no problem with -- the Board has, by consensus, agreed to allow this one witness to testify out of sequence. Who is it?

MEMBER RENSHAW: Madam Chair, while the party is coming to the table, could I just ask a quick question whether blasting is anticipated?

MR. COX: Blasting is not anticipated. We have as I said earlier, the condition of the soil is such that we do not anticipate any removal of rock. There is no rock present.

MR. GIBSON: Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. My name is Tom Gibson. I live at 4400 Edmond Street, N.W. and I very much appreciate being taken out of sequence. The flights into Charleston, South Carolina are very rare and I will be able to catch my return flight to be with my family on vacation because of

your indulgence.

I am here on behalf of the Wesley Heights Association for Preservation of Residential Streets. We are organized as a committee of the Wesley Heights Historical Society and we have done over a year ago at a meeting in March at Horace Mann School attended by 90 members of the community. The Wesley Heights Historical Society is a 501(c)(3) organization with long standing participation in the community on zoning and quality of life issues.

I am very pleased to discuss land use issues of the Cafritz estate as proposed by the Field School. Indeed, we see land use as an essential issue before you, an issue which was regrettably was largely excluded from expression and discussion in the final three ANC meetings prior to the ANC resolution taken just recently.

As part of our commission by the Wesley Heights Historical Society, we undertook research and dialogue programs in three dimensions and I thought it might benefit the community just to understand our charter by the historical society and I'll read briefly from a June 1999 document.

"Specifically, the committee will carry out the following activities in furtherance of the Society's tax-exempt purposes. Item, the review,e valuate and formally respond to the school's development plans as they relate to lower 44th Street and the abutting park land. Item, to negotiate an agreement between

the school and the Society concerning issues related to the impact of the proposed development on lower 44th Street and the abutting park land, and if necessary, to participate in opposition to any applications filed by the school with government agencies for required land use or their other approvals."

Well, that's why I'm here today, but I'm not here in opposition to the school. I'm here in support of it. As part of this mission we undertook a program with three dimensions. We retained the law firm of Robbins, Kaplan to review zoning and traffic issues.

Secondly, we obtained volunteer professional services to review environmental issues related to Glover Archibald Park and more specifically to engage in conversations with National Park Service, particularly in the person of David Murphy who is charged with Park Service land use issues.

Thirdly, we worked hard to have conversations with all corners of the Wesley Heights community with Field School representatives and were very active in ANC proceedings from the outset.

Here are our summary views based on this year's worth of work with one sentence as follows: we are persuaded that the Field School development of the Cafritz property will not alter the existing character of our neighborhood community except where it brings enhancements. There are five areas and I'll give you a sentence on each. First on protection of Glover Archibald

Park, as you've heard, the school has worked with the National Park Service to establish a site plan that will ensure proper runoff into the park, thereby preserving existing wetland areas, protecting the last stand of old growth forest in the District of Columbia and not pose any additional erosion threats. In our conversations with the Park Service, if you want to see what happens with high density development, go look at Battery Kimball Park and the gorge there where Foxhall Crescent development and Battery Kimball Place have increased erosion concerns and I'm advised are a major concern of the Park Service.

Secondly, on preservation of green spaces, the school has pledged a green buffer, as you've heard, of existing landscaping on the boundaries and most importantly, from our view, the maximum impermeable surface of the school's plans remain quite reasonable. This stands opposed to any alternative probably development use where dense residential development could pave and cover up to 60 percent of land area.

Thirdly, on the protection of lower 44th Street, then I'll stop here to pause to say that I live on the corner of Edmond and 44th Street, that's full disclosure, and I see the trust -- lower 44th is largely regarded as an extension of the park, dog walkers,kids at play, joggers, hikers, bird watchers, I see them every day and that's largely why I moved into this community because 44th extended is park extended.

The Field School has provided binding long term

assurances that they will not use their rear access to 44th Street which was a concern of ours.

Those three items I see as key and core elements preserving the character o the community.

Fourth item, that what we'll get in the Field School is an additional recreation space for our children. The Field School, as you've heard, pledged weekend use of their playing fields for the informal use of local community which is very welcome in view of the very, very heavy use up at Horace Mann and Stoddard where the playing fields are all packed mud. I see that as do many members of the community as the principal enhancement that the Field School brings to the community.

Finally, what we see in the Field School is a good neighbor. They have pledged to convene and on-going dialogue with the community and we see that as very representative of the character of the school. These aren't people that we can quote deal with. These are people that I believe we can work with and that has been very welcoming in view of other aspects of recent give and take in the community with other school properties, G.W. in particular.

We support the Field School's plan to relocate to the Cafritz property. We believe their current plans reflect a shared commitment to preserving the environmental integrity of the park, preserving green and open spaces and the quiet residential character of Wesley Heights. Further, we fear the potential

environmental and aesthetic consequences of alternative land use, especially another high density development project which is, we believe, inevitable if you look at what's going on with real estate values and the lusting of developers after that open tract of land.

Finally, as you consider the Field School application, you will certainly hear more about what our community has in great abundance and has had for many years, commuter traffic. I would urge you all to give great weight to preserving what is quite scarce in our community, green, open spaces and recreational grounds for our community's children.

We believe of all possible uses of the Cafritz property, the Field School proposal with what I'll say remarkable sensitivity to environmental and community concerns, both preserve the existing character of our community and brings enhancements, now soon and well into the future.

We believe they will be very good neighbors and we will welcome them to the community.

Many of the letters that Dr. Ely cited, the 240 letters are from our group and group extended and thank you very much for letting me go out of turn.

CHAIRPERSON REED: And to have considerable extended time.

MR. GIBSON: I'm sorry. Well, am I a 5 minute or a 10 minute person.

CHAIRPERSON REED: You're about a 10 minute person, but we let you go ahead and do that since we ready to go to recess, but I just wanted to caution everyone else, we're not going to do that and I think that many of the issues and concerns that -- for people in support have been already aired through this particular -- name, sir?

MR. GIBSON: Tom Gibson.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Mr. Gibson and we would look to hear things that differ primarily when you do --

MR. GIBSON: Fair enough. We've been working at this very hard for a full year.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Thank you very much. Then we will now recess and come back, reassemble at 1:15, I'm sorry, 2:15. Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 1:45 p.m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 2:15 p.m., Wednesday, March 29, 2000.)

A F T E R N O O N S E S S I O N

2:25 P.M.

CHAIRPERSON REED: The hearing will please come back to order. Thank you.

All right, we'll now have cross examination of the witnesses that testified on behalf of the applicant, with the applicant.

Mr. Aguglia and Mr. Bolotin. Did you have questions? Who wants to go first? Okay. And also the attorneys for Mrs. Shagrue.

All right, now proceed.

MR. AGUGLIA: Thank you. Richard Aguglia, again for the Neighbors Against Foxhall Gridlock.

Mrs. Ely, a few questions for you. First, I want to applaud you for your successful education efforts. This is, please, not about the school, this is about the location and traffic.

Your application and pre-hearing statement were unclear about your expansion goals. Is it your testimony that once you reach the 320 students that that would be it, that would be the maximum population forever at the school?

MS. ELY: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Speak into your mike, please.

MS. ELY: Yes.

MR. AGUGLIA: If this Board was inclined to grant your application, would you agree that to be a stipulation as part

of the Board's order that you would never exceed 320 students?

MS. ELY: I would have to consult my Board.

MR. AGUGLIA: So you're not certain?

MS. ELY: I would have to consult my Board. I'm pretty certain, but I wouldn't want to commit myself until I consulted with the Board. But I will let you know.

MR. AGUGLIA: Now from the testimony that was presented here today, is there going to be a cafeteria on the grounds?

MS. ELY: No.

MR. AGUGLIA: There is not?

MS. ELY: There is not.

MR. AGUGLIA: There's only one tennis court?

MS. ELY: One.

MR. AGUGLIA: So that would not be sufficient for a team?

MS. ELY: No.

MR. AGUGLIA: Have you or any of your representatives made any requests to purchase any of the surrounding properties?

MS. ELY: Never.

MR. AGUGLIA: Neither you, not you?

MS. ELY: No, none of us.

MR. AGUGLIA: Nor any of your representatives?

MS. ELY: Nor any of our representatives. That was

absolutely, the answer is no.

MR. AGUGLIA: So despite, so you have no plans to expand beyond the Cafritz estate if, in fact, you are allowed to put the school there?

MS. ELY: Yes, no plans.

MR. AGUGLIA: Give me an idea of the student population you have now.

MS. ELY: 212 students.

MR. AGUGLIA: 212. How many roughly in the lower grades, 7th and 8th grade?

MS. ELY: 7th and 8th grade would be about 48.

MR. AGUGLIA: 48 combined?

MS. ELY: Yes.

MR. AGUGLIA: And the difference between --

MS. ELY: Between 48 and 12 would be 36, 164. No, no, no. 174, 184. I can't count.

MR. AGUGLIA: Perhaps 164. All right, and then what would be the mix once you reach the potential 320?

MS. ELY: There would be 60 in each grade at the high school level and 40 in the 7th grade and 40 in the eighth grade. That's 320.

MR. AGUGLIA: Now you testified that approximately 90 percent of the student body is involved in extracurricular, or sports activities or extracurricular activities?

MS. ELY: Sports activities.

MR. AGUGLIA: Sports activities?

MS. ELY: Yes.

MR. AGUGLIA: Which take place after school?

MS. ELY: Yes, they take place after 2:30.

MR. AGUGLIA: After 2:30.

MS. ELY: But not after school. The 2:30 is the end of the academic day.

MR. AGUGLIA: Do the sports take place after 2:30?

MS. ELY: Uh-huh.

MR. AGUGLIA: What about the other 10 percent of the student body, do they normally stay after school for drama or yearbook or other activities, nonsports?

MS. ELY: That other 10 percent, they do their sports outside of the school. They have trainers or they do dance or whatever.

MR. AGUGLIA: All right, but do students do extracurricular activities after 2:30, other than sports, at the school?

MS. ELY: Some do.

MR. AGUGLIA: For instance, yearbook?

MS. ELY: Yes. MS. ELY: From time to time, yes.

MR. AGUGLIA: Debate?

MS. ELY: Yes.

MR. AGUGLIA: If you are allowed to place the

school at this site, will you apply for a tax exemption from the city from real property taxes?

MS. ELY: Yes.

MR. AGUGLIA: Is your current school tax exempt?

MS. ELY: Yes.

MR. AGUGLIA: Now I have some questions for Mr. Cox.

Mr. Cox, there was testimony that the site is approximately 10.5 acres?

MR. COX: Correct.

MR. AGUGLIA: And I think there was also testimony that about 2.5 of the acres were going to be dense woodlands or would remain dense woodlands?

MR. COX: I think that was Mr. Rhodeside's testimony, yes.

MR. AGUGLIA: Is it fair to say that there's about 8 acres of affected ground there for the school?

MR. COX: What do you mean by affected?

MR. AGUGLIA: Practically speaking, even though the site is 10.5 acres, the usable portion is about 8 acres?

MR. COX: Again, I'd have to ask you to clarify what you mean by usable. Do you mean --

MR. AGUGLIA: For the school, usable, buildable.

MR. COX: That may be a fair statement.

MR. AGUGLIA: Now what was the slope differential

of the property from north to south, do you know the square footage? The slope differential from the north part of the school to the southern tier of the school, approximately?

MR. COX: You're talking about the vertical elevation difference?

MR. AGUGLIA: Yes, yes.

MR. COX: Not square footage.

MR. AGUGLIA: No.

MR. COX: Approximately 100 feet.

MR. AGUGLIA: 100 feet. Perhaps maybe as high as 120 feet?

MR. COX: I couldn't say with any direct certainly. In that neighborhood, east to west was the description that I gave as part of my testimony that the elevation dropped approximately 100 feet. North to south I would say it's less than 100.

MR. AGUGLIA: In order to build the additional administrative buildings as well as to in-fill the field, the soccer/baseball/lacrosse field, how many tons of dirt do you estimate will be moved, excavated and moved?

MR. COX: I don't know.

MR. AGUGLIA: Considerable, on a scale?

MR. COX: I don't know.

MR. AGUGLIA: Do any of your witnesses know? No

one knows how much? However, you testified that as much as -- you determined that as much fill that you excavated, as much dirt that was excavated would be enough to meet the needs toot filling the field up to a level playing field, correct? Wasn't that testimony?

MR. COX: That's correct.

MR. AGUGLIA: But you have no idea how much that is?

MR. COX: I don't have that number.

MR. AGUGLIA: Then how could you make such a statement that what comes out will go in, unless you had a number?

MR. COX: Because I was using it as -- on a comparative basis. The comparative analysis was prepared at an early point int he design by our construction management firm and they did a computer analysis and the quantities, I simply don't know what those quantities are, expressed in tons or cubic yards or whatever measurement you want. But we did a comparison to insure ourselves to ourselves that we would not have to export material off-site.

MR. AGUGLIA: But again, you don't know how much --

MR. COX: I do not.

CHAIRPERSON REED: You asked that already twice.

MR. AGUGLIA: Please, the sizes of each new building, the meeting house, what will the size of the meeting house be?

MR. COX: Approximately 8,000 square feet.

MR. AGUGLIA: The gym?

MR. COX: The gymnasium is approximately 15,000 square feet.

MR. AGUGLIA: The new administrative wings?

MR. COX: We don't use the term "administrative wings". I've referred to it as the academic wings which are a combination of uses. The academic wing number one is approximately 12,000 square feet. Each of the wings are approximately 12,000, 12,500, 25,000 square feet for the academic wings.

MR. AGUGLIA: And that's in addition to the existing 14,000 square feet that is there now?

MR. COX: Correct.

MR. AGUGLIA: That's roughly 39, 49, 62,000 square feet?

MR. COX: That's correct.

MR. AGUGLIA: Will there be any other buildings, square footage that we could measure on the site?

MR. COX: No.

MR. AGUGLIA: So 62,000 square feet. Now you said that the buildings will take up about 7 percent of the lot?

MR. COX: That's correct.

MR. AGUGLIA: Whereas the lot occupancy maximum is

40 percent, so it's well within the limit under zoning, correct?

MR. COX: Correct.

MR. AGUGLIA: I think there was also testimony that even when you include the automobile parking that it would still be -- under the 40 percent it would be 27 percent?

MR. COX: That's correct.

MR. AGUGLIA: If you include the field, how much percentage of the lot would that entail, so we have a perspective?

MR. COX: Again, I have just not calculated that.

MR. AGUGLIA: You have no idea how much space the field will take up?

MR. COX: No.

MR. AGUGLIA: Would it be fair to say that when you include the field, the park, the parking facilities and the buildings proposed and existing that it would probably in excess of 50 percent?

MR. COX: Yes.

MR. AGUGLIA: In excess of 60 percent?

MR. COX: I can't speculate.

MR. AGUGLIA: But in excess of 50 percent?

MR. COX: I'd go as far as to say in excess of 50.

MR. AGUGLIA: Could you detail the parking facility for us? How many parking spots?

MR. COX: 128 parking spots.

MR. AGUGLIA: And how many bus spaces?

MR. COX: 10.

MR. AGUGLIA: Does that include spaces for the two large buses that were discussed?

MR. COX: Including the two large buses.

MR. AGUGLIA: So there would be 138 spaces in that southern tier for parking?

MR. COX: Now your question I thought referred to the total parking on the site.

MR. AGUGLIA: Okay, I'm sorry. Total parking on the site, 128 spaces and 10 bus spaces?

MR. COX: Correct.

MR. AGUGLIA: How many parking lights, approximately how many parking lots will be needed in order to park these number of cars?

MR. COX: Again, we haven't totaled it up. I can give you an estimation.

Approximately 9 lighting standards in the south parking lot.

MR. AGUGLIA: And what about in the other parking, the north parking lot, next to the gymnasium?

MR. COX: We do not have any light standards, free standing poles there. That lighting would be provided on the gymnasium building itself.

MR. AGUGLIA: So the gymnasium would have exterior

lighting?

MR. COX: Directed downward to the parking lot, yes.

MR. AGUGLIA: Would these lights be broadcast lights or Musco lights? Are you familiar with Musco lighting?

MR. COX: Now, you're talking about a brand name for a lighting?

MR. AGUGLIA: It's a brand name that's become synonymous with placing the lights in a directed downward focus with minimal spill and glare?

MR. COX: Yes, we refer to it as low angle cut off exterior lighting and that is the type of lighting we are proposing.

MR. AGUGLIA: For all standards?

MR. COX: Yes.

MR. AGUGLIA: I would ask that you counsel give me a copy of your construction management plan.

This is a question for Mrs. Ely. How do you intend to prevent weekend use of the field by nonstudents?

MS. ELY: We will have protocols for the use of our property as we have now. I would imagine that those protocols would cover any intrusions, you know, delineate who or what an intrusion might be and we would have an appropriate way, as much as we can at this point to police that and we will depend on our

neighbors, we will depend on -- the Field School is a place where teachers come and work. We'll depend on them to see that that's enforced. Where we are we will have an intrusion maybe once in a year, but people know and soon know that it's not tolerated.

MR. AGUGLIA: But you don't have any specific enforcement plans at this point in time?

MS. ELY: We have the same kind of protocols that I just mentioned to you that we will know who, if anyone, has been allowed to come, they pass a ball back and forth. And we will be able to delineate for ourselves who is supposed to be there and who is not supposed to be there. We have somebody usually on the property, even on Saturdays, teachers come and go into their offices and grade papers and so on. They would know.

MR. AGUGLIA: Would you have any enforcement officers on the property on the weekends?

MS. ELY: We haven't planned on it.

MR. AGUGLIA: Okay. The field will be interchangeable for soccer, lacrosse and baseball?

MS. ELY: Yes.

MR. AGUGLIA: Of course, one of the concerns of the neighbors is foul balls from the baseballs that are being hit that will go over the wall or the trees and hit their property or break their windows.

Do you have a contingency plan for that?

MS. ELY: I'll have the baseball coach answer that

one.

MR. KAUFMAN: Clay Kaufman. I was the baseball coach for a long time. The main plan for that is to set, because the field is set so far away from the neighbors, we deliberately situated it so that even a long foul ball has a great distance to go to go anywhere close to where the neighbors. In addition, all the tree lines that are there, during baseball season when there are leaves on the trees that keeps balls from going that far, plus there is a fence that is the baseball backstop which also presents balls. I can't promise that a 400 foot foul ball wouldn't possibly go in one direction, but given the situation it's very unlikely.

MR. AGUGLIA: From one of the landscaping plans that I saw it appeared that the home plate area where people would be batting was fairly close to the southern -- was fairly close to the neighbors along Foxboro Place and W Street.

MR. KAUFMAN: It faces away from the southside of the property so that the backstop would be, it's a tilted, have you seen one of those tilted backstops that keeps foul balls, a batter from going backwards, would take care of 99.5 percent of those.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Do you have any more questions?

MR. AGUGLIA: I think just a couple more. Are there any shuttle buses now at the present location for your students?

MS. ELY: No.

MR. AGUGLIA: What is their main method of getting to school?

MS. ELY: I think Clay has done all these traffic studies, so I just refer to him. Well, then I'll have to say I don't know.

MR. FEOLA: Madam Chair, that's sort of covered in our traffic analysis and it would probably be more appropriate to address it --

CHAIRPERSON REED: We are all aware that for that portion to be covered within the traffic presentation at which time you will also be given an opportunity to cross examine on that testimony.

MR. AGUGLIA: For the architects or the landscape architect, what measures will be taken to prevent spill off into the adjoining homes during the construction management period?

MR. COX: As part of the overall construction management plan, we have to conform to DCRA regulations concerning temporary measures taken. There are such things as silt fences, straw bails. We have to actually include a prevention plan for -- or retention plan of all runoff on the site during the construction period as a part of the building permit process so we will conform to all district standards on the construction aspects.

MR. AGUGLIA: Is it possible for you to have that,

as far as your construction management plan for us to review?

MR. COX: Certainly.

MR. AGUGLIA: Thank you. Is there any plan for emergency entrance or exit on 44th Street in the event that Foxhall Road is -- there's an accident on Foxhall Road and there's no traffic going in and out?

MS. ELY: I'll refer that question to David.

MR. COX: The answer is no.

MR. AGUGLIA: No?

MR. COX: There is no contingency or otherwise plan to exit onto 44th Street.

MR. AGUGLIA: So if the street is blocked because of an accident, then the students will simply wait there until the accident is cleared?

MR. COX: That's correct.

MR. AGUGLIA: I think that's the extent of my questions now, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Thank you. The ANC Chair?

MS. HEUER: I'd like to address the first question to Mrs. Ely.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Give your name.

MS. HEUER: Ann Heuer, ANC Commissioner, 3DO6.

You mentioned the fact that the playgrounds would be open to neighborhood children and so did one of our witnesses that the 44th Street would be able to use it. Is there going to

be a gate down there on 44th Street?

MS. ELY: I'll have to refer that to David.

MR. COX: In the current plan we are not contemplating any gate along 44th Street, that it would be a continuous chain link fence around the property.

MS. HEUER: So in other words, anybody using it would be driving their car and parking it on the school parking lot to be using the playground?

MR. COX: Or they could walk to the site, yes.

MS. HEUER: It's rather dangerous to walk to the site.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Don't testify, please. Ask questions.

MS. HEUER: So you don't know, in effect. Has there been any decision on whether the parking lot is going to be closed over the weekend or is there going to be a gate on it at night?

MR. COX: Again, that's also part of our transportation management plan, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON REED: If in fact that is the case when a question comes up of that nature, simply say it. Just simply say we'll address that during the traffic presentation.

MS. HEUER: Could you tell me what percentage of the land will be under asphalt paving?

MR. COX: The percentage would be the difference

between the 7 percent figure and the 25 percent figure, so what is that, 18 percent.

MS. HEUER: So 18 percent of the land will be under paving?

MR. COX: 18 percent of the land would reflect the combination of sidewalks, paved plaza areas and asphalt parking, correct.

MS. HEUER: Have you thought about doing any other type of paving other than blacktop asphalt?

MR. COX: We have considered other choices. Most other paving materials are significantly more expensive. At the moment we have asphalt as the medium being proposed.

MS. HEUER: I have one more question. In terms of -- I guess I would address to do with landscaping. You show pictures of lots of shrubs and trees and everything, but if I look at it it looks like when they are mature and I would like to know how long is it going to take for that planting to mature because certainly the berm, those trees that you plant there in the beginning are going to be quite small and really won't offer much coverage.

MR. RHODESIDE: We were planning to do the way we illustrated it in the rendering. They show about a 5-year growth on the plants.

MS. HEUER: Five years to reach maximum growth?

MR. RHODESIDE: They were shown as being at the 5-

year rate of growth, not at the mature growth.

MS. HEUER: Just for clarification, in other words, you're showing them as how tall they're going to be when they are five years old?

MR. RHODESIDE: Approximately, yes.

MS. HEUER: Thank you. I have no other questions.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Thank you. Mr. Bolotin?

MR. BOLOTIN: Yes, I have some quick questions, if I may.

What is the geographic breakdown of the students presently enrolled at the school?

MS. ELY: All right, 43 from Virginia; 117, I think it is from the District, and let's see -- what is that, 52. I was going to say 56, but it didn't add up.

MR. BOLOTIN: And what is the average tuition for students attending the school?

MS. ELY: $15,900.

MR. BOLOTIN: $15,900?

MS. ELY: Yes.

MR. BOLOTIN: I just have one question with regard to the planters. How many trees are going to be cut down in order to make way for construction on the site?

MR. RHODESIDE: There would be 19 specimen trees removed and a total of, including those 19 trees, 110,000 square feet or approximately 2.5 acres of canopy. We weren't able to

individually count all the trees in the forest, so we used the canopy coverage.

MR. BOLOTIN: Thank you. That's all the questions I had.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Thank you. Mr. Swendiman?

MR. SWENDIMAN: Yes, thank you, Madam Chair. If you all will bear with me because I'm going to try to eliminate traffic from this.

Let me follow up with regards to the landscaping. I just want to confirm that the plan that has been submitted is not a mature plan in terms of that berm. You're projecting five years in terms of that. What will that landscape consist of?

MR. RHODESIDE: Both evergreen and deciduous plants?

MR. SWENDIMAN: Would it make sense to have more evergreens than deciduous in terms of screening the parking lot and the school from Mrs. Shagrue's property?

MR. RHODESIDE: We do show a considerable amount of evergreen trees. The reason we were doing both evergreen and deciduous would be to make it compatible with plantings in the neighborhood with are both, in many cases, evergreen and deciduous.

MR. SWENDIMAN: Is it fair to conclude that the screening really won't fully take place until 5 years from now or five years from installation?

MR. RHODESIDE: Yes.

MR. SWENDIMAN: What percentage of the development of the property is going to be devoted to landscape?

MR. RHODESIDE: On the third plan that we had showed, we did a canopy coverage of approximately 4 acres and that was based after five years of growth of those canopies and that included both existing woodland and new planting.

MR. SWENDIMAN: I think, sir, that you had testified that there will be substantial or at least significant earth movement in terms of -- and that there will be no need to import any fill to the site. Is that correct, Mr. Cox?

MR. COX: Yes, that's correct.

MR. SWENDIMAN: Will the school's plans have to conform with District of Columbia environmental regulations dealing with land disturbance?

MR. COX: When we submit drawings for permit review by the city, we will be reviewed by the environmental desk as well. So at that time we will get review comments that we will need to respond to.

MR. SWENDIMAN: How will you conform to the District of Columbia's regulations with regards to land disturbance and earth movement?

MR. COX: I'd have to know what the specific request would be from the city.

MR. SWENDIMAN: Will the school file a

comprehensive erosion and sediment control plan for the site?

MR. COX: Yes, if the city requires it, we will do everything that is required of us.

MR. SWENDIMAN: And is it fair to say that you will file a comprehensive storm water management plan with the city as well?

MR. COX: Yes.

MR. SWENDIMAN: How do the proposed plans prevent sediment ladened water from spilling over to adjoining property, in this case, Mrs. Shagrue's?

MR. COX: Maybe Mr. Keller can answer that.

MR. KELLER: Typically, on a project of this nature we would set up perimeter controls, diversion berms and that kind of thing that would direct all on-site runoff to a sediment trap, trapping device or mechanical structure that would actually trap that sediment before it left the site.

MR. SWENDIMAN: You've discussed the fact that you've had conversations with the National Park Service with regards to storm water management. Have you had any conversations with the other adjoining neighbors in terms of storm water management and then specifically, Mrs. Shagrue?

MR. KELLER: I have no discussed it with her specifically, no.

MR. SWENDIMAN: Mr. Cox, I think you described the lot, the Cafritz site as being a continuing slope from the house

down to the property line with Mrs. Shagrue. Isn't it a fact that there is actually a rise that comes up near her house and then levels off to the fence?

MR. COX: That's generally accurate, yes.

MR. SWENDIMAN: How is the berm going to be constructed in view of that natural rise in the property site?

MR. COX: Mrs. Shagrue's property is sitting here on the south end and the land does have a continuous downhill slope to it. Just roughly in this area as it approaches the southern property line, the land, I wouldn't call it a rise so much as it is a leveling out of the land, but then it drops again as it gets directly in front of her property line.

What we are proposing to do as part of the construction of this parking lot, the contours in this area are going to be reconstructed, reconfigured and along with that in order to develop this parking lot as a series of trays or terraces stepping down the hillside and to redirect the flow of water instead of aiming in this direction which it would do naturally we are redirecting it back towards the center, actually making it run slightly north, but primarily east so that it can be directed towards the flow, the sand filters that Mr. Keller had described. None of the water will be directed in this direction.

As we regrade this parking lot, this berm will, some of the fill area that we have taken from other parts of the site will be brought in to create an artificial berm running

roughly from Foxhall Road all the way along to the rear of Mrs. Shagrue's lot.

MR. SWENDIMAN: Help me, when the rain hits the berm, where's the water, which way is the water going to flow?

MR. COX: Of course with a berm, I want to separate two things here. There is certainly an allowance for water runoff, rainfall hitting permeable surface, grassy areas and certainly land along here will have a pitch on the south side of that berm, that is a natural slope, as the current slope is a natural slope. So some water runoff will happen. Most of it will penetrate down because it's permeable softscape. That's quite different than what I was describing with the control of rainwater in the parking lot where it has to be controlled per city regulations.

MR. SWENDIMAN: Would you anticipate or do you know whether the construction of a berm would exacerbate or increase the water runoff towards her property, that is, from the berm to the property line?

MR. COX: We do not feel it will.

MR. SWENDIMAN: We talked about the southern parking lot. How many spaces or confirm for me how many spaces that southern parking is going to have?

MR. COX: Currently this lot has approximately 84 spaces.

MR. SWENDIMAN: 84, and how many buses will be

there?

MR. COX: We've covered that earlier. I had proposed that two buses would be parked here. The other eight buses, a total of 10 would be behind the gymnasium and one of the suggestions was could we evaluate moving these two buses back here as well.

MR. SWENDIMAN: Subject to check, would you accept that basically approximately two thirds of the parking is going to be in the southern end of the site?

MR. COX: As I said, roughly 84 spaces of the 128.

MR. SWENDIMAN: Maybe I can turn back to, was it Mr. Rhodeside, in terms of the landscaping. When the soil is moved, clarify for me what type of subsoil is going to be exposed?

MR. RHODESIDE: I think that's more o fa geotechnical question. I don't know what the answer is to that.

MR. SWENDIMAN: Well, do you know whether that subsoil has to be modified in any way to handle drainage?

MR. RHODESIDE: I don't know.

MR. COX: The geotechnical report which is filed as part of the application gives details on the type of soils. Basically there are three layers. The top layer, for a couple of feet down is composed of top soil and fill that happened at various points and is quite permeable.

Then there is a layer of clay and beneath that at the bottom, some 30 feet down are sandy silts. All of these soils

are considered fairly representative of this part of the city. They do not represent any particular problems, both in terms of permeability of the site or of the bearing capacity of the footings on the buildings.

MR. SWENDIMAN: Correct me if I'm wrong, but as part of your proposal then whatever fill is there that's going to be moved that includes construction fill will be used and moved over to the playing field?

MR. COX: That's generally correct. We will have to do this on a more specific basis when we actually -- you can only ascertain so much by taking soil boring grids. You can't take grids over 100 percent of the property. obviously, so we are using our findings as representative.

Generally though, the quality of the soil we have found is suitable for fill for playing fields, yes.

MR. SWENDIMAN: Is there any negative impact of using construction fill as opposed to natural soil in terms of drainage?

MR. COX: What do you mean by construction fill?

MR. SWENDIMAN: Basically I would say the remnants of when the Cafritz property was constructed.

MR. COX: I don't know the answer to that.

MR. SWENDIMAN: Ms. Ely, you mentioned the fact that there would be no events starting at 6 o'clock or after. Is it fair to say that there may be events that started let's say

5:30 or 5:45 that will extend beyond the 6 o'clock hour?

MS. ELY: I will refer that to Clay because he's much more in charge of the athletic program and that kind of question than I am.

MR. KAUFMAN: The answer is that because our fields will not be lit that when it gets dark all outdoor activities will be over. It is possible that a basketball game, inside the gym could start at 5:45, but given the fact that Field School only runs from September to May, end of May when we begin exams, we don't have long daylight hours. In the fall, our dusk happens very early, especially after Daylight Savings Time. So no, it couldn't start in the fall, a soccer tame couldn't start at 5:45 in order to finish.

MR. SWENDIMAN: Well, you would agree that there is light with Eastern Daylight Time for let's say late April and May.

MR. KAUFMAN: That's the very bitter end of our season and because of the fact that we end, we'd be in exams the first week of June.

MR. SWENDIMAN: Mr. Cox, in terms of the parking lot, has there been any study done in terms of what level of auto emissions and heat emissions will be generated by the automobiles and buses there or from the asphalt parking lot?

MR. COX: No, we have not conducted those studies.

MR. SWENDIMAN: Madam Chair, if you will just indulge me just one quick moment, please?

CHAIRPERSON REED: Do you have any more questions?

MR. SWENDIMAN: Just I think one or two more, if you could just indulge me one second.

Clarification, I think, Mr. Cox, you had run through a series of numbers in terms of distances between Mrs. Shagrue's property and the school. I think you said that from the southern most building to Mrs. Shagrue's line it was 325 feet and then from a proposed southern entrance to Mrs. Shagrue's would be about 200 feet north and then you said it was about 80 feet, but I did not -- your sentence trailed off and I didn't hear what that third measurement was in terms of some relationship of the school to Mrs. Shagrue's property.

MR. COX: Possibly I was referring to the dimension of the landscape buffer as it changed dimension. That it was a variable width because of the curvature that we have to the edge of the parking lot and I believe I said that it was 80 feet wide at the side closest to Foxhall and diminished down to approximately 50 feet towards the rear of Mrs. Shagrue's property.

MR. SWENDIMAN: Do I understand that correctly to mean that the edge of the parking lot is approximately 80 feet from Mrs. Shagrue's property?

MR. COX: Correct. Again, as you can see on the drawing, it's a curving line, so these are not constant dimensions.

MR. SWENDIMAN: Mr. Rhodeside, I think you may have

mentioned that there would be no blasting on the site or maybe it was Mr. Cox who had stated that. Isn't it a fact that there is a substructure on the property as a result of a previous house that was located there, am I not correct?

MR. COX: My understanding is that there is a potential for the existing basement or foundation of a house, just to the north of Mrs. Shagrue's property. I don't know for sure. If there is a structure of that type below grade, we certainly would not use blasting to get rid of it. That's easily removed with machinery.

MR. SWENDIMAN: Do you know whether you're going to have to address the location of that low grade structure in terms of your plans?

MR. COX: At this point, I don't know.

MR. SWENDIMAN: Madam Chair, I have no further questions.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Thank you very much. All right now, that concludes the cross examination segment and we will move now to -- let me see, typically, it would be the Office of Planning Report. Nonetheless, I think that it will not be done today and done after they receive the new presentation by the applicant or have they received it? Our understanding is that they want to reconsider and to give their report at the next hearing that we have.

MS. VOGEL: Yes, that is correct and we would also

like to have the benefit of the response of the ANC and other representative of the community.

CHAIRPERSON REED: I said reconsider. It may not be reconsideration, but you just want to basically take these other things into consideration and to do another report, not necessarily reconsideration.

Okay, now the DPW report was made a part of the Office of Planning Report, so that will also be done at that appropriate time and we do not have any other government reports that I know of. Did we not

--

MS. VOGEL: Yes, the other government reports were also attached to the Office of Planning Report. We had a report from the Metropolitan Police Department and also from the Fire Marshal, Office of the Fire Marshal, both of which had no issues with the proposal, the application.

CHAIRPERSON REED: We have not received that, Ms. Vogel, so therefore, let's do it all at one time. When you do your report we will then have received copies of all the other reports and then we can make the assessment or determination predicated on what, in fact, we received which we don't have yet.

MR. AGUGLIA: Madam Chair, for the next meeting since the DPW report is such an integral part of this whole hearing process, I think it would be important that someone from DPW be here prepared to take questions, otherwise we'll be asking

Ms. Vogel a question and she will not be able to answer because just the report is attached. I think it will be extremely helpful to all parties.

CHAIRPERSON REED: If the Board so desires, then we can request through staff a representative from DPW to be present at the hearing. Thank you.

All right, we will now go to persons and parties in --

MS. PRUITT: Excuse me, Madam Chair, we do have the Park Service here. We normally take not only District government, but federal agencies. I believe the Park Service would like to defer their testimony until the next time so that they can also have the benefit of the OP report.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Was I aware of the fact that we had Park Service representation?

MS. PRUITT: We don't have it in writing, but --

CHAIRPERSON REED: I wasn't aware of that. When I ask for government reports that is always inclusive of both the city, municipal and the federal government. Can you please come forward, sir?

Give us your position?

MR. MURPHY: Good afternoon, Madam Chairman. I am representing the National Park Service, Rock Creek Park. In light that the Office of planning Report will not be available, it would be better for us to review it and consider their insight at a more

opportune time.

CHAIRPERSON REED: At the next hearing, okay.

MR. MURPHY: So we'll be able to comment at the next hearing.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Well, thank you very much for coming today.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you, ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Now we move to persons in support of the application. I'm sorry, Ms. Heuer, come forward, and I should have mentioned it. I thought that you were not going to give your report until you'd gotten an opportunity to get the other traffic report and then go to the ANC and community and get input and then make your report.

MS. HEUER: Well, I guess my concern is part of my report has nothing to do with the traffic. The ANC rejected this application for not only traffic reasons. So what is your preference, there was one issue that we were concerned about. Several of the issues we actually are concerned about, I still think I should go on record and say something now about it since in May it is my understanding you're only going to deal with traffic, is that correct or can we bring up other issues?

I mean that's where I'm a little bit confused.

CHAIRPERSON REED: And understandably so, because it is rather confusing. My thinking -- I don't know how the other Board Members feel, when you give your report you're also going to

give a position predicated upon a vote. I didn't know, if in fact, the ANC body would take another vote predicated upon the review of the information that we -- the information that they are going to submit to you so that -- and also, our presentation or whatever they're going to do, if in fact, there's another vote that would be taken or are you going to stand on the position of the ANC that you have submitted to us already. That's where it's confusing.

MS. HEUER: For me, too, considering I'm just one.

CHAIRPERSON REED: I wouldn't want you to have to today give a report and give us your position predicated upon the vote being taken, a forum and all that and we give you the great weight and then after they have presented the other information to you, you then take another vote. So I think would be the best thing to do and I would like to hear from other Board Members is to have you give your report after they've already given that new report to your body and made the presentation and then when you are giving your report you would be allowed to give your full report. You would not have to deal with --

MS. HEUER: So I could deal with some of the other issues, if in fact, they're still there.

CHAIRPERSON REED: You would give your report in its entirety. That's my point of hesitancy, that it would not be two reports being done and not cause confusion, but when you give your report, you give your full report. That would be my

position.

MS. HEUER: I just wanted it clarified so therefore my full report may not necessarily just concern traffic issues.

I would like to say one thing to the school when we had our last meeting and voted and believe me, we've had a lot of meetings an da lot of discussion. We had given the school two months' notice to please send their traffic experts and they did not come. Now I'm concerned that our next scheduled meeting is April 10th and I've been told that their traffic expert is going to be out of town so I hope that we will be able to take a position.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Comment?

MR. FEOLA: Madam Chair, for the record, Phil Feola. With all due respect to Commissioner Heuer, the traffic consultant was at least three of the previous ANC meetings. He happened to have a conflict that night. He was at another hearing at another case. He did not come, but the traffic information and he stood for questions and actually, she may not know this, she was absent for one of the Commission meetings that he took questions from the Commission. So to say he didn't come when he had two months' notice I think is an unfair characterization. And his shop is bigger than himself and he'll send an associate or another principal to talk about this one issue which is the creation of a left hand turn land.

MS. HEUER: Excuse me, but that's not quite true.

He had come, but then we asked for specific answers to when the traffic report came out

--

MR. FEOLA: You were not there. The Chair wanted to hear about traffic management, creative traffic management solutions to the traffic problems. Traffic management has nothing to do with traffic analysis. It was are you going to run shuttle buses, how are you going to do it? Those are management issue that the school addressed.

MS. HEUER: I think you misunderstood what she wanted.

MR. FEOLA: That could be.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Ms. Heuer, if in fact, the traffic expert makes someone from his staff available to the ANC to address any questions or issues that might arise as a result of the subsequent report, would that be satisfactory to you?

MS. HEUER: I think because we have not had answers to a lot of their total analysis.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Mr. Feola, will you see to that?

MR. FEOLA: Yes ma'am

CHAIRPERSON REED: Thank you.

MR. AGUGLIA: Madam Chair, for all of our sakes, we need a date from the applicant that they can submit to the Board, to the ANC and to those of us in opposition their final traffic report.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Well --

MR. FEOLA: With all due respect to counsel this has been given to his clients at least six months ago, but we will resubmit it by Monday, close of business.

CHAIRPERSON REED: I think he's referring to the more recent one.

MR. FEOLA: The recent one is a site plan which he got Friday, but we can put it in a nice little package and give it to him by close of business Monday.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Close of business on Monday, is that satisfactory to you?

MR. AGUGLIA: That's satisfactory and we're to understand that this is the final plan that we will then --

CHAIRPERSON REED: Final, final.

MR. AGUGLIA: That we will be before you in May?

CHAIRPERSON REED: Uh-huh, no more changes or modifications, right?

MR. FEOLA: Madam Chair, this whole process is one of change and modification. These changes came about because Mr. Aguglia's clients, the ANC, the Department of Public Works and the Office of Planning requested us to look at it. This wasn't something that we just were thinking around in the back of our minds that the school is going to spend another half a million dollars to build a left turn lane on Foxhall Road which is a city street because we just felt like it. So you have to understand

that these things evolve. If they came back and said well, if you do three more things we might support you, I think this Board would want to hear those three new things. So it is our best shot at Monday close of business.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Well, that makes sense that that would be your final --

MR. FEOLA: And we'd be willing to rely on that unless the ANC tells us to do something different.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Given the fact that you don't foresee the ANC making any more recommendations for change and that is key in all fairness. This is where some of the changes are coming from, then it seems to me that when he goes to make the presentation before the ANC, if, in fact, at that time the ANC makes recommendations or asks for different changes, then that wouldn't be the final.

MS. HEUER: I am concerned about one thing. I saw this map, but that's not -- just looking at the map I hope that the works and artists will come forward with a traffic management plan because there is no indication even from the map what they're planning on doing.

MR. FEOLA: Monday close of business.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Traffic management plan.

MS. HEUER: And our concern, of course, will be since we said we could not accept what they had proposed originally, now our concern will deal with this traffic and left

hand issue. We don't know whether it is safe or anything else. We have not had any analysis of it.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Uh-huh. So --

MS. HEUER: Yes, of course, we may come up with some other recommendations.

CHAIRPERSON REED: That's exactly the point that's being made here. It does not -- would not be a good idea to close it off, given the fact that we don't know what the response is going to be from the ANC. So why don't we in a time line, Ms. Pruitt, determine when they will make the presentation to the ANC and then give them a time certain to have the report in which will be made available to everyone concerned and proceed to have the subsequent hearing.

MS. HEUER: Well, I've known it to happen and it certainly happened with G.W. that we had a number of meetings and it may be when they present their plan and we make other suggestions that they, in fact, we may even have another meeting before May 11th.

MS. PRUITT: Excuse me, Madam Chair. I need to make one correction. Mr. Hart brought to my attention as we were looking at the calendar, it's May 10th which is a Wednesday. I had the wrong date, but the right day. It's May 10th. Please make note of that.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Okay. Are we all on the same page now?

MS. HEUER: Yes, I think so.

CHAIRPERSON REED: We'll -- so how many days before the next hearing should the submissions be in, given the fact that they would have had a chance to meet with the ANC and the community and get comments, input, whatever, and make whatever changes so that the final, final would be in by what date certain?

MS. PRUITT: As I have it down in my notes here, we're going to continue the hearing to May 11th with the ANC and parties, excuse me, May 10th, ANC and parties sort of response to it due May 3rd. So it would have to be before May 3rd that the applicant would have to have everything in to us and everyone by a time certain and I am sort of leaving it up to you, I guess the parties and the ANC to give me a little bit of guidance as to -- not to push you all too much, actually.

MR. SWENDIMAN: This is my suggestion that Mr. Feola give us his plan close of business Monday as he said. The ANC meeting is April 11th. He would then have until April 18th to advise the Board and the parties in opposition as to whether or not he intends to keep with that plan that he's already submitted or because of the changes that have been requested and let's just say for the sake of argument that the ANC would approve, he then has until April 18th to submit a document that says here is the changed plan because of the ANC meeting. If nothing is submitted by the 18th, then in fact -- is that a weekday?

MS. PRUITT: Yes, it is. It's a Thursday.

MR. AGUGLIA: Then in fact we are dealing with the April 3rd submission as being the final submission and my clients have until May 3rd to submit their opposition to that plan and we have a hearing on the 10th.

MS. PRUITT: So just for me to go back over, on the 18th, the applicant has the possibility of responding to any -- to ANC's previous meeting or to you -- I guess to any meetings.

MR. AGUGLIA: The applicant would have the meeting to submit a revised plan based upon the meeting with the ANC that says we will approve if you do this, this and this.

MS. PRUITT: And that's by the 18th of April?

MR. AGUGLIA: By the 18th of April.

MS. PRUITT: And if they do not --

MR. AGUGLIA: If they do not, then we are all working off of the April 3rd submission as being the final plan.

MS. PRUITT: And if they do, then they should submit it also to the office here so that we can get it to the Board Members so everybody has the same amount of time.

MS. HEUER: But that's not our deadline.

MS. PRUITT: The ANC's deadline would be for your report to the Board?

MS. HEUER: Yes.

MS. PRUITT: May 3rd.

MS. HEUER: That's what I wanted to clarify, May 3rd.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Are we all on the same page and everyone has their marching orders? Okay, all right.

Let's move to persons in support of the application. How many persons here are in support of the application who wish to testify? Can I see a show of hands.

Okay, okay. All right. Let's set some ground rules. Come up in panels, five at a time and we would just ask that, we're going to allow three minutes apiece. Hopefully, you may not even need three minutes, but remember now the Board has received a voluminous amount of material, both in opposition and in support of so state whatever you want to state quickly. Please do not be repetitive or redundant. If somebody has already said what you wish to convey, then just simply ditto that or simply say that my full support, or whatever, so we can kind of move this along. We want to give everyone an opportunity, but at the same time we don't want to be here until midnight. Come up please, five at a time, the first five. Any five?

MS. BAYLISS: My name is Mary Bayliss and I live out that way. A number of us who are in full support, are in full support for a number of reasons, both we don't accept the dire statements about traffic and we believe that the school would be good for the community. How do you want us to handle that?

Do you want us to talk about the traffic or wait until next time?

CHAIRPERSON REED: Well, I think that all things

considered and this is just my own personal view and I don't know how the other Board Members feel, by virtue of the fact that you are speaking in support of the application I think that it's implicit that you are not opposed to the traffic issue, the traffic problem, so I don't think that you really need to speak to the traffic problem, unless, specifically you wanted to and if that is the case, then you should come back at the next hearing and then speak to the traffic issue. But if you can, if you are able to accomplish what you need to accomplish here today, then I think that the Board Members will basically assume that if, in fact, you don't show up for the next one that you didn't have a problem with the traffic. I hope that makes sense. This is a little unusual.

I see, in other words, you're saying either/or, you have the option of testifying today without going into any traffic issues or saying that you are not opposed to the traffic, or you can come back and testify at the next hearing at which time you can bring in anything you want to say about traffic, so it's up to you. It's your choice. Either/or. Option of speaking today without any discussion about traffic or if they choose to talk about traffic, then they would have to testify at the hearing that is specifically set up for the traffic aspect.

MS. SEESTEDT: My name is Sandy Seestedt. I'm a current Field School neighbor and I was wondering can you address the current traffic situation at the current location?

CHAIRPERSON REED: No. In these particular proceedings the site that we're considering today is the one that is presented, that is before us and as such we cannot consider any other site, any other location that the applicant may own or may occupy or may have because that is not germane to the impact at this particular site or the issues that are site specific for this particular application. We can't go into any other sites or any other locations that the applicant may be affiliated with.

Who wants to start?

MS. BULLOCK: My name is Alice Gresham Bullock. I am a resident at 6127 Utah Avenue, N.W., Washington. I'm the Dean of Howard University School of Law. I appear here today in support of this application as a parent at the Field School who has been quite satisfied, not only with the education that it's providing at that site, but as well to indicate to you that commitments made by this institution to this Commission or to the neighbors I have some degree of confidence that those commitments would be fulfilled. Having gone through this experience in doing construction on my own campus, I recognize that neighbors concerned to some extent, at least one of those concerns centers around whether what an institution tells you today in order to get the permit to do what they wish to do will be fulfilled after you have allowed them to make that move. My experience in dealing with this administration and this school is that commitments made are commitments kept. I have seen zero tolerance policy for

students not adhering to the rules at the school. I think that's very significant when it comes to your being able to and the neighbors being able to rely on their commitment that efforts will be made to keep people off the playing fields, that they would make efforts to have the students follow the rules. Again, my experience has been commitments made will be commitments kept.

I have no indication that the head of school will change. I have no indication that the Board will be much different than is the case usually with the self-perpetuating Board. As a result, I am confident as a parent that the philosophy that drives this institution will drive it whether it's on Wyoming Avenue or Foxhall Road, whether they have 225 students or 300 students and for that reason I've spent the better part of the afternoon to say this in support of this institution and relocating and doing what it proposes to do over on Foxhall Road. It will be an enhancement to what we already know is a very good neighborhood, but I think the Field School can make it an even better neighborhood.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Thank you, Ms. Bullock.

MR. EDWARDS: My name is Ricardo Edwards. I'm a father of four children, all of whom have been educated in Washington. As such I've experienced public schools, parochial schools as well as private schools. My 15-year-old boy is presently a 9th grader at Field and I would like to share my

overall impression. Field students appear quite unique in my opinion. The student body reflects an attitude of love and respect for each other, as well as the greater community, one perpetuated by the directoress and carried through by the staff. Field's commitment to diversity is authentic and its effects are visible to anyone who visits the campus. I remember my first visit to the school. I was impressed mainly by the relaxed, informal nature of the environment. Students almost appear to be at home and the interactions that I observed were only comparable to my son's elementary school experience at Capitol Hill Day School, another small establishment whose philosophy incorporated very small teacher to student ratios as its optimum learning mode.

I want to impress everyone here with the idea that Field School will positively affect its surrounding community and provide desirable influences to all who will be affected.

My experience with Mrs. Ely assures me that any and all concerns that may arise resultant of the school's presence would be effectively addressed.

It must be obvious to all present that she spearheads a sensitivity to the community that has been expressed continually throughout this application procedure and I offer that her sensitivity is not political. Field's proposed use of this property will be an asset to the community and I am confident that the very real concerns that have been repeatedly voiced here will be satisfactorily settled.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Thank you very much.

MEMBER RENSHAW: Mr. Edwards, what is your address, please?

MR. EDWARDS: I'm sorry. I live at 1534 Otis Street, N.E., Washington.

MEMBER RENSHAW: Thank you.

MR. SHINBERG: Good afternoon, my name is Milton Shinberg. In addition to being a Field parent, I'm a lifelong resident of the District who cares -- yes, 2949 Upton Street, N.W.

I'm a lifelong resident of the District who cares about its future just like everyone else in this room. I'm also an architect who has worked on behalf of many community groups on zoning and neighborhood issues. That's the context of my thoughts and I hope you'll find this perspective of some use to you.

With all the schools coming before the BZA you'll have tough decisions and I deeply hope that my home town won't end up sending a message that private schools can't evolve in the District or that the city and its citizens can't handle any stress for worthy goals. That attitude could send these and future applicants away from our city. While some might applaud that for a time, we would diminish ourselves. If we really value education which we say we do, we would have to work hard to find solutions when solutions are possible to put all the issues in their unique context, the issues of each school, each neighborhood and of the city overall.

BZA was created to deal with context. The context of Field's application reflects the fact that it doesn't exist in a vacuum, that it has an impact on its current neighbors and it will have an impact no matter how that future develops. If we look at the broad context, the real question isn't its total impact, but the change in its impact in relocating to Foxhall.

I think a narrow and a broad reading of context will show that it's a positive change.

Washington is not a blank slate and it's not static. And I don't think anyone can argue that the status quo at Cafritz is good or sustainable. I think no one can argue that it's appropriate to use the Cafritz mansion as a huge shed for a lawn mower which it currently is. The only that produces zero stress is an empty site.

As to the real stress in the proposal I would urge to you that you wrap that reality around another reality which is the quality and substance of the applicant. Field's purpose isn't trivial, as you've heard. So there should be a motivation to solve the problems that are inherent in its vitality. Those are also part of the context before you. Our city, as well as the school should share in that motivation.

The neighbors who are relocating or expanding schools generally have nothing to gain other than some amount of stress, so their opposition is generally assured. The site is the client too. Denying this application would be a serious lost

opportunity for joining a good site to a good use in ways that are physically superior to the present use. It leaves one of the great remaining open green spaces of the city undivided. It respects the unique Cafritz mansion. It uses landscape and topography with skill to help modulate both the site and the buildings.

The real problems that are created for the immediate neighbors must be addressed and the test here is whether you agree that Field has done that sufficiently. Not everything is possible. The solution must be appropriate, not perfect.

The city's interests, its character and its families are served by helping existing private schools, but only when the schools proposals balance their interest with the burdens they may create for close neighbors.

I heard Mayor Williams speak of Martin Luther King Day. He said if he believed Dr. King were alive today he would make education his highest priority knowing that everything else from political to economic self- determination would flow from it. But priorities have costs. Our duty is to find good solutions that enable all our children to succeed. I believe this school has found not just a fit, but a splendid, enlivening place to forward that mission with your help and support.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Thank you very much.

MR. PETERSON: My name is Michael Peterson and I'm

the Dean of Faculty at the Field School where I've worked for 19 years. I live at 11705 Judson Road in Wheaton, Maryland.

Since 1972, the Field School has provided a quality, middle and high school education to a thousand children in the D.C. area. This thousand has, in turn, touched the lives of thousands more as they've gone off to colleges, other countries and in many cases returned to this area to take up careers in business, law, finance, the arts and politics.

But it is not their ultimate professional success that we emphasize in our teaching, rather it is the inner student we seek to educate, helping him or her identify interests and talents and inculcating respect and care for others and nurturing responsible, independent thinking citizens.

At Field we try to educate the student not simply transfer information from the teacher and the textbooks. We do this through dialogue, conversation and mutual understanding between teacher and student. As such, we nurture the growth of students over a period of years. Our curriculum which selects the best works and topics from the classical tradition and mingles these with modern writers and topics builds strong character in the sense of deep responsibility and connectedness to others.

Our students are unique, thoughtful and deeply responsible. Each February, students go into the wider D.C. community to volunteer for service, support museums, learn about the professional world. Inevitably, they come to understand the

exciting world of the city. And year after year we hear the wonderful remarks from employers and supervisors of these students in their work internship program: maturity, responsibility and dedication are the words that are most commonly used to describe them.

We cherish the civil nature of our students. But our current facilities make it nearly impossible to teach these virtues to the community as a whole because we don't have enough space for the entire school to assemble regularly and easily. The sense of togetherness and shared experience that is fostered by hearing Elizabeth Ely reflect on her five decades as an educator, the positive feelings of experiencing the same string quartet performance or hearing a student present her science fair project can't be captured in any series of smaller group meetings. By the same token, the outstanding achievements of our athletes and track, basketball or soccer, cannot now be shared on a home field. All our games are away from campus and we don't have a local facility to adopt as our own. This limits the possibility of athletes after their training and commitment getting the feeling of support they would from a home field.

Please examine the evidence presented to you today with great care. You have the chance by approving our zoning proposal to improve the lives of thousands of students and their families for years to come. You have the chance to build a stronger future for the District of Columbia.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Thank you.

MR. HABEEB: Hi, my name is Joseph Habeeb. I live at 627 Conestoga Boulevard in Lancaster, Pennsylvania and I drove down today to be here. I'm an alumnus of the Field School and very proud to be here in support of the Field School moving to the Foxhall Road location. I'm also proud that I was one of the first students to go the Field School for a full six years from grade 7 through 12. I graduated in 1978. These are very formative years for people where you grow and you change and you learn who you are and who you will become. It provides a cornerstone for where you will go in the future.

For myself I was able to continue and receive my doctoral degree in physics from MIT, consequently, due to what I learned at the Field School. I remember well the old days, 28 years ago, when we were in the Wonder Building on Connecticut Avenue, occupying some office space above a deli and a bookstore. But the school grew because it changed and we moved to Wyoming Avenue and there was some opposition, but eventually the neighbors realized the school was a very, very good thing.

Now there's more growth and more change and the school once needs to expand and move to a new location and they have found a perfect location on the Foxhall Road site. Of course, there will be some problems within the community, but there's always room for compromise in a situation like this.

I believe that if someone moved in a community and

they were to plant a garden, all the neighbors would be glad for the garden because you can come and you can see the garden, you can see the flowers grow and you can see the wonder of nature and be inspired. Well a school is the greatest garden you could ever have because this is the garden where children grow. You can have no greater garden.

I think anyone completely opposed to the school must have forgotten what it's like to be young because it's special. I suggest you open your hearts, you open your minds and you find room for compromise to allow the Field School to move into the Foxhall Road location. Change can be embraced. It is a good thing. It is a positive thing for the community. It's an opportunity for this community to grow and make this city proud of what they've done.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Thank you.

(Applause.)

CHAIRPERSON REED: Let me just say this. We cannot allow disruptions in this particular hearing room, understandably so and while we can appreciate our presentations, some of them are very good and we take note of that, please do not cause any disruption with applause or laughing or whatever so that we can kind of keep moving through.

Thank you.

MS. LEONARD: My name is Clair Leonard, I live at

2850 Arizona Terrace, N.W., D.C. I've lived at that address all my life. It's about three quarters of a mile from the Cafritz estate. I attended St. Patrick's School which is very near the Cafritz estate. I'm now a senior at the Field School and I'd like to speak to you today as both a resident of the area and a student of the Field School.

I really support the school's application to move to the Cafritz estate for several reasons. First, ever since I was a child I've been going past the Cafritz estate on Foxhall Road in a car, walking, running and it's sort -- it's a local landmark to me and I believe to others in the area. I don't believe that any other proposal would involve preserving the Cafritz mansion and attempting to preserve the character of the estate as it is now. I've observed in the last few years that there's been a lot of growth and development in the Foxhall area around MacArthur Boulevard and it's mostly consisted of high density housing, like the Foxhall Crescents which are almost townhomes and I believe that the Field School would make the best use of this really beautiful property.

I also believe there are no high schools in the neighborhood whatsoever. The nearest high school is Wilson High School in Tenley Town which is about two miles away. When I attended St. Patrick's as an elementary school student I would have been overjoyed to have a middle or high school in the immediate neighborhood to move on to and I believe that having a

high school, especially one with the character and quality of caring that the Field School has would enhance the desirability of the neighborhood.

Another thing I've observed in my time at Field is that Field students and administration and the whole school is just infinitely adaptable. The school did start out as a space on the second floor on Connecticut Avenue in a building and now we're in two houses on Wyoming Avenue. Field makes due with what it has and the school has -- it's just incredibly adaptable. I can't even explain some of the things that we've done and I would really support this application.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Thank you.

MR. JOHNSON: My name is Dale Johnson and I live at 5901 31st Place, N.W. I'm grateful for the opportunity to speak, Madam Chair.

Ten years ago Friday I visited Washington to interview for a job at the Field School. The following August I moved my belongings from suburban Minneapolis to the District to start my first job out of college teaching and coaching at Field. Over ten years I have taught and coached hundreds of students, most of them residents of the District. I've gained experience as the school's technology coordinator and I'm now the business manager. Three years ago, my wife and I were married. She was and is a teacher at the Field School. Two years ago we bought our

first house here in the District and one year ago, April 8th, we were blessed with the birth of a son at Sibley Hospital. My wife and I are thrilled to have a native Washingtonian in our household.

I wish to point out that in addition to the students that serve so well, the Field School has provided my wife and I with meaningful, fulfilling work and has given my family a wonderful start. We are proud to live and work in the District. This is our community. This is our home and with your approval of the Field School move to Foxhall, this is our future.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Thank you.

MR. VAN DORN: I'm Charles Van Dorn, which is two houses from Foxhall Road, so I am in Wesley Heights and am very close to Foxhall Road. I fully support this application. I'm very familiar with the school and its history and I'm a great admirer of it. It's a first class institution and I'm particularly an admirer of its head and found, Mr. Elizabeth Ely who can be counted on to always keep her promises who is a great manager and who will work with the neighbors to make the school as presentable as she can and responsive to their needs. Basically, my faith in their carrying out their part of the bargain is very, very strong and I highly commend it. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Thank you.

MR. DOHERTY: Hello, my name is Martin Doherty and

I have lived in the District over 21 years this June at the corner of Van Ness and 47th Street in Northwest. I'm a teacher of art, drawing, painting and printmaking and I've been at the Field School for 13 years.

I've come today to speak very strongly in support of this application. For over 28 years, Field has operated and it's been dedicated to laying a strong educational foundation for all secondary students and I have three points to make. The first would be with junior high, our seventh graders every year work particularly on Washington, D.C. analyzing its neighborhoods, its political institutions and its cultural treasures. Our work internship program which has been mentioned where all of our students for two weeks have jobs, relying on the Washington, D.C. community to give them employment and I feel like D.C. is a crucial element to the history of this school and the idea of moving to Foxhall and remaining in the District is crucial and also, I had one last moment is that as someone who's a little tall, 6 foot 11, the school that I've been in is a little small and the new location would be an ideal location not only for me to have more room, but for the growing number of students applying and the slow increase of students enrolled, we would have the space to really thrive and let the students bloom.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Thank you. As these panelists are leaving, please come up so that we can kind of keep things

flowing.

MS. LEE: I'm Jean Lynn Lee and I'm at 2127 California Street, back doors with the Field School and I'm quite familiar with zoning because for several terms I was chairman for our ID, 1D Sheraton Kalorama. We were here I'd say probably 160 times.

Madam Chairman, the purpose of this letter is to express my strong support for the application of Field School to establish a private school at the former Cafritz estate located along Foxhall Road in Northwest. I believe that the development plan proposed by the Field School will create no objectionable conditions to the surrounding community and will not create any detrimental impact on the immediate community on the site.

Since I am a current neighbor of the Field School and for quite a few years I was on Massachusetts Avenue, 2207, Embassy Row. I know the neighborhood and love it.

Field is a wonderful school and we have had very cordial relations. I know they will do everything possible to work out any potential problems that could arise in their location. They are a great asset to our community.

The District of Columbia government should do everything possible. I notice we're all saying this, to encourage educational facilities of this calibre to remain within the District. I appreciate your attention and I hope you will approve the Field School application and I wish to goodness as a former

teacher that many of the students could be listening in and could be participating because this is an experience in government that is right on their front door and back door and they would learn unbelievable amounts. I think some would even begin to see possible careers.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Thank you very much.

MR. AUCHMANIK: My name is Jed Auchmanik. I live at 513 Constitution Avenue, N.E. I'm a junior at the Field School and I've been going there for three years. The Field School is the best school that I have ever attended. It is a school which fosters and is founded on individuality and I believe that Field will retain this individuality even in a new location. At the Foxhall location, Field will gain the much needed facilities which are unattainable at its present location, better science labs, a gym and playing fields of our will at last become a reality.

With these facilities, Field will be far from isolated. It will still remain part of D.C. Through the work internship program, the school will continue to be in touch with the community and all that D.C. has to offer, the museums and the parks, etcetera will still be available to the Field community. Field will continue to participate with the area in a positive way.

I see Field growing in size as a positive thing as well. With a maximum of 320 students the school will still retain

its personal feeling while allowing for a few more classmates.

Overall, the move has full potential to be a positive experience for the Field School and the surrounding area. Should the school not move to the Cafritz estate, what guarantee do we have that it will not remain unoccupied or as yet be sold to a developer who will build homes and create an even greater traffic problem.

Foxhall is good for Field and Field has the possibility to be good for Foxhall.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Thank you for your testimony. You did a very good job.

MS. CHECKOV: Good afternoon, Madam Chair and Members of the Board. I am grateful to be able to speak in support of the Field School application. My name is Lorena Checkov. I'm a resident at 3909 North Hampton Street, N.W. I have lived in the District for the past 30 years. I speak as a parent of an alum who attended Field School for five years, five years ago and I also speak as an architect of the District of Columbia who actually has had first time experience on a business level dealing with the Field School in its current location where I assisted them in two renovations. So I have had a chance to deal with the integrity of Mrs. Ely's and the school's business dealings. And I'm very aware of the tight environment that they're presented with and how frustrated they are in terms of

providing the quality education that they still do provide.

I want to say a few words about how grateful I am as a parent to have had my son attend the Field School and how impressed we both are with the quality of the education, the commitment, the philosophy of diversity and I'll quote my son the first semester that he was at Field, how impressed he was about how every student was made to feel special and the idea of being able to develop a human being in that crucial stage of their lives where they can really feel that they can develop into a member of society where they can actually contribute is to be highly commended.

I don't see any reason why the application should not be approved. I can see very well that the school has made every attempt to comply with the requirements of the neighborhood and as an architect I don't see any better adaptive re-use of a piece of property that is standing vacant right now.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Thank you.

MR. COOPER: Madam Chairwoman and Members of the Board, I am George Cooper. I live at 3420 Ligation Street, N.W. and I come to speak in favor of the Field School petition. For two years in the

mid-1960s I lived at 2425 Foxhall Road which is just three doors up from the Cafritz property. I still travel that road frequently and shop in the area so I am somewhat familiar with the problems

and the property.

My wife and I have been residents, employees and taxpayers in the District for over 38 years. We do understand that this Board and other District governmental bodies have a difficult task in balancing the citizen concerns and needs with those of governmental, institutional and business requirements. But through the years we have been pleased to observe in our area that decisions regarding schools and the educating of our children have been given a very high level of importance and to the best of our knowledge this favorable emphasis has always benefitted the city at large and seems to result in a long-term enhancement of the impacted neighborhoods. We believe that those same results would happen in the Field School case.

Our relationship with Field began when our youngest daughter entered as a 7th grader in 1987 and continues today while my wife works in the administration office of the school and in our involvement in activities as parents of a Field graduate.

In brief, here are our observations over these 13 years about the school. The school has been managed expertly in all facets, including financial, administrative and academic personnel, maintenance and use of facilities and in its relationship with its neighbors. In short, if someone is going to have a new neighbor they couldn't pick a better organization to fulfill expectations in developing and maintaining strong relationships and upholding their promises.

Field has a superb reputation as an outstanding academic institution. Many of its alumni have attended the top colleges and universities in America. But at this point in its life Field needs larger and better facilities to continue to progress as it must.

It would be a significant loss to the District if the school has to locate in another jurisdiction. You will hear more or have heard already about the traffic issues involved and how they will be managed, but I want to offer one additional point. At Cafritz, Field's athletic events would be held on the premises, thereby reducing the current safety concerns that are due to required travel for the athletic teams because they must now have to play at distant places.

Cafritz property has stood fallow for several years. That isn't the most effective use of a valuable resource. If Field is not allowed to occupy, how many more years will the place be vacant. If not the Field School, then what? Will it indeed be a higher occupancy complex? Field has promised it will keep much of the land open, landscape it beautifully and maintain it in a manner appropriate to that upscale area and I would think that current residents there would welcome that prospect.

For these and many more reasons I support the Field School request to occupy the Cafritz property and I thank you for allowing me to make my remarks today.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Thank you.

MR. HALL: Good afternoon to the Chair and to Members of the Board of Zoning Adjustment. My name is R. David Hall and I reside at 1315 Q Street, N.W. in Washington. I'm here today with my wife Dale Waldonhall and my son, David, Jr., who is an 8th grader at the Field School. I'm here to testify in support of the application of the Field School for the use of the Cafritz property as the new location for the main campus of the school.

As a former school principal and former President of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, I believe that I have had an opportunity to view school related issues from both the public and the private perspective. The Field School is a very unique college preparatory school with the philosophy of student development that radiates the positive values of its founder and educational leader, Mrs. Elizabeth Ely. The small class sizes, superior staff, close integration of academic preparation, literature, art, music and sports have all become part of an educational gem which is know as the Field School.

The student body is made up of young people who are becoming the responsible adults of our community. I cannot even imagine any student at the Field School being disrespectful to a parent, a teacher or a member of the community. Anyone who has been to a science fair, a parent meeting or simply watched the character of these students at work or at play would be impressed with the educational community that has been created.

The school is now located on Wyoming Avenue, N.W.

where there are embassies, one hotel and yes, even Councilwoman Carol Schwartz lives in the 2000 block of Connecticut Avenue. And yesterday I called her office and the office of every other council member to ask this question, have you ever had even one complaint of any kind concerning the Field School. The answer is and the answer will always be no.

There have been absolutely no complaints. In fact, Field has been a good neighbor on Wyoming Avenue and will be a very good neighbor on Foxhall Road.

This application is supported by honest and earnest attempts to eliminate the fears and the apprehensions which are sometimes conjured up by those who oppose the application. However, the facts are clear, there are only 211 students enrolled in the Field School; 24 7th graders, 26th 8th graders, 46 9th graders, 33 10th graders, 45 11th graders and 37 12th grade seniors. You could even hold the senior prom in a room 20 by 30. It is a human characteristic for people to be afraid of the unknown, however, in this case their fears have no basis in fact. Clear evidence exists that this proposal is not a disruptive use of the property, but rather a constructive one.

Finally, I submit that our city is a mixture of cultures and traditions. It is an international place, a world capital, not a provincial village. In this, the nation's capital, there is a place for this school with its small student body and excellent staff and it should be at the Cafritz mansion on Foxhall

Road in Washington, D.C.

I respectfully ask that this body consider the facts, not the fears and approve this application.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Thank you very much, Mr. Hall. Let's see how many more people are yet to testify in support? There is still enough space for at least one more person. You two are coming up and two more. Now after this panel there is a show of hands again, one more panel? Is this it? One more panel after this panel, right?

Thank you.

MS. SEESTEDT: My name is Sandy Seestedt, I live at 1852 Biltmore Street, N.W. and I've lived on Biltmore Street for 20 years. The Field School has been fabulous neighbors and it's an honor and a privilege for me to have two of my four children attend there.

CHAIRPERSON REED: You've been the best one so far. That was 10 seconds. Thank you.

MR. SANDERS: My name is Maurice Sanders. I live at 5622 Sherrier Place. I've lived there for about 20 years. It's about -- it's less than a mile from Cafritz mansion. I was an officer in the Palisades Citizens Association for many years and at our Palisades Citizens Association meeting, Alice Stewart is one of our neighbors and a former teacher speak of the positive impact of these schools on our total economy in D.C. and our Alice

has a cousin Alice, Alice Rivlin, who is Vice Chairman of the Federal Reserve and at a dinner meeting with her she said that one of her concerns is that these major companies are moving further and further out of D.C. for a funny reason, I thought, and that was -- she said they can't find high school graduate kids that can work in the mailroom which is where a lot of people start. The kids don't have the work habits. They don't have what it takes and that it's the schools that produce the product these companies need and that they are moving out in an expanding circle, first to the suburbs and now they're moving out further, but they're still looking for the same thing. We need schools in the Palisades that can help every kid thrive. I know we have a lot of choices and we had our kids at the schools of the Cathedral for 8 years and then it became obvious that Cathedral School was not the right school for one of our daughters and I had a momentary reaction that other parents have that look, this school is so darn hard to get into, you're going to stay in there even if it -- well, it didn't go that far. We started looking for other schools and we found that the Field School was the best match for her and my daughter has entered in the Field School in the 7th grade and after she had been there for about 9 months she said something that was important because at the Cathedral School she was withdrawn and sad and an overworked kid. After she had been at Field for about 9 or 10 months, she said this is the best year of my life. And about a year later, she said no, I think this is the

best year of my life. And that's what any parent would want for their child and I wish I could get that for every kid.

I know there are a lot of zoning issues and having been in the citizens association for at least 10 of the -- an officer for at least 10 of the last 20 years and a member for 20 years, I know that these things can be worked out.

I just want the Board to be open about the possibility of moving Field School.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Thank you.

MS. PHILLIPS: My name is Molly Phillips. I live at 6117 32nd Street, N.W. I am an 8th grader at the Field School and while I love the current location of our school and will be sad to leave it, I know how inadequate the space has become. It's really cool, but it's old and crowded and has no land of its own for sports.

The school has been really resourceful at providing us with a fabulous education with great studio and performing arts and a strong sports program, using facilities around the city and the small space that we have. But it will be nice for us to be able to do plays for an audience of more than 50 people and to not have to take a bus to a field for our soccer practices.

The Field School has really great and respectful kids, fabulous teachers and the best administration around. The neighborhood that Field is now in is mainly beautiful old townhouses, apartments and embassies. Some of the neighbors hire

Field students to do things like walking their dogs. I know of a student who started out walking a neighbor's dog and now babysits for their son as well. The Field kids know how important it is to be good neighbors and good citizens and would be really good neighbors to the Foxhall community as well.

One of the things that is so special about the Field School is how well the teachers and administration listen to the concerns that we have and respond to them. They take our feelings very seriously. All of us at Field have watched the same type of treatment directed towards the neighbors on Foxhall Road and the concerns that they have.

Mrs. Ely and everyone at Field want to make sure that we have a good relationship with our new neighbors and we will all work very hard to make sure that that is the case.

I know that the Foxhall neighbors are worried about traffic that our school will bring. I've taken public transportation the whole time I've bene at Field and so do almost all of my friends. I love seeing all of the kids on my bus in the morning and plan to take the shuttle bus that the school will provide from Tenley Town Metro stop to get to the Foxhall campus.

I'll close by saying that I love living and going to school in Washington, D.C. and I'm glad that Field wants to say in Washington. While the new campus will feel very different from the old one, it will give us the classroom space and other facilities that a quality school like Field needs and that the two

houses that we're in now can't provide.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Thank you for a very good presentation.

MS. SEABROOKS: My name is Carol Seabrooks and I live at 1519 Underwood Street in Washington, D.C. and I am a parent of an 11th grade student at the Field School. The Field School I also call like a field of dreams, it's a place to shape your dreams.

Let me tell you about this school. This is a school that values the student, the individual, it values talents, character, achievement. It's a place that believes in integrity, honesty, respect for one's self and respect for others. Decency, dignity, responsibility and fairness. Old fashioned values. It believes in providing an education to the whole person, a place that challenges and nurtures. It makes and molds children into young adults and into future citizens.

As Mrs. Ely, the director has stated, an education at Field means both an informal and reflective approach to life, relationships and our environment. Moral and ethical values are taught by example and by thoughtful consideration of such issues in every discipline. This school practices what it preaches.

Why do I know these things? I know it because my daughter has attended for Field for the past five years. I've seen her evolve. I've seen her grow and flourish in ways that

even I, a loving parent, could not dream for her, much less imagine.

In addition to the academic pursuits that many schools offer, she has been exposed to a variety of real life experiences in working environments. She has learned what it means to be involved, to be cooperative, to be committed and responsible to the community. Needless to say, I love my child, but recognize that I love what Field has helped her become.

Education here is what it should be everywhere. Located in the District, Field students have easy access to the rich pool of resources, the government, the institutions, the museums, the libraries, the galleries and the area's university campuses, all of which enhance Field's academic curriculum.

The Field School is a high quality college prep school that wants to remain in the District of Columbia. For that reason, shouldn't D.C. support it and other institutions that want to remain here when others readily look to leave?

I urge the Board of Zoning to respond favorably to Field School's application with a resounding and unanimous yes. Indeed, as Mr. Shinberg said earlier, it will give you an opportunity to put a good site to a good use.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Thank you.

MR. MONACO: I'm David Monaco. I live at 9 E Street, S.E. in Washington, D.C. on Capitol Hill. I am a fourth generation Washingtonian. About 100 years ago, my great

grandfather came over from Italy and set up shop on Capitol Hill. My grandfather was born on Capitol Hill. My father was born in D.C. and lived on Capitol Hill and for 30 of my 32 years I have lived on Capitol Hill.

My two brothers, I am currently president of the Field School Alumni Association. I am a Member of the Board. I attended the Field School. My two brothers attended the Field School. I strongly support this application. I think Field is an outstanding institution and it would absolutely hurt me to the marrow of my bone to see the school have to consider even leaving the District.

Thank you.

MR. WINOGRAD: Madam Chair, all Members of the Board, my name is Jeffrey Winograd. I'm a resident at 421 1st Street, S.E. in the District where I have lived for 7 years. My son is a third year student at a major university in Massachusetts and I'm here to speak in behalf of the Field School. And what I'm going to say is a little bit different because I could talk about a lot of the arguments and I didn't recognize David, but I'm proud to say that I think my son as a soccer player for Field who had to go to West Potomac Park as a 7th grader and every place but a home field, I think my son may have challenged either David or one of his brothers for one of the soccer records at the Field School which my son says is his greatest accomplishment.

But here's where I'm going to be a little bit

different and I hope nobody misconstrues what I'm saying either on the Board or any of the people in opposition. I'm a graduate of Brooklyn College, City University of New York. When I graduated in 1965 I was commissioned as a Second Lieutenant in the U.S. Air Force, I spent four years of my life in the Air Force. When I first went on active duty to a place called Hurlbett Field, Florida in Fort Alton Beach, Florida, one of my first jobs as a junior officer in the security police squadron was to arrange for a picnic for the squadron and I went and I made the plans. And I came back and I spoke to my sergeant who was really my teacher and I said here it is, it's going to be great. And he said Lieutenant, what were you thinking? And where did I make the mistake? This was in the fall of 1965 or the spring of 1966. We couldn't have our squadron in that public park because it was still the Florida panhandle, it was 1966. So where I don't want anybody misconstrue what I'm saying, when I was coming over here I thought of that because I was left with the same feeling that I had back then that a group of Americans and a certain class were not welcome in a certain place and again it's only by comparison. I'm not saying please don't misconstrue. I don't compare the two. But I see a very small class of children who are students at the Field School, potential students at the Field School who seemingly are not wanted in a community because they're students. And only for that, so please don't misconstrue and I don't compare the relative importance of either, but it's a gut feeling

I have. And I'm a working reporter and when I came in my gut feeling as well says I know what the story is here. And no matter what happens there are going to be people in opposition and they don't want to compromise.

So where do you go? And I think basically the thing is simple. If the Field School in your considered judgment has done everything possible to meet every reasonable concern and the opponents still do not want to accommodate it, I think you have no choice but to say well, the Field School will hold them to these certain commitments, but we will not deny them the right to have their school here.

I also in my final conclusion just left with the feeling that when somebody who is known, I believe it's the Squire, and he owned a football team here, closed the public alley in the District of Columbia, I suspect there were a lot of people in opposition to the Field School who never wagged their finger and said this isn't right and it shouldn't be done. I thank you very much. I look forward to the opportunity of coming back on May 10th to talk about the traffic problems.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Thank you. Maybe you didn't understand when we first began this particular testimony. Those persons who want to speak about the traffic problems wouldn't speak today. They would speak on the next hearing date.

MR. WINOGRAD: Madam Chair, my understanding was as

long as we didn't speak to the traffic problems today we were welcome back the second time.

CHAIRPERSON REED: No, that was not it. It was people who want to speak about traffic in their testimony would speak on that next hearing date. So that being the case then can you submit to us in writing what your concerns are about the traffic?

MR. WINOGRAD: I absolutely can and I purposely disregarded a note I had made here and I will submit my concerns, but I will say without following this issue closely, but from what I heard in the last hour and it's like a journalist walking in to cover something, you're in for an hour and you're out. It is my understanding, at least what I thought I heard was that the Field School apparently has said it would contribute its money, money that it raises to make an improvement or a change on a public accommodation, a public street and if that is the case, that is an absolutely incredible thing.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Were you here this morning?

MR. WINOGRAD: No ma'am, I was working.

CHAIRPERSON REED: That's okay. Just to make sure that everyone understands, this is the last panel, right, there are no other people here in support? Okay. Those people who have testified today will not testify on the next hearing date.

Are there any persons here who are in support who will want to testify only on the next hearing date?

Okay. Then there are only three or four people? Make sure you give your name to staff before you leave because when we come back on next hearing date then those will be the only four people that will be allowed to testify because they opted to testify on the next hearing date, specifically as it pertains to traffic, but not exclusively. If you want to speak about the other aspects you may do that, but as far as the traffic is concerned that is the date that was set aside. I hope everyone understands that.

Yes, come forward. You have to speak into the mike.

MR. SANDERS: As it was announced that the traffic issues were being deferred to May, I'm aware of several people at least who left.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Oh, I see what you're saying.

MR. SANDERS: And therefore they could not raise their hand --

CHAIRPERSON REED: I see what you're saying. I'm glad that you raised that point because we did not say that before and I don't know how we can -- we can't really control it that much. Nonetheless, if they were here today and did not speak because they wanted to speak for the next hearing, they will be allowed to speak whether they're here now or not.

Okay. Thank you. But be sure to submit in writing your testimony in regard to the traffic portion. Thank you.

MS. NELICK: My name is Kathleen Nelick. At live at 2806 Arizona Avenue in the District and I've lived there for 22 years. I would like to express my support for the establishment of Field School on Foxhall Road. Field has put forth solid plans, but with design and the property management and the traffic management. The property design is exceptional. It maintains much of the feeling of the current property and includes large open spaces and significant landscaping. It provides an area for recreation and play in our neighborhood.

Many in the community have expressed concern over the issues of traffic and I believe that the plan coming forward will address those. Those of us who live here have chosen to live in the city and in a city environment along with that we get many of the advantages of living in the city, but also have some hurdles. Foregoing garbage pickup when it snows or having our streets well traveled are two notable examples. But that is the life in the city and in exchange we get so very much in terms of cultural, educational and economic opportunity. I urge you to approve the Field application.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Thank you.

MS. HOLLADAY: My name is Ann Holladay and I'm here not as a resident of the District but actually of Arlington, Virginia. I live at 3333 North Glebe Road in Arlington. However, I'm here as a parent to support the Field School application. I'm a parent of two sons of the Field School and I'm also an educate

who 11 years ago helped start a small private school in Virginia. So I feel a real kindred spirit with Elizabeth Ely as a pioneer to a unique educational experience.

I greatly admire her and have been so amazed at her ability to maintain this vision and philosophy which includes a very small student body population. Anyone who has played a part in starting an institution of any kind knows how difficult it is to maintain the vision. Elizabeth has managed to hire a large core faculty that have been at the school 15 years plus and intend to carry the school on with its unique vision after Elizabeth retires. It is highly unusual in this very transient area to keep a strong team in place. She has done a remarkable job and I am very confident that the philosophy and vision, including its small size, will continue on.

The highest compliment is from my son, Ryan, currently a senior at the Field School. A few months ago when discussing his future he said he'd like to go to college and then return to teach at Field School before attending graduate school. But then he added, well, maybe I'll go to graduate school first and then stay like so many of the teachers have, a supreme compliment.

The Field School has a wonderful, unique, educational philosophy and a very talented group to carry it on after that very sad day when Elizabeth Ely retires.

Thank you.

MS. FINNER: My name is Anna Finner. I live at 2805 35th Street, N.W., Washington. I am an 8th grader who has been attending the Field School for two years. Field is a wonderful school in almost every way, but there is one big problem at our current location and that's space. I feel that field students would really excel if we had more room for science labs, photo labs, art studios and athletic facilities. Some people have suggested that if Field wants more space it should move to the suburbs. But I think that if we want families with children to live in the District, we have to make it possible for good schools to exist in the District, besides being in an urban area is an essential part of what Field is.

In looking for a new campus location, we didn't even think to look outside of the city. All in all, I think that moving Field to the Cafritz property would do a world of good for the school and for the city. I know that there are things like traffic and property values that you have to think about as well, but I hope that you will also think about the needs of the young people in our city.

Thank you very much for your time.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Thank you for a very good presentation.

MR. LORRAIN: Good afternoon, my name is Christophe Lorrain and I'm an employee of the Field School. I am an 18 year employee. I'm a life-long D.C. resident. I was born here in

Washington, D.C., lived here my whole life. I wanted to speak to the Field School in the neighborhood, commit ourselves to the same kind of relations in the neighbors on the Foxhall Road. To give you an example, we had a complaint last week from a neighbor who called up. It was the second time she was complaining and she caught herself in mid-complaint because she said, I want to complain that your students are putting their trash in my trashcans and then she realized -- her complaint had to do with the fact that the trash company wouldn't take loose trash in the trashcans, but she caught herself halfway through the sentence and she realized that she's much better off having them put their trashcan than dropping it on the street. I think that's the kind of acceptance that we have in the neighborhood. People realize that we're there, but they accept us, they support us. They contact us when they have concerns and we respond very well.

We're also very much well accepted by the merchants in the community, the 7-11 store on Columbia Road, the Embassy Market on California Street, the Doyle Normandie Inn right next door to the Field School, Alliance Francaise on Wyoming Avenue and the many embassies. We are invisible to most of those institutions in all the best ways possible. While many stores around the city are loathe to have high school and middle school students come into their stores unsupervised, our students have been doing so for over 20 years with no problems.

We're accepted by the residents in the community

and we do everything we can to accommodate them in reasonable fashion. Our buses, for example, which are parked off-street are pulled onto the street for us to use only at 2 p.m. which means that they're only parked in front of the school for 25 minutes before our teams get on the bus and drive off to athletic events, so I think we do many things at our residence to be conscious and sensitive to the neighborhood. I believe we'll do the same when we move to Foxhall Road.

Our faculty parking is limited. We don't have parking for all our faculty and we basically faculty if we don't provide a spot for you you need to use public transportation, again very sensitive to the community, we don't want to block up people's streets with our faculty parking. So I think all these ways should indicate to you and to those people who currently oppose us that we are a school that believes in interacting with the community in positive ways and listening to their concerns and responding in a timely and appropriate manner.

And I thank you for your time.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Thank you very much.

MS. SENDER: My name is Michele Sender. I am a resident of the District. I live at 2801 29th Place, N.W., Washington. I live between a private school, Maret School and the Oyster School. I'm within a block and a half of each school. I don't believe that my location being between two schools has diminished the value of my property in the District one cent. It

probably has increased the value of my property.

You've heard, I think, sufficiently from the students of the school of the wonderful school. You heard from people about the responsibility of the school to its community. I'm a parent of two former students of the Field School and I support the move for the Field School to the Foxhall location where I know they will be a good neighbor.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Thank you.

MR. POTTER: Madam Chair, Members of the Board, since I'm batting cleanup, I just want to commend you all for the patience and durability of hearing us all. Thank you, it's great to see this local government board working.

My name is Orlando Potter. I am a 35-year resident of Wesley Heights. I'm speaking today in addition for my wife who is here today, Roseann Potter, a teacher and tutor. Our daughter Ann was a graduate of the Field School, Class of 1981 and I just want to echo every good thing that was said about Field School so far.

CHAIRPERSON REED: You need to give us your address.

MR. POTTER: 3110 45th Street, N.W., sorry. What I would add is perspective as a realtor which is my retirement career after government and I do a lot of activity in this area of northwest Washington and it seems to me that after hearing the plans for this school I would have no question but that the values

of this neighborhood would be supported, sustained, perhaps improved. And particularly because of the care with which the planning has proceeded to guarantee the continuance of green space. It seems to me it's going to do a great deal to maintain the values in the area. So I support it wholeheartedly. I urge you to accept it. I thank you.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Thank you very much.

I think that concludes the segment for persons in support, except for those persons who will be testifying at the next hearing, specifically with issues germane to or testimony that pertains to traffic, as well as whatever else they wanted to say. So now we come to the persons and parties in opposition, however, we need to do an assessment to determine, number one, the three attorneys who are here for the persons who have party status, Mr. Aguglia, Mr. Bolotin and Mr. Swendiman. Mr. Bolotin, I don't know, are you an attorney also?

MR. BOLOTIN: I'm sorry?

CHAIRPERSON REED: Are you an attorney?

MR. BOLOTIN: Yes, I happen to be one as well.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Okay. Typically, the opposition would have an hour to put on your case and that time can be divvied up however you wish to do that. And then we have individuals who would speak in opposition.

So let me just get an assessment, how many people here are her in opposition? Who want to speak in opposition?

Okay, so the assumption I guess is that some people left because they wanted to speak at the next hearing. That's what my understanding was as such. Then it will probably be best for us to adjourn at this time and to allow you to put on your case at the next hearing because I would assume that much of it has to do with traffic, parking and that whole aspect of the adverse impact.

Do other Board Members have any comments regarding -- I'm sorry?

MS. PRUITT: Madam Chair, I believe you had two people today who raised their hand in opposition. Is that correct?

MR. AGUGLIA: Parties in opposition.

MS. PRUITT: I'm just talking about individuals.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Only a couple of people raised their hand in opposition, unless --

MS. PRUITT: You're a party, sir? I'm sorry -- is there any individual here right now who is not represented by a party who is in opposition and would like to testify?

CHAIRPERSON REED: But --

MS. PRUITT: Then we're okay.

CHAIRPERSON REED: The people, most of the people who are with the opposition have concerns regarding parking and traffic and that new traffic plan.

MS. PRUITT: I understand. I just didn't want anyone who sat all day long who wanted to get their testimony in

today an opportunity.

CHAIRPERSON REED: I understand what you're saying and as such, anyone who is here who would like to testify in opposition in opposition who would like to testify without any mention of the traffic aspect of it can do so, but I don't think anyone wants to do that. I don't think anyone here wants to do that.

So we would then -- did you have something to say?

MEMBER RENSHAW: Madam Chair, there are two people I would like to invite to -- or have the staff invite to our next meeting and I'd like to have just a moment to discuss that with the Board.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Okay. All right, then we will now adjourn this particular segment of the hearing to be picked back up on the next hearing date at which time we will then hear the traffic report and the ANC report, Office of Planning report, the DWP report and cross examination of those particular persons and we will conclude with the opposition, not conclude -- the opposition will have an hour for their case and we will hear persons in opposition, will be given 3 minutes each, and conclude with closing remarks by the applicant.

Did I leave anything out? Okay, then Ms. Pruitt will reiterate for everyone here the time lines and the next hearing dates because there will not be any notice in that once we announce something at a hearing to continue, it's not put in the

D.C. Register. This will be the only notice you receive of the next hearing date.

MR. AGUGLIA: Madam Chair, I just want to make sure I understand correctly. When we come back on the 10th, the applicants will have 16 minutes and 22 seconds.

CHAIRPERSON REED: To conclude.

MR. AGUGLIA: To put on their traffic?

CHAIRPERSON REED: That's right.

MR. AGUGLIA: Whatever expert they have.

CHAIRPERSON REED: We said approximately 20 minutes. We're not going to like hold them to the --

MR. AGUGLIA: I understand.

CHAIRPERSON REED: But approximately and they understand that and they have agreed to do so.

MR. AGUGLIA: And I would hope that you would grant us the same if we ran over.

Then we would hear from the ANC. We would hear from Planning. And then we would have ours, we would have one hour in opposition to present all aspects of our case, correct?

CHAIRPERSON REED: Yes, three parties, so I suggest you all determine how you want to divvy that time up?

MR. AGUGLIA: Yes, we will.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Okay. Cross examination?

MR. AGUGLIA: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON REED: And persons in opposition?

Closing remarks by the applicants.

MR. AGUGLIA: Thank you.

MEMBER RENSHAW: Madam Chair, I would like to have the BZA invite two officials to our next meeting. Their names are on Exhibit N as in Nancy and Exhibit O of the material that we received today, the full report of the Office of Planning. One is Nola Joyce, the Senior Executive Director of the Office of Organizational Development for the Police Department and the other is James N. Short, Jr., Battalion Fire Chief for the Fire and EMS Department and I would like to have them at our meeting to ask questions and they would also be available to -- those who are in attendance for cross examination.

CHAIRPERSON REED: The purpose of that request, Ms. Renshaw is because the submission they gave us was inconclusive?

MEMBER RENSHAW: Inadequate.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Well, we can do that, I think. I think we can. But also what we can do is to pose questions to them in written format and ask them to respond to it in the event that date is not a date that is convenient for them because they're not here to kind of juggle their calendars, but if you have specific questions we can ask staff to pose those questions to them in writing and have them respond to it, if they aren't able to be here.

MEMBER RENSHAW: Perhaps staff could start by ascertaining whether or not these two individuals are available to

us and perhaps in their offices there are others who worked on this review and we could determine whether or not there is someone, a representative, but I think it would be good for our hearing to have these officials present or a representative thereof.

CHAIRPERSON REED: All right, any other comments of the Board Members? All right.

MR. RODEN: My name is Danath Roden. I live at 1403 Montague Street, N.W., as you were listing the process that we'll go through on May 10th, I didn't hear an indication that those of us who wish to testify in favor will have an opportunity. I just wanted to make sure that that's part of it.

CHAIRPERSON REED: I did say that. I said that at least -- I will say it again. Those persons who are here today or who were here today who did not testify and wish to testify in support, specifically in regard to traffic because everyone else spoke today in support that did not have or did not wish to speak about the traffic. So those persons who are here today who wish to speak, not today, but at the next hearing who are going to speak, say something about the traffic aspect of this will be given an opportunity to speak.

MS. RODEN: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON REED: I can imagine it is rather confusing. But hopefully we all understand. We're all on the same page unless there's some unreadiness or some uncertainty or

unpreparedness, then we can conclude.

Ms. Pruitt, can you just give us the time line and again the format?

MS. PRUITT: The hearing is continued to May 10th at 9:30. Parties in opposition and the ANC have, reports are due by May 3rd in reference to the revised traffic. OP will present its report at that time along with the Park Service in response to the new traffic concerns.

The applicant will provide a copy of their traffic, revised traffic by Monday, April 3rd, close of business. The applicant has until April 18th to make any revisions as a result of any meetings with the neighbors or parties. And to submit those revised plans to both the parties and the BZA for the hearing on May 10th.

And when we come back we will start with the applicant continuing their hearing, followed by cross examination, followed by parties in opposition, putting on their case. Those who are in support who did not testify today and those in opposition who did not testify and closing remarks.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Those in opposition who testified?

MS. PRUITT: Who did not testify.

CHAIRPERSON REED: No one in opposition testified.

MS. PRUITT: Correct, so they'll testify next hearing.

CHAIRPERSON REED: Okay. If for some reason you're still a little confused, then just check with staff and they will reiterate it for you, explain it to you, but primarily the applicant and the opposition understand what is expected of them. The other things are just a matter of those of you who just came down to testify as citizens, just know that you will be given an opportunity to do so if you haven't.

Okay? All right, that concludes today's hearing.

(Whereupon, at 4:45 p.m., the hearing was recessed to reconvene Wednesday May 10, 2000 at 9:30 a.m.)